Claudia Sanchez Bajo

Peace, Cooperatives and Solidarity Economy: Theoretical Basis and Practical Examples in Peacebuilding

Povzetek

Mir, zadruge in solidarnostna ekonomija: Teoretska osnova in praktični primeri vzpostavljanja miru

Prispevek obravnava povezanosti med konceptoma mira in solidarnostna ekonomija, pri čemer se osredinja še zlasti na vlogo zadrug pri vpostavljanju miru. Mir je večpomenska beseda, a se o njem zadnje čase razpravlja predvsem v povezavi s poslom, večinoma z velikim poslom, kot elementom »liberalnega mira«. Vendar ko mir razumemo kot zavetje življenja ali njegov varni pristan, se razprava razširi na vprašanje, kako pomembna so prizadevanja za vzpostavljanje miru s strani povezanih ljudi na terenu, zmožnih delati, sodelovati in živeti skupaj ter obenem ustvarjati varnejši, bolj trajnostni in dinamični svet. Zadruge in solidarnostna ekonomija imajo pozitiven vpliv v vseh fazah krize: pred nasilnim konfliktom, med njim in po njem. Poleg tega imajo pomemben potencial za vzpostavljanje miru kot »pozitivnega miru« v Galtungovem pomenu.

Ključne besede: zadruge, solidarnostna ekonomija, mir, vzpostavljanje miru

Claudia Sanchez Bajo je doktorica razvojnih študij, ki predava na Univerzi v Pavii. Doslej je delovala na različnih univerzah v Evropi, Kanadi in ZDA, svetovala Mednarodni organizaciji dela (ILO) in Ženevski mednarodni nevladni mreži »Tretji svet« ter sodelovala v programih Združenih narodov. (claudia.sanchezbajo@ymail.com)

Abstract

The text discusses the connections between peace and solidarity economy, and how can the latter, and in particular cooperatives, contribute to peacebuilding. Peace is a polysemic word and has recently been debated in relation to business, mainly large business, as part of "liberal peace". Yet, when peace is understood as refuge or safe haven for life, the debate opens up to the degree of importance of peacebuilding efforts by socialized situated human beings, able to work, share and live together while generating a safer, more sustainable and dynamic world. Cooperatives and solidarity economy

contribute in all phases of crises, and before, during and after violent conflict. Their characteristics offer significant potential for peacebuilding towards "positive peace" in Galtung's terms.

Claudia Sanchez Bajo holds PhD in Development Studies and teaches at the Institute of Advanced Studies at the University of Pavia. She has been lectured at different Univestities in Europe, Canada and United States, worked as consultant with ILO (International Labour Organization) and Geneva Third World NGO. She colaborated also with United Nations. (claudia.sanchezbajo@ymail.com)

Introduction[1]

Peace studies have been gathering attention in the last decades, in reaction to the multiplication of recurrent violence. In the 21st century, violence is breaking the pattern of that of the 20th, with more conflict-ridden sub-national areas facing repeated cycles of violence (World Bank, 2011). Repeated violence in its various forms, including open war, structural, cultural and political, has led to more than 65 million people being forcibly displaced worldwide.[2] As old policy does not provide stable outcomes, there is mounting interest on how civil society and business can help deliver peace beyond individual efforts. Already in 2005, the UNHCR, the UN organization specialized in forcibly displaced peoples, defined capacity-building as not only individual but also *collective action*.[3] On the other hand, in a world reeling from previous debt crises and the global one of 2007—2008, with many nation-states undergoing structural adjustment and austerity policies, distrust in the political system and elites has become mainstream. Extreme voices nurture hatred and polarise politics by means of simplistic thinking. In this context, what is peace, and how does it connect to cooperatives and solidarity economy? We do not necessarily link these concepts together.

---

[1] This text builds on a February 2017 presentation in Imshausen, Germany, on peace and cooperatives. The author thanks comments by reviewers.

[2] By June 2017, there were 65.6 million people forcibly displaced worldwide, out of which 22.5 million refugees and 10 million stateless. This is a historical record, with more than half in the Middle East, North Africa and Africa in general. Top hosting countries are Turkey, Pakistan, Lebanon, Iran, Uganda and Ethiopia.

[3] Capacity building is "a process by which individuals, institutions and societies develop abilities, individually and collectively, to perform functions, solve problems and set and achieve their goals.". (UNHCR, 2005: Appendix Two, 7).

Part 1 reviews the main views on peace and political-economy. Many current studies adhere to the notion of "liberal peace" and a contractual view of peace and business as explained in the next sections, but others have begun to discuss other views of peace that allow for a perspective along the lines of cooperation and solidarity. In modern research, Galtung's distinction between negative and positive peace helps us distinguish peace from violence and connects both.[4] Both views of peace find their roots in the 17th century in Hobbes and Spinoza. In Part 2, major studies on business and civil society roles in peacebuilding are reviewed. Galtung's positive peace re-enables the connection to solidarity economy, with a perspective on peacebuilding as an enabling, living, caring, safe space and environment. Part 3 discusses examples of peacebuilding in connection to cooperatives and solidarity economy, with their successes, potential and limitations.

Concepts of Peace

The meanings of Peace

Peace is central to human beings for survival, and tends to be conceived as a safe space, a refuge, where humans can develop their fullest possible potential, in terms of skills, consciousness and aspirations in response to perceived needs. Peace can be thought of belonging to the individual sphere as well as to the social and universal ones in a sort of continuum. In most languages, peace means living within a world-vision, enabling human beings to situate themselves in a world or cosmos as a shared place, namely living together in a friendly manner, or harmony, but also one which necessarily contains difference of views in need for dialogue and reconciliation, thus to decide together and manage eventual conflicting views. After the 14th century upheavals in Europe, its meaning turned into one of a dualistic relationship between a winner and losers, of a dominium over others, through a permanent contract or pact between the two sides.[5]

Irenists link peace to ecumenism, justice and law. For Erasmus, peace was both the condition for human possibility and the work of justice (Erasmus, n. d. [1521]). For Rousseau (n. d.[1761]), in his version of the Abbe Saint-Pierre's plan of the same name favouring a united

---

[4] Negative peace is the absence or reduction of violence. Positive peace creates the conditions for eliminating the root causes of violence, including direct cultural or structural causes (Galtung, 1969).

[5] For linguistic expressions and views on peace, see Sanchez Bajo, 2017.

federation of states in Europe, peace between contracting parties was no more than a temporary truce, therefore calling for an overarching system:

> let us admit then that the Powers of Europe stand to each other strictly in a state of war, and that all the separate treaties between them are in the nature rather of a temporary truce than a real peace: whether because such treaties are seldom guaranteed by any except the contracting parties. (Rousseau, n. d.[1761])

Kant adds the notion of a civil constitution upholding the cosmopolitan rights of citizens, which at the world level would traduce itself into an ideal federation of free republics without national debts (Kant, 2010[1795]: Section II, 5—11). Later, Einstein will subscribe to a 1946 Appeal to peace reaffirming that peace is not the mere absence of war, but the result of justice and law (Otto and Heinz, 1960).

The contractual view of peace upholds the rights of an absolute sovereign, whose power on policy, the levy of taxes, the decisions on war and peace and control over public expression, does not need provide guarantees against arbitrary power. This view stems from Hobbes (1588–1679), whose focus on security excludes the notions of solidarity, empathy and integral grasp of the human condition. Hobbes' *Leviathan* (Hobbes, 2010[1651]) argues that peace derives from the monopoly of power yielded through a contract or covenant, after subjects submit to a King permanently. "Justice consists in the keeping of valid covenants; but the validity of covenants begins only with the setting up of a civil power sufficient to compel men to keep them." (Hobbes, 2010[1651]: ch.15, 66). Here, victory means peace.

Against Hobbes, Spinoza (1632—1677) explains that it is peace that leads to more peace (Spinoza, 2002c: Ch5, 4). Inner Peace flourishes in an environment where there is both freedom from fear, which in turn flourishes best through *mutual aid*. For him, humans are free by natural right and must be free to express themselves. They are social beings who can be both rational and emotional. Everybody experiences being alive and is conscious of one's own existence (Spinoza, 2002b: Part 3, S9 and 4 S8), but reasoned understanding, enhanced by inner peace, leads to knowledge and self-knowledge. Those with wisdom and knowledge may be closer to peace. Knowledge distinguishes the minds of the most powerful or virtuous people, who are truly conscious (ibid.: 5). Peace of mind should not be purely inward but entail coherent action in the world "preserved by vigilance, right action, and thought" (Spinoza, 2002a: Ch4, S34).

Spinoza saw Hobbes' view as despotism and servitude (Spinoza, 2002a:: Part 1, Ch 20, S07[6]; Spinoza, 2002a: Part 1 – Ch20, S24). For Spinoza, humans are social and rational beings who must be cooperators to survive and thrive (Spinoza, 2002b: Part IV, Prop.35, Corollary 2, S. 338). Spinoza's ontological position, deployed in the polity, upholds mutual help and agreement by reason as necessary to enjoy living in peace and all the equal rights humans are entitled to by nature. This also carries the application of the law to all with the defense of the same rights for all (Spinoza, 2002a: Ch16, S08). In his view, democracy and republic were the best systems, on which peace could be based (Spinoza, 2002c: ch. 6, point 4).

Ravven connects Spinoza with neuroscience, philosophy, and psychology (Ravven, 2013: 414–420). Cognition implies responsibility and openness, awareness of being part of the whole, where human beings are socially and situationally driven, enabled through social structures at the group level (ibid.: 130). A human being needs to be a "situated self"; capable of a self beyond itself (the ego or belief in pure individuality); in the best possible knowledge, aware of the environment and all other beings; and in empathy that enables the grasping of a situation and acting upon it. To situate oneself allows to achieve agency, while openness and freedom of thought are essential, both demanding attention and effort.

Spinoza's view led Plockhoy's social and economic cooperative undertaking. Pieter Cornelis Plockhoy, in close contact with Spinoza and Van den Ende (Israel 2001 177—179), made a written call (Plockhoy, 1660) and founded a community in 1663 near today's Lewes in Delaware (destroyed by the British one year later). His 1660 call has the key characteristics of modern cooperatives and solidarity economy, with the main goal of building a shared safe haven where members could live with solidarity, education and welfare for all, in a peaceful living economy. No discrimination was allowed, and girls received the same education as boys at school while welfare covered everybody. Part of Plockhoy's undertaking was in common, with members having ascribed one and the same economic amount for membership, while another part was private with families having their own private home and part of their business or crafts activity. They all had one vote and could be elected to office, with a rule of law equal for all. This was a democracy, a republic, a commons and a cooperative undertaking.

---

[6] *"The best organization for freedom and peace to thrive is the republic."*

Modern Peace Studies

Johan Galtung is considered as the founder of modern peace studies, talking of peace not only as the absence of direct overt violence between states and/or humans but also of structural and cultural violence, and by distinguishing negative from positive peace (Galtung, 2011). Positive Peace hinges on shared wellbeing, a trend towards equality of rights and entitlement within peacefully acknowledged difference, transcultural, cross-cultural humanising affects and an exercised capacity to cooperate, to generate both trust, safety and common-wealth. Peace differs from justice and resilience, although the three interact, and it is also considered as a type of culture, in contrast to violent culture. Structural violence is related to inequality, issues of poverty, wealth and land concentration, power or institutional structures that are unjust, unfair and arbitrary. Galtung began by looking at positive peace as freedom from suffering through economic development and social justice, and has recently proposed cooperation and cooperatives as a major way to achieve "positive peace". Through the latter, the concept of peacebuilding gathered pace as a bridge between, but distinct from, peacekeeping and peacemaking, centering around positive peace. Galtung founded the *Journal on Peace Studies*, with studies on violence from and onto individuals and/or groups. These studies have been undertaken at macro and micro levels, including direct, structural and cultural violence, for which large sets of data are gathered.

Galtung (Galtung, 2015) proposes Peace as an equation equal to:

$$\frac{\textbf{Equity} + \textbf{Empathy}}{\textbf{Trauma} + \textbf{Conflict}}$$

Equity is mutual and for equal benefit. Empathy is to grasp what others feel. Both should be larger than trauma and conflict.

At the dialogical level, Raimon Panikkar (Panikkar, 1995) speaks of *cultural disarmament* to enable peace, which presupposes a critique of culture with a perspective of a genuine intercultural approach and pluralism.[7] For Panikkar, we need first a true philosophy of peace.

---

[7] For a brief introduction to Raimon Panikkar, listen to a 1996 interview at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cbjd_Tdnqxg and read the webpage at https://www.giffordlectures.org/lecturers/raimon-panikkar. Panikkar proposed these ideas first in a letter

In a letter, he defines peace together with non-violence. Peace is not purely passive, or the lack of strength and power, but respect for the intimate dignity of every being; we need first to prepare ourselves to achieve peace. Like Spinoza, inner and outer peace are interdependent. In Pannikar's view, there is no peace by preparing to war. Peace cannot be conquered or imposed; it is to be discovered, nourished and created. There is no single concept nor recipe or programme for it. It is more than justice or balance; it is the ultimate value of life. He speaks of peace as *mythos*, which allows for conflicting views. The road to peace goes through forgiveness as transcendence from the heart (not the will) and continuous dialogue, not restoration. "The only way to peace is a path forward", through dialogue as equals, as only reconciliation arrives at peace and dialogue at reconciliation. Dialogue not to arrive at a solution, but a as process *for being*. Every culture has built an understanding of what is peaceful, and this is why inter-cultural dialogue, hybridity and shared experience are important. For example, Rwanda has the Ubuntu concept, while Spanish speaking countries have the one of *comunidad de base* and Jesuit thought.

Hannah Arendt took the idea of "good peace" to politics, as the active outcome of mutual compromise and understanding. Focusing on peace as a process, she claims that means make the difference. Arendt's pragmatic approach affirms that "power lies in collective action and solidarity" (in Enns, 2015: 223—224).

In brief, there has been an evolution in peace thinking, from negative peace to holistic and comprehensive approaches (Groff, 2008). Students can now major in peace studies at various universities around the world, but the field has been criticized for lacking theoretical rigour and methodology. Academic critique derides macro enveloping concepts such as "hybrid peace governance" (Belloni, 2012), "liberal peace" (Richmond, 2006) and "bureaucratic one-dimensional peace" (Goetschel and Hagmann, 2009). Meanwhile, the gap between macro and micro-approaches, the latter focusing on a set of individuals and their safety, leaves aside the analysis of the intermediate level composed of organizations and structures. Although the subject area literature is vast, many peace studies focus on violence and its negative effects, security issues and political negotiations. In Europe, where roots go as far back as the 18th century, as seen in Section 1, Nordic countries have taken the lead with institutes such as the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO), and the Stockholm International Peace

---

thanking authors of the book *Philosohia Pacis, homenaje a Raimon Pannikkar* (Siguan, 1989), reproduced in his book *Paz y desarme cultural* (1993).

Research Institute (SIPRI). Other networks include the IPRA (International Peace Research Association) and the EPS (Economists for Peace and Security).

Practitioners show a more systemic thinking, aiming at holistic, multi-level or multi-layered, trans-cultural and matrix approaches. They look at each specific situation in both a descriptive and analytical manner, including key actors, levels, and systems' attitudes, values, perceptions and beliefs, behaviour and strategies. Lederach and others gathered the tools designed by peacebuilding practitioners (Lederach et al., 2007). Echavarria introduces Dietrich 's elicitive conflict mapping tool (that elicits stakeholders' response) for peace workers (Echavarria, 2014). Meanwhile, CDA Collaborative Learning Projects (CDA), a US non-profit organization, has come up with the concepts of "Peace Writ Large" and "Peace Writ Little",[8] as well as with Reflecting on Peace Practice (RPP) case studies, to assess the degree and leverage of change (Anderson and Olson, 2003).[9] Evaluation has become a requisite within the framework of otherwise prescriptive recommendations in peacebuilding (for example at the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development – OECD DAC, 2007).

Business and Civil Society in Peacebuilding

Business and Peacebuilding: the State of the Art

Nowadays, the main approach to peace thinking is normative, based on the concept of "liberal peace". Liberal peacebuilding means the promotion of market-based economic reforms and institutions linked to the idea of modern state (Newman et al., 2009), whereby business is assumed to contribute to peace by investing, creating jobs or building infrastructure, to which they may voluntarily add behavioural traits to diminish or restrain conflict in sensitive areas or regions, building upon CSR guidelines and/or corporate philanthropy, to address the impact

---

[8] "Peace Writ Large is concerned with the 'bigger picture' of a conflict rather than any specific single element of a conflict situation … It often refers to national level conflict dynamics, but can include relevant sub-national or regional dynamics as well. Being accountable to Peace Writ Large means ensuring that initiatives address key drivers of conflict and make a contribution to this bigger picture … Not all programs can be expected to produce concrete changes at the larger societal level. Many programs are successful at smaller scale interventions, e.g. operating at community level, or with small groups of people, thus contributing to 'peace writ little'." (CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, 2014: 10).

[9] Questions include: does change have impact on more or key people? On levels and extension of impact: does change impact at the personal, social, political levels? Does it change attitudes, values, perceptions, or institutions and systems?

of their for-profit business operations on human rights. The study of business in relation to peacebuilding is rapidly expanding, mainly connected to voluntary corporate social responsibility (CSR) codes of conduct during and/or after conflict, first and foremost in violence-ridden environments. In the 21st century, academic publications on peace and business have promoted some practices that seem to reduce violence (Fort and Schipani, 2007), sometimes calling it transformational entrepreneurship, most focusing on how large foreign firms may contribute to local rights.[10] Interest on management for business and peace has shown three major trends: a) promoting corporate social responsibility, b) rallying the private sector to take up development and policy in the context of public debt and austerity policies or structural reforms, and c) tracing supply chains and portfolios in emerging markets and across borders (Ford, 2015: 451–452). This approach does not pay attention to the motivations of business, who decides and how the internal governance ensures that contributions to peace are effective and sustainable.

At the United Nations, the term peacebuilding was introduced in 1992 by Boutros Boutros-Ghali's Agenda for Peace, and contrasted to peacekeeping, peacemaking and diplomacy. The UN *Agenda for Peace* was "to identify and support structures that would tend to consolidate peace and advance a sense of confidence among people" (United Nations, 1992: 824). In 2005, the UN set the Peace architecture with a Peacebuilding Commission, Peacebuilding Fund, and Peacebuilding Support Office. The UN Global Compact followed through with its Business for Peace (B4P) after having identified the topic as a major CSR component (United Nations Global Compact, 2015). Businesses are invited to adhere voluntarily, with the idea that there will be incentives to take up roles that lay beyond purely commercial interest. In view of effectiveness, business is invited to join in by 'the reduction of operational costs'.[11] In 2007, in Oslo, a Business for Peace Foundation came to light, giving annual Oslo Business for Peace Awards.[12]

---

[10] See forum with the same name at http://globaltransformation.com/#home.
[11] According to the UN Global Compact (n. d.): "By joining Business for Peace, companies will be able to:
- Better identify and manage business risks and opportunities while reducing operational costs
- Engage in public-private dialogue to establish local priorities and implement projects
- Align business strategies and operations with good practice from across the globe
- Share best and emerging practices and learn from the experiences of peers
- Demonstrate leadership and receive recognition for advancing practical solutions."
[12] See the website: http://businessforpeace.no/ (03 January 2018).

CDA Collaborative Learning Projects for the 2014 UN Global Compact's Business for Peace Meeting in Turkey reviewed the forms of engagement of a firm in a conflict situation, in their operating environment. A spectrum goes from a) avoiding negative impact, b) doing some good, to c) addressing the key drivers of conflict, stressing that it is not enough to add jobs or improve individual livelihoods (CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, 2014). In their view, only the third option may contribute to peace, resting at the macro-level. CDA criteria for peacebuilding effectiveness include four arguments: a) larger frameworks of change are necessary for peacebuilding to become sustainable, such as legal and political ones; b) communities' autonomy should be able to develop by themselves their own peace initiatives and critical thinking; c) people in general should become resilient to provocations while feeling more secure, and d) inter-group relations should see meaningful and sustainable improvement (Anderson and Olson, 2003).

The "liberal peace" approach reflects a shift from maintaining peace between states to maintaining peace within one state, mainly those seen as failed or below 'modern' standards. Prescriptive and normative, it appears within reach by bureaucratic means, and may be confused with top down state building or local power structures engaged in economic liberalisation (Richmond, 2006; 2012). Applied in a long list of countries, it has been criticized for not being very liberal, as it ignores the community, the disempowered, the moderates, traditional forms of dialogue and/or justice, and voices of dissent (Newman et al., 2009: 13, 44, 139, 324).

Conciliation between constituencies in conflict is essential (Lederach, 1997). But if local capacities or peace constituencies are mentioned in the liberal peace approach, they are expected to just change or constrain the "bad" side. As Newman notes, "international peacebuilding, oriented around the creation of strong states, appears to reflect the legacy of Hobbes rather than, as is generally claimed, Wilson or Kant." (Newman et al., 2012: 27) Others reinforce the argument on how the quest for 'liberal peace' has favoured the securitization of peace (in terms of intervention, expertise, and industry); during the post-conflict phase (through investing in rebuilding, and demobilization) as well as the search for transitionalism in terms of identity, understood as social anomie (Goetschel and Hagmann, 2011). Considering the current state of the art, questions are raised around the lack of critical research and theory, imprecise terminology, among which the need to discuss business

governance within the entity and along value chains (and not only talk of single factories or firms) (Ford, 2015).

A UN 2016 review of its own peacebuilding work called for more operational and policy coherence, better funding, and more inclusion of development and gender considerations among other critical issues (United Nations, 2016). A few months earlier, a critical note had made a more insightful description in the same direction. [13]

Reviews show that:

> there is no set of business activities which can be characterized as unambiguously peace-positive. Rather, it appears that it is not only what businesses do, but the manner in which they do so, the alliances of which they are part, and the context in which their actions unfold that may be more determinative of their impact. The fact that these insights are not more central to contemporary debate highlights that most analysis of business and peace, emerging as it does largely in response to the literature on the causes of conflict, seems profoundly disconnected from the contemporary peacebuilding literature. (Ganson, 2017)

The dominant discourse shuns the peacebuilding literature both in terms of theory and of practice, as well as the literature on business and conflict such as on land disputes. Studies are presented as best cases with little critique, and no attention to institution-building for peace inside the firms themselves. The latter means that governance is not in question. There is thus a growing call for research to take a critical stand, to look for emancipatory purposes that favor agency and autonomy, do research *in situ*, learn local languages instead of ignoring them, analyse power relations as a system of rules, and see how power is institutionally organized and socially reproduced (Korf, 2004) both at the ground and macro level, even the global one.

Civil Society and Peacebuilding

Civil society in peacebuilding has been sought to prevent violent conflict and provide early warnings and to manage conflict and restore peace in post-conflict situations. Various actors from civil society can become peace mediators, facilitators and negotiators for peace. Among civil society efforts at peacebuilding we find the same large array as in every other broad

---

[13] Letter and annex of 1 February 2016 from the Permanent Representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, Concept note for the Security Council open debate on the theme, "Post-conflict peacebuilding: review of the peacebuilding architecture".

concept, from religious groups to development NGOs to advocacy groups to community-based organizations including cooperatives.

A 2006 World Bank study on peacebuilding and civil society potential reveals some contradictions. To start with, civil society would not include enterprises. It wants to prevent civil society from monitoring and/or providing services (without any link to either author or literature): "Service delivery is thus not a civil society function per se, but rather a task of the state, the market or the third sector." (World Bank, 2006: 18). However, in its Annex 2 *Philosophical Roots and Theoretical Concepts of Civil Society* (ibid.: 42) there is no distinction between civil society, market and the so-called *third sector* (there is no acknowledgement of solidarity economy), but only between civil society and state or central authority, which is correct. In the study, civil society roles include 1) reconciliation, 2) conflict management and transformation, 3) preventing violence, 4) building trust and bridging, 5) monitoring and advocacy, the main goal for "Community building-integration" being to instill "bindings and attachments" (ibid.: 43). It discusses tenders and financing, partnerships and support with/to international NGOs and local NGOs under a project framework approach, recognizing that national NGOs located in capital cities get most support.

A 2004 International Peace Research Institute (PRIO) document on civil society and peacebuilding, commissioned by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, recalls that conflict alters civil society, and there "is an inherent danger in forcing non-Western societies into assuming an organizational form that is recognizable from a Western viewpoint" (Harpviken and Kjellman, 2004: 13), reducing civil society to only NGOs, in particular those receiving foreign funding or transnational support, and which "have increasingly assumed responsibility for many of the state's functions within health and education. While these NGOs are certainly a vital component of civil society, they do not challenge the state from below, being instead horizontal contemporaries of wider institutions of transnational governmentality" (ibid.: 13).

To make it clear, civil society belongs to the private sphere (it is not a sector but a sphere). It does include the so-called third sector, community organizations, local community and member-based organizations. In 2013, the World Economic Forum argued for a broader notion of civil society (World Economic Forum, 2013: 9-10).

Civil society can spontaneously provide solidarity, helping restore and improve human and group relations. Germany, for example, has had waves of social movements building up solidarity and cooperatives after wars and in times of crises, whereby people can communicate, play, learn and help each other, make friends and support networks that enable peace and agency (Müller-Plantenberg, 2015).

There may be though limitations, such as not impacting on the wider setting that is causing the violence. It may need training in peace negotiations from others like the Sant'Egidio Community. Lederach (1997) has proposed levels of peacebuilding training for actors according to level of leadership, from top leaders (government, military, religious) to grassroots ones.

Peacebuilding, solidarity economy and cooperatives

Galtung's positive peace is a situated experience, understood as empathy and sanity, freedom from suffering, economic development and social justice. By doing so, the process of de-polarization can be scaled up and the rule of law enhanced through stronger trust in some inter-connected and shared truth. Structural violence related to inequality, issues of poverty, wealth and land concentration, power or institutional structural that are unjust, unfair and arbitrary need to be addressed. Peace in the fullest sense is based on patterns of cooperation (Galtung, 2011) and Galtung emphasizes cooperation and cooperatives as a major way to achieve positive peace (Galtung, 2012).

Cooperatives[14] blend association (civil society) and enterprise (business) and, according to MacPherson and Paz (2015), their contribution to peacebuilding has significant potential, as more than 650 million human beings take part in the cooperative movement world-wide (when we consider a probable double-counting as many human beings are members of more than one cooperative, see Sanchez Bajo and Roelants 2013, ch. 4, point 2.2). Cooperatives abide by an internationally recognized business model, are incorporated under sub-national or

---

[14] ILO *Recommendation N°. 193 on the Promotion of Cooperatives* includes a clear definition of what a cooperative is, in accordance with the definition voted by the global cooperative movement at the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA) in 1995. Cooperatives are enterprises in the formal economy with their own values, standards and representation bodies, while a broader range of initiatives are called Social and Solidarity Economy units (SSE). The term cooperative means "an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly owned and democratically controlled enterprise." (International Co-operative Alliance (ICA), n.d.),

national legislation, existing in virtually all business sectors. Cooperatives are "jointly owned and democratically controlled" (International Co-operative Alliance (ICA), n. d.), namely they are governed by a one-member one-vote system, regardless of business done with or investment in the enterprise, and part of the wider social and solidarity economy.

Bourdieu saw cooperatives as are part of the groups and collectives that underlie the values of solidarity and humanity, capable of winning back democracy from structural violence (Bourdieu, 1998). Like Galtung, other thinkers have also promoted cooperatives as a tool for building peace, most notably Elise Boulding (2000), Mahatma Gandhi with his Tolstoy Farm (Bhana, 1975) and Martin Luther King (1966; 1967). There is documentation that Tolstoy's idea of commonwealth strongly inspired Jewish cooperatives and the cooperative movement in Argentina (Plotinsky, 2015).[15] Mennonites too have built cooperatives and engaged in peacebuilding and peace studies and the idea of common wealth, going way back to the XVII century with Spinoza, Van den Ende and Plockhoy.

In *Making Democracy Work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*, cooperatives, which grew out of the mutual aid societies, strongly contribute to democracy and civic culture (Putnam, Leonardi and Nanetti, 1994: 139, 142, 148). Putnam's social capital is a pre-requisite and a social virtue, linking up social structuring with norms, and utilitarian strategies with democracy and public policy (Putnam, 2000: 19; 1996). Indeed, Northern Italy was a major birthplace for workers and artisans' cooperatives (together with France) and credit unions (together with Germany), as well as consumer cooperatives (the first one in 1854 in Turin, also the very first 'modern' cooperative in Italy), and housing (one of the first housing cooperatives dates back to 1884 in Bologna).

Solidarity economy accounts for solidarity behavior in any phase of the economy, production, distribution, consumption and accumulation, covering cooperatives, community work, native communities, fair trade, barter, social currencies, ethical banks and consumption (Guerra, 2002), in a new paradigm for sustainable development.

But business roles in peacebuilding are seen as a normative goal. Under 'liberal peace', management promotes peace with the assumption that peace arrives through commerce from which prosperity is expected to derive (Forrer and Katsos, 2015). Solidarity economy

---

[15]See: guia web ana frank, n. d. and CGCyM, 2015.

initiatives and community-based organizations are usually considered critical in the first stages of peacebuilding but expected to fade once the economy has picked up. Cooperatives are mainly rallied as community-based organizations or CBOs to provide for human needs or gather labour, to defuse post-conflict tension, demobilise soldiers, and restart agriculture. This is not to deny their great contributions in post-war, but to acknowledge that they contribute well beyond with other functions and roles, before, during and after conflict.

> In many countries, including Bosnia, East Timor, El Salvador, Guatemala, Lebanon, Macedonia, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sri Lanka and Nepal, cooperatives have played a critical role in post-conflict reconstruction by creating jobs for returning minorities and ex-combatants, rebuilding businesses and homes, giving refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) access to markets, and facilitating reconciliation and peacebuilding. In Sri Lanka, the World Council of Credit Unions (WOCCU) worked with Sri Lanka's financial cooperatives to expand access to finance for people living in rural and conflict-affected areas. Sri Lanka Women's Development Co-operative Society, a network of more than 120 branches owned and operated entirely by women has benefited from this support ranging from group lending and insurance to health and education services. (ILO, 2015)

In South Sudan, cooperatives were part of the peace process, but they were also key for a peaceful living economy.

> During the so-called hunger months, there can be very high price differences between cooperatives and traders, and the main task of agricultural cooperatives is to reduce these differences. Traders usually pass by and buy large quantities of crops … when the farmer runs out of stock the trader returns and sells the grain back to the farmers, at a much higher price. The cooperative also buys it off from the farmer, stores it and then sells it back to the farmer to the original price. So, the main role of these cooperatives is to level off seasonal price fluctuations. (Havers, 2007)

And, we may add, improve food security. This is possible because cooperatives are made of people, not shares or capital sums invested. If it were only the latter, they would not be cooperatives.

Sentama's PhD thesis on Rwanda studies a cooperative case with a membership of more than 50 % female. The cooperative restores interpersonal relationships in post-conflict peacebuilding in a private manner, enabling to overcome previous negative and dehumanizing relationships, and fostering positive and (re)humanizing ones (Sentama, 2009: 164).

According to the 'contact theory', conflicting parties working for a common goal cooperatively engage in positive communication that enables truth to emerge, while reciprocal acknowledgment of wrongdoing and expressions of forgiveness take place (ibid.: 166). This goes well beyond what the literature used to acknowledge as the instrumental use of cooperatives. People from the two sides of the genocide work together and are able to engage in peacebuilding, like in a refuge.

In the case of Rwanda, while some studies question why genocide did not happen before, Turshen provides the clearest trail of causes:

> Four economic and political factors played havoc with the society in the 1980s: 1) the abrupt drop in the price of coffee, the principal income source for 60 per cent of Rwandan families, coupled with a 40 per cent currency devaluation in 1989 and rapid inflation after 1990; 2) a structural adjustment program that curtailed or reduced social services and charged for health care, schooling, and water, combined with a drought in the southern regions, which turned into a famine; 3) from 1990, the war in the north, which drained government resources and led to rapid army recruitment, and which created huge refugee camps just north of Kigali—the displaced came from Rwanda's 'breadbasket', exacerbating the external factors contributing to inflation; and 4) the paradox of democratization, which encouraged opposition to the already embattled government. (Turshen, 2001: 3).

Cooperatives in Rwanda, according to the literature, appeared under colonial rule, and have been generally promoted and even initiated by governments, most usually seen as enterprises (Musahara, 2012). Let us not forget that cooperatives are both enterprises and associations stemming from civil society or the community. Some citizens may feel obliged to take part, but even then, cooperatives may become a terrain of contestation, because they do build a path towards agency (Pottier 1989; 2002: 22). They engage in advocacy, they reconstruct social capital, and strive for fair trade and just economic development on a sustainable basis. Others see their capacity for innovation where risks are better accepted because it is done together. "While cooperatives are usually used to counter market imperfections and to avoid trade injustice in Rwanda after 1994 cooperatives offered a possibility of addressing vulnerability, assisting in poverty reduction and as one of the few vehicles for reconciliation." (Musahara, 2012: 5) It is observed that more research and support is necessary for them to achieve their full potential, as cooperatives engage in business and peacebuilding hand in hand.

Thinking about any crisis now includes four phases: 1) coping, 2) recovery, 3) sustainable livelihoods and 4) preparedness for a new crisis. In the first phase, in an emergency, cooperatives contribute to humanitarian aid through donations and volunteering direct help, raising awareness and giving advice (eg. legal). These contributions are usually done by well-established cooperatives, as in the case of Japan and Thailand in 2011 in the face of sudden disasters such as earthquakes and flooding (Kobayashi, 2013). In the second phase, they contribute with local integration, services of all types, jobs and skills training. In the third phase of livelihoods, they contribute in any sector of activity, enhancing market and credit access, bargaining power and lower costs of inputs. In the fourth phase of risk mitigation, they contribute with micro-insurance and participatory community planning.

Working with refugees and asylum seekers requires skills and theoretical knowledge, including languages and mediation. Practitioners in cooperatives are innovating with grounded theory such as brokering and agency. For lack of space, two cases are mentioned here. A case in Canada, MCHB, provides formal delivery and support between two asymmetrical systems.[16] MCHB is a worker cooperative composed of already established immigrants to Canada, helping newcomers who have been refugees and are vulnerable. The former, after obtaining the trust of the community, and with the knowledge of values, beliefs and practices of cultural groups (both host and arriving ones) understand traditional and indigenous wellness and can build healing networks in and across diverse communities.

The evolutionary aspects of resilience inherent to the refugee status also require attention and appropriate knowledge. Many social cooperatives in Italy like Terrenuove Cooperative (see Terrenuove) provide psychotherapy and care services and allow refugees with the right to stay to become worker-members alongside other host community members. Since 1998, Terrenuove has developed its own theoretical and operational tools and in networks with other Europeans, such as with Françoise Sironi, former director of the Centre Devereux Paris, in clinical practice and supervision conducted at distance and broadcasted live, and with Renos Papadopoulos, professor and director of the Center for Trauma, Asylum and Refugees and member of the Center for Human Rights at the University of Essex. The cooperative works with the City of Milan through a protocol of collaboration on immigration, providing them with training and supervising centers and social services in the area. It also offers

---

[16] MCHB acts as a cultural broker. See Yvonne Chiu, MCHB slides, adapted from: *Bridging the Cultural Divide: Health Care Settings: The Essential Role of Cultural Broker Programs*, NCCC, 2004. Developed by National Center for Cultural Competence, 2006

psychological assistance to reception centers managed by another cooperative 'Farsi Prossimo' – 'Make oneself close' (see Terrenuove, n. d.). Social cooperatives have social and general interest goals in their mission statements. While profit is not their goal, they must be sustainable, responsible and transparent, including in budgets and operations. They can thus be successful where for-profit large businesses have no interest in working with vulnerable populations, as well as where states fail to address their needs. Attention however must be paid to cooperatives' autonomy because, due to their very success, there have been a few cases of infiltration by illegal interests (in Italy, mainly in the South up to Rome).

Interviewees stressed that cooperatives benefitted *both* the host community and refugees at the same time. In addition, according to them, responses and interventions must be integrated (social, psychological, work, health and housing) because refugees and IDPs (internally displaced persons) are not the same as an economic migrant in 'normal' times. They carry trauma and a history of abuse, sometimes of poor mental health, with a difficulty to situate themselves in the reality and environment. For such reason, responses were undertaken in networks in which cooperatives played certain functions and roles but also helped in coordination and communication.

In the case of refugees worldwide, the author did a study for the ILO in 2016 on the roles that cooperatives have played for both refugees and IDPs and the hosting community, finding out 28 cases, dealing with job creation, raising awareness and empowerment, reconciliation, dialogue and mediation, enhancing work skills and bargaining power, building resilience and livelihoods (see Sanchez Bajo, 2016). The 28 examples in the study show that cooperatives are sought as a tool for personal, household and community self-reliance. They have benefited the vulnerable population and the host community alike, able to contribute to acceptance and integration, thus peacebuilding. Cooperatives are one of the responses to the refugee crisis, valuable in times of hardship and crisis, and, most important of all, enablers of what vulnerable refugees and IDPs need most, namely agency and resilience, sustainable livelihoods and peace. The examples from Canada, Italy, and others used theoretical perspectives such as agency, actors' resilience, human security, brokerage and constructivism. They were bottom-up, participatory, community-based, and needed to be backed up by appropriate methodology in research and intervention. In most cases, they were small and medium scale cooperatives, scaling up through networks, groupings, and second and third level cooperatives, composed and built by all the smaller grassroots' initiatives. Finally, their

work is never purely economic, but also social and holistic, including issues of mental health and gender. In conclusion, there is the need to shed new light on the neglected issue of peacebuilding that breaks cyclical violence and can engender sustainable livelihoods, as suggested by peace researchers and thinkers.

Conclusion

First, the importance of justice and equality for peace cannot be overstated. Second, to have peace, one needs to prepare for peace. Spinoza provided the ontological basis for a contrasting vision to Hobbes, one in which democracy and commonwealth were preferable to other types of sovereign authority, and where cooperation was possible, practical and desirable. The self is situated, a socialized-self with bounded rationality, able to and seeking to cooperate for the common good and peace. Spinoza, and Plockhoy's experience, opened the way to the Enlightenment, as well as to cooperatives, and later to the solidarity economy.

Applied to human organizations, there are roughly two main approaches to peace in relation to political economy: a) Hobbes' contractual view of a dualistic relation that becomes permanent in terms of power and security and b) Spinoza's view based on a view of diffuse power relations, based on solidarity and exercised through checks and balances. These two views with different perceptions of the individual and society, has been applied onto business models.

Solidarity economy and cooperatives have significant potential in terms of peacebuilding and positive peace, offering a special vantage point as they are associations and enterprises, offering a learning path in democracy and how to build checks and balances, namely that nobody is above the law. In them, work reappears as a key experience in rebuilding agency and humanity. The capacity to create activity bottom-up generates autonomous capabilities as well as leadership. Learning to live together in a cooperative manner is essential to sustainable peace. However, the pressures for any group to turn closed minded are always present. For this reason, a wider cooperative environment can safeguard openness and peacebuilding acumen.

Galtung's formula (Galtung, 2015) recalls that equity means mutual and equal benefit, that empathy is to feel what others feel, and both should be larger than trauma and conflict. Peace

cannot be conquered or imposed. It is more than justice or balanced act, it is the ultimate value of life.

Living together necessarily entails difference of views. Such difference needs dialogue and equality to engage in dialogue, to decide together and manage conflicting views in a non-violent manner. In view of current cycles of violence and the growing distrust of anything that may appear diverse or different, key thinkers and researchers on peace suggest that we should be looking at peace not as a normative goal, but as a double process of intercultural understanding, and of identity building and community resilience with a situational logic. To advance peace in the fullest sense, all types of violence (direct, cultural and structural) and its key drivers must be addressed. In this manner, we can envisage peace as a shared refuge or safe haven for life to flourish.

Bibliography

ANDERSON, MARY and LARA OLSON (2003): *Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners*. Cambridge, MA: CDA. Available at: http://www.cdacollaborative.org/media/60894/Confronting-War-Critical-Lessons-for-Peace-Practitioners.pdf (03 January 2018).

BARASH, DAVID and CHARLES WEBEL (2008): *Peace and Conflict Studies*. London: SAGE.

BELLONI, ROBERTO (2012): Hybrid Peace Governance: Its Emergence and Significance. *Global Governance* 18(1): 21–38.

BHANA, SURENDRA (1975): The Tolstoy Farm: Gandhi's Experiment in 'Co-operative Commonwealth'. *South African Historical Journal* 7(1): 88–100. Available at: http://www.mkgandhi.org/articles/surendrabhana.htm (03 January 2018).

BOULDING, ELISE (2000): *Cultures of Peace: The Hidden Side of History*. Syracuse: University Press.

BOURDIEU, PIERRE FELIX (1998): *Acts of Resistance: Against the New Myths of our Time*. New York: Polity Press and the New Press.

BOURDIEU, PIERRE FELIX (2004): The Forms of Capital. In *Reader in Sociology of Education*, S. Ball (ed.), 15–29. London: Routledge Falmer.

CDA COLLABORATIVE LEARNING PROJECTS (2013): *Reflecting on Peace Practice Participant Training Manual*. Available at: http://cdacollaborative.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Reflecting-on-Peace-Practice-1-Participant-Training-Manual.pdf (03 January 2018).

CDA COLLABORATIVE LEARNING PROJECTS (2014): *Business for Peace: Understanding and Assessing Corporate Contributions to Peace*. A discussion paper presented at the UN Global Compact's Business for Peace (B4P) conference. Istanbul, 29 September.

CGCyM (2015): *Pioneros del mutualismo y cooperativismo agrario entrerriano Nº 4: La Agrícola Regional de Crespo, 105 años de trayectoria cooperativa*. Available at: http://cgcym.org.ar/?s=http%3A%2F%2Fcgcym.org.ar%2F2014%2F09%2F19%2Fpioneros-del-mutualismo-y-cooperativismo-agrario-entrerriano-ing-miguel-sajaroff%2F+ (03 January 2018).

ECHAVARRIA ALVAREZ, JOSEFINA (2014): Elicitive Conflict Mapping: A Practical Tool for Peacework. *Journal of Conflictology* 5(2): 58–71.

EINSTEIN, ALBERT (AUTH.), OTTO, NATHAN and HEINZ NORDEN (EDS.) (1960): *Einstein on Peace*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

EMMANUEL, JOY and IAN MACPHERSON (ED.) (2007): *Co-operatives and the Pursuit of Peace*. B. C. Victoria: New Rochdale Press.

ENNS, DIANNE (2015): Hannah Arendt on Peace as a Means to Politics. In *The Question of Peace in Modern Political Thought,* T. Koivukoski and D. E. Tabachnick, (eds.), 223–242. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

ERASMUS, DESIDERIUS (n. d. [1521]): *The Complaint of Peace*. Available at: http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/erasmus-the-complaint-of-peace (03 January 2018).

FORD, JOLYON (2015): Perspectives on the Evolving "Business and Peace". *Academy of Management Perspectives* 29(4): 451–460.

FORRER, JOHN AND JOHN KATSOS (2015) Business and Peace in the Buffer Condition. *Academy of Management Perspectives* 29(4): 438-450.

FORT, TIMOTHY and CINDY SCHIPANI (2007): An Action Plan for the Role of Business in Fostering Peace. *American Business Law Journal* 44(2): 359–377.

GALTUNG, JOHAN VINCENT (1969): Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research* 6(3): 167–191.

GALTUNG, JOHAN VINCENT (1990): Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research* 27(3): 291–305.

GALTUNG, JOHAN VINCENT (2011): Peace, Positive and Negative. In *The Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology*, D. J. Christie (eds.). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

GALTUNG, JOHAN VINCENT (2012): Peace Economics: From a Killing to a Living Economy. Grenzach-Wyhlen: TRANSCEND University Press.

GALTUNG, JOHAN VINCENT (2015) Positive Peace, What is that? Editorial, 5 January, TRANSCEND Media Service. Available at https://www.transcend.org/tms/2015/01/positive-peace-what-is-that/ (28 January 2018).

GANSON, BRIAN (2017): *Business and Peace: A Need for New Questions and Systems Perspectives*. Paper for the Africa Centre for Dispute Settlement at the University of Stellenbosch Business School, CDA and PRIO, January.

GOETSCHEL, LAURENT and TOBIAS HAGMANN (2009): Civilian Peacebuilding: Peace by Bureaucratic Means?' *Conflict, Security and Development* 9(1): 55–73.

GOETSCHEL, LAURENT and TOBIAS HAGMANN (2011): Rethinking Peace: Peace Research and Peacebuilding. In *The Politics of Peace: From Ideology to Pragmatism? Proceedings of the Swiss Peace 20th Anniversary Conference*, H. Goetschel (eds.), 45–60. Zürich.

GROTIUS, HUGO (2001 [1631]): *On the Law of War and Peace* (*De Jure Belli ac Pacis).* Kitchener: Batoche Books. Available at:
https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3ll3/grotius/Law2.pdf (03 January 2018).

GROFF, LINDA (2008): Contributions of Different Cultural-Religious Traditions to Different Aspects of Peace: Leading to a Holistic, Integrative View of Peace for a 21st Century Interdependent World. *Future Takes* 7(1): 27–34:

GUERRA, PABLO (2002): *Economía de la Solidaridad. Una introducción a sus diversas manifestaciones teóricas*. Available at: http://tacuru.ourproject.org/documentos/guerra.pdf (03 January 2018).

GUIA WEB ANA FRANK (n. d.): *Las primeras inmigraciones a fines del siglo XIX: La inmigración judía en el proyecto de la Generación del 80.* Available at: http://www.annefrankguide.net/es-AR/bronnenbank.asp?aid=283252 (03 January 2018).

HAVERS, JULIAN (2007) *Cooperating for Peace, Assessing the Role of Cooperatives in Post Conflict Recovery*, Report for the ILO, July, mimeo.

HARPVIKEN, KRISTIAN BERG AND KJELL ERLING KJELLMAN (2004) Beyond Blueprints, Civil Society and Peacebuilding, Concept Paper commissioned by NORAD, 9 August, Oslo: PRIO.

HOBBES, THOMAS (2010, [1651]) Leviathan. Part I, Man. Available at http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/hobbes1651part1.pdf (28 January 2018)

ILO (2015): *How Workers' Cooperatives Can Help Tackle the Refugee Crisis*, 09 November. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/features/WCMS_418992/lang--en/index.htm (03 January 2018).

ISRAEL, JONATHAN (2001) *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATIVE ALLIANCE (ICA) (n. d.): *Co-operative Identity, Values & Principles*. Available at: https://ica.coop/en/whats-co-op/co-operative-identity-values-principles (03 January 2018).

KANT, IMMANUEL (2010 [1795]): *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*. Available at: http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/kant1795_1.pdf (03 January 2018).

KRAFT, KENNETH (ED.) (1992): *Inner Peace, World Peace: Essays on Buddhism and Nonviolence*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

KOLK, ANS AND FRANCOIS LENFANT (2016): Hybrid Business Models for Peace and Reconciliations. *Business Horizons* 59(5): 503–524.

KING, MARTIN LUTHER Jr. (1966): *Nonviolence: The Only Road to Freedom.* Speech on May 04. Available at: https://www.gilderlehrman.org/sites/default/files/inline-pdfs/mlk_nonviolence_abridged.pdf (03 January 2018).

KING, MARTIN LUTHER Jr. (1967): *Where do we go from here?* Speech delivered at the 11th Annual SCLC Convention, August 16. Available at: http://kingencyclopedia.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/documentsentry/where_do_we_go_from_here_delivered_at_the_11th_annual_sclc_convention.1.html (03. January 2018).

KOBAYASHI, HIROFUMI (2013) *Cooperation among Farmers and Cooperatives*, Presentation at the Policy Partnership on Food Security Meeting Plenary, Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Agenda Item 7, 10, Slide 6. Jakarta, Indonesia, 25-26 January. Available at http://mddb.apec.org/Documents/2013/PPFS/PPFS1/13_som_ppfs1_019.pdf (28 January 2018).

LEDERACH, JOHN PAUL (1997): *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

LEDERACH, JOHN PAUL, REINA NEUFELDT and HAL CULBERTSON (2007): Reflective Peacebuilding, a Planning, Monitoring and Learning Toolkit. Notre Dame: The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame. Available at: https://www.crs.org/sites/default/files/tools-research/reflective-peacebuilding.pdf (03 January 2018).

MACPHERSON, IAN AND YEHUDAH PAZ (2015) *Concern for Community: The Relevance of Co-operatives for Peace*, Series on Co-operatives & Peace Vol. 2, published by Joy Emmanuel, Turning Times Research and Consulting.

MOORE, ADAN, THOMAS GRUBER, JENNIFER DEROSE AND PETER MALINOWSKI (2012): Regular, Brief Mindfulness Meditation Practice Improves Electrophysiological Markers of Attentional Control. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 6: 18. Available at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00018/full (03 January 2018).

MULLER-PLANTENBERG, CLARITA (2015): Social Solidarity Economy Enterprises and Cooperatives Perspectives for Refugees' Solidarity Economy Enterprises in Germany. Mimeo.

MUSAHARA, HERMAN (2012): *Perspectives on Cooperatives with Reference to Rwanda.* Paper mimeo on the Regional conference on "Perspectives for cooperatives in Eastern Africa", October 2012. Kampala/Uganda.

NEWMAN, EDWARDS, ROLAND PARIS and OLIVER RICHMOND (EDS.) (2009): *New Perspectives on Liberal Peacebuilding*. Tokyo: UNU Press.

NEWMAN, EDWARDS (2009): ''Liberal'' Peacebuilding Debates. In *New Perspectives on Liberal Peacebuilding*, E. Newman, R. Paris and O. Richmond (eds.), 26–53. Tokyo: UNU Press.

NUSSBAUM, MARTHA (2000): *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

NUSSBAUM, MARTHA (2003): Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice. *Feminist Economics* 9(2/3): 33–59.

OKEM, EMMANUEL ANDREW (ED.) (2016): *Theoretical and Empirical Studies on Cooperatives: Lessons for Cooperatives in South Africa*. Berlin: Springer.

OECD DAC (2007): Encouraging Effective Evaluation of Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities: Towards DAC Guidance. *OECD Journal on Development* 8(3). Available at: https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/39660852.pdf (03 January 2018).

PANIKKAR, RAIMON (n. d.): *Cultural Disarmament: The Way to Peace*. Available at: http://raimon- pannikkar.org/english/XXXV-2-Cultural-Disarmament.html (03 January 2018).

PANIKKAR, RAIMON (1993): *Paz y desarme cultural.* Santander: Sal Terrae.

PANIKKAR, RAIMON (1995): *Cultural Disarmament. The Way to Peace*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

PARNELL, EDGAR (2001): *The Role of Cooperatives and other Self-Help Organizations in Crisis Resolution and Socio-Economic Recovery*. Report prepared for ILO Cooperative

Branch and IFP/Crisis (InFocus Programme on Crisis Response and Reconstruction), ILO, Geneva.

PARNELL, EDGAR (2002): The Role of Co-operatives and Other Self Help Organizations (SHOs). ILO: Genova.

PLOCKHOY, PIETER CORNELISZOON (1660) A way propounded to make the poor in these and other nations happy: by bringing together a fit, suitable and well-qualified people unto one household-government, or little commonwealth: wherein everyone may keep his propriety and be employed in some work or other, as he shall be fit for without being oppressed. London, Printed for the promoters of this Society. Text accessed at the University of Texas at Austin Library, August 2016.

PLOTINSKY, DANIEL (2015): Origenes y consolidacion del cooperativismo en Argentina. *Revista Idelcoop* 215(March): 157─178. Available at: https://www.idelcoop.org.ar/sites/default/files/revista/articulos/pdf/revista-215-con-membretes-origenes_y_consolidacion_del_cooperativismo_en_la_argentina.pdf (03 January 2018).

POTTIER, JOHAN (1989): Debating Styles in a Rwandan Cooperative: Reflection on Language, Policy and Gender. In *Social Anthropology and the Politics of Language*, R. Grillo (ed.), 41─60. London: Routledge.

POTTIER, JOHAN (2002): *Re-imagining Rwanda: Conflict, Survival and Disinformation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PUTNAM, ROBERT DAVID, ROBERT LEONARIDI and RAFFAELLA NANETTI (1994): *Making Democracy Work. Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

PUTNAM, ROBERT DAVID (1996): Unsolved Mysteries: The Tocqueville Files. *The American Prospect* March-April. Available at: http://prospect.org/article/unsolved-mysteries-tocqueville-files-0 (03 January 2018).

PUTNAM, ROBERT DAVID (2000): *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

RAVVEN, HEIDI M. (2013): *The Self beyond Itself: An Alternative History of Ethics, the New Brain Sciences and the Myth of Free Will.* New York: The New Press.

RICHMOND, OLIVER P. (2006): The Problem of Peace: Understanding the 'Liberal Peace'. *Conflict, Security and Development* 6(3): 291–314.

RICHMOND, OLIVER P. (2012): Missing Links: Peace Infrastructures and Peace Formation. In *Peace Infrastructures – Assessing Concept and Practice*, B. Unger, S. Lundström, K. Planta and B. Austin (eds.). Peace Infrastructures – Assessing Concept and Practice. Berghof Handbook Dialogue Series No. 10. Berlin: Berghof Foundation. Available at: http://www.berghof-handbook.net/documents/publications/dialogue10_richmond_comm.pdf (03 January 2018).

ROUSSEAU, JEAN-JACQUES (n. d. [1761]): *A Lasting Peace through the Federation of Europe and the State of War.* Available at: http//perpetualpeaceproject.org/resources/rousseau.ph (03 January 2018)

SALAMON, LESTER and HELMUT ANHEIER (1997): The Civil Society Sector. *Society* Jan/Feb 34(2): 1997: 63–67.

SANCHEZ BAJO, CLAUDIA and BRUNO ROELANTS (2013): *Capital and the Debt Trap: Learning from Cooperatives in the Global Crisis*. London, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

SANCHEZ BAJO, CLAUDIA (2016): *Cooperatives and Refugees*. Research study done for ILO COOP. Mimeo, final text available on demand.

SANCHEZ BAJO, CLAUDIA (2017): *Frieden und Genossenschaften,*. In Die ökonomische Dimension des Friedens: Soziale Solidarische Ökonomie, Verein zur Förderung der Solidarischen Ökonomie (Eds.), Kassel: Kassel University Press. Available at: http://www.upress.uni-kassel.de/katalog/abstract.php?978-3-7376-0394-2 (03 January 2018).

SENTAMA, EZECHIEL (2009): Peacebuilding in Post-Genocide Rwanda: The Role of Cooperatives in the Restoration of Interpersonal Relationships. PhD thesis. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.

SIGUAN, MIQUEL (ed.) (1989): *Philosophia pacis. Homenaje a Raimon Panikkar*. Madrid: Simbolo Editorial.

SPINOZA, BARUCH (2002a): Theological-Political Treatise. In *Complete Works,* M. L. Morgan (ed.). Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hacker Publishing Inc.

SPINOZA, BARUCH (2002b): Ethics. In *Complete Works*, M. L. Morgan (ed.). Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hacker Publishing Inc.

SPINOZA, BARUCH (2002c): Political Treatise. In *Complete Works*, M. L. Morgan (ed.). Indianapolis, Cambridge: Hacker Publishing Inc.

TERRENUOVE. Available at: http://www.terrenuoveonlus.it/ (03. January 2018).

TERRENUOVE (n. d.): *Rifugiati e richiedenti asilo*. Available at: http://www.terrenuoveonlus.it/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Informazioni-sul-servizio-rifugiati.pdf (03. January 2018).

TURSHEN, MEREDETH (2001): The Political Economy of Rape: An Analysis of Systematic Rape and Sexual Abuse of Women During Armed Conflict in Africa. In *Victors, Perpetrators or Actors: Gender, Armed Conflict and Political Violence,* C. Moser and F. Clarke (eds.), 55–68. London: Zed Books.

UNITED NATIONS (2016): *UN Resolution A/RES/70/262*. Review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture. Available at: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_70_262.pdf (03 January 2018).

UNITED NATIONS (1992): An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping—Initial Proceedings. In *Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council*, 822–828. Available at: http://www.un.org/en/sc/repertoire/89-92/Chapter%208/GENERAL%20ISSUES/Item%2029_Agenda%20for%20peace_.pdf (03 January 2018).

UNHCR (2005): Employment for Peace: Ilo Tools to Rebuild Conflict-Affected Communities (Appendix Two). In *Handbook for Self-Reliance, Glossary and Abbreviations,* 1–10. Geneva: UNCHR. Available at: http://www.unhcr.org/44bf7b012.pdf (08 January 2018).

UNITED NATIONS GLOBAL COMPACT (n. d.): *Join Business for Peace*. Available at: https://www.unglobalcompact.org/take-action/action/peace (03 January 2018).

UNITED NATIONS GLOBAL COMPACT (2015): *Advancing the Sustainable Development Goals by Supporting Peace: How Business Can Contribute.* Available at: https://www.unglobalcompact.org/library/3151 (03 January 2018).

UTTING, PETER, AMALIA CHAMORRO and CHRISTOPHER BACON (2014): *Post-conflict Reconciliation and Development in Nicaragua: The Role of Cooperatives and Collective Action*. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) Working Paper 2014-22. Available at: https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/148740/1/861280601.pdf (03 January 2018).

WORLD BANK (2006): *Civil Society and Peacebuilding: Potential, Limitations and Critical Factors*. Report No. 36445-GLB. Available at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/244362-1164107274725/3182370-1164110717447/Civil_Society_and_Peacebuilding.pdf (03 January 2018).

WORLD BANK (2011): *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development.* Available at: https://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWDRS/Resources/ WDR2011_Full_Text.pdf (03 January 2018).

WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM (2013): *The Future Role of Civil Society*. Available at: http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_FutureRoleCivilSociety_Report_2013.pdf (03 January 2018).