

## **Effect of the peace process and Diplomacy on Government performance**

Effect: None (Failed to address the political dynamic due to elite dominance, military control, limited decentralization, and ethnic exclusion, which obstructed democratic reforms and contributed to a fragile governance structure)

Confidence in study findings: Low (three studies, low confidence)

### **Short Summary**

The three qualitative studies examine post-conflict governance in Myanmar, Nepal, and global cases (Bosnia, Cambodia, Kosovo, East Timor, and the Middle East), documented military dominance, elite control, and ineffective peacebuilding. In Myanmar, the Tatmadaw maintained power through coercion and limited decentralization, obstructing democratic reforms. In Nepal, despite the 2006 Comprehensive Peace Accord (CPA), elite dominance and ethnic exclusion led to the collapse of the Constituent Assembly in 2012. Globally, the liberal peace model struggled as international interventions failed to address local political dynamics, entrenched divisions, and weak institutions, limiting sustainable governance.

### **Long summary**

#### *The intervention*

The Peace Process and diplomacy have faced significant challenges due to internal contradictions, external influences, and local adaptations. In contrast, some peace initiatives have been driven by illiberal strategies aimed at control rather than genuine conflict resolution. Dahal(2015) critically examines the liberal peace approach in Nepal's state-building and peacebuilding efforts. Richmond(2011) assessed the liberal peace approach to post-conflict state building, promoted by the US and UK since the 1990s. It examines case studies from Cambodia, Bosnia, East Timor, and Kosovo to highlight the failures of this approach, often due to internal contradictions or local manipulation. Stokke(2022)Peace initiatives in Myanmar over the last three decades have primarily served as illiberal strategies employed by the military to contain armed resistance groups, rather than genuine attempts at resolving the underlying causes of conflict.

#### *How is the intervention expected to work*

Post-conflict governance efforts are expected to rebuild state institutions, ensure political stability, and promote inclusive governance through constitutional reforms, power-sharing agreements, and international support. However, elite capture, military influence, and weak institutions frequently hindered these objectives. In Myanmar, governance efforts focused on hybrid models of military and civilian rule, but the 2021 coup reaffirmed military dominance. In Nepal, the CPA sought democratic transition, but the exclusion of key groups led to governance failure. Globally, peacebuilding efforts struggled as international interventions failed to account for local political complexities, limiting long-term stability.

#### *The evidence base*

There are three qualitative studies assessing the **Effect of the peace process and Diplomacy on Government performance**. These studies are by Stokke, K., Kham, K. K. M., Nge, N. K., & Kvanvik, S. H. (2022). *Illiberal peacebuilding in a hybrid regime*.

*Authoritarian strategies for conflict containment in Myanmar. Political Geography, 93, 102551*; and Richmond, O. P. (2009). *Liberal peace transitions: between statebuilding and peacebuilding. Edinburgh University Press*; and by Dahal SH. *Statebuilding and Peacebuilding in Nepal, 1990–2012: Anatomy of a Democratic Transition* (Doctoral dissertation, George Mason University). All references are from these studies.

### *The evidence*

The studies provide qualitative insights into post-conflict governance, highlighting how elite dominance, military control, and international interventions shaped state-building efforts.

- 1) In Myanmar, political control was maintained through military offensives, ceasefire agreements, and economic incentives rather than genuine democratic reforms. While a hybrid regime was introduced, it primarily served military interests. The 2021 coup further entrenched military dominance, demonstrating the failure of previous governance efforts. The military-based government institutionalized a hybrid regime with decentralization and representation as a framework for political transformation of EAOs. There was some degree of dual territorial, administrative and resource control at the local scale. The case study documented that the military used its tutelary power to obstruct substantive conflict resolution through negotiated state reforms, thus concluding that Myanmar's peace initiatives during the last three decades should be understood as illiberal strategies for containing armed groups rather than attempts at substantive resolution of the core conflict issues (Stokke et al., 2022).
- 2) In Nepal, the 2006 Comprehensive Peace Accord (CPA) aimed to transition Nepal toward democracy, but governance remained heavily influenced by elite dominance and ethnic exclusion. The collapse of the Constituent Assembly in 2012 highlighted the fragility of the state and the exclusion of key political actors from decision-making, ultimately weakening governance (Dahal, 2014).
- 3) International efforts to promote liberal peace through democratization, economic reform, and legal frameworks often failed due to local manipulation, entrenched divisions, and weak institutional capacity. In Bosnia, Cambodia, Kosovo, East Timor, and the Middle East, peace interventions frequently reinforced elite power rather than fostering inclusive governance, limiting their long-term effectiveness (Richmond & Franks, 2011).

Across all three studies, a common finding observed that post-conflict governance efforts often failed to achieve substantive reform due to power imbalances, exclusionary politics, and ineffective international interventions.

### *Confidence assessment*

Overall confidence: Low Confidence Qualitative Studies (for two studies It is unclear whether the study uses an established small n approach; for two studies no triangulation was found; for sources of potential data bias not for two studies)