



Working Group on Development and Peace

**Building a Future on Peace and Justice
Nuremberg, 25 – 27 June 2007**

Workshop 3

Expert Paper

Looking Back and Moving Forward

The Nexus between Development and Transitional Justice

Rama Mani

1. Introduction

The award-winning author, Frances Moore Lappe eloquently states, "Fairness is inherent to human nature. It is at the core of human values. When people are treated unfairly, this goes against the grain of their very humanness. It violates their integrity. They become willing to take up violence as a way of regaining their humanity."

When war ends and violence ceases, this lost sense of integrity and fairness must be restored. In the aftermath of conflict, in order for peace to be more than merely symbolic, national stakeholders and their international supporters have to tackle the social inequities that were causes of the war just as much as they have to redress the gross human rights violations and war crimes that were consequences of war, and the rule of law whose absence or manipulation permitted the recourse to violence. This requires both transitional justice processes and development policies to be adapted to address the past and overcome injustice and to build the future based on inclusive justice and fairness.

2. Looking Back: Overcoming Injustice

Guatemala and Rwanda are two examples of post-conflict countries that have moved significantly farther regarding Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR) than reparations, demonstrating the general points made above regarding commitments made to justice issues and those made to peace and security issues.

2.1. Three Dimensional Justice

A full and meaningful conception and application of transitional justice must encompass the *three* key dimensions of justice that directly emanate from the injustices that are embedded respectively within the *causes, symptoms and consequences* of war and violent conflict, and are experienced painfully by populations in war-torn countries.

The first most familiar and oft-addressed dimension is *rectificatory justice*, which is, rectifying the injustices that are direct *consequences* of conflict, in terms of abuses committed against civilian non-combatants – gross human rights abuses, war crimes and crimes against humanity. This is the traditional focus of transitional justice, and is relatively well covered in most cases, although 'victors justice' has a tendency to prevail.

The second dimension is *legal justice or the rule of law*, stemming from legal injustice which is a common tell-tale *symptom* of conflict and often predates the outbreak of violence. This refers to the breakdown of the rule of law, the political manipulation of the legal system, the corruption of law makers, law enforcers and judges, and the consequent lack of legal redress for injustices and grievances experienced by the population.

The third dimension, and by far the most neglected, is *distributive justice*, stemming from structural and systemic injustices and distributive inequalities that are frequently underlying *causes* of conflict.

2.2. Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict Causation

Systematic analysis by scholars has shown that horizontal inequalities are a particularly conducive factor for violent conflict. Horizontal inequality refers to inequalities between groups, which may be identified on the basis of a variety of factors such as race, religion, caste, class, ethnicity or profession. The inequalities are not only economic but of all kinds - economic, political, social or cultural, and they usually tend to overlap. When such differences are seen as illegitimate, and when the structures of society implicitly or explicitly reinforce such differences, they create the fertile ground for grievances that can be manipulated by 'conflict entrepreneurs' to foment war, on the ostensible basis of group identity. It is erroneously presumed that it is always the poor and marginalised who instigate violence against the powerful. As often, the political or economic elite use violence to resist redistributive justice and maintain the status quo.

It is a high priority after conflict to address these causes of conflict and to redress these horizontal inequalities, in order to avoid a relapse into violence, and build the foundations for an inclusive and just peace. Yet this is most often overlooked in peace building both by Transitional Justice (TJ) planners and by development policy makers. An important cause of the high rate of relapse into violence is found to be the failure to create an inclusive political community, that is, a society where the sense of marginalisation and discrimination has been replaced by a sense of meaningful inclusion of all participants in the polity.

At present the development policies of the donor community in the aftermath of conflict do not address these horizontal inequalities that caused war. Frances Stewart (Crisis Prevention, 2000) notes,

"In practice, current conditionalities (of international donors) do not contribute to a reduction in horizontal inequality except accidentally. Current political conditionality is concerned with establishing democracy, not inclusive government, while current economic and social conditionality is directed towards promoting growth and efficiency, but not reducing horizontal inequality."

So far, TJ has dealt primarily with the war crimes and gross human rights violations committed during war, but recently has also started to address rule of law reform. TJ now needs to take an additional step to encompass this third important and overlooked dimension of social justice. As noted by Louise Arbour (Economic and Social Justice for Societies in Transition, 2006):

"By reaching beyond its criminal law-rooted mechanisms to achieve social justice, transitional justice could contribute to expand our traditional and reductive understanding of 'justice' by rendering it its full meaning. It is not a matter of possibility; it is a matter of choice, one which we now can, and must, make."

2.3. Transitional Justice Processes and Social Justice

The four main mechanisms of transitional justice accepted in the literature and in practice are: trials; truth commissions; vetting; institutional reform. To this we add two more here: security sector reform and reparations. While as currently implemented these mechanisms are not designed to redress social injustice and inequality, it is suggested that they could do so with some redesigning in the following ways.

Trials

Trials have an indirect rather than a direct effect on social justice. However, reversing impunity and establishing accountability is a high priority for all three dimensions of justice. Trials should be based on public consultations and conducted at the appropriate time when desired by the population, i.e. when the population and country are ready for them – this may sometimes be immediately after conflict ends and sometimes only some years later. Trials should be even-handed, they should prosecute the worst offenders whatever their group affiliation, they should not exonerate the powerful, and they should particularly prosecute those who abused the weaker or marginalized groups, in order to have positive effect on perceptions of inequality and marginalization. Trials should be held locally within the country in question wherever feasible and should be as low-cost and rapid as possible to avoid the perception among locals that scarce resources are being ‘wasted’ on war criminals to the detriment of the poor. Importantly, TJ trials should be specifically mandated to prosecute economic and war crimes, such as looting and illegal trading in resources, to punish economic war criminals and deter war economies which are a major factor in prolonging wars and causing human suffering.

Truth Commissions

Truth Commissions (TC) have become more relevant to social justice in recent cases like Sierra Leone, as they identify underlying structural causes of conflict and recommend remedies. TCs should be mandated explicitly to uncover causes of conflict and recommend measures for redress, and be given the access and means to fulfil this mandate. Again, war economies should be covered explicitly as well. Further, TC recommendations should be enforceable, ideally through explicit commitment by parties in the peace accords. Mechanisms to ensure implementation of recommendations and monitoring should be conceived from the beginning.

Institutional and Rule of Law Reform

The indirect effect of rule of law and governance reform on social justice is considerable as it provides the first step for the removal of discriminating laws and procedures, such as apartheid, and introduction of more inclusive and fair ones. The most urgently required reforms to rule of law and governance institutions, particularly reforming the judiciary and police, should be discussed during peace negotiations and clearly spelt out with timelines and commitments in the peace agreement itself, in order to get explicit commitment from all parties to the conflict. Monitoring mechanisms and accepted penalties for non compliance should also be included, so that these are accepted by all parties and not contested thereafter.

Security Sector Reform and Inequality

Security Sector Reform (SSR) has so far been approached primarily as a technical issue of training, reorganization and democratic control. However, as above, since the military and police are composed largely of the poorest sections of the population who have few other job opportunities, it should be ensured that social justice criteria are fully considered in conducting SSR. Some scholars note that military recruitment reduces inequality in society. This argument should be analysed more carefully to ensure that SSR promotes equality and does not

further aggravate inequalities, and ensures inclusive and non-discriminatory outcomes.

Vetting

Vetting, that is, eliminating the worst abusers of human rights from the military, police and government service, can also have an indirect effect on social justice but care should be taken that social injustice is not exacerbated by skewing vetting against underprivileged groups. Since the rank and file of militaries and police are often from the poorest sections of the population, vetting should not be tilted only against them. The powerful commanding officers who ordered violations should be treated more severely than rank and file who carried them out. Social justice consequences of vetting should be factored in.

Reparations

Reparations could go beyond narrowly defined victim groups to achieve greater social justice impact, and donors should support this. These could include changes in access to opportunities like education and employment, investment in services, etc. Quotas and reservations have particular problems but they may be a necessary short term measure to quickly overcome the generations of structural inequality. Simply removing the impediment or obstacle may not suffice to bridge these deep gaps in equity. (Arbour, 2006)

In conclusion, as presently designed, TJ mechanisms have not taken on a conscious and deliberate mandate and responsibility to address the causes of conflict. They are specifically designed to address the consequences of conflict which lie in gross violations of rights. If TJ measures are reoriented, they could make a modest but important contribution to social justice.

3. Building the Future

There is no doubt that a new approach to development is required in post-conflict countries within the process of peace building to bridge the gap to transitional justice and squarely address and promote social justice. The World Bank has highlighted that equity is essential for economic growth (WDR 2006), so there is not just a humane but also an economic rationale for promoting social justice. The section above noted some modest ways in which TJ mechanisms might contribute to social justice and could be adapted to make a greater contribution to overcoming past inequities. Development policies and programmes could be adapted in order to reinforce and deepen the contributions made by TJ processes.

3.1. Global Social Justice and Fairness

A first requirement in this direction is to reorient development policy and the global economy towards greater social justice, as this would be the greatest reinforcement to national processes of transitional justice. However, this cannot be achieved in isolation. That is, simply adjusting the development and TJ policies within countries in, emerging from, or at risk of conflict will not be sustainable. A prerequisite for appropriate policies of social justice advocated by donors in recipient countries is first a change in the principles of global economy. It is urgent that the global economy and the pre-eminent economic actors prioritize equity and social justice as necessary for both growth and for stability worldwide.

A new global economics is needed that is premised not only on growth, profits and efficiency but on equity, shared dividends and compassion. This would require equitable and humane policies for aid, trade, migration and industry adopted by the G8 and the OECD which benefit the whole world including the poorest and not only the richest populations. This would have a clear positive effect on reducing violent conflict and enabling just peace building, as the development policies in conflict-prone countries would be in harmony and not at cross-purposes with global economic policies.

3.2. Development Policies to Address Social Justice and Redress Inequality

It was described above that the three dimensions of injustice implicit in conflict pertain to the causes, symptoms and consequences of conflict. Consequently, the policies required in specific countries to promote social justice fall into three phases: pre-conflict, during conflict and post-conflict. It is important for development policy to undertake all three phases in order to be sustainable, credible and effective. This implies development policy taking on the "Responsibility to Protect" which requires responsible action at all three stages of conflict – to prevent, intervene and rebuild. It also implies development policy adopting a three-dimensional approach to justice taking on all the three aspects of justice relevant to conflict.

For the sake of brevity, the following section will focus on post conflict policies. A full outline on development policy before and during conflict can be found in the study.

The recommended policies are presented in two parts. First, the ways in which development actors can contribute to the TJ mechanisms discussed in the previous section. Second, the additional policies and processes development actors could institute to redress the legacies of war and reduce inequalities.

Development Actors Contribution to TJ mechanisms

First and foremost, Development actors could play a decisive role in ensuring that TJ mechanisms are adapted in the ways suggested and by working alongside them to monitor, report on and implement decisions with social justice impact. Specifically:

(a) Trials

In trials, they could first ensure that war economies and violations of both political and civic but also social, cultural and economic rights are prosecuted. They could also ensure that judgments take into account the social justice impact on perpetrators, victims and society, and that trials are conducted in the lowest cost manner possible, with maximum information to and inclusion of grassroots communities to avoid the perception of wastage.

(b) Truth Commissions

Development Actors could support the work of TCs - without interfering in or influencing their work - to ensure their mandate covers social injustices, provide them with factual data on structural inequalities to facilitate their work, and put them in direct access with affected and marginalized populations.

(c) Vetting and Institutional Reform

Development actors should collate and provide detailed data on the composition of existing military, police, government and judicial bodies, and analysis on the

projected social justice consequences of vetting and institutional and rule of law reform, and find ways to mitigate negative effects and bolster greater social equality.

(d) Reparations and Others Memorials and Symbolic Gestures

Donors must recognize their great impact on the entire community and support reparations and symbolic measures to ensure that they reduce and seek to eliminate perceptions of marginalization, reduce the divisiveness of victims versus victors, and instead foster healing and inclusion of all survivors in society. They should pressure governments to make genuine apologies to victims and provide reparation. They should ensure that no hate propaganda remains especially in school text books, songs and poems in national folklore, and in media rhetoric.

Designing Development Policies to Redress the Legacies of War

In addition to taking into account and contributing in the above ways to TJ processes, development actors can also play an important role in designing their policies in ways that redress the violent legacy of war and particularly old inequalities. These would include the following

(a) Establishing Social Justice Commissions

In order to consider these different dimensions of inequality in post-conflict societies, a separate *Social Justice Commission* or mechanism might be introduced. This could comprise experts from different disciplines (economics, human rights, politics, anthropology, sociology) to examine the underlying patterns of inequality, their structural causes and consequences, and to design acceptable and applicable measures to redress these gradually and incrementally.

(b) Transforming War Economies to Peace Economies

A major failing of development policy in post-conflict peace building has been the inability to arrest and transform war economies into peace economies and hence a criminalization of the economy. Kosovo and Montenegro are examples. This undermines totally the efforts of development policy to promote growth and reconstruction after conflict, and further exacerbates inequalities by providing huge illegal profits to some groups while exacting a terrible human cost on others. This is why the recommendation that TCs and trials investigate and prosecute war criminals is so important.

This is the area where development policy makers and implementers will have to take a firm, principled and decisive action or risk entirely losing credibility and failing in their mission. Following up the measures on natural resource exploitation during conflict, here specific measures to arrest and transform war economies will be required. Agreements on access to and exploitation of natural and mineral resources signed by parties including the government during conflict should be temporarily suspended, and subjected to impartial review by the Social Justice Commission, or by a specific joint panel of independent and uninterested eminent experts both national and international. They should be revoked if judged unaccountable, unethical or inimical to the best interests of the country and to social justice considerations of fair distribution of resources to the community. No compensation should be paid to companies which lose due to reclaiming of sovereign national resources after conflict, if they entered into agreements during conflict with unaccountable governments or rebel forces. Rather, any company or individual who benefited unethically or illegally from war should be tried and required to pay full compensation.

This will also dramatically reduce the cost of post-conflict peace building to donor agencies as it will require less external funding to rebuild devastated war torn

countries if these countries can access their own natural wealth and use this for reconstruction. It will also have a deterrent effect for the future and reduce war economies if development actors show a zero tolerance and penalize companies and individuals and affix both corporate responsibility and individual criminal accountability.

(c) Land Reform and Property Restitution

Wealth and particularly land tends to be highly concentrated in countries that descend into violence. The demand for equitable redistribution of land and for land tenure lies at the heart of innumerable conflicts, including El Salvador, Guatemala, Namibia, South Africa, Zimbabwe, etc. Notwithstanding rhetoric during conflict, once peace building begins, most national stakeholders have proven reticent to distribute land and undertake land reform and their international donors and development policy leaders have not urged them in this direction.

Simultaneously with the return of IDPs and refugees the demand for property restitution rises. While land redistribution has been largely ignored, property restitution (i.e. the restoration of property to people whose land was confiscated by government or rebels) has become a significant part of UN missions such as Kosovo. As a consequence, post conflict land distribution becomes more skewed and unequal than even before conflict. Development donors need to ensure this doesn't happen and that the two processes are balanced and rationalized. The head of UNMIK's property restitution believes that restitution need not rule out redistribution but may need to precede it. He says, once land has been legally restituted to the prior owner then the government may pass a decree or decide to redistribute land. This may be one possibility, but may not be applicable in each case. Donors should recognize the potential clash between the two and should prioritise land reform and equitable distribution and secure land title for poorer populations.

(d) TJ, SSR, Inequality and Healing

The often overlooked fact in TJ is that soldiers, police or combatants drawn from disadvantaged groups are in the front lines and commit the worst atrocities on behalf of the government (or rebel armies). However, this is often against their own groups i.e. their kin, as with Mayan soldiers against Mayan villagers in Guatemala and black police against black populations in South Africa, or child soldiers against their own families in Sierra Leone. Thus, healing the rifts and traumas within these communities is more complex than acknowledged. It is not a simple case of distinct perpetrator groups against victim groups, but rather perpetrators and victims within the same group, due to the inordinate compulsions and coercions of war. This requires an adjustment of both development and TJ policy as also of SSR design. When new armies and police forces are formed or reformed, the nexus between TJ, SSR and inequality needs to be more carefully understood and addressed. If the forces will combine both ex soldiers and combatants and IDPs or civilians tortured by them, this will require sensitive approaches to SSR. Psycho-social interventions and reparations will also need to be designed accordingly. Vetting too as mentioned earlier must take social justice ramifications into account. In addressing social justice and designing TJ, development policy could innovate ways to promote reintegration within communities of kin that comprise both victims and perpetrators who must now coexist.

(e) Accountability to Beneficiaries

So far accountability in aid funding has been mainly from recipients to donors. However, there is a move towards demanding accountability from donors towards their beneficiaries, especially towards impoverished populations in war torn

countries. Aid must be leaner and more efficient. One simple measure that should be adopted immediately for greater accountability and resource saving by all development donors is to rationalize and harmonise their aid and grant making policies. The aim is to reduce and eliminate the great wastage of time and human resources in resource strapped conflict countries through the multiple and overlapping processes of donor evaluations and complex processes of donor reporting.

Aid must be more compassionate. It must build the capacity of locals and not of foreign consultants. It must win trust and build peace sustainably. The OECD DAC has demonstrated to a great extent its commitment to developing principles and upholding high standards. This must be sustained and expanded.

4. Synergising Transitional Justice and Development Policy

There is a unique opportunity today in societies emerging from conflict to synergise approaches to development policy with transitional justice and thus achieve - at one stroke - both just peace and a deeper partnership between aid recipients and donors (e.g. Millennium Development Goal 8).

This requires following on one hand Louise Arbour's injunction to widen TJ beyond criminal justice, to take on its threefold dimensions and role. On the other hand it requires development policy to go beyond economic reconstruction and growth to ensuring human security for all members of the community, requiring therefore the achievement and balance of security, development and human rights.

The three dimensions of justice form the bedrock of and provide the framework for all the core components of peace building identified and pursued by the international community: social/distributive justice and equity is central for economic and human development; the rule of law is the bedrock of governance and democratization; reparative justice starting first with reversing impunity and restoring accountability is essential to achieve immediate security and longer term human rights protection in highly volatile and still-abusive post-conflict contexts. Thus a strategic framework for peace building that builds its security, governance/human rights and development strategy on the back of this threefold categorization of justice would ensure that the aims of peaceful development and of transitional justice are pursued conjointly.

In this case, there is no division or clash between the two agendas of development and TJ and the task of synergizing the two approaches becomes straightforward and even essential in post-conflict peace building. Thus peace building takes on its rightful the task of securing an inclusive, just and lasting peace which guarantees human security for all, and which requires development actors, political actors and security agents to work in tandem. This may also ensure that the rate of relapse into violence is significantly reduced.

This synergized approach will take time to achieve as habits have to adjust and new methodologies for working together towards this goal need to be set in place. However, the process could begin immediately, through the adoption of two parallel processes, one internationally within the OECD DAC and one at country level.

International Level

At international level, the OECD DAC should constitute a new '**Task force on Social justice, peace building and development**'. It should comprise not only donor agency representatives but also select highly respected and experienced national civil society representatives and three international practitioners. The TF would work in tandem with the three country processes and also inform itself based on accumulated experience on TJ and post-conflict development policy to develop international guidelines. These would not only be applicable to DAC, but also to the UN system including World Bank and all IFIs, international and national NGOs, and national stakeholders to ensure a much greater impact and application than normally accrues to DAC guidelines.

Country Level

At country level, three pilot countries could be selected immediately, to start developing and implementing this new approach of synergizing development with TJ.

- One country should be still in conflict, which as explained above is the stage at which ideally planning should begin for both TJ and development. **Sri Lanka** would be an ideal candidate given the salience of all three justice dimensions: social justice, human rights and abuses of rule of law, and the importance of development donors.
- The second could be a country in the early stages of peace building where TJ and development policy decisions are still being made or implemented and where the synergies could immediately be beneficial. **Burundi** would be an ideal candidate, as this would also allow a timely synergy with the UN Peace Building Commission which has just set up its policy unit and could benefit from being involved in and informed by this new approach.
- The third should be a country well advanced in the peace building process where there is apparent risk of backsliding into violence and where there might be benefits to trying now to synergise TJ and development policy in the aspiration for avoiding a relapse into violence. Either **Afghanistan or Rwanda** would be good cases.

The following suggests how this synergy might be achieved in the three pilot cases, with the adjustments as appropriate to accommodate the stage of conflict/post-conflict planning.

The DAC task force would also be informed by this approach in their international deliberations and formulation of guidelines.

- Broadened approach to transitional justice is adopted to include all three dimensions i.e. distributive/social justice; legal justice/rule of law; reparative justice. Balance between the three is sought, recognizing their interdependence and mutually reinforcing nature.
- Full broad-based consultation is sought with cross section of civic population in both decisions on and implementation of transitional justice measures.
- No attempt to impose TJ from above should be made (as in Sierra Leone). No 'template' or 'model' should be framed; however, generic guidelines and underpinning principles and values should be enunciated.
- No economic development plan should be adopted that does not fully integrate measures for equity, social justice and redistribution of assets, opportunities and power.

- PRSPs and UNDAF should be consolidated into a single process that would therefore be more resource and time saving, while enabling civic consultation and expert input. This would ensure that the economic element is integrated with the social and political, facilitating the formulation of a conjoined TJ and development policy. World Bank strategies in high conflict countries often overlook conflict and inequity altogether or exclude conflict areas from the evaluation while UNDAFs over-emphasise the political and conflict dimension and leave out the rest of the country. (e.g. Sri Lanka)
- Establish the social justice commission referred to above with a cross section of highly respected intergenerational women men and youth, with a clear mandate and adequate resources. Their recommendations should feed into both the joint team below and ensuing national and international planning processes.
- Constitute a joint team of national stakeholders (governmental and civic) with few selected and trusted international experts comprising (a) human rights lawyer (b) economist (c) political analyst/actor (d) military/security agent, to devise a common 'justice package' based on civic consultation results, that combines measures for three dimensions of justice. That is, at the same time how social and redistributive justice reform, rule of law reform, and measures to deal with past human rights abuses will be undertaken.
- Identify and define time frames, benchmarks, incremental implementation schedule, and monitoring and feedback mechanism.
- This plan should be presented to and approved jointly by government, political parties, civic groups as well as by bilateral and multilateral donors and development agencies. This plan would be adopted as the post-conflict strategic framework for peacebuilding and implementation strategy. This builds on past attempts at UN level to develop strategic frameworks and integrated planning. All parties national and international would act in tandem and in integrated fashion towards its achievement.
- Develop system for broad civic participation in implementation and monitoring and information dissemination, so that public knows at all times what is being done and why and can feed in to process.
- Donor and government transparency and accountability to the civilian population should be built in from the beginning to win and sustain public trust and hence ensure the stability of the new political dispensation.
- Regular monitoring and coordination meetings with a joint national/international team comprising the cross section of development agencies, human rights actor and security agents should ensure that at no point do development programmes, political processes and security diverge.

5. Conclusion

The renowned Chilean economist Manfred Max-Neef exclaims, 'spirituality, intuition and beauty have been removed from economics and they must be reintroduced.' (World Future Council, Hamburg, May 2007). There is today a need to reorient development paradigms away from efficiency and economy as the sole criteria and measure towards including values and compassion alongside them as critical barometers. Chico Whitaker, the Brazilian social activist and co-founder of the World Social Forum notes, "as long as competition and profit are the

principles, there is no hope for social justice and conflict will always be a possibility.”

Nowhere is this need greater than in the aftermath of conflict within the beleaguered process of peace building, where half the countries that emerge from war are estimated to tumble back into violent conflict in the first decade. And nowhere are both the need and the potential for a more humane, equitable and compassionate approach more relevant than within the framing of transitional justice.

For a just peace to be built after the trauma of justice, all three dimensions of injustice experienced before and during war must be redressed to ensure they do not perpetuate themselves. Egregious violations must be punished and accountability restored; victims rights respected and their trauma healed; reparations must be paid; truth and memorials must be established. Thus the traditional remit of ‘transitional justice’ is still relevant and important. But alongside this, the rule of law should be restored guaranteeing just laws that are applicable to all and justice systems that are accessible to all, so that all grievances can be legally redressed and no-one can act above the law. So too, horizontal inequalities that cause those grievances must be eliminated in all spheres – economic, political social and cultural, and the basis for inclusive social justice laid to eliminate the basis for the mobilization of violence.

This broadened agenda for TJ will require a much more concerted and engaged participation by the development community than in the past. Development actors can ensure that TJ mechanisms are shaped in ways that reduce the inequalities and marginalization that caused war, and can work alongside TJ processes to ensure this. Further, it must be the role of development policy to reverse the legacy of war and foster through their aid and policies the equity, inclusion and social justice that were so elusive before as to cause violent conflict, and prevent a possible degeneration into renewed violent conflict. Also, their role is not restricted to post-conflict development but also in pre-conflict and active-conflict areas.

There is a need for a change of mind, heart, and strategy particularly among the donor community. Stakeholders need to recognize the inherent value of social justice as not just a means to an end of preventing violent conflict, but as a value and basis of life. Social justice was the original rationale of development aid. It needs to be readopted today, particularly in post-conflict and conflict prevention contexts. Social justice is the path to human dignity. Equality is the basis of the true partnership that is sought as the goal of development and human rights. This need no longer be merely an aspiration: through concerted collective effort beginning now, this can be achieved in practice.