Modicum Chains of Peace-Making Process, Truth and Restorative Justice as a Factor for Conflict Reconciliation

Effiong Ekpo
Department of History and International Studies
Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria
dreffiongekpo48@gmail.com

&

Effiong Duncan Asananyi
Department of History and International Studies
University of Uyo, Uyo, Nigeria.
Effiongasananyi@gmail.com

Abstract

Peace is a continuing practice, it therefore required that conflicts be addressed in relation to specific situation that exist in a society. Response to conflict therefore requires thoughtful actions. It is a mutual process. Peace is a major component of conflict reconciliation. This paper evaluates the peculiarity of peace building strategy, integrated framework for peace building as well as justice as a factor of reconciliation. It dismisses the popular notion of operational challenges for peace mission. The paper instead opines that there is capacity building in peace building process which encourage economic peace building target. The method used was empirical by contacting textbooks and relevant journals. The paper arrives at the conclusion that, restorative justice is veritable factor of conflict reconciliation.

Keywords: Truth, restoration justice, peace building strategy, peace making process.

Introduction

Peace is a continuing practice; it therefore requires that conflicts be addressed in relation to specific situations that exist in a society. In this respect, although immediate conflicts arising in society require a fast response, it needs long term vision to respond effectively to conflicts and to be able to transform it. Response to conflict requires thoughtful actions. It is a mutual process. Peace is a major component of this process. Recent peace settlements have been aimed largely toward this end. The negotiations and agreements that have so captured media attention are matured more by the benefits that parties see arising from the opportunity to tap into global integration and capital than by the desire for a just peace this was rather clearly evident in the Oslo agreement with its on-again, off-again implementation.

Movement toward such a peace is not, however, the same as a socially just peace that address fundamental structure causes of war or one based on reconciliation indeed, the two are quite different. Rules of governance can be put into place, elections can be held currencies and markets established and economies revived.

Peacemaking building or post conflict reconstruction is a process that encourages the establishment of desirable peace and tries to prevent the reoccurrence of conflict by dealing with the root causes and effect of such conflict through reconciliation, institutional and eco-political

transformation or rebuilding. It involves a whole repertoire of ways of trying to build peace in the society. Peace building as a process involves "approaches planned to advance a protected and firm lasting peace in which the basic human needs of the people are met and violent conflicts do not recur". It is a complex and the impact become visible only in the medium and long term. A great number of agents engage in a wide variety of reconstruction efforts. However, peace building aims at all stages of society and all aspects of its structure, thus it is only necessary that a wide variety of different agents engage in the implementation of peace building such as international organizations, donorand regional institutions, specialists among others.

International organizations get involved at the legislative or governmental level on the appeal of the country involved. Such intervention carries the legality of the international community, thus they possess the capacity and authority to alter existing structures, while donor and regional institutions are international organizations has provided the necessary funding for peace building, projects and may possess a regional mandate to implement such peace building strategies. This may also constitute of NGOs who carried out small scale projects to strengthen the grass-level of affected countries. Specialists in this aspect comprise people in the academia, professionals and religions networks. Their various expertise plays important roles for the reconstruction of the state and transformation of the society. The rebuilding of moral ethics and the provision of important insight for practitioners through research and theories are consequent thereof.

Peace building creates some cynicism in a peace process. It involves being smart enough to respond to building opportunities, however small, maybe it is rooted in building trust and relationship where events are fluid and may have experiencing violence and destruction, opinion and delusion have accumulated over a long period of time. The outcome of peace building becomes a process of understanding and learning. The main principles of peace building are promoting peace through exposing the community to conflict analysis and resolution skills and to peace making suggestions and experiences; it is sensitizing and training in peace with emphasis on activity and empirical learning. Peace building is an integral part of community life and should address all dimensions of society.

Peace Building Strategy: A Conceptual Analysis

Many a time a pace building strategy is not written down, it is in the head of key actors; desk officers, officials on the ground, some of the lead Non-Governmental Organization (NGOs) and International Government Organization (IGO) professionals. In fast changing situations, it may be that an implied strategy among capable and well informed people is better than a strategy statement because the informal strategy is more likely to be flexible and receptive to changes. An informal strategy, however, risks being interpreted in radically different ways by key actors. Newly ready arrived staff may have trouble even finding out what it is some project evaluation comment on strategic, misunderstanding between key project actors. In formal terms, this is the problem of a lack of internal transparency. Between a donor country's general peace building strategy for a specific country or region in conflict, the formal should give guidance for the latter. While the general peace building strategy should indeed be general, the specific peace building strategy must likewise be specific (Agre, 2000: 21-24).

Capacity Building in Peace Building

Building national capacity to administer diversity and regulate conflict is an integral component of good governance and sustainable development and essential to promoting social unity and facilitating the work of government. It builds state and non-state conflict resolution capacity by developing and or strengthening skills, mechanisms and institutions to promote mediation and alternate forms of peaceful dispute resolution and to reduce bias and discrimination.

Capacity building needs to be infused into national development strategies in an anticipatory manner in pre-conflict environments, as well as in post conflict situations, in order to develop an enabling environment for non-violent resolution of disputes, collaborative, problem-solving and tolerance building and ending the spiral of conflicts while the international community has recognized the need for broader, universal conflict prevention and management, the current direction is often still limited to "early" warning, conventional negotiation, emergency operations and peace keeping, all of which are usually too reactive, rather than proactive(Akpuru-Aja, 2007: 14).

A developmental concept of preventive action would originate and execute practical preventive strategies for communities at risk of violent conflict. The extent that national actors have the capacity to participate and facilitate the building process has major implication on bridges the gap in the context of reintegration; capacity building is a prerequisite for local ownership of programmes, a necessity to ensure that the reintegration process is sustained. Regarding local and international institutions and actors' capacity building must take place through a rights-based approach, with human rights as a core element in the process building process which requires a sustainable and safe environment. Building capacity that does not follow this course could lead for tremendous damage later on, should local or national institutions operate in a manner contrary to the rights-based approach.

The Idea of State Building

Examining the concept: the idea of state building has many definitions and uses. Thus, the concept will need to be disentangled, so as to gain a better understanding of the purposes that state building serves, officially and unofficially, this would include consideration of the contradictions in past state building efforts. This include the following:

- **Implication of State Building for Civil Military Relation:** Recent state building operations have hazed traditional boundaries between military and non-military actors and functions. The activities of national militaries, international organizations, private cooperation and NGOs have become increasingly disbelieved in these missions. Even the "embedding" of journalists breaks down traditional reparations.
- **Addressing Root Causes:** Focusing on the social conditions that foster violent conflict. Many noted that stable peace must be built on social, economic and political foundations that serve the needs of the populace. In many cases, crises arise out of systemic roots. If these social problems are not addressed, there can be no lasting peace.
- **The Proportion of Substantive and Procedural Justice:** Through structural means typically involves institution building and the strengthening of civil society. Avenues of political and economic transformation include social structural change to remedy political or economic injustice, restoration problems, designed to help communities ravaged by conflict

revive their economics and the institutions of effective and legitimate restorative justice systems. Peace building initiative aim to promote non-violent mechanisms and essential services to its citizens, a state needs strong executive, legislative and judicial institutions.

Integrated Framework for Peace-Building

We intend to examine what one may refer to as integrated framework for peace building as well as examining the role capacity building, peace building strategy and idea of state building could play in enhancing the peace building process. Having an integrated framework borrowed from experience from other conflict situations is essential to the peace building process. However, it is equally important that this is not imposed on a particular conflict situation. Rather, the approach should be flexible enough putting the country. Specific requirements into consideration, it is equally important that the indigenous national capacity be developed, not only to be able to implement the peace process but also to be able to sustain it(Alder and Graham, 1987: 7).

Peace-making as a Component of Reconciliation

There is little doubt that peace-making is a major component of reconciliation. Without peace there will be no basis or opportunity to discuss and negotiate and therefore plan for the future. Though war procedures its own contradictions or even benefits and they often benefit the military industrial complex, in the end, long term peace is the better option in ensuring the prosperity of all. Peace is a continuing practice; it therefore requires that conflicts be address in relation to specific situations that exist in a society. In this respect although immediate conflict arising in society require a fast response, it needs long-term vision to respond effectively to conflicts and to be able to transform it. Response to conflict therefore requiring thoughtful actions, it is a mutual process. Peace is a major component of this process(Arson, 1999: 3-5).

Peace and Economics of War

In term of economics of war, though war continues to be one mode of accumulation of countries engulfed by domestic violence cannot hope to offer themselves as attractive site for Foreign loans, Production and Investment, indeed, although such provide ready markets for surplus light military equipment such as AK-47s and "technical assistance". They are of little interest to defense cooperation or major military suppliers such as the United States, and they can also absorb vast sums of money without showing any return to investment. If "the rising tide is to lift all ships" as the old capitalist saw it, the reliability of contracts and market stability must be established to provide assurance to capital. Fund will be allocated only if the production of goods and services on which a profit can be earned is possible. Such arrangements are plausible only if the conflicting parties can agree to fundamental rules of state governance.

Recent peace settlements have been aimed largely toward this end. The negotiation and agreements that has captured media attention are motivated more by the benefits that parties see arising from the opportunity to tap into global integration and capital then by the desire for a just integration and capital then by the desire for a just peace that was rather clearly evident in the agreements, with its on-again, off-again implementation. War pays, but peace seem to hope, pays more(Bonfield & Rally, 1998: 16).

Movement toward such a peace is not however, the same as a socially just peace that addressees' fundamental structural causes of war or one based on reconciliation indeed, the two are suite different. Rules of governance can be put into place, election can be held, currencies and markets established and economics revived. However, memories are difficult to erase. Even if the funding myths of communication conflict can be shown to be demonstrably false as for example, in the case of "ancient hatreds" between Serbs and Croats, one cannot simply write off the deeds, injured and dispossessed victims of the most recent cycle of violence(Botes, 2001:5).

The Process of Peace in Reconciliation

The term, peace process can be defined in many different ways, Former Track I and Track II, diplomat Harold Sounders, defines peace processes as a political process in which conflicts are reconciled by peaceful means. They are a "mixture of politics, negotiation, changing relationships, compromise, mediation and dialogue in both official and non-official arenas. Peace processes operate concurrently in four areas:

- the executive arena
- the semi-executive arena
- civil peace processes
- civil society

- **The Executive Arena:** this is the area of official 'Track 1' diplomats who ascertain personal relationship with their complements in the other side, confer provisional and fund, agreements and work to recover relationships between governments.
- **The Semi-Executive Arena:** this is the area of the Susan Allen Iran in her essay. Track 1 – Track 11 Coordination calls track one-and a-half. The people involved are outside of government, but have close ties to government and trade information back and forth.
- **Civil Peace Processes:** This is the arena of continued discourse between non-officials, who try to take the "human" (as divergent to governmental) causes of conflict; opinions, stereotypes, distrust and sense of hopelessness.
- **Civil Society:** this is the arena in which civilians live and work. It is comprised of network of relationships, often between disputing groups. In intractable conflicts, these relationships breakdown, causing fears in the framework of civil society which must be rebuilt in any peace process.

However, peace process is step-by-step reciprocal moves to build confidence, resolution issues such as disarmament and carefully define the future through the design of new political institutions. In their terms, a peace process is a complicated set of step-by-step. Third-party media, among parties in conflict that help to gradually exchange war for peace(Cohen, 1993: 9-12).

Peacemaking/Peacekeeping

The term "peacemaking" is used in two ways. First, the peace-making is sometimes used to refer to a stage of conflict, which occurs during an extended conflict after tactful intervention has

failed and before peacekeeping forces have had a chance to intervene, in this context peacemaking is an intervention during armed combat.

The second way the term is used is to mean simply "making peace". The idea of making peace implies a certain commitment towards that goal. Peacemaking is necessary and important that in cases of prolonged violence that does not seem to burn themselves out and in cases where war crimes and other human desolation demand the attention of outside process. In both cases, peacemaking always implies that the threat of violent intervention as an act of last resort. In the second case it may demand violent interference sooner rather than later, we will portray peace-making in this context(Cohen, 1977: 4).

Peacekeeping will be understood as the second phase of the peace process that is different from long term peace building. This reflects the United Nations' view that peacekeeping is an effort to "monitor and observe peace processes that emerge in post-conflict-situations and assist ex-combated to execute the peace agreements they have signed". This includes the use of peacekeeping forces, collective security arrangements and enforcement of ceasefire agreements. The so-called third phase of peace keeping described above on the other hand, is commonly regarded by the UN as part of peace building. Peace according to these criteria is the short term absence of violence might be lasting.

Most research in the field agrees that peacekeeping forces are quite effective at accomplishing that the first criteria but have more trouble with the second. Thus we can say that the introduction of a PKO into a conflict is very effective at ending violence and establishing short-term peace, but less successful at maintaining that peace after they have left. Peace according to these criteria, however, is the short-term deficiency of violence that might be lasting. After all, an inert partial peace is preferable to continued violence. Through building a stable and peaceful state may be preferable to maintaining peace through continued presence of peacekeeping forces, the preservation of peace on any form is preferable to continued violence. In these limited circumstances peacekeeping operations can offer a valuable solution to violent intractable conflicts(Coleman, 1971).

- **Economic Peace Building Targets both the Micro and Macro-Level and Aims to Create Economic Opportunities and Ensure that the Basic Needs of the Population are Met**

On the microeconomic level, societies can set up micro-credit institutions to increase economic activity and investment at the local level, promote inter-communal trade and an equitable distribution of land and increase school enrolment and job training. On the macroeconomic level, the post conflict government should be assisted in its efforts to secure the economic foundations and infrastructure necessary for a change to peace.

- **Another way for the parities to build a future together is to follow joint project that are unrelated to the conflicts core issues and center on share interests**.

This can benefit the parties' relationship, leaders who project a clear and hopeful vision and the future and the ways and means to get there can play a crucial role here. But in addition to looking towards the future, parties must deal with their painful past. Reconciliation not only envisions a common connected future but also recognised the need to readdress past wrong doing.

If the parties are to renew their relationship and build a co-dependent future, all incidents must be exposed and then forgiven(Dan, 1995).Indeed, a crucial part of peace building is

addressing past wrongdoing, while at the same time promoting leading and rule of law. Part of repairing damaged relationships is responding to past human rights violations and genocide through the establishment of the truth commissions, fact-finding missions and war crimes tribunals.

These processes attempt to deal with the multifaceted legal and emotional issues associated with human rights abuses and ensure that justice is served. It is commonly thought that past injustice must be recognised and the perpetrators punished if parties wish to achieve reconciliation(Carment and Actreach, 2004).

However, retributive justice advanced by western legal systems often ignores the needs of victims and exacerbates grounds. Central to restorative justice is its future- orientation and its emphasis on the relationship between victims and offenders. It seeks to engage both victims and offenders in dialogue and make things rights by identifying their needs and obligations. Having community-based restorative justice processed in place can help to build a sustainable peace (Francis, 2005).

Coordination of Points of Conflicts for Peace Building

Sometimes peace building involves a substantial number of actors, both local and international, requiring an appreciate mixture of the repertoire of peace building strategies.

At this point, peace building becomes a complex operation where it is now necessary for the coordination of points of contact to achieve the set objectives, usually, horizontal and vertical coordination of efforts become essential. Generally, it is recognised that peace-building is a complex operation which requires as much as is possible the coordination of activities of the various actors, individuals, state institutions, local and international NGOs etc, towards attending the objectives of the process. Therefore, being able to coordinate the points of contact for peace building is a necessity for efficiency in operations and attaining the set objective (Malone and Hampson, 2006).

Vertical and Horizontal Coordination

Given the limited pledge and resources from various external organizations, any successful mission for peace buildings benefits from operational effectiveness. Coordination and teamwork are essential for maximisation of the effects of each components operation. Peace building programmes require both vertical and horizontal coordination among a large number of organizations which have diverse responsibilities. In a multi-functional mission, with geographical diffusion, there is always a danger of miscommunication if each component reports only to its central headquarters without tangential contact at every level. Since various components of peace building mission often work in the same theatre of operation in remoteness and against each other, horizontal co-ordination is critical for promoting the audience of actions among organization. At the same time, vertical coordination is also necessary for policy implementation across levels.

The co-ordination of activities within a mission presupposes a certain unity of command to ensure that a coherent strategy is consistently carried out.Through vertical communication, the local wealth of knowledge (with is necessary for strategic decision making) is passed up to higher-level agencies. Operation through vertical cooperation is made through communication lies among various types of agencies at international, regional and local offices. Due to limitation

of major international organizations to reach local communities, NGOs, fill in the gaps between decision-making agencies of the centre and local communities. Besides, Co-ordination issues become complete because many organizations tend to go beyond competence in particular areas of expertise with the development of dual mandate in other areas. For instance, UNDP and UNICEF have long term social and economic development goals, but they have recently been involved in short-term humanitarian emergencies. At the same time, development agencies begin to pay more attention to fostering human rights with a focus on long-term social needs (Desombre, 2003).

Sometimes, economic and social reconstruction cannot be co-coordinated through a clear chain of command, which is common in war zones. Since coordination has to be based on consensus, leadership lies in the capacity to devise and articulate response ground common objectives and set up priorities. In the absence of an effective coordinating entity, the elementary exchange of information can be achieved through regular briefing sessions (Dukes, 1999).

The compatibility of field activities can be promoted by the cooperation of inter-agency frameworks for action with the establishment of task teams on specific issues, clear structures for coordination among key agencies emerge from the division of labour among actors (Enright, Garson & Wuching, 1992).

Justice as a Factor of Reconciliation

This paper will examine justice and its various interpretations. We are therefore urged to be familiar with the various theories of justice. However, justice is a complex concept, which has substantive and symbolic, social and economic, legal and psychological meaning. Philosophers in defining justice have covered the various schools of thought on justice by devising terms to identify these variations in what justice is. Justice, like truth is another significant aspect of the reconciliation process. Most people use the term "justice" in a much tapered sense of trial and punishment of individual proprietors through the formal justice system.

In understanding what forgiveness is, one will begin to see justice in terms of the connotation of forgiveness. The command to forgive does not prescribe the objective demands of justice, but justice in the correct sense of the word is actually the little note aim of forgiveness (Fisher, 1980). Justice is not penalty or chastisement but restitution, not necessarily to bring things back to the way they were, but to the way they should be. It is about restoring people's lives, restoring peace and harmony.

Justice that seems to take into account not only victims but also the persons responsible for the crimes, may appear to exhibit a lack of justice for the victims. In a reconciliation procedure, however, justice not only functions at the more individual level, but also at the level of social order. There may be very price for those individuals and families who are asked to make yet further sacrifices. This price does not necessarily completely exclude justice. Sacrifices by the few may be necessary for the sake of many. Some may sacrifice the formal trappings of justice for an even higher good to close the chapter of the past and to avoid confrontation. This is the line of defense that the minister of justice of South Africa employed in response to the question of victims' compensation for justice during the apartheid era. We have a nation of victims, and if we are unable to provide complete justice on an individual basis, and we need to try and achieve maximum justice within the framework of reconciliation. It is possible for us to ensure that there is historical and collective justice for the people of our country. If we

achieve that, we will achieve social justice and move in that direction (Roger, William and Patterns, 1991).

Types of Justice and Reconciliation Process

- **Retaliatory Justice**: It is a retroactive approach that justifies punishment as a response to past injustice or wrongdoing. The central idea is that the offender has gained unfair advantages through his/her behaviour and that punishment will set this imbalance straight.

  In other words, those who do not play by the rule should be brought to justice and deserve to suffer penalties for their transgressions.

  In this idiomatic sense this form of justice is one which echoes "Do unto others what they have done unto you or more" and its motion espouses vengeance but to this may be added to variations.

- **Punitive Justice:** it is a process which draws back from total retribution, here the retaliator is of the belief that no wrong, once discovered, should allow the perpetrator escape without punishment (Forester and Stitzal, 1989).
- **Distributive Justice:** However, invokes the claim that there are goods to be divided among people. Some may merit more than others, but all are worthy of some for all have claim on some of the produce. It applies to the allotment of honour wealth, and other social goods and should be equally to civic merit. Also termed economic justice, it is concerned with giving all members of society a "fair share of the benefits and resources available" (Garch, 2008).

  However, while everyone might agree that wealth should be distributed fairly, there is much discrepancy about what is regarded as "fair share". Some possible decisive factors of distribution are equity, equality and need. (Equity means that one's rewards should be equal to one's contributions to a society" while "equality" means that everyone gets the same amount, regardless of their input. Allocation on the basis of need means that people who need more, will get more, while people who need less will get less.

  Fair allocation of resources or distributive justice, is crucial to the stability of a society and the wellbeing of its members. Thus, "to each his/her own", with regard to the principle that suggest how the allocation should be done one would suggest (Wright, 1990).

- **Contributive Justice:** That is, to all according to their contribution. Those in favour of a market economy take preference to this type of justice. Opponents of market economics are quick to entrust.
- **Compensatory Justice:** This advocates response to a historical, empirical phenomenon: Given the disparity in economic and political power, some people get more than they contribute and some get less. It asserts that those who lose out in a contest for benefits deserve some protection against disaster. This crosses a boundary to another version of justice that is termed;
- **Restorative Justice:** Simply put, it states that as we damage each other, it is elementary justice that such damages should be repaired. Restorative justice focuses on violations as crimes against individuals. It is concerned with healing victim, wounds, restoring offenders to law-abiding lives, and repairing harm done to interpersonal relationships and the community victims take an active role in directing the exchange that takes place, as well as defining the responsibilities and obligations of offenders (Gordon, 2006).

Offenders are encouraged to understand the harm the have caused their victims and take responsibility for it restorative justice aim to strengthen the community and prevent similar harms from happening in the future. At the national level, such processes are often carried out through victim-offender mediation programme, while at the international level restorative justice is often a matter of instituting truth and conflict commissions. For countries emerging from conflict, balancing the compromises of peace settlements with the pursuit of justice and long term reconciliation is a significant challenge.

Processes of justice and reconciliation are influenced by numerous factors including the impact of the conflict, parameters of the settlement, resources available, the degree of political will and consensus, institutional capacity, culture norms etc. for instance, the demand for truth and justice and the desire to achieve reconciliation began in East Timor as soon as the multinational, peacekeeping troops arrived in September 1999. The Timorese people had suffered human rights violations for decades and after the ballot the desire for truth about these crimes was intense (Hall, 2007).

Justice and reconciliation are often presented as being at odds. Frequently, Justice is forfeited on the altar of peace, because justice is portrayed not to end the circle of violence, but on the contrary some to restart another cycle. In some instances, this is true, however, only if justice has not been fair, but has been a victor's justice or vengeance.

If the justice instrument applied is seen to be lawful and fair by the international community and local civil society then this form of justice will rarely incite continued violence. It is the argument thus that unless there is some form of justice then the chances of continued peace are limited. Justice in this context does not only refer to broader issues of social or economic justice, but also as action taken in a court of law tribunal or as part of a traditional mechanism to ascertain the guilt or innocence of the accursed (Ibeanu, 2005).

Justice, according to Lederach, involves "the pursuit of restoration, of rectifying wrongs of creating right relationships based on equity and fairness. Pursuing justice involves advocacy for those harmed, for open acknowledgement of the wrongs committed and for making things right. The challenge is to pursue justice in ways that respect people and (at the same time) to achieve restoration of relationship based on recognizing and demanding injustices (Lederach, 1997).

Operational Challenges for Peace/Missions: Intervention and Peace Building

Most intractable conflicts require outside intervention in order to be constructively transformed or resolved. This can take many forms. The most popular form of intervention is third party intervention, in which a neutral body, individual, panel, an organization or country will try to assist the disputing parties sort out their difference in a reciprocally tolerable way. However, this does not mean they have power to compel a resolution. Instead they facilitate the parties to educate their interests and needs and their alternatives, in an attempt to find a solution.

For this reason, the success of intervention in conflict and in the facilitation of peace building is a noteworthy challenge. However, intervention takes the form of a grant by a third part to one of the combatants, this could be either military or non-military. It is assumed that the grant is considered as a pure transfer. In this case, the third party is not directly involved in the conflict. Under non-military intervention, one of the combatants will necessary be successful which enables him to appropriate some of the country's resources (Janosky, 1978). In contrast,

military intervention requires the direct participation of the third party in the conflict, where her fights both warring factions. An advantage of military intervention is that when the third party is successful in the conflict, then neither group is able to appropriate the country's resources. Just as political reconstruction has to take into account specific country conditions and the nature of the civil war, economic reconstruction must start from the basic conditions of the economy in question(Jeong, 2000)). They include (1) level of development (2) level and types of war damage (3) the capacity of the state apparatus (4) special needs of the peace process (5) when the third party cares.

- Level of development which has implication for example, capacity to absorb large aid funds (including vulnerabilities to distortions).
- Level and type of war damage, this require proper needs assessments. The economy of war and alternative opportunities. To reverse beneficial war economics has proven every difficult, especially, if employment generation and alternative opportunities in the regular economy are few and slow to develop.
- The capacity of the state apparatus, in this situation, some poor post war countries may have limited public sector capacity to handle major reconstruction programmes after the war as such they need foreign aid.
- Special needs of the peace process, however, some peace process may require special economic measures to enable them address the underlying causes of the conflict.
- When the third party cares, similarly, about the warring groups and the rest of the populations, when he will not intervene. If the third party cares more about the warring factors, then he might intervene and will help the stronger faction unless he places an adequately about the rest of the population or cares about the net resources that will be left after the war (kremenyak, 1991).

Intervention Coordination

Intervention coordination is any attempt to carryout pieces of a peace process for utmost combined impact when conflict resolution professionals take on a peace process, they are intervening. They are many interventions by international and local government and non-governmental organization in every peace process when this professional seek to inform their own and others interventions so that they build a stronger overall peace process together, that is intervention coordination.

This admittedly wide definition allows for a service from the coolest to the closet forms of coordination and includes some activities that might be labelled teamwork (Johnson, 1976).

Intervention coordination between separate organizations is usually controlled. Peacemakers choose to coordinate with each other in order to support their shared goal of resolving a particular conflict. In some circumstances, coordination is mandated, such as within the UN system where the office of coordination of humanitarian affairs has an unambiguous mandate to coordinate international efforts to meet humanitarian needs.

In other circumstances, diverse groups some together to share information, share resources, jointly analyse development, directly next steps and even develop and implement joint programmes together. Although, intervention coordination takes time and money, conflict resolution professionals may choose to organised because coordinated responses are most effective over the long term in progressing towards a shared goal of conflict resolution (Moore, 1986).

In other circumstance, conflict resolution professionals will coordinate simultaneous interventions. Intervention coordination can strengthen the work of the most diverse group of interveners. Groups that address the structural, political and social aspects of conflict find that that their work combines to build towards a shared goal. Development and peace building initiatives are integrally related in post conflict zones.

In addition to aiding groups working on different aspects of a peace process, coordination can also be useful when interveners' initiatives are very closely related. Thus, intervention coordination spans a range of activities that may be appropriate across the breadth of interactions surrounding peace processes(Schmeidle& Jenkins, 1998).

Conclusion

Peace is a process involving activities that are directly or indirectly linked to increasing development and reducing conflict, both within specific societies and in the wider international community. This paper has examined peace as the component of conflict reconciliation. In this respect, although immediate conflict arising society require a fast response through reconciliation of parties involves; as such it needs long-term vision to respond effectively to conflict and to be able to transform it. However, response to conflict therefore requires thoughtful actions. It is a mutual process.

This paper sees peacemaking as a major component of this process. Besides, peace-making is used in two ways, peace-making is sometimes used to refer to a stage of conflict, which occurs during an extended conflict after tactful intervention has failed and before peace-keeping forces have had a chance to intervene. The second way, the term is used is to mean simply "making peace". The idea of making peace implies a certain commitment towards the goals. This paper has also examined the various types of justice and the relationship of these to achieving reconciliation. Justice is many faceted and requires a lot of the truth element in bringing about the types of justice that will be acceptable to all involved. This is because if justice is not seen to be done, even the efforts of reconciliation will trigger further conflict.

Recommendations

However, this paper has the following recommendations:

1. The process of peace in reconciliation should undergo normal procedures
2. The process should terminate violent conflicts and encourage peace building, which involves form an alteration phase to a consolidation phase
3. In this aspects, the process should see justice as not penalty for chastisement but restitution, not necessarily to bring things back the way they were, but to the way they should be
4. On course of reconciliation, justice should be about restoring people's lives, restoring peace and harmony.
5. A retaliatory justice approach need redressed for the sake of peaceful reconciliation
6. Compensatory justice, which advocates response to historical and empirical phenomena should be giving equity and fairness for the purpose of reconciliation.
7. Civil society attributes which comprised of networks of relationships must rebuilt accordingly in any peace process.

References

Agere Sam (2000). "Promoting Good Government: Principles, Practice and Perspectives". Commonwealth Secretariat.

Aja Akpurn-Aja (2007).*Basic Conflicts, issues and Strategies of Peace and Conflict Resolutions.* Enugu, Keny and Brothers Enterprise.

Alder N. J. And J. L. Graham (1987). Business Negotiations: Canadians are not just like Americans.*Canadian Journal of Administrative Science,* 4(3),7.

Arnson Cynthia J.(1999). *Comparative Peace Process in Latin America*, Standford, Standford University Press.

Blomfield D. And Ben Rally. (1998). "The changing Nature of Conflict and Conflict Management", In Peter Harns and Ben Rally (eds), Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA).

Botes Johannes (2001). "Conflict Transformation: A Debate over Sematics or a Crucial Shift in the Theory and Practice of Peace and Conflict Studies, "International Journal of Peace Studies, Autum/Winter, 6 (2)

Cohen Raymond. (1993). An Advocates View in G. O. Faure, and J. Zubin (eds) *Cultural and Negotiation*. California: Sage Publication.

Cohen Raymond. (1997). Negotiating across Cultures: International Communication in an Interdependent World", Washington, United States Institute of Peace Press.

Coleman, James. (1971).*Background to Nationalism*. California, University of California Press.

Dan Bronkhorst (1995). *Truth and Reconciliation: Obstacles and Opportunities for Human Rights.* Amsterdam, Amnesty International Dutch Section.

David Carment and Actreacht Schnabael, (2004).*Conflict Prevention from Rhetoric to Reality* Lexington Press.

David J. Frances. (2005). Peace and Conflict Studies: An African Overview of Basic Concepts, in Shedrack Gaya Best (eds), Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.

David M. Malone and Fenoscer Hampson. (2006).*From Reaction to Conflict Prevention*. Barnes and Noble Press.

Desombre Elizabeth. (2003). *The Global Environmental and World Politics.* International Relations for the 21st Century, London: Briddles, Kings, Lynn, Norfork Press.

Dukes E. Franklen, (1999). Why Conflict Transformation Matters: Three Cases.*Peace and Conflict Studies,* Vol. 6(2)

Enright Robert &, Garsin, Elizabeth A. And Wu, Chring-Ru, (1992). Forgiveness - A Developmental View, *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(2),100

Fisher Glen, (1980). *International Negotiation: Across Cultural Perspective.* Boston: International Press Inc.

Fisher Roger and William UN, with Bruce Pattern", Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving in" Second edition, New York Penguin Books. 1991

Forester John and David Stitzel, (1989). Beyond Neutrality: The Possibilities of Activist Mediation in Public Sector Conflicts, Negotiation Journal.

Garcha Amen, (2008). Diplomatic Culture or Cultural Diplomacy: The Role for Cultural in International Negotiation, http:www/culturaldiplomacy.org/content/pdf/icd-diplomatic-culture of cultural-diplomacy.

Gordon S., (2006). Mediation and the Mediation Process in S. G. Best (ed), *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

Hall P., (2007). "Early Warning Systems: Retraining the Discussion", the Australian, Journal of Emergency Management, 22(2)

Ibeanu Okechukwu. (2005). Conceptualising Peace in Shedrack Gaya Best (ed), *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*, Ibadan, Spectrum Books Ltd. 2005

J. P. Lederach. (1997). Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies, Washington D.C. United States Institute of Peace.

Janoski R. Y,(1978), "Rethinking and Cultural Negotiation Link", Negotiation Journal, 3.

Jeong H. Won. (2000). "Peace and Conflict Studies: An Introduction, Aldershot: Ashgate Press.

Kremenyak V. A., H.(1999) (ed), "International Negotiation" Sam Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publication.

L. Gunnar, Johnson, (1976). "Conflicting Concepts of Peace in Contemporary Peace Studies, Sage Professional Paper in International Studies, Beverley, Hills, Ca, Sage Publications, 4, No.02-146.

Moore C. W., (1996). The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Conflict Management, San Francisco and California: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Sehmeidle S. And Jenkins, J. C., (1998). "Early Warning and Humanitarian Disaster: Problems in Building and Early Warning System" *International Migration Review*, 32(2)

Shriver Donald W. Jr, (1995). An Ethic for Enemies" Forgiveness is Politic, Oxford University Press.

T. R. Mockaitis. (1997). Peace Operation and Interstate Conflict: The Sword or the Olive Branch", Westport, Praeyer Press.

Wright Q., (1990). "The Nature of Conflict", International Journal, Burton and F. Dukes (eds) Conflict: Readings in Management and Resolution", London: Macmillan Press.

Zartman I. W. and Maureen, R.(1982). "The Practical Negotiations. New Haven and Connecticut: Yale University Press.