CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

As Paffenholz (201: 281) notes, in the absence of "a monocausal development variable that causes armed conflict or helps to support more peaceful transitions," and with the reality that many different variables combined foster violent conflict, this thesis seeks to address and explore the context-specific nature of Development's role in transforming violent conflict, specifically using the case study of TAF's work in southern Thailand. There are many different approaches to understanding and defining Development and Peacebuilding; here, I explain those chosen definitions and put forth the main concepts as they relate to this study.

2.1 Development

In the beginning of the 'development age' President Truman introduced the modern notion of Development to the world as a growth-based form of Development, measured in GDP (Rist, 2002: 71). Development was imagined within the context of modernization (material progress) and was implemented via technology trade and direct foreign investment. The idea that bringing technologies and foreign investment to developing countries, or 'underdeveloped countries', would increase their GDP and thus "help them realize their aspirations for a better life" was the means established to achieve this 'Development'(ie. economic growth) (Rist, 2002: 71).

In response to what can be termed as Conventional Development[1], Alternative Development proposed a more human-centric or "people centered" (as opposed to "growth-centered") approach to Development (Korten, 1995 in Thomas, 2000: 32).Where early Mainstream Development focused on economic growth as both the means and ends of Development (with a contending relationship between the role of the market and government in delivering this growth), Alternative Development

---

[1] "Conventional Development" used in this case to refer to Mainstream Development in the period that preceded Alternative Development, since thereafter Mainstream Development later evolved to incorporate and institutionalize concepts of Alternative Development.

represented a strong resurgence in civil society- the third system of agency, where the state and market are the first two systems (Pieterse, 2001: 94). Not only was the agency of civil society identified as a new means of Development, more prominently society and people also became the ends of Development, in terms of the vision of Development. When Development was announced in President Truman's speech of 1949 declaring the 'development age' (Rist, 2002: 71), it was assumed that the end-point or desired goal of Development was that which the 'exporters of development' had achieved and attained. The 'developed countries' exported their technology and invested in the infrastructure and economic growth of the 'underdeveloped', so that they could replicate the model of 'the developed'. In that version of Mainstream Development, the means and the ends were both economic growth measured in GDP. In contrast to this, Alternative Development sought to separate the means and ends of Development. Pieterse (2001: 86) describes Alternative Development's methodology, or means, to be "participatory, endogenous, self-reliant" while its objectives to be "geared to locally defined needs."

Contemporary development strategies (means and attempted ends) vary with a range and mixture of these mainstream guiding notions of material progress and modernization and various forms with human-centric and locally informed and tailored approaches. As concepts of 'Development' relate to this study, the practice and understanding of Development in alignment with Alternative Development- more human centric, locally informed, participatory approaches- will be under specific investigation, after a comparison with other development approaches.

2.2 Empowerment

In this paper, Development will take on the more progressive and inclusive meaning that considers social and political development as well as economic aspects. In examining and considering the role and use of 'empowerment' in Development, the inherent political nature of Development is recognized. Amartya Sen's understanding of 'empowerment' in relation to Development will also be explored and used to discuss concepts of 'empowerment' as it connects to structure-oriented outcomes for

Conflict Transformation. Considering that 'empowerment' is often used and understood in different ways, here empowerment will specifically take on the meaning of "the expansion of assets and capabilities of [disempowered individuals or groups] to participate in, negotiate with, influence, control and hold accountable institutions that affect their lives" (Samman and Santos, 2009: 11). "In its broadest sense, empowerment is the expansion of freedom of choice and action. It means increasing one's authority and control over the resources and decisions that affect one's life" (Narayan, 2002: 11). This increase, or identified trend variable of empowerment, can be understood as one's agency.

2.2.1 Empowerment and Agency

Sen (1999) defines agency as a 'process freedom', or "what a person is free to do or achieve in pursuit of whatever goal or values he or she regards as important" (Sen, 1985: 203). Further, he sees 'process freedoms' (agency) and 'opportunity freedoms' ["the various combinations of beings and doings a person can achieve" (Sen 1992: 40)] as constituting Development, itself; therefore allowing empowerment to be understood as the expansion of agency (Ibrahim and Alkire, 2007 cited in Samman and Santos, 2009: 5). This relates to the wider conceptual debates of whether empowerment should take into account one's opportunity structure (essentially, "what enables... an agent to become effective") when evaluating empowerment (Samman and Santos, 2009: 3). This research and analysis will adopt Sen's framework of empowerment which essentially conceives "empowerment... as the expansion of agency, which, alongside the expansion of opportunities, constitutes development" (Samman and Santos, 2009: 5).

In recognizing the key role of Bigdon and Korf's (2004) 'empowerment and recognition' and Francis'(2004) capacity building and conscientization, it is useful to look closely at the difference in definition. According to Bigdon and Korf (2004: 353), the difference between 'empowerment' and 'capacity building' has less to do with a difference of intended outcomes as it does with the realization of capacity building, as the authors state that empowerment is the natural outcome of "capacity

building of the disadvantaged, and the reform of oppressive rules and practices." In this sense, efforts to build capacity can also be seen as efforts to empower (so long as they simultaneously work toward the elimination of oppressive rules and practices). This fundamentally relates back to the visualization of empowerment as helping to transform latent or protracted conflicts, as identified in Francis' (2004: 99) process of Conflict Transformation. This also reflects the similar framework of Sen's understanding of agency essentially being a "trend variable" of empowerment (Samman and Santos, 2009: 4). So then 'capacity building' efforts that increase agency can be understood as contributing to an increase of empowerment.

Unlike a conventional approaches to Development via capacity-building that could be viewed as a form of technical exchange of knowledge and tools, in line with an approach that relies on 'development as modernization', a mere mimicking of other Western or 'developed countries' 'success' (Parks and Cole, 2010); here, capacity building takes on a pluralistic approach, in that the intention of this capacity building- in the context of Francis' 'Stages and Processes of Conflict Transformation' (2004)- is overtly political, and not necessarily in opposition with development approaches and theory that take into high consideration the political necessity and effects of development interventions.

Ultimately capacity building and empowerment both seek to "foster structures that meet basic human needs (substantive justice) and maximize participation of people in decisions that affect them (procedural justice)" (Lederach, 1999: 83).The DAC Guidelines (OECD/AC, 1997: 9) outline the role of aid in 'complex emergencies' pointing to the need for development cooperation's end point to be a form of sustainable development defined by "an environment of structural stability." This "environment of structural stability" is specifically defined as "one in which there are dynamic and representative social and political structures capable of managing change and resolving disputes without resort of violence", which they conclude "over the long term... can contribute to alleviating the root causes of conflict and help to develop institutions capable of managing and resolving disputes in a peaceful manner" (OECD/AC, 1997: 9). This, therefore, reinforces the notion that

Development's aim in complex emergencies can be in line with Conflict Transformation, when they not only seek to address root causes of conflict, but further to establish a system or culture of peace.

2.3 Peacebuilding

As Development theory and practice has evolved over the years, so too has the relationship between Development and Peacebuilding. Although it is clear that Development is dependent on the state of peace or conflict in which it is situated, the claim "that measures for poverty reduction and, thus, almost all development activities per se are a contribution to Peacebuilding in the long run (Collier, 2003),"can no longer be assumed. In fact, there is a recognition that Development and humanitarian aid can even "inadvertently exacerbate conflict lines" as was seen in the eye-opening example of Rwanda (Paffenholz, 2011: 278). This topic will be further elaborated in the consideration of negative contributions that Development can have on Peacebuilding (see section 3.1).

However, since the early 90s there have been a variety of approaches suggested and endorsed, relating to Development's practice in situations of conflict, or complex emergency, as a way to control the negative impacts of this relationship between Development and conflict. Anderson's 'Do No Harm' (Paffenholz, 2011) is an example of a 'conflict sensitive development' approach that was quite popular in the 1990s; however, recent academic inquiries into the relationship between Development and conflict call for more integrated approaches to Development and Peacebuilding efforts (Paffenholz, 2011).

Peacebuilding, as a generic term used to encompass "all activities intended to encourage and promote peaceful relations and overcoming violence," also refers to "activities connected with economic development, social justice, reconciliation, empowerment of disadvantaged/strategic groups and humanitarian support," (Austin, Fischer and Ropers, 2004:465). These forms of Peacebuilding fall into the category of Track III, defined as "activities directed towards Conflict Transformation and

Peacebuilding normally at the grassroots level [that] encourages interaction and understanding between formerly hostile local communities and involves awareness raising and empowerment within those communities," (Austin et al., 2004: 466). Whereas Track I "relates to activities on the stratum of high-level leaders, primarily in the form of conflict settlement," and Track II is described as "activities in parallel with the formal processes of communication and negotiation that are designed to open up dialogue an understanding between parties in conflict and encourage new thinking about future relationships after the conflict," such as for example "building a co-operation and infrastructural connections between hostile parties so that they become more mutually dependent and cannot revert to war in the future." (Austin et al., 2004: 466). These tracks, however, are not mutually exclusive, and, in fact, as many scholars, recognize they represent different levels of the conflict that all must be addressed so that efforts toward and goals or outcomes for peace work can, firstly, reinforce one another and, secondly, can achieve a higher likelihood of sustainability[2].

In terms of identifying frameworks of understanding, it is important to recognize that how one understands a conflict (or perceived problem) helps to determine the strategic design and framework of intervention chosen, be it for conflict or development intervention. Specifically in terms of conflict intervention, Bigdon and Korf (2004) outline three lenses through which conflict can be framed and understood (resource conflict, interest conflict, and identity conflict), each with their own implications for the respective discourse of conflict intervention. The authors link the conflict frame of interest and resource to the discourse of conflict management, while arguing that the discourse of Conflict Transformation is more appropriate for identity conflicts.

Since many identify and understand the underlying and root causes of this conflict to be largely connected with concepts of identity conflict (Thanet Aphornsuvan, 2006; Burke, 2011; USAID, 2009), a frame "that recognizes that most intractable conflicts are really about the articulation and confrontation of individual and collective identities" (Bigdon and Korf, 2004: 348), the authors would support the

---

[2] see section 3.2 for a discussion on the insufficiency of elite decision-making

use of Conflict Transformation as the discourse through which to analyze and understand this conflict. These frames, however, are not mutually exclusive and can be helpful in describing different aspects of the conflict (ie. interest frame may be more appropriate for understand the role and position of different actors, rather than understanding the causes and consequences of this conflict). Like the three tracks of conflict intervention, they are not mutually exclusive, but rather represent a specific frame geared toward the analysis and understanding of a specific issue. However, having said this, in this paper Conflict Transformation, not only due to the identity aspect of the conflict in southern Thailand, but also accounting for the level through which intervention will be studied, will take a leading role as a framework of understanding. However, before going further into the discourse of Conflict Transformation, it is useful to frame where Conflict Transformation locates itself in the larger picture of other guiding frameworks of conflict intervention. Korf and Bigdon (2004: 342) outline and explain the interrelated nature of conflict intervention's three main discourses: conflict settlement, conflict resolution, and Conflict Transformation.

The first discourse, conflict settlement, addresses those strategies which seek an agreement of sorts, whose aim is to end violent conflict, without necessarily addressing the underlying causes of the conflict. Since, this form of conflict intervention often takes the form of official governmental diplomacy, it does not usually directly relate to strategies pursued by development agencies. It is widely viewed as a top-down approach to peace and its outcomes, as identified by Ropers (2004: 264), are results-oriented, in that it seeks and measures it success by its ability to achieve "political settlements with stabilizing effects."

Secondly, there is conflict resolution. Often a blanket term used to express a variety of conflict interventions, the discourse of conflict resolution particularly describes a 'process-oriented' approach, whose main aim is "to address the underlying causes of direct, cultural[3], and structural violence[4]" (Bigdon and Korf, 2004: 343).

---

[3] Cultural violence defined as "social and cultural legitimation of direct and structural violence" (Reimann, 2004: 50)

"Conflict resolution begins by defining protracted conflicts as a natural result of unmet human needs", as such, according to this framework, the "origin of protracted conflict can be found in the underlying needs of its participants" (Reimann, 2004: 50). In terms of measuring successes, conflict resolution seeks "improved communication, interaction, and relations between parties [as well as] respect for different collective identities" (Ropers, 2004: 264).

Lastly, Conflict Transformation discourse (Track III) focuses on "long-term peacebuilding efforts oriented to outcomes, processes and also structural changes" (Bigdon and Korf, 2004: 343), a discourse in which the root causes of the conflict are seen as arising from "unsatisfied human needs, *as well as* from unequal and repressive social and political structures which result in the deep dissatisfaction of marginalized groups" (Bigdon and Korf, 2004: 351). As such, and according to Lederach (1999a: 79), Conflict Transformation requires both a structural and procedural lens.

2.3.1 Conflict Transformation

In using and understanding Conflict Transformation, particularly as it relates to the analysis of the conflict in southern Thailand, it is necessary to explain and understand its dimension of transformation, dimension of time, and the stages and processes of Conflict Transformation as it relates to the overall framework of Peacebuilding. This understanding of Conflict Transformation as a discourse linked to certain issues and time frames is further elaborated by John Paul Lederach (1999, 2003) and Diana Francis (2004).

John Paul Lederach (1999a: 77) describes Conflict Transformation as a middle range perspective in terms of 5-10 years (as opposed to short term's months, short range's years, and long-term's generational conception and planning of time) that focuses on the "design of social change" (as opposed to short-term's focus on crisis prevention, short-range's attention to preparation and training, and generational

---

[4] Structural violence defined as "the social, political, economic structure of a conflict situation when unequal power, domination, and dependency are perpetuated" (Reimann, 2004: 50)

visions' articulation of desired futures). Considering peace work at large, all of these responses are necessary, given the need for different responses to immediate to long-term planning, strategies, and responses in complex emergencies. When put within the larger framework of Peacebuilding, Lederach's (1999a: 77) use of nested models, representing different paradigms and time frames, places this middle range(Conflict Transformation) at a cross-section between the time frame activity of 'social design of change' and the level of a subsystem analysis. The unique position of Conflict Transformation, at the intersection of those short term and short range responses and levels of analysis, essentially fills the gap in asking and attempting to answer what mechanisms can be put into place to allow for the transformation of crisis to desired change for the long term (Lederach, 199a: 78). "Central to this framework is the idea that any given immediate intervention is connected to movement toward a long-term goal, perhaps best articulated as the concept of sustainable development" (Lederach, 1999: 75).

Similar to Lederach's (1999a) time framing of peace, its responses, and its level of analysis, Development also requires a similar pathway that balances, integrates, and connects immediate with long term goals, desires, and visions. Eguren's (2011) report on Theory of Change highlights a method to draw out this process through visualization of desired and possible future scenarios, the identification of one's own assumptions and abstract projections, as well as the identification of milestones and conditions necessary for this long-term realization of this process or pathway to occur. One relevant lesson in this approach is the importance of the 'visualization of desired and possible future scenarios' for both Development and Peacebuilding. This relates to the notion of Development as a goal, objective, and endpoint; however, it, like, peace is never a resting state; it is always, at the same time, a process as well.

Francis' (2004: 99) 'Stages and Processes in Conflict Transformation' draws out a similar abstract map, taking into particular consideration the unique context of the asymmetry of power that is relevant to the conflict in southern Thailand. Here she identifies conscientization (awareness raising), mobilization (group formation) and

empowerment for action (analysis, strategy, building support) as part of a larger process of Conflict Transformation that can help a situation of unequal power relations realize conflict resolution (focusing more on the issues and its root causes) (Francis, 2004: 99). More than just the root causes, Conflict Transformation addresses the relationships and the current system of relations. Bigdon and Korf (2004: 343) describe its objectives as aiming to "overcome revealed forms of direct, cultural, and structural violence," or the root causes, *as well as* "transforming unjust social relationships and promoting conditions that can help to create cooperative relationships." Francis' (2004) capacity building and conscientization- similar to Bigdon and Korf's (2004: 352) empowerment and recognition- are necessary for the transformation of conflict to a place where conflict resolution is possible (Francis, 2004: 100). Additionally, constructive roles that 'outsiders' can play, such as bridge builders, human rights monitors, resource providers (in terms of money, expertise, and information), directly relate to the effects that Development and Peacebuilding efforts and actors can have on the opportunity structure, in addition to agency increasing projects (Francis, 2004: 100).