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Dialogue Processes in Eurasia: Grappling With a New World Order and a Return to “Strong Arm Politics”

Case Study of Roxana Cristescu
Our History and Approach to Peacebuilding

Since 2002, the Kroc Institute for Peace and Justice (Kroc IPJ) has been working for preeminent Women PeaceMakers (WPM), learning from and with them. We co-research with these women to document the leading-edge practices they are using to navigate and challenge extremism, violence, and inequality on the frontlines of conflict around the world. Together, we develop powerful and bold new strategies to end cycles of violence. The following case study is an outcome of such collaboration.

Case Study Focus: Understanding how to ensure women have a seat at the peace negotiation table

To best align the WPM program with today’s most relevant peacebuilding needs, each year the Kroc IPJ asks its network of WPM alumnae (now over 65 women from 35 different countries): What is the most pressing issue women peacebuilders are currently facing? In 2018, the WPMs selected the ongoing lack of inclusion of women in peace negotiations. Therefore, to better understand this issue, the Kroc IPJ brought together four WPMs who have held multiple roles in a range of peace negotiations, and paired them with Peace Researchers to explore the following research question:

*How can international partners work more equitably with national women to broaden their participation and representation in the decision-making process before and during peace negotiations, and the implementation of peace agreements?*

In addition to exploring this question, this case study highlights other critical junctures, strategies and experiences that shaped the WPM and her personal approaches to ending cycles of violence.

Methodology

In order to best understand the complex realities pertaining to the peace negotiations that the WPMs were involved in, the Kroc IPJ conducted over 70 hours of in-depth semi-structured interviews with each WPM during a seven-week period. Additionally, this case study is informed by secondary sources. The secondary data was gathered through the analysis of contemporary news articles, expert reports, academic peer-reviewed articles, and relevant research papers. Lastly, to best elevate the expertise of the WPM, the framework of the research process and the outline of the case study were co-designed by the Kroc IPJ and the WPM. Through this process, each WPM's unique and rich perspective of building peace in her own context is captured.
ROXANA CRISTESCU’S BACKGROUND: BUILDING PEACE IN EURASIA

Cristescu is a professional with 12 years of international experience in mediating political and armed conflict. She specializes in designing dialogue processes for government agencies and non-government actors and providing mediation support for regional organizations and governments. Her work has covered country-specific settings in Eastern and Southern Europe (Kosovo, Georgia, Ukraine, Moldova, Azerbaijan, and Armenia), the Russian Federation, Turkey, Central Asia (Afghanistan), Africa (Ethiopia, Sudan, and South Sudan), Asia (Indonesia and Thailand) and the Middle East (Lebanon).

Since 2015, Cristescu has served as the Head of the Eurasia Program for Crisis Management Initiative (CMI). Throughout these years, she has engaged in diverse peacemaking initiatives, ranging from work on Track II\(^1\) peace processes with youth and civil society actors to organizing strategy sessions for international mediators such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), and the United Nations (UN). Furthermore, Cristescu has been building dialogue and trust across divided conflict lines such as in the South Caucasuses, Ukraine, Russia, and Turkey, engaging in sustained dialogue with civil society actors and translating those engagements into concrete policy and peace process design recommendations for national and international political actors.

Cristescu has also actively contributed to designing the UN and OSCE Guidance on Effective Mediation. She regularly advises the EU External Action Service on how the European Union can act as a supporter of the mediation process, including helping EU officials design strategies to support confidence-building measures in the Europe’s Eastern and Southern Neighborhood. Her skills in peace process design, implementation, facilitation and combining dialogue components within official peace talks have brought crucial expertise to different institutions and mediation focused actors.

“I have dedicated – and will continue to do so – my whole career and personal life to contributing to and understanding how individuals can overcome trauma and how societies can transition from violent conflicts to constructive interactions,” Cristescu shares.

---

\(^1\) Unofficial or nonofficial (also called citizen or track II) diplomacy refers to the use of nontraditional diplomatic agents, including business executives, religious figures, nongovernmental organizations, academics, and other private citizens who are typically conducting dialogue and problem-solving activities (Snodderly, 2016).
As the Head of the Eurasia Program at CMI, Cristescu has a deep understanding of complex dynamics in the region. Apart from her professional career, her personal life is also connected to the region, as she was born and raised in Romania. Cristescu lived through the transition process from the Soviet Union and experienced the post-Soviet dynamics that her homeland and other post-Soviet union countries went through.

“I wanted to work within the region because I belong to it. I am able to understand it in a nuanced, unsuperficial manner. I know what frustrates and challenges it, but I also know what motivates its societies – societies which have lived through the collapse of a system and the rebirth of a more chaotic system.” Cristescu further shares, “I don’t think we had a constructive transition process in my country. With my work, I try to understand how one can create appropriate spaces for reflection and better understanding of how a country / nation can pick up various pieces and reinvent itself. The same applies for societies and individuals. I feel the transition process my country has gone through has been a rushed one – if I could give a comparison, I would say it was a bit like trying to climb on a train at full speed – with little understanding of the destination we were embarking for or the baggage we carried along.”
Elements from the Soviet Union’s ideological legacy that are currently affecting state-building efforts in the region

Failure to build political identities

Cristescu thinks it is important to recognize how the Soviet system relied on a strong ideological construct which made speaking about different views and diverging opinions unwelcome. For her today, most contexts in the region clearly illustrate this legacy: the notion of diversity and plurality of political ideas is politically charged, and many are not ready to acknowledge this as a reality. Furthermore, take language and the various assertions of political identity built around it. In all the post-Soviet countries, Cristescu has seen, the language one speaks at home is clearly associated with a political position, usually pro or against a certain someone or something.

As a result, Cristescu has found, individuals and groups outside the mainstream discourse often cannot, or do not wish to, be included in dialogues on peace as their views are commonly met with aggression or dismissal. Cristescu believes this is also important for the conversations on the women, peace and security agenda. For her, people should also nuance their understanding of women as political actors and deepen their recognition of women’s diverse roles in peace and conflict.

If Cristescu had to think about the Republic of Moldova, for example: language is, and has always been, an issue of political identity. It goes beyond the issue of ethnicity and borders to the system of values or the view of a political world that people feel they belong to. Cristescu feels assertions of political identity centered around language are not, however, a characteristic of a post-Soviet syndrome – the issue goes way back in history (a history that unfortunately new generations in eastern Europe are less and less familiar with). It has perhaps to do also with the fact that after World War II, entire populations were shifted around in an attempt to homogenize societies around the issue of nationalism – or worse, to create territorial borders in a perhaps artificial manner.

In any case, Cristescu believes generalizations cannot be made about all of the countries from the former soviet bloc. There are big differences between countries from Central and Eastern Europe as well as countries in the Caucasus region. She further feels geography played a big role in how these different states and nations were created – as we know them today. Cristescu would say that the process of definition is far from being over. For example, as we have seen over the last five years, the refugee crisis is another force shaping European understandings of identity and nationhood.
State building – a work in progress

After the Soviet system collapsed, Cristescu shares, political instability became not the exception to the rule, but the rule of the game. Post-Soviet states (and de facto states alike) are not stable, consolidated or unitary actors. For Cristescu, she saw they all have numerous challenges – particularly dealing with changing societies, creating new institutions and imaginary politics\(^2\) after a system collapse. Cristescu notes that to date, there is little understanding of state formation in this region as a competitive process where no single actor or entity is presumed to represent either the state or society. While the majority is privy to all advantages offered by democracy, most of the society is still excluded. The elected majority in most of these contexts act in an exclusive manner and political life is usually defined by a struggle between multiple sets of individual or institutional actors to establish their authority through various means.

While having similar challenges of identity and state building, different countries manifest political struggles in very different ways. For instance, in Cristescu’s opinion, you can’t compare Armenia and Azerbaijan with Georgia. One needs to take into account a variety of factors – including the history of the region before WWII to be able to understand the dynamics of the current nation building and state formation challenges.

I ideological polarization and feelings of belonging

When looking at the region, Cristescu believes, one needs to understand that this is an area that has been constantly exposed to different shifts. States/empires/blocks have existed and disappeared in a continuous flux. Cristescu remembers stories about some of her relatives living in the north of Romania’s current border (now Ukraine) who would tell her that during masters.\(^3\) Cristescu further shares the challenges of ideological belonging did not start during the Soviet Union, they preceded WWII. The dynamics of belonging to a certain camp have perhaps been exacerbated by the war itself and by the fact that in the wake of the war the nationalist and socialist ideologies became taboo. “To date,” Cristescu shares, “we are still struggling with questions like: who was a fascist and who was a communist? How far did the Red Army go and who has sacrificed for the Red Army? Are you a dissident or are you with the party? All these divisions brought people to become extremely polarized, engaging a friend or foe approach.”

Cristescu thinks this is visible today in Ukraine. If you think about the revolution of “Dignity” and “Maidan” — there are various interpretations of what happened — depending on whom you speak to in Ukraine. People in different regions have very different

---

\(^2\) The domain of the imaginary [politics] consists of a set of representations that go beyond the limit established by the results of the experience and deductive reasoning that is based on (Patlagean, 1978).

\(^3\) Masters: they can sing three different anthems and have personal IDs to account for the fact that they were part of the Austro-Hungarian empire, Romania and the Ukrainian SSR.
understandings of what went wrong and why the violence and the current conflict happened. Crestescu feels, even though it is often articulated in a completely different manner, the question remains the same: where do I belong? There is a perception that we need to belong to something that is very solid: (i.e., somebody tells me what to do, I get my clear instructions, both in terms of what should I believe, who’s my friend and who’s not, etc.).

State building, polarization and binary approaches

Cristescu shares, that after the Soviet system collapsed, the identities that had been constructed, both political and social, have been built against dividing lines. She feels they have not been designed around this idea of diversity and inclusion: accepting all nationalities and all political ideas. “We” are the good camp and then there is the bad camp. Usually the bad camp has everything to do with everything that was bad about the post-Soviet era or everything that was bad about the war.

Cristescu notes that systems in Eurasian countries are continuously evolving. It’s not static, it’s not something that has happened at a given point in time when you consider the results today. She thinks there are new dynamics and new realities that are being created every day based on all sorts of causes that happened in the past or that are happening today.”

“Sometimes I agree with what my colleagues from Russia say, and sometimes I agree with something that my other colleagues in Western Europe or the United States (US) say. I think it’s very difficult for people to actually comprehend that. It’s as if there’s something wrong with you if you do not take a given position. I do not think that this is something that is actually embedded. This is a result of actually being forced to think in a very binary way. I do not think that communism has helped, because you’re supposed to be a part of the system and to be loyal to the system, and if you’re not, that means you’re like a non-person,” expresses Cristescu.

A way forward to overcoming existing polarization and binary approaches

The need for a deeper dialogue

“I think a deeper type of conversation and dialogue is needed. However,
nobody does that, nobody is interested or invested in it,” says Cristescu. To her the US has a problem with such dialogues as much as everybody else. Europeans and Russians talk past each other. Cristescu thinks it is key to have honest conversations about lived experiences and memories and identities. For her, there is a need for a deeper understanding of each others’ possibilities and limits. She further thinks we might have missed that train between the EU and Russia. For her, the challenge is more profound than meets the eye. There are very few discussions about the divide between Western and Central and Eastern Europe. While some specialized analysts focus on this, the topic is definitely not part of the mainstream public discourse. Yet, one can observe the consequences of those differences in pretty much every reaction to an EU-led decision.

When it comes to Russia, Cristescu believes there was a moment of openness in the ‘90s, after the Soviet Union collapsed, when Russians themselves were reinventing their own political imagination and strategy. Additionally, she shares, the EU was too preoccupied (even at the time) with internal processes of integrating new countries and positions so the Russian openness was met with a very cold shoulder. People today talk a lot about a Russian threat. Cristescu does not believe that – she thinks we should be smarter and not box everything as “all that is bad comes from the East.” The friend and foe label is really not helpful. The spaces for dialogue are closing up more and more, and Cristescu does not believe that the answer to the lack of channels of communication are new treaties or new policies or discussions on the environment and student exchanges. Cristescu argues that “We will never get anywhere if we keep scratching the surface. You cannot make a dog happy by wagging its tail.”

**Generational change**

“This is a topic that is also not discussed properly: generational change. Better said, the implications of the generational change for Europe and its neighbors are not accurately understood. For example, we started talking in Brussels about different generations articulating their political aspirations differently – only with the Brexit aftershocks. We started considering only recently the huge difference of opinion between people that move across borders and speak four languages and make lifelong friendships with their Erasmus fellows⁴ and people that have lived all their lives in the same neighborhood and knew the name of their local pet vendor and watched dubbed Hollywood movies. And we are still not speaking about the feeling of failure that the people who decided or were forced to stay (not emigrate for work or study) may feel – this is particularly relevant for the new generations in Central and Eastern Europe.

⁴ An EU programme that encourages student exchanges
Yet we keep scratching our heads and wondering, ‘how is populism still possible in modern Europe?’” explains Cristescu.

Cristescu thinks there is a huge hope in the next generation. However, she feels it is important that people keep talking to each other and get to understand each other. The world seen from the perspective of “I do not agree” – is still the world. Socially constructed narratives are bad and Cristescu thinks we must work to go past this.

People today talk a lot about a Russian threat. Cristescu does not believe that – she thinks we should be smarter and not box everything as, “all that is bad comes from the East.”

Exploring the similar challenges and common threats pertaining to conflict faced by countries in the region

» Mentality of exploiting, not investing

Businessmen and politicians in the region often have the mentality of exploiting, not investing as Cristescu explains. For her, many such actors believe that they are going to do their five years and whatever happens next is not their business. Cristescu thinks this is unfortunately reminiscent of the system that discouraged any kind of trust. Everybody tries to play the system, but nobody invests in the system. In Cristescu’s opinion, there is little hope for progress under such a system.

» Peace negotiations in Eurasia

Cristescu has found peace negotiations in the Eurasian region challenging due to the numerous geopolitical factors that come with the diverse region. For her CMI is one of the key neutral actors in the region, strengthening local, national, and regional conflict resolution capacities to prevent and resolve violent conflicts through informal dialogue and mediation. For almost a decade, Cristescu has found CMI has worked to contribute to a peaceful future in Eastern Europe, the South Caucasus, and Central Asia.

CMI’s know-how in mediating peace in the region

Cristescu explains that CMI organizes retreats and then discussions behind closed doors for many days. She emphasizes that they are not imposing any kind of moral judgement or
biases to their work. Instead, they encourage people to think in a critical way and get inspired by others’ experiences rather than stay in their boxes. By doing that they hope to construct the strategy that can bring a change from inside.

For Cristescu, mediation practitioners have grown affectionate to the “multi-tracks” model and the vision of society sliced in a three-segment triangle (track I – political leadership, track II – opinion makers, track III – civil society and grassroots) in the post-Soviet context. However, this static frame of conflict analysis is misleading in a space with multiple centers of authority-building – each with different sectoral capabilities and degrees of influence.

Cristescu does not believe in the system of separate tracks in the work that they do at CMI. They work with people who have the power to influence policy and decision-making. In their work, a conflict analysis tool that does not consider the epicenters of pressure and gravity exerted on the state structure and on the processes of state formation by oligarchs, political parties, and executive leadership on the one hand, and international financial institutions or regional trade associations on the other is bound to inform flawed mediation strategies.

CMI’s working environment is typically fluid and high-risk. Conflicts are prime examples of “wicked problems”: unique in their characteristics, and impossible to describe definitively. For Cristescu, there are no right or wrong solutions to such problems, only better or worse ones. She feels resolving complex conflict is itself a complex undertaking, involving a wide and often conflictual agendas of individuals, groups, interests, and risks. Conflicts are invariably characterized by starkly polarized perspectives, and this can lead to narrowed perceptions of the possibilities for peace and the means to achieving it.

In such complex circumstances, Cristescu has found, demonstrating cause and effect in simplistic terms is not the way to go. At the same time, however, there is always a strong public demand for clear results. Those working with conflict and peace must be able not only to assess, but also clearly communicate the results of their work to funders, decision-makers and the general public. The increasing number of donors and their specific requirements pose an additional challenge.

Conflicts are prime examples of “wicked problems”: unique in their characteristics, and impossible to describe definitively. For Cristescu, there are no right or wrong solutions to such problems, only better or worse ones.
Cristescu explains: “At CMI, we created several focuses including: 1. relationships, 2. capacities, 3. inclusion, 4. solutions, and 5. opening the channels of communication. These are the five baskets that we have identified for ourselves.”

Cristescu explains finding the people, including women, who have experienced and are directly linked to negotiations often become a challenge. Cristescu does not have any women in her processes because the criteria for their selection is established presence within the system - something that is practically unachievable. She feels this is greatly based around the political decision-making power one has, and often there are no women with such power around.

Women’s participation in peace negotiations

Between 1990 and 2017, women constituted only two percent of mediators, eight percent of negotiators, and five percent of witnesses and signatories in all major peace processes. Alarming or not, for Cristescu these statistics undoubtedly deliver a message regarding

women’s participation in peace negotiations. Also, frequent formal commitments to increase women’s participation in peace negotiations and mediation are rarely backed up by any means of implementation. Hence the de facto situation remains unchanged.

Women at the negotiation table as official representatives or mediators

“All too often I am the only woman in the room. At CMI we monitor the female-male ratio of participation in our processes, and generally women’s participation is below 20 percent – especially if we have to convene meetings of official actors mandated to negotiate or mediate in a given context. I believe in the Eurasia context women are more represented in negotiation teams – it is the international community that falls behind when it comes to appointing female envoys or mediators,” shares Cristescu.

Exploring whether gender parity is an important indicator for ensuring equity of peace negotiations

Cristescu likes to place this topic, of gender parity, beyond the normative “right” or “wrong” thing to do. For her, including more women at all stages of peace efforts is an intelligent and efficient thing to do. She thinks we have a lot of research in the past decade that has led to a vast majority appreciating how the inclusion of women and their interests in peacemaking is not only pivotal from the standpoint of equal rights, but necessary for a qualitative transition process in the short and long term. However, we still lack the implementation measures of this normative framework. Cristescu argues that we prioritize immediate security arrangements and political deals that continuously exclude women from the table.

Cristescu notes that to date there is still this short term approach - stop the violence and then we will wait and see what happens after that. “In the rush of the moment or when mediators are caught up in bureaucratic international machineries, mediators and negotiators alike struggle to see that peace processes offer decisive moments when the rules of the political game can be rewritten. Women’s inclusion at these critical junctures can pave the way for democratization and more just and equitable societies in the longer term. But this is never the priority – especially when one is expected to deliver quickly and to stop the loss of human life. This is a problem that pertains to different components of what a peace process ought to be – nobody has time for lengthy strategic discussions and for designing inclusive forums of participation and representation. “Better than nothing’ or ‘as good as it gets’ dictates action in peace negotiations,” shares Cristescu.
Cristescu believes important issues get missed in this rushed process. For example, for her, women, just like men, play a range of diverse roles in peace and conflict – including those of potential spoilers which can only be addressed if brought onboard. The issue of women’s groups acting as spoilers is still a taboo topic in the field. Another example is “selling” an agreement. Involving society at large significantly increases the legitimacy of a peace or transition process and its outcomes. Without the active participation of different groups, including women, a substantial part of society may refuse to accept a peace deal, endorse a given reform agenda or participate in its implementation. But this is rarely the real concern of an international mediator – they are mandated to get a deal signed – it is up to the parties to take it home and make sure it sticks.

“I think gender issues in Eurasian countries are even more difficult because they are deeply embedded. You see successful women in academia, in business, and in politics - so it is seen as a non-issue. But there are so many challenges,” says Cristescu.

She further elaborates: “Women and men see their roles with natural divisions and are fine with it. Men are supposed to be providing for the family, making sure you do not get into trouble. However, women’s job is to teach children the history, create their identity and make the generational transition happen. Some women are often more assertive than their male counterparts, leaving the men to be identified as bridge builders too.”

Equality of genders in peace mediation and negotiations

For Cristescu, she believes that genders should not be treated differently in peace mediation and negotiations. In particular, she expresses, “for me it always has been an issue of capacity. I have never felt that I am in a room where I should not be. I never felt that I know less than my colleagues. So, the fact that you are a woman or man was completely irrelevant to me. I have never worried that I could be perceived badly in a certain role due to my gender. Age perhaps but never gender. I believe that what matters the most is what are you saying and what you are bringing to the table. I don’t play by men’s or women’s rules. I play with what I think are my own rules. They can obviously be gendered but I never think of them as such,” shares Cristescu as she explains her experience.

In the past five years, Cristescu has recruited women for her team. In this pursuit, she has come to realize that one’s own gender perception is a recurrent matter. It appears some women are aware of others’ perception of
them being a strong female professional, which they feel can impede on their own success. Through this experience Cristescu is more aware of gendered dynamics, and is working to use a gendered lens in analyzing both individual and group dynamics that she is navigating. Even so, it is daily work for her to recognize that things are not always as equal as they may appear - or as she wants them to be.

Supporting female peace mediators and negotiators

“In my CMI team I think we are 60 percent women and 40 percent men. Perhaps one thing that we have special is talking a lot and not separating ‘women’ and ‘men’ discussions – we talk jointly about women’s and men’s issues – even if the topics are sensitive or embarrassing or related to … women’s and men’s health,” explained Cristescu. She further highlighted the importance of how they challenge each other and each other’s perceptions, so they can become better at understanding the world and the individuals around one another. In her job it is fundamental to understand and work with people – rigidity is the faux pas. If one’s emotional intelligence falls short or if one cannot listen and be able to change her or his opinion based on observed behaviors or based on argumentative reasoning, one has no business in peace mediation — at least when it comes to working directly with people and not processing big data.

Fundamentally, Cristescu disagrees with the mantra of, “giving a voice to women.” For her they have the voice to begin with. It is about creating the spaces where they can use it without constraining or adapting it to fit a given expectation. Giving women a voice implies a change that needs to happen in the individual. The problem is not there, the problem is in the public or private space that needs to accommodate diversity and not tremble at any phenomena that does not fit a known pattern. Cristescu thinks our social and political systems are very rigid and prescriptive and constrained. We do not do well at all with what we perceive is out of the regular. Look at the whole way we deal with migration or look at school curricula and education systems.
Cristescu keeps coming back to this issue of diversity and plurality. She believes humans are not comfortable with change and what we perceive as chaotic – we need rules and patterns and tribes. We need the us and them. However, she believes that we can capitalize on the fact that we are creatures of habit. If we become accustomed to the fact that one can find baby changing tables in non-gendered washing rooms, maybe we could also make women using their different voices in whatever way they please in whatever form they wish – the norm.

“My goal has never been to empower any one individual. I have always strived to succeed as a team. Let’s make sure this works. We are going in this as a team and let’s make sure that this is top notch. Instead of obsessing about your status, about how you are perceived and how you are seen – you just do it. You just do what the team needs,” exclaims Cristescu.

For Cristescu shifting the format of peace negotiations to create greater gender parity is something she is not certain can occur. As she shares, “Perhaps women are natural negotiators, but even if this is the case, they should not be invited to the table based on their gender. They should be there because they add substance to the dialogue. I have a lot of open questions to myself and to others that I constantly explore. However, I don’t have many solutions,” exclaims Cristescu.

Cristescu does not think gender should be a criterion at any point in negotiations. She believes who participates in peace negotiations should be more about their experience and political background.

While there has been significant progress in the peacebuilding processes in the region, the geopolitical situation is still unstable and requires years of engagement and work. “What happens at the grassroots level feels so separated from the negotiation table - so much so, the two worlds feel entirely different,” explains Cristescu.
For Cristescu, the political agenda in the region is always very binary. “It’s never about ‘are we going to construct something that is completely new?’ It’s always about, are we with West or East? It’s all about either… or,” shares Cristescu. Therefore, when it comes to designing strategies that are effective, Cristescu thinks the distinction of peace tracks are misleading and that it should not be used as a reference.

“People who are not involved in the peace negotiations have no idea about what is actually happening in the room. That is why there is no connection between tracks. We need to change all of it,” explains Cristescu. Cristescu feels the need to structure peace negotiations to more aptly reflect how they are occurring and how they should occur is vital for building more effective talks. Peace talks do not fit perfectly into the three silos of tracks I through III. More often than not there is fluidity between these tracks. The individuals and parties are speaking at and interacting with all spaces in and around the negotiations. 

To begin, **Cristescu believes it is vital we work beyond structuring peace negotiations into three siloed tracks, and in turn foster the fluid structures that are beginning to arise organically around peace talks**. For example, the mediators in these talks can do more to facilitate the exchange and interactions of working / advisory groups, civil society and negotiation parties. This will improve the flow of accurate information to the negotiating parties, and also ensure the issues discussed at the track I level are already rooted in a local context. In turn this will help with the implementation phase of the agreement. Lastly, the more these three groups can speak to each other the more the agreement reflects the actual peacebuilding needs of the local conflict and its larger cultural context.

*To learn more about the Women PeaceMakers program, go to: sandiego.edu/peace/wpm*
“It’s never about, ‘are we going to construct something that is completely new?’ It’s always about, are we with West or East? It’s all about either… or,” shares Cristescu. Therefore, when it comes to designing strategies that are effective, Cristescu thinks the distinction of peace tracks are misleading and that it should not be used as a reference.