

Relief and Rehabilitation Network

World Bank
Washington, DC

World Bank
Washington, DC

Network Paper 5

**Advancing Preventive Diplomacy
in a Post-Cold War Era:**

**Suggested Roles for
Governments and NGOs**

Kumar Rupesinghe

September 1994

Please send comments on this paper to:

Relief and Rehabilitation Network
Overseas Development Institute
Regent's College
Inner Circle
Regent's Park
London NW1 4NS
United Kingdom

A copy will be sent to the author.

Comments received may be used in future Newsletters.

ISSN: 1353-8691

© Overseas Development Institute, London, 1994.

Photocopies of all or part of this publication may be made providing that the source is acknowledged. Requests for commercial reproduction of Network material should be directed to ODI as copyright holders. The Network Coordinator would appreciate receiving details of any use of this material in training, research or programme design, implementation or evaluation.

**Advancing Preventive Diplomacy
in a Post-Cold War Era:
Suggested Roles For Governments and NGOs**

Kumar Rupesinghe¹

Contents		Page
1.	Introduction	1
2.	The Problem of Conflict in a Post-Cold War World	1
3.	Responses to Conflict: Opportunities and Obstacles	4
4.	Towards a Global Conflict Prevention Capacity	8
5.	Suggested Roles for Governments, Humanitarian and Development Agencies	12
6.	Conclusions	19
	References	21
Annex 1	Useful Contacts and Addresses	23

¹ *Dr Rupesinghe* is Director General of International Alert, London. Information on the work of International Alert is provided in the Annex to this paper.

Advancing Preventive Diplomacy in a Post-Cold War Era: Suggested Roles For Governments and NGOs

1. Introduction

The number of internal conflicts have increased dramatically since the end of the Cold War. This phenomenon presents enormous challenges to the international community as to how to respond and also how to address the causes of the conflicts. So far the attention of the international community has largely focused on responding to actual or imminent conflicts and their effects, often through the provision of humanitarian aid and occasionally in certain recent cases through intervention by armed forces under a UN flag. The high cost of armed conflicts to the affected countries and to rich countries in terms of the rapid growth in expenditures on humanitarian aid coupled with a growing recognition of the inherent difficulties of responding at a late stage in the development of conflicts, is leading to an increasing focus upon actions which might be taken at an earlier stage to reduce tension and prevent the development of potential conflicts. In this field of preventive diplomacy humanitarian and development NGOs have an important role to play.

The purpose of this paper is to provide RRN members who may be unfamiliar with issues of conflict and conflict prevention with a brief overview of recent trends and research in relation to conflicts, review the prospects for advancing preventive diplomacy and suggest some of the options for action which governments and NGOs might pursue. A list of useful contacts and addresses in the conflict prevention field is provided in Annex 1 for those RRN members wishing to explore this area further.

2. The Problem of Conflict in a Post-Cold War World

During the Cold War, the West focused on the possibility of global conflict through

the distorting lens of the nuclear threat hanging over all humanity. The severity of other conflicts were judged in terms of the degree of superpower involvement. It is now apparent that conflicts which developed during the Cold War together with the numerous newly emerging conflicts have their own complex dynamics. A difficulty facing Western governments and publics is that current and potential conflicts can no longer be neatly categorized, explained or understood as proxy wars or other types of offshoots of the superpower rivalry.

According to Ted Robert Gurr, head of the 'Minorities at Risk' project based at the Centre for International Development and Conflict Management at the University of Maryland in the USA, there were 50 serious and emerging ethnopolitical conflicts around the world in 1993-4. Gurr attributes 26.8 million refugees to these conflicts and about 4 million cumulative deaths over the duration of the conflicts listed (Gurr, 1994). The Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University has compiled an initial list of 32 major armed conflicts in 1993 (defined as conflicts which have produced more than 1,000 casualties in a particular year) as well as 15 minor conflicts.

In the most recent edition of the *Human Development Report* the UNDP estimates that during 1993, 42 countries in the world had 52 major conflicts ongoing and another 37 countries had political violence. Of the total of 79 countries affected by major conflict and political violence 65 were in the developing world. It notes:

More than half the conflicts had been under way for more than a decade, taking the lives of four to six million people... Since 1945, more than 20 million people have died in wars and other conflicts (UNDP 1994).

Most of today's conflicts are internal rather than interstate. According to the UNDP only three of the 82 armed conflicts between 1989 and 1992 were between states. Civilians make up the vast majority of casualties in today's wars, according to the UNDP, as much as 90%.

The Netherlands-based Interdisciplinary Research Programme on Root Causes of Human Rights Violations (normally known by its Dutch acronym PIOOM) identified 160 violent and potentially violent domestic and international conflicts in 1992. PIOOM's survey for that year enumerated 32 Outright Wars, in which there were at least 1,000 battle-related deaths per year; another 69 Low Intensity Conflicts 'in which the violence is more sporadic and less intense', and 59 Serious Disputes 'in which one of the parties has threatened the use of violence or has deployed military troops or made a show of force' (Colijn, Ko et al, 1993). The fact that the number of Outright Wars was outweighed by those in the Low-Intensity Conflict and Serious Dispute category, indicates the potential for disputes escalating to become low-intensity conflicts and for both these categories to escalate to become outright wars.

Whilst there was a decrease in global spending on armaments from 1987 to 1990 of some \$240 billion, military spending in many parts of the world, particularly Sub-Saharan Africa and East Asia, did not decline (UNDP, 1994). Violent conflicts have generally led to the diversion of scarce resources towards military spending. Such diversion is most significant in developing countries. According to the UNDP, in 1990-91, all developing countries spent the equivalent of 60 per cent of their combined expenditures for education and health on military expenditure, compared with 33 per cent in the case of industrialised countries. The proportions were substantially higher in many developing countries for Somalia the proportion was 200%; Ethiopia 190%; Angola 208%; Yemen 197%; Pakistan 125%; India 138%; Myanmar 222%; Iraq 271%; Sri Lanka 107%; Syria 373% (UNDP, 1994).

Countries which are experiencing or have recently experienced conflict are extremely vulnerable to further devastation from famines and disease as trading systems and the mechanisms for the provision of basic services become less effective or breakdown altogether. Conflicts are responsible for the dramatic increase in refugees and internally displaced people which now number 19 million and 25 million respectively (UNHCR, 1993).

3. Responses To Conflict: Opportunities and Obstacles

Whilst there is broad agreement that the number of internal conflicts has increased and is likely to increase further over the next decade and that their consequences will become increasingly dire, there is no consensus on how best to tailor preventive responses to emerging conflicts.

Interest in the preventive aspects of diplomacy was given a considerable boost by the publication in 1992 of *An Agenda for Peace*, effectively the UN Secretary General's blueprint for revitalising the UN in the aftermath of the Cold War (Boutros Ghali, 1992). He defined preventive diplomacy as 'action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur'. He also stated that **the most desirable and efficient** employment of diplomacy is to ease tensions before conflict erupts and 'to act swiftly to contain it and resolve its underlying causes.

Elaborating on the UN's role in terms of conflict prevention and resolution, Boutros-Ghali stated that the aims of the UN should be:

To seek to identify at the earliest possible stage situations that could produce conflict, and to try through diplomacy to remove the sources of danger before violence results;

Where conflict erupts, to engage in peacemaking aimed at resolving the issues that have led to conflict;

Through peace-keeping, to work to preserve peace, however fragile, where fighting has been halted and to assist in implementing agreements achieved by the peacemakers;

To stand ready to assist in peacebuilding in its differing contexts: rebuilding the institutions and infrastructures of nations torn by civil war

and strife; and building the bonds of peaceful mutual benefit among nations formerly at war;

In the largest sense, to address the deepest causes conflict; economic despair, social injustice and political oppression...

The principal instruments of preventive diplomacy were listed as:

1. Confidence-building measures, i.e. exchanges of military missions, risk reduction centres, information exchanges, monitoring of regional arms control agreements;
2. Fact-finding, i.e. information gathering and a willingness to act on information;
3. Early warning, i.e. a synthesis of UN environmental, nuclear accident risk, famine, disease and population movement warning information with political indicators and possible UN action;
4. Preventive deployments, i.e. the insertion of armed forces before a crisis develops.

As can be seen from the types of measures envisaged, *An Agenda for Peace* placed the greatest emphasis on international **military** responses to potentially violent conflicts. The existing and potential **non-military** roles of both governmental and non-governmental organisations in preventing or resolving conflicts were largely ignored.

Over the last two years the optimism which existed in terms of enhancing the UN's role and the establishment of a 'New World Order' at the time *An Agenda for Peace* was published has largely turned to disillusionment. Failed attempts at diplomacy and peacemaking in the former Yugoslavia, Angola, Haiti, Somalia and now Rwanda have demonstrated the UN's current financial, logistical and political

inability to effectively intervene in high-risk internal disputes.

As *The Economist* (30 April 1994) noted:

Mr Boutros Ghali himself has acknowledged that the world body has neither the will nor the resources to intervene in a civil war. It can try to promote or keep a peace but is not equipped, physically or mentally, to enforce one. Though that thought hardly needed driving home, the UN's prevarications in the Bosnian tragedy have amply done so.

Regional intergovernmental bodies such as the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) and the Organisation of American States (OAS), have also had their own share of failures: the CSCE attempts at mediation in the former Yugoslavia; the OAU's failed Arusha process for Rwanda; the OAS' response to the Haitian coup, are some examples.

However, despite the recent record of the UN and other intergovernmental bodies, it should be borne in mind that it is the failures of diplomacy that are prominently reported, not the successes. For instance, while the debacle in Bosnia continues to command headlines, the recent treaty of reconciliation between Poland and Lithuania received little notice, nor does the quiet diplomacy of the CSCE's High Commissioner for National Minorities. In Africa, a regional diplomatic initiative was instrumental in establishing indirect and then direct contacts between the warring parties in Mozambique, which eventually led to the Rome peace accord of 1992.

On the non-governmental level, the sustained dedication and courage of grassroots peacemakers in South Africa still has not received the public attention it merits, nor have the efforts of citizen peacemakers in the Philippines, those who helped facilitate the Israeli-Palestinian breakthrough and many others in all regions of the world.

Because of the complexity and multifaceted nature of many internal conflicts, there is evidently a need to involve a variety of non-governmental and governmental actors. In recent years, non-governmental organisations have played a constantly expanding role in the advancement of human rights, in organising and providing humanitarian assistance, in promoting adherence to humanitarian law, fostering economic and social development and conflict resolution. This 'third system' serves as a primary link between 'we the peoples' of the UN Charter and states and the intergovernmental system.

A major paradox of our time is that the international system which evolved to guarantee peace and security among nation-states has not developed effective standards, mechanisms or the political will to address violent internal conflicts and their consequences. In this post-Cold War world of **disorder**, international organizations, the remaining superpower and national governments have not kept pace with the changing character of war or shed the institutional and intellectual straitjacket of the paramountcy of state sovereignty woven during the Cold War era.

The international system and the components of that system, whether governments, intergovernmental organisations or non-governmental organisations have, in most cases, **only been able and willing to react** to events. Development of effective capabilities to **prevent** catastrophic internal conflicts and their consequences has been sorely neglected. The reasons for this are several and complex involving narrowly defined national self-interest, deference to the increasingly obsolescent concept of 'absolute' sovereignty, distorted allocations of resources for the protection and promotion of peace and security, and inertia. At the same time technological, economic and cultural globalization, the inability of weak or virtually non-existent governments to protect the basic human rights of their citizens and/or humanitarian solidarity all dictate that the concept of absolute sovereignty must be re-evaluated. Common sense dictates that shifting governmental and non-governmental energies and resources to preventive activities would be a more cost-effective means of addressing internal conflict than responding to the consequences of such conflicts after they erupt in violence.

To quote Max van der Stoel, High Commissioner of National Minorities of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE):

'Capital invested in conflict prevention is capital well spent. In humanitarian, financial and political terms, conflict prevention is much cheaper than peacekeeping or rebuilding societies after a violent conflict' (van der Stoel, 1994).

In a similar vein J. Brian Atwood, head of the U.S. Agency for International Development recently remarked,

'Just the other day we made a decision to contribute \$35 million additional to handle this disaster [Rwanda]. One wonders if we had had \$35 million in the previous two years we could have done something to avoid the killing' (quoted in the *International Herald Tribune*, June 1, 1994).

Given the destructiveness of existing wars, what appears to be an increasing spiral of violence, and the current difficulties of international organizations or individual governments in effectively addressing these conflicts, it is of critical importance to develop complementary approaches between NGOs, governments and intergovernmental bodies, as well as to enhance co-operation among NGOs concerned with the prevention of internal conflict and conflict transformation.

4. Towards A Global Conflict Prevention Capacity

Repeated tragedies, lost opportunities, our knowledge of emerging conflicts and common sense all dictate that shifting governmental and non-governmental energies and resources to preventive activities would be a more humane and cost-effective means of addressing internal conflict than responding to the consequences of such conflicts after they erupt in violence. This is of course true as well when we are looking at how to foster and sustain development.

To maximize the strengths of both the non-governmental and governmental communities in preventing violent conflict, efforts should be concentrated on the co-ordination and operationalization of preventive strategies in **strategic alliances** of various partners. This will take firm political and financial commitments, as well as commitments of human resources. These are the basic building-blocks for an effective and sustainable preventive system.

Parallels to effective approaches to preventive diplomacy can be found in areas sometimes taken for granted - fire prevention and preventive medicine, for example. In the case of the former, modern preventive measures began with the invention of stand-by fire brigades and horsedrawn equipment in the 19th century and have since grown into what can only be described as a culture of fire prevention. That culture involves substantial public and private investment and is comprised of rigorous fire safety standards, modern firefighting equipment and techniques, public awareness campaigns, and, in the home, smoke detectors and fire extinguishers. It also involves different actors - governments, public services, business leaders, the media - all working to get the preventive message across to publics and to implement and maintain preventive measures. The lives and property saved through prevention have been inestimable.

The development of preventive diplomacy as an effective instrument for the peaceful and constructive resolution and transformation of complex and protracted internal conflicts will also involve a sustained, multi-dimensional approach at both the national and international levels. Below are some of the possible general approaches which different elements of the international community may find useful in developing preventive strategies and practices.

Options for Early Preventive Action: Based on early warnings, non-military and non-coercive 'emergency' responses by governmental and non-governmental organisations might include:

- # international appeals;

- # fact-finding missions aimed at framing the issues and exploring fora for dialogue and negotiation;
- # informal consultations with parties to conflict;
- # lobbying of national governments and intergovernmental bodies;
- # logistical and technical support for mediation or negotiation efforts;
- # expert facilitation of negotiations;
- # the deployment of non-governmental peacemakers to areas of potential conflict.

Options for Longer-Term Preventive Action: Longer-term actions should seek to address sources of conflict such as economic and social disparities, weak government and non-governmental structures and the enhancement of elements of civil society. Essentially, what is needed is a global shift in thinking and practical approaches to conflict, by which increasingly effective preventive action pre-empts reaction to catastrophic developments.

Such preventive initiatives might include:

- # The development of integrative economic packages to sustain peacebuilding efforts;
- # Development aid targeted to conflict-prone areas or regions;
- # Aid targeted on development of conflict management mechanisms;
- # Support for improving the structures of governance and support for civil society;
- # Cross-cultural conflict resolution training and training of local trainers;
- # Broader schemes to develop regional conflict prevention institutions.

Other important areas are the promotion of multi-culturalism and, in the political arena, the development of mechanisms for the peaceful and constructive resolution of claims for self-determination. For instance, International Alert is currently exploring the viability of a non-governmental 'Forum' which would deal with claims related to national, ethnic, religious and linguistic groups, and, in particular claims involving discrimination or group bias, recognition of identity, self-

government, autonomy, and self-determination.

Generating the necessary political will to act upon warnings of developing conflicts is crucial. As Max van der Stoel and others have pointed out: "Early warning activity can only be as effective as the political response...to it." An effective system of preventive diplomacy needs to be comprised of individuals and organisations who can provide political decision-makers and decision-shapers with sufficient warning of impending disasters and who also have the contacts and credibility to effectively encourage them to act to avert disasters.

Some of the key groups and institutions within an area of conflict in positions to influence that conflict could include:

- # political leaders within a given government and other political groups;
- # mid-level political leaders;
- # business leaders;
- # media;
- # the military;
- # other institutions of civil society;
- # public opinion;
- # cultural figures.

Using timely and accurate analysis of the causes of a particular conflict, principled interventions can take a number of forms. Among these are efforts to influence international measures to address a developing conflict, such as the promotion of dialogue and problem-solving, support in the establishment of channels of communication and the establishment of fora for negotiation.

Other approaches might include:

- # the use of special envoys, mediators or arbitrators acceptable to all parties;
- # public or private lobbying of specific target groups - the media, union

leaders, religious leaders, other influential social and political actors - within a society faced with violent internal conflict or the escalation of conflict;

- # working with international financial or developmental organizations or business consortia with interests in peaceful outcomes.

Because so many of today's violent conflicts can be characterised as ethnic conflicts, special measures to address these types of conflicts are necessary. Such measures could include the clarification of international law and policy regarding the rights of communal groups; consistent enforcement of international law and policy regarding communal minorities; establishment of systems for information gathering and early warning of impending communal conflicts and humanitarian crises; strengthening of regional organizations in the South, as well as non-governmental organizations to meet emerging ethno-political crises; and, an increasingly urgent need - in light of the humanitarian disasters in the former Yugoslavia, and now Rwanda - the establishment of internationally accepted criteria for humanitarian intervention, including the use of force in cases of gross and persistent violations of human rights.

5. Suggested Roles for Governments, Humanitarian and Development Agencies

From the rather cursory outline above of some of the possible responses available to members of the international community to emerging violent conflicts or escalating conflicts, some of the particular problems facing non-governmental organizations and political leaders in addressing these issues and some possible avenues for increasing the overall effectiveness of preventive responses to conflict are now examined.

Governments

Governments, both at the national and international levels, have a particular obligation to assume a leadership role in shaping and implementing preventive responses to emerging conflicts. As members of the United Nations, states, in part, are committed to eliminating the scourge of war, guaranteeing international peace and security, promoting development and human rights, preventing genocide and enforcing humanitarian law. They also have the responsibility of putting their taxpayers' money to the best possible uses.

In terms of preventive diplomacy, it is governments which can effect the greatest amount of change most quickly. But a global shift in how effectively the international community addresses violent internal conflict will necessitate innovation, forceful leadership, the revision of priorities and the reallocation of resources at the political level.

Trends in aid are not encouraging. In 1992, according to a study carried out for ActionAid, ICVA and Eurostep, Official Development Assistance from the major industrialised countries which are members of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development amounted to \$60.4 billion which represented a decrease of 0.57 per cent over the previous year (ActionAid, 1994). Within stagnant or decreasing aid budgets an increasing portion of total Official Development Assistance is expended on humanitarian responses to conflict situations - spending on humanitarian assistance increased from 2.26 per cent of Development Assistance Committee countries' aid budgets in 1988 to over 7 per cent in 1991 (ActionAid, 1994). Meanwhile, the IMF estimates that military spending in the world outside the former Soviet Union has fallen by nearly a quarter to 3.1 per cent of global GDP in 1992 from 3.9 per cent in 1986. However, savings being made through defence cuts are not being rechannelled into aid budgets. The peace dividend has turned out to be one of the more elusive promises of the post-Cold War age.

Clearly, there is a need for a realignment of humanitarian, development and military budgets to more effectively address conflict before it leads to widespread violence

and human catastrophe. One possible mechanism to achieve this could be through the establishment of specific budget lines to support aspects of preventive diplomacy by both governmental and non-governmental entities.

Recommendations for Governments:

1. That the major industrialised democracies take a lead internationally in promoting preventive measures for the avoidance and resolution of potentially violent internal conflicts;
2. That specific cabinet portfolios be established with responsibility for preventive diplomacy, so as to integrate defence, foreign affairs, humanitarian assistance and development assistance priorities related to conflict prevention;
3. That development assistance budgets be re-evaluated with an eye to devoting 10 per cent of the budget to specific conflict prevention initiatives;
4. That the governments of the major industrialised democracies promote the establishment of United Nations ambassadors in all countries, who could receive political early warning information and provide it to the Secretary General.
5. That governments promote the development of an effective logistical capability within the European Union, the United Nations, the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and other international organisations to deal with emerging crises.
6. That governments promote and actively support innovative approaches to peacemaking, such as civilian peacemakers and peace

monitors, eg. non-military "white helmets".

7. That the governments of the major industrialised democracies support and work in close collaboration with non-governmental organizations in the field of preventive diplomacy.

Humanitarian Agencies

Expenditures on humanitarian assistance have risen dramatically in recent years, largely as a result of the humanitarian needs created by conflicts. In 1992, member governments of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD provided about \$4.7 billion (US) worth of humanitarian assistance (food, emergency and distress relief and refugee aid), an increase of more than 47 per cent over 1990 (ActionAid, 1994). Whilst saving hundreds of thousands of lives in emergency situations, several aspects of humanitarian actions have become increasingly problematic. Not only do such needs compete for funds for longer term development efforts, there is growing evidence that humanitarian aid may have the effect of prolonging conflicts by sustaining the warring parties (see for example contributions to Macrae and Zwi et al. 1994 forthcoming).

Other factors hindering humanitarian responses to conflicts are that the mandates of many humanitarian agencies do not reflect the erosion of the concept of state sovereignty, the changed character of war, or the life- and cost-saving logic of prevention. In the affected area, violence, or the threat of violence seriously hinders and often prevents the delivery of humanitarian assistance and endangers relief workers. In many conflict situations, those delivering humanitarian assistance have become targets of combatants or criminal elements and victims of violence and coercion. In some instances, those delivering assistance are seen as acting as aggressors.

Delivery, in some circumstances, has involved diversion of aid to combatants or criminals, thus helping to sustain violence. In-the-field co-operation with

combatants aimed at facilitating delivery has undermined the credibility of humanitarian agencies with donors and the public in donor countries. External organizations have disempowered local organizations, structures and individuals. Meanwhile, negotiating for passage of aid has legitimized parties to conflicts.

Recommendations for Humanitarian Agencies

1. That the mandates of humanitarian agencies be reconsidered in light of the increased numbers of vulnerable populations and the changed character of war. Despite having information on the probable escalation of conflicts, some agencies with the resources and credibility to help avert violence are restricted by their mandates and could not effectively communicate the need for urgent preventive action or act toward prevention.
2. That humanitarian agencies consider participating in the establishment of country-specific and/or region-specific networks for the better coordination of preventive and transformative activities.
3. That they consider how to participate in multi-sectoral approaches to conflict prevention and transformation.
4. That the allocation of a significant portion of humanitarian budgets to conflict prevention and transformation activities, including effective early warning of impending violence, be considered.
5. That individual supporters of humanitarian agencies be asked what percentage of funds they want to be allocated to preventive activities.
6. That humanitarian agencies contribute to the design of sustainable long-term peace initiatives using their in-depth knowledge of conflict situations.

7. That humanitarian agencies participate in consortia of agencies with a direct interest in conflict prevention and transformation to minimize duplication of work and maximise impacts.
8. That humanitarian agencies improve on the early warning information currently available through better in-house gathering, handling and use of information relevant to existing and emerging conflicts. This could involve training in information handling, the use of standardised reporting formats for field workers, the targeting of recipients of information and the development of information strategies related to existing or emerging conflicts.
9. And that they participate in the establishment of a multi-sectoral information clearing house with a capacity for analysis and information targeting of those relevant to conflict prevention and transformation.

Development Agencies

It is already recognized that prevention can be considerably more cost-effective in human and financial terms than reacting to violent conflict. For development assistance and developmental organizations, not to have as their primary or secondary goal the prevention of conflict in the broadest sense is misguided. What is more the issue is how best to sharpen the focus of the preventive aspects of development assistance by implementing specific measures, such as those mentioned above in terms of country-specific consortia.

A significant proportion of development assistance should be used for emergency preparedness, early warning systems, conflict resolution, conflict resolution training and related strategies. There is also a great need for sharing information on the root causes of conflict, evolving trends which can lead to violence and possible means of averting violence with those who would be directly affected. Meaningful forecasting of incipient violent conflicts or the escalation of existing conflicts is a

prerequisite for local preventive action, as well as non-governmental action that may be either complementary to international efforts or the only alternative to no action to avert a catastrophe.

Based on the historical record, *ad hoc* responses to emerging conflicts are recipes for continuing disasters. There is therefore a need for concerted pre-planning on how the available resources can best be deployed to prevent violence and its consequences. Such contingency planning should involve local actors, who have the greatest stake in averting violence and in creating sustainable mechanisms for managing conflict and preventing violence. Development organizations and humanitarian agencies can also be more effective in helping create the political will to move toward a cohesive preventive regime at the national and international levels.

Recommendations for Development Agencies

1. Developmental organizations should consider refocusing their overall approach to development to take greater account of the need for practical initiatives to prevent conflict.
2. The possibility of shifting 10 per cent of overall development budgets to preventive activities should be explored.
3. The creation of dedicated departments for preventive activities should be considered.
4. Developmental organizations should explore the contribution they can make to strategic consortia aimed at addressing country-specific conflicts.
5. Development agencies should also examine their direct participation in the establishment of conflict early warning systems, and in specific conflict resolution initiatives, conflict resolution training and related

strategies.

6. Conclusions

For the international community, what has emerged most clearly from the violent conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, Cambodia, Liberia, Somalia and elsewhere is that in each case a **strategic concept** is needed that unites the non-governmental community, local peacemakers, international organisations, scholars and governments in co-operation towards conflict prevention and transformation. The scale and complexity of the problems faced are such that the only realistic approach is concerted action involving all levels of the international community, as well as co-operation within the components of that community to maximise the impact of their respective strengths. One way of characterizing such a system is as a "strategic umbrella of concern", under which an overall strategy for the prevention or resolution of conflicts could be developed and implemented.

The number of internal armed conflicts, the economic and social devastation they engender, the massive increase in refugee flows, the unprecedented proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and small arms, all lead to the conclusion that traditional approaches are failing us and a new strategic vision is needed if the world community is going to learn how to prevent war. Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacebuilding are the conceptual and operational tools to make progress in this field. But to advance the concept and operational goals for conflict prevention requires concerted action.

The end of the Cold War has not meant the end of history as Francis Fukuyama would have had us believe. In fact, history has become more complex, more rife with risks and opportunities. We can turn away from these complexities and risks in despair, or remain locked in old habits and ways of attempting to prevent or mitigate these man-made disasters. If we attempt to deal with the tide of war-generated human misery using current concepts and instruments, our efforts are bound to fail. Alternatively, we can pool our experience, energy and resources to help break the conceptual and operational logjam which currently afflicts the

international system and confronts millions of people around the world with further suffering.

References

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros, 1992, *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping*, United Nations, New York.

The Economist, April 30th 1994, Vol 331, N° 7861, p12.

International Herald Tribune, June 1 1994.

Macrae, Joanna and Zwi, Anthony et al., 1994, *War and Hunger: Rethinking International Responses to Complex Emergencies*, Zed Books, London and New Jersey.

Rupesinghe, Kumar and Kuroda, Michiko (eds.), 1992, *Early Warning and Conflict Resolution*, Macmillan/St Martin's Press, London/New York.

Rupeshinghe, Kumar (ed.), 1992, *International Conflicts and Governance*, Macmillan, London.

UNDP, 1994, *Human Development Report 1994*, Oxford University Press, New York/Oxford.

UNHCR, 1993, *The State of the World's Refugees - The Challenge of Protection*, Penguin Books, London/New York.

van der Stoel, Max, 1994, 'Keynote Speech' CSCE Seminar on Early Warning and Preventive Diplomacy, Warsaw, Poland, January 19th.

Annex 1 Useful Contacts and Addresses

Amnesty International is a worldwide voluntary movement that works to prevent some of the gravest violations by governments of people's fundamental rights. The main focus of its campaigning is to free all prisoners of conscience; ensure fair and prompt trials for political prisoners; abolish the death penalty, torture and other cruel treatment of prisoners; and end extrajudicial executions and 'disappearances'. Amnesty International is impartial. It is independent of any government, political persuasion or religious creed. It does not support or oppose any government or political system, nor does it support or oppose the views of the victims whose rights it seeks to protect. It is concerned solely with the protection of the human rights involved in each case, regardless of the ideology of the government or opposition forces, or the beliefs of the individual. Amnesty International has more than 1,100,000 members, subscribers and regular donors in over 150 countries and territories. There are 4,349 local Amnesty International groups registered with the International Secretariat and several thousand school, university, professional and other groups in over 80 countries in Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe and the Middle East. To ensure impartiality, each group works on cases and campaigns in countries other than its own, selected for geographical and political diversity. Research into human rights violations and individual victims is conducted by the International Secretariat of Amnesty International. No section, group or member is expected to provide information on their own country, and no section, group or member has any responsibility for action taken or statements issued by the international organization concerning their own country.

Amnesty International Secretariat
1 Easton Street
London WC1X 8DJ - United Kingdom

Tel: +44 71 413 5500

Article 19 takes its name and purpose from Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 19, the International Centre Against Censorship, works impartially and systematically to identify and oppose censorship world-wide on behalf of victims of censorship. Article 19 monitors individual countries' compliance with international standards protecting freedom of expression. The Executive Director is Frances D'Souza.

Article 19
33 Islington High Street
London N1 9LH - United Kingdom
Tel: +44 71 278 9292 - Fax: +44 71 713 13 56

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is an American organisation founded in 1910 by Andrew Carnegie. It is an operating (not grant-making) foundation, which conducts its own programmes of research, discussion, publication and education in international relations and US foreign policy. The Endowment also sponsors meetings of foreign policy specialists in Washington and publishes a quarterly journal - *Foreign Policy*. Presently the Endowment is headed by its President, the Honourable Morton Abramowitz.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

2400 N Street NW

Washington DC 20037 - USA

Tel: 1 202 862 7900 - Fax: 1 202 862 2610

The Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University

was created in 1969. The main disciplines studied are political science, sociology, history and economics, international relations, peace and conflict theory, non-violent conflict resolution, arms proliferation and disarmament. A key aspect of the work at Uppsala is the annual compilation, listing the number of conflicts in the previous year. In this categorization, major conflicts are defined as those incurring over 1,000 battle-related deaths. The department publishes a monograph and its current Director is Professor Peter Wallensteen.

Uppsala University Department of Peace and Conflict Research

Gamla Torget 3

753 20 Uppsala - Sweden

Tel: 46 18 18 2354 - Fax: 46 18 69 5102

Human Rights Watch was established in 1978 to monitor and promote the observance of internationally recognized human rights among the signatories of the Helsinki accords. The areas it covers today include Africa, the Americas, Asia and the Middle East, along with five collaborative projects which include the Arms Project, Children's Rights Project, Prison Project, Women's Rights Project, and the Free Expression Project. Human Rights Watch conducts regular, systematic investigations of human rights abuses in some seventy countries around the world. It addresses the human rights practices of governments of all political stripes, of all geopolitical alignments, and of all ethnic and religious persuasions. In internal wars it documents

violations by both governments and rebel groups. Human Rights Watch defends freedom of thought and expression, due process and equal protection of the law; it documents and denounces murders, disappearances, torture, arbitrary imprisonment, exile, censorship and other abuses of internationally recognized rights. Human Rights Watch maintains offices in New York, Washington, Los Angeles, Brussels, London, Moscow, Belgrade, Zagreb, Dushanbe, and Hong Kong. As an independent, non-governmental organisation, Human Rights Watch is supported by contributions from private individuals and foundations. It accepts no government funds, directly or indirectly.

Human Rights Watch
485 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10017-6104 - USA
Tel: 212 972 8400 - Fax: 212 972 0905

International Alert is an independent international NGO established in 1985 and is a registered charitable foundation in the UK and the Netherlands. The organisation seeks to contribute to the resolution of internal conflict by promoting peace and conciliation through dialogue and furthering the observance and enhancement of international humanitarian and human rights standards. International Alert's current activities include Training, Early Warning & Preventive Diplomacy, Self-Determination, Conflict Resolution in the Soviet Union, Peace and Negotiations in Africa.

International Alert
1 Glyn Street
London SE11 5HT - United Kingdom
Tel: +44 171 793 8383 - Fax: +44 171 793 7975
E-Mail: Intl-Alert@Geo2.Geonet.de

PIOOM stands for 'Programma Interdisciplinair Onderzoek naar Oorzaken van Mensenrechtenschendingen' which in English means 'Interdisciplinary Research Programme on Root Causes of Human Rights Violations'. The PIOOM Foundation was established in 1988 to support the work of Amnesty International and other human rights organisations, as well as UN agencies. PIOOM. PIOOM has a network of Associates from 50 countries and produces a Newsletter, usually twice a year. The current headquarters of PIOOM is the Centre for the Study of Social Conflicts (COMT) of Leiden University. The Research Director and editor of the PIOOM Newsletter is Prof. Alex P Schmid.

PIOOM c/o COMT
Leiden University
Wassenaarseweg 52
2333 AK Leiden - The Netherlands
Tel: +31(0)71-273861/273848 - Fax: +31(0)71-273788
E-Mail (Internet): IN% "PIOOM@RULFSW.LEIDENUNIV.NL"

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) was established in 1966 as an independent research institute to examine crucial areas of international peace and security. Its creation by the Swedish government, commemorated Sweden's 150 years of unbroken peace and was designed by a Royal Commission chaired by Mrs Alva Myrdal. Although it is funded entirely by appropriations of the Swedish Parliament, its staff and governing board are international. Much of SIPRI's work has focused upon the question of armaments manufacture and the disarmament debate. It studied the technological arms race, the state of arms proliferation worldwide and comments of disarmament negotiations. SIPRI studies are an authoritative source of information and in recent years it has attempted to

broaden its constituency by making its findings available to non-governmental organisations and concerned citizens. SIPRI has published over 50 books and some 20 research reports. The best known is *World Armaments and Disarmament*, *SIPRI Yearbook*, which is an annual compilation about arms and conflict.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
Pipers vag 28 s-170 73 Solna
Sweden
Tel: 46 8 655 9700 - Fax: 46 8 655 97 33

Other Addresses

Centre for International Development and Conflict Management
Professor Edy Kaufman (Director)
0145 Tydings Hall
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20724-7231
USA
Tel: 301 314 7703
Fax: 301 314 9256

Huridocs Secretariat
Kofi Kumado (Chairperson)
2 rue Jean-Jacquet
Ch-1201 Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: 41 22 741 1767

Fax: 41 22 741 1768