The Civil Society Building Peace Amid War: A Conceptual Proposal

Mariangela Rueda Fiorentino and Angélica Rodríguez Rodríguez
Universidad del Norte (Barranquilla-Colombia)

Through the analysis of the Colombian case (2012-2021), which includes mapping 211 Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) working for peace, we propose a mixed conceptual framework that allows for the conceptualization of CSOs based on fundamental and complementary attributes. As a result of the intersection of these attributes, we propose four ideal-typical forms: (1) CSOs for the culture of peace and democratic strengthening, (2) CSOs for democratic strengthening based on membership in a vulnerable group within the conflict context, (3) CSOs for comprehensive development as a means to pacify society, (4) CSOs for the development of a group and/or territory affected by the conflict, based on belonging to that group or area. Although as ideal abstractions overlapping is possible, the results show that 166 of the studied CSOs work around the democratic cause. Specifically, 97 of them related to culture of peace, and 69 based on belonging to vulnerable groups. On the other hand, 64 of the observed CSOs work for development. Here it is possible to distinguish between CSOs that emerge around the agenda (39 out of 64) and those that organize themselves around a sense of belonging or identity (25 out of 64).

Keywords: Colombia, armed conflict; ideal forms, peace; civil society.

Within the framework of the Sustainable Development Goals, the Member States of the United Nations reaffirmed a global commitment to peace and justice in 2015. In this context, the importance of Civil Society (CS) participation is increasingly emphasized as a fundamental actor in the pursuit of peaceful conflict solutions, peacebuilding, and the defense of Human Rights (HR). Now, more than ever, CS is engaged on issues of public interest (ur Rahman, 2021) and exercise an active role, considered a prerequisite for good governance (Riaz & Pasha, 2011). One of the most relevant characteristics attributed to CS actors is their ability to organize pressure networks at the national and international levels for the defense and guarantee of HR in contexts of violence (Della Porta & Kriesi, 1998; Keck & Sikkink, 1998, 1999; Thörn, 2006; Lopez & Hincapie, 2015). Their growing prominence is evident in various sectors, including public advocacy, the demand for public policies, and support for victims (Strange, 2011; Lopez & Hincapie, 2015).

In this context, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) also play significant roles - and/or serve as strategic communicators - in generating, framing, and disseminating information (Fröhlich & Jungblut, 2016, 2018). One of the active roles in this sense is mobilizing citizens around the peace cause (Kali, 2022; Kim 2022). Thus, CS, as a social actor within the international system contributing to peacebuilding in conflict contexts, emerges as a fertile research space that allows for the bridging of different bodies of literature in the social sciences.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Angélica Rodríguez Rodríguez Department of Political Science and International Relations at the Universidad del Norte (Barranquilla-Colombia)
Email: angrodriguez@uninorte.edu.co

The functions of CS in peacebuilding can be situated within the analytical framework proposed by Paffenholz and Spurk (2006), which outlines seven functions: advocacy, protection, monitoring, socialization, social cohesion, intermediation, and services (in Marín Aranguren, 2017). In light of the case study, the cross-cutting nature of these functions within different expressions of CS in Colombia was observed. In other words, civil society organizations working on the issue of peace in Colombia may fulfil several of these functions over time or even engage simultaneously in multiple roles aligned with their goals or mission.

Although CS plays an important role in promoting the cessation of armed conflict, and constitutes a vital force in post-conflict recovery, also faces challenges and obstacles to build peace amidst conflict situations. First, war may have a significant impact on CS, because it is transformed as a result of resisting the pressures of war. The state, which frames CS functions within, may fully or partly break or could become more authoritarian. War divides people and erodes the social ties that bridge various groups (Harpviken & Kjellman, 2004). In that context, the relationship between civil society and peacebuilding is particularly complex, because war undermines CS (Harvey 1998).

For historical reasons related to the violence, CS was not, for a long time, a vibrant sphere in Colombia. Violence limited solidarity and organizational capacity and stigmatized it by associating it with the left and supporting the guerrillas. It had an impact in working methods and associative ties, undermining both, the strength of CS and its contribution to a sustainable peacebuilding process.

Second, CS is often excluded (or given a menial role) in peace processes/peacebuilding due to the standard state-centric approach and the monopoly of power held by state institutions and the established elites (Paffenholz, 2009). In fact, one explanation for the lack of CS impact is the absence of institutionalized and transparent relationships between society and the state (Gready, 2010). Furthermore, on several occasions there is limited citizen participation and diversity of citizens involved in CSOs, limiting their impact (Transparency International Rwanda, 2015).

Third, some CS peacebuilding initiatives have been lauded for their ability to promote conflict transformation, at least in the local communities in which they operate. When it comes to changing the broader conflict dynamics, however CSOs are generally considered relatively impotent, and their work must be complemented by middle and top-level actors and institutions (Fischer, 2010).

Fourth, national and local CSOs have sought, and continue, to play multiple roles to tackle challenges exacerbated by violence, including persistent conflict, widespread corruption, poor governance, and extreme poverty. However, there are doubts about the extent to which they have been able to, or can, influence elite level politics and achieve impact beyond local-level improvements in peacebuilding amids conflict (Mutasa & Virk, 2017).

Finally, the role of CS promoting peace amid war could show a pattern, with an initial flurry of engagement and activities, but declining over time and being overly dependent on international funding (Öjendal, Leonardsson & Lundqvist, 2017).

That said, there is a broad elasticity and a vague conception of the concept of CS, resulting in analyses that are disconnected from contexts (Bhattacharyya, 2021; Edwards, 2011, 2014; Marchetti & Tocci, 2009; Theros, 2019; Waters, 2015). Theoretical developments on this

topic have primarily taken into account Western, peaceful, and democratic contexts, while there is still a need to expand and qualify studies on CSOs operating in areas affected by armed conflicts and/or violence (Lemaitre & Sandvik, 2015; Marchetti & Tocci, 2009; Theros, 2019).

In fact, the limited understanding and often abstract conceptions of CS and its organizations have led to a reduced awareness of their real or potential role on the local and international stage, especially when it comes to violence-affected or internally conflicted areas. Addressing this theoretical-conceptual challenge is a fundamental task, as Sartori (1970) suggests that concepts form the foundation of the analytical and interpretive process, and dedicated and profound reflection on them can guide a true understanding of the constantly changing social reality.

In Colombia, armed conflict has been a constant since the 1960s. Paradigmatically, the Colombian government achieved a peace agreement with the FARC-EP guerrillas in 2016 and is currently engaged in negotiations with the ELN guerrillas. In a country marked by violence, where armed conflict persists due to the state not having a monopoly on weapons, CS has made a commitment to peace and peaceful conflict resolution, despite stigmatization and violence it has faced.

Colombian CS has not only been crucial in identifying the needs of vulnerable population groups such as indigenous people, Afro-Colombians, women, displaced individuals, and conflict victims, but it has also played a key role in monitoring public policies, transparency, and the administration of justice, among other functions (Sánchez-Garzoli, 2016).

On the other hand, in Colombia, it is challenging to map CS, both due to the volatility of the entities and the diversity of criteria used by sources to register them (Appe, 2011). Therefore, one of the significant contributions of this research lies precisely in mapping 211 CSOs working for peace in the midst of an armed conflict context, allowing for the classification of their different members and agendas (Gómez-Quintero, 2014).

Although in Colombia, peace negotiations with insurgent groups during the 1980s and 1990s, and even with paramilitary groups in the early 2000s, did not involve actors like CSOs or the international community, this landscape changed with the agreement with the FARC-EP. In this process, CS participated in commissions, workshops, colloquia, and committees and is currently a relevant actor in dialogues with the ELN (Valencia-Agudelo & Villarreal-Miranda, 2020).

Recognizing the need to address the gap in the literature regarding the contribution of CSOs to peacebuilding in conflict and post-conflict contexts (Ishkanian, Manusyan, Khalatyan & Margaryan, 2023; Nilsson, 2018), this work, based on the analysis of the Colombian case from 2012 (start of the exploratory stage with the FARC-EP) to 2021 (the first five years of peace agreement implementation), seeks to provide theoretical and conceptual tools to understand who CSOs are and the themes around which they organize. It also highlights the relevance of CSOs not only for the associative activities they undertake but also for their ability to promote and achieve better policy outcomes (Rincón Gabourel, 2018).

Method

For this research, a mapping of 211 CSOs in Colombia working on peace-related issues amidst the armed conflict was conducted, documenting their diversity in members and agendas. The "Memories in Times of War: Repertoire of Initiatives" report by the National Center for Historical Memory (2009) served as the starting point for tracking CSOs in the country. The collection of information was expanded using data from Government's freely accessible database, "Open Data" (Government of Colombia, 2020).

Three criteria were used for the selection of CSOs: (1) that their mission explicitly expressed a commitment to conflict transformation and/or peacebuilding and/or included a line/area of work dedicated to conflict transformation or peacebuilding; (2) that they were formally constituted with registration in the Chamber of Commerce and/or had a formal organizational structure that allowed for their continuity over time (Magatti, 2003); (3) that their data/information were available and accessible. In other words, they had a website, their data could be found in institutional reports, they had a presence on social media profiles, or other platforms.

The constructed database compiles information on nine elements: (1) the name of the CSO; (2) date of formation and justification; (3) the conflict/peace axis it focuses on; (4) scope of action (national or regional); (5) city and/or region where it operates; (6) members (classified into two categories: individuals or groups of individuals and networks of local CSOs, with 35 subcategories accounting for elements such as whether they are victims of the armed conflict, women, indigenous, Afro-Colombian, LGBTQ+ population, geographical origin, among others); (7) agenda; (8) cause (the thematic focus of the CSO's action, including three categories: security, democracy and governance, and sustainable socio-economic development); (9) functions (including protection, monitoring, advocacy, socialization, community building/social cohesion, intermediation between citizens and the State, and services).

Once the database was constructed, invitations for semi-structured interviews were sent to representatives of all CSOs via email or social media. The questions in the instrument were validated by two expert academics, and 38 representatives accepted the invitation and responded to the interview questions in person or virtually between January and June 2021. Specifically, the interviews aimed to understand how participants defined the CSO they represented, its members, its mission, and its work in the context of peacebuilding.

At this point, it is necessary to include a methodological consideration regarding possible limitations and/or biases in the construction of the database. Specifically, the information available on the Internet tends to over-represent successful cases. In this regard, direct contact with field actors during the interviews was crucial to verify the data. The field research phase was a fruitful period that enabled direct contact with CSOs, promoting a deeper understanding of the context and the actors involved.

Based on the data obtained and drawing from the research by Barrenechea and Castillo (2019), which argues that the conceptual category of CS can be studied by combining 'necessary and sufficient' attributes ('fundamental') and 'complementary' attributes (determined by the context), Fundamental Attributes (FAs) and Complementary Attributes (CAs) were constructed for the Colombian case.

The FAs resulted from a deductive process and were obtained through a review of specialized literature. The procedure involved documentary analysis, where, through the review

of literature, recurring themes and characteristics used to define the concept of CS were identified, and those on which there is a certain consensus in the literature. In this way, four FAs were identified: (1) non-governmental nature; (2) independence; (3) motivation; and (4) structure and interaction. These attributes serve to define what is understood by CS in this research and to locate the groups that comprise it.

In contrast, the CAs resulted from an inductive process and are linked to the characteristics of the studied context. The procedure in this case was based on empirical observation. For the CAs, a matrix was proposed containing seven elements divided into four categories related to their members and three categories related to the cause. Regarding their members, we identified: (1) autonomous and independent citizens; (2) citizens organized based on territorial criteria; (3) citizens organized based on identification with a group or sector of society; and (4) networks of social organizations. Regarding the cause, we identified: (1) democracy and governance, (2) sustainable socio-economic development, and (3) security.

The intersection between the FAs and CAs led to the formulation of ideal types under the label 'Forms of Civil Society' (FCS), determined by the combination of two elements: the motivation towards peacebuilding, including democracy and governance and sustainable socio-economic development, and the factors that drove the organization of individuals, which encompass the agenda and identity.

Before continuing with the conceptualization of CS in conflict zones, it is important to recognize the limitations of the research findings for other regions or conflicts beyond the Colombian case. However, two elements should not be lost sight of. First, the relevance of the case addressed, derived from the uniqueness of Colombia, where post-conflict coexists with armed conflict. Although the Havana agreements signed in 2016 between the Colombian government and the FARC-EP guerrillas marked a period of peacebuilding, the International Red Cross points out that at least six internal armed conflicts persist in the country (Inguanzo & Rodríguez Rodríguez, 2023). Second, the proposed approach has the potential to travel beyond the Colombian case because it promotes a better understanding of the concept of CS in conflict zones based on the observation and analysis of the attributes (fundamental and complementary) that characterize CSOs in such contexts. This mixed conceptual formulation, has allowed us to generate ideal types of organizational forms of CSOs that serve as an analytical and conceptual tool that can be used in future research on CS in conflict contexts.

Conceptualizing CS in Conflict Zones

When considering a more comprehensive understanding of CS engaged in peacebuilding within conflict zones, the researchers propose an approach that combines fundamental attributes (those necessary and sufficient to delineate the CS sphere) with complementary attributes specific to the context. They adopt a conceptual formulation strategy that amalgamates the significant contributions of the classic structure advocated by Sartori (1970) with the more recent Family Resemblance (FR) approach (Collier & Mahon, 1993; Goertz, 2006; Wittgenstein, 1968), known as the Mixed Conceptual Structure (MCS) (Barrenechea & Castillo, 2019). According to Barrenechea and Castillo, the MCS offers an advantage over the FR approach in that "the use of at least one necessary attribute in this structure provides a more solid anchor of belonging than is found in pure family resemblance structures" (2019, 112).

According to Sartori (1970, 1971), the task (and challenge) for those involved in scientific conceptual formation is to create concepts that are "capable of traveling" (also known as general concepts) without falling into the trap of "concept stretching." Sartori's proposal

places concepts within a taxonomic hierarchy, where "each category has clear boundaries and defining properties shared by all members that serve to place it in the hierarchy" (Collier & Mahon 1993, 845). However, it is now clear that many categories do not possess these attributes (Collier & Mahon 1993), and the concept of CS is a clear example of this.

At this point, it is pertinent to mention that this article does not aim to provide a universalist view of the concept in question; on the contrary, it questions both the utility and the possibility of limiting itself to such an exercise. As Jensen (2006) observes, "the uses of this term [CS] can only be understood within the theoretical, practical, and historical contexts in which they originated" (p. 39).

Procedure: Formulation of FAs and CAs
FAs

Based on the previous observations and considering the main approaches in the literature, four fundamental attributes emerge to initially define the space or sphere of CS: (1) non-governmental character; (2) independence; (3) motivation; (4) structure and interaction (Table 1).

Table 1
Fundamental Attributes of Civil Society

AF1: Non-Governmental Character	It is a sphere composed of associative networks of citizens who come together freely and voluntarily (see Cesareo 2003; Cohen & Arato 1997; Edwards 2014; Putnam 1993).
AF2: Independence	This refers to both its position in the social space, as a sphere distinct (but not separate) from the State, family, and the market (Donati, 2002), and to the autonomy of proposal and action that characterizes these groups (directing their activities, defining and modifying their mission and/or organizational structure, and selecting their members and officials (Villar 2001).
AF3: Motivation	The motivation guiding the organization arises from the recognition of elements of common interest (Frisanco 2008, 7), which are not oriented toward obtaining political gains (political power, see Olvera 2004) or economic gains (income profits, see Anheier 2005).
AF4: Structure and Interaction	This refers, on the one hand, to the relative permanence of the members who make up these groups in more or less formal structures (Cesareo 2003, Magatti 2003) with the ability to interact with other actors and operate in the independent public sphere (Anheier & Themudo 2002; Kaldor 2003; Villar 2001) and takes place in the public sphere (Habermas 1984, 1996; Spini 2006).

Source: own elaboration.

Instead of asserting that CS has an opposing or contrasting role to the State, it is more useful for us to start from the observation that CS is an independent sphere, distinct from the State, as having an opposing or proactive function towards the State is an attribute strongly determined by the context. Thus, being an independent sphere situated between the State,

family, and the market is a fundamental characteristic for delineating the space of contemporary CS.

In contrast, its orientation or function concerning these spheres is a complementary characteristic, observable and interpretable only considering other factors such as context or the historical roles of CS in specific realities. The same applies to issues like the place of conflict in the practices of the third sector (Busso & Gargiulo, 2017) or the relationships between CS, civilized society, and violence (Marchetti & Tocci, 2009). As Busso and Gargiulo point out, it is necessary to "distinguish general reflections on the category from the forms that individual experiences can take" (2017, 151).

In this regard, the attributes presented in Table 1 represent the substantive basis for constructing the conceptual proposal of CS and for locating the organizations that comprise it. However, at this level, there is still a high level of conceptual abstraction. Here lies both the importance and originality of a mixed conceptual formulation that includes distinctions between fundamental and complementary attributes. In this way, we formulate a proposal that, using the terminology of Magatti (2003, 43), aims to be seen as "an attempt to move away from generality."

CAs in Light of the Colombian Case

As mentioned earlier, the conflict, its dynamics, and consequences have greatly influenced the actions and operations of Colombian CSOs, which have demonstrated a high degree of adaptability and autonomy in the face of armed actors (Rettberg & Quishpe, 2017). According to reports by Apaz et al., (2019) and Rettberg and Quishpe (2017), the dynamics of the conflict and the widespread diversification of violence in Colombia have given rise to a variety of civil society initiatives working for the defense of HR and peacebuilding at the local and regional levels. These initiatives have been grouped into four categories in relation to their members and three categories in relation to the cause (Table 2).

Table 2
Complementary attributes.

In relation to members / Composed of:	In relation to the cause / Work for:
AC1: Autonomous and independent citizens who organize themselves with the purpose of contributing to a cause related to the transformation of conflict and peacebuilding.	AC5: Democracy and governance
AC2: Citizens organized based on territorial criteria.	AC6: Sustainable socio-economic development
AC3: Citizens organized based on identification with a group or sector of society (e.g., women, victims, peasants, etc.).	AC7: Security
AC4: Networks of local organizations.	

Source: own elaboration based on available empirical data.

Regarding the members, there are groups of citizens who organize with the aim of contributing to the transformation of the conflict and peacebuilding in general (AC1). These groups come together or are formed by the individual interest in contributing, through social and collective organization, to the pacification of the country; therefore, they do not indicate possessing a distinctive identity criterion among their members. Thus, it is common to find among the observed CSOs groups composed of the general civilian population who do not belong to the same group or community.

The second attribute in relation to their members is territoriality (AC2). Particularly in the areas most affected by the armed conflict, the territorial aspect is of vital importance when analyzing the organization processes of CS because the conflict did not have the same consequences throughout the national territory. For these groups, the issue of violence and the consequences of the conflict must be addressed from a territorial approach and through initiatives that arise from the needs and realities of the population in these areas. In this way, we observe organizations that were born as an initiative of the residents of a particularly violence-affected area or region, such as the Montes de María.

There are also groups composed of citizens who identify themselves as belonging to a specific group or sector of society (AC3). Here, members primarily organize around group identity rather than territory to contribute to a cause within the context of the conflict. This is the case, for example, with women's organizations, victims' groups, indigenous and/or Afro-Colombian populations, entrepreneurs, former combatants, among others.

The fourth complementary attribute related to members (AC4) refers to networking, which means initiatives that are, in turn, composed of other local CSOs; in many cases, there is also the presence of international CSOs. The latter tend to be larger CSOs that work at the national level with greater visibility and impact. In their internal structure, they have a group of people working on the development of their mission and coordination among the CSOs that make it up.

Regarding the causes, the issues that mobilize the work of CSOs in terms of cooperation for peacebuilding can be mainly grouped into two agendas: democracy (AC5) and development (AC6). The orientation towards one or the other thematic line is related to each organization's understanding of the conflict itself, the causes that led to it, and possible solutions. On the other hand, the "security" attribute (AC7), which in theory is considered, along with democracy and development, one of the dimensions of peacebuilding (Castañeda, 2014), appears as a transversal attribute in the demands of most groups, being a key factor for their survival. However, based on the empirical data from this research, it does not seem to be a cause or agenda that specifically drives the formal organization and/or mobilization of CSOs, as is the case with the aforementioned dimensions of democracy and development.

In this way, while the FAs could be considered relatively constant, the CAs can overlap in multiple ways, giving rise to a multitude of expressions of CSOs organized in conflict zones.

Results and Discussion

The typological construction is a way to address the conceptual stretching challenge posed by Sartori (1970); it is an alternative that allows for "productively organizing thought" (Collier et al., 2012). Throughout this article, an attempt has been made to confront the extensive theoretical debate surrounding the concept of CS with a focus on conflict-affected contexts. However, a fundamental question arises in its definition, which is the impossibility of establishing absolute polarity. The concept of CS goes beyond any kind of systematization. Precisely for this reason, we use FAs and CAs as a basis for the development of ideal types conceived as a form of empirical abstraction.

The case study shows that the members of the analysed CSOs organize themselves because they are motivated by an agenda related to the transformation of the conflict or because they identify themselves as belonging to a territory or a group or sector of society affected by the war (identity). Furthermore, it is observed that the cause or purpose they pursue falls into two broad categories: democracy and development. Based on this, it is possible to create four ideal abstractions conceived as the forms of civil society that build peace in conflict zones: (1)

CSOs for the culture of peace and democratic strengthening, (2) CSOs for democratic strengthening based on belonging to a vulnerable group in the context of the conflict, (3) CSOs for integral development as a means to pacify society, (4) CSOs for the development of a group and/or territory affected by the conflict, based on belonging to that group or area.

As ideal types, they are rarely limited to a specific form. For example, a CSO could contribute to different causes simultaneously or change its focus over time in response to contextual factors such as the level of conflict intensity or local and international incentives. Thus, the first forms of civil society correspond to CSOs for the culture of peace and democratic strengthening (FSC1) and CSOs for democratic strengthening based on belonging to a vulnerable group in the context of the conflict (FSC2). Both types are expressions of civil society that focus on the issues of democracy and governance as the main goal and an indispensable condition for regulating and transforming the conflict. At this point, it is important to underline that a vibrant CS is fundamental to strengthening democracy (Durrani & Alam, 2020).

Table 3

Forms of Civil Society Engaged in Peacebuilding in Armed Conflict Contexts (FSC).

Motivation towards Peacebuilding

		Democracy and Governance	Sustainable Socioeconomic Development
Factor Driving Individual Organization	Agenda	Civil Society Organizations for Peace Culture and Democratic Strengthening. (Democracy cause-based CSO).	Civil Society Organizations for Integral Development as a Means to Pacify Society (FSC3). (Development cause-based CSO).
	Identity	Civil Society Organizations for Democratic Strengthening, based on Belonging to a Vulnerable Group in the Context of Conflict (FSC2). (Democracy group-based CSO).	Civil Society Organizations for the Development of a Group and/or Territory Affected by Conflict, based on Belonging to that Group or Area (FSC4). (Development Group-based CSO).

Source: own elaboration.

From the collected data, it appears that 166 of the studied CSOs work around the democratic cause. However, as ideal abstractions, some of them may also incorporate causes related to development. When they are formed by autonomous and independent individuals who organize themselves to contribute to this cause as a means of pacifying society, the CSOs correspond to the first type (FSC1). They are often larger and more structured organizations that manage to have a national impact, making their cause more visible. A particular case within this ideal type is that of organizations that originated from the initiative of churches/religious groups, as well as groups of professionals (e.g., lawyers, journalists, professionals from various sectors).

In these cases, despite the CSO's origin in a specific group, the observation shows that their motivations are primarily oriented by the cause and not by group identity. In other words, it is observed that in the Colombian case, most CSOs driven by churches and groups of

professionals are oriented by the cause, which in this case is democracy, as a vehicle for peace. These organizations initially emerge from a group or sector (e.g., Catholics, Protestants, lawyers, journalists, etc.) but are not oriented to defend the interests of that specific group. Instead, their mission is aimed at promoting rights and democratic governance in general.

On the other hand, the second type of CSOs that organize around the democratic agenda emphasizes the membership of its members in a minority, group, or territory whose rights have been violated in the context of the conflict (FSC2). Therefore, their actions for democracy and governance are particularly motivated by belonging to identity groups (e.g., women, LGTB, victims, Afro-descendant population, peasants, indigenous communities). Within this type, two categories are of particular relevance: women's CSOs and territorial CSOs.

On one hand, groups organized through women's initiatives for the defense of their rights have a significant presence both in terms of quantity (26 out of 66 records belonging to FSC2) and in results. A common aspect among women's CSOs in the Colombian case is the recognition of the vulnerability of women victims in the context of the conflict and the lack of women's participation and representation at the political level in seeking a negotiated resolution to the conflict. In fact, as emerged from the interviews conducted, these CSOs have successfully proposed the adoption of a gender differential approach in the Peace Agreements. As a result of the participation of 18 women's and LGBTIQ+ organizations in the working groups in Havana, the Final Agreement contains more than 100 gender-related measures.

On the other hand, the territorial dimension prevails, especially in areas most affected by the conflict. In this case, CSOs start from the awareness that the conflict would have affected all territories in the same way, so responses to its structural causes, including the democratic deficit, must be addressed from a territorial approach.

On the contrary, the third and fourth ideal types (FSC3 and FSC4) are linked to the dimension of development as a fundamental condition for conflict transformation and peacebuilding. From empirical observation, 64 of the observed CSOs work for development in this context. These, like the previous typologies, distinguish between CSOs that emerge around the agenda (39 out of 64) and those that organize themselves around a sense of belonging or identity (25 out of 64). CSOs that organize around the agenda of integral development to pacify society (FSC3) are expressions of CS composed of citizens in general who see the socio-economic development of the country as the main goal that would allow progress toward addressing the structural causes of the conflict.

Given the multidimensional nature of development, these organizations tend to cover multiple topics in the political, social, environmental, and economic spheres, so they may be the least thematically defined. They have broad geographic coverage and generally tend to work in networks. It should be clarified that this is not an exclusive characteristic of CSOs of this type but is present to a greater or lesser extent in most of the observed groups. On the other hand, the fourth and final form (FSC4) shares characteristics related to the broad thematic scope of development but is limited by criteria of identity. Therefore, their actions are aimed at addressing the structural causes of violence by promoting the comprehensive development of a specific sector, group, or territory. In this type, CSOs favour development with a local and/or group focus, and in some cases, these are CSOs that work for the development of both a group and a specific territory. An example would be organizations working for the development of women in a specific region or organizations focusing on the comprehensive rural development of peasant families in western Colombia.

Conclusion

Colombian CSOs represent a heterogeneous universe, whose original nature is delimited by the four fundamental attributes: they are non-governmental organizations, independent, with a motivation, a more or less formal structure, and interaction in the public sphere. Regarding the complementary attributes identified in the case study, the first observation to be made is that in a context of marked violence against the civilian population, the agendas that motivate the work of most Colombian CSOs (democracy and development) coincide with the historical grievances that have been considered as structural causes of the Colombian conflict, namely, exclusion at the political, economic, and social levels.

Regarding the composition of these groups (their members), given the marked consequences of violence in terms of rights violations, exclusion, and poverty, it is found that people decide to organize because they want to support the pacification of the country in general or because they identify as belonging to a group, territory, or sector that has been especially vulnerable within the context of the conflict. Thus, the causes of strengthening democracy and comprehensive development intersect with the motivations (agenda and identity) that drive members to organize or join an existing CSO. In this way, four ideal types are conceived under the conceptual label "forms of civil society.

The broader forms are those oriented by the agenda (FSC1 and FSC3), and in them, there is no distinctive criterion of identity (group or territorial). On the contrary, the factor that drives individuals' organization and guides their work is linked to the individual interest in contributing to the pacification of the country in general. These forms tend to manifest in groups with broader agendas due to the greater diversity among their members and a more diversified operational coverage, often based in the capital, Bogotá, and extending throughout the country.

The main difference between them lies in the way they conceive peacebuilding: peace built based on strengthening democracy, participation, and the defense of rights (FSC1), or peace based on comprehensive, human, and sustainable development (FSC3). On the other hand, the forms that are based on criteria of identity for their organization and operation (FSC2 and FSC4) are more restricted groups, both in terms of their members and the agendas they advocate for. These groups organize around a territory, usually rural, or a specific group of society (women, victims, LGBTQ+ population, among others), and base their work on recognizing the differentiated consequences that the conflict has had on that part of the Colombian population.

Thus, the four forms resulting from the constructed typology are intended to be an analytical-conceptual tool that can be used in future research on the topic. The main contribution in this regard is the generation of an analytical tool that can be adapted to different contexts without stretching the conceptual framework. For example, future research could use the constructed types as lenses of analysis to understand the similarities and differences observed in peacebuilding processes based on the different forms that civil society takes, or to study the outcomes they achieve according to the agenda (democracy or development). Additionally, the process of conceptual construction from a mixed structure could be used to study CS (or other concepts) with an emphasis on different contexts considering a greater number of variables. Besides to the above, some suggestions for future research include exploring the long-term trajectories of the proposed four ideal-typical forms and understanding factors (fundamental and contextual) influencing their evolution. It would also be interesting to advance, considering the proposed forms, in the comparison of the dynamics of CSOs working for peace in other areas or regions with armed conflict, in order to identify other configurations and agendas.

        Finally, in addition to academia, this study also has the potential to be utilized in the practical field. From a political perspective, decision and policymakers could gain greater ownership and understanding of the interest groups working on peace-related issues to address proposals that are more grounded and relevant to the requests and demands of societal groups. From the perspective of CSOs, this ideal-typical classification could also be useful for establishing alliances and synergies with peers.

References

Anheier, H. (2005). *Nonprofit Organizations. Theory, management, policy*. Routledge.

Anheier, H., & Themudo, N. (2002). Organizational forms of global civil society: implications of going global. In M. Glasius, M. Kaldor, & H. Anheier (Eds.), *Global Civil Society* (pp. 191–206). Oxford University Press.

Appe, S. (2011). Civil Society Mappings by Government: A Comparison of Ecuadorian and Colombian Cases, *Journal of Civil Society*, 7:2, 157-178. DOI: 10.1080/17448689.2011.573668

Bhattacharyya, H. (2021). Partha Chatterjee's concepts of civil society and 'uncivil' political society: Is the distinction valid? *Journal of Civil Society,* 17:1, 18-33. DOI: 10.1080/17448689.2021.1886759

Barrenechea, R., & Castillo, I. (2019). The many roads to Rome: family resemblance concepts in the social sciences. *Qual Quant*, *53*, 107–130. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-018-0732-7

Busso, S., & Gargiulo, E. (2017). Una 'società armoniosa"? Il posto del conflitto nelle pratiche e nel discorso sul Terzo Settore. *CARTOGRAFIE SOCIALI Rivista Di Sociologia e Scienze Umane*, *II*(3), 137–154.

Castañeda, D. (2014). *The European Approach to Peacebuilding Civilian Tools for Peace in Colombia and Beyond*. Palgrave Macmilan.

Cesareo, V. (Ed.). (2003). *I protagonisti della Societa' Civile*. Rubbettino Editore.

Cohen, J., & Arato, A. (1997). Politics and the reconstruction of the Concept of Civil Society. In A. Honneth, T. McCarthy, O. Claus, & A. Wellmer (Eds.), *Cultural-Political Interventions in the Unfinished Project of Enlightenment*. The MIT Press.

Collier, D., LaPorte, J., & Seawright, J. (2012). Putting typologies to work: Concept formation, measurement, and analytic rigor. *Political Research Quarterly*, *65*(1), 217–232. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912912437162

Collier, D., & Mahon, J. E. (1993). Conceptual " Stretching " Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis David Collier, James E. Mahon and Jr. Published by: American Political Science Association Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2938818 CONCEPTUAL"ST. *The American Political Science Review*, *87*(4), 845–855.

della Porta, D., & Kriesi, H. (1998). MOVIMENTI SOCIALI E GLOBALIZZAZIONE. *Italian Political Science Review/Rivista Italiana Di Scienza Politica*, *28*(3), 451–482. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048840200026241

Donati, P. (2002). La giustizia e la società civile nell'era della globalizzazione. *CIAFIC Ediciones*. http://www.ciafic.edu.ar/documentos/Donati_2001.htm#nota9

Durrani, B., & Alam, R. (2020). Coverage of Government and Judiciary Relationship: A Study of Urdu and English Newspapers of Pakistan. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, *14*(4), 131-139.

Edwards, M. (2011). *The Oxford Handbook of Civil Society*. Oxford University Press.

Edwards, M. (2014). *Civil Society* (Third Edit). Polity Press.

Fischer, M. (2010). Civil Society in Conflict Transformation: Strengths and Limitations in Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation II.

Frisanco, R. (2008). *Il ruolo della Societa' Civile e gli strumenti della partecipazione attiva*. Il Volontariato Rende Attiva La Sussidiarietà. Un Percorso Di Partecipazione Attiva Alla Realizzazione Del Bene Comune. http://www.fondazioneterzopilastrointernazionale.it/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/6-IL_RUOLO_DELLA_SOCIETA_CIVILE.pdf

Fröhlich, R., & Jungblut, M. (2016). *Effective and Coherent Media-related Communication During War and Armed Conflicts. Policy brief for political actors and NGOs.* http://www.infocore.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/D6.3_Policy-Brief_Strategic_Communication.pdf

Fröhlich, R., & Jungblut, M. (2018). Between factoids and facts: The application of 'evidence' in NGO strategic communication on war and armed conflict. *Media, War & Conflict*, *11*(1), 85–106. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750635217727308

Gobierno de Colombia. (2020). *Datos Abiertos*. https://www.datos.gov.co/

Goertz, G. (2006). *Social Science concepts: A user's guide*. Princeton University Press.

Gómez-Quintero, J. D. (2014). Organizaciones no gubernamentales y entidades sin ánimo de lucro en Colombia. Despolitización de la sociedad civil y tercerización del estado. *Gestión y Política Pública, XXIII*(2), 359-384.

Gready, P (2010). 'You're either with us or against us': Civil Society and policy making in post-genocide Rwanda. *African Affairs*, 1-20.

Grupo de Memoria Histórica. (2009). *Memorias en Tiempo de Guerra Repertorio de iniciativas*.

Habermas, J. (1984). *Storia e critica dell'opinione pubblica.* Laterza.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Fatti e norme. Contributi a una teoria discorsiva del diritto e della democrazia*. Guerini e Associati.

Harpviken, K. B. & Kjellman, K. E. (2004).Beyond blueprints. Civil society and peace building. *International Peace Research Institute*, Oslo.

Harvey, P., (1998). Rehabilitation in Complex Political Emergencies: Is Rebuilding Civil Society the Answer. *Disasters* 22:200-217.

Inguanzo, I., & Rodríguez Rodríguez, A. (2023). Analysis of the Colombian Constitutional Court's Transformative Approach to Conflict-Related Sexual Violence. *Social & Legal Studies*, 0(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/09646639231159048

Ishkanian, A., Manusyan, A., Khalatyan, M. & Margaryan, N. (2023). Why ideas matter: Exploring the potential and limits of local civil society agency in peacebuilding, *Journal of Civil Society*, 19:2, 193-211. DOI: 10.1080/17448689.2023.2206156

Jensen, M. (2006). Concepts and Conceptions of Civil Society. *Journal of Civil Society*, *2*(1), 39–56. https://doi.org/10.1080=17448680600730934

Kaldor, M. (2003). *Global Civil Society. An Answer to war*. Polity Press.

Kali M., (2022), The untold story of civil society organizations' contribution to peacebuilding in Lesotho, *International Politics*, 59 (6), pp. 1082 – 1100, DOI: 10.1057/s41311-021-00345-w

Kaplan, O. (2017). *Resisting War: How Communities Protect Themselves*. Cambridge University Press.

Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Cornell University Press.

Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1999). Transnational advocacy networks in international and regional politics. *International Social Science Journal*, *51*(159), 89–101. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468–2451.00179

Kim, D.J. (2022), Reciprocal empowerment for civil society peacebuilding: sharing lessons between the Korean and Northern Ireland peace processes, *Globalizations*, 19 (2), pp. 238 - 252, DOI: 10.1080/14747731.2021.1882814

Lemaitre, J., & Sandvik, K. B. (2015). Shifting Frames, Vanishing Resources, and Dangerous Political Opportunities: Legal Mobilization among Displaced Women in Colombia. *Law & Society Review*, *49*(1), 5–38. https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12119

Lopez, J. A., & Hincapie, S. (2015). Campos de acción colectiva y las ong de derechos humanos. Herramientas teóricas para su análisis. *Sociológica*, *30*(85), 9–37.

Magatti, M. (2003). Per una definizione di Societa' Civile. In V. Cesareo (Ed.), *I protagonisti della Societa' Civile* (pp. 27–70). Rubbettino Editore.

Marchetti, R., & Tocci, N. (2009). Conflict society: understanding the role of civil society in conflict. *Global Change, Peace & Security*, *21*(2), 201–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/14781150902872091

Mutasa, C. & Virk, K., (2017). *Building peace in South Sudan. Progress, problems and prospects*. Cape Town: Centre for Conflict Resolution.

Nilsson, M. (2018). Civil society actors in peace negotiations in Central America, *Journal of Civil Society*, 14:2, 135-152. DOI: 10.1080/17448689.2018.1484004

Öjendal, J., Leonardsson, H. & Lundqvist, M. (2017). *Local peacebuilding – Challenges and opportunities*. Gothenburg: EBA

Olvera, A. (2004). Representaciones e ideologías de los organismos civiles en México: crítica de la selectividad y rescate del sentido de la idea de sociedad civil. In J. Cadena (Ed.), *Las organizaciones civiles mexicanas hoy* (pp. 23–48). Universidad Autonoma de México.

Paffenholz, T. (ed.), (2009) *Civil Society and Peacebuilding: A Critical Assessment*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers

Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton University Press.

Rettberg, A., & Quishpe, R. C. (2017). *1900 Iniciativas de paz en colombia. Caracterización y análisis de las iniciativas de paz de la Sociedad Civil en Colombia 1985-2016. Informe Nacional*.

Riaz, S., & Pasha, S. A. (2011). Role of citizen journalism in strengthening societies. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*(1), 88-103.

Rincón Gabourel, E. (2018). La sociedad civil organizada responde al impacto de políticas públicas. Las políticas sociales como factor causal del rol asistencialista de organizaciones de la sociedad civil (osc) pro migrantes en Tijuana. *Gestión y Política Pública, XXVII*(1), 181-209.

Sánchez-Garzoli, G. (2016). *La sociedad civil: la mejor apuesta de Colombia para la construcción de paz*. WOLA. https://www.wola.org/es/analisis/la-sociedad-civil-la-mejor-apuesta-de-colombia-para-la-construccion-de-la-paz/

Sartori, G. (1970). Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics. *The American Political Science Review*, *64*(4), 1033–1053.

Sartori, G. (1971). LA POLITICA COMPARATA: PREMESSE E PROBLEMI. *Italian Political Science Review/Rivista Italiana Di Scienza Politica*, *1*(1), 7–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0048840200000022

Spini, D. (2006). *La Società Civile Postnazionale*. Meltemi.

Strange, M. (2011). Why Network Across National Borders? TANs, their Discursivity, and the Case of the Anti-GATS Campaign, *Journal of Civil Society*, 7:1, 63-79. DOI: 10.1080/17448689.2011.553432

Theros, M. (2019). Reimagining civil society in conflict: Findings from post-2001 Afghanistan. *Journal of Civil Society*, *15*(2), 143–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2019.1594083

Thörn, H. (2006). The Emergence of a Global Civil Society: The Case of Anti-Apartheid, Journal of Civil Society, 2:3, 249-266. DOI: 10.1080/17448680601104337

Transparency International Rwanda (2015). Rwanda Civil Society Development Barometer. Kigali.

ur Rahman, K. (2021). Use of Narcotics in Pakistan: Situation Analysis and Way Forward. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, *15*(4), 163-174. http://doi.org/10.51709/19951272/Winter-2021/

Valencia-Agudelo, G. D. y Villarreal-Miranda, K. D. (2020). Participación de la sociedad civil en el proceso de paz con las Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia -FARC-ep- (2012-2016). *Entramado*, *16*(2), 238-250. https://doi.org/10.18041/1900-3803/entramado.2.6745

Villar, R. (2001). *El tercer sector en Colombia. Evolución, dimensión y tendencias*. Confederación Colombiana de Organizaciones sin Ánimo de Lucro.

Waters, T. W. (2015). Clearing the Path: The Perils of Positing Civil Society in Conflict and Transition. *Israel Law Review*, *48*(2), 165–187. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021223715000060

Wittgenstein, L. (1968). *Philosophical Investigations* (3rd ed.). Basil Blackwell.