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Abstract

Peace and economic development are often regarded as separate fields with little overlap. The association with the field of economics makes the latter seem more measurable, more tangible, and therefore more academic. However, a shift is taking place as peace practitioners and researchers discover ways to compare the level of peace within and between countries. Current research in peace studies shows a salient link between the level of economic development and the level of peace within societies. Researchers that work in these two fields must pursue them simultaneously and jointly. The purpose of this paper is to highlight evidence of this phenomenon and to provide an example of practitioners acting accordingly.

Section I defines peace (both negative and positive) and discusses in detail Anderson’s suggested methodology for measuring it. Section II summarizes the leading indices by the Institute for Economics and Peace that provide measurements of peace. Section III analyzes the cost of violence and therefore its impact on the ability of a community or country to develop. Section IV defines and applies the concept of systems thinking to economic development and peace building work. Finally, section V is a case study of the work combining both peace building and economic development done by the non-profit the Bagyéli’s Cultural and Development Association (BACUDA) in and near Kribi, Cameroon.
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Section 1: What is peace and how can it be measured?

“To write about peace thinking is to write about everything and nothing; it is neither precise nor sufficiently vague to be discarded completely as a subject of serious inquiry; the closer one approaches it the more does it recede - and it is frighteningly important. But this is in the nature of human affairs: the more important the matter, the vaguer and the more difficult becomes the thinking about it - for if it had already been conquered intellectually and mastered technically, then it would no longer have been so important because it would no longer loom so high as a problem. Some other problem would have taken its place.” - Johan Galtung (1967)

Peace is often discussed in terms of what it is not rather than what it is. This underlies the basis of the distinction, proposed in the 1960s by the “father of peace studies” Johan Galtung, between negative and positive peace. Galtung’s distinction ultimately is that negative peace is the absence of particular factors such as war or violence, whereas positive peace is the presence of beneficial factors such as the “restoration of relationships, the creation of social systems that serve the needs of the whole population and the constructive resolution of conflict” (Dijkema 2007). Anderson discusses the difficulty of measuring peace because there is no agreed upon definition. Additionally, different cultures think of peace in dramatically different ways making it particularly challenging to have a universal understanding of it (Anderson 2004).

The most salient division in peace thinking, unsurprisingly, is between the east and the west. Western ideas of peace typically stay within the bounds of negative peace meaning the absence of war or other forms of direct violence (Anderson). The Oxford English Dictionary defines peace as “freedom from, or cessation of, war or hostilities; that condition of a nation or community in which it is not at war with another” (Anderson). The word peace is derived from, “pax” often heard in the context of pax romana, is related to social contract theory, the idea of a legal agreement being the means to end or prevent conflict between individuals or larger groups. Eastern definitions of peace align more closely with positive peace. Rather than simply the absence of violence many cultures include the presence of other factors also deemed vital for
peace. The Hebrew and Arabic words for peace, *shalom* and *salaam* respectively, mean whole or undivided. Hindi and Sanskrit have several words for peace that have different meanings. *Avirodha*, from the root “virodha” meaning war, simply means the absence of war and is therefore similar to the way peace is conceived in the west. In contrast, both *shanti* and *chaina* refer to spiritual, mental, or inner peace and overall calmness. The Chinese characters for peace include harmony and balance. There is nothing in the Mandarin language that means peace according to the western definition. Similarly, the Japanese characters indicate harmony, simplicity and quietness (Anderson). A complete definition of peace must include both eastern and western views if we want to develop a global definition of peace. We are all stakeholders when it comes to having a more peaceful world, so researchers must have a complete picture of what is desired when measuring peace.

Anderson provides a definition of peace that acts as a platform for measuring it in a way that invokes a global perspective: “Peace is a condition in which individuals, families, groups, communities and/or nations experience low levels of violence and engage in mutually harmonious relationships” (Anderson). The western influence lies in the first part of the definition which discusses violence and the eastern influence is portrayed in the second. It is important to understand how to measure each component to make this definition operational. Anderson proposes both subjective and objective indicators for harmony and violence as the most comprehensive way to attain viable results.

To measure violence objectively, he suggests using other already available sources for statistics on deaths from international violent acts, injuries, torture, incarceration and displacement. Additionally, the World Health Organization provides data on homicide, suicide, legal interventions, terrorism, repression, involuntary disappearance, organized crime and more.
This particular measurement of violence includes only physical harm of people and, therefore, does not include other forms of violence that are experienced (Anderson). For example, Galtung suggests a definition of violence which states that an act is violent whenever “human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations” (Anderson). Although this definition is incredibly comprehensive, it is also equally troublesome to measure. We cannot know the potential realizations of a person. However, Galtung’s definition provides a good reminder that violence is not only physical. A slightly more workable definition to encompass violence that exceeds the physical, known as structural violence, is the “social, economic and political conditions embedded in the social structure that systematically distribute violence, inequality, injustice or lack of access to social services that contribute to the deaths, poor health, or repression of individuals or groups of individuals within a society” (Anderson). Again, using existing indices as a starting point to measure peace comprehensively is beneficial to peace researchers because it would be incredibly time consuming otherwise. Objective measurements of “harmony” are less obvious, but Anderson provides various recommendations which are also listed in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Indicators of Peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two Dimensions of Peace</th>
<th>Violence</th>
<th>Harmony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics on death and injuries caused by international violence.</td>
<td>Individual assessment of levels of international violence.</td>
<td>Statistics on cooperative agreements, international travel, and ongoing communication between countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics on death and injuries caused by violence within a country.</td>
<td>Individual assessment of levels of violence within one’s own country.</td>
<td>Statistics on programs promoting social integration, free travel and active communication within a country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With so many different components to violence and harmony, which are the primary elements within Anderson’s operational definition of peace, it is impossible to find metrics for every area. In fact, one could easily argue that it is impossible to even create a comprehensive list of categories that fit into the definitions of violence and harmony. One way to control for this is to include subjective measurements through surveys. For example, this could include “single- or multiple-item measures with an attitudinal response scale indicating relatively higher or lower levels of subjectively experienced violence” (Anderson). In this way, individuals can decide for themselves considering their comparatively more complete (than any number of statistics) societal knowledge of violence and harmony. A major complication of this method is that the researcher and the research participant may have different definitions for one or both terms. Even if the survey clearly defines both harmony and violence at the beginning, one frequently is unable to separate themselves from their preconceptions. Therefore, a participant may still respond according to their own definitions and life experiences, which can vary drastically across cultures as mentioned previously. Although this is a limitation, it can provide insight into how different populations define harmony and violence and, therefore, peace differently. Additionally, the researcher could also ask survey participants to provide their own definitions of peace, violence, and harmony to have a better conception of how the terms are understood across cultures or across groups within a particular culture.

A valid argument against doing peace research is that because peace is such a difficult concept to define and has so many different definitions, it should not be measured at all. Instead, researchers would benefit from focusing on all of the separate components which are easier to define and far less controversial. For example, money spent on militarization, the number of homicides, and the number of exchange programs, among many others, can all be measured in
isolation from each other. However, what this logic fails to address is the interconnectivity of all of these factors. Systems thinking is becoming increasingly vital to the “lingo” surrounding measuring peace and will be discussed in section 4.

Section 2: IEP’s Measurement of Peace

The Institute for Economics and Peace conducts the most robust measurements to date. Each year, they release two reports: The Global Peace Index and the Positive Peace Report. The reports build on each other and cumulatively provide indices that fit the definitions of both negative and positive peace.

2.1 Global Peace Index

The Global Peace Index (GPI) was developed by the Institute for Economics and Peace and has been released annually since 2007 using data starting in 2005. The index measures peace in 99.7% of the world’s population using 23 different qualitative and quantitative indicators. Each indicator falls within one of three domains: the level of societal safety and security, the extent of ongoing domestic and international conflict, and the degree of militarization. Therefore, the report measures negative rather than positive peace. However, the most recent report (2018) provides a chapter on positive peace. Positive Peace is discussed in the following section of this paper. Appendix A provides the full list of GPI indicators, their domains, and whether they are qualitative or quantitative. Additionally, Table 2 on the following page provides the top five and bottom five countries for each domain that the GPI measures. It is interesting to note that due to the United States’ high military spending, it is in the bottom five countries for militarization. The militarization category itself marks the only category where the bottom five includes advanced developed countries (Global Peace Index 2018).
Table 2. Global Peace Index (N = 163 countries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Ongoing Conflict</th>
<th>Militarization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 Top 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Iceland (1)*</td>
<td>1. Botswana (29)</td>
<td>1. Iceland (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Norway (16)</td>
<td>2. Brazil (106)</td>
<td>2. Hungary (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Denmark (5)</td>
<td>3. Chile (28)</td>
<td>3. New Zealand (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. New Zealand (2)</td>
<td>5. Uruguay (37)</td>
<td>5. Moldova (64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety and Security</th>
<th>Ongoing Conflict</th>
<th>Militarization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 Bottom 5**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Afghanistan (162)</td>
<td>1. Syria (163)</td>
<td>1. Israel (146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Iraq (160)</td>
<td>2. Afghanistan (162)</td>
<td>2. Russia (154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. South Sudan (161)</td>
<td>3. South Sudan (161)</td>
<td>3. North Korea (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Somalia (159)</td>
<td>4. Pakistan (151)</td>
<td>4. United States of America (121)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall rankings are in parentheses  **Ranked from worst to 5th worst


The research team weights internal (domestic) measurements at 60% and external (international) measurements at 40% because of the belief that internal violence is a predictor of external violence. Researchers revisit this decision to assure its continued relevance. For each individual indicator, researchers decide on a weight between one and five. It was found that, regardless of the weight of each indicator, approximately “70 percent of all pairwise country comparisons in the GPI are independent of the weighting scheme” (Global Peace Index, 80). This finding is similar to the widely used and highly respected Human Development Index and therefore highlights the credibility of the GPI (Global Peace Index).

---

1 The scales and what each score from one to five means for each indicator can be found in Appendix B on pages 82 through 89 of the Global Peace Index 2018 report.
Of the 23 total indicators, seven are qualitative. To control for the risks of subjectivity and the potential influence of researcher bias, several measures are taken. The Economist Intelligence Unit Country Analysis team, which is in charge of the initial qualitative scores for each country and filling in gaps that may exist in quantitative data, includes over one hundred country experts and economists. They also receive additional support from more than 650 in-country contributors. Once the country expert for a particular location decides on a qualitative score for an indicator, a regional director provides feedback and the score is re-assessed. Finally, an independent external advisory panel looks over the finalized scores and they are either confirmed or potentially changed again if there is a disagreement. These internal and external checks and balances help to ensure that the qualitative data is more unbiased than it would be without them (Positive Peace Report).

2.2 Positive Peace Report

The first Positive Peace Report by the Institute of Economics and Peace (IEP) was released in 2015. The most recent report is from 2018 and uses data from 2005 through 2017. This report measures peace in a way that aligns closely with Galtung’s definition of positive peace. It is, therefore, a much broader measure than the Global Peace Index and encompasses more than the western notion of peace. The Institute for Economics and Peace itself defines positive peace as “the attitudes, institutions and structures that create and sustain peaceful societies” (Positive Peace Report, 4). The results for the 2018 Positive Peace Report were “empirically derived by IEP through analyzing thousands of cross-country measures of economic and social progress to determine which have statistically significant relationships with actual peace as measured by the Global Peace Index” (Positive Peace Report, 7). The criteria for
measuring positive peace include eight different pillars with three indicators for each and can be seen in Appendix B.

**Section 3: The cost of violence (the benefit of peace)**

One unique feature of the Positive Peace Report is its discussion of the impact positive peace has on a nation’s economy and economic development. In 2017 alone, the containment of violence worldwide cost $14 trillion, or 12.4% of global GDP (Positive Peace Report). Similarly, a 2013 report by the German government states that “the cost to an average developing country of a violent conflict is 30 years’ worth of its GDP growth and 20% more people living below the poverty line than is the case in countries without any experience of violence” (Development for Peace and Security 2013, 7). With violence having such a significantly negative impact on a nation’s GDP, funding development projects and initiatives becomes all the more challenging. At the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) Summit in 2010, a major point of discussion centered around how 22 out of the 34 countries that made the least progress were either in conflict or post conflict (Development for Peace and Security). Conflict can lead to economic problems, but economic problems can also lead to conflict. Some examples of economic causes of conflict include “unequal or negative growth, competition over scarce resources, such as capital, education, food, health and water, abrupt shifts in income and wealth, institutional changes resulting from socio-economic development, and lack of regional economic integration” (Smoljan 2003, 235).

Although many conflicts are caused by problems rooted in religion, nationalism or race, lack of economic development also plays a large role. For example, there are race problems in the United States and problems regarding French nationalism in Quebec, but conflict has ceased to reach a point where civil war is probable or even seemingly possible. Smoljan points out that a
potential explanatory variable for this discrepancy is the level of development within the societies at hand (Smoljan).

Additionally, once a country has entered into violent conflict it is significantly more likely for conflict to re-emerge. In fact, in the five years following a war, 44% of countries resume conflict and the number climbs to 50% in the first decade (Junne and Verkoren 2005). The 2018 Positive Peace Report provides further examples of the connection between economic development and peace which are listed in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Economics and Peace Connection: Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real GDP growth per capita</td>
<td>Every 1% improvement in positive peace corresponds with a 2.9% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign direct investment as percentage of GDP</td>
<td>2% in most peaceful countries versus .84% in least peaceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term median inflation</td>
<td>3.5% in high versus 9.7% in low positive peace countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4: Systems Thinking

Although the data from the Global Peace Index and Positive Peace Report suggest a strong link between peace and economic development, there are still two distinct camps with opposite views. Smoljan provides definitions of each group:

- Inclusivist: Economic development and peace building are “mutually reinforcing and capable of operating simultaneously” (Smoljan, 233).
- Exclusivist: Economic development and peace building are “two distinct stages of a phased process, undertaken separately and under different conditions” (Smoljan, 233).
The inclusivist group uses systems thinking which is “a way of viewing the world, not in discrete parts but as systems of relationships. It focuses on interactions, on links between parts or subsystems” (Leroux-Martin and O’Connor 2017, 13). Instead of simply viewing economic development as leading to peace or peace as leading to economic development, systems thinking challenges us to consider other possibilities. The Positive Peace Report of 2018 provides the following scenario as an example:

Consider the relationship between three Pillars: High Levels of Human Capital and a Sound Business Environment bolster a country’s economy. A Well-Functioning Government will ensure law-and-order, provide stability and respond to the needs of its citizens—factors that further contribute to economic success. Prosperity leads to more funding for endeavors that reinforce the Positive Peace Pillars, such as educational services, unemployment programs and health services. Under the right circumstances, Positive Peace and economics can create a virtuous cycle, with improvements in one driving improvements in the other. (20)

This highlights how the distinction between what is considered peace building work and what is considered economic development is often blurred, and how initiatives in one area affect the whole system.

It is natural for the human brain to seek simplistic solutions to problems. The philosopher Karl Popper discusses a continuum that applies to the ways in which we approach problems. The range of the continuum is represented by a cloud on one end and a clock on the other. The clock represents “systems that are orderly, regular, and predictable,” whereas the cloud represents “systems that are disorderly, irregular, and unpredictable” (Leroux-Martin and O’Connor, 9).
Galtung echoes this idea in his analysis of simplistic versus sophisticated peace theories.

Diagrams 1 and 2 provide visual aids for the following discussion.

Diagram 1 implies that one criterion related to economic development (Q), for example more education, leads to higher levels of peace (P). However, Galtung argues this is likely not the full picture (Galtung 1967). Instead, more education may lead to increased levels of political participation. Increased levels of political participation may lead to increased levels of political accountability. Finally, increased levels of political accountability may lead to higher levels of peace. Therefore, the simple relationship in Diagram 1 misses several steps of the process where more education eventually leads to higher levels of peace.

Diagram 2 provides a more sophisticated approach to peace thinking. In this case, two different development criteria (Q₁, Q₂) impact three unique “peaceful” outcomes (P, P₁, P₂). Broken arrows signify negative relationships between two variables. Therefore, in this circumstance, more of Q₂ leads to less of Q₁. For example, if Q₂ represents income equality and Q₁ represents efficiency, then an increase in income equality leads to less efficiency. Although both income equality and efficiency are factors that contribute to more of the peaceful outcome P, it is necessary in this case to find the optimal levels of each to achieve the highest possible level of P.

The concept of the equality efficiency trade-off was coined by Arthur Okun in 1975 and remains a contested topic of discussion today. Okun’s thesis is that “inequality is an incentive, both reward and penalty, to promote efficiency in the use of resources and to generate a greater and growing national output” (Sharpe 2003, 10). Efficiency in this case is equated with economic growth. Okun argued that policies that redistribute wealth (make society more equal) lead to less economic growth because they decrease incentives to produce more or potentially even to join the labor force at all. Researchers Picot, Morissette and Myles found that in Canada “during the 1993-97 period economic growth did not generate any gains in employment earnings among families most likely to live in low income” (Sharpe, 11). Similarly, in the latter half of the 1990s the United States had both the largest increases in income inequality as well as the fastest economic growth out of all of the G7 countries. Burtless found that Okun’s theory explains this phenomenon because comparatively, the United States had fewer social programs to support struggling individuals. This in turn created the incentives for increased productivity which led to higher growth rates. Additionally, he found that technological developments provided
significantly more job opportunities for high-skilled workers rather than low-skilled, leaving them behind in the sense high-skilled workers’ wages increased and theirs did not.

However, a study of OECD countries by Arjona, Ladiak and Pearson claims that it is much more complicated than a strict rule of a trade-off between equality and efficiency. For example, although they found that spending more on social safety nets to increase equality negatively impacts economic growth, it depends on the type of social programs. Those that encourage more people to enter the labor market or work more hours have a positive impact on economic growth, whereas passive income support programs have a negative impact on economic growth. Their policy advice is that “given the desirability of both equity and growth, the appropriate policy conclusion is not to cut social expenditure to boost growth, but to shift the focus from passive to active social protection programs” (Sharpe, 12). Additionally, some research shows that virtuous cycles between higher income equality and economic growth are possible through careful policy considerations. For example, tax revenues increase with higher economic growth. This money can be used for social programs that help poorer individuals who would not have otherwise been able to go to tertiary school get an education. This increases human capital and leads to greater productivity. The cycle can continue through the creation of more social programs which again lead to increased productivity. The equality efficiency trade-off is one particular instance that highlights the ambiguous nature of systems and the importance of critical analysis of each situation rather than the application of generalizations (Sharpe).

Diagram 2 is further complicated by the fact that more of the peaceful outcome P leads to less of the peaceful outcome P₂. This could be true in a situation where P is peaceful interactions between two ethnic groups within a country and P₂ is peaceful interactions between neighboring countries. As peaceful interactions between the two ethnic groups within a country increase, it
can lead to a greater sense of nationalism. This increased sense of nationalism can appear threatening to neighboring countries and therefore negatively impact relations between the initial country and its neighbors. Finally, the line between P and Q in both directions symbolizing a mutual feedback loop; more P leads to more Q and more Q also leads to more P.

Two other complications present in systems thinking include time lags and whether an effect is probabilistic or deterministic. For example, Q may eventually cause P, but only after some indeterminable amount of time. Additionally, it may only be likely rather than certain that Q will lead to P at all, meaning that it is probabilistic rather than deterministic (Galtung). Galtung laments how:

One cannot find many authors who include cautions to the effect that ‘in reality matters are more complicated than we have presented them here’ but as long as it remains at that level of generality with no accompanying effort to work out in detail how the ‘complicated relations’ are ‘in reality’ this is not a sign of sophistication, only a sign of (usually justified) dissatisfaction with extreme simplicity.” (Galtung, 31)

According to the United States Institute of Peace, “in the past decades, only 8 out of 102 historically developing countries have reached strong capabilities to deliver core services to their citizens” (Leroux-Martin and O’Connor, 9). Andrews, Pritchett, and Woolcock came to this conclusion through analyzing various data sets, such as the United Nation’s World Economic Situation and Prospects classification, to categorize each of the 102 countries by state capacity. Although the official list is unavailable, they report that the majority of the countries that improved in state capacity are small states, such as Singapore and the United Arab Emirates, and cover only 1.7% of the total population in historically developing countries (Andrews et. al 2017). Donors pressure practitioners in both peace building and development to find quick
solutions that produce immediate, short-term results that are not sustainable. Another contributing factor to the shortage of systems thinking is a lack of integration between practitioners in different fields. For example, development organizations often look at post conflict countries as too unstable to work in, and peace builders frequently think that development activities should not be started until a traumatized population has had some time to heal (Junne and Verkoren). However, given the clear relationship between peace and economic development and the potential for mutual feedback loops between them in practice, “conflict resolution and peacebuilding efforts can only be fruitful in the long run if they consist of activities involving all other kinds of policy development as well as permeate all development projects and policy issues” (Junne and Verkoren).

Development and peace practitioners must think critically about the roots of conflict such as colonization or friction from globalization, income inequality, ethnic cleavages, a weak state, political ideologies etc. in order to plan for projects that do not exacerbate existing problems. In the case where the post-conflict country in question was colonized, the road and/or railroad systems were likely built to connect the most remote areas to ports for the extraction of natural resources by the colonizer. This likely left many areas entirely isolated, meaning that rebuilding the same system after a conflict would not be the most effective measure for a more prosperous future (Junne and Verkoren). The following section provides an example of a non-profit pioneering projects that involve both peace building and economic development work simultaneously.
Section 5: Cameroon Case Study

In the spring of 2018 I studied abroad in Cameroon through the School of International Training (SIT). The program, “Cameroon: Development and Social Change,” culminated in a four-week internship at a non-profit in Kribi, Cameroon at the Bagyéli’s Cultural and Development Association (BACUDA). The Bagyéli (also known pejoratively as “pygmies”) are indigenous to Cameroon and face many problems largely as a result of deforestation which has forced them to transition from hunting and gathering to a more sedentary lifestyle. My main focus throughout the internship was on the provision of land to several Bagyéli communities so that they would be able to grow crops both for food and to sell for a source of revenue. This process included bringing together all stakeholders, gift giving, conversation facilitation and mediation, as well as vocational training on best practices in agriculture. First, I provided information on the Bagyéli people and gave an overview of BACUDA as an organization. Then, I provided specific details on my role as an intern and the necessity of facilitating both economic development and peace building processes to achieve our goals.

The mission of BACUDA is to contribute to the self-promotion of the Bagyéli population. The Bagyéli people are indigenous to Cameroon and have traditionally lived in the forest close to the city of Kribi which lies on the coastline. Because of deforestation, they are obligated to live closer and closer to their Bantu neighbors and to change their way of life. They are considered to be a vulnerable population and are therefore protected by the government. Nevertheless, the governmental programs have been insufficient at satisfying all of their needs and they continue to live in extreme poverty. They are in a constant struggle to fulfill their nutritional requirements and many among them are malnourished. Additionally, they have difficulties accessing education and basic health care. This is primarily because the majority do not have identity cards or birth certificates. Bagyéli children are most often born outside of
hospitals which are where these state documents are typically issued. Getting them later in life is largely contingent upon family members having them, and there are many cases where entire families are without. Children are unable to enroll in school without birth certificates and moving freely without an identity card is illegal for adults 18 and over. This means that if an adult member of the Bagyéli indigenous group goes into a town or city and is stopped by the police, which occurs frequently at security checkpoints, he or she is at risk of arrest and jail time. Additionally, without identification one is unable to possess land. These factors greatly reduce the autonomy of the Bagyéli because freedom of movement and freedom to own land should be rights that all humans enjoy and benefit from. BACUDA has six specific areas on which it focuses in order to ameliorate the living conditions of the Bagyéli peoples:

1. Improve access to education
2. Secure land ownership for land that is already occupied by the Bagyéli
3. Educate the Bagyéli in ways to improve their agricultural practices and increase the number of revenue generating activities
4. Facilitate the receipt of identity cards and birth certificates
5. Highlight the value of the culture of the Bagyéli
6. Improve access to basic health care

5.1 BACUDA works in each domain through the following projects

5.1.1 Health

BACUDA raises awareness within Bagyéli communities about the options available to them when someone is sick. Frequently they are skeptical of going to the hospital because for centuries they have used only natural medicines found in the forest. Therefore, members of Bagyéli communities risk dying from something entirely curable, such as malaria or typhoid.
BACUDA sends doctors directly into their communities to educate and also to do tests for things such as HIV/AIDS and malaria where they are most comfortable.

5.1.2 Education

Because many Bagyéli communities subsist rather than generating any amount of revenue, it is incredibly difficult for most parents to pay the cost of sending their children to school. Although primary schooling in Cameroon, which encompasses ages six to age twelve, was declared free and mandatory by the government in 2000, this is often not the case in practice (ICA Canada). Even where primary schooling is free, parents still must cover the costs of supplies such as books, paper, writing utensils, backpacks, and uniforms. Additionally, there are always fees for secondary school, so if a child wishes to continue with his or her education past age twelve, the fees are unavoidable. Each year, BACUDA pays for approximately 350 students to go to school. Although this practice does not fall under the category of sustainable development because it does not directly solve the root of the problem which is a lack of funding, BACUDA holds the position that it is a necessary initiative for the time being. Until other projects such as those in agriculture ensure reliable and continuous revenue generation, Bagyéli children rely on this form of charity.

5.1.3 Agriculture

To assist in the creation of revenue generating activities, BACUDA accompanies Bagyéli communities in agricultural pursuits. Initially, BACUDA assists by providing tools and training in clearing land on which to grow crops. Then, agricultural experts provide training on how to grow cocoa, corn, and plantains which are three of the most lucrative crops to sell in and around Kribi. Additionally, BACUDA provides seeds, hoes, machetes, irrigation systems, buckets, etc. to ensure that they have all that they need to begin and acquire initial funds to ensure project
sustainability. Furthermore, extra money can go towards the education of children, keeping community members healthy, purchasing medicine for the sick and whatever other pertinent needs exist. The ultimate goal is to ensure that Bagyéli communities become autonomous and cease to need the support of BACUDA. Appendix C shows a benefactor of the agricultural initiatives of BACUDA.

5.1.4 Citizenship

Because of the lack of access to identity cards and birth certificates within Bagyéli communities, BACUDA helps facilitate the process through which they apply to receive them. They focus primarily on getting newborn babies birth certificates because it ensures their ability to go to school later on. Additionally, BACUDA prioritizes getting at least one adult per community an identity card and birth certificate because without these state-issued documents it is impossible to own land. If one adult within a community has that ability, the entire community can benefit from land that belongs to him or her.

5.1.5 Culture

BACUDA hosts expositions of medicinal plants that are used by the Bagyéli to increase understanding of their practices and to not lose these valuable traditions. Due to globalization and the domination of western medicine, it is paramount to ensure that other methods of healing are not forgotten. In addition, BACUDA holds art and dance expositions for the greater community with the goal of fostering understanding between the Bagyéli and the Bantu with whom they are becoming integrated.

5.2 The Chad-Cameroon Pipeline

Pipelines are being put in place all over the world on land that was previously intact wilderness. This often impacts indigenous groups that traditionally lived on the land in remote
areas. We have seen this at Standing Rock in the United States and a similar situation is also impacting the Bagyéli (Levin 2016). The Chad-Cameroon pipeline, finished in 2003, passes through 120 kilometers of land that the Bagyéli people live on and has significantly changed their way of life (Nganguè 2002). There is fear amongst many of the communities that the pipeline is dangerous or some sort of warning from the gods. This fear directly impacts daily life because many community members avoid areas near the pipeline as well as crossing its path which inhibits access to areas that hold vital resources such as particular foods or medicines.

Another negative impact of the construction of the pipeline is that the machines used during building and now for maintenance caused the flight of many animals that the Bagyéli hunted, making food insecurity an even more prevalent issue. The Cameroon Oil Transportation Company (COTCO) who constructed the portion of the pipeline in Cameroon had a complaint filed against them in 2011. The reasons for this complaint included decreased fish populations, increased AIDS cases, illegal dumping of waste, land stolen from the Baygéli by the Bantu, water pollution from construction and leaks, increased alcoholism and a loss of traditional beliefs and knowledge (Ejolt 2018). Despite minimal compensation being provided by the government, the same problems still exist within these communities requiring the work of non-profits like BACUDA to support them as they are forced to transition to a new way of life.

5.3 Cessions of Land: Bantu to Bagyéli

5.3.1 My Role

The primary activity of BACUDA during my internship was the facilitation of land cessions from the Bantu to the Bagyéli. In my role as an intern, I was able to go out into the field with several of my co-workers to witness and document two processes of Bantu chiefs signing over land to the Bagyéli. I was tasked with taking photographs and writing posts for social media
which are available in Appendix D. Additionally, I interviewed the Bantu chiefs, Bagyéli community leaders and members, and the government officials involved in each cession of land.\textsuperscript{2} The interviews aired on a local radio station to increase awareness in the greater community.

5.3.2 The Process

As many of the Bagyéli move out of the rainforest and closer to the Bantu, there have been serious problems between the new neighbors. For example, due to the problems listed above including a lack of access to education and identity cards as well as a lack of knowledge about best practices in agriculture, they are in a particularly vulnerable position. Many Bantu communities have turned towards exploitation of the Bagyéli in ways that are not dissimilar to modern day slavery. Without access to all of the foods offered by the rainforest, the Bagyéli are often almost entirely dependent on the Bantu to meet their nutritional needs. Bantu communities will offer a meal or a half pint of palm wine in exchange for an entire day’s work in the fields. Even in cases where the Bagyéli have successfully begun to grow a particular crop such as cocoa, they are at risk of having that land taken from them by the Bantu because they do not hold the land title and the Bantu have much more influence and power in local government. Therefore, BACUDA finds it absolutely imperative for the autonomy of these indigenous peoples to ensure ownership of the land on which they live and/or grow crops.

In order to facilitate this process, BACUDA initially reaches out to a Bagyéli community leader, a Bantu chief and a government official responsible for the particular area. BACUDA understands which Bantu chiefs and government officials empathize most with the plight of the Bagyéli and therefore does not waste time and resources in situations that are nearly hopeless. Once initial contacts are made, often through long and arduous trips via motorcycle into the bush.

\textsuperscript{2} Interviews (in French language) available upon request
for in-person conversation, a game of gift offering with the Bantu chief begins. Although poverty among the Bagyéli is particularly extreme, there is still poverty within Bantu communities and therefore chiefs want to ensure that they will also benefit from signing land over to the Bagyéli. BACUDA discovered that the offering of gifts such as alcohol, rice, tomatoes, fish and other foods in the form of a joint celebration between the Bantu and Bagyéli communities is a particularly effective method of convincing Bantu chiefs to participate in this process. Additionally, it serves as an effective measure towards more positive relationships between the two communities moving forward. BACUDA provides the same food in equal amounts to each community which acts as an equalizer between them and lessens the uneven power dynamic. Furthermore, although neighboring Bagyéli and Bantu communities may participate in agricultural activities together, that is often the extent of their contact. The joint celebration provides a level of social integration that goes beyond previous norms. The participation of a government official is necessary for the legality of the land turnover, but also provides an extra measure of formality that allows the Bagyéli to feel heard and valued and makes it more likely that the Bantu will take the event seriously. For example, the Bantu are aware that if they do not respect the land rights of the Bagyéli there will be legal repercussions.

Once the land is signed over to the Bagyéli from the Bantu, they can either continue or begin growing crops on it as a form of subsistence farming and revenue generation. Therefore, this is an example of peace building acting as a catalyst for economic development. In the future, the new revenue generation possibilities for the Bagyéli communities impacted will increase their socioeconomic status and provide them with more autonomy. For example, they will be less dependent on, and eventually completely independent from, support from the Bantu. Additionally, more Bagyéli children will have the opportunity to go to school with their Bantu
neighbors. These factors can lead to another level of peace and integration between the communities as their children are educated together and their relationship ceases to be defined by exploitation and dependency. BACUDA’s approach of focusing on both economic development and peace building through a single initiative provides a robust example of systems thinking in application and should be used to inform similar situations where indigenous peoples are forced off of their traditional land.

5.3.3 Moving Forward

The employees of BACUDA struggle to measure the results from the various ongoing projects and the land cessions are no exception. This is due to a variety of factors including a lack of access to and knowledge about adequate technology. Additionally, BACUDA is understaffed with only three full time employees. Taking these factors into consideration, I suggest that BACUDA adopt a plan for measuring the success of each land cession using one qualitative and one quantitative indicator. The qualitative indicator would be a survey of each adult member of the Bagyéli community immediately and then every six months for two years after a land cession takes place. Because many members of Bagyéli communities are illiterate, it would have to be an oral survey with a BACUDA employee. The employee would ask the Bagyéli community member if they feel their relationship with the neighboring Bantu community is very bad, bad, neutral, good, or very good. In this way, the qualitative indicator would measure the level of peace between the two communities as a result of the land cession. On the other hand, the quantitative indicator would measure economic growth by collecting the official numbers of school attendance for children from the community where the land cession occurred. This would also transpire on the day of the cession and every six months for at least five years afterwards. Only students who went to school without financial support from
BACUDA would be counted. Although this is an imperfect measurement of economic growth, tracking revenue from agricultural initiatives on the plots of land handed over to the Bagyéli would be nearly impossible with current record keeping capabilities. School attendance serves as a viable proxy because Bagyéli communities by and large value education. Sending more children to school is one of the first investments Bagyéli community leaders make when additional funds are available. If school attendance increases substantially after the Bagyéli are given the rights to land and begin agricultural initiatives, it will be clear that the community in question has increased their overall revenue.

Conclusion

The relationship between peace and economic development is being recognized by more and more practitioners in both fields. Peace is more measurable than ever before, as shown by the work of the Institute for Economics and Peace in their indices. Not only has this work shown that the link between each area is strong, it has also shown that it is incredibly complicated and requires an approach that applies systems thinking. In development work, we must all be careful to avoid the trap of seeking the quick fix. The Bagyéli’s Cultural and Development Association provides an example of an organization pursuing both developmental and peaceful ends. In any initiative where scarce resources are being allocated to achieve a particular goal, it is vital to have a procedure in place to measure the results. In this way, both the organization itself as well as other practitioners are able to learn more about the complex and significant connection between peace and economic development.
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## Appendix A. Global Peace Index indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing Domestic and International Conflict</th>
<th>Societal Safety and Security</th>
<th>Militarization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and duration of internal conflicts</td>
<td>Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP); Institute for Economics &amp; Peace (IEP)</td>
<td>Level of perceived criminality in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of deaths from external organized conflict</td>
<td>UCDP Armed Conflict Dataset</td>
<td>Number of refugees and internally displaced people as a percentage of the population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of deaths from internal organized conflict</td>
<td>International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) Armed Conflict Database (ACD)</td>
<td>Political instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number, duration and role in external conflicts</td>
<td>UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset; IEP</td>
<td>Political Terror Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity of organized internal conflict</td>
<td>Qualitative assessment by EIU analysts</td>
<td>Impact of terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with neighboring countries</td>
<td>Qualitative assessment by EIU analysts</td>
<td>Number of homicides per 100,000 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of violent crime</td>
<td>Qualitative assessment by EIU analysts</td>
<td>Ease of access to small arms and light weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of violent demonstrations</td>
<td>Qualitative assessment by EIU analysts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jailed population per 100,000 people</td>
<td>World Prison Brief, Institute for Criminal Policy Research at Birkbeck, University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of internal security officers and police per 100,000 people</td>
<td>UNODC CTS; EIU estimates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix B. Positive Peace Report Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Peace Factors</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well-functioning</td>
<td>Democratic political culture</td>
<td>Measures whether the electoral process, civil liberties, functioning of government, political participation and culture support secular democracy. Reflects perceptions of the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government’s commitment to such policies.</td>
<td>EIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government effectiveness</td>
<td>Reflects perceptions of the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence.</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rule of law</td>
<td></td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Business</td>
<td>Business environment</td>
<td>Measures a country’s entrepreneurial environment, its business infrastructure, barriers to innovation, and labor market flexibility.</td>
<td>Legatum Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Index of Economic Freedom</td>
<td>Measures individual freedoms and protection of freedoms to work, produce, consume, and invest unconstrained by the state.</td>
<td>Heritage Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Levels of</td>
<td>Factionalized elites</td>
<td>Measures the fragmentation of ruling elites and state institutions along ethnic, class, clan, racial or religious lines.</td>
<td>Fragile States Index, Fund for Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>Corruption Perceptions Index</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>Transparency International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control of corruption</td>
<td>Captures perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including both petty and grand forms of corruption.</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary school enrolment</td>
<td>The ratio of children of official school age who are enrolled in school to the population of the corresponding official school age.</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Innovation Index</td>
<td>The Global Innovation Index (GII) aims to capture the multi-dimensional facets of innovation and provide the tools that can assist in tailoring policies to promote long-term output growth, improved productivity, and job growth.</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>YDI measures the status of 15-29 year-olds according to five key Pillars: Education, Health and Well-being, Employment, Civic Participation and Political Participation.</td>
<td>Commonwealth Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Flow of Information</td>
<td>Freedom of the Press Index</td>
<td>A composite measure of the degree of print, broadcast, and internet freedom.</td>
<td>Freedom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile phone subscription rate</td>
<td>Number of mobile phone subscriptions per 100 inhabitants.</td>
<td>ITU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Press Freedom Index</td>
<td>Ranks countries based on media pluralism and independence, respect for the safety and freedom of journalists, and the legislative, institutional and infrastructural environment in which the media operate.</td>
<td>Reporters Without Borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Relations with</td>
<td>Hostility to foreigners</td>
<td>Measures social attitudes toward foreigners and private property.</td>
<td>EIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Number of visitors</td>
<td>Number of visitors as per cent of the domestic population.</td>
<td>EIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional integration</td>
<td>Measures the extent of a nation’s trade-based integration with other states.</td>
<td>EIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inequality-adjusted life expectancy</td>
<td>The HDI life expectancy index adjusted for inequality scores countries based on both average life expectancy and the degree of inequality in life expectancy between groups.</td>
<td>UNDP HDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social mobility</td>
<td>Measures the potential for upward social mobility based on the degree to which either merit or social networks determine an individual’s success.</td>
<td>IDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty gap</td>
<td>The mean shortfall from the poverty line at $2 per day PPP (counting the non-poor as having zero shortfall), expressed as a % of the poverty line.</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of the</td>
<td>Empowerment Index</td>
<td>An additive index using indicators of freedom of movement, freedom of speech, workers’ rights, political participation, and freedom of religion.</td>
<td>CIRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Others</td>
<td>Group grievance rating</td>
<td>Measures the extent and severity of grievances between groups in society, including religious, ethnic, sectarian and political discrimination and division.</td>
<td>Fund For Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Inequality Index</td>
<td>The Gender Inequality Index (GI) reflects women’s disadvantage in three dimensions: reproductive health, empowerment and the labour market.</td>
<td>UNDP HDI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NGO BAKOUME Solange is a young, single Bagyéli woman with five children. Thanks to the support of BACUDA and FEDEC, she has been taught agricultural techniques and has started to grow corn. As of today, she has already harvested 20 kg of corn and expects even more. Her family will benefit greatly from the profits.
Yesterday, the 11th of April 2018, BACUDA went to the village of Madoungou to facilitate the process of the cession of land to the Bagyéli from the camp of Bakoussi. In the presence of local authorities, an agreement about the cession of the land was signed by the Bantu Chief of the locality. Madame BISSA Madeleine, a Bagyéli woman in the community, began the efforts for securing this piece of land. This is a big step for the Bagyéli because with this space, they can begin agricultural ventures to earn revenue. The communication between the government and the Bantu Chief began Sunday, so everything happened very quickly and without difficulty. We could feel the hope in the air between the communities for a future of cohabitation between the Bantu and the Bagyéli in Madoungou.
Tuesday the 24th of April 2018, BACUDA visited the village of Kouambo to oversee another cession of land to the Bagyéli population that lives there. Government officials from the commune of Bipindi, the Bantu chief His Majesty Mi Énam André and the Bagyéli beneficiary Woule Serge signed to seal what started as a verbal agreement. The piece of land had already been developed by the Bagyéli through the cultivation of plantains and cocoa. Through securing ownership of this land, they are also securing their ability to generate income for years to come. Each piece of land that Bagyéli communities are able to own is a step on the path towards autonomy.