

Protecting Human Rights and Peacebuilding: Examining Complex and Dynamic Relationship

Naheeda Ali¹ 

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Law, University of the Punjab, (Gujranwala Campus).
Correspondence: naheeda.ali@pugc.edu.pk¹

ABSTRACT

Aim of the Study: The subject of the relationship between human rights and peacebuilding has been at the forefront of academic, policy, and practitioner discourse since the 1990s. In recent years, it has gained momentum as a result of the realisation in many policy statements that human rights, peace, and development are interconnected and that practical actions should be based on these connections. In reality, a certain blurring of these areas' borders may be noticed. To date, however, experience has shown that connecting human rights and peacebuilding successfully is frequently easier said than done, because efforts in the two domains may both complement and contradict one another.

Methodology: This study is based on qualitative research. The researcher analysed statutes, local and international laws, protocols, conventions, treaties and reports for the accomplishment of this work.

Findings: This study serves as the Human Rights Practice devoted to human rights and peace-building. It describes the larger legal framework in which human rights and peacebuilding are discussed, as well as the significance of interacting with discourses and policies pertaining to state building and development aid. These influence the understanding and execution of human rights and peacebuilding independently and in connection to one another, both internationally and within particular country contexts. To date, they have been seldomly examined openly with regard to the intersection between human rights and peacebuilding.

Conclusion: This article clarifies the use of key concepts and discusses three implications of the close relationship between human rights violations and violent conflict, thereby establishing the foundation for a collection of law and policy and practice notes on the connection between human rights and peace-building.

Keywords: Human Rights Violations; Peace Building; Legal Framework, Legal Conflict.

Introduction

This introduction provides an overview of the connection between human rights and peace-building in a general sense. It establishes the context for the forthcoming contributions by commencing with a discourse that emerged within the international context and Pakistan peace process. This statement emphasizes the growing recognition that thought and practice in many disciplines have become more interconnected, necessitating a more collaborative approach and the development of more integrated

Article History

Received:
April 23, 2023

Revised:
June 25, 2023

Accepted:
June 27, 2023

Published:
June 30, 2023

methodologies. To comprehensively actualize the potential inherent in human rights and peacebuilding convergence, practitioners, policymakers, and academics must allocate additional effort towards identifying, appreciating, and implementing interconnections. Moreover, cross-fertilization holds significant potential. The two divergent schools of thought and action present many analytical frameworks and possibilities for engagement, often exhibiting higher compatibility than commonly perceived. To comprehensively actualize the potential at the convergence of human rights and peacebuilding, practitioners, policymakers, and academics identifying, recognizing, and implementing interconnections.

Throughout history, the idea of justice, peace, and democracy are not mutually exclusive ideals but rather mutually reinforcing imperatives has gained acceptance. The significance of rights standards as a vital component of the global policy framework in conceptualizing and addressing violent conflict has grown in tandem with our comprehension of the role of human rights in the origin, manifestation, and advancement of such conflicts. Additional factors to be taken into account encompass an escalating apprehension regarding the well-being of non-combatants and, on a broader scale, the progression of fundamental human rights within this context, "the preeminent normative or moral language of international politics." There are many statements and publications these days that emphasize the link between promoting peace and defending human rights. The plea has acquired more attention due to three assessments by the United Nations (UN) in 2015. The studies above (UN et al. 2015a, 2015b; UN Women, 2015) focused their attention on peace operations, the formulation of peacebuilding strategies, and the execution of Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000), which pertains to the involvement of women in matters of peace and security. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development explicitly establishes a connection between attaining peace and advancing justice (Curtis, D. E., et al., 2022).

Goal 16 of the UN General Assembly calls for creating just, tranquil, and inclusive communities, providing access to all, and forming institutions that are efficient and inclusive of all people at all levels. The gap between peacebuilding and human rights domains has mostly been closed in addition to legal frameworks. This phenomenon is attributed to an increasing comprehension of the principles behind promoting human rights and sustainable peace and the escalating expectations and adaptations made to existing methodologies within these domains. This phenomenon can be attributed to an increasing recognition among individuals of the paramount importance of promoting human rights and fostering enduring peace. The demarcation between human rights and peace initiatives is occasionally discernible within society's general populace and upper echelons (Leal Filho, et al., 2019).

it is noteworthy that the United Nations Security Council has progressively acknowledged the significance of human rights in its examination and deliberation on matters of international peace and security, even though this subject was largely avoided for a considerable period. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has become a regular interlocutor in the United Nations Security Council due to the significant human rights duties and capabilities associated with most missions authorized or established by the Security Council (Bradshaw, et al., 2017). The monitoring of peace processes to ensure gender inclusivity and the fulfilment of women's rights has been initiated by the CEDAW Committee, a treaty body affiliated with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. This case presents a paradoxical illustration of "reaching across" by emphasizing the importance of incorporating women's rights into peace processes. In February 2017, the UN Human Rights Council (UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) 2017) organized the annual high-level panel on human rights mainstreaming. The UN Human Rights Council panel deliberated directly on the interrelation between human rights and peacebuilding for the first time (Women, U. N. 2018).

Civil Society (NGOs) Integrate; Human Rights and Peacebuilding

In contemporary times, many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) integrate the principles of human rights and peacebuilding in various manners. Several ways can be employed, from verbal interactions to

more substantial collaborations, such as establishing partnerships between non-governmental organizations (NGOs) involved in human rights and peacebuilding efforts or facilitating the simultaneous engagement of different groups in separate but interconnected human rights and peacebuilding endeavors. In the groups above, a specific unit was responsible for monitoring and recording instances of human rights violations that occurred. Another unit actively engaged in dialogue programs to address grievances, prevent further violence, and cultivate positive connections within the local community. Civil society entities may endeavor to amalgamate peacebuilding and human rights considerations and approaches into a unified and coherent program to leverage a human rights matter, such as children's healthcare accessibility, to foster reconciliation among conflicting factions (de Almagro, M. M. 2020).

Additionally, the area where human rights and peacekeeping overlap has expanded within development cooperation. This is due to the development programming's growing emphasis on considering conflict sensitivity and adopting a human rights-based approach. Little consideration was given to the linkages between these methodologies or the consequences for practicing as they emerged independently within the development sector, mirroring the expansion of the disciplines. Both perspectives emphasize the importance of programming in various areas, including media development, local government and decentralization, transitional justice, access to justice, and land reform. Thus, several bilateral institutions work to connect these disparate streams (Adunimay, A. W. 2023).

Cross-fertilization Still Happens Seldom

Nevertheless, establishing a connection between human rights and peacebuilding remains challenging, if attainable. In the context of organizational structures in various domains, such as international, bilateral, or non-governmental entities, it is common for human rights and peacebuilding endeavors to exhibit a degree of segregation. Furthermore, allocating funds for programs through various channels is common practice. The need for recognition and integration of various projects within human rights advocacy and peacebuilding is common, often attributed to institutional limitations and other related challenges. Consequently, individuals often need help and value divergent perspectives, objectives, and approaches. Additionally, operationalizing conceptual linkages is still challenging; it is far simpler to suggest than do the user's text needs to be longer to be rewritten academically. The observation that numerous sections about rights in UN Security Council resolutions are predominantly declaratory or hortative rather than efficacious, as noted by Security Council Report (2016b: 31), is not unexpected. However, it is important to acknowledge that additional political reasons also play a role in this phenomenon. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, promoting human rights may or may not have a bearing on preserving peace and security. During his introductory statements at the high-level mainstreaming meeting organized by the Human Rights Council in February 2017, he asserted that this particular goal continues to be seen as "interfering with attempts to rebuild a stable governance framework and players from exploring more pragmatic solutions." He believes this objective is still perceived as "preventing players from exploring more pragmatic solutions" (UN OHCHR 2017).

Nevertheless, it is not solely the proponents of "peace" who have difficulties when it comes to accommodating demands and addressing concerns that go beyond the purview of established entities. Following her tenure as the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and Prosecutor, Louise Arbour has engaged in diverse professional endeavors within human rights and peacebuilding. The author has observed that the confluence of justice and the resolution of armed conflict necessitate compromise. However, it is highlighted that numerous advocates for justice exhibit reluctance to engage in negotiations, likely due to concerns regarding potential setbacks. An illustrative example demonstrating the continued presence of conflicts worldwide is Human Rights Watch's endorsement of the Pakistan peace agreement. Furthermore, it is indicative of the prevailing circumstance that, due to a distinct concern, there exists a significant level of reluctance among individuals involved in peacebuilding and human rights advocacy to acknowledge and value each other's endeavors towards advancing global welfare. The task involves promptly ceasing pervasive violence while ensuring that individuals culpable for severe human rights transgressions during crises are held responsible. The hesitancy observed can be

attributed to the reluctance of peacemakers and advocates for human rights to acknowledge (Hachmann, S., et al., 2023).

This ongoing conflict has been commonly referred to as the "peace versus justice debate" because the individuals who must be held responsible often play a vital role in establishing and preserving a peace agreement. Certain scholars argue that the most severe conflicts between peacebuilding efforts and human rights tend to occur during ongoing discussions to resolve violent conflicts or when there is a prioritization of narrow concepts of "peace" and "justice." In the context of Pakistan, Numerous clauses about transitional justice underwent modifications in subsequent negotiations with the government. Given how things came out, how can one understand Human Rights Watch's strong opposition to (parts of) the accord? Was the strategy used to convince the parties to discuss justice-related concerns, which could ultimately jeopardize peace and necessitate the creation of a more substantial and authentic, bold and effective accord. this approach could be deemed a risky strategy that could jeopardize the ongoing peace process, undermine trust in its effectiveness, and negatively impact the dynamics among key stakeholders, ultimately leading to an absence of peace and justice. There are valid arguments to be made for both interpretations and additional perspectives that still need to be addressed in this discussion (Hume, E., & Baumgardner-Zuzik, J. 2022).

This specific instance serves as an exemplification of broader patterns in the interplay between advancing human rights and promoting peace, as it presents complex inquiries regarding both the content and approach that often lack definitive solutions. Interpreting the existing circumstance and assessing the various imperatives will significantly influence the outcome, as context plays a pivotal role. Individuals are subject to a multitude of influences, encompassing their present frame of Reference, previous encounters, occupational trajectory, discipline expertise, and personal interpretations of concepts such as "human rights," "justice," "peace," and "peacebuilding." (Randazzo, E., & Torrent, I. 2021).

Taking into Account Human Rights while Achieving Peace

Human rights and peace-building, although they are not usually used similarly, both are frequently used in academics, policy, and practice. "Human rights" is commonly associated with legal and protective language. Historically, human rights have been perceived as legal provisions that safeguard persons from governmental misuse of authority or as principles and benchmarks that prescribe the appropriate conduct of governments towards the populations under their jurisdiction. The notion and established criteria around this matter have evolved progressively, leading to the prevailing recognition that organizations can assume the role of "rights holders" and non-state actors can be held accountable. The human rights principles govern the interaction between governing authorities and the governed to ensure the accountability of those in authority. Conversely, human rights are often regarded as an emancipatory construct that empowers individuals to safeguard themselves against perceived injustices, determine their objectives and aspirations, and advocate for recognizing and preserving their personal choices. This linguistic framework facilitates a more seamless emergence of a novel power distribution and a reformed justice system. This argument posits that to create a more just, equal, and inclusive society, it is imperative to promote social justice alongside the liberation of marginalized groups and the questioning of established norms. This will ultimately lead to establishing a society where individuals can experience freedom and dignity (Hume, E., & Baumgardner-Zuzik, J. 2022).

Socio-legal scholars have observed that the term "human rights" encompasses multiple dimensions, including its application as a legal framework, embodiment of certain values, and promoting ideals related to effective governance. The legal dimension emphasizes the existence of specific laws, their formalization, and the mechanisms for their implementation. The values dimension emphasizes human rights' aspirational and principled nature, with a particular focus on social justice and the potential for societal transformation. Lastly, the governance dimension highlights the procedural aspects of human rights, such as including individuals in decision-making processes, establishing mechanisms for accountability, and promoting transparency. Certain human rights ideas and techniques place ongoing

focus on the law. The conceptual frameworks and methodologies employed in this context are predicated upon using legal texts, discourses, authorities, and procedures as the primary means to delineate and ascertain the nature of rights and their practical implementation. These ideas and methodologies conceptualize human rights as legally binding principles that impose affirmative and negative duties on governments. The weight attributed to them is increased when they are subjected to judicial review. Human rights are regarded as legal instruments that impose both positive and negative obligations on states, which can be enforced by judicial means. There are differing perspectives on the conceptualization of human rights, with some arguing for their autonomy and advocating for a more pronounced moral or political positioning, dissociating them from their grounding in international law. These folks perceive rights as fundamental ethical principles comparable to equality, justice, fairness, participation, dignity, and empowerment (Ogega, J. (2022).

Consequently, there has been an increase in social and governmental intervention calls, which may or may not involve legal action, turned into assertions of human rights. Various sets of actors regularly accept different interpretations of human rights and have a variety of strategic repercussions, even if they are not necessarily incompatible with one another and can coexist within the same organization. Even though they are not mutually exclusive, this is the case. The legal positivist perspective on human rights focuses on the interconnected legal assertions by individuals and entities and the human rights enshrined in international treaties, conventions, and customary law. From the constructivist standpoint, human rights are perceived as social constructs that are continuously interpreted. The concept of human rights is closely related to norms that articulate anticipated conduct, embody principles of moral equality among individuals, and stimulate a range of ethical and legal assertions and diverse social and political endeavors (Balmaceda, et al. 2023).

Peacebuilding

On the other hand, there are many different ways to interpret the term "peacebuilding." One of several books that emphasizes the absence of conceptual agreement is the Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding. It remarks that "peacebuilding" has gained widespread acceptance and usage because it has become the hegemonic and collective term for various mediation, atonement, and peacebuilding techniques. Although there is disagreement over what the phrase "peacebuilding" actually involves, this is the case. It has yet to be defined and is frequently used to represent various concepts to diverse individuals. Peacebuilding is a dynamic and iterative societal and political transformation process that integrates peacemaking, social justice, and development to tackle the underlying factors contributing to violent conflict and establish a solid foundation for enduring peace. This approach is implemented to address the underlying factors contributing to violent conflict and establish the foundation for enduring peace. The notion was delineated in Boutros' (year) publication titled "Agenda Ghali's for Peace" as a strategy to identify and endorse establishments that will enhance and sustain peace, thereby preventing a regression into hostilities. Furthermore, these establishments are expected to foster a sense of assurance and contentment among individuals. To mitigate the risk of relapse into conflict, the concept under consideration entails implementing measures to identify and bolster systems that foster and consolidate peace. This paradigm was influenced by a perspective on conflict that saw social injustice and structural violence as the root causes of conflict and relied on political freedom and economic development to resolve differences effectively. The conflict was considered to be one of the main causes of conflict. It supported the idea that prerequisites for the long-term sustainability of peace should be incorporated into peacebuilding efforts. Positive peace is the umbrella term for these requirements, including social fairness, inclusivity, political freedom, and cooperative intergroup relations within society. Negative peace cannot exist without conflict or other physical kinds of violence (Vaaitinen, T., et al. 2021).

Even now, diverse perspectives on peace continue to influence how peacebuilding is seen. Nevertheless, the phrase above has become increasingly linked to a specific range of endeavors carried out by the United Nations and other global entities. These endeavors aim to facilitate the process of democratization, foster economic advancement, promote effective governance, enhance the development of state

institutions, uphold the principles of the rule of law, safeguard human rights, and foster the expansion of civil society. These activities have been undertaken to achieve many objectives, including promoting democracy, fostering economic growth, ensuring effective governance, enhancing the development of state institutions, safeguarding human rights, and facilitating overall societal progress. The concept under discussion is known as "liberal peacebuilding" and is a "collective framework for achieving comprehensive transformation at the state level." This approach places significant importance on and places trust in promoting liberal democracies and market economies to attain peace and prosperity. The peacebuilding approach has garnered significant criticism due to its perceived alignment with a liberal internationalist agenda, which emphasizes political and economic liberalization while potentially neglecting the possible destabilizing consequences of these policies or their suitability in conflict-affected settings. This is because it is the root of the criticism. For a variety of reasons, including its tendency to follow standardized and technocratic formats, its reliance on Western ideals and state models, its imposition of change from above and outside the region, its cultural insensitivity, and its disregard for non-state forms of government, the liberal approach to peacebuilding has drawn criticism (Kwaja, C. M., & Emah, E. B. 2023).

Structural Violence; Oppression, Exploitation, and Inequality

Incorporated within the intricate structure of society, this phenomenon detrimentally impacts both people and communities due to disparities in resource allocation. Instead of conveying moral judgement, "negative" and "positive" conceptualize peace as the presence or absence of particular conditions. Supposed to bring about liberty and change, but it is a hegemonic power's strategy to keep peace, uphold the status quo, and advance the Western world's political and economic interests. Although this special issue is aware of the criticisms of the liberal peace paradigm, it does not restrict its consideration of peacebuilding to just one paradigm. Two distinct observations led to the following points: The argument is invalid because "peacebuilding" might refer to a much larger spectrum of people, activities, and objectives than is typically accepted in the scholarly literature on liberal peace. In this context, "peacebuilding" refers to various initiatives with the overarching objectives of preventing the onset, intensification, continuation, and resumption of violent conflict; resolving the structural, interpersonal, and cultural causes of such conflict; and promoting social cohesion and harmony. The root causes of violent conflict will be addressed, and improved methods and capabilities for managing conflict in a healthy, non-violent way will be developed. This includes procedures and actions that various actors may carry out at various societal strata and any phase of a violent conflict, be it before, during, or after the conflict has already occurred. This contrasts with earlier conceptualizations of peacebuilding, which positioned it solely as an endeavor after a violent conflict. This approach is consistent with the phrase "sustaining peace," used in the 2015 UN peacebuilding reviews. The emphasis in this terminology is on the fact that peacebuilding happens across the whole conflict cycle and that prevention is a crucial step in the procedure. This approach is consistent with the phrase "sustaining peace," used in the 2015 UN peacebuilding reviews. The comprehensive definition of peacebuilding presented here does not imply that international groups will take the initiative in bringing about peace (Hume, E., & Baumgardner-Zuzik, J. 2022).

Human Rights and Building Peace are Interconnected

This introduction utilizes the phrases "human rights" and "peace-building", similar to how other publications use these terms. Both names are used to refer to professionally defined fields of study and strategy, as seen by expressions like "the human rights field" and "the peacebuilding field. The term "fields" refers to semi-autonomous areas of socially controlled activities that are often characterized by distinct boundaries by a certain discipline or profession and giving rise to identities containing specific attitudes, beliefs, values, and routines. For knowledgeable people, they offer concepts and categories that are challenging to understand, but for those who are not, they offer a particular perspective on reality. Consider the way the introduction describes this phenomenon by utilizing phrases like "structural violence," "human rights-based approach," "conflict sensitivity. Additionally, the discourse includes

mentions of concepts such as "positive/negative peace" and "rights holders/duty bearers." The terminology employed to delineate the "domain" recognizes that the concepts of "human rights" and "peace-building" are separate realms of intellectual inquiry and practical application, which have typically evolved autonomously and are grounded in diverse disciplinary foundations, namely law and social sciences, respectively (Howell, G. (2021).

They impose particular goals and agendas on social reality, favoring some approaches to problem-solving while limiting others. In other words, they prefer some approaches to problem-solving over others. Various Settings (such as the United Nations Security Council and peace negotiations) play a significant role in addressing several global concerns, including but not limited to gender equality, resource management, and transitional justice., these domains come into contact with one another. The vocabulary being used here, "the disciplines of human rights and peacebuilding," even if it is based on actual occurrences, has the potential to be misleading and made up. This is because attempts to enhance human rights, make amends for wrongdoing, and improve institutions that support the rule of law are regularly mentioned in conversations about peacebuilding. This is because issues of the rule of law are regularly included in discussions about peacebuilding (Richmond, O. P., & Mac Ginty, R. 2020).

Justice, Legitimacy, and Rights; Notion of Positive Peace

The ideas of "justice," "legitimacy," and "rights" are all components of the notion of positive peace. According to writers, a complete human rights agenda, safety, economic development, political transformation, and justice and reconciliation are a few of the traits that constitute modern peacebuilding. Human rights and peacebuilding thus coexist and even belong together, despite their differences. Treating these notions as distinct entities risks oversimplifying their nature since they are inherently fluid and subject to change over time. Conversely, the inclusion of identities and knowledge inside the concept of an "interface" can hinder its usefulness in accurately capturing the complexities of these phenomena. The linguistic choices employed within this particular edition exhibit authenticity and artificiality, exacerbating the gaps it seeks to reconcile. It also appears artificial to divide "human rights activists" and "peacebuilding practitioners" as separate players. Some productions may feature actors who specialize in a particular area. Many people and organizations, though Individuals that actively promote human rights or facilitate peacebuilding efforts in regions plagued by violent conflicts, only sometimes neatly fit into one specific category. when human rights and peacebuilding are considered jointly, a complex, contradicting picture results. Additionally, they emphasize how a publication like this contributes to the behavior it aims to evaluate because the "connection between human rights and peacebuilding" is a social construction (Ogega, J. 2022).

Causation and Effect

Acknowledging that human rights violations can serve as both a consequence and a catalyst of destructive conflict has profoundly impacted research, treatment, and public policy. The examination pertains to the rigorous enforcement measures implemented by law enforcement authorities in response to demonstrations against the government, as well as the complete prohibition of a language spoken by a substantial minority group. Instances in which rights are infringed upon and may potentially lead to discontent and aggression encompass scenarios when specific identity groups are systematically excluded from participating in the democratic process. Based on empirical facts, it can be observed that immediate and short-term violent conflicts are often associated with violating civil and political rights, especially those concerning physical integrity. On the other hand, fundamental and structural factors are more usually linked to economic and social rights abuses. According to one study, such offences cast doubt on a government's authority, which encourages the formation of potentially dangerous rebel movements and popular support for those organizations. According to another viewpoint, group identities and grievances resulting from discrimination and the infringement of social and economic rights may occasionally result in civil unrest. This hypothesis is predicated on the premise that particular reasons may be identified for civil disturbance (Richmond, O. P., & Mac Ginty, R. (2020).

According to studies on horizontal inequality, identity groups are more susceptible to political mobilization when most group members hold a grievance. People and groups frequently employ common, non-violent forms of political action, such as exerting pressure or submitting grievances, to voice their actual and perceived issues where proper institutions are in existence. Numerous tactics, including legal action, governmental policy change, and legislative reform, may be used to solve these problems. In political systems lacking these communication avenues or in cases where institutions are weak, corrupt, influenced by politics, or oppressive, there exists a potential risk of fostering systemic prejudice, unequal distribution of services, or curtailed civil liberties, which may ultimately lead to the emergence of violent socio-political conflicts. The risk of violence is intensified when state persecution is employed as a response to protests or demands for human rights since it converts latent concerns into "active animosities" that provide "compelling justifications for the persecuted to resort to violence." Historical events hold great significance. Political elites have been known to exploit collective memories of suffering to incite violence, as the degree of previous repression has a notable influence on contemporary government actions (Howell, G. (2021).

Alterations in the Conflict Dynamics

Of course, other elements often contribute to violent conflict; human rights abuses are typically just one of these. Nevertheless, even conflicts that started for other reasons, like a party's desire to further their political agenda and access resources, over time, conflicts that arise from attempts to expand territorial claims or alter existing income distribution tend to acquire a human rights dimension, as they often lead to multiple instances of abuse when they escalate into violence. This is because once they turn violent, disputes initially prompted by other factors frequently result in numerous cases of abuse. Thus, according to Sriram and others, human rights violations not only cause or exacerbate violent conflict but can also alter their course by fostering fresh grievances about real or imagined transgressions, escalating polarization and the perception of the enemy, and introducing redress demands. All of these factors have the potential to make a conflict more intrusive. A human rights dimension can likewise be added to a covert dispute without overt abuses. This phenomenon occurs when individuals, groups, or institutions frame their appeals for change using the language of rights, employing phrases such as "justice," "fairness," or "access," irrespective of whether their underlying concerns are directly linked to violations of human rights as defined within the official legal framework. Human rights issues might also arise in latent conflict without overt abuses. Of course, other elements often contribute to violent conflict; human rights abuses are typically just one of these (Byrne, S., & Dean, C. 2022).

Nevertheless, even conflicts that started for other reasons, like a party's desire to further their political agenda over time, endeavors aimed at resource acquisition, territorial expansion, or economic redistribution often acquire a human rights dimension as they give rise to various forms of abuse when they escalate into violence. This is because once they turn violent, disputes initially prompted by other factors frequently result in numerous cases of abuse. Thus, according to Sriram and others, human rights violations not only cause or exacerbate violent conflict but can also alter their course by fostering fresh grievances about real or imagined transgressions, escalating polarization and the perception of the enemy, and introducing redress demands. All of these factors have the potential to make a conflict more intrusive. A human rights dimension can likewise be added to a covert dispute without overt abuses. This happens when individuals, organizations, or organizations phrase their requests for change in terms of rights and employ words Terms such as "justice," "fairness," or "access" are frequently employed by individuals, irrespective of whether their underlying concerns are linked to explicit infringements of human rights within the confines of formal legal frameworks. Human rights concerns may also emerge in hidden conflicts where explicit violations are not readily apparent (Curtis, D. E., et al. 2022).

Conclusion

The intricate interplay between human rights and peacebuilding is characterized by its multifaceted nature, ever-evolving dynamics, and sensitivity to contextual factors, as is becoming increasingly clear. It

has been demonstrated that this interface also has a large synergy potential, contrary to earlier assumptions that it was inevitably conflictual. Both human rights and peacebuilding may present difficulties and mutually useful opportunities. Professionals and organizations operating at the global, national, or local level must address the nexus between human rights and peacebuilding. It is imperative to acknowledge that operating within human rights and peacebuilding can no longer be regarded as a mere choice, as the convergence between these two fields is highly probable. This is due to the intricate nature of the challenges associated with rights and conflict that individuals and societies encounter and the potential for valuable contributions from one domain to bolster endeavors in the other. Every time a human rights or peacebuilding intervention is planned or implemented, the other perspective must be considered in order to ascertain whether anything was overlooked in the analysis that could be detrimental to its implementation or whether anything should be added to increase the relevance and impact of what is being done. In order to develop a more thorough and well-rounded strategy, actors promoting rights and fostering peace can also include concepts and strategies from both fields in their work. By supporting complementary activities and efforts to build bridges, as well as by rethinking institutional divides and split financial sources that can encourage ignorance, competition, and segregation, funders can aid in creating synergies.

Human rights actors must focus more on comprehending the broader context and fundamental conditions of structural violence that significantly influence human rights endeavors' significance. Additionally, peacebuilders should strive to enhance their comprehension of operating within the legal framework and effectively utilize human rights concerns to address community divisions. The goal is to recognize that specialism comes with hazards that could thwart efforts to augment the safeguarding of human rights or facilitate sustainable progress and resolution of conflict. This is not to propose that peacebuilders become human rights campaigners or vice versa. Furthermore, it is imperative that education and training foster a heightened level of critical analysis regarding the scope, nature, and limitations of one's cognitive frameworks. Finally, individuals who are endeavoring to enhance the global condition by fostering increased safety, compassion, and dignity. the place should follow the situation or context rather than relying on what they are most familiar with, comfortable with, or what "normally works." They should not rely on what "usually works," in other words. The argument made here for improved communication, comprehension, and collaboration is not driven by the mistaken notion that all tensions between the advancement of human rights and initiatives to promote peace can or should be overcome. Some "meta-conflict" will likely remain, Considering the persistent and significant disparities in the sectors' evaluations of social reality and their respective preferred remedies. While eliminating all forms of stress may not be the most prudent approach.

Acknowledgments

None.


Conflict of Interest

Author declared no conflict of interest.

Funding Source

The author received no funding to conduct this study.

ORCID iDs

Naheeda Ali ¹  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2587-9608>

References

- Adunimay, A. W. (2023). The Role of Regional Organisations in Peacebuilding: The Case of the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region. *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies-Multi-, Inter-and Transdisciplinarity*, 18(1), 3-23.
- Balmaceda, V. N., Gerstbauer, L., & Huff Jr, J. G. (2023). Faith in Peacebuilding Assemblages in Colombia and Peru. *International Journal of Latin American Religions*, 1-26.
- Bradshaw, S., Chant, S., & Linneker, B. (2017). Gender and poverty: what we know, don't know, and need to know for Agenda 2030. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 24(12), 1667-1688.
- Byrne, S., & Dean, C. (2022). *External aid and peacebuilding*. In *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding and Ethnic Conflict* (pp. 304-314). Routledge.
- Curtis, D. E., Ebila, F., & Martin de Almagro, M. (2022). Memoirs of women-in-conflict: Ugandan ex-combatants and the production of knowledge on security and peacebuilding. *Security Dialogue*, 53(5), 402-419.
- de Almagro, M. M. (2020). *Hybrid clubs: A feminist approach to peacebuilding in the Democratic Republic of Congo*. In *The Politics of Peacebuilding in a Diverse World* (pp. 37-52). Routledge.
- Hachmann, S., Löhr, K., Morales-Muñoz, H., Eufemia, L., Sieber, S., & Bonatti, M. (2023). Conceptualizing Community-based Environmental Peacebuilding in Cesar, Colombia. *Human Ecology*, 1-15.
- Howell, G. (2021). Harmonious relations: A framework for studying varieties of peace in music-based peacebuilding. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 16(1), 85-101.
- Hume, E., & Baumgardner-Zuzik, J. (2022). Why the Peacebuilding Field Needs Clear and Accessible Standards of Research Ethics. *Wicked Problems: The Ethics of Action for Peace, Rights, and Justice*, 221.
- Kwaja, C. M., & Emah, E. B. (2023). *Peacebuilding, Fragility, Cattle Rustling, and Armed Banditry in Nigeria*. Rural Violence in Contemporary Nigeria: The State, Criminality and National Security.
- Leal Filho, W., Tripathi, S. K., Andrade Guerra, J. B. S. O. D., Giné-Garriga, R., Orlovic Lovren, V., & Willats, J. (2019). Using the sustainable development goals towards a better understanding of sustainability challenges. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 26(2), 179-190.
- Ogega, J. (2022). *Conclusion: A Gender-Responsive and Inclusive Peacebuilding Framework*. In *Women, Religion, and Peace-Building: Gusii and Maasai Women of Faith in Kenya* (pp. 99-108). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Randazzo, E., & Torrent, I. (2021). Reframing agency in complexity-sensitive peacebuilding. *Security dialogue*, 52(1), 3-20.
- Richmond, O. P., & Mac Ginty, R. (2020). Peacebuilding and Legitimacy: Some Concluding Thoughts. *Local Legitimacy and International Peace Intervention*, 261.
- Vaaitinen, T., Donahoe, A., Kunz, R., Ómarsdóttir, S. B., & Roohi, S. (2021). *Care as everyday peacebuilding*. In *Feminist interventions in critical peace and conflict studies* (pp. 67-82). Routledge.
- Women, U. N. (2018). *Promoting women's economic empowerment: Recognizing and investing in the care economy*. Issue Paper, UN Women, New York.