Architecture of Peace

Architecture of Peace is an international long-term research and action project in which a large number of stakeholders are involved. The project will consist of local case studies, interventions, university research studios, debates, publications and exhibitions.

How do we materialize peace? How do politics, finance and power, social structuring and empowerment need to balance with design processes? And how does this lead to a stable, safe, clean and inviting environment that facilitates peaceful interaction between groups of people?
Cities in the post-conflict rebuilding phase have recurrent, comparable problems. Political power vacuums at the national level and the absence of civil self-monitoring generate uncontrolled forces which seriously damage the cities’ chances for recovery. For this reason it is necessary to scrutinize the aid and planning strategies we have used and intensify the search for possible alternatives. We call upon all those working in the field of politics, aid, architecture, and community work and development cooperation to share their knowledge and experience and rethink how to rebuild the community by a smart reconstruction of the city. The integral approach will provide innovative insights to create new tools and methods to approach reconstruction. The outcome will be an inventory of case studies and good practices as well as an inventory of clear themes for further research and proposed partners to conduct that research. Reconstruction is a highly political process in which every step that is seen to favour one side over another can ignite new violence. Unbalanced reconstruction can create new inequalities, which would lead to new grievances. But can reconstruction also be an instrument of peace?

This project concentrates on the second phase out of the three phases of reconstruction that can be distinguished:

• In the first phase, provisional shelter and other forms of temporary construction dominate, from make shift refugee camps to large-scale relief infrastructure. The military still plays a large role.

• In the second phase, people try to resume everyday life. There is no real coordination yet, and the lack of control and process often leads to ethnic enclaves, gated communities, illegal settlements, and urban sprawl. It is in this phase that structures get shape which later on, when regulatory institutions start to function, constrain interventions. It is especially in this phase that rebuilding takes place in a form that, later on gives rise to new conflicts. But this phase could also offer a window of opportunity to advocate positive interaction and reduce the chance of a resumption of conflict.

• In the third phase, institutions have been created that start a more coordinated process, in which space is allocated, property titles are acknowledged, and longer-term infrastructure development is planned. This phase resembles more closely the normal processes of city planning, in which outcomes are negotiated between different groups and authorities, and less the result of spontaneous actions of inhabitants.
The public kick-off of the programme was a two-day conference in Rotterdam, The Netherlands on the 3rd and 4th of May, 2010. Participants included architects, urbanists and professionals from the fields of development studies, sociology and conflict studies. Keynote speakers were Jolyon Leslie, Hilton Judin, Kai Vöckler and Sultan Barakat.

The main goal of the conference was to bring together the fields of design and social (conflict) studies and create an agenda for action that would both help to develop the knowledge and knowledge exchange in the field and at the same time create good practice.

The first day was focused on lectures by specialists in the field to highlight the main issues at stake on both a practical as academic level. The second day the participants worked in groups to construct the necessary ingredients for the Architecture of Peace discourse.

‘There are many quick impact projects but there is a need for long term development, such as institutional development.’
Sultan Barakat
Architects should
develop an ethical code
for their profession

Identity is important for communities to re-establish belonging and identity. However, Sultan Barakat remarked: ‘reconstruction efforts often ignore the two most important basic needs for human recovery: to reaffirm a sense of identity and to regain control over one’s life, both have their expression in the built environment’. How do we accept the necessity of improving the built environment and how do we get this urgency across? Architects have tools and a way of thinking, and moreover a method of coordination and collaboration. They are brought up to talk to others. Can they influence what happens after the handshake, when people often get caught up over square meters and the number of mosques vs. churches? Whatever the case, in this debate, architects have been marginalized.

The architect does bring many skills to the table:
• The problem-solving and interdisciplinary processes inherent in architectural conceptualization and production can contribute to understanding the complexity of the reconstruction processes
• Extending the role of the profession beyond being the conceivers and executors of blueprint plans to potential negotiators and mediators of built environment politics
• The need to move away from relief-driven charitable actions to longer term developmental leadership

Early engagement is important - it cannot be assumed that political and funding support will be maintained throughout the period needed for recovery. In general there is a very simple graph that shows the discrepancy between the level of support and the need for support. During the period of reconstruction when the local capacity is slowly returning (from diaspora) and the need for support is growing, the media and political attention from the world has already been turned to another topic.

Barakat states that in order to make architects more relevant in the process they need to be trained in conflict; there needs to be codes and legislation, although it is difficult to maintain after war. We also cannot ignore religion and faith in the built environment. How do we allow for multiple identities?

During post-war reconstruction, some everyday situations of the population become worse. For example, there is increasing targeting of civilians, internal conflicts and a lack of political and social infrastructure. Accordingly, the post-war architect should firstly address the important needs of human recovery. The second significant aspect is to move away from the charity approach. This approach usually leads to an initial concentration of help and a subsequent abandonment of the local situation later on.

In a post-war situation, planning codes and legislation are not in place. As a consequence, architecture should be flexible and easy to adapt to the day-to-day environment.

‘Architects should be engaged in the early stage of the post-war reconstruction process’
Hilton Judin illustrated the case study of the Kliptown neighborhood, a part of Soweto in Johannesburg, South Africa.

Judin and his colleagues did years of research on the area and learned from practice. An important ‘tool’ in the project was the creation of an oral history of the neighborhood. Before any kind of intervention Judin recommends to analyze living flows, informal patterns, daily movements, how to connect left-over spaces, try to create continuity with old historical fabric and above all… involve the inhabitants! Instead of the erasure of the existing informal structure – that in many eyes would seem ‘poor’ or ‘ugly’- it is better to respect the local energy and creativity and facilitate initiatives for improvement. The possibility to recognize and identify with the physical environment is of crucial importance.

‘We need to listen better to the local communities!’

The proposals the group made to the local authorities focused on the connectivity between the existing local structures.

Judin illustrated his view with the newly designed Walter Sisulu Square in Johannesburg. He begins by outlining the conditions of South Africa. The nation has no history of ‘public space’, especially the role of a public square. In comparison with other important public squares in the world, he points out that they are always surrounded by other important buildings or programs; like museums, churches, governmental buildings or retail. Sisulu Square is created in emptiness and is not embedded in the urban fabric. An architecture of good intentions is not good enough; enormous damage can be done as a result of reconstruction.

‘Is Kliptown to be transformed or can we be transformed by Kliptown?’
Reflecting on the experience of some 20 years of work in Afghanistan, Jolyon Leslie explored how indigenous notions of ‘time and space’ risk being ignored in the ongoing international military engagement in the country. With any facility associated with this engagement, and indeed with government, now barricaded off, the distance between ruler/occupier and the Afghan people is growing - despite assurances that civilians are at the heart of the strategy of counter-insurgency. If anything, the intrusion into Afghans’ lives is growing, as the ‘enemy’ is now perceived to be everywhere. Rather than razor-wire and concrete blast-walls, what is called for is a process of urban reconciliation that aims to have a positive impact on the lives of ordinary Afghans; in both physical and social terms. It is only with time to negotiate and undertake the institutional transformation that will enable lasting recovery, and the space that allows Afghans themselves (rather than foreign troops) to ‘clear, hold and build’ their own neighbourhoods or villages, that the country will move forward. Despite claims that the international presence is maintaining some kind of ‘order’, it is in fact a complex web of Afghan interests - political, commercial, factional and, increasingly, criminal – that arguably preserve a relative form of stability. In order to make the point about perceptions, Jolyon Leslie went on to present a series of images to illustrate the differing points of departure that seem to prevail in contemporary Kabul:

‘We have to become proactive instead of reactive.’
He went on to describe several projects in Kabul that respond to the need for time and space. In the case of Baghe Babur, the intervention has tapped into Aghans’ innate understanding of and respect for the natural environment, while continuous public consultations have helped to ensure the ‘neutrality’ of a site that has been visited by more than a million Afghans in two years, since its rehabilitation. Along with other examples, this points to an alternative approach to recovery in the complex urban dynamic of Kabul, entailing the removal – rather than the erection - of physical and social barricades to maintain public confidence and order.

From these examples, Jolyon Leslie stated that Afghans need time and space to realize their own plans. They are not to be portrayed (only) as victims.

‘Transform the victim into a citizen’

The pivotal meaning of the city as an agent for political and social changes becomes particularly obvious in a post-conflict situation. Political power vacuums at the national level, along with the absence of self-monitoring in the civilian population, generate uncontrolled forces that seriously endanger these cities’ chances for recovery. For this reason, it is necessary to scrutinize the aid and planning strategies we have used so far and intensify the search for possible alternatives.

Cities grow enormously after conflicts, - often triple (Prishtina) in ~2 years. There is a rapid growth due to rural people flocking to the city, whom are not accustomed to city life and to living next to people with different backgrounds and customs. There is a boom of informal construction, which leads to new types of social interaction.

Ideally, the work of NGOs should conform to the following description:

- they represent interests that have no voice in existing political structures (political advocacy)
- they identify problems and topics, and include them in political negotiations and decision-making processes on both the local as well as international level (agenda setting)
- they mobilize factual expertise and knowledge in order to solve or debate topics in public
- they develop projects that are not undertaken by state and supra-state players, or else carry them out when governments or the international community cannot do so for organizational or political reasons
But all too often NGOs have – whether they want it or not – a role in global governance and contribute to the export of capitalist principles. The workings can be seen in the following image:

‘Us’ and ‘Them’ – the New Divide

Also architects are part of political and economical forces. Space is not neutral. A few basic questions an architect should consider before intervention:

- Where: Where are spaces that are not disputed and controversial, but “neutral”?
- What: is it possible to create a new space, which will open up new perspectives?
- Why: who needs it, who will profit from it? Who are the partners involved in the process? Is it in the interest of the public welfare?
- How: what tools and strategies are needed, in order to create this space? How can collaborations be established, and how can the process be shaped?

The obvious failures of city government and the international organizations in post-conflict situations, responsible for city development, can be traced back to a problematic understanding of planning and the role of the expert.

If the traditional top-down model of urban planning is rejected, then new forms of cooperation and processes of negotiation between private parties and governmental institutions need to be developed: processual, participatory, and hence, communications-based types of plans (collaborative planning).
Paul van Tongeren outlined the structures of local and regional peace committees in his presentation. They are essential, he emphasized, in diffusing tension, per se during elections. He puts forward two examples: 1) The Brochure of the Ministry of the Interior of Ghana on a National Architecture of Peace, and 2) a document presented to the parliament of Kenya on Management of Conflict and Peace Building. The examples of Ghana and Kenya are two nations that have not gone through protracted conflict but have experienced post-conflict conditions so how do we manage post-conflict, especially if there was no conflict? Van Tongeren suggested that infrastructures of peace are needed in every society. He further proposes that these organizations need to be housed and visible in a civil building in public space.

Cees Hamelink presented the annual award for the most communicative city, which will be organized from 2011 onwards by the Urban Communication Foundation.

In the literature on cities, begins Cees Hamelink, there is little to be found on communication, and vice versa—in the literature on communication, there is little about cities. Cities will be the major site of human conflicts in the future. Cities ‘steal’ water from the rural areas. Some parts of the cities are ‘disneyfied’, others ‘bronxified’. The capacity of cities to prevent conflicts and to deal with conflicts will be dependant on strong communities, for example, in how far they invite people to ‘conversations in a disarming way’. (A great deal of communication is mindless, gives rise to escalation, is too often violent, and judgmental.)

The criteria for consideration will include: public space, comfortability, no time limits, safety, sites of wonder (‘isn’t it wonderful’), and the human scale.

Cees Hamelink

‘The urban question is the core question as politics is embedded in the city fabric; there is a necessity to marry political science and urban discourse in dialogue.’
Allard Wagemaker pointed out some of the complexities of the situation in Afghanistan and explained how the military strategy has changed over the years. At the ISAF headquarters in Kabul he conducted research and advised on the new strategy.

Afghanistan had been a strong nation with a weak state whereas Pakistan has been a weak nation with a strong state. However, there has been a change in Afghanistan shifting it from a strong nation to one split into 31 ethnicities, with a decline in the use of shared languages. The ‘network’ of paved roads is very limited; about a third of its land surface is littered with mines leaving 23% of the population with disabilities. There has been a massive displacement of its population, mainly to Pakistan—those who left return with a ‘new culture’.

Concurrently, there has been a change in relations between organizations (the UNAMA, ISAF and GIROA) at the national, provincial and district level. The example is given that a governor at the district level may have no more than $10-15 per week to ‘run’ the district.

Many well-educated people still reside in Afghanistan, however they work with skills that are underutilized (such as interpreters). Wagemaker (like most of the other speakers) stressed the need for time to rebuild the government and a stable and sustainable peace. Furthermore, he stressed the need to connect government and execution/implementation.
A totally different condition exists in South Africa, where a legitimate government and its mechanisms are in place – but at a cost: the tremendous communal energy that helped change the apartheid regime, for the most part, no longer exists.

In June 2001 the Kliptown Our Town Trust (KOTT) was established to drive development initiatives. These include adapting the exhibition for publication as a coffee-table book, a documentary film, further oral history research, a household survey, rehabilitating the Klipspruit to become the picnic spot loved by elderly residents, reviving the San Souci Cinema, a famous landmark which attracted many patrons from Soweto and even further afield. Sytse de Maat questions the redevelopment aspect. De Maat is the author of the blog Perfect Slum, and criticizes the ‘regimented’ approach of new settlements built according to a uniform formula.

Hilton responds: Do not overromanticize how people ‘organically’ live together. There are often criminal elements controlling the settlements.

After the end of the war in 1999, a building boom began. Due to the enormous lack of both residential and commercial space, the real estate market became one of the most profitable branches of business. With the influx of rural migrants and repatriated Kosovo refugees, within a brief period of time, Prishtina’s population tripled. About seventy-five percent of the city’s existing structures—and with them, their historical legacy—were demolished, due to illegal construction. Until 2005 it was practically impossible to get a construction permit. Institutional structures had to be rebuilt, and there were no fundamental documents (such as a land registry, for instance) to secure the legal system. The consequences were grave: not only is most of old Prishtina gone, but public squares are neglected, the infrastructure is totally overwhelmed, and almost everywhere there are blatant safety violations; such as blocked or missing emergency exits and insufficient, overburdened structures. In short, Prishtina has serious social and safety problems (people and buildings).

What can be done?

Archis Interventions founded a local branch in Prishtina (Archis Interventions/Prishtina) to first analyze the phenomenon and then to make it comprehensible. The various situations were charted and mapped, in order to make it clear how extensive the rebuilding of the city actually was. Parallel to this, we combined various strategies: the urban-architectural strategy, the support from the Archis network, the inclusion of different interest groups in a model project, and the support of local institutions and organizations.

The project was publicized in VOLUME (spring 2007) and presented at conferences, some of which were organized by the European Union and the United Nations’ Habitat. Eventually, the new mayor of Prishtina, Dr. Isa Mustafa appointed the co-founder of Archis Interventions/Prishtina, Florina Jerliu, as his personal consultant on issues pertaining to urbanism. In 2009, we collaborated with city administrators and the building ministry to create a “Manual on the Legalization of Structures Built without Building Permits.” In July 2009 the City Council used the fundamentals of this concept to pass a resolution to start the legalization process. At the same time, we produced a television show about illegal construction. Currently, we are working on a possible model project, which would make it possible to apply a new process for coordinating some sort of agreement between the various interest groups and the realization of our ideas.

Gert Breugem presented his architecture graduation project ‘Pass the Green Line’, a strategy to overcome Nicosia’s divided status by stimulating cultural (ex)change and regeneration in the heart of the old town. Nicosia is the only capital city still divided (and one of many divided cities mentioned during the two day conference along with Mostar, Jerusalem and Berlin). It is also the backdrop to the stark contrast between the Turkish world of Islam and the Western world of the Greeks. Since 1974 a demilitarized buffer zone, the Green Line, has physically divided the city and the entire island. Breugem speculated upon speeding up the reintegration of the divided city by transforming corridors and the buffer zone into connection points; where the no-man’s-land becomes the heart of the city once more.
Yemen has an extended history of conflict and reconstruction. Sultan Barakat presented a case-study of the reconstruction in Yemen, following the 1982 Dhamar earthquake. Prior to the earthquake, houses were poorly built (with weak construction materials, old houses and sited on steep slopes or hilltops). In Dhamar, 80% of the total houses were destroyed. In response, there were two programs: 1) Foreign contractor built settlements, and 2) Self-help program repaired and rebuilt settlements.

1) Foreign contractor reconstruction

9 years later 45% of the settlements made by foreign contractors had been abandoned. This is due to several factors:

Where 25 or more houses in a settlement were damaged, the construction took place on a new site up to 1-3 km away. There were flaws in this tactic, including:

Site Selection:
• Newly designated site land was often privately owned. People were forced to give up such land with little compensation.
• There was often limited access to a main road with reliance therefore on poorly maintained roads, which restricted accessibility to the new settlements.
• Distance from the main settlement, if new settlements were built.
• Distance from agricultural land.
• Dissimilar topography to previous settlement.
• Housing sites were predominantly relocated from highland to flat land causing issues of privacy and discomfort.

While self-help programs proved slow and also had to use the set designed unit, they did help to build capacity and engage with the local traditions.

Aim: 17,000 repaired houses from 1984 - 86
Achieved: 2,216 houses by 1991.

Aim: 10,000-12,000 new builds from 1984 - 85
Achieved: 1,229 houses by 1991.

‘Problems are often well recognizable, problem ownership far less so.’

2) Self-help reconstruction

House Design:
• Lack of consultation with locals
• Lack of differentiation of houses
• Houses built for supplied water and electricity that for the villages was often not possible
• Followed international standards that did not fit locally
• Use of inappropriate material

Instead of just providing international contractors, it is essential that local builders are trained and educated to build safely, because it is known that self-help houses are inhabited, unlike the contractor constructed houses.
WORKSHOPS

On the second day of the conference the case studies were presented and the participants discussed a variety of themes and (sub) topics in 4 workshops. Since the first day already established consensus on the relevance of the subject and the viability of the interdisciplinary approach, the main goal of these discussions was to establish further steps to be taken. In the open discussions the following issues were addressed, being divided into issues that addressed more general (socio-political) notions like: ownership, law, governance, remittances/migration, integration/segregation, memory and citizenship; and design decisions like: planning without a plan, informal/formal, tabula rasa/acupuncture, regulation/spontaneous development, permanent/temporary, cultural heritage, infrastructure and public space.

Ownership is contested both locally and globally, vertically and horizontally. It seems the more we control ownership, the less we achieve. This holds also true for donors. In the former Yugoslavia, there is a UN specific court for ownership issues. A law of peace: does it exist? There is a law of war, for example. In times of peace, is it possible to access the judicial system? And how can we ensure a coexistence between traditional codes and customs with ‘proper’ law. Migration is regarded as a strategic threat and becomes a motivation behind aid. What can we do to keep people at home and reverse the skill drain?

Making a state function is a prerequisite but, in a post-conflict society, governance is highly centralized with little capacity left. Who takes over (minimal) coordination? Who can support the people? We need ways of making governance more practical. The state and other organizational bodies move around each other like islands. How do we bridge this gap? There is also a disconnection between politics and urbanism. Remittances are the lifeline for the majority of people. After 9/11, remittances have come under increasing pressure; money transfers take more than ten times longer. In times of turmoil, people want to keep Something, they do not want to change Everything, and therefore cling to old structures because it is the only familiar thing that is left. Cultural heritage is sometimes an important factor of identification. With reconstruction, there is the need to reconstruct the city's identity, but which historical period is relevant (e.g. neglect of socialist or indigenous past)? What does the reconstruction symbolize to (different groups of) citizens? We need to think more about less permanent structures. In unstable situations where nevertheless quick action is needed, things we do have to be adaptable for future change. As shown by the examples of Jolyon Leslie the creation of safe public space is highly relevant and effective. There is a general expectation that everything will be ultimately regulated. But in the meantime, there must be some guiding principles, that is, not a thick book of laws, but some general guiding principles with enough room for spontaneous development.

In more general terms, confronting post-conflict situations implies confronting models and structures associated with the modern state. For instance a notion like 'control' and dealing with the informal: this usually comes down to projecting the known upon the unknown, structures and regulations that have proven to be functional in the West applied to completely different cultures and social-economic realities. These days there is a growing interest in flexible, more malleable systems of governance, control and regulation, incorporating the spontaneous, yet acknowledging structure. These attempts to use less rigid systems, to allow for the unexpected and make use of existing energies and conventions might also feed back into western society, which is facing the limits of planning society.
Questions from the audience

- How do we influence and ensure a stable media and political support?
- How important are issues of religious faith to the construction of the built environment?
- As architects are trained in abstractions, isn't there a danger of oversimplifying matters? Who might act as a counterpart?
- If we (Westerners) push too much, how is it possible to lower the pressure? If the money gets there too early, is it a solution to deposit it and wait until people come back into the country?
- Where does an architecture of peace end and an architecture of rights start?
- What is the role of agriculture in post-conflict situations? Can it become a tool for peacemaking?
- Can we rephrase the term from architecture to design, to infrastructure, to building? Why do we use the term architecture?
Sultan Barakat  
Sultan Barakat is Professor at the Department of Politics, University of York, UK. He is the founding director of the Post-war Reconstruction and Development Unit (PRDU), which was established at the University of York in 1993. He has acted as an advisor on policy and strategy, provided technical assistance, delivered training workshops, and undertaken studies and evaluations on behalf of the governments of Afghanistan, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Uganda, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Sri Lanka as well as for the United Nations, the European Commission, the World Bank, the Overseas Development Institute, and numerous non-governmental organizations. These projects, which have involved finances in excess of £2 million, have taken place in Afghanistan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Colombia, Egypt, Indonesia (Aceh), Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kosovo, Lebanon, Macedonia, Nepal, Northern Ireland, the Palestinian Territories, the Philippines, Somalia (Puntland), Somaliland, Sudan, Sri Lanka, Syria, Turkey, Vietnam, Uganda, and Yemen.

Gert Breugem  
Gert Breugem graduated from the Academie van Bouwkunst Amsterdam (urbanism); his graduation project investigated healing the ‘fracture’ in Nicosia, which he will present at the conference. Currently, he is working for the urban development department in Almere.

Cees Hamelink  
Cees Hamelink is Professor of International Communication at the University of Amsterdam, and Professor of Media, Religion and Culture at the Free University in Amsterdam. He has also worked as a journalist with a Dutch broadcasting station, as researcher with international organizations in Geneva and Mexico-City, as advisor of national governments and international bodies (including the UN). He is the editor-in-chief of the International Journal for Communication Studies: Gazette. Among the phalanx of books he has authored are Cultural Autonomy in Global Communications (1983), Finance and Information (1983), The Technology Gamble (1988), The Politics of World Communication (1994), World Communication (1995), and The Ethics of Cyberspace (2000).

Hilton Judin  
Hilton Judin is an architect and curator working in Johannesburg. He developed the exhibition and research projects ‘setting apart’ and ‘blank Architecture, apartheid and after’ (as well as the associated publication which he edited with Ivan Vladislavic). Together with his partner Nina Cohen, he designed the Nelson Mandela Museum in Qunu and the Living Landscape in Clanwilliam. He is currently an adjunct professor at the University of the Witwatersrand and is working on urban design frameworks and their improbable implementation.

Jolyon Leslie  
Jolyon Leslie is an architect who has worked extensively in post-disaster and post-war reconstruction in the Middle East and in Asia. His work has included the implementation of building and infrastructure reconstruction projects and the transfer of skills to national field staff through training. His position with the United Nations Development Programme involved the management of a national resettlement program for Afghanistan which promotes the use of traditional vernacular techniques for housing. He has been involved in efforts to safeguard the cultural heritage, including historic buildings, in the region. Jolyon Leslie manages the historic cities program of the Aga Khan Trust for Culture in Afghanistan. He has been working in Afghanistan since 1989.

Paul van Tongeren  
Paul van Tongeren is the Honorary Chair of Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC). Under his leadership, GPPAC organised the first international civil society conference at the United Nations Headquarters in New York, which brought together a thousand participants from around the world in 2005. At this conference the Global Action Agenda for the Prevention of Violent Conflict was launched. In 1997, he founded the European Centre for Conflict Prevention (ECCP) and proceeded to serve as its Executive Director for ten years. Over a period of forty years, he has initiated and co-established several programs, international networks and NGOs in the fields of fair trade, development, environment, twinning and linking (Towns and Development), and peace and conflict.

Kai Vöckler  
Kai Vöckler is head of the Berlin office of Archis Interventions and program director for South Eastern Europe. Archis Interventions provides cities in need with clues and concepts that can revive the public domain by re-energizing urban spirit and renewing trust in dialogue as the essence of civic life. Local partners play a crucial role in developing the projects. Kai Vöckler is also the author of *Prishtina is Everywhere*, it describes, maps and analyzes the situation in Prishtina after 1999, documents problem-solving strategies, and discusses the significance of this kind of urban development for the way urban life evolves in crisis zones.
Allard Wagemaker is a Marine Corps officer and scholar, currently Associate Professor at the International Security Studies Department of the Netherlands Defense Academy in Breda (Netherlands). Recently he was working in Kabul for the ISAF staff where he contributed extensively to ISAF’s stabilization program and updated strategy. He studied International Relations at the Naval Academy in Den Helder (Netherlands), Military Arts at the American Military University in Manassas (VA, USA), History at the University of Amsterdam and Political Science at Leiden University. He is momentarily finishing up his PhD dissertation on the Challenge of Stabilizing Afghanistan after 9/11. He has been deployed to Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Western Sahara, Iraq and Afghanistan.
Agenda

• Create a platform for interdisciplinary knowledge exchange and a collection of case studies. Instead of offering an endless repository of case studies, the examples may be organized around about 10 crucial dilemmas and show how different projects dealt with each. Case studies should include a history of failures - lessons to be learned.

• Create a study module on working in a conflict situation as an architect/planner to improve conflict consciousness and provide basic do's and don'ts. This module could extend for 2-3 months so that students can easily add that unit to their own curriculum.

• A working group has been formed to create an ethical code for architects in conflict areas, which may build on the 1987 ‘Charter’ to which Sultan Barakat and Jolyon Leslie contributed.

• An e-learning program should be created which is easily accessible worldwide.

• Create an award for an Architecture of Peace to collect more exemplary case studies and raise awareness.

• A Handbook with basic rules of engagement for anyone working in the field must be the ‘final’ outcome.

• An exchange program for students from different zones of conflict should be established to learn from each other’s situation.

The project will extend at least three years (2010-2012).

May 2010.................................................. first AOP conference at NAI Rotterdam
May- November 2010............................... publishing results of conference, creating network, collecting of case studies, initiate pilot projects, fundraising
September-December 2010........................ launching AOP website, launching ethical code for architects, publication of Volume 26, Architecture of Peace
January-November 2011........................... setting up e-learning site and AOP- study module
November- December 2011........................ second AOP conference with presentation of results so far to an international audience of stakeholders
launch of AOP Handbook
exhibition on AOP projects (case studies)
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