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Introduction

In the history of the modern world, Vera Zasulich, a Russian woman who attempted to assassinate the Governor of St. Petersburg, Fedor Trepov, was the first person who was put into trial for a terrorist act. Her proud proclamation in the trial, ‘I am a terrorist’—was a reflection of the societal acceptance of using violent methods to challenge authorities. Richard Pipes calls it a ‘miscarriage of justice’ that gradually led to destabilizing of the social rules and conditions. The assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881 only highlighted the worsening of terrorist violence in Russia, which led to the emergence of the Russian police state. Jessica Stern points out how this “standard of brutality...became the modus operandi of the final two reigns of the Romanovs and of the Soviet regime”. Responses to terrorism vary, either explicitly or implicitly, if terrorism is seen as
warfare, crime, or disease. Often terrorism is considered in the lexicon of irregular warfare and therefore responses are framed accordingly. If the war analogy holds, retaliation and punishment become the norms where the role of the security forces in establishing law and order becomes central. 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 under the 1977 Second Protocol to the Geneva Conventions of 1949. If, however, terrorism is viewed as a 'disease', the ranges of responses will have to take into account of the symptoms and causes. Thus, it has been argued, that the contemporary shift in terrorism, especially after the 11 September 2001 (9/11) terrorist attacks in the United States (US) might be viewed from a 'global public health threat' and thereby insights should be drawn from "a growing body of research on 'social contagion phenomena' such as fashions, fads, rumors, civil violence, and revolutionary ideas".4

The shift to prevention began as a concept after 9/11, spurred in large part by the changing nature of terrorism and the advent of decentralized actors and self-radicalized small groups and lone wolves. Of course, the cases of the Maguire Seven and the Birmingham Six had raised questions in the past about the effectiveness of counterterrorism (CT) efforts. Apprehensions were expressed that some post-9/11 CT approaches exacerbated the threats and added new foot soldiers to the movements. One example is Kenya's overzealous security crackdown on Somalis. Taking this context in mind, this paper analyzes how peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations Peacekeeping Operations (UNPKOs) can contribute to preventing violent extremism (PVE). While doing so, this chapter critically discusses the concepts of peacebuilding and violent extremism especially by highlighting their evolution and the contemporary shift in the understanding. The discussion also involves how the changing nature of conflict influenced scholars and multilateral bodies like the United Nations (UN) to gradually reflect and revise the ideas and responses on wars and conflicts. It is in this context, the Malian conflict is illustrated to understand the relationship between PVE and peacebuilding and the need to apply 'sustainable peace' concept of the UN. The chapter begins by discussing the issue of peacebuilding.
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Conceptual Framework of Peacebuilding

The twentieth century has seen two World Wars and reaching to the final political settlement for the humankind by dividing the globe into demarcated boundaries. As humankind accepted the Westphalian system of nation-state as the supreme political organization, an idea emerging in Europe first, the transition from primordial attachment to a more civic attachment towards statehood has often been difficult. The experiences of the West and the rest of the world in creating homogeneity within a defined territory have been not only fundamentally distinct but also set in different historical juncture, where the latter merely emulated the system. Thus, for many of the newly independent states of Africa and Asia sustaining internal cohesion and establishing peaceful societies became a challenge. The first manifestation of this unfolded in South Asia with the partition of the subcontinent, leading to the birth of India and Pakistan both of which led their claims on Kashmir. The intractable nature of the conflict gave birth to the idea of ‘peacekeeping’ among the belligerents where the task of the peacekeepers would merely be observing the particular type of deal brokered among the actors involved. Peacekeeping has traversed a long way since its first mission in 1948. It has gone through fundamental shifts from merely being an observer to introducing the ideas of robust peacekeeping where the nature of peacekeeping shifts towards not only keeping peace but also enforcing it. Similarly, another significant shift in the UN’s original idea has led towards developing the concept of ‘peacebuilding’.

The seminal work of Johan Galtung provided one of the earliest and a comprehensive understanding of ‘peace’ and ‘violence’. While ‘peace is absence of violence’, Galtung reminded us that to understand peace, we need to understand violence as well and he stresses, “violence is present when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations”. Thus, he introduced the ideas of negative peace and positive peace, which is reflected in the changing UN approaches to peacekeeping. It was the UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali who first sowed the seeds of ‘peacebuilding’ as future agenda of the UN in his Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping, submitted to the
United Nations Security Council (UNSC) in June 1992. \(^7\) Identifying "[T]he sources of conflict and war are pervasive and deep", the Secretary-General introduced the concept by defining it as "action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict" with an aim to preventing "the recurrence of violence among nations and peoples". The idea was later emboldened in the Brahimi report which defined peacebuilding as building "foundations of peace and provide the tools for building on those foundations" and provides broad guidelines for the peacebuilders in the following manner:

peace-building includes but is not limited to reintegrating former combatants into civilian society, strengthening the rule of law (for example, through training and restructuring of local police, and judicial and penal reform); improving respect for human rights through the monitoring, education and investigation of past and existing abuses; providing technical assistance for democratic development (including electoral assistance and support for free media); and promoting conflict resolution and reconciliation techniques.

Thus, the idea of peacebuilding expanded to include the concept of sustainability of peace efforts after a conflict is contained. It is in this context that one must look into how the UN gradually took into account of a changing reality of international peace and security in the wake of the end of the Cold War.

**The Changing Concept of Conflicts**

The Westphalian state system is based on the understanding of the external inviolability of state actors. The division of the world into sovereign nation-states predicated a system where security threats to the survival of a state actor could typically emerge from another state actor. In the absence of a supranational authority above states, a state is left to be the sole provider of its security. The system that is in effect since 1648 emboldened a rigid concept of security particularly during the Cold War, where the world was practically divided into two blocs, one led by the US and the other by the former Soviet Union. In such a state-centric concept of
security, two interconnected dilemmas appear. The first one is explained
by Elie Kedourie in terms of the role of nationalism where the idea holds
as if ‘humanity is naturally divided into nations’—in other words, creation
of boundaries. This leads to the next idea of state-centrism in international
politics, where authors like Michael Mann argues, “state is merely and
essentially an arena, a place, and yet this is the very source of its
autonomy”. Although the idea behind this bifurcation of the globe into
different states led to determining boundaries acting as a mechanism “to
put an end to territorial conflict”, as envisaged since the Treaty of
Westphalia, this also led to a clear identification of the sources of
insecurity emanating from another state. State-centrism, thereby, led to
ignoring internal characteristics of states that might lead to potential
insecurity for a state.

The Cold War was seen validation of this high politics in the global
stage where maintaining territorial integrity was the primary task of a
country. In other words, the iron curtain of stability held a state together,
no matter how grave its internal conditions were. With the end of the Cold
War, what surfaced was challenging the colonial nationalist settlements
and dissatisfaction of ethno-nationalist and religious groups in Asia, Africa
and at the heart of Europe. While conflicts generally involved state parties,
now we saw the rise in ‘monopoly of violence’ being claimed by parties
other than state authorities. In such a condition, the idea of conflict needs
to be revisited—as state parties are no longer the primary bearer of arms.
In one estimate, 3.2 million deaths occurred in internal armed conflicts
from 1990 to 1995. This led scholars as well as policy-planners to look
into the emerging new threats to security as well as the gradual change in
the nature conflicts erupted and fought.

Mary Kaldor is one of the earliest scholars to identify the trends in
‘new wars’. In her book, she outlines the difference between
Clausewitzian sense of war—an organized violence where the participants
are states—and the new wars, where the nature of the warring parties,
political goals, tactics and methods, sources of finance—all signal a new
era in conflict. Kaldor was not alone in bringing such new dynamics to
understand the nature of war and conflict. An array of authors, such as
Martin Van Creveld, Rupert Smith and Herfried Munkler also pointed out
the obvious shifts in the nature of organized violence where war has
become more of a privatized affair as well as asymmetrical in nature where civilians become the new and indiscriminate targets. The fundamental shifts in the nature of conflict, thus, need to be reflected in international law for ensuring protection of the civilians as well as bringing the perpetrators under justice.

A number of reports by the UN and other international agencies also started to take into account of such changes. An International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) report identifies the connection between the availability of small arms and light weapons and the changing pattern of conflict where the pattern of deaths highlights the changes:

In most conflicts of the 1990s death and injury have resulted less from the major conventional weapons associated with war (tanks, aircraft, warships) than from small arms and light weapons... A study of 101 conflicts fought between 1989 and 1996 revealed that small arms and light weapons were generally the weapons of preference or even the only weapon used.

Similarly, another study argues that since the Second World War, there have been 190 conflicts where state parties were engaged in only one quarter of these conflicts. It also pointed out possible linkages between globalization and rising inequalities where control of natural resources as well as exertion of power due to inter-group rivalries may lead to intra-state conflicts. An Agenda for Peace also identifies the trends in “new assertions of discrimination and exclusion and, on the other, by acts of terrorism”. The UN Women, Peace and Security report, almost a decade later, also highlighted the impacts of changing nature of conflicts on civilians in particular by citing “[W]hile during the First World War, only 5 per cent of all casualties were civilians, during the 1990s civilians accounted for up to 90 per cent of casualties”. Thus, not only the scholars, but also the policy-planners gradually pointed out both the changing nature of conflicts as well as how this now have found a target group—the civilians—during conflicts.

The question of whom does the state belong or in other words—whose security does the state ensure—started to emerge with the end of the bipolar rivalry at the global level. The concept of security broadened from its state-centrism to include a plethora of issues that directly affect its
citizens. The concept of ‘human security’ espoused by Mahbub ul Haq first conceptually and philosophically challenged the ideas of security in the following manner:

For too long, the concept of security has been shaped by the potential for conflict between states... For most people today, a feeling of insecurity arises more from worries about daily life than from the dread of a cataclysmic world event. Job security, income security, health security, environmental security, security from crime-these are the emerging concerns of human security all over the world.\(^{18}\)

This led to the reconceptualizing security in the wake of the Cold War. The idea took into account of the changing realities of everyday life, changing nature of security and how these affect the concept of security. The concept of human security thus identified two central components of security encapsulating ‘freedom from fear’ and ‘freedom from want’. The concept keeping the impacts of conflicts upon human beings, identifies the interlinkages “between peace, development and human rights, and equally considers civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights”\(^{19}\). It is in this context, the changing nature of conflict reflects the definition of violence espoused by Galtung and connects it with the concept of human security to apply into expanding the area of UNPKOs—peacebuilding as an essential part of peacekeeping as peace needs to have a lasting effect and remove ‘fears’ from societies as well as provide them with a situation where they can realize their potentials in life in the absence of ‘fear of violence’.

**The Concept of Countering and Preventing Violent Extremism**

The area of violent extremism also denotes how nature of conflicts have shifted over the years. Organized violence against legitimate political authorities existed since humans have lived under definite rules and regulations. The activities of the Zealots-Sicarii is often considered the very first expression of such organized violence against an established authority, which gradually came to be conceptualized as terrorism. However, the term terrorism itself originated containing a positive
meaning, arising out of the context of the French revolution. It acquired a pejorative connotation with the onset of the anarchist movement primarily in Russia at the end of the 19th Century. The term terrorism has been much contested as scholars and policymakers alike failed to provide a concise and all-encompassing definition of the term. During the anti-colonial movements, the concept of terrorism became further diluted as one man’s terrorist was considered as another man’s freedom fighter. Later on with the ushering of the new left wave from 1965 onward, the UN attempted to define terrorism and to bring the perpetrators under international legal regimes. Gradually authors have also identified how different countries emphasize on different aspects in defining terrorism—terrorists’ purpose, action, target, method and agents. The whole idea became more challenging with the 9/11 attacks in the US by al-Qaeda where terrorists no longer required an audience to achieve sympathies from people and therefore, carried out mindless terror as they felt that they were undertaking religious duties. While religious terrorism is noticed since 1980s, the 9/11 unfolded a new reality before us—that terrorism could not be fought or quashed with security forces alone. In other words, this new type of terrorism “revolves around the interplay between maintaining state sovereignty while attempting to quell a threat that knows no boundaries”.20 Therefore, this demanded revisiting of the factors that radicalize a person or a group of persons. While much attention was brought upon to the religious character of terrorism, it was broadly surmised that religion was often used instrumentally to achieve certain goals as no religion preaches annihilation of innocent human beings.

The event of 9/11, thus, brought about a fundamental change in the conceptualization of terrorism where the term no longer fitted to explain organized violence against an established authority. The term ‘violent extremism’ was introduced by a number of countries to identify this ‘new’ type of terrorism and find a way to battle these by looking into the before-the-fact situations that leads to violence.21 Thus, the new term purported to investigate the ‘softer aspects’22 of terrorism by recognizing the fact that a broader understanding of a society, its norms and values, education system to a number of issues are required to be examined which a state alone cannot deal with. This called for a continuous interaction between the micro and the meso levels as well as between the private and the public
actors. The terms countering violent extremism (CVE) and preventing violent extremism (PVE) thus emerged in the agenda of individual countries and multilateral agencies due to its transnational characteristics. It was understood that conflicts cannot be won only by winning in a battle but it is an imperative so that the conditions of conflicts are also removed through conscious attempts after a conflict has ended. In other words, a new target is set—'winning the hearts and minds' of people to eradicate the roots of radicalization and violence. Keeping this understanding in mind, the UN which already planned to adapt to a new reality of changing nature conflict added yet another area to watch—how to prevent violent extremism through peacebuilding process.

**Peacebuilding and Preventing Violent Extremism: Understanding the Malian Conflict**

The idea of 'Sustaining Peace' is based on the UNSC and United Nations General Assembly (UNGA)'s April 2016 resolutions that provides a 'policy space' for the UN to focus on peace and security within a collective framework. The twin resolutions recognize peace as "both a goal and a process to build a common vision of a society, ensuring the needs of all segments of the population are taken into account". This was reiterated in the Deputy Secretary-General's remarks at the open debate on UNPKO at UNSC forum in 2017 as "Sustaining peace [is] understood as a process and a goal to build a common vision of a society" underlines the "comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred approach of the 2030 Agenda". While the context of such broadening of the concept of security was influenced by the changes taking place in the understanding of 'security' and 'peace', this was also enhanced by the fact that the number of wars more than tripled since 2010. Thereby, the Agenda 2030 highlighted the UN's original goal of maintaining international peace and security by taking into account of a wider view of development. A sustaining peace approach to addressing violent extremism must definitely break from strategies that rely too heavily on war and criminal perspectives. The 2015 Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture emphasizes that the "saving succeeding generations from
the scourge of war” principle must embody the “before, during and after violent conflicts” principles to all UN activities. Thus, peacebuilding, which is often left as an afterthought, must include a “sustaining peace” approach in a comprehensive manner and consideration must be made of values, such as sustainable development and the protection of human rights. This approach also helps to address the wider panoply of factors that contribute to general instability and conflict across the globe and that in turn contribute indirectly to violent extremism. It is in this context, that the Malian conflict is elaborated here.

In March 2012, the Government of Mali, one of the most touted symbols of Africa’s democratic potential fell in a military coup. At the same time, a four-decade-old rebellion among Tuaregs, seeking autonomy reached new heights, fueled by weapons from Muammar Gaddafi’s fallen government and perhaps by the belief that the Arab Spring could extend to northern Mali. Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) and their allies were quick to capitalize on the increasing chaos in a territory characterized by lack of state control and poverty and seized the major cities in the north. The imposition of a severe form of religious law and a growing food crisis sent the population fleeing south across Mali’s international borders. The French-led military intervention, Operation SERVAL, ousted the militants from the main cities in the north but did not address the crisis’ underlying issues including grievances that feed the Tuareg nationalist movement, the establishment of a civilian-led government in Mali, and the near- and long-term threats to food security. Over the longer term, Mali must also deal with the effects of climate change which will result in less rainfall and increase in temperature. Mali’s average annual rainfall has decreased 30 per cent since 1998; droughts are longer and more common. Desertification is also a problem in Mali and as a result of the Sahara’s southern movement, Mali is experiencing a climate zone shift. All these may result in a US$300 million agricultural loss; even under the most optimistic climate models, annual losses of US$120 million are forecast.

This looming of climate change will put even greater strains on the population and society in northern Mali, and increase the potential for instability that can be exploited by criminals and terrorists. Insecurity in Mali worsened as extremists allied to al-Qaeda dramatically increased their attacks on Malian and UN forces. Peace process envisioned to end the
2012-2013 political-military crisis stalled in 2017. In the north, armed groups made scant progress on disarmament and the government made inadequate progress on the restoration of state authority. The resulting law and security vacuum has led to rampant banditry and displacement. Intercommunal violence in central and north Mali has left scores dead and displaced thousands, and was exploited by ethnically aligned and abusive vigilante groups to garner recruits, prevented delivery of basic healthcare, education and humanitarian assistance.

The Malian case demonstrates a number of issues that underscores the need to apply the 'sustaining peace' concept as an integral part of peacebuilding process. The local peacebuilders of Mali suggested for an all-inclusive agenda for peace where it was recommended for the state to ensure employment, reintegrate the ex-combatants, implement the 'national countering violent extremism strategy', reinforce dialogue framework between the state and the civil society as well as effective information sharing mechanism among the national security forces, civil society and the local population and engage women and youth in the peace process. For the international actors, the local peacebuilders suggested to look beyond only military actions to resolve the crisis, to support peace and reconciliation as a national priority, to look at the regional actors and regional conditions to understand the local contexts, among others.39 To this end, a number of initiatives are taken to involve and understand the dynamics of civil society actors as peace is contingent upon involving all the actors towards the same goal of sustainability and development.30

While the Malian case enhances our understanding on the nuances of a particular case and the interlinkages between peace and extremism, this also leads to the broader understanding of why do we need to apply the concept of 'sustaining peace' as an integral part of UNPKOs. The concept offers a fresh understanding of peace and conflict in the sense that we do not only need to find out the drivers of conflicts rather also identify the drivers of peace. A successful peace can only be established by identifying these drivers and how to effectively harness these drivers to make the optimum transitions after the end of a conflict to establishing peace. It is therefore for the peacebuilders to work to achieve those particular goals as peace is linked with three pillars of the UN—development, security and
human rights. Thus, the concept of sustaining peace leads towards inclusiveness, especially by involving the marginalized voices of women and youth in making a political settlement of peace that would be owned by all members of a society. In this way, every member of a society becomes a stakeholder to sustain peace.

How can Peacebuilding Help?

Peacebuilding as an idea emerged to prevent the recurrence of conflicts. UN Secretaries-General from Boutros Boutros-Ghali to Kofi Annan emphasized on building a lasting peace. The task of a peacekeeper therefore extends to ensure sustaining conditions for peace or in other words, the framework provided by Galtung of ‘positive peace’. The question of integrating PVE and CVE approaches with peacebuilding is rather of a recent origin. Its origin lies with adopting the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015 and integrating SDGs with UN Plan of Action (PoA) to Prevent Violent Extremism (PVE). Gradually, peacebuilding efforts started to identify extremism as one of the challenges that needs to be addressed within a larger framework of activities to establish long-term peace. However, this becomes challenging in an extremism-ridden society. Authors argue that the causes and expressions of violence vary as well as the very definition of ‘violent extremism’, which indicate that violent extremism is contextual and diverse. Keeping this in mind, contextual approaches to building peace and eradicating radicalization from a society may be a useful tool. A number of authors provided analysis of individual case studies on how to prevent and counter violent extremism through distinct ways of peacebuilding. Boutellis and Mahmoud, for example, emphasize on involving regional actor in determining the root causes and transnational character of violent extremism. In the discussion involving the countries of the Sahel-Sahara countries, the authors outline how states have the central role in PVE through building institutions, balancing between preventive measures and security-oriented approaches as well as identifying the perpetrators accountable for their deeds.

Emeka Eugene Dim uses the theories of poverty, relative deprivation and social identity to understand Boko Haram’s activities in Nigeria.
According to Dim, these three theories help in explaining the root causes of violent extremism ensued by Boko Haram and its continuous presence and thereby, she proposes an integrative conceptual analysis. In addressing a long-term solution to violent extremism in Nigeria, the peacebuilding process should take into account these aspects. The 2017 Stockholm Forum on Peace and Development that designated a session on ‘Preventing Violent Extremism through Peacebuilding’ emphasized the need to collect data from the field to identify the areas of grievances that are translated into violent extremism.34 Selen A Erkan, on the other hand, drawing on Australia’s example of as a multicultural society fighting extremism, argues that a deliberative democratic approach might be an influential tool to create spaces of engagement.35 Erkan argues that deep divisions in societies cannot always be addressed through multiculturalist approaches, rather than providing voices to channel disagreements may assuage grievances in a divided society. Looking into the peacebuilding process in Myanmar which has endured 70 years of violent conflict, Mollie Pepper argues that the involvement of women in peacebuilding through informal channels have made a key contribution in sustaining peace.36

While there has been much research on specific case studies on what are the areas a peacebuilding process must address while countering and preventing violent extremism, applying neoliberal internationalism can be useful to provide an overarching guide. In fact, it is the paradigm of neoliberal internationalism that is conceptually equipped to guide the work of most international agencies engaged in peacebuilding. Borrowing its central thesis Wilsonian idealism as well as liberal internationalism, neoliberal internationalism emphasizes on Kantian ‘perpetual peace’ that can be established between and within states through advancing the ideas of ‘liberal peace’. The liberal peace theory emphasizes that democracy and liberal economic policies tend to create drivers of peace. It receives its consent to govern by the governed in the manner that the citizens become direct stakeholders to maintain peace. In such a case, peacebuilding leads towards a social engineering of a given society which gradually learns to experiment on Western models of social, political, and economic organization in conflict-affected countries in order to control conflict and extremism. However, Roland Paris proposes a strategy of Institutionalization Before Liberalization (IBL) instead of forcing liberalization on an
unprepared community. Paris argues that in an immediate post-conflict situation, the democratic transition must ensure transition of institutions to that end. A hurried election may not be able to ensure participation of all people. Similarly, institutions needed to ensure such participation or transitions to market economy may be weak themselves. Therefore, Paris recommends "a gradual and controlled approach to liberalization the immediate building of governmental institutions that can manage these political and economic reforms". Peacebuilders should limit political and economic freedoms in the short run to establish effective institutions that can facilitate a smooth transition to a 'durable peace' in the long run.

The approach offered by Paris argues for postponing elections until moderate political parties have been created, and mechanisms to ensure compliance with the results of the election have been established. It also calls for designing electoral rules that reward moderation instead of extremism. To make political transition to peace possible, the state should encourage the development of civil-society organizations in the manner that would cut across lines of societal conflict and proscribe those that advocate violence. One of the other significant area that needs to be monitored is the spread of incendiary 'hate speech'. Alongside, creating spaces for political reforms, attention should be paid to promote economic reforms through a process of gradual change in the society instead of any drastic measures as well as developing effective security institutions and a professional and neutral bureaucracy.

The concept of IBL and liberal peace, however, is not out of criticism. From the perspectives of peacebuilding missions, peacebuilders who follow the IBL approach will become bogged down in endless missions. Also, a direct international administration of conflict-affected societies may create a 'culture of dependency' among local people who might come to rely on international officials and lose interest in governing themselves. The budgetary considerations also need to be taken into account, as such a long-term peacebuilding may become too costly and is therefore impracticable.

Concluding Thoughts

This chapter discusses broadly about the changing trends in the areas of peace and security. It argues that the idea of peace needs to be investigated
and applied in a holistic manner. To do so, it argues that peace is not only an absence of conflict but also an absence of the fear and the return of destabilizing factors. One of the current such destabilizing factors of peace is violent extremism, which demands the engagement of all sectors of the society, not just the security forces to address extremism. However, while peacebuilding processes need to take into account of sustainability, the question of viability of large UNPKOs remain contested. The fact remains preference for traditional forms of counterterrorism involving the war and crime approaches continues to far outweigh that devoted to preventive measures and tackling root causes. The US is estimated to have spent US$6.4 billion on military operations to defeat Islamic State in Iraq and Syria or Levant (ISIS) between August 2014 and August 2016 alone. This compares with approximately US$15 million for the entirety of its PVE activities at home and abroad in 2016. The challenge remains not only in individual states, but also within the broader multilateral system, many of whose instruments and decision-making process remain tied to a reactive security-focused approach.
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Ibid., Chapters 2 & 7.
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