

**Local Peace Committees:  
Potentials Contributing Factors in the Peace-building  
Process in Conflict-Affected Areas of Pakistan**  
**{A Case Study of Maidan, (Lower Dir) in the Province  
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa}**

*Nizar Ahmad, Farhat Ullah, Amir Zada Asad & Shagufta Shah*

**Abstract**

This study aims to evaluate the key contributing factors of Local Peace Committees in peace-building efforts at conflict-affected areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan. Data were collected from a sample of 56 respondents through a structured interview schedule using the Likert Scale, and the sample size was calculated through online survey system software. The majority of the LPC members were found to be local elders of advanced age, who belonged to various political parties in the area. Many aspects of the LPCs, such as provision of necessary information and support in identification of militants to state actors, showed a significant relationship with peace-building in the area. The role of LPCs is very vital for peace-building in the area and further research needs to be carried out regarding the issues and problems faced by LPCs in the area.

**Keywords**

LPCs, Peace Building, Non-State Actors, Traditional Methods

**1. Introduction**

Today, conflict destroys societies and peace is the dire need of the Globe. Peoge (2007) notes that today's many conflicts are of a hybrid nature so peace-building and conflict transformation also need to be of a hybrid nature, both the state and non state local actors coalescing with a special focus on non state traditional actors, institutions and methods. The mutual cooperation of both state and traditional local actors can make a way to answer hybridity of conflict. An approach including combining Local Peace Committees (LPCs), traditional institutions and customary practices, and state agencies should be adopted in conflict of a hybrid nature. Adan & Pkalya (2006) in an analysis of Kenian Peace building process, indicated that efforts are being made not only on a national and international level but also at a local level by local communities and peace builders by utilizing their local capacities. Local Peace Committees (LPCs) are one of the key peace-building actors, playing an important role in promoting peaceful coexistence, crime prevention, and conflict management in the rural communities of developing countries. The Carter Center (2011) indicates that LPCs functioning in their districts have improved through the hard work of the LPC staff, coordinators and members.

## 1.1 Local Peace Committee

The Nanyunki workshop (2005) defined Local Peace Committees as; “*A group of people whose broad job is to define parameters for peace.*” According to Oxfam GB (2005); “*Peace committees is a community based structure and initiative to prevent, manage and transform intra and inter community conflicts.*” A Local Peace Committee Training guide, published by USAID (2005) defined LPC as;

*“It is a group representing different sectors and interests of the community on issues of reconciliation, peace building and conflict resolution. The committee is the basic unit in the community that addresses day to day conflicts. The formation and composition of a peace committee is voluntary and varies from one region to another.”*

In an orientation session, The United Nations (UN Peace building: 2010) emphasized on LPCs as a quality option in the promotion of peaceful coexistence, justice and development. LPCs have two important functions: to avoid relapse into violence or conflict, and to make sustainable peace. (Miall, Ramsbotham et al. 1999: 188-194; Bush 2004). In their book “Towards Understanding Pukhtoon *Jirga*,” Yousufzai and Gohar (2005) stated that the local practitioners and peace builders have made significant contributions to peace building and conflict resolution in their communities through traditional approaches and indigenous institutions. Likewise, Tsali (2009) reported that in areas where state control is weak, indigenous societal structures are reliable and powerful paths to peace. In such cases Scheye and McLean (2006) suggested that the international community should avoid the westernized concept of state authority and persuade both state and non-state actors' partnerships for the provision of justice and security.

## 1.2 LPCs in Conflict Affected Areas of Lower Dir

Maidan, a beautiful valley of Lower Dir is one of the affected areas of recent conflict where the army started operation against militants in 2009. Local people had made continuous efforts before, during, and afterwards to trade conflict for peace and harmony in the area through Local *Jirgas*, Peace Committees, Political Influences and the media, to pressure both the state and non-state parties to avoid conflict. Asad (2008) reported that a *Jirga* comprised of local elders of Dir Lower opposed the military operation, assured the authorities of cooperation in containing terrorist activities, and condemned the attack on a security check post by militants.

They activated the peace committees to keep an eye on the subversive activities in the area. The recent study specifically evaluates such efforts of LPCs for peace building in the area.

## 2. Literature Review

According to Bush (2004) "Peace-building is not about the imposition of solutions, it is about the creation of opportunities." The involvement of Local People is important, as local citizens have a much better understanding and higher level of experience in understanding of conflict because of proximity and familiarity with the situation. Because of this, people are more psychologically engaged in the conflict, which needs to be recognized in order to have a successful intervention. LPCs know how to classify, increase, and utilize the essential means to construct a nonviolent, flourishing, and fair social order. In other words LPCs will succeed if people of the affected area take the responsibility for implementation of peace (Project Saamsan 1998, Lederach 2001). The mandate of LPCs may be different from area to area, such as "prevention of violence" or "promoting reconciliation," or more pointed aims such as prevention of violence during an election (Neyroud and bakley, 2001). LPCs are noteworthy due to the 'soft approaches' to peacemaking (Ball, 1998). Scheye and McLean (2006) and Poege (2007) both criticized the only westernized concept of peace building and emphasized the adoption of context-specific approaches, as weak governments often lack the capability, regulatory and legal framework, and spirit to carry basic state duties. Non-state actors can support state actors in justice and security systems to ensure peace.

The selection of LPC members is based on consensus. The chairperson of an LPC has shown a significant contribution in the peace-building process (Odendaal and Spies, 1996; 1997). The organization and structure of LPCs vary from society to society, mostly based on selection by local communities. Mostly LPCs are formed by military, religious entities, and Civil Society Organizations (Adan and Pkalya, 2006). LPCs are often dependent on outside sources such as NGOs and government organizations because they lack capacity and resources and in some cases lack a legal framework as well (Gunja and Korir, 2005).

LPCs have the ability to decrease different types of aggression and to build secure communities. LPCs have a variety of functions and solve many burning issues through dialogue. UNDESA (2007) contends that "the significance of discussion and dialogue as a fundamental instrument in the societal assimilation procedure". Lund and Myers (2007) concludes that: "in reality, LPCs construct a secure place to assent on procedures intended for ending indigenous variations." LPCs use traditional approaches for strengthening civil society, raise awareness in the community as to their role in conflict management, and also establish a mechanism to protect and monitor human conflicts. Ball (1998) argues that LPCs

are able to arbitrate differences even in extremely violence-prone societies and that having reconciliation as its major objective. Lederach (2005) argued that reconciliation is necessary to deal with the most terrible of human situations, and is an attempt to restore the unevenness of rapport and existence itself. Dressel and Neumann (2001) stated that LPCs support of government and NGOs is also positively involved in capacity building, problem solving workshops, and even personal emotional growth. LPCs also strengthen civil society and work for elimination of discrimination. Adan and Pkalya (2004) argue that LPCs facilitate peace dialogues, reconciliation forums, work towards strengthening civil society, and also coordinate peace initiatives.

Scheye and McLean (2006) focus on locally responsive solutions which are a more legitimate, accessible, and acceptable way to link communities with the state through an information exchange and citizen participation in the shape of LPCs from local religious and political figures. Indigenous actors are nearby, reachable, and quickly able to be involved, as well as inexpensive. They are seen as considerably less inclined to bribery than the state actors as they are working in their own community. There are few linguistic or intellectual obstacles and the conventional methods as well as its consequences generally contain legitimacy in the eyes of all parties concerned (Post-Conflict Peace-building in Liberia, 2007). Chris Spies reports regarding South African National Peace Accord, that under the accord there exist more than 260 LPCs and 150000 skilled peace monitors serving all over the South African Society. In order to obtain the facilitation and negotiation skills needed to engage in dispute resolution, the volunteer LPC members were trained, and were remunerated for out-of-pocket operating costs. Asad (2008) reported an initiative of local elders against terrorism in Lower Dir, the local elder in a *Jirga* promised to contain the violent element in the area, condemned the presence of militants in the area, and also opposed the use of violence from the government side against the anti-state elements. They decided to form Local Peace Committees to keep an eye on the subversive activities in the area.

### **3. Method of Research**

The study was conducted in the conflict affected area of Maidan, Lower Dir of Khyber Pakhtoonkhwa. A structured interview schedule was constructed using a Likert scale to weigh the views of respondents. Respondents were the members of Union Council level LPCs formed by law enforcement agencies, with coordination of local community in the area after conflict. There are a total of 7 Union Councils in Maidan area, among which 3 Union Councils were randomly selected. The total number of target respondents was 65 among which a sample of 56 were drawn using an online Survey System Software from Creative Research Systems (Best Survey

Software, 2013). Uma Sikaran's table for determining a sample size also gave a similar result. Data was analyzed using SPSS 16 version and a chi square test was applied to determine the association of different factors of LPCs with peace-building in the conflict affected area.

## **4. Results of the Study**

### **4.1 Demographic Information**

The study aimed to evaluate the contribution of LPCs in peace-building in the conflict affected area, Maidan of Lower Dir. Fifty-six Local Peace Committees members from the target area participated in the study. The study showed that half (50%) of the members of LPCs were of the age group 40-50 and above while among the rest, 26% and 23% were of the age group 30-40 and 20-30 respectively. The majority (91%) of the respondents were married, while a small portion (9%) consisted of unmarried individuals. Most (73%) of the respondents were members of the political parties in which the majority (28% and 25%) were affiliated with Jumat-e-Islami and Pakistan People Party respectively.

### **4.2 Findings of the Study**

This study of LPCs role in peace-building shows that a majority of the respondents (92.9) agreed that the LPCs made a significant contribution to the peace-building process in the area and most of the respondents (69.6%) were of the view that LPCs should be part of peace-building activities in the future. Similarly, a large portion of the study population (83.9%) opined that LPCs work in close coordination with law enforcement agencies (i.e. army and police) and about half (46.4%) of the subjects said that militants left the area due to the pressure of LPCs. The majority of the respondents (78.6 %) agreed that LPCs could help prevent militancy in the area, (69.6%) indicated that LPCs helped law enforcement agencies in the identification of militants in the area, (78.6 %) viewed LPCs as providing necessary information to the state actors and half (51.8%) of the respondents pointed that LPCs helped in the expelling of militancy from the area. Regarding violence and subversive activities in the area a major portion (71.4 %) of the target group agreed that LPCs keep an eye on the subversive activities in the area. Most of the respondents (82.1%) viewed LPCs as a link between community and state actors to bridge the gap between the two, a vast majority (89.3%) believed that the existence of LPCs is vital for peace-building in the area. Likewise, most (80.4%) of the respondents favored LPCs, as they had the support of local people, and the people believed that LPCs were promoting peaceful

coexistence in the area. The majority of respondents (75%) acknowledged that LPCs promote justice, (73.2%) viewed that LPCs prevent violence and violent activities, and (82.1%) viewed that LPCs believes in dialogue, arbitration and reconciliation. A small number (37.5%) of respondents stated that LPCs members had training of conflict management skills and most (85.7%) of them expressed the needs for training and skills in conflict management. The respondents (91.1%) supported the statement that LCPs had contributed to the rehabilitation of IDPs, (96.4%) supported the assertion that LPCs help NGOs in resource transfers, (85.7%) said that LPCs work for the development of the area, (73.8%) highlighted that LPCs members are also members of development committees, and (73.2%) showed satisfaction with the work of LPCs.

## **5. Discussions**

In this study of evaluating effort of Local Peace Committees role in the peace - building in conflict affected areas of Pakistan; Mostly (92.9%) participants of the study acknowledged that LPCs have a key contribution towards peace-building in the area. Boege (2007) reported empirical evidence from both state-based and civil-society-based successful conflict transformation cases where local actors and approaches were part of the peace-building process. This study identifies many key factors in the way LPCs are involved in contributing to peace-building and are considered important by the local peace builders. The, Majority (78.6 %) reported that provision of necessary information by LPCs to the state actors and law enforcement agencies facilitated peace operations and elimination of militancy from the area. This factor showed a significant association ( $p = .025$ ) with peace-building. Chris Spies (n.d) observed that LPC members and volunteers regularly reported the alleged offenders to police in South Africa. Because of the successful operation of state-based peace-building efforts, the participation of local peace builders and indigenous knowledge is crucial. The support of LPCs in the identification of militants to law enforcement agencies are also vital and highly significant ( $P = .000$ ) for peace-building. Similar focus has been drawn by Boege (2007) on inclusion of Local actors in conflicts of a hybrid nature by highlighting its legitimacy and acceptance by local communities, timely actions, and process orientations. Chris Spies (n.d) in a discussion of South Africa in his report stated that in April 1993 when Chris Hani was assassinated, the LPCs formed joint venture of communication with police and deployed peace observer in order to mitigate potential violence and monitor the situation. Another key element, the coordination of LPCs with the state actors such as army and police also has a highly significant ( $p = .000$ ) connection with peace-building because most of the peace operation personnel in the area are non-local and not familiar with the local context. A similar

focus has been made in the report of the Center for Peace-building and Reconciliation Promotion (CPRP, 2010) on the intensification of coordination and structuring relationships among different peace actors including state intuitions, non-governmental organizations, LPCs and/ or other local peace builders in the peace-building process. In order to create an atmosphere of trust between community and state actors, LPCs work as a link between community and state actors ( $p = .05$ ). The belief of LPCs members in peaceful co-existence showed a strong association ( $p = .000$ ) with peace-building in the area. Neyroud and Bakley, (2001) also declared the prevention of violence and peaceful co-existence as one of the factors of LPCs mandate in election time. The importance of LPCs in both conflict and peace time cannot be ignored because it works for the creation of a violence-free, peaceful society that is based on social justice. The support of LPCs member in expelling the militants from a given area is also vital for peace-building as the results showed ( $p = .05$ ). The role of LPCs in the prevention of violence or violent activities is also highly associated ( $p = .001$ ) with peace-building in the area. Although LPCs cannot assume the role of local government agencies or police by taking any political and financial responsibilities, it supports and facilitates the state agencies in mediation of local disputes and consensus building (International alert, 1993; Adan and Pkayla, 2006). The other strongly associated factors with peace-building (having  $p$  values = .000) in the area are: LPCs work for the development of the area, satisfaction of the LPCs members from its work and perception of people regarding the support of LPCs in peace building in the future.

There are LPC-related factors that were not significantly associated ( $p > .05$ ) with peacebuilding in the area, such as the belief of LPC members on negotiation, arbitration and reconciliation are not significantly ( $p = .160$ ) related to peace-building in the conflict area. Our findings here contradict the statement of UNDESA (2007), as they reported that LPCs have a variety of functions, solved many burning issues through dialogue, and contended that the significance of dialogue as “a central mechanism within the social integration process” Should not me overlooked. Ball (1998) noted reconciliation as the core purpose of LPCs in worse conditions of violence, while Lederach (2005) and Adan and Pkalya (2004) outlined reconciliatory efforts to restore broken relations, life style, and coordinating peace initiatives.

Although negotiation and arbitration is the essence of the peace process, in our situation it could be because of the non-participation of one party (i.e. the militants, who cannot come to the forefront for negotiation with the state actors). The LPC members had not had any opportunity for interaction or negotiation during and after the peace operation in the area with the miscreants. Neyroud and Bakley, (2001) also reported that the mandate of LPCs may differ from area to area and is context-

specific. A non significant relationship was found between LPCs role as a watchdog on the violent and subversives activities in the area and peace-building. It may be due to the fact that they don't have any authority and official capacity, and those who are speaking openly against militants may put their lives in danger, as most of the respondents reported a lack of skills and a need for training of interested in becoming LPCs members. The members of LPCs to be members of Local Development Committees is not related with peace-building ( $p=.606$ ), the Carter Center (2011) outlined that members of the LPCs work in other committees for development of the area. We also found in our study that (76.8%) respondents agreed on LPC members being members of development committees but chi square results showed a non-significant association. As such, we can say that it is not necessary for LPCs to be members of local development committees, and it could be because of most are elderly as well as experienced political figures having little time and interest in such activities. However, their presence in peace committees is very much necessary.

## **6. Conclusions**

Our study expands the conclusion of earlier studies conducted abroad, the involvement of local people through LPCs is important in peace-building. LPCs have a significant contribution towards peace-building, combining an indigenous approach with state efforts. The vast majority of respondents acknowledged its role by highlighting the key factors associated with LPCs, such as provision of necessary information to state actors by LPCs, LPCs acting as a link between state actors and the community, LPCs support of law enforcement agencies in the identification of miscreants and keeping an eye on subversive activities in the area. The existence of LPCs is vital in the areas of armed conflict. It answers to the hybridity of conflict, working with state actors in coordination and providing necessary information and support to state actors. It contributes to the elimination and prevention of militancy, encourages peaceful coexistence, social justice and work for development of the area. Further research is needed to elaborate the structure and problems faced by LPCs in their operations.

Table I. Different Dimensions of LPCs in Peace Building in Conflict Ridden Areas

Dimension of LPC	Response	LPC Contribution in Peace Building			Chi Square	P Value
		Yes	No	Total		
LPCs provided necessary information to state actors / law enforcement agencies	Agree	43 (40.9)	1 (3.1)	44 (44.0)	7.343 <sup>a</sup>	.025
	Disagree	3 (3.7)	1 (.3)	4 (4.0)		
	Undecided	6 (7.4)	2 (.6)	8 (8.0)		
LPCs helped in identification of militants in the area	Agree	39 (36.2)	0 (2.8)	39 (39.0)	22.496 <sup>a</sup>	.000
	Disagree	5 (8.4)	4 (.6)	9 (9.0)		
	Undecided	8 (7.4)	0 (.6)	8 (8.0)		
Did LPCs work in close coordination with law enforcement agencies	Agree	47 (43.6)	0 (3.4)	47 (47.0)	32.631 <sup>a</sup>	.000
	Disagree	4 (4.6)	1 (.4)	5 (5.0)		
	Undecided	1 (3.7)	3 (.3)	4 (4.0)		
LPCs act as a link between local community and state actors	Agree	43 (42.7)	3 (3.3)	46 (46.0)	6.002 <sup>a</sup>	.050
	Disagree	1 (1.9)	1 (.1)	2 (2.0)		
	Undecided	7 (6.5)	0 (.5)	7 (7.0)		
LPCs promoting peaceful co-existence.	Agree	45 (41.8)	0 (3.2)	45 (45.0)	17.805 <sup>a</sup>	.000
	Disagree	3 (4.6)	2 (.4)	5 (5.0)		
	Undecided	4 (5.6)	2 (.4)	6 (6.0)		
LPCs helped in the expelling of militants in the area	Agree	29 (26.9)	0 (2.1)	29 (29.0)	5.995 <sup>a</sup>	.050
	Disagree	12 (13.9)	3 (1.1)	15 (15.0)		
	Undecided	11 (11.1)	1 (.9)	12 (12.0)		
LPCs prevent violence / violent activities	Agree	40 (38.1)	1 (2.9)	41 (41.0)	13.022 <sup>a</sup>	.001
	Disagree	7 (6.5)	0 (.5)	7 (7.0)		
	Undecided	5 (7.4)	3 (.6)	8 (8.0)		
LPCs believe in dialogue, reconciliation and arbitration	Agree	43 (42.7)	3 (3.3)	46 (46.0)	3.668 <sup>a</sup>	.160
	Disagree	7 (6.5)	0 (.5)	7 (7.0)		
	Undecided	2 (2.8)	1 (.2)	3 (3.0)		
LPCs keep an eye on the subversive activities in the area	Agree	38 (37.1)	2 (2.9)	40 (40.0)	2.340 <sup>a</sup>	.505
	Disagree	3 (3.7)	1 (.3)	4 (4.0)		
	Undecided	10 (10.2)	1 (.8)	11 (11.0)		

Dimension of LPC	Response	LPC Contribution in Peace-Building			Chi Square	P Value
		Yes	No	Total		
Militants left the area due to the pressure of LPCs / Local elders	Agree	26 (24.1)	0 (1.9)	26 (26.0)	3.985 <sup>a</sup>	.136
	Disagree	17 (18.6)	3 (1.4)	20 (20.0)		
	Undecided	9 (9.3)	1 (.7)	10 (10.0)		
LPCs also work for the development of the areas		47 (44.6)	1 (3.4)	48 (48.0)	23.145 <sup>a</sup>	.000
		2 (4.6)	3 (.4)	5 (5.0)		
		3 (2.8)	0 (.2)	3 (3.0)		
LPC members are also members of local development committees		40 (39.9)	3 (3.1)	43 (43.0)	1.002 <sup>a</sup>	.606
		6 (6.5)	1 (.5)	7 (7.0)		
		6 (5.6)	0 (.4)	6 (6.0)		
Are you satisfied with the functions/role of LPCs for peace-building in the area		41 (38.0)	0 (3.0)	41 (41.0)	15.458 <sup>a</sup>	.000
		8 (11.1)	4 (.9)	12 (12.0)		
		2 (1.9)	0 (.1)	2 (2.0)		
Do you think LPCs could help the prevention of militancy in the area?		43 (40.9)	1 (3.1)	44 (44.0)	15.420 <sup>a</sup>	.000
		4 (6.5)	3 (.5)	7 (7.0)		
		5 (4.6)	0 (.4)	5 (5.0)		

## References

- Adan, M. and R. Pkalya (2006). "The Concept Peace Committee, A Snapshot Analysis of the Concept Peace Committee in Relation to Peacebuilding Initiatives in Kenya", Practical Action
- Adan, M., R. Pkalya and Masinde Isabella (2004), "Indigenous Democracy: Traditional Conflict Resolution mechanisms". The Case of Pokot, Turkana, Samburu and Marakwet communities, ITDG, Nairobi
- Ball, N. (1998). "Managing Conflict. Lessons from the South African Peace Committees", USAID Evaluation Special Study Report, Center for Development Information and Evaluation.
- Bush, K. (2004). "Commodification, Compartmentalization, and Militarization of Peacebuilding. Building Sustainable Peace", T. Keating and W. A. Knight. Tokyo, United Nations University Press: 23-45.
- Dressel, D. and J. Neumann (2001). "The Long Road to Peace: Constructive Conflict Transformation in South Africa. Munster", LIT Verlag. p-132
- Gunja, P. J. and S. O. Korir (2005). "Working with the Local Wisdom", The National Council of Churches of Kenya Peace Program. People Building Peace II. Successful Stories of Civil Society. P. v. Tongeren, M. Brenk, M. Hellema and J. Verhoeven. Boulder, Lynne Rienner: 441-447.
- Ibrahim, D. and J. Jenner (1998). "Breaking the Cycle of Violence in Wajir", Transforming Violence. Linking Local and Global Peacemaking. R. Herr and J. Zimmerman Herr. Scottsdale, PA, Herald Press: 133-148.
- Lederach, J. P. (2001). "Levels of Leadership and Peacebuilding: A Field Guide. L. Reychler and T. Paffenholz. Boulder, Lynne Rienner: 145-156.
- Lederach, J. P. (2005). "The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace". Oxford, Oxford University Press. p-160
- Lund, M. and R. Myers (2007). "Can Fostering a Culture of Dialogue Change the Course of a Nation?" An Evaluation of the United Nations Social Cohesion Programme in Guyana. Freetown, United Nations
- Miall, H., O. Ramsbotham, et al. (1999). "Contemporary Conflict Resolution", Cambridge, Polity.
- Neyroud, P. and A. Beckley (2001). "Policing, Ethics and Human Rights", Devon, Willan Publishing.
- Oxfam GB, 2003, Oxfam GB Funded Peace Building Initiatives in the Arid Districts of Kenya : Lessons and Challenges, Nairobi

- Project, Saamspace (1998). Final Narrative Report on Project Saamspace submitted to the Royal Netherlands Embassy. Cape Town, Centre for Conflict Resolution.
- UNDESA (2007). "Participatory Dialogue: Towards a Stable, Safe and Just Society for All", New York, United Nations. P-3
- ITDG PEACE BULLETIN retrieved from [www.itdg.org/htm/itdg\\_eastafrica/peace3\\_peacecommittee.html](http://www.itdg.org/htm/itdg_eastafrica/peace3_peacecommittee.html), accessed on April, 2013
- Volker Boege, (2007), "Traditional Approaches to Conflict Transformation – Potentials and Limits", *Occasional Papers Series [Online]*, ISSN 1833-9611, The Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (ACPACS) The University of Queensland, Brisbane. Qld. 4072. Australia.
- Post-Conflict Peacebuilding in Liberia: *Much Remains to be Done, Third Annual KAIPTC/ZIF Seminar (2007) Report, Accra, Ghana, November 1 – 3, 2007*
- UN Peacebuilding: an Orientation: United Nations: Peacebuilding Support Office September 2010
- Bronwyn Bruton (2002). "An independent program evaluation of United States Agency for International Development, Office of the transition Initiatives, The Conflict Resolution Stakeholders' Network, School of Public Policy and Social Research University of California at Los Angeles.
- Chris Spies, (2002) "South Africa's National Peace Accord: its structures and functions" retrieved on 03/05/2013 from <http://www.c-r.org/accord-article/south-africa%E2%80%99s-national-peace-accord-its-structures-and-functions>

---

The author Nizar Ahmad Lecturer in Sociology, Department of Social Work & Sociology, Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat, Pakistan.  
email: [nizar@kust.edu.pk](mailto:nizar@kust.edu.pk)

The author Farhat Ullah Lecturer in Social Work, Department of Social Work & Sociology, Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat, Pakistan.  
email: [mrlawyer002@yahoo.com](mailto:mrlawyer002@yahoo.com)

The author Prof. Amir Zada Asad is a Professor of Social Work, University of Peshawar. He can be reached at [amir-zada@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:amir-zada@yahoo.co.uk)

The author Shagufta Shah MA Co-existence & Conflict, The Heller School for Social Policy & Management, Brandeis University, USA.  
email: [shagufta@brandeis.edu](mailto:shagufta@brandeis.edu)