SUSTAINABLE PEACE BUILDING AND CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION

M. Abdul Jabbar
&
Segu Ismail Mohamed Riyas

Introduction
Peace Building has emerged as one of the most critically important, albeit vexing, aspects of international involvement in conflict and post conflict situations. Peacebuilding, as a concept and strategy, has been adopted by national governments, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and regional and international intergovernmental institutions (INGOs) as a means by which the outside world can contribute to the resolution of intrastate conflict and to the reconstruction, or construction, of a culture of peace in post conflict situations. Persisting conflicts in places such as Afghanistan, Bosnia, Chechnya, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Haiti, Israel/ Palestine, Kosovo, Rwanda, Sri Lanka and Sierra Leone demonstrate both the overwhelming need for and significant difficulties in building sustainable conditions for peace in post conflict societies.

Peacebuilding operations in these and other settings have confronted many barriers and have achieved varying degrees of success. Yet the very attempt on the part of outsiders to undertake such measures reflects an acknowledgment of international humanitarian and human rights law and a significant shift in international attitudes and practices towards civil conflicts.

Violent conflict want to be transforms into positive social change, where underlying structures of conflict are addressed, resulting in changes of attitudes, relationships and behavior, and leading towards sustainable peace with respect for human rights.

Therefore, the sustainable peace require the Conflict transformation in the war tone societies, its only can be accommodate the people into the peace culture much like intuitional, cultural, Relational and psychological changes.

Discussion of the study
The first theme in the conceptualization of peacebuilding the genealogy of peacebuilding suggests rather radical origins found in the peace research writings of Johan Galtung and Kenneth and Elsie Boulding. (Oliver P. Richmond, 2001, p. 48) From this perspective, peacebuilding involves addressing underlying structural causes of conflict. It emphasizes bottom up approaches and the decentering of social and economic structures. In short, it calls for a radical transformation of society away from structures of coercion and violence to an embedded culture of peace. These ideas, although generally trumped by band-aid and sometimes shortsighted approaches to building peace, continue to resonate in the contemporary period. (John P. Lederach, 1997, p. 60) Many others have taken a less radical approach, while maintaining a holistic framework for peacebuilding. Lederach, for example, writes of marshalling all sectors of society in support of sustainable peace. Oliver Richmond elaborates on the model.

In Ledarach's model, the problem-solving approach to conflict resolution is combined with a public, process-oriented approach in order to address the multidimensional nature of protracted social conflicts in the context of a nonlinear peace-building process. This emphasizes the need for a multisectoral approach to conflict transformation that brings in grassroots, local, and NGO actors in order to create a sustainable process. The objective of such holistic approaches is to bring about a fundamental transformation of conflict-ridden societies. While the roots of peacebuilding can be traced to more radical peace studies literature appearing in the 1960s, the pervasive interest in peace building in the contemporary period can be found in the search for specific programs, policies and practices that can be employed to resolve civil conflicts in various regions of the world and restore conditions to the point where peace can be sustained.

Peacebuilding became part of the official discourse in the 1990s when former UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali used the term in An Agenda for Peace. Initially, the concept was linked specifically with post conflict societies. Boutros-Ghali defined post conflict peacebuilding as "action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict." He saw peacebuilding as an integral part of the UN's work. For him, preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping ought to be linked to peacebuilding so as to provide a seamless and comprehensive strategy for dealing with violent conflicts. The precise elements involved in peacebuilding, as envisioned by Boutros-Ghali, included disarming warring parties, restoring order, decommissioning and destroying weapons, repatriating refugees, providing advisory and training support for security personnel, monitoring elections, de-mining and other forms of demilitarization, providing technical assistance, advancing efforts to protect human rights, reforming and strengthening institutions of governance, including assistance in monitoring and supervising electoral processes and promoting formal and informal participation in the political process.

Peacebuilding, as it has been practiced to date, involves a number of diverse instruments and players, and much like a group, the instruments must be finely tuned and the players must work in concert in order to produce anything resembling a coherent approach to post conflict reconciliation and sustainable peace through Conflict Resolution, Conflict Management and Conflict Transformation. Among these approaches the Conflict Transformation is being an essential requirement to the sustainable peace making process.

The conflict transformation is a term which has increasingly been used in conflict approaches in the recent past. This approach of conflict transformation is closely connected with the framework of peace as justice, the building of rights and relationship and social structure through the respect for human rights and nonviolence as a way of Life.

Being scientifically more sound and clearer in vision, conflict transformation approach is a positive orientation toward conflict and a willingness to engage in the conflict in an effort to produce constructive change or a growth, it is try to ebb natural part of relationship and giving opportunities in constructive changing process in person, relation, structure and culture with transformation of goals.

Transformation understands social conflict as evolving from, and producing changes in, the personal, relational, structural and cultural dimensions of human experience. It seeks to promote constructive processes within each of these dimensions.

The personal dimension refers to changes effected in and desired for the individual. This includes the cognitive, emotional, perceptual, and spiritual aspects of human experience over the course of conflict. From a descriptive perspective, transformation suggests that individuals are affected by conflict in both negative and positive ways. For example, conflict affects our physical well-being, self-esteem, emotional stability, capacity to perceive accurately, and spiritual integrity. Prescriptively, (i.e., relating to what one should do) transformation represents deliberate intervention to minimize the destructive effects of social conflict and maximize its potential for individual growth at physical, emotional, and spiritual levels. (Nick Lewer, 1999, p. 17)

The relational dimension depicts the changes affected in and desired for the face-to-face relationships. Here issues of emotions, power, and interdependence, and the communicative and interactive aspects of conflict are central. Descriptively, transformation refers to how the patterns of communication and interaction in relationships are affected by conflict. It looks beyond visible issues to the underlying changes produced by conflict in how people perceive, what they pursue, and how they structure their relationships. Most significantly, social conflict makes explicit how close or distant people wish to be, how they will use and share power, what they perceive of themselves and each other, and what patterns of interaction they wish to have. Prescriptively, transformation represents intentional intervention to minimize poorly functioning communication and maximize mutual understanding. This includes efforts to bring to the surface in a more explicit manner the relational fears, hopes and goals of the people involved.

The structural dimension highlights the underlying causes of conflict, and stresses the ways in which social structures, organizations, and institutions are built, sustained, and changed by conflict. It is about the ways people build and organize social, economic, and institutional relationships to meet basic human needs and provide access to resources and decision-making. At the descriptive level transformation refers to the analysis of social conditions that give rise to conflict and the way that conflict affects social structural change in existing social, political and economic institutions.

At a prescriptive level, transformation represents efforts to provide insight into underlying causes and social conditions that create and foster violent expressions of conflict, and to promote nonviolent mechanisms that reduce adversarial interaction and minimize violence. Pursuit of this change fosters structures that meet basic human needs (substantive justice) and maximize people's participation in decisions that affect them (procedural justice).

The cultural dimension refers to the ways that conflict changes the patterns of group life as well as the ways that culture affects the development of processes to handle and respond to conflict. At a descriptive level, transformation seeks to understand how conflict affects and changes cultural patterns of a group and how those accumulated and shared patterns affect the way people in a given context understand and respond to conflict. Prescriptively, transformation seeks to

uncover the cultural patterns that contribute to violence in a given context, and to identify and build on existing cultural resources and mechanisms for handling conflict. (Uyankoda, 2005, p. 12)

Conflict transformation aims at truly achieving positive peace. It not only aims to end violence and change negative relationships between the conflicting parties but also to change the political, social or economic structures that cause such negative relationships. Conflict transformation is aimed at empowering people to become involved in non-violent change processes themselves, to help build sustainable conditions for peace and justice.

Advocates of conflict transformation argue that conflict resolution is ill-advised to the reality of protracted violent conflicts which 'require more than reframing of positions and identification of win-win outcomes' (Miall, 2001, p 3). It is better to think in terms of transforming the 'relationships, interests, discourses and if necessary the very constitution of society that supports the continuation of violent conflicts' (Miall, 2001, p, 3). The goal of conflict transformation is therefore not about resolving any particular conflict but transforming the way people deal with their conflict, i.e. that people may approach conflicts in a positive way (Miall, 2001, p. 3).
There is a danger to the transformative enthusiasm, where resolution is regarded as antithesis and transformation, as the synthesis. A conflict transformation view which considers the reaching of agreement as secondary 'to addressing the overall conflict process' (Rupensinghe, 1995 pp76) may retard attempts to resolve the political aspirations of the different groups in the conflict. Political agreement in itself may act as a catalyst for crucial changes to occur in other dimensions of the conflict With regards to the claim of crucial changes to the nature of contemporary conflict that 'calls for such a re-conceptualisation' (Miall i, 2001, p. 1), in my opinion, protracted, asymmetrical, violent conflicts with ex-situ linkages are not so recent a phenomena. As early as the 1970s' Azar had identified conflicts of such nature, including the regional/international dimension; leading him to advocate for changes in our approach to dealing with such conflicts.

As for the simplicity of conflict resolution, this is due to the narrow representation of the field. Admittedly, some conflict resolution writers may speak in terms of "win-win", but there are other conflict resolution theorists who reject such a view. For example, Hauss employs the "win-win outcome" terminology to define an outcome which satisfies all (Oliver P. Richmond, 2001, p. 40); but Galtung considers such jargon as mechanistic. Academics believe the point is made sufficiently by Galtung: 'The terminology alienates; it does not evoke images of life-and-death concerns, nor of the depth of involvement. Rather, parlor-game clevernes is elevated as metaphor for existential concerns'. (Gultung, J., 1976, p. 96).

The goal of conflict transformation as advanced a change to the way conflicts are handled in society, that is from violent to constructive conflict handling and to increase the capacity of the society in handling conflicts in a peaceful manner is not dissimilar to the vision of conflict resolution as advanced by Galtung. For Galtung, the problem posed is 'how a self-supporting conflict resolution could be found?' (Galtung, 1976, Vol. II, p. 297).

Galtung points out that even when a set of contradictions may have been resolved, that does not eliminate future contradictions arising in the relationship and for this reason he weighs an associative approach to conflict resolution. An associative approach to conflict resolution establishes infrastructures for positive conflict handling. The infrastructures are established in the society to act as a 'reservoir for the system to draw upon, just as the healthy body has the ability to generate its own antibodies and does not need ad hoc administration of medicine' (Galtung, 1976, Vol. II, p. 298).Establishing equitable relationship, entropy and symbiosis are some of the infrastructures suggested by Galtung as negation of antihuman conditions of exploitation, elitism and isolation. Also, mechanisms of conflict resolution need to be built into new arrangements/structures and relationships, for example institutionalising problem-solving mode of decision-making (Galtung, 1976, Vol. II p 301). But these mechanisms adopted into the transformation.

Therefore, these methods is identified the significant instrument for the sustainable peace and we can accommodate these characteristics into the conflict transformation approach.

Conclusion
Peace Building has emerged as one of the most critically important, its operations in these and other settings have confronted many barriers and have achieved varying degrees of success. Violent conflict want to be transforms into positive social change, where underlying structures of conflict are addressed, resulting in changes of attitudes, relationships and behavior, and leading towards sustainable peace with respect for human rights.

This approach of conflict transformation is closely connected with the framework of peace as justice, the building of rights and relationship and social structure through the respect for human rights and nonviolence as a way of Life. Transformation understands social conflict as evolving from, and producing changes in, the personal, relational, structural and cultural dimensions of human experience. It seeks to promote constructive processes within each of these dimensions.

The goal of conflict transformation is therefore not about resolving any particular conflict but transforming the way people deal with their conflict, that people may approach conflicts in a positive way to change negative relationships between the conflicting parties, and the political, social or economic structures that cause such relationships, its may be leads to the a sustain peaceful environment to all.