

POLICY RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

Over the past decade, parallel to diplomatic-military operations and political negotiations related to the violent break-up of Yugoslavia, a number of diverse community-based ("grassroots") peace initiatives and projects emerged in the war-stricken parts of the new political entities in the post-Yugoslav region. They were supported and initiated by various actors, including local NGOs, community groups as well as international donor agencies, relief and development NGOs and peace organizations with different degrees of experience in the region, different and often implicit understandings of peacebuilding and different restrictions in terms of their mandates.

Due to an acute sense of urgency regarding the timely implementation of community initiatives, continuous pressures for securing trend-based funds, lack of experience with any methods of evaluation apart from informal ones and externally induced by Western-donors, as well as strong identification with community members and their needs, most local projects had little capacity to document, reflect upon and evaluate their work, especially in ways which would be useful to them and their counterparts in the region. Most evaluation practice was related to donors' demands for external evaluations, which were frequently conducted by international consultants, written in English and closely linked with donor criteria of success and quantitative reporting requirements.

The intention of this research is to start filling the existent gap by (1) Analysis of the current Croatian institutional framework that would enable identification of particular policies conducive to community-based peacebuilding and opportunities for improvement; (2) Documentation of the particular community-based peacebuilding practices from Croatia that would enable the discovery of patterns of successful approaches, specific needs for support and their relevance to the overall post-war socio-economic development. In addition, (3) a preliminary examination of emerging locally-generated peacebuilding practices in Kosovo would provide insight into opportunities and constraints related to transfers of experiences and lessons learned between different post-war contexts of the post-Yugoslav/SEE region.

The findings will be used for the improvement of present projects, enhancement of the nation-wide and regional exchange of best practices and their timely integration into the stability and development policy frameworks at the local, national and regional levels in Croatia. The website presenting this research will hopefully turn into a community peacebuilding documentation and advocacy tool, to be used by the Center for Peace Studies and its numerous partners throughout the post-Yugoslav region.

As a protagonist of the community-based peacebuilding efforts in Croatia and the post-Yugoslav region, who has taken different roles of peacebuilding trainer, community organizer, public policy advocate and project evaluator, I am aware of the need for a more strategic approach to the documentation and public presentation of the community-based peacebuilding efforts, if they are to be considered as a valuable component of the overall post-war recovery and development policies, which are increasingly shaped by national actors, as international donors withdraw from the region. The timing of this research coincides with Croatia's intense preparations for the EU accession process, politically conditioned by the successful completion of the refugee return process. That presents a clear opportunity for influencing the Croatian government allocation of resources and interest in creating partnerships with non-governmental actors in respect to the social and economic development of the post-war areas. Parallel documentation of the community peacebuilding practices in Croatia – a sovereign state with possibility of devising long-term institutional framework where the war finished eight years ago, and Kosovo - a territory under international protectorate with an uncertain timeframe for the resolution of its eventual political status, where the war finished only four years ago, represent two major types of environments in the post-Yugoslav region where peacebuilding takes place. This research aims to explore whether there are practices and support strategies that are specific to each

type of environment, as well as whether there are certain experiences from Croatia that could be used in strengthening the community peacebuilding capacities of Kosovo.

The methodology has entailed a review of government policies, media coverage of peacebuilding issues, organizational documents (project proposals, reports, monitoring and evaluation frameworks), and interviews with policymakers, community peacebuilding organizers and members of local communities involved in certain projects. In addition, I have been directly engaged in consulting and facilitating the monitoring and evaluation processes of several organizations, including ZaMirNET, CESI, and the Center for Peace, Nonviolence and Human Rights Osijek. In Kosovo, I participated in several community peacebuilding actions, such as URBAN FM's Peace Train project, Cultural Container in Mitrovica or NORMA's visits to minority women's groups in enclaves. While the research methodology has been time consuming, considering the two-way exchange of information and knowledge between the peacebuilding actors and the researcher, as well a significant number of days spent in the field, it has enabled me to create lasting relationships with peacebuilding activists who have entrusted me with insight into their internal dynamics.

Finally, this research has enabled me to step out of hands-on peacebuilding project development and management and to be engaged in observation, consulting and evaluation of various peacebuilding activities. Through my continuous communication with different organizations, I have hopefully served as a catalyst of exchanges of best practices, contacts and new ideas. I have also had the opportunity to conduct a detailed review of the Croatian institutional framework and its potential relevance to community peacebuilding. None of that would have been possible without this fellowship. Just like peacebuilding, the impact of this research will probably take more than a year to show, as it requires continuous networking and quest for time specific opportunities for scaling-up current community peacebuilding practices and their greater integration into local, national and regional policy frameworks.

I. PEACEBUILDING CONSIDERED: POLICY, ACTIVISM, EVALUATION

Peacebuilding is a concept used both in policymaking and community-building arenas, referring to a wide array of efforts at all societal levels that aim to transform social relationships, structures and culture in a direction conducive to reduction of the root causes of social conflicts, such as political and economic inequality, and enhancement of the capacity of individuals, groups and institutions to manage emerging conflicts nonviolently and constructively.

1. Peacebuilding from the International Policy Perspective

The following international peacebuilding policies are described primarily for the benefit of the peacebuilding advocates in the post-Yugoslav region as well as government officials who may not be familiar with their contents and might find them useful in the review of the national and local policy frameworks conducive to peacebuilding. At the same time, it must be noted that in reality, the peacebuilding approach is often out shadowed by post-conflict state-building projects, like current UN Missions to Kosovo or Afghanistan, where the urgency of the reinstatement of governance structures, strongly driven by external actors, takes precedence over a focus on transformation of social relationships and the strengthening of local capacities that are key for the long-term creation of just political and economic conditions that would mitigate chances of reversal to violent conflict.

A decade ago former UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali introduced peacebuilding into the security framework and language of the UN, as part of his effort to reform the organization so that it can better respond to the complexities of the post-Cold war, globalizing world. In his "Agenda for Peace" (1992), peacebuilding is considered a complementary measure to preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping. While peacemaking and peacekeeping primarily include efforts to

open possibilities of peace negotiations, disarmament and physical separation of warring parties, peacebuilding is defined as an “action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict” and as “the construction of a new environment”, involving “sustained, cooperative work to deal with underlying economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems (that) can place an achieved peace on a durable foundation” (Ghali:92:paragraph 57).

Peacebuilding is considered both a preventive measure for inhibiting a breakout or recurrence of violent conflict and a long-term restorative measure of strengthening social relationships resistant to violence caused by social injustices and weak democratic structures. Thus, peacebuilding represents an innovation in the UN security framework, as it takes into account the need for a long-term strategy that links conflict management and development, with the goal of systemic social change primarily carried out by local social actors, supported by external parties. In practice, however, the UN peacemaking and peacekeeping missions tend to be more frequent and more clearly defined currently, while peacebuilding missions tend to be more complex (requiring high level of inter-agency coordination) and more rare (12 currently active)¹. Peacebuilding is mentioned in the UN Millennium Declaration in relation to the expeditious consideration of recommendations of the “Brahimi Report” of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, calling for a doctrinal shift in the complex peace operations which would increase a focus on strengthening the rule of law institutions and improving respect for human rights in a post-conflict environment and strengthening the UN's permanent capacity for peacebuilding, the strategic development of which is under the auspices of the Executive Committee for Peace Operations and the Department of Political Affairs (which has set up a Peacebuilding Support Unit).

In 1997 the OECD Development Aid Committee (DAC) issued a ground-breaking policy statement *Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation on the Threshold of the 21st Century*, which outlines a new integrated approach to conflict prevention and peacebuilding by the international donor community, where “helping strengthen the capacity of a society to manage conflict without violence must be seen as a foundation for sustainable development.” (OECD: 1997). The role of development assistance is considered most effective “when it is designed and timed to address the root causes of violent conflicts, as well as the precipitating factors, in ways that are relevant to local circumstances.” (OECD: 1997:2). The new approach calls for flexible, coordinated interventions into different phases of conflicts, which do not repeat the past mistake of neglecting the importance of long-term development assistance even in the midst of crisis and link post-conflict reconstruction with support for economic and political reforms that can eliminate some root causes of conflict. In 2001, DAC produced a supplemental set of policy guidelines *Helping Prevent Violent Conflict: Orientations for External Partners*, which focus on how to mainstream conflict prevention in policy formulation; take account of the relationship between security and development; strengthen peace processes and build partnerships with state and civil society actors; work with business to promote growth and avoid fuelling violence; and enhance donor coordination and policy coherence.

Canada, a prominent promoter of peacebuilding concept internationally, has created a *Strategic Framework*, which reflects a common understanding by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) of the aims and approaches to peacebuilding that will be undertaken within the inter-ministerial and cross-sectoral Canadian Peacebuilding Initiative, in order to “effectively address the peacebuilding needs of countries where violent conflict undermines sustainable development and human security”. The Strategic Framework defines peacebuilding as “effort to strengthen the prospects for internal peace and

¹ The UN Mission to Kosovo and former UNTAES (UN Transitional Administration in Eastern Slavonia) in Croatia, have not been defined as peacebuilding missions, even though their scope fit within the peacebuilding framework, probably due to a strong element of ‘state building’ with the UN taking a lead in setting-up provisional governance structures.

decrease the likelihood of violent conflict. The overarching goal of peacebuilding is to enhance the indigenous capacity of a society to manage conflict without violence. Ultimately, peacebuilding aims at building human security, a concept that includes democratic governance, human rights, rule of law, sustainable development, equitable access to resources, and environmental security. The pursuit of this goal in countries torn by internal conflict poses special and complex challenges. Peacebuilding may involve conflict prevention, conflict resolution, as well as various kinds of post-conflict activities. It focuses on the political and socio-economic context of conflict, rather than on the military or humanitarian aspects. It seeks to address this challenge by finding means to institutionalize the peaceful resolution of conflicts. External support for peacebuilding should supplement, not substitute, local efforts to achieve a sustainable peace."(CIDA: 1997).

The G8 Conflict Prevention Official-Level Meeting (CPOM) was set up in 2000 during Japan's G8 presidency, resulting in a "Comprehensive Approach" to conflict prevention, which puts emphasis on integration of conflict prevention into phases of conflict (Chronological Comprehensiveness), use of a wide array of political, economic and social policy options (Comprehensiveness in Measures for Conflict Prevention), respect for human rights and protection of civilians, as well as full consideration of contextualized characteristics of each conflict and coherence of conflict prevention measures with policies in other fields (such as international trade and finance) (G8: 2000:1). The *G8 Miyazaki Initiatives for Conflict Prevention*, launched at the 2000 Okinawa Summit, focus on the following areas where G8 are considered to have a comparative advantage in taking action - Small Arms and Light Weapons; Conflict and Development; Illicit Trade in Diamonds; Children in Armed Conflict and International Civil Police. In addition to a progress report on the *Miyazaki Initiatives*, the *2001 Genoa Summit Conclusions* include *G8 Roma Initiatives On Conflict Prevention*, which call for strengthening the role of women in conflict prevention, peace negotiations and post-conflict peacebuilding both at the policy and community levels as well as greater attention to the inclusion of corporate citizenship in post-conflict reconstruction efforts (G8: 2001).

The 2001 European Commission *Communication on Conflict Prevention* stresses the importance of an integrated approach, which revolves around the concept of *structural stability*. "Characteristics of structural stability are sustainable economic development, democracy and respect for human rights, viable political structures and healthy environmental and social conditions, with the capacity to manage change without to resort to conflict. All these elements need to be addressed in an integrated way. Most importantly, co-operation programmes are increasingly based on the countries' own strategies since it is now well recognised that ownership is a condition for success, allowing for consideration of countries' own situation, history and culture." (European Commission: 2001:10). In addition, the Communication explicitly mentions the beneficial role of NGOs in long-term conflict prevention and intends to strengthen its contacts and support through the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights: "By virtue of their support for the development of civil society and democracy, NGOs are key actors in long-term conflict prevention. They are often present on the ground in situations where official state structures are absent. They can also function as grassroots mediators as well as reliable and neutral observers in situation where there is no international presence. Mediation activities of specialist NGOs have sometimes proved decisive in a crisis." (European Commission: 2001:28).

2. Peacebuilding from the Post-Yugoslav, Peace Activist Perspective

In a brief but effective analysis of two pioneering community-based peacebuilding projects in Croatia and B-H, Paul Stubbs, UK sociologist and Goran Bozicevic, Croatian peace activist provide several suggestions relevant for conceptualization of peacebuilding in the post-Yugoslav post-war context, featured by intense internationalization and complex political, social and economic transitions. They embrace Ryan's definition of peacebuilding as "building bridges between the parties to allow for positive and creative interaction", which is significantly focused on "social, economic and psychological environments of ordinary people at the grassroots level." (Bozicevic and Stubbs:1997:3), but

problematize a sole focus on the grassroots as potentially 'deflecting attention from structural causality and the need for fundamental social change'. (Bozicevic and Stubbs:1997:3). Further, they affirm the relevance of Ghali's definition of peacebuilding to the post-Yugoslav context, in particular its focus on building local peace constituencies, confidence building, creation of a vision of an interdependent future as well as changing local power structures so that belligerent fractions become more marginal (Bozicevic and Stubbs:1997:3).

Bozicevic and Stubbs' main point of critique of contemporary peacebuilding practice and theory is a concern that the emphasis on firmly formatted and often dislocated conflict resolution training, adhering to set frameworks of Western knowledge, tends to marginalize the importance of direct community engagement with local power structures and the creation of opportunities for locally relevant social development (Bozicevic and Stubbs: 1997).

Further, they argue for adequate examination of complex interactions between local and international social movements and nongovernmental organizations in the peacebuilding process in the post-Yugoslav region, in order to understand how local peacebuilding practices are shaped by the cultural transfers of discourses of peace, development, politics and organizational practices between these different actors. Such analysis is a way to avoid simplistic accounts of Western imperialism in the post-Yugoslav peacebuilding context on the one hand and ahistorical (mis)understandings of local civil societies' development, as practiced by international relief agencies and NGOs, on the other (Bozicevic and Stubbs:1997).

Finally, Bozicevic and Stubbs propose a reconceptualization of peacebuilding as "social politics," in order to "occupy, and expand, the space between what might be termed classic social development and classic conflict resolution" both of which tend to become orthodoxies. It can be deduced that for Bozicevic and Stubbs, peacebuilding as social politics is a long-term process which engages actors from different organizational and institutional backgrounds (including local government agencies and social service providers, civil initiatives and nongovernmental organizations with different ideologies, politicians, as well as international organizations active in the local contexts) in a set of joint efforts aimed at devising locally relevant social and economic development of their communities and relating the practices that promote social integration of the micro-level to their impact at the macro-level of social structuring and politics (Stubbs:1997:10).

By putting into focus very concrete activities which at the same time generate social integration, create local spaces for the communication of difference, explicitly address the social and economic needs of the community members, and reconfigure political relations between the grassroots and the middle range leadership, Bozicevic and Stubbs reiterate Lederach's insistence on an integrated approach to peacebuilding and Fetherston's insistence on peacebuilding as an essentially political activity which transforms local-global hegemonies. However, Bozicevic and Stubbs are most resolute in advocating integration of 'communicative action' or a 'relational' approach with concrete responses to and demands for addressing burning developmental needs in (post) conflict settings on the part of diversely positioned, but primarily grassroots, actors. (Bozicevic and Stubbs:1997).

In that context, the concept of *conflict transformation* can be considered as more relevant to peacebuilding than the concept of conflict resolution, the term referring to an analytical interactive method of consensus building about the nature of conflict with the objective of its elimination. Conflict transformation refers to actions, which go beyond artificially created communicative situations (workshops), separated from the realities of conflicting parties. Its focus is on the potential for transformation of the relationships between conflicting parties, in a direction which would enable new, more just power relations as well as the creation of new social meanings that do not reproduce those social patterns and regimes of truth that were predominant before and during the acute stage of conflict (Fetherston: 1999).

Through conflict transformation, negative consequences of conflict are being reduced (e.g. broken relationships, losses), while the positive ones (e.g. increased social solidarity and civic responsibility) are being enhanced or restored. US peace activist and theorist, John Paul Lederach considers conflict transformation as a twofold process of change - changes induced by conflict and further changes brought about by deliberate interventions that aim to minimize or transform the negative effects of conflict and maximize those effects that provide opportunities for positive social change. "In essence, conflict transformation refers to change that can be understood in two fundamental ways – descriptively and prescriptively – across four dimensions: personal, relational, structural and cultural " (Lederach: 1997:82).

The following table presents Lederach’s framework of conflict transformation, which he considers the central strategy of peacebuilding, taking place at the level of subsystem (local community) within the middle time frame of a decade. It must be noted however, that peacebuilding is a term broader than conflict transformation, for it also refers to preventive interventions focused on strengthening the overall capacity of a society to create just social conditions and communication patterns that are conducive to the minimization of violent conflict.

TABLE 1: Lederach’s Framework of Conflict Transformation

Conflict Transformation	Descriptive Level /Conflict Dynamics	Prescriptive Level/Peacebuilding Approach or Intervention
<i>Personal dimension</i>	Positive and negative effects on health, self-esteem, emotional stability, perception, spiritual integrity.	Minimize destructive effects on personal development and well-being Maximize potentials for personal growth (physically, emotionally, spiritually).
<i>Relational dimension</i>	Changes of perception of interdependence, closeness/distance; reactive/proactive approach to others; imagination of the future relationship.	Minimize poor functioning communication; Maximize mutual understanding and expression of fears, hopes and goals in terms of affectivity and interdependence.
<i>Structural Dimension</i> (viewed as "substance" of conflict)	Effects of existing mechanisms for meeting basic human needs, access to resources, institutional patterns of decision making on conflict; Effects of conflict on social structures.	Explore structural causes of violent conflict; Foster structures that meet basic human needs (substantive justice) and maximize participation in decision-making (procedural justice).
<i>Cultural Dimension</i>	Effects of conflict on cultural patterns of a group; Effects of culture on perception of and response to conflict	Explore those cultural patterns that foster violent expressions of conflict; Explore and promote those culturally specific resources and mechanisms for constructive conflict management.

3. Evaluation in the Context of Peacebuilding

Considering the multidimensionality of peacebuilding shaped by diverse cultural contexts and systems of power and often unpredictable dynamics of post-conflict societies in multifold transitions, it is not surprising that the search for appropriate and operational criteria and indicators of success of peacebuilding practices poses a great challenge to practitioners and theorists worldwide. As Lederach notes, even though peacebuilding practices have many points of contact with social development, which itself is difficult to translate into stable quantitative and qualitative indicators, evaluating

grassroots peacebuilding is even harder, since it primarily requires discovering evidence of the qualitative change in relationships between horizontally and vertically positioned actors and the impact of these relationships on broader social structures and every-day well being of the people.

As Stubbs suggests, peacebuilding - finding the right balance between meeting broader needs after conflict, such as rebuilding physical and social infrastructure on one hand and promoting new sets of relationships that are subversive to the social order which gave birth to violence on the other -as well as its evaluation is "far more of an art than a science", requiring a great deal of flexibility and intuition (Stubbs:1996:33). For that reason, in order to grasp the uniqueness of each local approach to peacebuilding and then develop some broad 'rules of thumb' about which kinds of criteria are most valuable in particular situations, there is a need for a deductive approach based on action research on different projects in different conflict situations. (Stubbs:1996:33).

As Lederach points out, criteria for evaluating success of peacebuilding activities need to focus on assessing the quality of change or sustainability of the transformative processes, which take place at different systemic levels and in different time frames of action (Lederach:1997:142). There is an apparent similarity in criteria proposed by different researchers, whose perspectives are discussed in this paper. The outlined criteria stem from Lederach's integrated framework for peacebuilding, Stubbs's evaluation criteria for social development in post-conflict settings, as well as Ross's analysis of action evaluation, while Fetherston's approach delineates the scale of transformation, where the minimal value/scope is contestation of societal status quo and maximal value/scope is renegotiation of societal norms and practices that foster social justice (Fetherston:1998)

1. Impact on Livelihoods/Capacity to Respond to Strategic Needs of the Community

This criterion inquires into ways in which the peacebuilding intervention has contributed to (1) the alleviation of negative effects of conflict on individual lives and (2) the creation of new opportunities for community members to meet those pressing needs which they have identified as instrumental to their well being. These needs primarily include subsistence, physical and psychological security but need to be defined by community members through a participatory inquiry.

Lederach frames these needs as strategic issues that the community members face and which, if un-addressed, block the constructive process of desired change (Lederach:1997:144). Hence, he proposes a way of addressing a crucial obstacle to grassroots peacebuilding – immediacy of everyday survival in post-conflict settings, which may make reconciliation seem irrelevant.

Both Stubbs' and Lederach's definitions of the criterion put emphasis on the class and social composition of users/beneficiaries and ask questions about the involvement of and relevance of intervention to the most vulnerable and marginal groups in the community.

Perceptions of community members and other levels of society are treated as critical and principal sources of knowledge about the adequacy of impact of peacebuilding intervention on local people's livelihoods (Lederach:1997:145; Stubbs:1996:23).

2. Impact on Social Integration/Relationships/Mobilization of Peace Constituents

This is a central criterion for evaluating the transformative potential of peacebuilding, since horizontal and vertical reconfiguration of relationships is the main way of creating or enlarging social space for reconciliation between conflicting social groups.

Lederach examines social integration at the level of processes of horizontal and vertical relationship building as well as at the level of mechanisms (institutions, networks) that foster vertical/horizontal integration, which themselves represent emerging social structures that can sustain reconciliation. In the examination, he poses questions about individual, group and institutional potentials for change as well as sustainability of that agency (Lederach:1997:143).

Stubbs is more specific and focuses on two critical aspects of social integration in the Croatian and B-H setting – integration of survivors of war-related forced migrations (refugees, displaced, returnees) in the local community; and identification and support for the emergence of ‘alternative community leaders’ and ‘new civil society’ who act as peace constituents that subtly ‘undercut the dominant political culture of polarization and division”, as described by Shorr and Stubbs in the case study of the UNOV project in the Bosnjak/Croat divided town of Gornji Vakuf/Uskoplje, Central Bosnia (Stubbs:1997:36). This is the centerpiece of the counter-hegemonic impact of grassroots peacebuilding practice, as it can give rise to the recomposition of local political structures. Shorr’s analysis is useful for grasping the essence of this crucial evaluation criterion for transformative peacebuilding:

“The project has a policy of consulting with the political leadership at every step. But before they do, they build local support for their proposed programme. The authorities are thus faced with propositions for which there is already clear desire among their own constituents. This exercise of accountability gives the project a democracy-building aspect. Indeed, an official mechanism for consultation between the two sides, the Joint Education Committee, was established as a result of UNOV’s Project’s work in January 1996. The project hopes that this groundwork, especially in the education field, will result in approval for a plan to build a youth center right on the cease-fire line².”(Shorr:1996, quoted in Stubbs:1996:36).

In examining the effects of social integration on a local community, it is important to include effects of peacebuilding practice on its own organizers, who are themselves at some level, “partial-insiders”, embedded in the local culture, whose individual and collective identities are shaped by the local culture, experience of conflict as well as their peacebuilding practice. These actors have their own personal and professional social networks in the communities where they act or in the broader system they seek to transform. Therefore, the evaluation of impact of peacebuilding practice on reconfigurations of their relationships and identities of its actors is an initial step in exploring its impact on social integration among other peace constituents, community and the broader social system of which it is a part.

3. Impact on local culture of peacebuilding and conflict

This criterion is suggested in addition to the others proposed by Lederach and Stubbs and is based on the discussion of the role of culture in peacebuilding. It would examine ways in which a peacebuilding intervention has built its “theory of practice” on the understanding of the local cultural model, especially those elements of it that (1) perpetuate conflict and (2) are particularly conducive to reconciliation.

Further, it would examine whether the cultural model that the peacebuilding practice projects onto the community and thus influences the local culture contributes to sustained reconciliation. There is to my knowledge no local research specifically on the cultural aspects of peacebuilding practices in the post-Yugoslav region so there is a vast area for exploring applicability and refinement of this criterion.

4. Impact on Broader Long-Term Social Change/Social Infrastructure and Political Structures/Transformational Capacity Responsiveness

This criterion examines effects of a specific peacebuilding practice in a local community setting on, as Lederach put it, “strategic sub-systems” – central local institutions and networks and further effects on the broader social structures, such as national institutions, organizations, networks etc. Lederach proposes three points of inquiry - level of articulation and adequacy of vision of desired change; adequate identification of those networks and institutions (sub-systems) with the greatest potential and significance for change and community feedback on the relevance and quality of intended changes

² Indeed, the youth center was set-up right on the cease-fire line between the two ethnically divided parts of the city later in 1996 and has in the meantime gained credibility and trust of both Croatian and Muslim teachers, children, parents and local politicians, despite its explicit promotion of reconciliation.

(Lederach 1997:147). Stubbs emphasizes the need to track effects of innovative social practices initiated by peacebuilding interventions, such as volunteer-based provision of social services, establishment of community education or mediation committees, or new community based organizations, on the broader social (and political) infrastructure, rather than creating parallel, substitute or disconnected service. "The question should be focused in terms of what legacy will be left when the project ends" (Stubbs:1996:22).

4.1. Transformative Capacity of the Organizational Structure for Peacebuilding

Since peacebuilding interventions take organizational forms, it is important to examine whether these organizational structures' transformative potential, i.e. *create social space for reconciliation, foster horizontal and vertical social integration, reconstruct social meanings through a process of communicative action* (expression of different truths and dialogue on normative bases for common practice, with enough space for divergence and diversity); *respect local organizational cultures and stimulate critical approach to cultural change and innovation etc.* To put it in the language of peace activism – this criterion checks whether peacebuilding projects "walk the talk", without implying that there are any organizational forms or processes which are more "true" to peacebuilding than others, especially given the importance of the cultural context. Through a process of self-reflection, peacebuilding initiatives can explore the connections between their perpetually redefining goals, their values, theories of practice and actual practices, including their own organizational structures and culture.

In addition, the effects of newly created organizational structures for peacebuilding on other local institutions, organizations and social, economic, cultural practices needs to be examined. As Stubbs has pointed out in several articles, international and local nongovernmental organizations engaged in post-war relief and development in the post-Yugoslav war stricken countries, frequently can have a significant effect on local economies - as they act as often principal employers offering salaries far higher than in state institutions for social service provision; and their management systems and organizational structures reproduce those of Western European or US based NGOs and even business organizations. "*Complexities arise when, for example, volunteers are used as a source of 'cheap labor' for supranational agencies, or where foreign 'experts' are paid significantly more than those with local knowledge and, perhaps, more relevant qualifications*" (Stubbs: 1996:32).

The impact of these new organizational structures on the local environment and their actual contribution to peacebuilding is a contested and inadequately explored issue.

4.2. Impact on Peacebuilding Practices Elsewhere

Exchange of experiences and solidarity between localized peacebuilding practices, which operate in a particular, dynamic cultural, social, political contexts featured by protracted conflict is a necessary prerequisite for the creation of local hegemonies conducive of sustained reconciliation, that is the impact of accumulated localized peacebuilding practices on the broader system, such as a national political space or global structures for peacebuilding and international relations (Fetherston: 1998). For these reasons, an additional sub-criterion is suggested which would examine the transfers of knowledge, experience and other resources between different local peacebuilding practices and specifically examine whether a given peacebuilding project has a commitment and capacity to engage in such networking.