

2003

Toolkit for Peacebuilding and Conflict Transformation in Nepal



*Cover Photo Credit
Leah Barker*

Kai Brand-Jacobsen

Produced for GTZ Nepal

Contents

1. Tools and Concepts.....	3
Conflict and Violence	3
‘Pre-Conflict’, ‘Post-Conflict/Pre-Violence, Post-Violence.....	4
After War/Violence.....	4
Violence Breeds Violence.....	5
The Conflict Triangle – ABC – Attitudes, Behavior, Contradictions.....	6
Empathy, Nonviolence, Creativity.....	8
Conflict Transformation.....	11
Conflict History, Violence History	12
The Violence Triangle – DSC – Direct, Structural, Cultural.....	13
War Culture/Peace Culture	16
Cycles/Spiral of Violence, Cycles/Spiral of Peace	21
Pre-War, War, Post-War	24
Cease-Fire	32
Peace Process	33
Positive Constructive/Negative Destructive	42
2. Working for Peace: Five Tasks	44
2. End the Violence (Cease Fire)	44
3. Address Root Causes/Contradictions (Peace Process)	45
5. Heal	47
(Rehabilitation, Rebuilding, Reconciliation + building new, positive relations)	47
Post-War: 5 Rs + Healing	48
+ 2 Rs: Reparations & Reintegration	50
Post-War: 6 Ds.....	51
3. Empowering Peace-Workers/Forces for Peace.....	55
Training Programmes.....	55
Qualities of a Peace-worker	57
Confianza, Cuello, Coyuntura.....	59
Cooperation, Coordination, Communication, Commitment, Courage	60
Working In and With Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs).....	61
Steps that can help to empower the NGO sector in Nepal:.....	64
Working in and with Villages and Local Communities.....	65
Village and Community Level Involvement.....	66
Identifying Actors/Forces for Peace at the Community Level	68
Trust, Confidence, and Legitimacy.....	68
Steps that can help to empower Villages and Local Communities in Nepal	69
Mapping a Conflict and Peacebuilding Strategies/Approaches.....	70

Toolkit for Peacebuilding and Conflict Transformation in Nepal

1. Tools and Concepts

Tools and Concepts is intended as a brief practical unit going into some of the basic concepts, tools, methods and approaches for peacebuilding, conflict transformation and post-war reconstruction, rehabilitation, reconciliation and healing. It is a useful foundation for the trainer, individual or organization working in peacebuilding and conflict transformation. As such, it serves as an introduction to the concepts and approaches which are then integrated into the 'Training Guide'.

Conflict and Violence

There is a distinction between 'conflict' and 'violence'. Conflict is something natural; everybody experiences conflicts, and every single day people may have many different conflicts, of varying levels of intensity, regardless of their caste, gender, nationality, age, culture, ideology or religion. Conflict is part of life; it's what happens when people feel there is an incompatibility between their goals, when needs are unmet, and when expectations are unfulfilled¹.

Violence, however, is ***one way of dealing with conflicts***, though there are many forms of violence. *Violence* happens when a conflict has been systematically mismanaged or neglected, and when violence is accepted and seen as a legitimate way of responding to conflicts within the society/culture. While violence may result in some possible outcomes to the conflict – *winning* or *beating* the other – it cannot transform the conflict constructively and often leads to an ever-worsening cycle of violence. Investment in weapons and development of institutions and training for violence/war takes away resources from empowering people and meeting basic needs, and, together with a *war culture* approach to conflict and a history of dealing with conflicts with violence, increases the likelihood of violence being used as a way of responding to/dealing with conflicts.

¹ Though with some creativity and training in conflict transformation, these incompatibilities may often be easily transformed.

From this, five tasks arise:

- How to deal with conflicts without the use of violence?
- How to transform conflicts creatively and constructively, transcending incompatibilities and contradictions?
- How to ensure that basic needs are met and the root causes of violence and war overcome?
- How to promote *peace cultures* and commitment to finding constructive approaches to transforming conflicts?
- How to develop *peace structures* and resources, institutions and capacities for overcoming violence and war?

'Pre-Conflict', 'Post-Conflict/Pre-Violence, Post-Violence

The terms 'pre-conflict' and 'post-conflict', while common, are incorrect and ill used. Before the outbreak of *direct violence*, there can always be found *structural* and *cultural violence*, already causing significant suffering and harm, often far more extensive and wide-spread than that brought about by war and direct violence. A focus only on direct violence while ignoring deep structures of violence and injustice may only lead to greater suffering in both the short and long runs. Contradictions, *the root causes of conflicts*, are there long before the first shot is fired or the first bomb goes off. Conflicts only break down into direct violence when they have been dealt with negatively. The same is true for after the war or after *direct violence* has stopped. While the fighting may have ended, the root causes and underlying dynamics – the *structures* and *cultures* of violence and the contradictions and incompatibilities which gave rise to the conflict – often remain. If left unaddressed, the ending of one war – if it fails to deal with the issues and causes which gave rise to the war in the first place – may become the beginning for another.

Therefore, rather than 'pre-conflict' and 'post-conflict', what we are speaking of is *pre-war* and *post-war*, with the possibility of significant *structural* and *cultural violence* both before and afterwards. What is needed: *conflict transformation* to overcome contradictions and incompatibilities, *peacebuilding* to overcome *direct, structural* and *cultural violence* and to strengthen a community's/country's resources for peace, and building *direct, structural* and *cultural peace*. These can take place, though in different forms, at all three stages: pre-, during, and post-war, at the local level, within communities, and at the national level, linking communities together.

After War/Violence

An even greater challenge. After violence has been used in a conflict, it is not only necessary to transform the original contradictions and incompatibilities that gave rise

to the conflict, but to *heal* from the trauma and suffering which the violence has inflicted, as well as to rebuild from the *physical, social, economic, cultural* and even *spiritual* (this can also be seen as emotional/psychological) destruction brought about by the violence. Also, *violence* is likely to create new contradictions and new incompatibilities as the fighting sides and those affected by the war get caught up in an escalating *cycle* or *spiral of violence*. These new contradictions and incompatibilities, which may have little to do with why the violence started in the first place, must also be addressed to transform the conflict constructively and heal from the effects of the violence on individuals and the community. At the same time, if the violence is prolonged, the regular life of the community/country, or what might be called the *peace time economy*, is increasingly disturbed and affected. People are unable to go into the woods to get firewood. Younger people are forced to go abroad. People are unable to properly work their fields or transport their goods to and from local markets. Gradually, a *war economy* is developing in which, increasingly, individuals and groups benefit from the war and its prolongation. How to deal with those who have taken up arms on all sides, with those who are living by violence, with reconciliation between combatants and non-combatants, those who are using violence and those who have been affected by it, and with those whose identity and even their source of income may be based upon the 'armed struggle' and on war, are additional challenges that must be addressed in a war and post-war situation.

Violence Breeds Violence...

Violence breeds violence. This is almost a mathematical equation of violent conflicts. If one side uses violence against another, it is more likely that the 'other' will use violence against them. If you hurt or cause suffering to me or to my community, I may be more likely to want to hurt or cause suffering to you and your community. With each act of violence the cycle and scale of violence, revenge, killing, and torture escalates. What may not have been acceptable before ('pre-violence') now becomes 'acceptable', part of the violence/war, with the return to violence threatening to further intensify. This continues to escalate, with more and more people being drawn in and more and more people affected, with increasing suffering, devastation, pain and trauma on all sides, with, as Gandhi said, "An eye for an eye leaving the whole world blind".

What is necessary: active mobilization and ***training in non-violence*** as a force both for preventing/stopping violence and for overcoming, transcending injustices and structures of violence, ***creativity*** in transforming the contradictions and incompatibilities which lie at the root of the conflict, concrete skills and tools for transforming conflicts constructively, and ***empathy*** with the 'other', seeing common

bonds, common experiences, shared ties, and recognizing that there may be some validity/legitimacy in their goals, just as there is some validity/legitimacy in your goals. Important for transcending violence: to identify solving the contradictions and the root causes that gave rise to the conflict and overcoming/transcending the violence as the *common challenge* or *common goal*, something which unites the parties, rather than seeing each other as the 'enemy', driving each other apart, driving each other towards violence and the 'defeat', 'extermination' of the 'other'.

The Conflict Triangle – ABC – Attitudes, Behavior, Contradictions²

There are at least three aspects to any conflict – the three corners of the conflict triangle. Conflicts may start, and escalate, at any point of the triangle. To fully transform a conflict, all three points must be addressed – constructively! If any point of the triangle is left unaddressed, it can be a source of future conflicts and violence.

The three points of the triangle: Attitudes, Behavior, Contradictions – ABC, with 'B' – behavior – the 'visible' part of the conflict. You can see how people, groups, actors act, *behave*, more easily than you can see their attitudes and the contradictions underlying the conflict. Increased awareness and understanding of conflict and the conflict triangle makes all three points visible, as well as what can be done to transform them³.

What is important to note: there is not only one ABC for a conflict, but many. The ABC for one actor may be different than the ABC for another. There are ABCs for those using violence, just as there are ABCs for those affected by violence. What are the ABCs for villagers, NGO workers, women, students, youth, journalists, foreign governments and diplomats, combatants, those who have been affected by the conflict, widows, orphans, journalists, politicians, international development and aid organizations, local authorities, political cadres, and others? It can be useful to do individual ABCs for/with each actor/party to a conflict (particularly if you are going to be working with or addressing the conflict with that party or parties), going more deeply and more systematically into a conflict mapping, whether at the local, community level, an inter-personal or inter-community conflict, and/or at the

² Development of the Conflict Triangle, Violence Triangle and the 'Empathy, Nonviolence, Creativity' therapy have been pioneered by Johan Galtung. For further reference see the 1996 *Peace by Peaceful Means*, London: PRIO; the 2000 *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means (the Transcend Method)*, United Nations Disaster Management Training Programme.

³ Imagine mapping the Attitudes, Behaviors and Contradictions of each party in Nepal or in a local community? How would they perceive their Attitudes and Behavior? What is the Contradiction for them? How would they perceive the Attitudes and Behaviors and professed contradictions of others and vice versa, i.e. how would others perceive them? Also, what are your own ABCs for the conflict?

national level. It can also be useful to identify the *overall* ABCs, bringing together from all of the parties to the conflict, identifying possible common/shared features, as well as what is different.

Some features of ABC often found in conflicts (violent and otherwise):

<p>Attitudes (also included here: feelings emotions)</p>	<p>Fear, Anger, Sadness, Powerless, Impotent, Blaming the 'other', dehumanization, demonization, we/they, good vs. evil, right/wrong, win/lose, "violence is the only language they understand", "violence is acceptable (means) to achieve my/our goal", "they started it, they have to finish it", "if I keep my head low and don't make a fuss, it will increase my chances of surviving", feeling threatened on all sides, trapped, hopeless, frustrated, vengeful, hateful, fear/concern for those you love + determination, commitment to work for peace and stop the violence.</p>
<p>Behavior</p>	<p>In violent conflicts, behavior is normally violent – though only for an extreme minority of those in the community – i.e. those using violence, the combatants. This can include: rape, killing, abuse, shooting, hurting, harming, torture, beating, inflicting suffering, bombing, kidnapping, attacking, sabotage, burning down businesses, blowing up homes, offices, roads, and other forms of destructive behavior. Behavior can also include: withdrawal, turning away, doing nothing, not getting involved. These are also forms of behavior during violent conflicts which allow/perpetuate violence.</p>
<p>Contradictions</p>	<p>Root Causes, the <i>issue(s)</i>, what the conflict is actually about: major fault lines, exclusion, unmet basic needs, deep structures of violence, lack of participation. This is often what is most ignored by the media. It may be addressed by NGOs, but often only indirectly and in a fragmented way. Cease-fires do not deal with the <i>contradictions</i>, but only with the <i>behavior</i> (bringing an end to the violence). Unless the contradictions are constructively transformed, the conflict and the potential that it may break down into violence remain. In Nepal, 11 major fault lines have been identified: <i>gender, generation, political, military, economic, cultural, social, national, territory, nature, neighboring/foreign countries.</i></p>

These are primarily the negative ABCs in a conflict. What are the positive ABCs? Often, conflicts and violence inspire and mobilize people to recognize the importance of peace and the need to find solutions and ways of overcoming the challenges and problems (contradictions) facing them. During the cease-fire, many people across Nepal, also in rural areas, began to discuss how they could rebuild, as well as what could be done to overcome the legacy of the fighting. In other rural communities around the world and also in Nepal, people have united to help bring an end to the violence affecting them, with people from 'opposing' groups having often protected others whose lives were in danger. It is extremely important to identify what can be done at the local level, by people in their communities, and to recognize the numerous forms of constructive and even heroic efforts of people to survive and to protect and help each other out as well as to struggle to overcome the violence, even in the midst of war. How then do we transform the Conflict Triangle? The basic formula: *empathy* for attitudes, *non-violence* for behavior, and *creativity* for the contradictions, nurturing and strengthening these through organization, empowerment, raising consciousness and training.

Empathy, Nonviolence, Creativity

Empathy, nonviolence and creativity are some of the basic tools for transforming conflicts constructively, effectively, and through peaceful means. What is positive: they can be found throughout Nepal, and in every single individual human being, to greater or lesser extents. They can be nurtured, promoted through education and upbringing, trained, and developed, in individuals, communities and cultures. In many communities, cultures, belief systems and religions they are already highly valued and encouraged. Unfortunately, empathy, nonviolence and creativity are often some of the first victims of violence and difficult/intractable conflicts. Rather than trying to *understand* or see the perspective of the 'other'⁴, parties often dehumanize, or demonize the other, blaming the conflict, and the violence, on them, and legitimizing (in their eyes) their own use of violence. Behavior then quickly turns violent, though usually only for an extreme minority of actors in any given society, and creativity – the ability to find practical, viable, and constructive ways of dealing with the conflict to meet the basic needs of all the parties involved – becomes more difficult, as parties become locked in a negative conflict relationship and a spiral of violence.

⁴ Which is not the same thing as necessarily agreeing with it or adopting it oneself, but is based upon basic respect and recognition for the common humanity and legitimate goals and interests – including both basic needs and human rights – of each party.

Some characteristics of Empathy, Nonviolence and Creativity:

<p>Empathy</p>	<p>The ability to imagine, see, understand the feelings, experiences and perspectives of another, to see a situation from their perspective, to recognize the issues, needs and goals which might be important for them, and to see why they feel these are important. Empathy does not necessarily mean agreeing with or holding these same values/perspectives yourself, but it does mean recognizing them as valid and important because they are felt to be so by the one you are empathizing with.</p>
<p>Nonviolence</p>	<p>Nonviolence is one of the most effective tools for social struggle and empowerment. It is a <i>method</i> of struggle. Nonviolence may be principled (based upon the belief in the sanctity of life and <i>ahimsa</i>, non-violence, non-killing, not inflicting harm/suffering) and/or strategic (based upon its effectiveness as a method of struggle). Some recent examples of nonviolence: the global women’s movement, the liberation struggle in South Africa to end the apartheid regime, the civil rights and people’s movements in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union which ended those authoritarian regimes, the people’s power movement in the Philippines, and local people’s struggles in communities affected by war and violence around the world. Nonviolence has taken place throughout history, in every single country and part of the world. It has happened in the midst of wars, as well as in peace time situations, under authoritarian and dictatorial regimes and unjust economic systems, as well as under parliamentary ‘democracies’. It includes tens of thousands of different strategies, tactics, and methods of acting/struggling. What is important: nonviolence can often be <i>most effective in the face of violence</i>, and it has been proven as an effective tool even when confronted by the most authoritarian/violent regimes and movements. While many nonviolent workers may be prepared to give their lives for what they believe in and are committed to, there is no cause for which they are willing to kill. Nonviolence is the guarantee to the ‘other’ that you will not hurt or harm them, or inflict suffering/ retribution/pain upon them. It builds a link of common humanity and recognition of the life of the other, and</p>

	<p>transcends concepts of revenge or punishment. Nonviolence is both <i>action</i> and behavior as well as <i>attitude, language, and approach</i>. It can be a method of struggle and achieving one's goals, as well as a way of life, working to overcome war and violence (<i>dukkha</i>), and to increase peace and well-being (<i>sukha</i>)⁵.</p>
<p>Creativity</p>	<p>Creativity is the ability to see things from different perspectives, to imagine various possible outcomes, and to come up with ideas for how conflicts can be transformed constructively, effectively and practically, to meet the needs of all the parties involved. It may include coming up with a new, more positive <i>compelling vision</i> of an alternative to the violence and the current state of unresolved incompatibilities. It may also include helping parties to be able to see different ways of achieving their goals, and how they can do more together than they can apart. What is vital about creativity: if it is to be meaningful and effective, it has to be <i>creativity rooted and grounded in respect for the parties, the issues, and the culture/community, but with the ability to go beyond, to transcend and develop inclusive visions for peace which satisfy all the parties to the conflict</i> (including not only those who use violence, but all of the groups, actors and communities affected by the violence).</p>

In the face of war and the suffering, fear and terror it brings, empathy, nonviolence and creativity may be some of the most difficult things for people and communities to practice. When your community and the ones you love are affected by violence there are no easy choices. Empathy, nonviolence and creativity offer a way for transcending war and violence, and to work towards constructive, inclusive alternatives, empowering communities to meet the needs of all the parties and groups affected and involved. The challenge, and the need, is there. The question is whether we are up to it.

⁵ "For the concepts of *sukha* and *dukkha* and their relationship to peacebuilding and conflict the author is indebted to discussions with Johan Galtung. Those interested can find more on Galtung's work in the 2000 *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means (the Transcend Method)*, United Nations Disaster Management Training Programme.

Conflict Transformation

Conflict Transformation includes the processes, actions and approaches which seek to constructively address the conflict, dealing with the attitudes and behaviors of the parties, as well as the contradictions – the root causes and underlying structures and dynamics – of the conflict through peaceful means, using empathy, nonviolence and creativity. Empowering and strengthening the roots of conflict transformation in local communities is one of the most important steps for peace. *Conflict Transformation* is the process which leads to the development of a *positive constructive outcome* of the conflict, helping the parties to move beyond, to *transcend* the conflict, ensuring that the goals of all parties are respected and the basic needs and rights of all parties to the conflict upheld. Conflict Transformation is a process, rather than a single act, and can apply at the micro-, meso-, and macro-levels, at the intra- and inter- personal, group, community, social, cultural, national and state levels, and involves a series of events and approaches. For conflict transformation to be sustainable and effective, it must address all the levels and manifestations of the conflict, including the actual causes which gave rise to the war.

There is no single approach to conflict transformation. To be effective, however, *conflict transformation* approaches and methodologies used in any context or situation should be:

- *meaningful to the people/participants involved in and affected by the conflict*, not simply imported from outside the community/country or imposed from above;
- *practical*, providing effective tools and resources for people to be directly and actively engaged in working to address the conflict constructively;
- *participatory*, involving people as the participants, actors and decision-makers, guiders and *implementers* in the actual process of transforming their conflicts;
- *rooted in the traditions, culture and people of the community* (indigenous) and addressing the real needs of the people *as identified by the people themselves*;
- *integrated, comprehensive and holistic*, effectively addressing all of the issues – including the ABCs of each party – and aspects of the conflict, with different aspects and steps/stages complementing, reinforcing and supporting each other, avoiding the pitfalls of fragmented, competing, and contradictory processes;
- *sustainable*, not relying or dependent upon outside support and outside-driven processes and interference;
- *inspiring*, providing people with confidence and hope in their ability and the ability of the process to overcome and transcend the conflict, *transforming* it constructively, and creating new opportunities and possibilities out of the conflict.

Conflict History, Violence History

Focus on a conflict often begins after the first bomb or gun-shot has gone off – i.e. after the conflict has turned violent. The history of the *violence* can be written beginning with the first act of violence, and ending with the last act of violence. Before the *violence* begins, however, there are precursors to the violence, just as, long after the violence has ended, the devastation, destruction, trauma, suffering, grieving and pain created – at the personal-individual level and the broad, social level – may still remain. The history of the conflict, however, is different, with violence only one possible phase of the conflict history. Focus on the history of the conflict begins with focus on the *contradiction*, the root cause/issue of the conflict, i.e. when parties perceive an incompatibility between their goals, issues, intentions, needs and those of the other. Contradictions, incompatibilities – and therefore conflicts – can occur between actors, as well as between actors and *structures* and *cultures*. Always, however, there must be at least one ‘actor’ in the conflict. Long before the *behavior* of the party or parties to the conflict makes the conflict *visible*, the attitudes and contradictions of the conflict may exist. At the same time, even after the violence/fighting has stopped, the contradictions, anger, resentment, fear, hostility, grievances, and legacy of the conflict and the violence – as well as the root causes which gave rise to the conflict in the first place – may continue. Conflicts which have not been successfully and constructively transformed may escalate into violence if mismanaged, ignored, or neglected. This can happen both before the first outbreak of violence, and also to a conflict which has entered a violent phase, and in which the violence has then been brought to an end, but in which the conflict itself remains untransformed and in which the legacies and trauma + grievances of the violence provide fertile soil for future fighting and war. Conflicts only enter into a violent phase when they have been systematically mismanaged and neglected, and when they have not been transformed constructively and effectively.

Conflict Arena, Conflict Formation

For mapping parties and actors to a conflict the distinction between the *conflict arena* and the *conflict formation* is vital, even for conflicts in a community and at the local level. The *conflict arena* is the actual physical space, the territory, in which the conflict is taking place or is acted out. This may be a local community, a country, or entire region. While mappings of conflict *arenas* generally focus only on the area in which *violence* is being used, an actual conflict arena can often be much broader.

The *conflict formation* is based *not upon the physical/territorial space* of the conflict, but upon all of the actors, parties, groups and organizations involved in, affected by and party to the conflict, and the relationships between them. This includes both

those who may use violence, as well as all others who are contributing to, affected by and part of the conflict; those who support the status quo, as well as those trying to change it. Parties contributing to the dynamics and shape/nature of a conflict may often be *outside* the actual conflict *arena*, including neighboring villages and other parts of the country, foreign countries, international governmental and non-governmental organizations, UN and international government agencies, donors, international financial institutions, weapons producers and dealers, and many, many others. Mappings of *conflict formations* often only focus on *violent* actors to the conflict, disempowering both those who are being affected and can potentially mobilize and work for peace, and neglecting those who may be behind the scenes, affected by the violence and the conflict, or actively participating and part of the conflict formation but not using violence.

For identifying possible resources and actors who can be involved in working to transform the conflict constructively through peaceful means and to transform the dynamic of the conflict, effective mapping of both the conflict arena *and* the conflict formation are vital. Who are the actors, who is affected by the conflict, who is contributing to it in any way? Mapping of all actors should also be done together with different actors and parties to the conflict, as some groups and individuals may leave out actors that they do not perceive as part of the conflict, but which may be considered highly important by others. A full mapping of all actors to the *conflict formation* helps to improve both the *diagnosis* of the conflict, and to open up for *therapies*: what can be done, by groups, organizations and individuals affected and at every level, to mobilize to bring the fighting to an end and to transform the conflict constructively.

The Violence Triangle – DSC – Direct, Structural, Cultural

People normally think of violence as what we call here '*direct violence*'. In addition to *direct violence*, however, there are also two other forms of violence: *structural violence* and *cultural violence*, often more difficult to see, but also often much more devastating and deadly in their effects. The three together make up the three points of the violence triangle.

Violence is here more broadly defined as anything which inflicts suffering, harm, damage, pain and sometimes death – psychological, emotional, physical, and other. Violence is *dukkha*. Transforming/transcending violence is working to overcome *dukkha* and increase *sukha*.

Direct Violence, the most commonly identified form of violence, is *violence carried out by an actor*, i.e. a *direct act*. You can see the person, group, organization which carries out the act of violence; the causal relationship, between the *doer*, the *act*, and the *affected party* ('victim') is clearer. Direct violence includes physical as well as emotional, verbal and psychological violence.

Structural Violence is often much more difficult to see (in part because we are often trained/educated not to see it). It is the violence which is built into our political, social, and economic systems. It is the different allocation of goods, resources, power, opportunities, jobs, medicines, positions, and wealth between different groups, castes, classes, genders, nationalities, etc., built into the *structure* governing their relationship. It is the difference between the possible/optimum, and what is. Its relationship to *direct violence* is similar to that of the bottom nine-tenths of an iceberg, hidden from view, while only the tip juts out above the waterline, or the snow capped peak of the Himalayas in the summer (direct violence) and the 90% of the mountain (structural violence). In terms of devastation, suffering, destruction, and killing-loss of life, the impact of structural violence on Nepal is far more extensive than that of direct violence. More people die each year as a result of deep seeded structures of violence in Nepal than have been killed in the seven years of war afflicting the country. What is needed: to transform both!

Cultural Violence. If Direct Violence is the tip of the ice-berg and structural violence the nine-tenths beneath the water, *cultural violence* is the sea and the mist which hides the iceberg from view. It's what makes us think that *direct violence* is normal, acceptable, or a good way of dealing with conflicts, and that *structural violence* is natural, just, the way the world should be. *Cultural violence* are the elements of our cultures, belief systems, and ways of viewing the world (cosmology) which legitimize, enforce, and make violence seem acceptable, normal and good/just. What is needed: to transform all three!

Some examples of Direct, Structural and Cultural Violence in the case of Nepal:

Direct Violence	Killing, beating, raping, shooting, bombing, destroying infrastructure, abuse, torture, kidnapping, arson, extortion, fighting, and acts of intimidation, insulting, and 'terrorizing' others (including both other combatants, the other 'side' and particularly civilians, non-combatants).
------------------------	---

<p>Structural Violence</p>	<p>The caste system, ‘untouchability’, bonded labor, patriarchy/ structural discrimination and exploitation of women, unequal development (geographical as well as social and economic), over-centralization, corruption, structural oppression/ suppression of nationalities/cultural groups, exploitation of workers, <i>dalits</i>, women, unequal land distribution, neo-colonial dependency on outside countries, authoritarian/undemocratic/ unrepresentative political structures, the ‘aid’ system.</p>
<p>Cultural Violence</p>	<p>Those elements of the culture and values which legitimize ‘untouchability’, patriarchy, the exploitation of women, workers and the young, unequal development, concentration of power and wealth in the hands of certain castes/classes/families, etc., beliefs in the superiority of one group, gender, caste, nationality, over another. Belief systems and values which make the structures of violence seem legitimate or seek to enforce them as ‘good’ or the only option/the way things are, the need to ‘crush’ the other side, the ‘eliminate’ them. Also: values which legitimize violence as good when used in a ‘noble/just’ cause, i.e. violence is acceptable/legitimate because we are fighting against an unacceptable system/structure or against bad/evil actors. <i>Cultural violence</i> is also the belief that ‘I/we can’t do anything’, that violence is normal, or that only those ‘with power’ (politicians, combatants, soldiers, the King) can do anything to overcome/solve it, i.e. that ‘we’, as people, are powerless. Forms of cultural violence impressed and internalized through repression/exploitation. <i>All</i> of these are forms of cultural violence.</p>

To focus only on one form of violence (whether *direct*, *structural* or *cultural*) and to ignore the other two, or to focus only on the violence done by the ‘other side’ and its impacts, and to ignore one’s own violence, and its impact on others, are two of the most common features of intense conflicts. They are also a recipe for continued warfare and fighting. The real transformation of conflicts and the building of sustainable peace in Nepal can only take place *if all three forms of violence – direct, structural and cultural – are being addressed*. While this does not happen ‘over night’ or all at once, parties to the conflict and the people in a society/community must feel that the underlying causes of the conflict and all three forms of violence are being addressed if they are to have confidence in the process and to involve themselves in

working to build peace and development in their communities. This will also require a reassessment and reflection by all actors on their own role in leading up to, contributing, and perpetuating the current violence. An agreement which brings an end to *direct violence* and fails to address *structural* and *cultural violence* is neither a cease-fire nor a peace agreement, but the *continuation of war by other means*.

War Culture/Peace Culture

War culture approaches to conflict dominate in certain sectors in Nepal today, affecting how we see, deal with, and respond to conflict and violence. The essential characteristics of a *war culture* approach to conflict are to see conflict as:

- something *negative, destructive, bad*
- a struggle between ‘Good’ vs ‘Evil’, with ‘Self’ chosen by/on the side of Good, and ‘Other’ being/acting on behalf of/serving Evil;
- *Win – lose*: one side wins, the other side loses, with no in between and to win (victory) or to lose (defeat) as the only possible outcomes;
- *Zero-sum*: for one side to get what it wants, the other side has to lose what it wants. The resources/issue being ‘fought’ over are finite/absolute, cannot be shared but owned, won, controlled by one side at the loss/defeat of the other;
- *Black – White*: the parties hold absolute, exclusive views which allow for no alternatives, middle ground or other perspectives;
- *Dualism*: the world/conflict is divided into two⁶; an essential component of polarization;
- *Manichaeism*: Conceiving of the one part (Self) as only good and the other one (Other) as only bad, and the struggle between them. Together with Dualism: a part is good, the other evil; there are no in-betweens, one must choose sides;
- *Armageddon*: the final, irreconcilable battle + victory, the sole means to defeat the other side, ‘evil’, justifies the war against the other side, which yields to nothing else but victory in the ultimate battle;
- *The Chosen*: belief that a people, nation, class, has been chosen by a higher force to complete a mission in the world, and is therefore above, superior or different from others; when a nation, party, king, caste, class self-proclaims (or has proclaimed by ‘god’, ‘history’, ‘the market’ etc.) its supremacy over other nations/people as “the chosen one”, it seeks to make it and its actions immune, beyond critique and reproach;

⁶ Binary division: male-female, right-wrong, good-evil, black-white, believer-infidel, democrat-non-democrat, communist-Maoist-non-communist-Maoist, win-lose.

- *Glory*: moments of 'triumph', 'victory' in the past which are central to the groups identity and/or self-identification, used to rally members together and belief in the justness of 'Self' and their cause;
- *Trauma*: moments of 'defeat' and 'suffering' inflicted in the past, used as justification for struggle or violence and future victory to make-up for/overcome injustices and past suffering;
- *Polarization*: the process of reduction of the parties to two – Self and Other – severing all links, contact, relations between them which may show common ground, similarities, or serve to build bridges, and delegitimizing/eliminating even the possibility of alternatives or not belonging to either of the two sides. Polarization breaks down all relations other than those of extremes and violence, with the parties confronting one another as opponents. In this scenario, all positive qualities are attributed to the Self, and all negative qualities and defects to the Other which is blamed for the violence, and deserving all the violence it may then be given in turn, justifying irreconcilability and conflict, and forcing people to choose between the 'two' options – 'us' or 'them', so that you are either 'with us' or 'with them'. People who are not with either side, or who try to put forward alternatives, are often targeted.
- + *demonization* and *dehumanization*: making it easier to kill.

War culture is promoted through shared/common texts, monuments, historical symbols, speeches and political policies, education, music and popular folk songs, academic writings, media, journalism, and much, much more. In areas in which elements of *war culture* may be prevalent, it can determine an individual and/or community's response to conflict in a violent way, as well as how that community seeks to bring an end to violence and war. Addressing contradictions without addressing the way in which we perceive and deal with conflicts can mean that violence/war may be used again in the future when responding to or addressing other contradictions, or that the underlying contradictions which gave rise to this war may not be fully addressed. In such circumstances, 'peace processes' become acts of *realpolitik* and the continuation of war with different forms of violence.

To overcome and ultimately to immunize a community to large-scale violence it is important that in addition to transforming and transcending *direct* and *structural violence* a *culture of peace* which nurtures and supports peaceful and constructive approaches to transforming conflicts is promoted. The values and ideas which make up peace cultures provide holistic, interlinking and complementary world-views which open up for effective and constructive ways of dealing with conflicts.

In addition to the values of *empathy*, *non-violence*, and *creativity*, a *culture of peace/peace culture* may include values and belief in:

- *Human Rights*: Including social, economic, political, civil and cultural rights as fundamental and basic for all peoples, regardless of race, gender, nationality, class, age, and language group. Human Rights as a foundation provides an important element of a culture of peace. Recognition of the rights of all groups/peoples and not just of one's own can be an important step for transcending conflicts and dualist/Manichaeian elements of war culture. Certain groups may also require special *group* (in addition to individual) and even *village* and *cultural* rights. Rather than seeing this as weakening or dividing a singular/unitary whole, it can be seen as strengthening and enriching the diversity of parts which make up that whole. Many people are not even aware of their rights or the obligation of their government and others to uphold and protect those rights. In areas where groups are aware of their rights, there are often many barriers and difficulties to their effectively realizing them. Celebration and promotion of a culture of human rights and human rights education should also include how to work for human rights *through peaceful and rights-based means*.
- *Human Dignity*: A central tenet of a culture of peace is human dignity. This may also be combined with earth dignity and life dignity (respecting and celebrating the life of all living beings and the earth). Respecting the human dignity of each individual and group, even when we may disagree with them or seek different objectives, is vital to finding the commitment and courage to working together to transform conflicts constructively. Celebration and valuing of human dignity allows for seeing diversity as richness while respecting the common dignity of all peoples. Violence – direct, structural and cultural, including demonization and dehumanization of others – is one of the greatest barriers to the realization of human dignity. Economic, social, political, and cultural marginalization, oppression and exclusion are obstacles to people being able to live their lives in dignity.
- *Conflict as Constructive – an opportunity*: Whereas war cultures see conflict as *negative* and *destructive* (and often identify conflict with violence), a culture of peace sees conflicts as an opportunity for creativity, working to transform conflicts constructively. While this may at times be difficult, requiring commitment, humility and courage, it is also a goal and a value, as well as a way of seeing the world. In this view conflict is a challenge to find the best possible outcome for all parties/groups involved (requiring symmetry, respect and sincerity). Rather than a *threat*, conflict becomes an opportunity for

human beings and communities to constructively work together to transform contradictions and improve well-being.

- *Conflict as Uniting – a shared challenge*: Conflict is something which brings parties together. It is a common, shared challenge, a *relationship* uniting and affecting all the parties involved in the conflict. Rather than seeing ‘the other’ as the *enemy* or the *cause* of the problem/conflict – with the need to *defeat, win over* the enemy to ‘win’ the conflict – the conflict is seen as something shared, a challenge which requires the cooperation and involvement of both/all parties to transcend it, transforming the contradiction constructively for the well-being and to meet the needs of all involved.
- *Ubuntu*: In many ways, it is an underlying concept/world-view for many peace cultures. From southern Africa – though its parallel can be found in many parts of the world – it roughly means ‘I am who I am because of you’. This can be extended to: we are who we are because of each other. *Ubuntu* recognizes the common bond uniting all people. This can be seen in social, cultural, political, economic, civil, and spiritual ways. As with Buddhism, it sees all life as united in an intricate web of relationships. What is done by one affects another, and if one person suffers or is unwell, it affects all. Rather than being *against each other, win-lose, either-or, ubuntu* is a relationship which brings together, uniting in a common being, in which there can be both diversity and difference.
- *Sarvodaya*: Well-being for all. In one sense, the aim of conflict transformation and peacebuilding – and a pillar of many cultures and world-views – working to overcome *direct, structural* and *cultural* violence and to increase well-being, *sukha* for all people/life. *Sarvodaya* recognizes that I cannot be well-off, ‘healthy’ if my neighbor or another is suffering/hurting. Health comes from the health of each and all individuals and members of a community. *Sarvodaya*, therefore, is a commitment to guaranteeing the well-being and basic needs of all. As such, it can be a foundation both for community life and constructive approaches to conflict transformation.
- *Basic Human Needs*: Basic Human Needs may be defined differently by different groups. They are both broader and deeper than Human Rights, and are not limited to but include basic *biological* needs. Basic Human Needs include the need for life and survival, as well as reproduction, and also the need for identity and well-being. What is important: there is no set hierarchy to human needs, though at different times, certain needs may seem more pressing for different groups and individuals. Fulfillment of basic human needs, *sarvodaya*, is a central pillar of peacebuilding and development,

transcending some of the most extreme – and widespread – forms of direct, structural and cultural violence.

- *Democracy*: From *demos kratos* – people’s power – the power to make decisions and to act upon them by the people themselves. *Democracy* is based upon *whether people have the power and ability to make the decisions which affect their lives – including the social, economic, health, political, cultural and civil issues and systems in which they live – and to take part directly in processes, structures and decision-making in their community and country.* *Democracy* is fundamentally based upon the power which *people* – as individuals and communities – have to guide their lives and to take part in and guarantee the well-being and security of themselves, their families and their community, to meet their basic human (and community) needs, and to realize their human rights – social, political, economic, civil and cultural. *Democracy* – people’s power – is central to peacebuilding and constructive conflict transformation and to overcoming all forms of direct, structural and cultural violence.
- *Social Justice*: Fulfillment of the basic human needs and human rights of all groups, people, without *negative discrimination* based upon race, gender, nationality, culture, class, generation, while, at the same time, providing for the special needs of different social and cultural groups, men and women, nationalities and generations. *Social Justice* is implicitly a platform upon which to overcome and transcend all forms of *structural violence*.
- *Swadeshi*: Self-reliance. Developing and having the resources needed within the individual, within the community. Independent from outside countries/communities. *Self-reliance* is a foundation for democracy, self-determination.
- *Brahmacharya*: Self-control, humility, not trying to exert one’s control or superiority over others, or to take more than is required.
- *Yin and Yang*: Beyond ‘black –white’, good vs. evil, recognizing that there can be good things in ‘bad’ things and bad things in ‘good’ things, with *yin* in the *yang* in the *yin* and *yang* in the *yin* in the *yang*. Allows for greater complexity, and less ‘right/wrong’, win/lose perspectives and outcomes. The challenge: to be able to see what is good, valid, legitimate in view-points/objectives with which you don’t agree, and to recognize what might be seen as negative, threatening, destructive in your own goals/objectives.

Other values and principles may be added. Cultures of peace are diverse, varied and rich. Those principles outlined here are in some ways *common features* which can be found in many peace cultures around the world, and, to varying degrees, as valued in almost all cultures and communities. Identifying elements of cultures of peace within

communities and in the cultures of Nepal can help to empower the soil and the roots for peacebuilding and conflict transformation.

Cycles/Spiral of Violence, Cycles/Spiral of Peace

A single act of violence can be a spark which can set a field, a forest, or an entire society ablaze. Building upon the truth *violence breeds violence*, the idea of a cycle or spiral of violence is that with each act of violence – an attack, killing, bombing, torture, ambush – the likelihood of *escalated* and further acts of violence increases, thus creating an ever escalating *spiral* or *cycle* of violence, with each act of violence providing the justification/foundation for a further, intensified act of violence, which itself then serves as the justification/foundation for still further violence, increasing suffering, hatred, anger, enemy images, destruction, pain, feelings of powerlessness, and the belief that there is nothing that can be done/there is no alternative to violence, the cycle cannot be stopped/overcome.

As one side uses violence to attack another, it is more likely that:

- i) the other side will use violence to retaliate, possibly escalating the violence in its retaliation;
- ii) the first group which used violence, once having crossed that threshold, will also be more willing to use violence in the future;
- iii) those who are not using or who are resisting the use of violence may be targeted by both/all sides, making alternatives to violence and the pursuit of peace seem less viable/possible and discouraging people from (1) making efforts to transform the conflict constructively and (2) maintaining ties and communication with the 'other' side;
- iv) the worse the scale and intensity of violence, the less likely people will feel confident or even believe it is possible that peace and transforming the conflict through constructive means is possible;
- v) with each act of violence, dehumanization, demonization and polarization increase, making future acts of violence easier and more likely, and breaking down further ties, cooperation and links between people on the different 'sides';
- vi) a war economy will gradually take over, with increasing numbers of people having their livelihood directly affected by or linked to the war/violence, and peace time economic activities increasingly affected;
- vii) fighting sides compete to show their 'strength' and their capacity for revenge, attack, and to destroy the other, with greater likelihood that civilians and non-combatants will become increasingly targeted in these attacks and acts of war;
- viii) the challenge for peace together with the need for peace increases.

Yet just as there can be cycles and spirals of violence, there can also be cycles and spirals of *peace*. As one side takes a positive initiative or step towards transforming the conflict and/or meeting some of the needs of the other parties to the conflict, not waiting upon the actions of the other or depending upon joint initiatives, this may serve to encourage other parties to themselves take positive steps and move towards the (i) de-escalation of the conflict and the (ii) initiation of processes and actions which may lead towards peace.

Positive steps in these directions can include:

- recognizing the validity of (some of) the 'other side's' goals;
- recognizing and admitting one's own role and responsibilities in contributing to the current situation and the effects of one's own violence on the community and the other side (this may even include apology or renunciation of violence);
- unilateral cease-fire;
- ending of harassments, torture and persecution/targeting of certain groups;
- invitation to and initiation of dialogues with the local community and or low-level, medium, or even high level representatives of different groups, the 'other side' and those affected by the conflict and involved in the armed struggle;
- demilitarization, demobilization, and disarming, either in part or in full;
- release of prisoners;
- cessation of activities seen as negative and threatening by other groups and people in the community;
- removal of discriminatory or oppressive legislation, as well as legislating for the rights of previously marginalized/excluded groups;
- respect and protection for the human rights and basic needs of all sides and peoples/communities;
- rebuilding, reconstruction and rehabilitation of infrastructure and communities affected by the violence;
- concrete actions/initiatives to fulfill the needs of marginalized/excluded groups or those who have suffered from and been impacted upon by violence;
- proposals for how the conflict can be constructively transformed which also take into consideration the needs and positions of other parties to the conflict.

Such actions on the part of any party to the conflict show confidence and a commitment to the community/country and to finding effective and practical solutions to the conflict. Local communities, villagers, and other sectors may also be involved in taking the steps that can help to promote a spiral of peace. Often, a *peace*

spiral may be brought about as combatants recognize both the futility and the devastation of armed struggle. It may also be the result of increasing recognition that the causes pursued by the combatants can more effectively be achieved through other means, including continuation of struggle *without the use of violence*. Open refusal to accept violence while remaining open to and not denying the claims of those who have been involved in fighting can be important for making this transition. As one party takes a positive step, the other party may often feel themselves compelled to respond in kind. Even if they don't, it can be important that those who have recognized the importance of transforming a conflict constructively and effectively continue their efforts to promote practical and concrete steps towards peace, escalating and intensifying *constructive approaches* to the conflict.

Confidence-Building Measures

Confidence building measures are steps which help to convey the commitment of the parties to:

- (i) respect agreements made between parties to the conflict;
- (ii) respect/recognize the validity of the concerns/needs of the other side(s); and/or
- (iii) work to bring about the peaceful transformation of the conflict.

These may include many of the activities listed under steps of a spiral or cycle of peace. What is important, however, is that these activities and initiatives are not only good for building confidence between the parties to the conflict, but may often be beneficial and important in their own right, as positive steps towards meeting basic human and humanitarian needs, overcoming direct, structural and cultural violence, building links and direct acts of cooperation between the parties, and transforming attitudes, behaviors and contradictions to the conflict.

It is vital to recognize that if parties are not confident in the processes and approaches for addressing their needs and working to transform the conflict, or in the other parties to the process, then possibilities for a resumption of fighting may remain high. Confidence building measures therefore, may more accurately be seen as *sincere and honest efforts by the parties to a conflict to recognize and meet some of the needs and key issues of the other side*. They may be done, not simply to build confidence, *but because they are important issues and concerns for one or more party to the conflict*. Without confidence in the process and the parties to the process, any cease-fire or peace process will remain fragile and likely to break down.

Pre-War, War, Post-War

The war is seen by many in Nepal as something beyond their control. The concrete acts, events and processes which lead up to the war and have occurred during war, while affecting the entire country, are often not directly identified and addressed, particularly while they were happening. Many people in Nepal, even in the midst of the war, are unable to explain how the situation came about, what is happening, or why things weren't done earlier to prevent it. Even when the processes and dynamics which lead to war, and the effects and impacts of war have been identified, effective policy proposals and collective action to overcome them has been lacking, fragmented or top-down.

The division between 'pre-war', 'war', and 'post-war' is often blurry. Characteristics of one phase are frequently found in the others, though there are also several aspects of each phase which are distinct. A difficulty in Nepal has been that the 'post-war' phase during the cease-fire came about with a cessation of the fighting, but with none of the issues which gave rise to the war addressed and no effective process for doing so, leading to the break down of the cease-fire and return to fighting. Throughout, unresolved contradictions remain at the root, aggravated by deep structures and deep cultures of violence which may long outlast the next official cease-fire or ending of fighting. With the introduction of violence/war, the extra challenge of healing from the effects of the violence and overcoming its impact upon the community has been added. These involve political, social, economic, cultural, physical, as well as psychological and emotional issues, at the broad, social and at the individual, personal level. To bring this about, leadership (by individuals, organizations, formal and informal community leaders, civil society groups, and political parties and leaders), and broad-based cooperation and coordination are needed.

Individuals and organizations working to find ways to deal with the violence in Nepal are often overwhelmed, not seeing what can be done or even where to start. Because of this, some organizations may choose not to become involved, preferring to continue working in the areas (and methods/approaches) they were working in before the war broke out. Others are attempting to develop programmes and units which focus specifically on the conflict and supporting local capacities and resources for peace, while failing to integrate peacebuilding into other programmes and work which may directly address different aspects of the violence and conflict or to work affectively together with others. Meaningful cooperation between organizations (Nepali and international), with a concrete vision for what can be done and how to transform the conflict constructively while healing from the violence of the war is largely lacking, with some outside actors and countries even actively promoting the

escalation and intensification of the war. The challenge of developing people-centered and community-based approaches to dealing with conflicts, as well as large-scale violence and post-violence healing and reconciliation has hardly been addressed.

Many of the issues which peacebuilding and conflict transformation must address, however, draw upon skills, tasks and challenges faced in other aspects of government and NGO work and community life as well, and qualities and gifts which many different people in a community may have. When trying to see what can be done (therapy) it is first vital to see what the challenges and issues are which need to be addressed (diagnosis), and the resources which exist to address them. Often, individuals and organizations coming from a particular perspective may focus on only some aspects of how conflicts and violence are affecting communities, while others may be left out and neglected. Few, if any, of the key challenges in Nepal today, affected by deep-seeded conflicts, violence and war can be completely separated and divorced from each other. They require integrated and comprehensive approaches. While certain individuals or organizations may focus more on one area than another, it is important to promote cooperation and complementarity, coordinating efforts, working to involve and have the process rooted in and guided by local actors and communities, and working to do more together than can be done apart. Openness, transparency, and consistency of efforts and cooperation are vital here.

It can be useful for individuals, organizations and communities to map what is/was happening in their community and in Nepal in the different phases of 'pre-war', 'war', and 'post-war'. These can be collective exercises and brain-storming processes, providing people with the space to bring forward their experiences and points of view, and to bring up the issues they feel are necessary to be addressed to promote reconciliation and healing, and overcoming of deep structures of violence. This work is as vital for political parties as it is for NGOs and community members and organizations. The following table has been put together from the feed-back of participants in workshops, training programmes and discussions across Nepal and in other war affected areas.

Pre-War/Fighting	War/Fighting	Post-War/Fighting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heightened, unresolved contradictions; • Unmet social, economic, political, civil demands/needs, including demands for justice/rights; • Increased violations of human rights; • Wide-spread structural violence, increasing cultural violence; • Widening of gaps/divisions between groups; • Sporadic attacks / killings, possibly bombings; • Increased demonization and dehumanization of the 'other'; • Polarization; • Increased stereotyping/ labeling; • Inflammatory Speeches/Attacks, including speeches legitimizing violence against the 'other'; • Revisionism, manipulation of history; • Attacks on 'sacred symbols', statues, monuments, buildings, etc.; • Rise of nationalism/ exclusive identities; • Increased focus on 'glories', 'traumas', 'chosenness'; • Rumors, disinformation; • Mobilizing 'own' group, including 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surfacing of conflicts/contradictions – making structural violence and deep-seeded conflicts 'visible'; • Killing – of combatants, civilians, women, men, children, elderly; • Bombing – aerial and ground, of combatants, civilians, buildings, fields, camps, bases, homes, schools, newspapers, political offices, government buildings; • Maiming, wounding, crippling of combatant and civilian populations; • Battles, between (and within) fighting sides, also: armed attacks on civilian populations; • Attacking the other – combatants, civilians, leaders, members, homes, gatherings of; • Civilians caught/'sandwiched' between warring sides; • Attacks upon and targeting of civilians, non-aligned, peace activists, supporters of dialogue, NGOs, human rights groups, etc; • Rise of war-time, military leaders, including populists and political leaders/groups manipulating/playing upon the concerns/needs of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ending of large-scale organized violence; • Unsolved contradictions, deep structures and cultures of violence + the legacy of wide-spread direct violence; underlying causes and dynamics of the war left unaddressed, remaining as the potential/soil for a future war; • People killed; • Large numbers of wounded, maimed, injured, crippled; • Widows, orphans, elderly without children; • Families in which the primary earners have been wounded, or killed, and which are no longer able to support themselves; • Displaced populations, both within and outside the country; • Destroyed social infrastructure needing repair, including schools, hospitals, government offices, telephone lines, etc; • People left homeless, without shelter; • Need for resettlement and reintegration of internally displaced peoples and refugees, as well as of ex-

<p>possibly diaspora;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military build up: escalation of military programs, training and purchasing of weapons; • Arrests and attacks on opponent groups and their members and leaders; • Rising discrimination and repression; • Torture; • Rise of violence in public/social life and discourse; • Rise of war discourse: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 'we' vs. 'they' ○ good vs. evil ○ win / lose ○ zero – sum ○ black/white + legitimization of war/ violence against the 'other' • Dualism, Manichaeism, Armageddon; • 'Chosenness', Glory, Trauma; • Creation of new armies, para-military units, armed groups; • Creation of 'no go' areas and restrictions on travel/movement in certain areas; • New legislation: restricting rights and freedoms of certain groups; 	<p>people;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide-spread human rights violations; • Destruction/burning of crops and physical infrastructure/buildings; • Destruction of aid and development programs and infrastructure; • Increased targeting and destruction of sacred 'symbols' of the 'other'; • Assassination, killing of 'leaders', as well as family, friends, associates of targeted leaders/movements; • Cessation of civilian government services, including possibly education, health systems, etc., in areas affected by war/fighting; • Targeted political, military attacks of the 'other' side; • Forced population movements, internally displaced peoples (IDPs); refugees, ethnic cleansing; • Suspension of parliament and regular political institutions and local authorities; implementation of war-time measures; • Withdrawal of social services and increased channeling of state and other resources towards war time expenditures; • Increased rape, particularly targeted 	<p>combatants and retired personnel from the armed forces;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political and Military leaders/elites from the war or those who rose to power through war generally remain in power in the post-war period; • Negotiated agreements between fighting sides; • 'Cease-fire' but no real peace or peace process; • Post-War Rehabilitation and Construction programs by government, NGOs and international organizations and agencies; • Increase in the number of NGOs, local and international, dealing with post-war issues; • Attempts to deal with the psychological and emotional trauma and suffering of victims and those affected by the violence and the war; • People able to gradually rebuild peace-time economy; • Need for involvement by the community and people in mobilizing to address the issues which led to the war, to raise awareness of the effects and impacts of the war on the people and different communities, and to
---	---	--

<p>increasing powers of police, army, the state and executive;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlawing/ banning of political parties/ representatives of the ‘other’; • Revision of the constitution, particularly when excluding certain groups, removing rights (incl. language), or increasing the powers/rights of certain groups over others, as well as the power of the executive/military; • (Increasing) censorship and restrictions on the media; + abuse of the media; rise of war reporting; • Scapegoating, blaming of others for economic, social, political problems; • Militarization, including heightened visibility of the army, policy, militias, both in daily life and in politics; particularly also heightened visibility of weapons, military equipment, guns at checkpoints, etc.; • Structural adjustment programs – reduction of the role and capacity of the state in meeting/guaranteeing basic needs and social services; • Breakdown/collapse of normal social, political, economic processes, including failure of 	<p>rape of women, children, and sometimes men, of the ‘other’ side;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Torture, of combatants, civilians, those identified as ‘informers’, spies, traitors; both physical and psychological; • Trauma, suffering, pain, devastation, loss, on all sides, by all people; • Increased police and military ‘war time’ powers, including police and military courts; • Abuse of powers by military, police, armed combatants, political leaders, etc.; • Laying of mine fields’ • Internment camps; • Marginalization of groups supporting peace and dialogue, portraying opponents of violence/supporters of peace as ‘enemies’, ‘traitors’, ‘conspirators with the other side’; • Rise of a war-time economy, including smuggling, arms trade, extortion, bribes, ‘taxes’, as well as corruption and drugs-trade or trade in goods used to finance the war/fighting; • Blockades, embargoes, sanctions → on countries, communities, regions • Destruction of towns, villages, homes, 	<p>build skills, resources, forums and networks for peacebuilding, reconciliation and healing in the community and at the national level;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A need for support for rural communities and the poor to improve local economies and the social and economic well-being of those generally marginalized by war and post-war political and economic processes; • Grievances which caused the war often remain + new grievances/hostilities created by the war/violence; • Women, poor, marginalized, rural populations, workers, and non-combatants generally excluded from participation in peace process; • Attempts to create new forms of participation and empowerment, including rural and village forums, linking of communities, and strengthening of self-help groups coming from within the community (rather than imposed through external NGOs from above); • Forming of associations of those who have been affected by the violence; • Apologies, recognition of
---	--	--

<p>political/economic structures to meet needs and demands of different groups;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rise in unemployment, poverty, sharp downturn in the economy and in social/ economic security; • Dismissal of parliament/ exclusion/ withdrawal of certain groups from parliament; • Increased tension, fear, uncertainty; • Kidnapping; • Curfews; • Capital flight; • Corruption; • Abuse of power; • Price escalation of basic commodities; • Giving of ultimatums threatening war if needs/demands are not met; • Declaring ‘emergencies’, ‘martial law’; • Emigration, movement of people’s away from affected/disputed areas; • Increasing violence; • Declarations of war. 	<p>brought about by fighting;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rise of other forms of violence and abuse within the society, as well as within the home/family; • Kidnapping/abductions; • Recruitment/Kidnapping and training of child soldiers; • Militarization of the country/community, subjugation of ordinary life to ‘military’/war time life, increasing presence of uniforms, guns, weapons visibly displayed by combatants, soldiers, police, armed groups; • Rise of power based upon the gun, over social, political, cultural power, including subjugation and manipulation of social, political and cultural power to re-enforce and legitimize/support the war; • External/foreign intervention in support of war/fighting sides, including arming, training, sales of weapons and equipment; also possibly in support of peace processes and negotiations, cease-fires; • Worsening/destruction of non-war time based economy, affecting, in particular, rural populations, 	<p>responsibilities, by those who played a role in bringing about the war/violence;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Truth and Reconciliation Commissions and Processes to bring forward the truth of what happened during the war as well as what was done by all groups/sides, and what led up to the war/outbreak of violence; • Recognition of the need to apologize, to heal, to recognize what was done, and to forgive; • Compensation for ‘victims’ and those affected by violence; • Training of local community workers, government officials and civil servants, and NGO staff for dealing with post-war reconstruction, rehabilitation, reconciliation and healing; • Greater local and foreign investment in the economy; • Decrease in weapons purchases; • Shifting of resources from war-time to peace-time economy; • An attempt by political, social, cultural, religious, and academic leaders to mobilize the community
--	---	---

	<p>villagers, peasants, preventing harvesting of crops, transport to markets, fetching of firewood; not necessarily true of all 'economies'/industries → often, in times of war, such industries as cigarette production, alcohol, etc. benefit substantially, as well as smuggling, arms and drugs trade, etc.;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rise in prostitution, including child prostitution, particularly around military bases and armed units; • Rise of international NGO including humanitarian and aid organization involvement; • Restrictions on movement/travel; • Increased suppression and censorship of the media; war reporting; use of media/journalism as tool and instrument of war; • Increase in polarization, demonization, enemy images, dehumanization, labeling and stereotyping; • Blaming the 'other' for the war, identification only of the other sides 'crimes', human rights violations, wrongs, and not of one's own; • Ignoring affects/impact of one's own actions on 'the other', together with 	<p>and resources for post-war reconstruction and regeneration of the community (socially, politically, culturally and economically);</p>
--	--	--

	<p>justifying those actions by the 'evilness', wrongness, or previous actions of the other;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Monopolization/hegemony of war discourse;• War-time profiteering → of smugglers, traders, weapons dealers, corrupt officials, politicians, military leaders, combatants;• Worsening direct, structural and cultural violence; untransformed contradictions + suffering, devastation, trauma, pain, hurt, anger, and desire for revenge created by war, as well as sadness, alienation, hopelessness, and feelings of powerlessness on the part of large portions of the population.	
--	---	--

Cease-Fire

During the war in Nepal one of the most immediate and pressing needs was to bring about an end to the violence. People living in communities affected by the fighting often felt trapped between both sides – the armed forces and the Maoist guerrillas. The same feeling remained during the cease-fire. People whose livelihoods depended upon agricultural work and who relied upon wood for their fires were often afraid to go to the fields or into the forest fearing that they would be attacked by either side. Many NGO workers, teachers, and local leaders were targeted by one side or another. Nepal's overall economy suffered, affecting the livelihood and well-being of the people. Basic health services were unable to function in some of the worst affected areas, and increasing government funds were being diverted from basic services to pay for the war. While the fighting was temporarily stopped, many people mistook the cease-fire for peace, and a real peace-process never began. Because of this, even many of the moderate gains of the cease-fire were lost and the fighting began again.

A *cease-fire* is often an explicit or tacit agreement between the fighting sides to stop fighting, either for a specific, set period, or indefinitely (until something happens which leads to a resumption of the fighting, or, in some cases, the cease-fire simply holds). What is important to understand is that a cease-fire is, effectively, a halt in large-scale direct violence – small scale violence and violations of cease-fires and codes of conduct often continue, even while the 'overall' cease-fire continues to hold; the more violations, however, the more likely that the cease-fire will fail. It is an agreement – usually brought about by top political and military leaders of the warring sides – to stop fighting. A cease-fire, and cease-fire talks, however, are not the same as a *peace process*.

Issues generally covered or addressed by cease-fires:

- An agreement to stop fighting;
- Agreement on communications and regulations relating to the movement of soldiers and combatants;
- Codes of conduct governing the relations between the combatants during the cease-fire period;
- Exchange of prisoners;
- Areas of control

Some of these issues may also be covered by peace processes, however, they fall under the general scope of cease fire agreements.

Parties to a conflict enter into a cease-fire for various reasons:

- They may be exhausted from the fighting;
- They may recognize the futility of fighting and/or the destructive impact it is having on their community/country, and feel that there is a need for a different way to achieve their goals;
- They may use a cease-fire as an opportunity to re-arm and prepare for the next round of war

If a party enters a cease-fire expecting that, at the end of it, there will be a *political-economic-social* process to address their grievances, and a solution to the conflict, there must also be a *peace process* capable of addressing these issues and developing a constructive and inclusive agreement and process which meets the needs of all the parties involved and of communities affected by the war. If this does not happen, and the cease-fire continues, with occasional violations while there is no effective peace process, it is only a matter of time until the cease-fire breaks down and war begins again. Even if the original combatants do not take up arms again and start fighting, if the root causes and underlying dynamics of the conflict – including deep structures and cultures of violence – remain, there are significant chances that other groups/movements will take up the battle and turn towards violence.

People do not pick up the gun to put the gun down again. They do not go to war to end wars. Unless the reasons they picked up the gun and went to war are addressed, the fighting will continue.

(Alejandro Bendana)

Peace Process

A *peace process* is a series of meetings, events, and actions taken by the parties to the conflict and/or by people in the area affected by the conflict/fighting, to arrive at a compelling and inclusive solution to the social, political, economic and other root causes that gave rise to the fighting/war. An effective peace process will take account of and address the following eleven fault lines: Gender, Generation, Political, Military, Economic, Cultural, Social, National, Territory, Nature, Neighboring/Foreign Countries.

In different conflicts, and even in different areas/regions within a conflict formation, some fault lines may be more prevalent, and more urgent than others. If only some are dealt with and the others are neglected, this can provide the soil for future conflicts. A *peace process* must combine elements of symmetry and equality for the

parties involved, as well as their goals, recognizing the basic needs and guaranteeing the human rights of all parties to the conflict, the civilian population, and civil society organizations. It is also vital, if the peace process is not itself to degrade into another form of violence and exclusion, that women be involved and empowered as active participants and decision-makers at all levels and stages of the process, from the local to the national. A good peace process should be both inclusive and participatory, requiring the involvement and participation of a wide range of actors.

The aim of a peace process is not to *defeat* or 'win over' the other side. If this is the intention of the parties, then what is being put forward as a peace process is, either in part or in whole, a process of *realpolitik* and power politics – *the continuation of war by other means*. Peace processes can be begun at many different levels. While they may and should always involve all of the major parties to the armed conflict, they do not need to be limited to them. Peace processes may also be started by non-combatants, and can result from popular mobilizations within civil society. At the same time, as the conflict has affected different parts of Nepal in different ways, there may need to be several, overlapping 'peace processes' at different levels, from the local to the national, involving as wide a range of local actors and representatives of various national, social, and community groups as possible. Civil society organizations, NGOs, and local community leaders and activists can play a vital role in creating the space for these initiatives at the local level, gradually building up to involve and link together more and more communities. To be effective, it is important that a peace process address the real and pressing issues facing (i) the country and (ii) local communities, dealing with both the contradictions and underlying roots and dynamics which gave rise to the war and the effects and impacts upon the community of the violence itself. What is crucial is that the peace process should neither: (i) *focus exclusively on the issues of the warring parties* or (ii) *involve the warring parties as the only participants/actors in the process*. Many parties which may not have begun fighting may also have crucial issues (either from before the war or brought about as a result of the war) which need to be addressed, while parties and civil society actors which did not take up arms or take sides in the war may also have important contributions to make during the peace process and attempts to overcome the devastation and legacy of the war.

Characteristics of a Good Peace Process

Integrated	<p>The various aspects/steps of a peace process – such as those dealing with different sectors, i.e. women, <i>dalits</i>, former combatants, re-integration of displaced communities and ex-combatants, rural communities, victims, children, the health, social, political, economic, and cultural sectors, reconciliation, de-escalation, demobilization, and reparations, etc. – need to be interwoven and integrated together, supporting and complementing each other, and not competing/contradicting. Integration takes place both on the level of (i) ‘themes’/issues, and (ii) institutions/responsibilities. While institutions/NGOs may have responsibility for dealing with specific issues, or specific programmes/policies put forward for a single theme or themes, it is important that the various themes addressed in the peace process and the work of the different institutions and organizations involved in implementing it be effectively integrated. Economic and political policies put forward by the government in the post-war period should not conflict with the needs and objectives of peace-building and post-war rehabilitation, reconciliation and healing, together with overcoming the contradictions and injustices which led to the war. Ministries or organizations tasked with certain functions, or institutions created for a certain role – such as a Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), a body to deal with the reintegration of soldiers and ex-combatants, or local peace councils – should be sensitive to the conflict and the needs of the peace process, working to cooperate, developing their efforts and programmes together in an integrated and complementary way, rather than competing for jurisdiction and resources. The needs of political reconciliation, compensation for combatants, and regeneration of the economy are vital, but should not be carried out at the expense of other equally important issues. Gender, economic, social and political policies, the need for reconciliation and rehabilitation, and the effort to overcome structures of violence and exclusion, should be effectively integrated and addressed throughout, in all aspects of the process (rather than seen as individual ‘add-ons’). The needs of those affected by the violence, the poorest, of marginalized and excluded groups, the rights and the need for empowerment and participation of women and <i>dalits</i>, of participatory democracy, and the basic human needs and rights of all parties should be recognized, included and effectively incorporated in the planning and implementation of all steps and aspects of the peace process.</p>
-------------------	---

Cohesive	Building upon the need for integration of key themes and issues into all aspects of the peace process, the over-all peace process should form a united whole, in which the different issues – including justice, healing, participation, reconciliation, rehabilitation, rebuilding, restructuring, reculturing, reparations, and resettlement, as well as de-escalation, demilitarization, demobilization, and disarming – and the underlying dynamics and issues/contradictions which gave rise to the violence are addressed in a way that meets the needs and interests of all the parties involved. The actions of the parties and groups involved in the peace process should be aimed towards bringing up the issues and goals which are vital to them and to those who have been affected and suffered from the direct, structural and cultural violence.
Comprehensive	The needs of all parties, and all aspects of the transformation of the conflict, building peace, healing, justice, and post-war rehabilitation, rebuilding, and reconciliation, must be addressed by the process. This includes (i) the needs of combatants and parties to the armed conflict and (ii) the needs of all social sectors and social, economic, political, and cultural groups in the country, from the local to the national level. The sheer scale and complexity of issues to be dealt with is such that effective forums and mechanisms for the participation of a wide-range of actors and groups both in the development and implementation of the peace process are essential. No single group has the resources, awareness or capacity to effectively address all of the needs and issues facing the people of Nepal, arising from the conflict and war and of different groups and sectors in the country. The needs of women, <i>dalits</i> , and other socially, economically and politically marginalized groups should be addressed <i>by the participation of those groups themselves</i> , if the peace process is to deal with the deep-seeded underlying causes of the war. Grievances and fault-lines which gave rise to the war, as well as those which resulted from and had their origins in the war, should be dealt with, including each of the eleven fault lines: Gender, Generation, Political, Military, Economic, Cultural, Social, National, Territory, Nature, Neighboring/Foreign Countries. Exclusion and neglect of certain issues because they are not considered of sufficient importance or convenient by post-war governing parties or parties to the armed conflict – even though they may be highly important and fundamental for other groups/communities – is one of the surest recipes for future fighting and a return to violence.

<p>Needs-Based</p>	<p>The process as a whole should seek to effectively address the real needs of the communities, parties and different social groups taking part in and affected by the conflict – i.e. the people of Nepal. Proposals for transforming the conflict and dealing with the challenges of post-war Nepal should be based upon the real needs of the country, from the local to the national level, <i>as put forth by the people themselves</i>. Outside-imposed prescriptions or ‘solutions’ may often fail to do this adequately, as will top-down ‘peace’ processes which exclude certain actors – such as women or <i>dalits</i> – social, national, cultural and other groups. An important element of any peace process is to ascertain the real needs and issues which need to be addressed. This can best be done by constructive participation through local forums of all social groups in the process itself. While parties to the armed conflict may effectively bring forward a number of these issues, civil society organizations, NGOs, and the people themselves – in villages, towns, the capital, and throughout the country – can play a vital and important role raising their voices, participating actively, transforming conflicts, organizing to halt the violence, and building cooperation and confidence at the local and national levels, and working to ensure that their needs and concerns and the needs and concerns of their constituencies are addressed. A good process will be one in which the participation of and the commitment to addressing the needs of the communities and people of Nepal is seen as central to the overall transformation of the conflict and building peace, including both the final outcome as well as the way the process is carried out.</p>
<p>Inclusive</p>	<p>A peace process should be inclusive rather than exclusive, actively promoting the involvement of participants and representatives from all sectors, including not only armed combatants and their political representatives, but all political parties, as well as civil society groups, NGOs, and popular forums for the participation and involvement of the public (peace forums). Parties to the conflict, NGOs, and all social forces can contribute to creating an inclusive and constructive process. Conflict Transformation, peacebuilding, and post-war rehabilitation, rebuilding and reconciliation are both social and individual acts. Parties left out will have little or no interest in supporting the eventual outcome of the process (and can contribute to its derailment), while excluding parties may also lead to the marginalization of those who can actively contribute to overcoming the legacy of the war in Nepal. The more inclusive the process, the higher the likelihood of a sustainable outcome.</p>

Participatory	Building upon the importance of inclusiveness, participatory emphasizes the need for peace processes to be built upon the active participation and engagement of the groups involved and all sectors of civil society. It includes awareness raising together with organization, mobilization, and empowerment of the population to be active participants in the peace process at the local, regional and national levels, and the creation of spaces, forums and organizations for the participation of women, <i>dalits</i> , rural communities, former bonded labor, workers, academics, students, human rights organizations, journalists, and others in the peace process. Participation can involve different roles and responsibilities at different levels. Increasing spaces and possibilities for participation, both in the peace process and in the actual rebuilding, rehabilitation and reconciliation efforts, can dramatically increase the scope, depth, and effectiveness of these processes.
Reversible	Reversibility is a vital element of any process. Decisions and steps which are taken should be able to be undone if it is discovered that they were the wrong ones, are ineffective, or if they are having a negative effect upon the process. At the same time, participants must feel confident that what has been agreed upon will be implemented and that their basic needs and the reasons they have agreed to take part in the process will be respected and adequately addressed. A peace process or final peace agreement, to promote sustainability and prevent break-down, should include the mechanisms and ways in which challenges or contradictions which might arise in the process can be addressed and dealt with constructively, including the possibility of future referenda or additional meetings at set periods. Peace Councils which can monitor and support the transformation of the conflict and post-war reconstruction and healing, allowing for difficulties to be addressed without derailing the overall process, can assist this.
Compelling	If the <i>vision</i> for peace (the outcome) which comes out of the process is to be sustainable, it must be compelling – i.e. it must offer all parties the possibility to achieve what is important and vital to them, providing a positive, constructive alternative to continued fighting. <i>Compelling</i> here is meant to imply that the outcome made available through the process is <i>powerful, inspiring, and constructive</i> , mobilizing and attracting support through its ability to meet the needs of all parties, to provide avenues for their involvement and participation, to overcome the destruction of the war, and to give hope that peace is possible. No ‘outcome’ is sustainable which is enforced upon parties

	<p>from above, or kept in place through the threat of force. A peace process is compelling to the extent that it is concretely and practically able to address the real needs of the people, the parties to the conflict, and the root causes and contradictions which gave rise to the conflict, as well as those which have been brought about as a result of the war.</p>
Committed	<p>If a peace process is to be successful, the parties to the conflict and the population at large – including local communities as well as social leaders, NGOs, journalists, civil society organizations, and others – must be committed to finding an effective and constructive outcome to the conflict, using <i>empathy, non-violence</i> and <i>creativity</i>. The success of any process rests upon the commitment of the parties both to the <i>outcome</i> and to the <i>process</i>. For these reasons, the process itself must be an <i>honest one, addressing the conflict and its root causes, as well as the actions of the parties during the war, and deep structures and cultures of violence</i>, aimed not at the victory or triumph of one party or group above another but at the constructive transformation of the conflict. The degree to which parties are committed to this will affect the quality and sustainability of the process and final outcome.</p>
Symmetric	<p>Symmetry includes a balance between the parties. In terms of conflict transformation and peace building, this does not need to mean that the parties have reached military or even economic parity, something which can often be difficult or impossible in conflicts and wars in which the resources available to the different parties may be vastly unequal. Recognition and respect for the needs and concerns as well as the ABCs of each party, a commitment to arriving at joint and mutually acceptable and beneficial outcomes and an avoidance of <i>diktat</i> and imposition of forced outcomes based upon power politics and domination are vital. Unless the parties are treated as equal with regards to the <i>legitimacy of their basic needs and human rights</i>, no outcome arrived at can be considered sustainable or just. Within this context, the ‘parties’ included are not only those which took part militarily in the combat, but the representatives and participants of all social sectors and groups in the country.</p>
Indigenous	<p>The resources required for transforming the conflict and building peace, as well as post-war reconciliation and healing <i>can best be found within the country itself</i>. While it can be important and</p>

	<p>helpful to learn from experiences elsewhere and to draw upon constructive approaches to conflict transformation developed in other contexts and cultures, the transformation of the conflict, including the approaches and methods used, the decisions and outcomes arrived, and the responsibility for peace <i>must be rooted within the country and culture, coming from the roots of Nepal, its people and communities, rather than imposed from abroad</i>. Constructive dialogue can be useful, and there are many lessons and experiences from other areas which may help in the process of the transformation of the conflict in Nepal. Focus on external lessons however, to the neglect of searching, nurturing, and building the process and its roots within Nepal itself will be fatal. While it may lead to an ‘outcome’ and a final agreement, it will be neither sustainable nor empowering. <i>Peace</i> must be both an indigenous process and outcome, driven, owned and participated in by the people of Nepal.</p>
Sustainable	<p>The same criteria for a good conflict transformation approach also apply, together with the eleven principles outlined above (some of them reiterated here), to what is necessary to make a peacebuilding process sustainable. It should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>meaningful to the people/participants involved in and affected by the conflict</i>, not simply imported from outside the community/country or imposed from above; • <i>practical</i>, providing effective tools and resources for people to be directly and actively engaged in working to address the conflict constructively, as well as to deal with the underlying dynamics and causes of the war and the impact of the war and violence on the community; • <i>participatory</i>, involving people as the participants, actors and decision-makers, guiders and <i>implementers</i> in the actual process of transforming their conflicts and post-war reconciliation, rebuilding and healing; • <i>rooted in the traditions, culture and people of the community</i> (indigenous) and addressing the real needs of the people <i>as identified by the people themselves</i>; • <i>integrated, comprehensive and holistic</i>, effectively addressing all of the issues – including the ABCs of each party – and aspects of the conflict, with different aspects and steps/stages complementing, reinforcing and supporting each other, avoiding the pitfalls of fragmented, competing, and contradictory processes;

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>sustainable</i>, not relying or dependent upon outside support and outside-driven processes;• <i>inspiring</i>, providing people with confidence and hope in their ability and the ability of the process to overcome and transcend the conflict, <i>transforming</i> it constructively, and creating new opportunities and possibilities out of the conflict.• And supported by the creation and strengthening of peace resources, skills, tools and knowledge for transforming conflicts constructively in the community/country, including the promotion of peace education, the rewriting of text-books, promotion of a culture of peace, training of people for peace work, reconciliation and healing from violence, transformation of deep structures of violence, and creating of democratic and empowering fora for people's participation and the meeting of people's basic needs and human rights. |
|--|--|

Positive Constructive/Negative Destructive: Visions and Resources for Peacebuilding and Conflict Transformation

	Positive Constructive	Negative Destructive
Future		
Present		
Past		

People and communities affected by violence often feel trapped. The violence itself seems overwhelming, intractable. In Nepal, many people, at all levels, are uncertain both about what is happening now and what will come tomorrow. A common phenomenon in war affected communities is that people will glorify the past, the time before the war began, and the hoped for future, when the war will be over, while seeing the war and the violence as to blame, the cause for all their problems. The real root causes of the violence and the structures and cultures of violence which existed before the outbreak of the war may not actually have been identified or fully recognized/understood by all, leading to the possibility that they may remain unaddressed after the war – the direct violence – has been brought to an end.

The table above can be very empowering and brings out important aspects of the past, present and future in violence affected communities. Rather than identifying everything in the past as either good or bad, the aim is to identify *what aspects* of the past were **positive, constructive** – things that people liked, valued, supported, felt was good in their lives, their community and country – and which were *negative, destructive* – including things we may not have clearly identified at the time but which, looking back now, we realize may not have been positive or good for the community and/or certain individuals or groups/peoples in the community and country.

The same mapping may be done for the present, helping people to identify what it is in the present – the war, violence, and also other problems, challenges and issues (economic, political, social, cultural, health, gender, exclusion, etc.) they face – that they wish to change or to overcome. Addressing these issues may be vital to effectively transforming the ABCs – attitudes, behaviors and contradictions – of the conflict and the DSCs – direct, structural, cultural – of the violence. At the same time, people in war affected countries in which the violence is continuing or has recently been brought to an end by a cease-fire may not have identified or be fully cognizant of the positive aspects and resources that exist in their community, including the actions and initiatives of different groups and organizations to empower themselves to

transform the conflict and the violence constructively, and to heal from the impacts of the violence and war. Mapping what is positive and constructive in the present, at the local, regional and national level, socially, culturally, politically, organizationally, economically, and on the level of individuals and communities, can be part of the process of identifying the resources, capacities, networks, values, and skills which may exist in the community, and which may have been there from long before the war or violence, which may serve as seeds and soil for transcending and overcoming the war. It is these which may be built upon, enriched, and drawn upon for courage and inspiration, to help people in the difficult tasks of transforming the conflict, building peace and post-war reconstruction, rehabilitation and reconciliation.

Mapping the positive, constructive of the future – what you want your community/country to look like, what you hope for, your vision of tomorrow – and the negative, destructive – what will/could happen if the conflict is not addressed, if the root causes/structures and cultures of violence remain, and/or if the violence/war breaks out again or escalates in the future – is vital for two reasons. Essential to conflict transformation and peacebuilding is a vision of the conflict transformed: an image of the community *beyond* the violence and war, and an *outcome* satisfactory to and meeting the needs of all the parties involved. What would that look like? What would be included in it? An image of the *positive constructive future* is not only one in which the war itself has ended, but a vision of *what type of Nepal do the people of Nepal want*. In dialogues with people across the country, this usually reflects an image of tomorrow in which both the fighting and war has ended, and in which the root causes and structures of the violence have been transcended. Its concrete image and what this entails may take different forms in different areas. It is this vision, enunciated, shared, spoken and brought forth by people, which can help to inspire, mobilize, encourage and empower people and communities to work to overcome the war and violence.

The image of the *negative destructive future*, of what may happen and what Nepal might look like if the conflicts is not addressed and if the war continues, can be equally powerful. It shows to people the reality of what may happen if the violence continues and escalates, if it is left unaddressed, and if the war and its destruction and devastation of Nepal go on. This may also serve to mobilize and to empower people and to strengthen and deepen their commitment to finding an alternative – a more effective, concrete, and practical – way of dealing with the conflict and transforming it constructively.

2. Working for Peace: Five Tasks

There are at least five tasks facing those working for peace and to bring an end to the war and fighting in Nepal today:

- 1. Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means**
- 2. End the Violence (Cease Fire)**
- 3. Address Root Causes/Contradictions (Peace Process)**
- 4. Build Peace Resources**
- 5. Heal (Rehabilitation, Rebuilding, Reconciliation + building new, positive relations)**

Each of these is interrelated, while at the same time presenting different specific tasks and challenges. An overall holistic approach is essential, recognizing distinct aspects of each while understanding the importance of working on all five. Actors from all sectors of Nepali society, from NGOs and self-help groups to artists, journalists, youth, students, community and religious leaders, and those part of the armed conflict can play important roles in building peace and transforming and transcending the root causes of the war.

1. Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means

Transforming the *Attitudes, Behavior, and Contradictions* of the parties and the conflict, overcoming enemy images and dehumanization/demonization of each side by the other, transcending zero-sum, win-lose discourses and language of violence, and developing visions of outcomes to the conflict acceptable to all sides. This is not just about the actual parties to the war. Often, for conflict transformation to take place it can require the involvement of many other social actors, including those with close ties to the major parties, those affected by the conflict and violence, civil society organizations, journalists, women's organizations, workers, rural communities, youth, and others. Empathy, Nonviolence and Creativity are vital tools for conflict transformation *not only for those using violence*, but for all sectors of a society affected by conflict and violence and working to transform it through peaceful means. Involvement by all the sectors of Nepali society which have not been directly involved in the fighting in putting forward constructive proposals, recognizing the basic needs and legitimate concerns of all sides, and working to help facilitate real dialogues on the conflict and how it can be transformed constructively, are vital.

2. End the Violence (Cease Fire)

There have now been two cease-fires in Nepal in recent years. While the cease-fires themselves bring wide-spread relief and hope for an end to violence on the part of

most Nepalese, the collapse of each one has led to increasing feelings of powerlessness, together with increasing resignation to and acceptance of the war. The last cease-fire, lasting several months, was always very tentative. Violations of the cease-fire continued daily, while both sides continued to use violence, both against each other and non-combatants. Perhaps the most important lesson, however, was that no effective efforts were taken to utilize this period, either by the combating parties or by civil society organizations, to develop a broad-based, participatory peace process which could both (i) address the root causes of the war and (ii) prevent/resist a return to violence. Particularly during cease-fires, mobilization and empowerment of local communities and civil society organizations, together with national mobilization across the country to hold parties to the cease-fire, training in non-violence to actively resist a return to war, dialogues with the parties to emphasize the importance of avoiding a return to violence, and open support by all sectors of Nepali society for the ending of the violence are indispensable. NGOs and local communities which are often paralyzed during the fighting can play an active role in ensuring that cease-fires will not break down due to possible belligerence on the part of any side. Military and combatants on all sides can strengthen cease-fires by proclaiming their commitment to peace and to transforming the root causes of the conflict effectively through the development of a sustainable peace process.

3. Address Root Causes/Contradictions (Peace Process)

An effective peace process or peace processes in Nepal has/have to address the root causes and real contradictions underlying the war, and to come up with concrete proposals/ways of transcending them. Failure to do so will be a recipe for a return to violence. *Peace processes*, however, can take many forms. They can be started by those involved in the armed conflict (the Maoists and the Government), and they can also be carried out and promoted by civil society organizations (ie. a Women's Peace Process, a Youth Peace Process, a People's Peace Process), political parties, and others, drawing upon and involving people in working to come up with concrete visions and proposals for how to overcome the issues which gave rise to the war, to address the impact and effects of the war on Nepali society, and to strengthen the force for peace. Each of the fault lines underlying the conflict in Nepal – gender, generation, political, military, economic, cultural, social, national, territory, nature, neighboring/foreign countries – should be included, both individually and together. Every Nepali has the right to be engaged in the quest for peace in their country, and in the active work and efforts to realize that peace at the local and national levels. Peace processes should be carried out through *dialogue*, providing space and listening to all sides, addressing the basic needs of all parties and groups affected by the conflict, and

developing a *positive constructive* vision/outcome transcending the conflict and its root causes. Peace processes can take place at the national and local levels, bringing together individuals and multiple actors. There can be several, complementary processes carried out throughout the country, increasing people's awareness, empowerment, and direct involvement and participation in building peace. Including and developing strategies for how to rebuild and heal from the violence and destruction of the war, and to overcome the human, psychological, social, political, economic and cultural aspects of the war should also be part of every peace process.

4. Build Peace Resources

Developing peace resources within the country and increasing capacity and methods for dealing with conflicts constructively – with *empathy, nonviolence, and creativity* – is one of the most important things that can be done both to ensure that the war which has affected Nepal for the last seven years can be successfully transcended and the root causes of the violence transformed, and to ensure that future conflicts are dealt with constructively and without the use of violence. Building peace resources can include strengthening, mobilizing and empowering *constituencies for peace* – ie. those who wish for an end to the fighting and for addressing the root causes and deep structures of violence in Nepal – through concrete efforts and training, mobilizing and encouraging broad sectors of the Nepali population in favor of peace to unite, initiate and develop peace processes and post-war reconstruction, rehabilitation, reconciliation and healing at the local and national levels. Peace Resources can include:

- developing *peace councils* at the local/community and national levels bringing together members of the community who can help in transforming conflicts constructively;
- creating *peace forums* at the community and national levels, as well as for specific sectors (such as rural communities, women, youth, dalits, etc.), providing space for people to come together to discuss the effects and impacts of the violence – direct, structural and cultural – on their communities, what type of communities/what type of Nepal they want, and what can be done – in particular what can they do – to overcome the violence and to build peace in Nepal;
- peace education at all levels of education from elementary to university, formal and informal, including training of teachers and preparation of curriculum;
- creation of civil society networks and alliances for peace uniting self-help groups, NGOs, women's associations, grass-roots movements, and others at the local and national levels;

- training in nonviolence, constructive conflict transformation, peacebuilding, and post-war reconstruction, rehabilitation and reconciliation, together with training in human rights and people-centered, participatory development and empowerment at the local and national levels;
- building peace houses and centers in each community (these can be parts of schools for example);
- peace radio, informing people across Nepal about what is being done and local and national initiatives, both by the parties to the armed conflict and by people across Nepal, to bring about an end to the war/fighting, to address the root causes of the violence, and to promote rebuilding, rehabilitation and reconciliation;
- training journalists in peace journalism;
- working with artists to promote a culture of peace;
- and many, many more. What is important: that the initiatives build and draw upon Nepali cultures and traditions, and what is meaningful and concrete to communities and people in Nepal. Lessons can be learned from what has been tried in different parts of the country as well as internationally. While little focus has been given in Nepal (as in most countries) to strengthening and developing the country's resources for overcoming the war and building peace, this is vital if the efforts to transform the conflict(s), to heal from the impact of the violence, and to make peace sustainable, are to be effective.

5. Heal

(Rehabilitation, Rebuilding, Reconciliation + building new, positive relations)

There are both visible and invisible effects of war. The devastation and destruction done to buildings and physical infrastructure is often easy to see. The devastation and destruction done to people's minds and hearts, to their hopes and dreams, to their confidence and belief in each other, themselves, tomorrow, and even today, is often much less visible. Trauma and suffering – from physical, psychological, and emotional pain due to violence done to self, loved ones, and/or the overall violence of the war on the community – can often be far more difficult to overcome than destruction of infrastructure. Post-war rehabilitation, rebuilding and reconciliation must have, as their overall aim – including both *goal* and *process* – to heal, on the individual and broad social (community and national) levels. This should be at the very centre of all local and national peace processes, rather than seen as an 'add-on' or 'post-script' to be followed-up on and addressed later. Committed and sustained efforts on the part of the government and all actors to the armed conflict are vital. While the trauma and suffering of the war remain, real peace will not exist. Every

step taken to transform the conflict as well as post-fighting economic and political policies should be reviewed in light of their contribution to healing from the war and building new, and positive relations transcending the violence. A wide-range of civil society actors, from local community leaders to formal and informal networks, women's organizations, self-help groups, youth, artists, religious leaders, political cadres, journalists, and students can all play essential tasks in bringing out the truth and coming to grips with the past while working to build a culture of peace and reconciliation. As long as the violence of the war is unaccounted for, and deep structures of injustice, violence, and marginalization remain, there will continue to be significant obstacles to healing.

Post-War: 5 Rs + Healing

Again, each of these tasks is interrelated, and should be closely integrated with the five above. While primarily related to post-war contexts, each of the 5 Rs – Rehabilitation, Rebuilding, Restructuring, Reculturing and Reconciliation – may, to some extent, take place during violence as well. Post-war peacebuilding and reconstruction cannot exist as separate and detached from the actual peace process. It should be seen as a *continuation* and part of the actual process of building peace and healing from the devastation and destruction of the war, with involvement and participation both by governmental actors and parties to the armed conflict, and a wide-range of civil society groups and popular forces, including women's organizations and women, youth, workers, journalists, human rights organizations, and others. These tasks are, in essence, fundamental for securing the post-war foundation for peace, social, economic and political development, and building the resources and capacity for transforming conflicts effectively and constructively, preventing the return of violence. They are both an attempt to heal from and overcome the impact of the war on Nepali society, and to learn from the experiences of the last decades to improve the meeting of basic needs and building of well-being (*sarvodaya*) in Nepal.

1. Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation involves restoring, mending, repairing, and regenerating from the destruction/harm of the war, moving from violence and its impact towards restoration/revitalization of health. It addresses six key fields:

- Physical
- Psychological
- Social
- Cultural
- Economic
- Political

2. Rebuilding (Reconstruction)

Rebuilding addresses the physical destruction caused by the war, including the destruction of economic and social infrastructure, schools, buildings, homes, bridges, roads, etc., as well as rebuilding lives and communities after war and violence. Essential to rebuilding after war is recognition of the social, economic, political and cultural aspects of rebuilding, seeing it not only as a technical process, but as an integral part of the peace process and post-war recovery and healing in which communities and those affected by the violence, as well as ex-combatants, can play active roles.

3. Restructuring

Restructuring involves the building of peace structures and the transformation of structures of violence and war, including also of institutions and political, social, economic and other structures. This can include, for example:

- Transformation of military structures, the army, and extensive investment in armaments and military training and institutions towards the development of peace forces, and training and building of resources for dealing with conflicts constructively and addressing post-war challenges of rehabilitation, rebuilding, restructuring, reculturing and reconciliation;
- Transformation of educational structures to integrate peace education at every level of schooling, both as curricula and pedagogy;
- Transformation of political structures from overly centralized, exclusive, concentrated and top-down to decentralized, inclusive, representative and participatory;
- Transformation of economic structures from highly exploitative, unjust, centralized, and unequal distribution and control of assets and resources to people-centered participatory development, pluralistic, decentralized, with fairer distribution of land and resources and participation in decision-making;
- Creation of institutions for dealing with social, economic and political conflicts constructively, such as peace councils and peace forums;

4. Reculturing

Actively working, through education, cultural performances, the arts, social culture, dialogues, and creative popular participation to transform images and stereotyping, dehumanization, demonization of 'the other', and win-lose, good vs. evil, 'black'- 'white' towards a culture of peace, recognition, respect and celebration of diversity, basic human needs, human rights, and the richness of Nepal's cultural diversity, including values and traditions of empathy, nonviolence and creativity deeply woven into Nepali culture and society.

5. Reconciliation

Reconciliation involves both apology and forgiveness, together with truth, justice, empathy, and mourning, including the space and time which may be necessary for those to take place, and active support for them, from civil society organization, communities, and the government and parties to the conflict. Reconciliation is the healing of relationships between and within the individuals and communities affected both by committing and experiencing violence, pain, and trauma – emotional, psychological, mental and physical. It is the process of transcending relationships of violence towards peace and healing. Efforts at reconciliation should allow those affected by the violence to take part actively, to have their voices heard and stories told and listened to. Reconciliation cannot be imposed or decreed, and is not the same as trials or amnesties. Truth and Reconciliation processes, nationally, locally, within each community and individual, may be vital for a community to heal and overcome from the legacy and impact of violence, however this should be done in a way that is rooted in and woven into Nepali culture and tradition.

Healing

As with above, healing is a deeply personal, individual as well as social process, and should be woven in as an aim and part of the process of each of the five 'R's. Healing takes time, but time alone is not enough. Concrete efforts to address the legacy of the war and violence and to support individuals and communities in discovering and having recognized the truth of their experiences and how they have been effected, together with space for voice and participation of those who have been effected, traumatized, attacked, tortured, wounded, and hurt/harmed by the violence is essential. Mothers and fathers, children, social, religious and political leaders, artists, journalists, psychologists, story tellers, elders, and many others all have roles to play in helping to promote healing, both for individuals and the community.

+ 2 Rs: Reparations & Reintegration

Reparations – providing economic and other reparations to victims of the war and those affected, including those tortured, raped, beaten, abused, and crippled, those whose homes were destroyed and/or fields damaged, people unfairly targeted/dismissed from work, as well as widows (men and women), single parents, children and orphans, and the families of those killed. Reparations should not only be addressed to political and military leaders, but most importantly, should be addressed to civilian populations and those most affected by the violence, including ex-combatants. Reparations may take the form of economic compensation and reimbursement for loss resulting from the war, but for many, there can be no price put on the suffering and trauma they have experienced. Particularly in war affected

countries and countries with economies which have been devastated by maldevelopment and/or violence, economic reparations may not be wholly possible. It is important, therefore, to see what other forms of reparations can be made, such as those responsible for acts of violence actively working to rebuild and to help heal the community. This can present new challenges, as well as opportunities. Creativity in coming up with effective forms of reparations, and respect for people's experiences and suffering – while also working to empower those who have been affected to rebuild their lives and engage actively in post-war/violence healing – are essential.

Reintegration

Including:

1. Re-integration of ex-combatants and ex-armed forces into their communities as civilians
2. Re-integration of internally displaced peoples and those forced to flee their homes from the violence into their communities
3. Re-integration of refugees and Nepalese who have gone abroad due to the war
4. Integration of members of all factions/fighting sides into a single Nepali army

As with rebuilding/reconstruction, reintegration is more than a purely 'technical' process, and should involve all aspects of the 5 'R's and the five tasks for peacebuilding and conflict transformation. Important issues relating to reintegration include: employment and skills/knowledge training for those being reintegrated into their communities, small-seed support funds, reintegration centers and support structures, and assistance/help for those affected by violence and trauma. These should be directed both towards combatants and non-combatants.

Post-War: 6 Ds

While traditionally seen as activities which take place when fighting and war has stopped, *de-escalation*, *demilitarization*, *demobilization*, *disarming*, *demining* and *depolarization* are essential steps **even in the midst of armed combat**, to reduce confrontation and take concrete steps away from war and towards the effective transformation of the conflict

De-escalation

De-escalation is a gradually scaling down of violence/armed conflict and confrontation between parties to the conflict. De-escalation of the violence and confrontation between the parties is essential to create the space for empowering communities for working for peace and to end the terror which is beginning again to grip many parts of the country. With renewed fighting, the role of moderate forces

amongst the Maoists and Government (where there are many who do not support the resumption of the war) and the importance of active mobilization of local communities and Nepali society has become even more vital. NGOs, local community leaders, self-help groups, and individuals with contacts and influence with combatants on either side can exert pressure to encourage the fighting sides to:

- Refrain from armed attacks. This can include also the creation of de facto if not de jure local cease-fires;
- Refrain from *all* attacks against civilians and non-combatants. This should be declared as an absolute principle by all sections and forces in Nepali society;
- Refrain from acts of terror and torture against armed combatants from other forces;
- Create spaces for meeting between combatants and leaders from different sides, as well as with representatives from the community, to keep open spaces/channels for dialogue and communication.

Demilitarization

De-militarization includes the shifting of the struggle to non-military means and forces, as well as the reduction of military presence in public spaces, including road blocks and the presence of armed forces publicly displaying weapons (Maoist and Government) in villages, towns and communities. Even throughout the cease-fire there was wide-spread militarization of many public spaces and communities in Nepal, maintaining a psychology and presence of fear and intimidation. Demilitarization is an essential step to de-escalating the violence and addressing the conflict through non-violent methods of struggle and transformation.

Demobilization

Demobilization of armed forces would show the seriousness and intention of the Government and Maoists to end the war and work to transform the underlying causes of the war. Demobilization can be simultaneous as well as unilateral. It involves the transformation of soldiers and combatants into non-combatant roles. For effective demobilization, efforts will be needed to retrain combatants in non-war time skills for a peace economy, provide trauma counseling, and small-scale support for local employment. Demobilized former combatants should be actively involved in efforts at rebuilding, rehabilitation and reconciliation, and in taking part in the design and implementation of programmes designed for them. Most experiences with demobilization efforts in areas affected by armed conflict have been disappointing. Often, those demobilized receive no effective support for developing sustainable peace-time livelihoods. Consideration must also be given to how to integrate non-combatants into the demobilization programmes, and to ensure community

participation and involvement. Demobilization programs which benefit only former fighters without addressing the needs of the communities they are being integrated into may serve to create greater resentment and conflicts with those who did not pick up the gun in the first place.

Disarming

Disarmament of all sides is important for freeing up resources needed for the reconstruction and development of the country, healing from war-time destruction, and removing the capacity and tools of war. Offensive military equipment can be increasingly exchanged for small scale policing weapons. Maoists and Government forces, or a third party trusted by both sides, can conduct joint or unilateral disarmament and monitoring, reducing their reliance on violent force. NGOs and civil society organizations can importantly play a role in guaranteeing security and safety for forces which disarm as well as for bringing pressure upon all armed groups to give up their reliance on weapons. In order to ensure effective disarmament, combatants must be provided with a sustainable alternative to their weapons, both for (i) security and for (ii) livelihood. This is essential if a disarmament program is to be successful. Importantly, in many disarmament programmes, combatants have traded in old weapons in order to allow them to purchase new ones. To ensure that disarmament is effective, concrete steps should be taken to make certain that new weapons do not enter the country.

Demining

Demining is here meant in a broader sense of removing all remnants of weapons, explosives and other tools of war which may remain even after the violence has stopped. Unexploded grenades, ordinances, mortars and land-mines can continue to cause suffering and death even after the end of the war. Active efforts, including sustained involvement by demobilized armed forces and combatants in cleaning up the remnants of the war to ensure that its legacy of violence is not continued, are necessary. Demining, however, can also be considered in the broader sense: demining the mind, demining the heart, and demining the laws and political, economic, social and cultural structures/spaces which may include in them causes of war and structures and cultures of violence. Therefore: demining includes removing, transforming and transcending the buried or deep-seeded causes of violence which, at the end of one war, may give rise to another.

Depolarization

Both during and after violence, steps are often taken to promote enemy images and forcing apart of groups from different sides. Those who promote dialogue and

recognition of each sides rights and needs are often targeted and labeled as traitors or terrorists. Physical attacks upon members of different communities increase divisions and the formation of stereo-types, demonization and dehumanization. Just as active steps can be taken to promote *polarization*, it is also necessary, both during and after war, to carry out concrete initiatives and steps aimed at depolarization. This can include recognizing common/shared needs and characteristics, remembering common/joint experiences, and creating spaces for hearing/recognizing all sides needs and interests, recognizing the conflict and the divisions which exist as a common challenge, uniting rather than driving the parties apart. Depolarization is essential to healing divisions and fault lines created from the war, and includes psycho-social healing and rehabilitation, as well as removing structural causes of inequality and polarization. Parties to the armed conflict can themselves take direct efforts to bridge divisions between themselves and other combatants and civilians, while communities and social organizations can take active steps to help regenerate community, bringing all the parties to the conflict, including those not using violence, together.

3. Empowering Peace-Workers/Forces for Peace

Peace initiatives in Nepal and internationally have often focused upon top level political and military leaders, excluding the vast majority of social actors and those who can contribute to (i) transforming the conflict(s), (ii) bringing an end to the violence (including both the creation of local and national level cease-fires), (iii) addressing its root causes, (iv) healing from the violence and destruction of the war, and (v) building resources and institutions for peace in the country/community. The vast majority of people in Nepal, whether in national or international NGOs and development agencies or in communities and towns across the country, feel largely powerless, not knowing, concretely, what they can do or how they can contribute and be involved in bringing an end to the war. At the same time, mobilization of broad social involvement and pressure for peace, as well as the development of peacebuilding processes by local communities and actors across the country, and support for local capacities and resources for peace are essential if the paralyzing dynamics of war and confrontation are to be transcended. While significant investments are made in developing and training soldiers to kill, including purchasing of weapons, military training programmes, and actual combat – by the combatants, the Nepali State, and foreign countries – very little is done to prepare, empower and strengthen people for active peace work and conflict transformation by peaceful means. It is not that preparing for war is easier or more important than preparing and working for peace, but simply that more focus has been given to war, and the concrete skills, tools and methods which make it possible, than to peace, and that local, national and international actors often feel at a loss for what they can do when confronted with violence. In order to overcome the war it will be necessary to encourage, strengthen, mobilize and nurture individuals and communities across the country to be able to actively resist the spread of violence, to transform conflicts constructively, to regenerate community in areas devastated by war, and to build a concrete vision of what they want, addressing and transcending the root causes of the war. Multiple, sustained, and reinforcing efforts to strengthen local and national actors and social forces for peace are vital. In addition, developing institutions, networks, and structures which can support peacebuilding and peace-work at the community and national level are essential.

Training Programmes

- Training programmes can help to provide participants with concrete skills, tools and knowledge for:
- Mapping and understanding the dynamics and root causes of conflicts

- Conflict transformation by peaceful means
- Empowering individuals and communities for peace work and conflict transformation
- Peacebuilding and people-centered participatory approaches to peace
- Developing strategies and programs for peace work and social mobilization and empowerment
- Networking, cooperation and building alliances and joint-efforts for peace within and across sectors and communities
- Understanding and analyzing the impact of violence on individuals and the community
- Healing and post-war rehabilitation, rebuilding, restructuring, reculturing and reconciliation
- The six Ds – de-escalation, demilitarization, demobilization, disarming, demining, depolarization
- Recovering from trauma and violence – on the individual and social levels
- Dialogue processes – on the individual and social levels – including community forums and local, regional and national peace forums
- Building upon and integrating local and traditional skills, tools and knowledge for conflict transformation
- Developing and carrying out local and country-wide peace processes and peace mobilization
- Developing constructive and inclusive visions/proposals for how to go beyond the war and how to build peace, respecting and including the needs of all parties and social groups
- And much more

What is important is that training programmes for conflict transformation and peacebuilding should not be one-off events, but should be linked to broader programmes aimed at empowering and strengthening individuals and local communities' capacity for responding to conflicts and peacebuilding. Training should be needs-based, and highly interactive and participatory, responding to the concrete challenges and issues facing participants, building upon their own knowledge and experience, and integrating the content of the training into their real lives and situations. The content of the training should be specifically designed for the context in which the program is taking place, and the needs, skills and qualities of the participants taking part. The situation in Kathmandu is different than the situation in rural areas and areas directly affected by the violence, and the context from one village in one part of Nepal may be different from that in another village in another part of Nepal. Trainers and peace-workers should be able to interact with and

respond to the context, needs and situation of each area and/or group they are working with, building also upon local knowledge, culture and traditions, and addressing the real needs and immediate and long-term realities of participants. The trainer should be someone who has the confidence of the participants, and is seen as a legitimate resource person in their eyes. In each case, this confidence has to be earned by the trainer, and therefore the manner and way in which they do their work is very important. It is also an important reason for working with local trainers and resource persons, and involving them in the development of training. This can gradually lead to the development of a network of trainers and peace-workers cooperating across districts and nationally to build and strengthen resources and forces for peace.

Qualities of a Peace-worker

Some of the qualities, skills and characteristics identified in programmes across Nepal and in other conflict and war affected areas as important for a peace-worker include:

Honest	Humble	Aware of local	Able to see	Nonviolent
Committed	Respectful	cultures	and admit	Passionate
Sincere	Knowledgeable	Believes in what	when s/he's	Imaginative
Peaceful	Creative	he/she is doing	made a	Balanced
Good listener	Patient	Able/Open to	mistake	Sense of timing
Good	Dedicated	learning from	Disciplined	Sense of humor
communicator	Hard-working	others	Not biased	Able to
Good at	Able to relax	Wise	Constructive	articulate
transforming	Discreet	Able to inspire	Tenacious	Free of
conflicts	Hopeful	Concrete/Practical	Devoted	preconceptions
Courageous	Empathetic	Able to be peace	Willingness to	Vision
Sensitive			accept/be	Lifelong-learner
			challenged	

For a trainer or person working for peacebuilding and conflict transformation in their community/country, many of these characteristics are essential. What is important:

1) These are human qualities

While the list as a whole may be very imposing to some – it might seem impossible for any one person to have all of these attributes, making the peace-worker an ‘ideal’ or archetype – these are all human qualities/characteristics, which we each have, though some may be more developed than others in different individuals.

2) They are qualities which can be nurtured and developed – and trained

These are skills, qualities and characteristics which can be nurtured and developed, through our education, up-bringing, culture and training. They are characteristics and qualities which we can nurture and develop in ourselves, and support in others. One of the aims of peace-work and training peace-workers is to help this process, with the participants themselves identifying what they believe to be the qualities/characteristics of a peace-worker, identifying their own strengths and areas in which they wish to develop their skills and attributes further, and helping each other to do so. Peace-work is a constant process of reflection and continued development of skills and capabilities.

3) From one peace-worker to many

Different people have different strengths and abilities. One aspect of the list and the process of developing it might be to indicate that it can be good to have several peace-workers, working together as a team, rather than just one. In this way, individuals may support each other, building upon each others skills, gifts and abilities, rather than any one individual trying to cover all tasks. Many of the skills listed as those of a peace-worker are ones which can be found in other fields and professions.

4) Specialized training helps – and is often necessary

At the same time, while it is possible to find in many professions some of the individual skills and tools necessary for peace-work, to develop these to the point where they can be effective in empowering individuals for conflict transformation and peacebuilding, further education and training is necessary. The skills of someone working in farming, child rearing, development, psychology, teaching, social work, and other fields are very valuable when working to address conflicts, but they are often not, in and of themselves, enough. When confronted with violence, working in war affected communities, or trying to help/assist those affected by violence, special skills, knowledge and preparation are necessary.

5) Be the Change You Want to See – the power of example

For a trainer and peace-worker it is important to try to embody and live as many of these qualities, skills and characteristics as possible. While it is one thing to try and teach them to people, it can be much stronger, more empowering, and more authentic, if those you engage with feel that you take seriously what you are saying, and try yourself to fulfill and realize as many of these qualities as possible.

Confianza, Cuello, Coyuntura⁷

Three qualities important for a peace-work and for developing community-based peacebuilding approaches are what Latin Americans call *confianza*, *cuello*, and *coyuntura*.

Confianza is similar to 'confidence', and implies something more than simply 'trust'. It means that the people of the community, or the individuals/groups with which you are working, have trust in you – i.e. they have confidence in you as a human being, in what you say, in your work, and in your word when it is given. *Confianza* is essential for being able to do peace-work. Without it, very little can be done. Most importantly: *confianza* has to be earned. It is not simply given, or received, because of one's title or position in an organization or university. It comes from the work and commitment one makes to a community, to respect shown for people, cultures, traditions and values, and the way in which one carries themselves and interacts with others. At its very root, it comes from practicing and being the message you promote and are working for.

Cuello which means 'neck' is taken to symbolize 'network' – a series of relationships with people in the community, as well as with others who might be able to contribute to improving/transforming the situation. In part this implies what has been written before: that there may need to be several rather than simply one peace-worker. In some situations, the peace-worker's most important quality is not trying to do everything him/herself, but knowing who might be able to contribute and to do this best, and being able to work together in a team/with a network of people. *Cuello* means being rooted/connected, in the community, and in what you are doing, and having others you can call upon and turn to for help and assistance.

Coyuntura is 'timing'. This is an essential characteristic/quality of a peace-worker. Both: (i) knowing what to do when, including doing the right thing at the right time, and (ii) a commitment of time: being there, in the moment and when you are needed, not simply coming in and then going out again, but showing a continued and sustained commitment over time, including in difficult moments when it is most necessary. This relates also to *confianza*, which cannot be 'earned' at once, but comes about through sustained and honest effort/commitment.

⁷ The concepts of *Confianza*, *Cuello*, *Coyuntura* and their meaning in relation to peacebuilding are addressed by John Paul Lederach in *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies (1997)*, United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington DC.

Cooperation, Coordination, Communication, Commitment, Courage

Between teams of peace-workers and in local communities there are also 5 Cs which are essential: *cooperation, coordination, communication, commitment, and courage.*

Cooperation – it is important to be able to cooperate effectively with others, including other individuals, communities and organizations. Cooperation includes and implies a willingness to work together, to help out, and to contribute actively and constructively to doing more together than can be done apart. This also includes being willing and open to learning from and listening to others, respecting each other's involvement and contributions, and building effectively together.

Coordination – for this to be effective, coordination – of efforts, time, initiatives and vision – is essential. Coordination implies bringing together, synchronization, harmonization, and joint and open planning and carrying out of activities. Often, individuals and organizations are involved in similar or overlapping initiatives and activities with little effective cooperation, or even competition between different initiatives. Coordination at all levels, including planning as well as implementation, is essential for effective partnerships and cooperation.

Communication – sharing of information, openness, dialogue and transparency are essential for both cooperation and coordination, and for empowering communities and individuals for peace-work. Frequently, people do not know what is being done by other groups, individuals or organizations, or what is happening in other parts of the country or community. To help develop effective and constructive approaches to dealing with and responding to situations, and to ensure good cooperation and coordination, clear, timely, and responsible communication is essential. It is not enough, however, to simply expect people to communicate or share information which is needed. Often, people may be afraid or feel under threat, and might be unwilling to share information/perspectives with those they don't know. For this reason, understanding local contexts and conditions is essential. Communication between individuals and organizations also helps to prepare for this. Remember, however, communication is more than simply what is said – it includes eye and body language, posture, facial expressions, and 'presence': if one stays or goes when they are most needed, if one works more than is necessary or the absolute minimum, if one gives of themselves honestly, or simply fulfills a job, it communicates much, much more than words.

Commitment – for these reasons, commitment is essential when working in peacebuilding and conflict transformation. The peace-worker, as an individual, must

be open and honest about their level of commitment, and how able they are to sustain that over time and in difficult situations. Commitment is more than an enthusiasm or willingness to start something. It also involves a willingness to see it through, and to continue in the face of challenges. Through commitment and sustained/honest effort, *confianza* can be earned, allowing the individual to work more effectively with individuals and in the community/organization.

Courage – very importantly: peace-work often also requires courage; not only courage in the face of violence, but also courage in continuing under difficult contexts and situations. While a great deal of peace-work may be done without every coming under threat, many situations might develop in which the peace-worker him/herself faces possible harm, or must respond immediately – in a peaceful, nonviolent, constructive and determined way – to prevent violence. Courage is also the ability to work for what one knows is important – in this case peace – even when it may seem very difficult and far away.

Working In and With Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)

In Nepal, NGOs can be found working in almost all sectors – from education, human rights, social development, women's rights, health, and social infrastructure, to development, psychology, sanitation, and many other fields. More recently, an increasing number of organizations are focusing also on 'conflict resolution', 'conflict management' and 'conflict transformation/peacebuilding'. For many, increasing focus on working to transform the conflict and to promote peace in Nepal has come about either as a result of (i) a commitment to bringing an end to the war and the devastation it is causing to peoples and communities in Nepal and to addressing the root causes/structures of violence which gave rise to it, and/or (ii) a response to donor focus on conflict transformation and peace related activities. Together with this, an increasing number of foreign trainers and foreign-based organizations are coming into Nepal, holding training programmes, conferences, workshops, and different activities aimed towards addressing the conflict. While this may be positive, it also brings the danger of foreign imposed methods which may easily become popular, but which may not respond to the real needs and issues or the social, cultural, and political-economic context of Nepal. Often, models and methods adopted from the outside are not sufficiently adapted to the local context and needs, and approaches developed by academic-based or other initiatives may not have the practical experience of the difficulties and complexities of implementation on the ground. While foreign organizations may then leave, and even local NGOs may shift focus, the communities and peoples affected by their programmes will remain. For this reason, there is a significant responsibility for NGOs not only to '*do no harm*' but

to work actively to see how they can ‘do good’, and to contribute to organizing and mobilizing actively to empower civil society and social movements for peacebuilding and conflict transformation.

Some of the positive aspects, as well as shortcomings, of NGOs – both in Nepal and internationally – in terms of working for peace include:

Positive Aspects/Characteristics	Shortcomings - Negative Aspects/Characteristics
Committed to addressing social and community needs	Driven by funding and donor-based/dependent
Responding to issues in the community/country	Responding to diktat from foreign donors, embassies and agendas
Made up of committed people working to help their community	Made up of individuals dependent upon external methods and approaches, often with no or little roots in their communities
Skilled/trained personnel in many different fields which may be relevant for peacebuilding and conflict transformation tasks, as well as for meeting people’s basic needs and promoting sustainable, people-centered community development	Often poorly skilled and poorly trained personnel, with limited experience in peacebuilding and conflict transformation, and often with extensive internal conflicts within and between organizations as well as within and between organizations and local communities
Presence in different areas of the country	Often overly concentrated/based in Kathmandu and large cities
Direct contact with local communities and local authorities from experience working over many years	Often imposing themselves on local communities, removing decision making and power from the local level and training/directing people on ‘what is best for them’
Contact with different parties to the conflict and able to build bridges/go between them	Sometimes perceived as biased, siding with one side or the other
Able to respond rapidly to situations as they arise, often with greater flexibility and responsibility to local needs than governments or local authorities	Often hampered by lack of funding and resources, and unable to fully address important issues which arise, or to sustain commitment over time

Organized, often with infrastructure and resources which may not be accessible for other sectors of the population	Sometimes cut off from the realities and needs of people on the ground, even when working directly with them, by their different social background and economic realities
Empowering Nepali nationals for direct participation and involvement in working to address and find remedies to the key challenges facing communities and the country	Undemocratic internal structures – top-down decision making processes/hierarchies, often with foreign directors/donors making final decision
Greater efforts at cooperation between NGOs and various social sectors	Still relatively little effective cooperation and development of NGOs as a credible <i>social force</i> for peacebuilding and people-centered participatory development
Committed work with many different sectors on specific needs which may not be being addressed by governmental or other institutions, building credibility and legitimacy for NGOs as social actors	Over-reliance on western ‘NGO’-ism and under-reliance on building sustainable and authentic roots as members of communities working for social transformation and uplifting
Sustained commitment over years, often working for great lengths of time with the same communities and areas	Fragmented, short-term project-based activities, with various NGOs often trying to implement the same projects and initiatives in the same areas, with little effective cooperation, coordination or communication

NGOs are often confronted with unrealistic expectations from the community and government, and frequently face significant threats and challenges from many different sides. The war has also led to the direct targeting of many NGOs and individual development and human rights workers by all the armed actors. At the same time, NGOs and the individuals working in them may also play very important roles in their communities and the country, and many NGOs are made up of committed people doing the very best they can with limited resources. Strengthening NGOs direct ties with the communities they serve, making them more responsible and accountable to those communities as well as more open, democratic, and participatory *within* the organizations, and increasing effective cooperation, solidarity, and joint efforts between them, will be vital if the NGO sector in Nepal is going to be able to mobilize as a credible social force for peacebuilding in the country.

International NGOs must also be willing to listen more to local NGOs and to respond to their needs, rather than programmes and policies imposed from capitals and headquarters abroad, and should work to improve the quality and training of their own staff, many of whom are not prepared and lack basic/minimum qualifications and experience for working in their fields. Organizational learning, within and between local and international NGOs, and effective training of personnel, are essential tasks. Greater cooperation between organizations can help to improve this significantly.

Steps that can help to empower the NGO sector in Nepal:

- More effective cooperation, communication and coordination between NGOs working in similar fields and/or geographical areas, including better sharing of information and resources, joint program planning and implementation, and training of personnel;
- Greater democratization and development of effective conflict transformation techniques within organizations;
- Common (bringing together different actors) and regular (every few weeks to months) NGO forums in different areas with the participation and involvement of local populations and communities, jointly identifying key tasks and issues which need to be addressed, and how communities and NGOs, and NGOs and NGOs, can work more effectively together;
- Making international NGOs more accountable and responsible to Nepali NGOs and people, increasing joint programmes and cooperation, and training of foreign staff by Nepali nationals when they enter the country, and greater equality of pay and responsibilities/opportunities between Nepali and international staff;
- Creation of local, regional and national networks and forums of NGOs for peacebuilding and conflict transformation, across and within specific sectors;
- Intensive training and sustained support for NGOs initiatives in peacebuilding and cooperation, including effective communication, coordination and cooperation between these initiatives, working to link them together, learn from experiences, and improve implementation and sustainability;
- Collecting and sharing of experiences and examples of success/best practices of NGO and local community initiatives for peacebuilding and conflict transformation from across Nepal;
- A common front/support for good practices by NGOs as well as inviolability of NGOs and NGO staff in the face of threats and potential/actual violence.

Special Needs/Tasks – NGO staff working in war affected areas may also face new tasks and challenges, both in the implementation of their work and towards and from themselves. Previous skills acquired under and for different circumstances may not be enough. Specialized and intensive training designed to meet the needs of the changing situation and to effectively empower staff for the new issues they have to deal with is essential.

Support – Individuals in NGOs are often placed under great strain and trauma, doing difficult work, forced to regularly confront extremely difficult situations, and often placed in situations or threat of violence. Effective support networks, including psycho-social counseling, coming together with others in similar situations, spaces for sharing experiences, concerns and fears, as well as joys, hopes, and commitments, and times for healing and recovery are essential if burnout and exhaustion are to be prevented, and if a movement of individuals, communities and NGOs working, cooperating and empowering each other is to be developed.

Working in and with Villages and Local Communities

Nepal's rural population is the most directly exposed to the armed conflict, as well as the most excluded and marginalized in attempts to end it. For many in Kathmandu valley and other towns of Nepal, understanding life in Nepal's villages and their exposure to the war is a significant challenge. Programmes and projects by NGOs – both Nepali and international – and government agencies designed in the capital usually have little understanding for local needs and realities, and provide even less space for engagement and participation by local populations in designing, developing, and carrying out the programmes affecting their lives and intended to benefit them. Working at, empowering, and strengthening organization, mobilization, resources and institutions for conflict transformation and direct nonviolent action at the village and local community level are some of the most essential tasks for the creation of effective peacebuilding process/processes in Nepal, and empowerment of the Nepali people for overcoming the war and transforming/transcending the root causes and dynamics of violence. The most directly affected by the violence and armed conflict, Nepal's rural communities are often cut off from each other and other parts of the country, threatened by the military engagements and targeting by all sides.

In Nepal, village populations and local communities are often:

- the sites of direct armed conflict and fighting between the armed forces and Maoists, experiencing loss of life, killing, torture, rape, abuse, extortion of civilians, destruction of homes and infrastructure, including communications systems, threats and intimidation, theft, and terrorization of normal/daily life;

- trapped between both sides, targeted and threatened by both the Maoists and the armed forces for real or perceived aid given to the other side;
- targeted by both the Maoists and the armed forces for supplies, 'contributions'/'donations', information, and support for their side;
- cut off from other communities and other parts of Nepal because of the violence, particularly in rural areas;
- unable to maintain peacetime economic activities, and even have such basic subsistence activities such as farming, fetching wood from the forests, and going to the market directly affected or made impossible by the fighting;
- the source of combatants for both sides, with many families having a son or daughter fighting either with the Maoists or armed forces, and some families' children in both the Maoists and armed forces, including youth/children fighters;
- experiencing migration abroad, either to other parts of Nepal – as combatants, as internally displaced peoples, sold for forced prostitution, as economic migrants – or abroad – as refugees, economic migrants, and sold for forced prostitution.

With the resumption of the war, the hope that the cease-fire would bring an end to the violence has been shattered. For many, belief and engagement in peacebuilding and conflict transformation activities has been made much more difficult, with increased threat of targeting and reprisals against those who work to bring about an end to the fighting. In many areas, projects and initiatives begun during the cease-fire have been halted. Outside actors, individuals, and NGOs have also chosen and/or been forced to withdraw from many rural villages and local communities, increasing their isolation, fragmentation and exposure to the violence. At the same time, neither the Maoists nor the armed forces are entirely homogenous. Many see themselves as fighting for and defending the people of Nepal. Within villages, members of the combating sides are often seen as the sons and daughters, mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters of the people of the communities, whether they are with the armed forces or the Maoists. Local villages are often the direct sites of the war, and also the potential sites for peace.

Village and Community Level Involvement

An authentic and sustained peacebuilding process should be built upon the participation and engagement of people and communities across Nepal, promoting dialogue, participation and involvement at every level. Most peace processes in war-affected countries, however, have failed to include and have often actively marginalized and disempowered local communities and those most directly affected

by the conflict and the violence. Often, the root causes and the reasons why the war began in the first place as well as the impact and effects of the violence on communities and individuals are completely ignored and not addressed in post-war periods. Foreign and national NGOs and international agencies – which usually withdraw from areas most directly affected during the fighting – usually take over in place of local involvement and engagement in rebuilding and healing after the war, and project and program mandates take the place of authentic and sustained social processes engaging individuals and communities as the actors and social forces in their country. In most countries, this has led to sustained violence – direct, structural and cultural – after the war, reinforcing the marginalization of local communities and social groups which were severely affected during the violence, with little social involvement or popular participation in the peacebuilding process and often with greater numbers of fatalities and deaths in the ‘post-cease fire/peace treaty’ period than before. To fully tackle the depth and the complexity of the challenges facing Nepal, the active engagement of the people at every level, from village to town, formal and informal leaders, men and women, all castes and social groups, young and old, will be essential. This will include broad participation and social engagement in efforts to overcome all forms of direct, structural and cultural violence, including local village and community level peace processes, as well as direct participation by local communities in:

Rehabilitation	De-escalation
Rebuilding	Demilitarization
Restructuring	Demobilization
Reculturing	Disarming
Reconciliation	Demining
Reparations	Depolarization
Reintegration	

These processes can neither be led nor designed by foreign or national NGOs and outside actors. While they can play a crucial and constructive role, direct participation and involvement in decision-making and program design by the local population is essential. People-centered, participatory peacebuilding initiatives in which the involvement, skills and resources of the local community are the foundation for sustained engagement can provide one of the best foundations for lasting and genuine peace.

Identifying Actors/Forces for Peace at the Community Level

Support for local capacities for peace at the village and community level is essential. Identifying those actors is one of the first steps for working to strengthen and develop peace initiatives and resources within communities. Traditional, formal, and informal leaders may all have important roles to play, together with men and women, youth, elderly, religious/spiritual leaders, teachers, community healers, and local party cadres. Within many villages there will also be individuals with close ties to one side or another of the conflict. Peace-workers active at this level should see this as an opportunity and work to openly engage and maintain dialogue with all actors. Depending upon the local context/situation, this may require quiet, one-on-one dialogues at first, however, for efforts at this level to be sustainable, it is important that they be done openly and transparently, so as not to foster hostility or suspicion by any group. Because of this, it is also important that the peace-worker not be seen to be biased, siding or favoring one group or party above another. Often, by working with or appearing to support one group over another, outside actors have served to escalate and increase tensions and conflict within communities. As the peace-worker's aim is to strengthen local initiatives and capacity for peacebuilding and conflict transformation, it is important not to make this mistake. Anyone can be an actor for peace. It is important that those who wish to work to overcome the war and to promote peacebuilding and conflict transformation be actively encouraged and supported.

Trust, Confidence, and Legitimacy

For individuals and NGOs from outside the local community, it is important that they build and develop trust, confidence and legitimacy with the community. For this, it is not enough to come in one time from the outside and to expect people to engage in peacebuilding initiatives. Engagement and support for the local community should be carried out and sustained over time, showing commitment and credibility. Processes which build upon the best aspects of conflict transformation – i.e. that are (i) *meaningful to the people/participants involved in and affected by the conflict*, not simply imported from outside the community/country or imposed from above; (ii) *practical*, providing effective tools and resources for people to be directly and actively engaged in working to address the conflict constructively; (iii) *participatory*, involving people as the participants, actors and decision-makers, guiders and *implementers* in the actual process of transforming their conflicts; (iv) *rooted in the traditions, culture and people of the community* (indigenous) and addressing the real needs of the people *as identified by the people themselves*; (v) *integrated, comprehensive and holistic*, effectively addressing all of the issues – including the ABCs of each party – and aspects of the conflict, with different aspects and

steps/stages complementing, reinforcing and supporting each other, avoiding the pitfalls of fragmented, competing, and contradictory processes; (vi) *sustainable*, not relying or dependent upon outside support and outside-driven processes and interference; (vii) *inspiring*, providing people with confidence and hope in their ability and the ability of the process to overcome and transcend the conflict, *transforming* it constructively, and creating new opportunities and possibilities out of the conflict – stand the best chance of success.

Steps that can help to empower Villages and Local Communities in Nepal

- Establish dialogue, building trust and confidence with local actors and individuals in the community
- Identify, in dialogues and formal and informal workshops and programmes and through the participation of the local community, local conflicts, contradictions, attitudes, and behavior, direct, structural and cultural violence, and how the community is affected by the violence/war
- Informal and formal workshops, dialogues and training programmes on peacebuilding and conflict transformation specifically designed for the local community and community/village level peacebuilding processes and initiatives, strengthening/developing local peace-workers
- Sharing information on initiatives and what is being done for peace by communities and people in other parts of Nepal; this may also include broader initiatives such as the creation of a national peace radio which can keep people up-dated and informed on peacebuilding, conflict transformation, and strategies, methods and approaches for overcoming the war and violence in Nepal
- Support for local peace-workers, including more advanced training programmes on conflict transformation, peacebuilding, nonviolent action, and social organizations, mobilization and empowerment and financial 'seed-funding' for local peace initiatives
- Creation of a network of local peace-workers in the community and between neighboring villages, building from the local to the national level
- Engagement with local representatives of the Armed Forces, Maoists, and all parties to the conflict to guarantee the safety and non-targeting of civilians and non-combatants
- Accompaniment, providing non-violent, physical presence and protection to local communities
- Mobilization and promotion of traditional culture, songs, messages, and stories with a strong peace message, inspiring unity, solidarity, respect for difference and diversity, and constructive conflict transformation

- Support for local Peace Forums, within villages, between two or more villages, and at the district and national level, mobilizing and strengthening local initiatives for peace and cooperation, coordination, communication, commitment and courage
- Building of 'Peace Houses' within and by local communities, as spaces for peace and nonviolence, where all people can meet and be guaranteed safety and respect for their needs, as centers for dialogue and discussion, and support for peace initiatives at the local and national levels
- Support for and development of local Peace Councils bringing together respected formal and informal leaders within the community from all social groups/actors, including women, *dalits* and youth. These Peace Councils would work locally to strengthen and promote peace initiatives, encouraging participation and involvement, and working to transform conflicts constructively within and between communities.

Note: It is important that efforts by different individuals and NGOs working in the same villages or areas be coordinated, and that effective cooperation be supported. This will help to strengthen impact at the local level, and increase support for local and community level peacebuilding and conflict transformation.

Mapping a Conflict and Peacebuilding Strategies/Approaches

To ensure that peacebuilding and conflict transformation initiatives are effective and respond to the real context and situation in the community and/or at the national level, it is important that *individual initiatives be part of a broader, cohesive strategy, building upon the commitment, skills, knowledge and resources of many different actors, and working to develop constructive, pro-active and broad-based mobilization for peace.* This 9-step method for peacebuilding is intended to improve mapping of the conflict and development of initiatives, actions and processes for peacebuilding and conflict transformation. It can be done by individuals and within individual organizations, but is most effective when done in brain-storming with others.

1. Map the Conflict

- Map all actors, groups, organizations
This includes all actors at all levels, involved in/affected by/contributing to the conflict.
- Map all issues, goals, interests
The issues, goals and interests for each party, including how you see them, and how they see them themselves.

- Map the relationship(s) between them
Including the relationship between (i) the different actors, (ii) the issues, and (iii) the actors and the different issues.

2. Map Related Conflicts

What other conflicts, at the local, district, national and regional levels, and along the eleven fault lines (*gender, generation, political, military, economic, cultural, social, national, territory, nature, neighboring/foreign countries*), impact upon, contribute to, affect, and are related to the conflict you are looking at.

3. Map Unidentified/left out actors + potential actors

Which actors did we forget to include when doing the first mapping of the conflict? Are there other groups/actors at the local, district, national levels? Also: are their potential actors, ie. those not yet involved in or affected by the conflict, who may be able to contribute constructively to peacebuilding and conflict transformation?

4. What can be done?

Building upon the mapping in steps 1 – 3, brainstorm and come up with as many ideas as possible on what can be done, by each actor and at every level, as creatively and constructively as possible, for peacebuilding and conflict transformation.

5. How can we do it?

Go concretely into each proposal, develop the strategy and what is needed to implement it in practice.

6. What has been done before?

Including what has been done before in the area, in Nepal, and in other countries in similar situations, learning from experience and using this to go back to again and improve steps 4 and 5.

7. What are others doing?

Essential for promoting cooperation, identifying what is being done by others, and how more can be done together than apart, going back again to steps 4 and 5, and working to develop active cooperation and joint efforts.

8. Repeat the process 10,000 times

Repeat the process with different actors and groups, individually and together, at the local level and in communities across the country. Use this as a process of dialogue for peacebuilding and conflict transformation at the local and national levels.

9. **Do it/Implement it**

Carry out the proposals developed in 4 and 5, after going over 6 and 7 and improving, strengthening the proposals and initiatives further.