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Peacebuilding has gained its currency since the zeitgeist of the twentieth century’s war-torn history, especially in the backdrop of the two Great Wars. However, it was not until the end of the Cold War, there was buoyancy for peace and predominantly liberal peace as liberalism and democracy swept across the globe to establish Pax Americana as the new world order. Since then, the concept of liberalism inspired the Western democracies, the United Nations (UN) and other international institutions to take it on themselves to establish liberal peace in the conflict-ridden areas of the Global South.¹

Therefore, the post-Cold War era was marked by the emergence of discourses on peacebuilding based on the experiences from the UN peace operations. The period from 1989 to 1999 experienced peacebuilding as a model of peacekeeping within the multidimensional UN peace support operations framework carried out in several countries.² Although Norwegian sociologist Johan Galtung first developed the idea of
peacebuilding in the 1970s, the concept of peacebuilding entered the mainstream thinking in 1992 by the UN document titled, *An Agenda for Peace*. The concept accommodated the changing nature of the UN peacekeeping missions as they evolved from their traditional roles and tasks to become more multidimensional, largely by focusing on diverse peacebuilding approaches. These changing dynamics of peacebuilding was reflected in the Brahimi Report published in 2000. This report pointed out the need of complementing peacebuilding with 'action against corruption' and 'effective action against diseases'. Therefore, the report proposed the UN’s involvement in taking the lead role in the international peacebuilding actions. Another major recommendation of the report was the doctrinal shift in the use of civilian police and human rights experts to strengthen the rule of law and protect human rights. The necessity of peacebuilding became significant as the role of peacekeeping missions extended beyond the traditional tasks to post-conflict reconstruction and development which were all deemed necessary for lasting peace. Thus, the focus of that period since the 2000s was on peacebuilding as state-building measures.

Based on this report, strong discourses have sprung up around peacebuilding vis-à-vis state-building. Some argue that peacebuilding is a subset of state-building activities, while others consider state-building to be a part of peacebuilding. However, many analysts argue that the two concepts represent different perspectives on a very similar underlying problem, e.g., fragile social peace and the destruction of political order. They consider peacebuilding as a multi-faceted, single-purpose task and state-building as a multi-purpose, instrumental task. Moreover, three different debates are visible at the implementation level. The first one is integration versus segregation, the second one is peacekeeping for the rich versus peacekeeping for the poor and the third one is related to the application of a standard operating procedure for a wide range of disparate conflict management.

Apart from these disagreements, the concept is also criticized from different angles. Critics argue that the whole concept of peacebuilding is based on the idea of addressing the root causes of conflict, but what constitutes the root causes of conflict are not self-evident or agreed upon. Moreover, it is criticized on the ground that many of the ongoing peacebuilding missions solely focus on state-building measures. Though
there remains considerable disagreement among scholars and practitioners, peacebuilding continues to be the dominant paradigm within the UN peace missions and peacebuilding activities are considered more effective in achieving peace than previous methods. Some authors have divided peacebuilding activities into three pillars: (1) diplomatic and political; (2) military; and (3) humanitarian, whereas the current UN peacebuilding activities are classified into four broad components: security, development, democratization and human rights. The key priority of the security sector is to support basic safety and security in the conflict-ridden area. Its development component focuses on providing basic services while human rights component emphasizes women's post-conflict needs. Besides, the key priority area of democratization is to restore fundamental functions of the government and support the political process.

Parallel to the conceptual debates and development of the idea of peacebuilding, different notions of peacebuilding and other related concepts emerged based on experiences in peace operations conducted by the UN. Peace missions are one of the fundamental activities of the UN through which it has contributed towards peace and stability in many parts of the world. Statistics show that among UN-authorized peacekeeping operations, majority were beyond the traditional notion of peacekeeping. Based on the nature of initiatives undertaken, the UN peace efforts can be divided into four major periods—the traditional peacekeeping period (before 1990s), multidimensional peacekeeping (1990s), peacebuilding as state-building (2000s) and finally, nationally owned peacebuilding (since 2009). The role of the UN peace missions evolved into each of these periods and there are subsequent developments within the UN system to match new changes.

Therefore, a number of changes in world politics that the world community has been witnessing since the beginning of the twenty-first century are responsible to lead the transition from traditional peacekeeping to the peacebuilding activities. Hence, the war on terror in the post-9/11 era, the rise of intra-state conflict, increasing importance of human rights concept in the international arena, and of late the rise of populism, inequality and violent extremism in the Global North, influx of refugees from the Global South to the North, etc., allowed this transition. This transition manifested a different perspective to recognize the complexities
and changing nature of violence and conflict. Therefore, all these changes in the global scenario have created the demand for revisiting the concept of peacebuilding.

In addition, the latest Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) highlight the need for peaceful and inclusive society. Conflict prevention and peacebuilding hold an important place in the SDGs. Of the seventeen SDGs, the Goal 16—Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions—has a close connection with the idea of peacebuilding. By adopting Goal 16, the 2030 agenda for sustainable development supports that there can be no sustainable development without peace and no peace without sustainable development. Through Goal 16, the importance of peaceful and inclusive societies has been adopted for sustainable development. Accomplishing this goal requires close collaboration among nations. The Goal 16 also demands peaceful inclusive societies that ensure access to justice for all and building of effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. Therefore, positive peace, which means justice for all, gets huge importance in the SDGs.

Besides, the UN’s latest ‘Sustaining Peace’ agenda, which is based on the review report on UN’s peace operations, UN peacebuilding architecture and Security Council resolution 1325 also recognize the importance of peacebuilding. This latest idea can be the beginning of a policy breakthrough that contributes to significant positive change in how the UN approaches, manages, innovates, and resources its peacebuilding work. The idea of sustaining peace concedes building a common vision of a society by ensuring the needs of all segments of the population. It includes activities to prevent the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict by addressing root causes of the conflict. The idea of sustaining peace is a shared responsibility that needs to be carried out by the government and all other national stakeholders. Therefore, the latest agenda for sustaining peace appends a sense of urgency of revitalizing and renovating UN conflict management capacities under UN peacebuilding efforts.

As one of the largest troops-sending countries to the UN peacekeeping operations, Bangladesh proves its commitment to ensuring international peace. The country started its contribution to the UN peacekeeping by sending peacekeepers to the United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer
Group (UNIIMOG) in 1988. Since then, it is regularly sending peacekeepers to various UN peacekeeping missions. Along with male peacekeepers, Bangladesh is regularly sending female peacekeepers to various UN Peacekeeping missions. In combination with the armed forces, the country also contributed to civilian participation in the UN peacebuilding efforts. As of 2015, there were 48 Bangladeshi citizens working as international civilian staff in the UN. Since the country is committed to contributing in establishing international peace, it has the vision to expand its contribution in increasing the number of troops for ongoing UN peacekeeping missions and civilian participation in the UN peacebuilding efforts. Global conflicts induced by violent extremism and rise of populism demand inclusion of peacebuilding efforts. Supporting this fact, the Prime Minister of Bangladesh, Sheikh Hasina proposed six-points 'peace model' at the 66th United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in 2011. By outlining the 'peace model', the Prime Minister of Bangladesh underscored peace-centric development by countering violent extremism and empowering people through right-based approach. This six-point 'peace model' for sustainable development manifests the importance of peacebuilding in eliminating terrorism, extremism and accelerating human development through the inclusion of marginalized population.

Since Bangladesh prioritized the importance of peacebuilding, the Prime Minister of Bangladesh discussed with the Japanese Prime Minister on the issue of cooperation in peacebuilding. Japan, then, agreed to cooperate with Bangladesh in peacebuilding efforts. The two prime ministers agreed to cooperate in setting up a peacebuilding centre in Bangladesh. Bangladesh Institute of International and Strategic Studies (BIISS)—a leading research institute of Bangladesh—was assigned to set up and look after the Bangladesh Peacebuilding Centre (BPC). Japan as a peace-loving country contributes immensely to international peacebuilding endeavours and has supported in setting up the BPC.

In this backdrop, BIISS organized an international conference in cooperation with the Japan Foundation, titled “Bangladesh in International Peacebuilding: Experience from Japan” with a view to exchange ideas and share the experiences of Japan. Since Bangladesh wants to extend its peacebuilding effort, Japan’s experience in global
peacebuilding endeavours can be one of the best examples for Bangladesh to learn from. Therefore, this international conference was expected to provide a platform for learning experience from Japan and sharing what Bangladesh is doing on peacebuilding. Throughout the conference, challenges of the twenty-first century’s peacebuilding were discussed which are more complex and multidimensional in nature. Scholars from Bangladesh, Japan and beyond shared their expertise and valuable suggestions to successfully tackling the challenges of peacebuilding and formulating conducive policies in shaping twenty-first century peacebuilding.

This international conference provided an opportunity to enrich and contribute to the current academic discourse on peacebuilding. The discussion on peacebuilding was centred around five themes. The first thematic discussion was based on “International Peacebuilding: Concepts, Methodologies and Experience of Japan”, the second theme was “Peacebuilding and the Targets of SDGs Goal 16: the Imperative for Democratic Societies”. The third theme was “Theories and Practices of International Peacebuilding”. The fourth theme was “Preventing Violent Extremism: A Peacebuilding Perspective” while the fifth theme was “From Peacekeeping to Peacebuilding: Increasing Civilian Role in the UN Peace Operations”.

The present edited volume is a compilation of revised and edited version of the papers which were presented in that international conference. It aims to enrich the current discourse on peacebuilding in relation to changing global socio-political realities, such as the rise of populism, global expansion of violent extremism, declining liberal order, effects of globalization as well as locating Bangladesh’s place in global peacebuilding effort. Consequently, this volume also attempts to bring the SDGs and preventing violent extremism within the peacebuilding discourse. To think beyond the conventional approaches to peacebuilding, it also offers an opportunity for interplay among a broad range of perspectives. It intends to review existing theories and practices of peacebuilding with a particular focus on South Asian and Japanese practices of peacebuilding and to explore new approaches of peacebuilding to adapt with changing dynamics of global politics. Thus, this volume aims to provide readers and academics with a clear and succinct understanding
of the main strands and themes emerging from innovative research in the field of peacebuilding.

The second chapter of this volume titled “Contemporary Peacebuilding Challenges: Bangladesh as a Mitigating Actor”. A K M Abdur Rahman, in this chapter, tries to narrate the history and evaluation of peacebuilding. Since 1991 onwards, multinational peace operations extended from monitoring ceasefire to facilitate the political process, protect civilians, assist in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of combatants, support the organization of elections, promote human rights, and restore the rule of law and known as peacebuilding operations. In this context, he evaluates the concept of peacebuilding that was developed through four major periods. While discussing Bangladesh’s participation in the United Nations Peacekeeping Operations (UNPKO), the author argues that Bangladesh can play vital role in the UN peacebuilding efforts in three ways. Being the second largest troop contributor to the UNPKO, Bangladesh’s role is praiseworthy. Though civilian participation in the UNPKOs is increasing, participation of Bangladeshi civilians is very limited in number. However, Bangladesh is trying to increase its participation in peacebuilding operations. In this regard, the author also identifies the major strengths of Bangladesh such as maintaining neutrality and making peace as well as friendship as the central plank of foreign policy, commitment to uphold international laws and norms, possessing three decades of ground level experience in global peacekeeping operations, having a large number of youth population who are resilient and adaptive to adverse conflict situation. He also identifies a few challenges that are likely to undermine these strengths and recommends some possible ways to overcome these challenges.

Peter Wallensteen, in the third chapter titled “Global Conflict, Autonomous Agreements and the Challenge of Quality Peace”, brings the issue of quality peace and tries to explain its importance in making the ground for sustainable development. He defines peacebuilding as a way of describing a society or an inter-societal relationship that is able to maintain peaceful and constructive relations over a long period of time, perhaps even forever. It is applied to conditions after a war, which remains able to ensure quality peace. Quality peace refers to post-conflict situations in which the inhabitants of a society feel that, owing to the peace accord,
their life is secure and dignity is preserved. In this respect, the chapter provides an overview of global patterns of conflict and peace efforts. It points to a penetrating effect of major power relations for local conflict situations. The chapter then asks whether peacemaking is autonomous from these powers, and whether it is possible and sufficiently durable to constitute quality peace. Peter Wallensteen also argues that the application of such quality peace will offer an approach that is more likely to prevent the recurrence of war and lay the ground for sustainable development. The chapter goes on to identify challenges, such as lack of interest of major powers in cooperation, absence of respect for agreements by non-state actors and some state actors, emergence of a world of tripolar conflict configurations with reduced predictability in the pursuit of conflict management and conflict resolution.

In chapter four titled “Peacebuilding in South Asia: Beyond Good Theory and Bad Practice”, Imtiaz Ahmed argues that in South Asia, many efforts of peacebuilding faltered and failed to stop the recurrent violence because there is an abundance of theories of peacebuilding but not necessarily of practices. He identifies three big theories regarding peacebuilding in South Asia. These are the Asokan theory of peacebuilding, hyper-tolerance of the heterodox Bauls and Gandhian theory of peacebuilding. These three big theories have spread beyond South Asia and still practised by millions of people. The Asokan theory advocates the middle path but in practice, this fascinating theory had not done well in South Asia. Hyper-tolerance of the heterodox Bauls mainly has taken the tolerance and peace of three major religions, e.g., Hinduism, Islam and Buddhism, and blended them into a fascinating structure, e.g., Hindu Vaishnavism, Sufi Islam and Tantric Buddhism. In practice, as they consider state to be irrelevant in peacebuilding, this unconventional and dissenting approach to the existing societal life resulted in reproducing a life in exile, outside the domain of social norms. The Gandhian theory of peacebuilding considers both means (upaya) and end (upeya) as identical. In practice though this theory had a great impact, it had two limitations: it could not stop the partition of British India and stop the rise of fundamentalist forces in post-colonial India. The common elements of these three theories in building peace are: theory of abundance (demographically rich, diverse and highly-populated societies); and
empowering the person. These two elements faced serious hurdle like illiteracy, which in turn made society socially and intellectually divided. In this respect, the chapter proposes ‘a multi-layer, multi-verse intervention’ focusing on empowering person politically, economically, culturally, technologically, even psychologically.

Mari Katayanagi, in the chapter five titled “Wider Peacebuilding: Engagement of New Actors and Expanding Activities with Examples from Japan”, provides micro-narratives on peacebuilding activities including security sector reform (SSR), disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), democratization, transitional justice, reconciliation, support for refugees’ return and reconstruction. She explores various approaches to peacebuilding activities, measures and actors that have flourished over the years. With respect to approaches and measures, she focuses on Japanese engagement in peacebuilding through Official Development Assistance (ODA) and describes its wide scope of activities. This chapter also discusses the peacebuilding activities of the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). Four pillars of peacebuilding assistance of JICA, such as the reconstruction of social capital, economic recovery, rebuilding the governing functions and security enhancement are also discussed. In this regard, a specific example of JICA’s extended activities in Mindanao is also analyzed. Moreover, JICA’s recent assistance in the field of peacebuilding includes a combination of different schemes and direct cooperation with local stakeholders. While discussing examples of universities’ participation in peacebuilding, the author brings the example of Hiroshima University. This university is involved in a grassroots technical assistance project, in which selected young people are trained so that there will be sufficient human resources for the future autonomous government in Bangsamoro in the Philippines. By pointing out the triple approaches of peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding, Mari Katayanagi infers that triple approaches for assistance to Mindanao worked efficiently and could be used as a model for future assistance to other conflict-affected countries. With respect to the actors of peacebuilding, two new actors, e.g., universities and private sector that Japan introduces are also explained in this chapter. For example, the author provides two pieces of evidence from Hiroshima University, e.g., training of potential civil servants for Bangsamoro and postgraduate education for
Syrian refugees. The chapter goes on to explain the role of the university in peacebuilding. In peacebuilding research, not much attention has been paid to the private sector until recently. Mari Katayanagi clarifies the potential role of private sectors in peacebuilding by illustrating the case of a Japanese entrepreneur Keiichi Yoshino who owns a chocolate manufacturing company based in Kyoto. The case exemplifies the development of a unique Japanese peacebuilding approach and the expansion of peacebuilding in terms of both actors and activities.

Hideaki Shinoda, in chapter six titled “The Possibility of Japan’s Contributions to International Peacebuilding in the Age of Partnership Peace Operations”, tries to explain how Japan has increased its engagement in international peacebuilding since the end of the Cold War. Being a geopolitically neutral entity, Japan has been a good partner for many post-conflict countries. But in order to systematically enhance Japan’s contributions to peacebuilding, it requires additional doctrinal frameworks. In this context, Hideaki Shinoda stresses on the issue of partnership. Partnership is an important feature of contemporary international peace operations. In order to enhance efforts for international peacebuilding, it is crucial to go beyond simple bilateral partnerships and form an alliance of international peacebuilding contributors. He explains Japan’s understanding of the concept of peacebuilding when it comes to partnership. Peacebuilding is an extended operational procedure than peacekeeping operations. It requires long-term strategy and commitment for stable and long-term peace. In order to internalize the grand strategy, Japan needs more systematic way of thinking, such as identifying major social problems and their critical analysis. He also argues that Japan needs to develop its new strategy to enhance its engagement in international peace operations based on five characteristics, e.g., continuous avoidance of enforcement or avoidance of military measures, concentration on social-humanitarian areas in the wider context of peace operations, high respect for non-interference, Asian regionalism and less-value-oriented approach of Japan’s involvements in international peace operations. These characteristics are less emphasized in contemporary international peace operations. In this respect, he highlights three areas, such as technological contribution, capacity development and partnerships for Japan which help advance its
own interest in contributing to international peace operations. He also discusses the activities of Hiroshima Peacebuilders Center (HPC), e.g., Program for Human Resource Development for Peacebuilding as an example of areas that Japan should cultivate more strongly.

Rashed Uz Zaman, in chapter seven titled “Preventing Violent Extremism: A Peacebuilding Perspective” argues that peace is not only an absence of conflict and an absence of the fear but also preventing the return of destabilizing factors. One of such current destabilizing factors to peace is violent extremism. It can be seen as warfare, crime or disease. If the war analogy holds, retaliation and punishment become the norms where the role of the security forces in establishing law and order becomes pivotal. On the other hand, if terrorists are recognized as ‘soldiers’, then they would fall under the category of being ‘combatants’ and thereby would be entitled to combatant rights and duties. If terrorism is viewed as a ‘disease’, the ranges of responses will have to take into account of the symptoms and causes. It has been argued that especially after the 9/11, terrorist attacks in the United States (US) might be viewed from a ‘global public health threat’. As a result, scholars and multilateral bodies like the UN started to reflect and revise the ideas and responses on wars and conflicts. By taking these changing trends in mind, the author analyzes the role of peacebuilding efforts of the UNPKOs in preventing violent extremism (PVE). By demonstrating a number of issues regarding the Malian conflict, he discusses the application of ‘sustaining peace’ concept as an integral part of the peacebuilding process to prevent violent extremism. The concept offers a fresh understanding of peace and conflict by considering their drivers. Peace can be established by identifying the drivers and how to effectively harness these drivers to make the optimum transitions after the end of a conflict. Thus, sustaining peace concept leads towards inclusiveness as it engages all the sectors of the society other than just the security forces to address extremism. However, the challenge remains as many of the instruments and decision-making process remain tied to a reactive security-focused approach.

Zahid ul Arefin Choudhury and Jahidul Islam, in chapter eight titled “Terrorist Strategies and Counterterrorism in South Asian Democracies”, argue that the course of the world history in the post-Cold War period has been dramatically shaped by diverse types of terrorist attacks. In this
respect, they point out the organizational aspects of terrorist mobilization, e.g., hierarchic (or centralized organization, such as al-Qaeda or the Islamic State), a heterarchic (or network-based organization, such as the beginning phase of Hezbollah), or an anarchic (or leaderless entrepreneurial move by lone wolf terrorists seeking recognition from a larger organization) initiative. Regarding counterterrorism, they discuss four different strategic models such as war, criminal justice, reconciliation, and defensive models. Moreover, they evaluate the counterterrorism strategies of South Asian post-colonial democracies that have also been targets of medium to large-scale terrorist attacks in the recent past. They find that India, Pakistan and Bangladesh have taken an institutional approach by creating new agencies and enacting new legislation to combat terrorism. Although, this approach would be robust in the long run, it seems to suffer from inter-agency coordination problem. At the end, the authors discuss a coordinated framework under which multiple authorities and their decision-choices can be aggregated for countering terrorism.

Md Monirul Islam, in chapter nine titled “Preventing Violent Extremism and Peacebuilding: Perspectives and Prospects”, argues that peacebuilding is considered an alternative approach to prevent violent extremism (PVE) because successful peacebuilding activities create an environment that sustains long-lasting peace, bringing together opponents, inhibiting conflicts from resuming, assimilating civil society, forming instruments for rule of law and focusing on fundamental structural and communal concerns. Based on this argument, he intends to highlight a few points of interaction and tension among these two concepts so that they can complement each other in an effective way. To explain how the perspective of peacebuilding assists PVE, he discusses two contesting views. The first view considers peacebuilding as a field and appears from the ‘idealist’ rather than the ‘realist’ power epitome. In contrast, PVE is based on the ‘realist’ model since it considers order and security as the end result. Therefore, it is difficult to link the two concepts. On the other hand, the second view argues that there is a possibility of engaging with PVE agendas and partly upholds the ‘idealist’ notion of peacebuilding as both the programmes undertake the same kind of actions using the same framing. Regardless of the fact, he identifies possible intersection like learning from the experiences and approaches of the experts working on
relevant PVE programmes. PVE programmes may create opportunities for peacebuilders to engage in policy debates for ensuring a wider, prior and more preemptive peacebuilding approach. Peacebuilders possess an exceptional set of norms, best practices and analytical tools, which are useful in PVE. In this respect, the author gives two successful examples of peacebuilding approach for PVE, such as Borno state of Northeastern Nigeria and Northern Uganda.

In chapter ten, titled “Turning the SDG 16 into Reality: Ensuring Inclusivity and Rightful Access to the Public Institutions”, Shahab Enam Khan points out that SDG 16 provides a long-awaited and powerful mandate for donors and implementing organizations to develop a coherent focus on critically important issues like reducing violence and corruption, combating trafficking and organized crime and guaranteeing legal identity for all. He argues that endorsement of SDG 16 is a positive and welcome development but achieving significant and transformative results on SDG 16 by 2030 is a challenging task as it includes complicated technical issues and strong political will. In this respect, the author identifies four major challenges of SDG 16. Firstly, expanding the definition of aid to include more security related activities is being positioned as a way to encourage aid spending on SDG 16. But it is not immediately clear what further expanding the definition of aid to include more security-related costs would be achieved in the long run. Secondly, expanding the definitions of security and peace could lead to a narrowing of budgetary expenditure for peacebuilding or humanitarian relief and inadequate responses of the global community toward SDG 16. Thirdly, increasing focus on strengthening linkages between SDG 16 and countering and preventing violent extremism (C/PVE) within the conventional framework of development agenda by some governments and multilateral agencies results in lack of attention on the vital factors that drive conflict and instability that SDG 16 aims to address. Fourthly, as problem remains with state’s ability to make a distinction between security and public safety, the use of SDG 16 to strengthening state capacities to combat terrorism and crime may well be a cause of concern. In this context, the chapter also discusses avenues through which these concerns can be addressed.

In chapter eleven titled “Rethinking Peace as Sustainable Development Goal: Peacebuilding in ‘Apparently Peaceful’ Societies”, Nazmul Arifeen
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and A S M Tarek Hassan Semul argue why the idea of peacebuilding ought to be revisited in the context of sustainable development agenda. They contend that peacebuilding should not be conceived only as a post-conflict phenomenon, especially in light of the SDGs. The SDGs succeeded their predecessor Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) but are fundamentally different from their forerunner. The new sustainable goals are universal—to be pursued by both the developing and developed countries, putting all nations in the same boat. One of the major targets of SDGs relates to peace. Yet, the Western developed countries are deemed inherently peaceful as advocated by the ‘democratic peace’ logic. Peacebuilding evokes images of war-torn non-Western societies battered by protracted conflicts. However, an increasing appeal of populism, rising global inequality coupled with violent extremism are creating unanticipated rifts in the Western societies. In this context, it is important to view the idea of peacebuilding through the lens of SDGs. The authors discuss the need of a differentiation between ‘hard peacebuilding’, such as those overseen by the UN Peace Support Operations (UNPSOs) aimed at addressing negative peace or ending violence in post-war countries, at the same time, ‘soft peacebuilding’ in societies where functional state institutions are present but their existence does not translate into grievances of communities being addressed. Moreover, within Western societies a ‘soft peacebuilding’ approach is necessary to address mounting tensions between different racial, ethnic and religious groups.

The book compiles a state-of-the-art set of essays that are both theoretically and empirically well-explained and also covers almost all the contemporary issues related to the concept of peacebuilding. It focuses on what the authors prioritize as the most pressing areas to study for gaining more knowledge on peacebuilding. With this, it offers the mapping of the new agenda for peacebuilding research. The book attempts to bring in theoretical and conceptual underpinnings of peacebuilding. It examines the lessons for democratic societies to ensure and enhance global peace that will also help the countries meet the SDG 16 relating to peace. In this context, it discusses the prevention of violent extremism from peacebuilding perspective. The ideas for adapting to changing global dynamics through peacebuilding are explored as well. It also provides an in-depth assessment of Bangladesh’s role in peacebuilding discourse.
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