

OLGA SKLARLATO / SEAN BYRNE / CHUCK THIESSEN

The Eu Peace II Fund and The International Fund For Ireland: Transforming Conflict and Building Peace in Northern Ireland and The Border Counties

This article explores interview narratives of 98 Northern Irish participants regarding the impact of the International Fund for Ireland (IFI) and the European Union's (EU) Programme for Peace and Reconciliation (Peace II) on peacebuilding and development processes in Northern Ireland. The perceptions of community group leaders, funding agency civil servants and development officers are explored. The experiences of these study participants with the EU Peace II Fund and IFI are discussed in the greater context of economic and social development, addressing the legacy of conflict, and peacebuilding and reconciliation in Northern Ireland and the Border Counties.

Keywords: peacebuilding, international economic assistance, Northern Ireland, program evaluation

Evropski mirovni sklad II in Mednarodni sklad za Irsko: Transformacija konflikta in vzpostavljanje miru na Severnem Irskem in v mejnih pokrajinah.

Članek obravnava pripovedi 98 severnoirskih intervjuvancev o učinku Mednarodnega fonda za Irsko (International Fund for Ireland, IFI) in Programa EU za mir in spravo (EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation) (Mir/Peace II) na vzpostavljanje miru in razvoj na Severnem Irskem. Raziskuje mnenja voditeljev lokalnih skupnosti, uradnikov fundacije in za razvoj odgovornih uslužbencev. Izkušnje sodelujočih v raziskavi z Evropskim mirovnim skladom II in IFI so obravnavane v širšem kontekstu gospodarskega in družbenega razvoja, upošteva dediščino konfliktov ter vzpostavljanja miru in sprave na Severnem Irskem in v mejnih pokrajinah.

Ključne besede: vzpostavljanje miru, mednarodna gospodarska pomoč, Severna Irska, ocena programa

Correspondence address: Olga Skarlato, Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice, St. Paul's College, University of Manitoba, 252-70 Dysart Road, Winnipeg, MB, R3T 2M6, Canada, e-mail: olyaskar@yahoo.com.

Sean Byrne: Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice, St. Paul's College, University of Manitoba, 252-70 Dysart Road, Winnipeg, MB, R3T 2M6, Canada, e-mail: byrnejj@ms.umanitoba.ca.

Chuck Thiessen, Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice, St. Paul's College, University of Manitoba, 252-70 Dysart Road, Winnipeg, MB, R3T 2M6, Canada, e-mail: clthie@gmail.com.

1. Introduction

Peacebuilding in countries affected by the legacy of protracted conflict is a process which requires coordinated efforts between the civil society, the government, and the international community. The inherently divisive nature of ethnic conflict affects the social, political and human development of a country and its population. Scholars in diverse fields are currently debating the most effective ways of assisting post-agreement development and peacebuilding processes and posit a number of directions that may be taken by international and national policymakers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and local communities. To this end, peace and conflict studies (PACS) scholars and practitioners have worked on designing integrated peacebuilding approaches and frameworks, and have developed specific mechanisms for addressing and resolving conflicts after the violence has ended (Lederach 1997; Diamond & McDonald 1996; Burrows 1996). PACS scholars working in the conflict transformation paradigm have envisioned conflict which has the potential for constructive change and have sought peace through emphasizing dialogue, building relationships, and engaging social, economic, and political structures “in a joint creative search for a new reality” (Galtung 2007, 14)¹.

PACS research over the past half-century has highlighted numerous peacebuilding resources and approaches (Dunn 2005). Scholarship has brought to our attention new ideas, theories, and research evidence concerning the potential role of external economic assistance and aid as a peacebuilding strategy (Collier 2007; Tarp 2000; Easterly 2008; Riddell 2007). Such issues as the impacts of economic assistance on a divided society with a history of protracted violence, the necessity of regarding the role of economic factors in relation to sociopolitical and psychocultural factors in the process of policymaking and conflict resolution, the importance of grassroots participation and the involvement of middle-range leaders in peacebuilding efforts, as well as the significance of designing comprehensive evaluation of the process of external funding of peacebuilding initiatives have been debated by PACS scholars and practitioners (Byrne 2009; Lederach 1997; Racioppi & O’Sullivan See 2007; UNDP 2009). At the same time, new questions and dilemmas have emerged in this regard. The need for more empirical research on the effectiveness of foreign aid, the mechanisms and strategies of its delivery and coordination has been identified (Killick 2004). The analysis of specific cases such as Northern Ireland (NI) should prove valuable in identifying and further developing best practices.

94

The protracted NI conflict has devastated local economic and political infrastructures. Pre-partition economic structures were rooted in the 1607 Ulster Plantation and the economic differences that emerged between North East Ulster and the rest of Ireland in the 1800s (O’Leary & McGarry 1996). From 1921 to 1972, populist Unionist politicians ensured that sectarianism divided the working classes by propagating discriminatory economic policies targeted at NI’s Nationalists (Bew et al. 2002). The 1960s witnessed the collapse of the shipbuilding and textile industries, with working class Nationalists bearing the brunt of unemployment. In response, the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association (NICRA) sought to promote fair access to employment and housing, as well as voting reforms (Dixon 2007). Violent opposition to NICRA’s agenda resulted in the Troubles,² which continued well into the 1990s. The Troubles devastated NI’s economy as the British government failed to address deeply rooted structural problems and the resulting Nationalist alienation (Bew & Patterson 1985). Unemployment and poverty remained high during the 1970s and 1980s, as what was generally known as the ‘long war’ damaged the infrastructure of local economies (Cox et al. 2000). Poverty and inequality nourished support in Loyalist and Republican neighborhoods for competing paramilitary organizations (Arthur 2001, 35; McGarry & O’Leary 1995, 73). Further, a war economy emerged from the turmoil of the Troubles as paramilitaries were allowed increasing control over economic and political processes (Tomlinson 1995). In response, the 1985 Anglo Irish Agreement (AIA) and the 1998 Good Friday Agreement (GFA) created frameworks to tackle economic deprivation, marginalization, and unemployment by providing substantial monetary support through the International Fund for Ireland (IFI) and the European Union (EU) Programme for Peace and Reconciliation (Peace II).

This article investigates the efficacy of economic aid as a peacebuilding tool, as well as its impact on institutionalizing the peace dividend in NI and the Border Counties. While political aspects to the peace process remain predominant in civil and media discourse, PACS scholars are increasingly recognizing how appropriate post-accord economic policy (Addison et al. 2005; Collier 2001, 2008; Jeong 2005; Kamphuis 2005), the legislated reduction of inequalities (Stewart 2008; Smith & Chambers 1991), and support for private sector growth (Haufler 2001) all contribute to an economic context which exerts considerable influence on these same political aspects to the peace process. A report by The Portland Trust, an NGO interested in peacebuilding through economics, concludes that the NI context illustrates that “economic progress is crucial to the political forces that favour peace. Without it, even small acts of sabotage can derail a peace process” (The Portland Trust 2007, 4). While the British government invested a considerable amount of financial resources in Northern

Ireland throughout the period of the Troubles, this massive subvention focused primarily on economic development and addressed only “the symptoms and not the underlying causes of the political and economic crisis” (Byrne 2009, 21). At the same time, the rapidly improving economic conditions in NI coupled with key policy and legislative decisions have served to reduce tensions and disparity in NI and have motivated perseverance during the difficult peace process (Byrne et al. 2008). It remains to be seen, however, how the peace process will fare with the recent economic downturn due to the 2008 recession.

Specifically, this article is organized as follows. First, a brief overview of both funding programs is provided. Second, the role of economic development as a peacebuilding strategy is explored. Third, we summarize the respondents’ perceptions of the contribution of economic aid to:

- ♦ economic and human development;
- ♦ addressing the legacy of sectarianism;
- ♦ reducing human suffering; and
- ♦ creativity in peacebuilding.

Finally, the key findings are discussed in light of the theory. This study provides the discussion and analysis of potential contributions of economic aid to a peacebuilding process in Northern Ireland and is aimed at the audience of peace builders, including but not limited to practitioners, scholars, politicians, international funding agencies and students of conflict and peace.

2. Methodology

Our investigation was implemented during the summer of 2006, when the second author Dr. Sean Byrne conducted semi-structured face-to-face interviews with 98 participants. The interview participants included individuals and community groups from Belfast, Derry, and representatives of community groups on both sides of the border (Northern Ireland: Counties Fermanagh, Tyrone, Armagh, and Republic of Ireland: Counties Cavan, Monaghan, Leitrim, Donegal) that were devastated by the Troubles economically and politically. Belfast was chosen as the capital city of Northern Ireland and Derry as the second largest city in Northern Ireland with a majority of Catholic residents. There are also economic differences west of the River Bann (Derry and the Border counties) as industry and commerce is centered east of the Bann in Belfast.

The respondents were identified from IFI and EU Peace II websites and subsequently contacted and invited to participate in the study. The questions were field tested during a study of Peace I and subsequently reused in this study. The questions posed to the respondents were compiled from a reading of the IFI and EU Peace website information as well as from secondary literature sources on the role of economic aid and the peace process in NI. The questions addressed: access to funds, process of applying to funders, success and evaluation of projects, sustainability of projects and empowerment of applicants, building cross community contact and reconciliation, peacebuilding and development, the Belfast Agreement and the peace process, building trust and equity, and the hopes and fears of the respondents regarding the peace process.

Participants comprised 88 community group leaders who represented a wide a range of organizations working with peace and reconciliation, development, youth, victims, and women. 66 of the participants were from small volunteer-staffed community groups, 12 were from larger community groups, 5 were Peace II development officers, one was an IFI development officer, one was an EU civil servant, two were IFI civil servants, and one was a senior civil servant in the office of the Taoiseach.³ Interviews lasted approximately 80 to 120 minutes, were conducted in each participant's workplace, and aimed to elicit perceptions of the role of the IFI and the EU Peace II fund in supporting various development and peacebuilding efforts in NI and the Border Counties. Interview data was transcribed verbatim and analyzed inductively to draw themes from the transcripts.

3. Peace II and IFI Funding Programs: A Brief Overview

Following the 1994 cease-fire agreement in NI, the European Commission (EC) established a Task Force to explore practical ways in which the EU could assist in the transition towards peace and reconciliation within Northern Irish society (European Commission n.d., 5). The EC initiated a Special Support Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in NI and the Border Counties (Peace I) to be implemented in the form of a Community Initiative under the Structural Funds for the period 1995 to 1999 (*ibid.*). Upon the completion of Peace I, the EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in NI and the Border Counties of Ireland 2000-2004 (Peace II) was introduced to "promote economic and social development with a special focus on those groups, sectors/activities and areas which have been most affected by the conflict" (*ibid.*, 31). The overall

strategic aim of Peace II was “to reinforce progress towards a peaceful and stable society and to promote reconciliation” (*ibid.*, 30). The objectives of Peace II included both addressing the legacy of conflict and encouraging actions aimed at promoting the emergence of a stable society through implementing the following priorities: economic renewal, social integration, inclusion, reconciliation, locally-based regeneration and development strategies, and cross-border co-operation (*ibid.*, 31-32). The Border region was included in this program as the region that was significantly affected by the Troubles, specifically in terms of commercial development (including cross-border trade and the inflow of foreign direct investment), high numbers of migrants from Northern Ireland who moved to the bordering counties of the Republic of Ireland due to the consequences of the Troubles, and due to isolation and marginalization of communities in the Border region “resulting from severing of social and economic links” (*ibid.*, 19). Overall, Peace II received €531 million from the EU and €304 million from both the Irish and British governments (Buchanan 2008, 393).

The IFI was established in 1986 with a mandate to address “the underlying causes of sectarianism and violence and to build reconciliation between people, and within and between communities in Ireland, North and South” (IFI n.d.a, 1). In subsequent years, the IFI has promoted economic and social development, and encouraged contact, dialogue and reconciliation between Nationalists and Unionists throughout NI with financial support from the U.S., the EU, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. In its early years, the IFI concentrated on promoting economic revitalization and reconciliation mainly through supporting economic development projects. Moreover, the Troubles and the partition have led to alienation and “economic and cultural marginalization” of communities in the Border counties (*ibid.*, 5). Since 2006, the IFI has expanded its focus and is now addressing sectarianism and segregation, promoting the integration and reconciliation of society, and working towards a “shared future” for NI and the Border Counties (IFI n.d.b, 4-5). The objectives of the IFI funding for the period of 2006 to 2010 include:

- ♦ “helping to build and realize the vision of a shared future” for the communities in NI and Ireland;
- ♦ promoting understanding between communities in NI;
- ♦ working with communities suffering from economic and social deprivation;
- ♦ facilitating the integration of the two communities;
- ♦ “building strong strategic alliances with other agencies and bodies active on the ground, ensuring that efforts are complementary, sustainable and mutually reinforcing”;
- ♦ “helping ensure the long term continuation of its work in NI beyond the

lifetime of the Fund”; and

- ♦ “sharing the expertise and learning acquired over twenty years with peacebuilders in other regions (IFI n.d.a., 6). By 2007 the total resources committed to IFI amounted to €845 million (IFI n.d.c, 3).

4. Peacebuilding and Conflict Transformation through Economic and Social Development

External economic aid has the potential to bolster local economies during difficult post-agreement periods, as well as shape local political processes and policymaking. The political conditionality of external economic aid has been debated by scholars in the fields of international development (Uvin 2004, 56-82; Killick 2004; Lavenex 2008). For example, based on the Rwandan case study, Uvin (1998, 238) discusses the need for “positive conditionality, whereby aid resources are used to strengthen the social and political conditions for improved policies rather than to force governments to adopt such policies”. In addition, Uvin (2004, 83) suggests the concept of “positive support”, which is aimed at creating conditions for respecting human rights in countries affected by conflict, rather than forcing their governments to respect human rights. The peace projects supported by the Peace II and IFI funds have the potential to create favorable conditions for reconciliation and peacebuilding by encouraging economic and social development and cross-community contact. The fact that development projects can be initiated and designed by local communities is significant because efforts originating at the grassroots level are more likely to reflect the true needs and aspirations of the population. Thus, funding monies can effectively address the legacy of violence and ethnic division between the Unionist and Nationalist communities in NI⁴.

Another dilemma with economic development assistance is the sustainability of foreign aid in post-agreement situations (NICRC 2008). While “in the immediate postconflict period international publicity and goodwill is considerable, and so donors are keen to be seen as involved”, the gradual decline in aid and assistance follows within several years (Collier et al. 2003, 158). Short-term economic assistance towards rebuilding infrastructure or establishing cross-community projects may ease the strain on local economies and assist communities in transcending the hardships of post-agreement development. However, short-term programs will struggle to address the issues of chronic poverty, generational unemployment, and human suffering caused by the legacy of sectarianism and violence. Moreover, while external aid is critical for providing assistance and

resources in post-agreement contexts, the long-term sustainability of peace and the capacity for growth “hinges primarily on the ability of post-conflict societies to develop institutions for the delivery of public goods” (Elbadawi 2008, 5).

Foreign aid can assist social development and peacebuilding through funding cross-community cooperation projects which encourage building relationships, trust-building, as well as promoting participatory democracy (McCall & O’Dowd 2008). As Jeong (2005, 139) notes, “the participation of local populations in rebuilding their communities gives them a sense of regaining control over their own lives”. The involvement of voluntary and community organizations in building peace and reconciliation is significant as it encourages “a culture of cooperation / ... / and a focus on positive-sum or mutual benefit outcomes” (O’Dowd & McCall 2008, 97).

The significance of civil society’s peacebuilding initiatives has to be acknowledged, while an integrative framework and vision is needed for directing individual efforts towards overcoming sectarianism and promoting the integration of society. External support for transformative processes can encourage communities to address the legacy of the past and to transform the conflict. In particular, according to Buchanan (2008, 390), “in viewing conflict principally as the result of unequal and oppressive political and social structures, conflict transformation seeks constructive and sustainable social change”. Bringing about such change is a complicated process which requires commitment, determination and the strong will of local communities, their government, and the international community. While the international community has the resources which can be invested towards conflict transformation in NI, a clearer and integrative framework for foreign economic assistance funding delivery would increase the effectiveness of such initiatives.

Peacebuilding projects aimed at the reduction of human suffering and the legacy of sectarianism are difficult to evaluate due to their expansive scope and intangible outcomes. While evaluation commonly serves as a guide to improvement, it is also significant in seeking objectivity, identifying and acknowledging the limits for the work performed, for forming appropriate and important questions, and the drawing of conclusions (Weiss 2004). Furthermore, evaluation theories and practices are dynamic and are constantly being tested and adjusted to reflect new developments, contexts, and perspectives (Preskill 2004, 344-345). Thus, evaluation design is constantly changing to reflect current requirements and to address the deep roots of conflict and the legacy of violence (Paffenholz & Rychler 2007, 8).

100 In Northern Ireland, evaluation of the impact of the Peace funds and the IFI has ended in mixed results. Local social partnership models were created including intermediary funding bodies (IFBs) such as the Community Foundation of Northern Ireland (CFNI) as well as a new delivery structure, the Special EU Programmes Body (SEUP) (European Union 2008). Independent monitoring and assessment by the EU Court of Auditors (2000, 11-12) found that the IFI's evaluation of project applications and post-grant monitoring of projects did not "ensure sound financial management in all cases".

4.1. Contribution of Monetary Aid to Economic and Human Development

One of the stated goals of both the Peace II and IFI funds has been the support for economic revival and development in NI and the Border Counties (International Fund for Ireland n.d.a, 6; European Commission n.d., 31). Economic revival is perceived as a basis for further development and the strengthening of communities that were in the past divided by sectarianism and violence. The contribution of Peace II and IFI to reviving local economies and encouraging cross-community cooperation through investing in infrastructure, trade, business operations, and in creating employment opportunities is significant. The respondents were often able to identify specific achievements in these areas at the local level (including road construction, housing, job training, providing training in specific skills, as well as new employment opportunities), but had difficulty assessing their overall impact on peacebuilding and reconciliation. A community leader from County Monaghan discussed the impact of peace funding in the following way:

I still believe that the EU funding and the IFI have contributed enormously to improving the quality of life, the quality of infrastructure. I am talking about housing, roads and all the basic infrastructure, because there was a huge deficit at the level of basic infrastructure in the south particularly, and there was need for massive investment. (Respondent A).

The Peace II and IFI funds are perceived as improving the general standard of living and addressing the problems of economic deprivation and poverty in Unionist and Nationalist communities by investing in infrastructure, assisting community centers, and creating employment opportunities for participants. A community leader from Derry elaborated on this issue as follows:

Look at the number of people, regardless of what impact a project has in itself, the number of people that are employed on Peace funded projects. It is a significant cash injection into community despite what it said about the application process. The Peace funds, I do

think, have been fairly democratic in that people in all areas, and particularly in deprived areas, have been able to access Peace funded projects and work on Peace funded projects. So in terms of an economic boost, I think that definitely yes, in that sort of confidence-building notion of giving people the experience of working on projects (Respondent B).

Overall, many respondents identified various aspects of positive economic development made possible by the financial contributions of the IFI and Peace II funds. Other respondents, however, expressed doubt that economic aid which assists businesses and develops infrastructure actually contributes to building peaceful relations across NI's divided communities.

In terms of human development, the Peace II and IFI funds are aimed at contributing to social inclusion, integration, and reconciliation, addressing the local needs of communities, and encouraging dialogue and cross-border cooperation (IFI n.d.a, 6; European Commission n.d, 31-32). The respondents identified a number of ways that the funds have promoted and encouraged human development across communities in both NI and the Border region. These included community development, capacity building, empowerment, building confidence, and helping to cope with the legacy of violent protracted conflict. While the projects aimed at encouraging human development and community building may have had a strong impact on addressing the long-term divisions between the Unionist and Nationalist communities, the results of such projects are often difficult to quantify and evaluate in the short-term. However, it is crucial to recognize the significance of these projects in the overall framework of peacebuilding efforts.

In terms of capacity building and of assisting community members to acquire new economic skills and qualifications, the Peace II funded projects have contributed to both the economic and human development of members of the Unionist and Nationalist communities. There is an important link between personal growth and empowerment on the one hand and economic recovery and revival on the other hand. Moreover, the social interaction and dialogue encouraged between both communities through the process of establishing cross-community cooperation provides a connection between economic, social and personal capacity building processes. A comment of a community leader from County Fermanagh illustrated this connection:

Some training programmes, of which we have a very good one for cross border lines persons /.../. So we put those together and young unemployed people equally from each sides of the community and equally north and south of the border, train them in teams of ten. They were all promised jobs before they started their training, so if you like there was a goal there, the goal of the EU money was to get people to interact with each other, the goal we had was

to train young people for jobs that existed out there. So those two things worked very well together and there were very positive end results from it (Respondent W).

The projects that assist community members in gaining skills and qualifications enhance their employability and encourage them to get involved in economic activities which contribute to the growth of their communities. These programs are especially significant for former prisoners as well as the victims of violence. A community leader from Belfast, for example, reflected on the importance of personal capacity building as an indicator of success in evaluating funded peace projects:

I think it's fair to say that we have done very well, and our projects, have done very well in getting qualifications. One of the measures that we use, for success alone is by no means the only measure, is the qualification. Even with what qualifications people have got. So you might have, maybe, one person with in some cases two qualifications. So there's a couple of thousand people and more who have got their first qualification ever possibly through the availability of the peace programme, and I think it's a very important contribution to economic development (Respondent F).

Empowering local communities and assisting people in identifying their needs as well as locating available resources is a significant part of human development initiatives. An important observation was voiced by one community group leader from County Cavan: "You couldn't know the needs of the people unless you ask the people themselves" (Respondent K). This reveals a larger general problem associated with the external funding of local projects aimed at promoting peaceful relations and reconciliation between conflicting communities. The funding often supports projects designed outside of the communities and with little knowledge of local conditions, needs, interests, and capacity.

Assisting local communities by providing them with information about existing funding opportunities is also a necessary, but often overlooked, task. A community group leader from County Monaghan shared his concern about the lack of guidance and support for funding applications:

People didn't take up the funding for the reasons that they weren't at all prepared or enabled to take up the funding, because they had never been used to funding of that scale. They had never even been helped to identify what their needs were because the climate that I grew up in, and the climate that most of my people and my family and everybody else grew up in, there was nothing there. So there was no point in talking about funding and the expectation that was ground into us that if it was there this year it would not be there next year. So there was no trust, whatever, in any of the funding agencies or often in the funding personnel (Respondent A).

A number of community building initiatives were identified by the respondents as crucial in addressing hopelessness within marginalized communities including ex-prisoners and victims of conflict. Some respondents emphasized that there is a need for a better balance between addressing the social and economic needs of the communities. A community leader from Belfast pointed out that while the investments in infrastructure are considerable, “there’s very little investment in people” (Respondent O).

One of the important contributions of funded peace projects is to assist the participants in building personal confidence, as well as taking responsibility and control within their sphere of influence. A community leader from Belfast highlighted this issue in her response:

And also, the confidence /.../. Now people are more able to write, and the other thing that they have is a bit more confidence to be able to say it, and it doesn’t really matter that I have spelt that word wrong. Whereas when you’re in school or you’re in formal education you don’t have the confidence to say because the teacher’s right and you would have been marked down as wrong. It’s hard to measure that confidence building. It’s a very important player in economic development too because you’re not going to be able to think about going for a particular job, choosing a career, unless you have the confidence to actually see yourself doing that (Respondent F).

Her quote illustrates the difficulty in evaluating and assessing the results of many human development projects aimed at helping community members build relationships, engage in cross-community dialogue, and contribute to capacity building and empowerment.

Funded project personnel have accumulated knowledge and experience in peacebuilding and development initiatives that can be used throughout NI, the Border region, and other conflict-affected contexts around the world. Funding monies have contributed to the creation of a new expertise and the establishment of proven peacebuilding intervention models. A community leader from Belfast developed this point further:

What we have learned here is readily exportable to other areas / ... /. We’ve had to do a lot of work in learning what it means in those areas and the benefit for us has been threefold: its been money, we have been able to pay for work, we have been able to do good work, and that’s good in itself, our people have been able to learn about how to transfer knowledge, for a new context, about what it means to live in a racially divided society (Respondent E).

104 4.2. Addressing the Legacy of Sectarianism

The legacy of sectarianism is still visible in many areas of life in Northern Irish society including politics, education, religion and in everyday interactions (Hughes et al. 2008). In their interviews, community leaders revealed a number of important points concerning the role of external funding in addressing the legacy of sectarianism in NI and along the Border region.

While IFI and Peace II funding encourages the Unionist and Nationalist communities to come together and engage in dialogue, interaction, and cross-community cooperation, political and social division is still predominant in everyday life. One example of separation within Northern Irish society was provided by a community leader from Derry. She had this to say on the issue:

I know there is still a feeling that Catholics within the civil service don't get to a certain level, but you will find that a lot of the senior posts, if you do an analysis of all the senior civil servants, they will be all still Protestant. And even thirty years ago before the Troubles, me sitting here as a Catholic would not have happened. When I joined here in 1984, the Principal was Protestant and the two vice-Principals were Protestant, and all the heads of Department were Protestant, there were no Catholics in senior posts. And that's with Derry being majority Catholic (Respondent C).

Several respondents expressed concern that the application process and the distribution of funding reflected sectarian traditions to a certain degree. For example, a community leader from Derry referred to "the equal 50/50 funding" in the following context:

You have a community in the town which is made up of maximum three hundred people, men, women, and children, and you have a community in this area which is in the region of three thousand five hundred people. But if this community gets five hundred pounds, then this community gets five hundred pounds, now I think that is grossly unfair. I think funding should be distributed and based on need and I think that sort of, because you are a Protestant you get 500, because you are a Catholic you get 500 / ... / and visa versa. That can create a new kind of sectarian text (Respondent U).

Other participants worried that by distributing funds between the Unionist and Nationalist communities, the members of both communities might become increasingly aware that they are indeed separated. In the words of a community leader from County Monaghan: "In some sense it reinforces people's identity / ... / whether that is a good thing or a bad thing" (Respondent N). Another community leader from County Leitrim developed this point further having stated that the funds have occasionally reinforced sectarianism "because they are making labels" (Respondent T). The concern about labelling people through

funding distribution was also expressed in the comment of a community leader from County Cavan:

If you go to something that is involved in peace / ... / you have to nearly specify you are Catholic. I mean there is sheets you have to specify how many Protestants and how many Catholics are on that / ... / . If that is peace building or is actually highlighting the differences I just don't know, that is one of the questions I would wonder about. Some of the stuff and I don't know who draws up this, I wonder if they have really been developed by people who have lived in the areas or went through some of the stuff (Respondent P).

Despite the efforts of funding agencies to encourage cross-community dialogue and interaction and to promote reconciliation, the respondents noted the strong polarization within society which continues to be divisive in political, social, and economic life. While many communities no longer experience direct hostility or violence, the separation in everyday life is evident. A community leader from County Cavan elaborated as follows:

I think it is that people just live separate lives, if you are a Protestant you go to your Protestant church, you go to your activity that you organise. Catholics stay in their Catholic schools, they go to their church, they have their own sports their Gaelic or whatever. I think it has always been that separation, and even in terms of relationships or marriage I still don't believe it's acceptable for cross religion marriages. I don't think it is something that would be encouraged (Respondent J).

Another community leader from County Cavan emphasized the influence of parents who have experienced conflict on their children's attitudes towards the communal division:

You have chaps from down here who possibly have never set foot in the North in their life and probably have never gone further north than Enniskillen, and they are carrying this legacy of conflict in their mind and you are going, but you have never experienced conflict, your parents have experienced conflict, you have adopted somebody else's experience of conflict and you have taken it into yourself for whatever reason and then you are running with it (Respondent D).

A number of perceptions regarding the ability of funding to address the legacy of conflict were depicted in the interviews. Some progress was noted in bringing rival communities together and encouraging interaction through establishing cross-community projects and local peacebuilding initiatives. These projects facilitated increasing communication, interaction and understanding between Protestant and Catholic communities. Empowerment of members of both communities through building capacity, providing skills training, addressing the issues of poverty and hopelessness, and assistance in fulfilling their basic needs has also led to opening up opportunities for addressing the deeper issues of

106 sectarian legacy and protracted conflict in Northern Ireland. Cross-community initiatives have created space for dialogue and healing. At the same time concerns were raised among respondents with regards to the degree of success of these initiatives in addressing the root causes of the conflict and the underlying issues of division within NI and the Border area.

4.3. Peace Projects: Towards the Reduction of Human Suffering

Another important theme discussed by the respondents from various angles was the contribution of economic aid towards developing peace projects aimed at the reduction of human suffering experienced by the members of both communities. The community leaders referred to different sources of conflict causing suffering and hardships in both communities, including poverty, economic deprivation, unemployment, violence, fear, marginalization, alienation, social exclusion, and isolation. For example, a community leader from Belfast shared his perception of human suffering in terms of transgenerational unemployment and deprivation as follows:

Grandfathers, fathers, sons have no employment, through various reasons, and the conflict being one of them. Looking at it we can then impact and stop that generational underachievement by getting people skills to help their children. It's not ideal, and we never set out that everybody should get a job at the end of it because they have a long way to go. We are talking about people who are at the margins of the margins (Respondent I).

The legacy of violence, racism, and fear, as well as the existing tensions between Unionists and Nationalists causes suffering in local populations. Human suffering is difficult to measure or estimate, but providing concrete examples of activities and initiatives that have contributed to alleviating suffering may be useful in the analysis of the effectiveness of peace projects. For example, a community leader from Belfast talked about the positive changes that he has experienced and witnessed in relation to the reduction of violence and fear within the city of Belfast and the surrounding communities:

Yes, it has [reduced human suffering], particularly when you look around and there is not the same level of bombing and shooting and people are coming together and people are working together /.../. Working in town, I have seen the damage of bombs, the damage done in terms of people, and their fears of going into town, fear about their children going into town, and also the whole thing about security gates you had to go through and be searched, all of that is gone. Young people are able to go out much more into the city. I remember at one stage if I was going out on the weekend I would go to a hotel out in the country rather than go into the city of Belfast. That has all changed and some of the people of my age who have been through that can now see clearly the difference (Respondent G).

While the peace funding has created some opportunity for dialogue and cross-community trust building activities, some respondents also noted that the funding has once again reminded people of existing divisions between the Unionist and Nationalist communities. A community leader from Derry shared the following insight:

I think they have also reminded us that there are community tensions, community differences, and separateness. So in a way I think, yes, they have improved the quality of life and reduced suffering. Yes, they have also re-entrenched the notion that we live in separate communities. There is a sense of apartheid, certainly even in this city, which probably isn't as pronounced as it would be in the likes of Belfast for example (Respondent H).

The issues of equality and justice, according to a community leader from Belfast, "lie at the heart of the conflict", and at the same time "lie at the heart of all peacebuilding" (Respondent L). The funding has offered a way to address inequality, hopelessness, and marginalization by providing resources, employment opportunities, and a chance to meet and get to know people from other communities. Moreover, as noted by another community leader from Belfast, the funds have contributed to easing the suffering "by supporting the key people who / ... / are able to articulate at their own level a vision of an inclusive society and imagine the idea of being together in a post-conflict Ireland" (Respondent M). Concerns were also expressed by some respondents who were sceptical about the possibility of reducing genuine suffering through funding assistance and also about the mechanism for measuring suffering and its reduction. In addition, a community group leader from County Cavan discussed the problem of human suffering that may not be evident at a first glance, but yet exists in forms of hidden suffering:

I suppose I would see in these southern Border counties anyway, and even in the likes of Fermanagh or whatever I don't think you see the same level of suffering or violence or hatred that you would see in the likes of Belfast or Derry, but I think it is still there. I think it is more hidden and it is harder to get at. It is easier to get people who are throwing stones at each other out in the street, than to get this more hidden kind of hatred that definitely does exist (Respondent J).

Overall, the respondents revealed that the human suffering of members of both Unionist and Nationalist communities in NI and in the Border region takes many forms and reflect the existing legacy of sectarianism, marginalization, poverty, and social exclusion within both communities.

108 4.4. Creativity in Peacebuilding

There is no universal set of tools or methods to be used for building peace in societies affected by protracted conflict. While some of the more commonly used strategies include the provision of foreign economic aid to assist in post-agreement economic development, there is also a wide range of peacebuilding opportunities which often lie outside the conventional framework of economic aid. The funded projects that contribute to cross-community interaction and building relationships through dialogue, music, art, storytelling or sports are only a few of the examples of interventions that, in some cases, may be more effective in addressing the legacy of sectarianism and in promoting reconciliation among both communities.

Storytelling projects, according to a community leader from Derry, can be a “very powerful mechanism [which] has a potential for healing way beyond any other process that we know” (Respondent S). He referred to the work of Dan Bar-On who brought together family members of Holocaust survivors and the family members of Nazi perpetrators in Berlin to talk about the past through sharing their stories, and explained how Dr. Bar-On’s storytelling model was adopted in Northern Ireland:

We have run that for several years now, [the project] in which people are sitting and listening to each other’s story with respect /.../ you don’t make any insistence on reconciliation or forgiveness or any of that stuff. There is the basic ground rule of listening to each other with respect /.../ and it’s an extraordinary process of healing, absolutely extraordinary, and most recently we have people forming groups, from policemen, disabled police officers, paramilitaries, victims to survivors, all sorts of people /.../ That’s one of the projects we didn’t get continuation for, because, do you know why, because it isn’t cost effective, didn’t get the number through. So you can see how this relates directly back to my earlier frustration. There is the clearest example of where I think funders do not know what they are doing at times (Respondent S).

Music therapy is another creative and fun way to address the difficult problems associated with social isolation and marginalization. For example, a community leader from Belfast shared her experience and vision in easing tension through music:

It’s a fun activity for most children. Particularly when you have adolescents, music is such a vital part of who you are, how you wish to express, how you are feeling. We all use music in that way, to comfort us or to lift us. And most of those types of skills are to appreciate the music around when you are either a child or an adolescent, otherwise people never get to grips with music and their lives. So from that point of view, yes, it’s been a big move to alleviating suffering at that level /.../ Music therapy is not widely recognised /.../ it’s largely charitably provided,

so for an organisation like ourselves to break through into that type of funding scenario and be recognised as one of the therapeutic interventions that can actually help reduce feelings of frustrations or isolation or inappropriate behaviour or whatever in young children and therefore, to help manage that in some way, to me has to be a recognition (Respondent R).

Another intervention supported by the EU and IFI funding assisted members of both Unionist and Nationalist communities to face the legacy of the past through photography. A community group leader from County Cavan shared the following in his story:

We have had a new county library in Cavan town / ... / and one room in it is worth visiting, it is a photographic exhibition from the Troubles. It is absolutely cross-community. So it is on the one hand, a photograph telling you to get rid of or slay all the Unionists and on the other side then shoot all the Shinners, the Sinn Fein. So you have all types of depictions, and it is fantastic. It was the one room on the day of the opening that everybody wanted to visit, and I would say most people did visit before they left. That is creating this understanding of both sides of the traditions and somebody coming to look at this and saying there were rights and wrongs on both sides (Respondent Q).

These examples reveal the potential for creative peacebuilding initiatives to provide a unique opportunity for members of both communities – women, men, children, younger generation and senior citizens – to meet, to learn about each other, to hear the stories of each other, and start the journey of healing through stories, music, and learning from historical photographs. These initiatives do not require substantial resources or significant economic investments. However, they do require commitment, the willingness to participate and learn, and the desire to make an effort towards reconciliation and healing through sharing experience, knowledge, and perceptions of the conflict, as well as developing a shared vision for the future.

5. Discussion: Economic Aid and Conflict Transformation

The goal of the IFI's Community Bridges Programme is to tackle the underlying structural roots of conflict that promote sectarianism and violence, and to build reconciliation between both communities on the island. Peace I sought to integrate the unemployed in regions suffering from chronic long-term unemployment, Peace II focused on economic development, and Peace III has supported local residents, volunteers and community groups in their peacebuilding and reconciliation work with polarized communities. The aim of both funders is to encourage economic renewal, cross-border cooperation, social

110 integration to encourage a peaceful and stable society and promote reconciliation in the region. While the programs are relatively successful the competitive nature of the funding has in some cases promoted competition between both communities and encouraged single identity projects (Byrne & Irvin 2002). Consequently, the IFI and Peace II funds have contributed to the peacebuilding process in NI and the Border region in terms of economic, social, and human development. The economic and social impact of external funding included, but was not limited to, the development of infrastructure, the creation of job opportunities, the encouragement of community development, and assistance for cross-community contact and cooperation. In terms of human development the EU Peace II fund and IFI contributed to capacity building, empowerment, and building confidence among the members of the Unionist and Nationalist communities. In this context the significance of peacebuilding projects was reflected both through their economic development assistance component and through their contribution to reconciliation and conflict transformation. A number of projects focused primarily on economic development and addressed unemployment. However as the projects progressed, cross-community cooperation in the framework of many of them also contributed to mutual dialogue, interaction and relationship-building which has a potential to help build trust that is one of the critical initial steps for working towards reconciliation. Therefore, both the economic development component and the reconciliation component can be considered as complementary rather than competitive elements of these peacebuilding initiatives.

Many respondents stressed the need to focus on the issues of reconciliation and relationship-building among Protestant and Catholic communities within the peacebuilding efforts in Northern Ireland. In this context external financial assistance has the potential not only to contribute to economic development of communities but also to focus their efforts on deeper roots of conflict by helping to bring about reconciliation among community members. The present emphasis of Peace III (Special EU Programmes Body n.d.) on reconciliation and promoting cohesion between communities in Northern Ireland is a promising tendency within the peacebuilding and reconciliation process in Northern Ireland.

While the economic and social impacts of the funding may be more tangible and measurable, the human development component is often intangible and requires special mechanisms to be recognized and assessed. At the same time, economic, social, and human development initiatives are closely linked together in the efforts to build peace, and, perhaps, should be assessed as one holistic component. For example, acquiring skills and qualifications in

the framework of a cross-community training project incorporates all three dimensions of development: individual human growth, social interaction, and building up economic capacity. In particular, cross-border training programs in various fields, from computer skills workshops, to childcare provider classes, to tourism operator and guides training, etc., have contributed not only to participants' personal skills development and increased their employability, but also empowered them by providing the space for networking and building relationships by learning together with the members of the other communities, both Protestant and Catholic. This is reflected in the comment of a community leader from County Cavan: "People come together particularly in rural tourism, they develop linkages thereafter training programmes, and a lot of time would be put into social networking, and become familiar with other providers. The idea that they can do better if they work better together, that develops relationships through business linkages" (Respondent V).

Concerns with project evaluation and the assessment of funding results and success were voiced by a number of community leaders and project administrators. Several specific flaws in the funding process were also identified by the respondents. For example, a number of participants from both Catholic and Protestant communities talked about unfair money distribution process – i.e., allocating funds based on the size of communities and the amount of already available infrastructure, as opposed to doing so according to the needs of communities. The issue of insufficient knowledge of local circumstances and community needs by the funding agencies was also raised. Furthermore, it was noted that little or no work has been done to prepare communities for the application process and to assist them to go through the required bureaucratic procedures; sometimes the deserving communities simply didn't know they were eligible to apply for funds. A concern about sustainability of funding and the long-term commitment to supporting local and cross-community initiatives was also voiced.

At the same time, the means of evaluating the extent to which the projects achieved reconciliation or contributed to peacebuilding presented a challenge to many respondents. Further, it was often easier to assess the results of economic development projects (tangible outcomes), as opposed to projects aimed at human development, community building, or reducing human suffering (intangible outcomes). According to the report on monitoring and evaluation of peacebuilding activities prepared for the Special EU Programmes Body (SEUPS), "developing indicators and measuring outcomes can be considered a common problem across peacebuilding and reconciliation interventions" (PricewaterhouseCoopers 2007, vi). A lack of a clear integrative framework for

112 evaluating various components of the peacebuilding process was also noted by several respondents. Developing this point further, Buchanan (2008, 388) writes that “one of the major weaknesses of the Peace programmes is that there has been no comprehensive evaluation of their performance from the outset, stemming in part from the absence of single overarching government policy statements (Irish or British) relating to conflict transformation policy and practice”. One of the efforts to address this issue was the task given by the SEUPS to PricewaterhouseCoopers to research and develop a generic monitoring and evaluation framework for interventions aimed at conflict resolution, reconciliation, and peace-building (PricewaterhouseCoopers 2007).

Lederach (1997, 130-132) outlines three dilemmas in peacebuilding funding and evaluation, which are relevant to assessing the impacts of projects funded by the IFI and Peace II fund. First, the project dilemma reveals the contradiction between projects as concrete measurable units on the one hand and a deep-rooted process of building peace, relationships, and trust on the other hand. Second, the time dilemma recognizes that projects are time-bound versus lengthy, complex, and dynamic processes. Third, the reporting dilemma addresses the need to find the balance between sensitive, delicate, and often confidential projects versus the need for transparency and accountability in reporting. Theory-driven evaluation suggests the construction of a comprehensive program which directs the evaluation process (Weiss 2004; Chen 2004). To this end, Wilmot and Hocker (2007, 83) propose an evaluation strategy based on identifying prospective, transactive, and retrospective goals in the conflict transformation process; these goals change as conflict evolves and as more knowledge and information is accumulated.

The complexity in the evaluation of economic aid initiatives may cause the untimely termination of important projects that could have a strong but not clearly evident potential in contributing to the resolution of conflict and in establishing peace. It is also important to develop best practices and proven models in order to design more effective and efficient approaches to conflict resolution processes which might be modified and exported to suit the needs of other cross-cultural contexts.

When assessing the contribution of funded projects to human development and economic growth in NI and the Border Counties, many of the respondents shared that the key difficulties were associated with quantifying results and achievements, the long-term requirement for achieving sustainable results, and the inability to recognize the small but crucial steps that the project participants made towards peace and reconciliation. The research on a variety of evaluation

strategies and techniques for monitoring peacebuilding projects conducted within the framework of SEUPS has resulted in a recommendation to use the so-called Aid for Peace approach to evaluation and monitoring (PricewaterhouseCoopers 2007, xvi). The Aid for Peace approach is based on assessing the needs for peacebuilding and then designing the intervention according to these needs. The four main stages of this approach include peacebuilding needs analysis, peacebuilding relevance assessment, conflict risk assessment, as well as peace and conflict effects assessment (*ibid.*, x-xi).

The IFI and EU Peace II fund have also contributed to creating an exportable model of peacebuilding intervention that involves grassroots initiatives by members of both Unionist and Nationalist communities, as well as cross-community interaction. Referring to the EU Special Support Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in NI, Racioppi and O'Sullivan See (2007, 383) also note that the development of partnerships between elected officials, representatives of trade unions, business, agriculture, and other community members, has been a "pioneering approach to broadening input into decision-making processes", and that the funding has encouraged widespread grassroots participation in peacebuilding. Other development and aid programs will also benefit from a wider dissemination of evidence and evaluation results from previously delivered funded projects, since sharing accumulated knowledge can increase the effectiveness of future initiatives (Killick 2004, 26).

The problem of the legacy of sectarianism was discussed by many community leaders, who emphasized the need to address the root causes of the division between Unionist and Nationalist communities, which are still reflected in the everyday separation of civil activities. However, according to several community leaders, the funding process has also contributed to labeling and reinforcing identity divisions. While the peace funding has encouraged cross-community dialogue and interaction, it has made people more aware of the fact that they are indeed on one or the other side in the conflict. According to Anderson (1999, 69), "international assistance can make conflict worse in two ways: it can feed intergroup tensions and weaken intergroup connections. When aid has either of these impacts, it inadvertently exacerbates conflict."

The tensions over the agendas of justice and equality on the one hand and the politics of cultural and identity recognition on the other hand were discussed by the respondents in their comments regarding the structure and the process of peacebuilding in Northern Ireland. These tensions are also reflected in the debate by Fraser and Honneth (2003) on the significance and the dilemma of the politics of recognition vs. the politics of redistribution: while these two political

114 approaches often contradict each other, the concepts of cultural recognition and economic redistribution are both significant and are interrelated. In particular in the context of justice, Fraser (2008, 404) writes that “justice is better viewed as a multidimensional concept that encompasses the three dimensions of redistribution, recognition and representation”. This conceptualization of justice, and injustice, is further advanced by the necessity to include a political dimension, and specifically the power of the state, in the analysis (Feldman 2002). It is important to consider these issues in the framework of designing and funding peacebuilding initiatives.

The interviews revealed some differences in the ways Catholic and Protestant respondents perceived the process of funding distribution for peacebuilding projects across Northern Ireland and the Border region. In particular, both groups expressed concern regarding the fairness of some aspects of the funding process and a number of respondents claimed that the other group or community has received more funds or received funds faster or easier. A number of Catholic respondents blamed this on Protestant political and civil service leadership. Several Protestant respondents shared that the possible reason is in the fact that Catholics were more organized in applying for funding, while Protestants are generally more independent and in the words of a community leader from County Cavan tend to be “reluctant to seek outside aid and funding and support” (Respondent P).

Further variations included perceptions about purely economic and softer types of peacebuilding projects: generally the respondents saw more visible immediate effect of peace funding on economic and infrastructure development rather than in the area of cross-border relationship building and reconciliation. It was noted that the contributions of softer projects to peacebuilding were harder to point out and estimate. In addition to that, variations expressed by respondents in the Border areas and in the North indicated that generally the levels of violence and the intensity of conflict were perceived to be higher in Belfast and Derry than in the Border area.

The protracted conflict in NI has led to human suffering through social exclusion, alienation, estrangement, poverty, unemployment, despair, mistrust, marginalization, as well as the legacy of violence and fear. Furthermore, according to Racioppi and O’Sullivan See (2007, 384), “despite a significant reduction in major political violence such as bombings and assassinations, neighborhoods, particularly in ethnic interface areas, continue to be unsafe, with knee-cappings, beatings, and drug-related violence running high”. The conflict has caused significant suffering for innocent civilians. Jeong (2005, 160) points out that

“atrocities of violent conflict are mostly inflicted upon civilians, many of whom are females and children / ... / as these civilian victims suffer great mental distress and lose their capacity for social trust, rehabilitation is necessary to reintegrate them back into their communities”. Reconciliation between former combatants and the victims and survivors of violent conflict is encouraged through arranging opportunities for interaction, dialogue, and collaboration (De Vries & De Paor 2005). However, “both the political and social marginalization of former combatants is problematic to the implementation of peace processes” (Mitchell 2008, 16). Funding cross-community cooperation provides a space for dialogue which can lead to the healing of both communities.

It is also important to deal with the so-called hidden suffering, which is especially complex and difficult to recognize and address. Hidden suffering refers to pain and misery of individuals and communities in Northern Ireland which was caused by the protracted conflict but which is not generally talked about; often it cannot be easily identified or named and sometimes it is openly denied. For example, these are the feelings of fear, hopelessness, hatred, and isolation that are hidden deep inside people’s hearts. As a community leader from County Cavan noted, “it is easier to get people who are throwing stones at each other in the street, than to get this more hidden kind of hatred that definitely does exist” (Respondent J). The work of Galtung (1996, 2) on structural (indirect) violence which takes the form of deprivation of material and non-material human needs, denial of human freedoms and alienation that is built into social, economic and political structures provides the framework for understanding and addressing the hidden suffering of individuals and communities.

Over the past decades considerable knowledge of practice on external economic assistance to countries and regions affected by protracted conflict and violence has been accumulated, but it may be argued that best practices standards in this field are still under construction. The contribution of this research to developing best practices in external economic assistance to peacebuilding initiatives has been three-fold. First, it showed the significance of supporting both local economic and human development cross-community projects. The importance of developing infrastructure along with investing in capacity-building, community development and empowerment through learning new skills and promoting personal growth was emphasized. Facilitating interaction and cooperation at the grassroots level can lead to building relationships, trust and more understanding between conflicting groups through sharing their views on conflict, learning from each other’s stories and interacting on every day matters (Byrne et al. 2009). This, in turn, can open up space for addressing the deep rooted sectarian division in Northern Irish society.

116 Second, the issues and problems arising from the evaluation of the process of funding peacebuilding initiatives discussed in the paper highlight both the complexity and the importance of a comprehensive evaluation of these activities. Specifically, such aspects as the relevance of the project to addressing the needs of a particular group or community, developing criteria for assessing both tangible and intangible outcomes of peacebuilding projects, and recognition of small but crucial contributions of local initiatives need to be reflected in the evaluation process.

Finally, creativity in designing community projects and initiatives is identified as one of the significant factors in the post-accord peacebuilding process. Creativity in peacebuilding can be incorporated and expressed in diverse ways. For example, participants described innovative approaches to building peace (e.g. art, music, theater), gave existing approaches a creative twist (e.g. narrative mediation),⁵ or combined different approaches and applied them across community divisions (e.g. police diversity training initiatives). Galtung (2004, 160) emphasizes the values of creativity, empathy, and non-violence in working towards conflict transformation. There is a need for recognition and the support of creativity in conflict resolution and post-agreement peacebuilding interventions (Senehi 2009a). By using available funding creatively, it may be possible to not only cut the costs of interventions, but more importantly, to provide alternative tools and resources for reconciliation and the promotion of cross-community contact and dialogue. For example, both communities can tell their stories through art, voice, and music, which may assist communities in accepting that “there were rights and wrongs on both sides”, and to move towards seeking processes and strategies of reconciliation and develop a joint vision for a common future (Ryan 2007, 138; Senehi 2009b).

6. Conclusion

Building the peace dividend in a country affected by protracted conflict is a task that is difficult to design, carry out, and evaluate, because so many aspects of the conflict are crucial and often intangible. It is important to nurture economic development and growth at both the national and local levels, as well as encourage and support human development and social interaction. Building relationships and trust amongst people is central to reconciliation and peacebuilding. However, the effectiveness of these processes depends on a number of interconnected aspects. These include a comprehensive intervention design conducted in partnership with local communities, national and local

governments, as well as peace researchers and practitioners who have knowledge, experience and understanding of the needs, priorities, and goals of local communities. There is also a need to create an integrative process to analyze and evaluate the role of external funding in peacebuilding and development. Such a process would be based on the assessment of the needs of local communities and available resources, the incorporation of the creativity, and leaving space for adjustments and improvements in the process of conflict transformation.

117

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Jessica Senehi, Tom Boudreau, Hamdesa Tuso, and the anonymous reviewers from *Treatises and Documents, The Journal of Ethnic Studies* for reading various drafts of this paper. This research project is supported by a research grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).

118 Notes

¹ See also Lederach (2003).

² The term 'Troubles' refers to the period of a violent ethno-political conflict between Protestant unionist and Catholic nationalist communities in Northern Ireland generally dated 1960s-1998. For a detailed review and analysis of the Troubles see Coogan (1996), Bew & Gillespie (1999).

³ The term 'Taoiseach' refers to the head of government or the Prime Minister of Ireland.

⁴ For discussion of grassroots peacebuilding initiatives in Northern Ireland see Byrne (2001), Hughes & Knox (1997).

⁵ For discussion of the method of narrative mediation see Winslade & Monk (2000).

References

119

Addison, T., Chowdhury, A. & Murshed, M., 2005. Financing Reconstruction. In G. Junne & W. Verkoren (eds.) *Postconflict Development: Meeting New Challenges*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, 211-222.

Anderson, M., 1999. *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace – Or War*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, London.

Arthur, P., 2001. *Special Relationships: Britain, Ireland and the Northern Ireland Problem*. Blackstaff Press, Belfast.

Bew, P. & Gillespie, G., 1999. *Northern Ireland: A Chronology of the Troubles 1968-1999*. The Scarecrow Press, Inc., Lanham.

Bew, P. & Patterson, H., 1985. *The British State and the Ulster Crisis: From Wilson to Thatcher*. Verso, London.

Bew, P., Patterson, H. & Gibbon, P., 2002. *Northern Ireland, 1921-2001: Political Forces and Social Classes*. Interlink Publishing Group, Northampton.

Buchanan, S., 2008. Transforming Conflict in Northern Ireland and the Border Counties: Some Lessons from the Peace Programmes on Valuing Participative Democracy. *Irish Political Studies* 23(3), 387-409.

Burrows, R., 1996. *The Strategy of Nonviolent Defence: A Gandhian Approach*. State University of New York Press, Albany.

Byrne, S., 2001. Consociational and Civic Society Approaches to Peace Building in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Peace Research* 38(3), 327-352.

Byrne, S., 2009. *Economic Assistance and the Northern Ireland Conflict: Building the Peace Dividend*. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, Madison.

Byrne, S. & Irvin, C., 2002. A Shared Common Sense: Perception of the Material Effects and Impacts of Economic Growth in Northern Ireland. *Civil Wars* 5(1), 55-86.

Byrne, S., Skarlato, O., Fissuh, E. & Irvin, C., 2009. Building Trust and Goodwill in Northern Ireland and the Border Counties: The Impact of Economic Aid on

120 the Peace Process. *Irish Political Studies* 24(3), 337-363.

Byrne, S., Thiessen, C., Fissuh, E., Irvin, C. & Hawranik, M., 2008. Economic Assistance, Development, and Peacebuilding: The Role of the IFI and EU Peace II Fund in Northern Ireland. *Civil Wars* 10(2), 108-126.

Chen, H-T., 2004. The Roots of Theory-Driven Evaluation: Current Views and Origins. In M. Alkin (ed.) *Evaluation Roots*. SAGE Publications, London, 132-152.

Collier, P., 2001. Economic Causes of Civil Conflict and Their Implications for Policy. In C. Crocker, F. O. Hampson & P. Aall (eds.) *Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict*. United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington, D.C., 143-162.

Collier, P., 2007. *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Collier, P., 2008. Postconflict Economic Policy. In C. Call & V. Wyeth (eds.) *Building States to Build Peace*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, 103-117.

Collier, P., Elliott, V. L., Herge, H., Hoeffler, A., Reynal-Querol, M. & Sambanis, N., 2003. *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy*. World Bank and Oxford University Press, Washington, D.C.

Coogan, T. P., 1996. *The Troubles: Ireland's Ordeal 1966-1996 and the Search for Peace*. Roberts Rinehart Publishers, Boulder.

Cox, M., Guelke, A. & Stephen, F., 2000. Introduction: A Farewell to Arms? From Long War to Uncertain Peace in Northern Ireland. In M. Cox, A. Guelke & F. Stephen (eds.) *A Farewell to Arms? From "Long War" to Long Peace in Northern Ireland*. Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1-11.

De Vries, J. & De Paor, J., 2005. Healing and Reconciliation in the L.I.V.E. Program in Ireland. *Peace and Change* 30(3), 329-358.

Diamond, L. & McDonald, J., 1996. *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace*. Kumarian Press, West Hartford.

Dixon, P., 2007. *The Northern Ireland Peace Process: Choreography and Theatrical Politics*. Routledge, London.

Dunn, D., 2005. *The First Fifty Years of Peace Research*. Ashgate, Burlington.

Easterly, W. (ed.), 2008. *Reinventing Foreign Aid*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Elbadawi, I. A., 2008. Postconflict Transitions: An Overview. *The World Bank Economic Review* 22(1), 1-7.

European Commission, n.d. *EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland and the Border Region of Ireland 2000-2004, Operational Programme*. European Commission, Brussels.

European Union, 2008. *European Programme for Peace and Reconciliation (Peace II): Operational Document*. European Union, Brussels.

EU Court of Auditors, 2000. *Special Report No. 7 Concerning the International Fund for Ireland and the Special Support Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland and the Border Counties of Ireland (1995-1999), Together With the Commission's Replies*. EU Court of Auditors, Brussels.

Feldman, L., 2002. Redistribution, Recognition and the State: The Irreducibly Political Dimension of Injustice. *Political Theory* 30(3), 410-440.

Fraser, N., 2008. Abnormal Justice. *Critical Inquiry* 34 (Spring), 393-422.

Fraser, N. & Honneth, A., 2003. *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. Verso, London.

Galtung, J., 1996. *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. Sage Publications, London.

Galtung, J., 2004. *Transcend and Transform: An Introduction to Conflict Work*. Paradigm Publishers, Boulder.

Galtung, J., 2007. Introduction: Peace by Peaceful Conflict Transformation – the TRANSCEND Approach. In C. Webel & J. Galtung (eds.) *Handbook for Peace and Conflict Studies*. Routledge, New York, 14-32.

Haufler, V., 2001. Is There a Role for Business in Conflict Management? In C. Crocker, F. O. Hampson & P. Aall (eds.) *Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict*. United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington, D.C., 659-675.

122 Hughes, J., Campbell, A., Hewstone, M. & Cairns E., 2008. "What's There to Fear?" – A Comparative Study of Responses to the Out-group in Mixed and Segregated Areas of Belfast. *Peace and Change* 33(4), 522-548.

Hughes, J. & Knox, C., 1997. For Better or Worse? Community Relations Initiatives in Northern Ireland. *Peace and Change* 22(3), 330-355.

IFI (International Fund for Ireland), n.d.a. *Sharing This Space: A Strategic Framework for Action 2006-2010*. International Fund for Ireland, Belfast.

IFI (International Fund for Ireland), n.d.b. *Effective Peace Building: The International Fund for Ireland Experience*. International Fund for Ireland, Belfast.

IFI (International Fund for Ireland), n.d.c. *Annual Report and Accounts 2007*. International Fund for Ireland, Belfast.

Jeong, H-W., 2005. *Peacebuilding in Postconflict Societies*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder.

Kamphuis, B., 2005. Economic Policy for Building Peace. In G. Junne & W. Verkoren (eds.) *Postconflict Development: Meeting New Challenges*. Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, 185-210.

Killick, T., 2004. Politics, Evidence and the New Aid Agenda. *Development Policy Review* 22(1), 5-29.

Lavenex, S., 2008. A Governance Perspective on the European Neighbourhood Policy: Integration Beyond Conditionality? *Journal of European Public Policy* 15(6), 938-955.

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

Lederach, J. P., 2003. *The Little Book of Conflict Transformation*. Good Books, Intercourse.

McCall, C. & O'Dowd, L., 2008. Hanging Flower Baskets, Blowing in the Wind? Third-Sector Groups, Cross-Border Partnerships, and the EU Peace Programs in Ireland. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 14, 29-54.

McGarry, J. & O'Leary, B., 1995. *Politics of Antagonism: Understanding Northern*

Ireland. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxford.

Mitchell, C., 2008. The Limits of Legitimacy: Former Loyalist Combatants and Peace-Building in Northern Ireland. *Irish Political Studies* 23(1), 1-19.

NICRC (Northern Ireland Community Relations Council), 2008. *A Sustainable Peace? Research as a Contribution to Peace-Building in Northern Ireland*. Northern Ireland Community Relations Council, Belfast.

O'Dowd, L. & McCall, C., 2008. Escaping the Cage of Ethno-national Conflict in Northern Ireland? The Importance of Transnational Networks. *Ethnopolitics* 7(1), 81-99.

O'Leary, B. & McGarry, J., 1996. *The Politics of Antagonism: Understanding Northern Ireland*. Athlone, Atlantic Highlands.

Paffenholz, T. & Rychler, L., 2007. *Aid for Peace: A Guide to Planning and Evaluation for Conflict Zones*. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden Baden.

Preskill, H., 2004. The Transformational Power of Evaluation: Passion, Purpose, and Practice. In M. Alkin (ed.) *Evaluation Roots*. SAGE Publications, London, 343-355.

PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007. *A Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for Peacebuilding*. Special European Union Programmes Body, Belfast.

Racioppi, L. & O'Sullivan See, K., 2007. Grassroots Peace-building and Third-party Intervention: The European Union's Special Support Programme for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland. *Peace and Change* 32(3), 361-390.

Riddell, R., 2007. *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ryan, S., 2007. *The Transformation of Violent Intercommunal Conflict*. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Senehi, J., 2009a. Building Peace: Storytelling to Transform Conflicts Constructively. In D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste & J. Senehi (eds.) *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*. Routledge, London, 201-214.

Senehi, J., 2009b. The Role of Constructive Transcultural Storytelling in Ethnopolitical Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland. In J. Carter, G. Irani

124 & V. Volkan (eds.) *Regional and Ethnic Conflicts: Perspectives from the Front Lines*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, 227-237.

Smith, D. & Chambers, G., 1991. *Inequality in Northern Ireland*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Special EU Programmes Body, n.d. *Peace III: EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation 2007-2013, Northern Ireland and the Border Region of Ireland, Operational Programme*. Special EU Programmes Body, Belfast.

Stewart, F., 2008. Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict: An Introduction and Some Hypotheses. In F. Stewart (ed.) *Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict: Understanding Group Violence in Multiethnic Societies*. Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 3-24.

Tarp, F. (ed.), 2000. *Foreign Aid and Development: Lessons Learnt and Directions for the Future*. Routledge, New York.

The Portland Trust, 2007. *Economics in Peacemaking: Lessons from Northern Ireland*. The Portland Trust, London.

Tomlinson, M., 1995. The British Economic Subvention and the Irish Peace Process. *International Policy Review* 5(1), 20-35.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), 2009. *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluating for Development Results*. UNDP, New York.

Uvin, P., 1998. *Aiding Violence: The Development Enterprise in Rwanda*. Kumarian Press, West Hartford.

Uvin, P., 2004. *Human Rights and Development*. Kumarian Press, Bloomfield.

Weiss, C., 2004. Rooting for Evaluation: A Cliff Notes Version of My Work. In M. Alkin (ed.) *Evaluation Roots*. SAGE Publications, London, 153-168.

Wilmot, W. & Hocker J., 2007. *Interpersonal Conflict*. McGraw Hill, Boston.

Winslade, J. & Monk, G., 2000. *Narrative Mediation: A New Approach to Conflict Resolution*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.