Peace Ecology: Integrating Environmental Sustainability into Conflict Resolution

By

Stephen Egwuatu Amadi, PhD.
Department of History and Diplomatic Studies
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt
stephen.amadi05@gmail.com
08032667347

Abstract

Environmental degradation and resource scarcity increasingly fuel conflicts, yet existing studies on peacebuilding often overlook ecological dimensions. While current literature highlights climate–conflict linkages and sustainable development, it rarely integrates ecological sustainability directly into conflict resolution frameworks. This gap limits holistic peace strategies. The present study justifies the need to embed ecological principles in peace processes for enduring stability. Its objective is to examine how environmental sustainability can enhance conflict prevention and post-conflict reconstruction. Using qualitative content analysis of scholarly works, policy documents, and case studies from Africa and Asia, the study finds that ecologically informed peacebuilding fosters cooperation, reduces competition over resources, and strengthens community resilience. However, weak institutional capacities and lack of ecological awareness hinder implementation. The study concludes that peace ecology provides a viable framework for sustainable peace and recommends mainstreaming environmental education, inter-agency collaboration, and green policy integration in peacebuilding initiatives.

Keywords: Peace ecology, environmental sustainability, conflict resolution, sustainable peace, ecological peacebuilding

Introduction

The global pursuit of peace and environmental sustainability has increasingly converged within contemporary scholarship and practice. This intersection, commonly framed under the emerging discipline of peace ecology, underscores the

inseparable link between ecological balance and social stability. Across the world, particularly in Africa, environmental degradation, desertification, and competition over scarce natural resources have intensified human insecurity and contributed to violent conflicts. From the Sahel region, where pastoralists and farmers contest dwindling water and grazing resources, to the oil-rich Niger Delta where environmental pollution fuels militancy and economic grievances, ecological stress has become a potent driver of instability (Okoli & Atelhe, 2021; UNEP, 2020).

Despite these realities, many traditional conflict resolution frameworks in Africa and beyond continue to prioritize political, ethnic, or economic dimensions of conflict while relegating environmental factors to the background. This narrow focus has produced peace agreements that fail to endure, as they neglect the ecological foundations upon which sustainable peace depends. The consequences are visible in post-conflict societies that relapse into violence once environmental pressures resurface. Thus, understanding and integrating environmental sustainability into peace processes is no longer optional but essential for ensuring durable peace.

The problem this study addresses lies in the limited incorporation of ecological considerations into peacebuilding and conflict resolution frameworks. While there is a growing body of literature linking climate change to conflict, few studies have systematically articulated how environmental restoration and sustainability can serve as tools for peacebuilding in Sub-Saharan Africa. The gap between environmental policy and peace practice remains wide. Furthermore, weak institutions, corruption, and poor governance have undermined ecological justice and intensified resource-based conflicts (Akinola, 2018; UNEP, 2022).

This study is therefore justified by the urgent need to reorient peace studies and conflict resolution towards ecological realities. Integrating sustainability into peace frameworks ensures not only the cessation of hostilities but also the creation of resilient societies capable of coexisting with their environment. It aligns with the African Union's Agenda 2063 and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly Goals 13 (Climate Action), 15 (Life on Land), and 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions).

The objectives of this study are fourfold:

1. To examine the theoretical foundations of peace ecology.
2. To analyze the relationship between environmental sustainability and conflict resolution in Africa.
3. To identify gaps in existing literature and peacebuilding practices.
4. To propose strategies for integrating ecological sustainability into conflict management and post-conflict reconstruction.

The study is significant for peace practitioners, policymakers, and scholars of environmental studies. It contributes to the evolving discourse on environmental peacebuilding and provides a framework for understanding how ecological harmony can reinforce social justice and political stability. Ultimately, the research aims to demonstrate that peace ecology offers a transformative approach to achieving both sustainable development and lasting peace in Africa's conflict-prone environments.

Conceptual Clarifications

Peace ecology is a contemporary interdisciplinary framework that integrates ecological sustainability into the pursuit of peace. It posits that peace is not merely the absence of war or direct violence but also the presence of environmental justice, ecological balance, and sustainable human–nature relations (Brauch, 2019). The concept emerged from the convergence of peace studies, environmental science, and sustainability research, emphasizing that ecological degradation often fuels conflict, and that ecological restoration can be a pathway to reconciliation and stability.

In the African context, peace ecology finds resonance in traditional ecological ethics and communal resource management practices that view humans as custodians rather than exploiters of nature (Boahen, 2020). African societies historically emphasized harmony with nature through customs governing land use, water sharing, and forest conservation. However, colonial exploitation, rapid industrialization, and contemporary resource extraction disrupted these ecological balances, creating conditions for conflict over land, oil, and minerals (Okoli & Atelhe, 2021).

Environmental sustainability, within this context, refers to the responsible use and management of natural resources in ways that preserve ecosystem integrity for present and future generations (UNEP, 2022). It involves adopting policies and practices that mitigate environmental harm, reduce carbon footprints, and ensure equitable access to natural assets. When integrated into conflict resolution, environmental sustainability encourages cooperative problem-solving, shared resource management, and inclusive governance, which collectively contribute to peacebuilding.

Conflict resolution, on the other hand, encompasses processes and mechanisms designed to address the underlying causes of disputes and promote reconciliation among conflicting parties. Traditional approaches have largely centered on mediation, negotiation, and peace agreements focused on political and social grievances. Peace ecology expands this horizon by including ecological restoration and environmental justice as critical components of durable peace (Conca & Dabelko, 2018).

Theoretical Foundations

The theoretical framework of this study draws primarily from three interrelated theories: Ecological Systems Theory, Environmental Security Theory, and Human Needs Theory.

Ecological Systems Theory

Proposed by Urie Bronfenbrenner (1979), this theory posits that human behavior and social systems are embedded within interconnected ecological environments — from individual and community levels to global systems. In the context of peace ecology, this perspective underscores that conflict is not an isolated event but a manifestation of disrupted ecological and social relationships. For instance, in regions like the Sahel, degradation of ecosystems and shifting climate patterns directly affect livelihoods, leading to intercommunal clashes between farmers and herders (Benjaminsen & Ba, 2019). Peacebuilding, therefore, requires restoring the ecological systems that sustain human coexistence.

Ecological Systems Theory provides a holistic framework for understanding how environmental, political, and social dimensions of conflict interact. It also helps explain why purely political solutions often fail when the ecological context remains ignored.

Environmental Security Theory

Environmental Security Theory emerged from post–Cold War scholarship linking environmental degradation to national and human security (Homer-Dixon, 1999). It argues that scarcity of renewable resources, such as water, arable land, and forests, can heighten tensions, exacerbate poverty, and destabilize societies. In Africa, where livelihoods depend heavily on natural resources, environmental insecurity translates directly into human insecurity.

This theory justifies the integration of environmental management into conflict prevention and peacebuilding policies. It explains phenomena such as the Lake Chad Basin crisis, where the shrinking of water resources has intensified competition among communities, fostering violent extremism and displacement (Onuoha, 2020). Hence, addressing environmental insecurity becomes an essential component of building sustainable peace.

Human Needs Theory

Developed by scholars such as John Burton (1990), Human Needs Theory posits that conflicts persist when fundamental human needs — such as security, identity, and recognition are unmet. Peace ecology expands this framework by arguing that a healthy environment is also a basic human need. Degraded ecosystems undermine livelihoods, cultural identities, and the psychological well-being of communities dependent on natural resources.

This perspective highlights that environmental justice, ensuring fair access to and distribution of natural resources is central to meeting human needs. It thus redefines peace not only as social justice but also as ecological justice, where human dignity and environmental integrity coexist.

Integrative Framework: Towards Ecological Peacebuilding

By synthesizing these theoretical perspectives, peace ecology emerges as a transformative paradigm for conflict resolution. It shifts attention from short-term political settlements to long-term ecological resilience. Ecological peacebuilding involves restoring degraded environments, promoting sustainable livelihoods, and encouraging intercommunal cooperation over shared ecosystems.

In African contexts, peace ecology also calls for reviving indigenous ecological knowledge systems that promote stewardship, dialogue, and collective responsibility for natural resources. Such approaches complement modern policy interventions and foster bottom-up participation essential for sustainable peace.

Thus, the conceptual and theoretical framework positions peace ecology as both a preventive and restorative model. It recognizes that the health of human societies is inseparable from the health of their environment, and that lasting peace must therefore be both socially and ecologically grounded.

Literature Review

The nexus between environmental degradation and conflict has attracted growing scholarly attention over the past three decades. Early studies, such as those by Homer-Dixon (1999) and Gleditsch (1998), established that resource scarcity and ecological degradation often exacerbate existing political and economic tensions. They argued that when critical resources like water, arable land, and forests decline, competition intensifies, leading to violent conflict. More recent research has extended this analysis to climate change impacts, showing how droughts, desertification, and extreme weather events amplify insecurity, displacement, and migration, especially in fragile states (Koubi, 2019; Raleigh & Urdal, 2020).

Globally, environmental peacebuilding has emerged as a framework linking ecological restoration with post-conflict recovery. Conca and Dabelko (2018) conceptualize environmental cooperation as a confidence-building measure that fosters dialogue and interdependence among former adversaries. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP, 2022) further supports this approach by emphasizing environmental governance as central to sustainable peace and development. For example, post-war restoration projects in Rwanda and Colombia

have demonstrated that community-based natural resource management can rebuild trust and create shared economic opportunities.

However, despite these advances, much of the global literature remains Western-centric, often applying generalized models without adequate attention to local ecological and socio-cultural contexts. Moreover, environmental peacebuilding studies tend to focus on post-conflict reconstruction rather than the preventive potential of ecological sustainability in mitigating conflicts before they occur (Ide, 2020). These gaps limit the effectiveness of global theories when applied to complex African realities.

African scholars and regional institutions have increasingly explored how ecological factors drive conflicts and undermine stability. The continent's dependence on natural resources makes it particularly vulnerable to climate-induced tensions. In Nigeria, for instance, oil exploration in the Niger Delta has produced severe environmental degradation, breeding poverty, social injustice, and violent militancy (Akinola, 2018). In the Sahel region, desertification and rainfall variability have led to conflicts between farmers and herders, as well as transnational security challenges linked to migration and insurgency (Benjaminsen & Ba, 2019).

Similarly, in Sudan and South Sudan, disputes over water, grazing routes, and land tenure have been critical triggers of protracted conflict (Suliman, 2017). These cases demonstrate that ecological pressures often intersect with ethnic, political, and governance challenges, resulting in complex and multidimensional conflicts.

African policy frameworks have recognized these links. The African Union's Agenda 2063 and the African Climate Change Strategy underscore the role of environmental management in peace and security. The Lake Chad Basin Commission and Great Green Wall Initiative are examples of regional ecological interventions aimed at restoring degraded landscapes and promoting cooperation. Yet, these initiatives often face weak institutional capacity, funding shortages, and inadequate integration with peacebuilding programs (Onuoha, 2020; UNEP, 2022).

Strengths of Existing Literature

The literature provides valuable insights into how environmental degradation contributes to instability. It has helped policymakers recognize that sustainable development and peace are mutually reinforcing goals. Key strengths include:

Empirical depth: Many studies use case-based analysis linking ecological decline with social conflict, providing a solid evidence base for environmental peacebuilding (Raleigh & Urdal, 2020).

Policy relevance: The growing alignment of environmental security with global peace agendas, such as the UN SDGs, reflects the practical importance of these studies.

Interdisciplinary integration: The literature increasingly draws from environmental science, political ecology, and peace studies, broadening the analytical lens (Conca & Dabelko, 2018).

These contributions have significantly advanced understanding of the ecological dimensions of conflict, fostering new thinking among peace practitioners and researchers alike.

Weaknesses and Gaps in Existing Literature

Despite these achievements, several weaknesses persist. First, conceptual fragmentation remains a challenge. Many studies treat environmental sustainability, security, and peacebuilding as separate domains rather than as interdependent components of a unified ecological system (Ide, 2020). Second, regional underrepresentation is evident; African experiences are often underexplored, while Western or Middle Eastern contexts dominate the discourse. Third, methodological limitations persist: much of the literature relies on quantitative correlations between environmental variables and conflict incidence, with limited qualitative engagement on how communities perceive and manage ecological stress (Benjaminsen & Ba, 2019).

Furthermore, policy disconnects are common. While environmental restoration projects exist, they often operate parallel to peacebuilding efforts, leading to

duplication and inefficiency. The absence of a comprehensive framework that integrates ecological restoration into negotiation, mediation, and reconstruction processes is a significant gap. Additionally, indigenous ecological knowledge, long embedded in African communal systems of resource management is rarely incorporated into formal environmental peacebuilding models. This omission weakens local ownership and sustainability of interventions (Boahen, 2020).

Emerging Trends and the Research Gap

Recent scholarship is moving toward a more integrative understanding of peace and ecology, coining terms like eco-peacebuilding, climate diplomacy, and environmental justice for peace. These perspectives emphasize cooperation over shared natural resources, joint conservation initiatives, and inclusive governance (Brauch, 2019). Nevertheless, there remains a lack of grounded, region-specific models that reflect African environmental realities, socio-political structures, and cultural practices.

The research gap addressed by this study lies precisely in this intersection. While existing literature explores how environmental degradation triggers conflict, few studies demonstrate how ecological sustainability can actively serve as an instrument of conflict prevention and resolution, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa. The emerging concept of peace ecology offers an integrative and transformative approach to bridging this divide. It goes beyond diagnosing the environmental causes of conflict to propose ecologically grounded solutions that sustain peace.

In summary, the reviewed literature shows growing recognition of the link between environmental sustainability and peacebuilding, yet it reveals limited theoretical integration and insufficient regional specificity. By situating peace ecology within African realities, this study contributes to closing that gap and promoting a holistic understanding of sustainable peace as both a social and ecological construct.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative descriptive research design anchored in interpretive and analytical inquiry. The qualitative approach is most appropriate for exploring

the complex relationships between environmental sustainability and conflict resolution, which cannot be adequately captured through quantitative measures alone (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The research relies on secondary data derived from scholarly articles, policy documents, institutional reports, and relevant case studies. The aim is not only to describe but also to critically interpret the emerging paradigm of peace ecology as a framework for sustainable peacebuilding in Africa. Data were obtained from both academic and institutional sources to ensure credibility and comprehensiveness. Academic sources included peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and conference papers on environmental peacebuilding, ecological sustainability, and conflict resolution. Institutional data were drawn from reports by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the African Union (AU), and regional organizations such as ECOWAS and the Lake Chad Basin Commission. Additional data were gathered from governmental and non-governmental publications addressing environmental and peace initiatives in Africa between 2010 and 2024.

The study employed documentary analysis as its principal method of data collection. Documents were systematically reviewed to identify recurring themes, patterns, and insights relevant to the integration of environmental sustainability into peace processes. A thematic content analysis approach was used to interpret the data. Key themes, such as resource scarcity, environmental degradation, ecological justice, and sustainable peacebuilding were identified and analyzed in relation to their implications for peace ecology (Bowen, 2009).

The analysis was guided by three interrelated theoretical perspectives: Ecological Systems Theory, Environmental Security Theory, and Human Needs Theory. These frameworks provided the analytical lens for examining how ecological and human systems interact to shape both conflict dynamics and peacebuilding opportunities. The interpretive synthesis aimed to draw conceptual linkages rather than statistical generalizations, thereby advancing the theoretical discourse on ecological peacebuilding.

Case Selection

To illustrate the regional relevance of peace ecology, the study considered case-based insights from the Niger Delta (Nigeria), the Sahel region (Mali, Niger, Chad), and the Horn of Africa (Ethiopia, Sudan, Somalia). These regions were selected due to their history of resource-based conflicts and ongoing environmental crises. The comparative insights derived from these contexts facilitated a grounded understanding of how ecological stress and governance failures intersect to sustain insecurity, and how environmental cooperation could foster peace.

Ethical Considerations and Limitations

Although based on secondary data, the research adhered to ethical principles of academic integrity, proper citation, and intellectual honesty. Only publicly available and credible sources were used. The main limitation of the study lies in its reliance on existing literature and reports, which may not capture the most recent field-level developments. However, triangulation of diverse data sources helped mitigate potential biases and ensured validity.

In summary, the qualitative and interpretive methodology adopted in this study enables a holistic understanding of peace ecology as both a theoretical construct and a practical framework. It provides the analytical foundation for the subsequent section on Findings and Discussion, where the study synthesizes insights on the ecological dimensions of peace and conflict in Africa.

Findings and Discussion

Overview of Key Findings:

The analysis reveals that environmental degradation, weak governance, and socio-economic inequalities are central drivers of conflict in Africa. The study finds that the absence of environmental considerations in peacebuilding efforts significantly undermines the durability of peace. It further identifies that ecological cooperation and sustainable resource management serve as catalysts for reconciliation and community resilience. Across the examined regions, the Niger Delta, the Sahel, and the Horn of Africa, conflict dynamics are deeply intertwined with the degradation of ecosystems and competition for scarce resources. However, where environmental restoration and sustainable livelihood initiatives have been

integrated into peacebuilding, more enduring and inclusive peace outcomes have emerged (UNEP, 2022; Onuoha, 2020).

The Nexus Between Environmental Degradation and Conflict:

Environmental degradation was found to be both a direct and indirect source of conflict. In the Niger Delta, oil pollution has devastated farmlands and fisheries, eroded traditional livelihoods, and created deep grievances among local communities. The resultant unrest has taken the form of militancy, sabotage, and organized criminality, reflecting how ecological harm translates into social violence (Akinola, 2018). Similarly, in the Sahel region, desertification and erratic rainfall have triggered competition between nomadic herders and sedentary farmers, leading to cycles of communal violence and displacement (Benjaminsen & Ba, 2019).

The findings affirm the Environmental Security Theory, which posits that ecological stress undermines human security and destabilizes societies (Homer-Dixon, 1999). In many African countries, dependence on natural resources makes ecological changes immediately felt at the local level, often with political repercussions. Moreover, weak governance and inequitable resource distribution amplify these tensions, as environmental decline becomes both a livelihood crisis and a justice issue.

Environmental Sustainability as a Tool for Peacebuilding:

A major finding of this study is that environmental sustainability can serve as an effective mechanism for conflict prevention and peace consolidation. Programs that focus on restoring degraded environments and promoting shared resource management tend to foster cooperation among communities. For instance, the Great Green Wall Initiative, which aims to restore 100 million hectares of degraded land across the Sahel, not only mitigates the impact of desertification but also provides jobs, strengthens cross-border collaboration, and reduces migration pressures (African Union, 2021).

Similarly, the Lake Chad Basin Commission has used environmental diplomacy to encourage dialogue among Nigeria, Niger, Chad, and Cameroon, demonstrating

how ecological cooperation can become a platform for regional peace (Onuoha, 2020). Such initiatives exemplify peace ecology in action, where ecological restoration aligns with socio-political reconciliation and shared human security.

The findings also reveal that ecological peacebuilding enhances community resilience. When local populations participate in managing forests, water, and land resources, they not only restore their environments but also rebuild trust, identity, and social cohesion. This echoes Human Needs Theory, which emphasizes that peace endures only when basic human and environmental needs are met (Burton, 1990).

Indigenous Ecological Knowledge and Peace Ecology:

An important insight emerging from the data is the enduring relevance of indigenous ecological knowledge systems in promoting sustainable peace. Many African societies historically practiced communal land tenure, rotational farming, and sacred forest preservation—mechanisms that ensured equitable resource access and minimized ecological conflict (Boahen, 2020). For example, in parts of Nigeria and Ghana, traditional councils historically mediated disputes over water or grazing rights based on ecological ethics and intergenerational responsibility.

Integrating these traditional models with modern peacebuilding offers a culturally grounded pathway to sustainability. Unfortunately, the literature and policy frameworks reviewed show limited recognition of indigenous ecological wisdom. This represents a critical gap and a missed opportunity for inclusive peacebuilding. Peace ecology advocates for the revival and formal incorporation of such indigenous practices into environmental governance structures.

The Role of Governance and Institutions:

Findings indicate that institutional weakness remains a major obstacle to realizing ecological peace in Africa. Many peacebuilding programs remain fragmented between ministries of environment, agriculture, and security, with little coordination. The absence of coherent environmental governance frameworks undermines policy implementation and fuels perceptions of neglect among marginalized communities (Akinola, 2018). Moreover, corruption and elite capture

of resource revenues, particularly in extractive economies, exacerbate inequality and erode public trust.

For peace ecology to be effective, governance must shift toward transparency, inclusivity, and environmental accountability. Building local institutional capacity and empowering civil society actors can strengthen environmental monitoring, community participation, and early warning systems. Strong institutions act as mediators between ecological challenges and human security, thereby preventing resource competition from escalating into violent conflict.

Integrating Environmental Diplomacy:

The research also finds that environmental diplomacy is emerging as a powerful tool for managing transboundary ecological challenges. Shared rivers, forests, and wildlife corridors require cross-border collaboration and negotiation. The Nile Basin Initiative, for example, demonstrates how dialogue over shared water resources can reduce geopolitical tensions between upstream and downstream countries (Abebe, 2021).

Such initiatives align with Ecological Systems Theory, which views peace and stability as products of interactions within and between ecological systems. Environmental diplomacy thus extends the logic of peace ecology to the international sphere, framing the environment as both a source of common interest and a platform for cooperation.

Challenges in Implementing Peace Ecology

Despite its promise, several challenges hinder the adoption of peace ecology in Africa. These include limited financial resources, inadequate environmental awareness, politicization of resource management, and weak integration between peacebuilding and environmental policy sectors (UNDP, 2021). Many donor-driven interventions focus narrowly on short-term conflict mitigation without embedding ecological sustainability in their design. Additionally, climate-induced migration and rapid population growth continue to strain fragile ecosystems, complicating peacebuilding efforts.

Another challenge is the knowledge-policy gap, where research on peace ecology remains largely theoretical and underutilized in policymaking. Bridging this divide requires stronger collaboration between scholars, practitioners, and decision-makers to translate research into actionable strategies.

Synthesis and Theoretical Implications

The study's findings validate and extend the theoretical frameworks guiding this research.

Environmental Security Theory is confirmed in showing how environmental scarcity triggers insecurity.

Human Needs Theory is reaffirmed in linking ecological well-being to social stability and identity.

Ecological Systems Theory provides the overarching understanding that peace depends on the health of interconnected human–environment systems.

Together, these theories reinforce the argument that peace ecology is both a theoretical innovation and a practical necessity. It broadens the scope of conflict resolution to include ecological justice, sustainability, and intergenerational equity. Overall, the findings demonstrate that environmental sustainability is not peripheral but central to durable peace in Africa. Ecological degradation perpetuates conflict, while ecological restoration fosters reconciliation and resilience. Peace ecology, therefore, provides a transformative framework that aligns human security with planetary health, a necessary paradigm shift for the future of conflict resolution in the region.

Conclusion

This study examined the emerging paradigm of peace ecology as a framework for integrating environmental sustainability into conflict resolution, with a focus on Sub-Saharan Africa. The findings reveal that ecological degradation, resource scarcity, and climate stressors have become significant drivers of insecurity in the region. Traditional peacebuilding frameworks—anchored primarily on political

dialogue and security interventions—have often failed to address these ecological dimensions, thereby undermining the sustainability of peace processes (Matthew, Barnett, & McDonald, 2022).

The concept of peace ecology provides a holistic and transformative approach by recognizing that environmental systems and social systems are deeply interdependent. It posits that peace cannot be achieved or sustained in environments of ecological collapse; just as sustainable environmental management cannot occur in contexts of violent conflict (Conca & Dabelko, 2018). The study's case analyses, from the Niger Delta to the Sahel and Horn of Africa, underscore that ecological insecurity is both a symptom and a cause of deeper structural violence, including inequality, marginalization, and weak governance.
Moreover, peace ecology bridges the gap between environmental peacebuilding and human security paradigms. It shifts the focus from reactive conflict management to preventive and restorative ecological justice. By linking sustainable resource management with local participation, equitable distribution, and climate adaptation, peace ecology offers a pragmatic pathway for building durable peace (Ide, 2020).

Nonetheless, while the literature increasingly acknowledges the nexus between environment and peace, there remains a gap in translating ecological principles into institutional and diplomatic frameworks. Environmental governance is still fragmented across ministries, and peacebuilding institutions rarely integrate climate resilience into their core strategies. The study concludes that a shift toward ecological consciousness in conflict resolution demands systemic transformation, one that aligns political will, scientific knowledge, and community agency.

Recommendations

Drawing from the study's findings, the following recommendations are proposed to strengthen the operationalization of peace ecology in policy and practice across Africa and beyond:

Integrate Environmental Sustainability into Peacebuilding Frameworks:
National governments, regional bodies (such as ECOWAS and IGAD), and international organizations should embed ecological sustainability as a cross-cutting objective in peacebuilding strategies. This includes incorporating environmental impact assessments in post-conflict recovery and peace negotiations.

Promote Cross-Border Environmental Cooperation:
Many conflicts in Africa are transboundary in nature, revolving around shared resources such as rivers, forests, and grazing lands. Regional frameworks for environmental diplomacy, such as the Great Green Wall Initiative, should be strengthened to encourage collective ecological management and reduce resource-based tensions (UNEP, 2023).

Enhance Community Participation and Ecological Justice:
Local communities bear the brunt of ecological degradation and conflict, and yet are often excluded from peace processes. Grassroots participation in environmental decision-making enhances legitimacy, sustainability, and local ownership of peace efforts. Mechanisms for ecological justice, including community compensation and fair access to resources, should be institutionalized (Swain & Öjendal, 2018).

Build Institutional and Technical Capacities:
There is a need to strengthen national and regional institutions with the technical capacity to assess, monitor, and respond to environmental risks that threaten peace. Integrating environmental scientists, climate experts, and peace practitioners into multidisciplinary teams can foster innovation in ecological conflict resolution.

Foster Research, Education, and Advocacy on Peace Ecology:
Academic and policy-oriented research on peace ecology should be expanded to refine its theoretical foundations and practical applications. Peace studies programs, especially in African universities, should incorporate ecological literacy and sustainability studies as core components of their curricula (Carius, Dabelko, & Wolf, 2004).

Global Partnerships for Climate-Sensitive Peacebuilding:
International donors and development partners should align funding priorities with climate-sensitive peacebuilding initiatives. Supporting renewable energy, reforestation, and climate adaptation projects in post-conflict zones can reduce environmental vulnerability and strengthen social cohesion.

Final Reflection
In essence, peace ecology redefines the very meaning of peace in the 21st century. It invites scholars, policymakers, and peace practitioners to transcend the narrow confines of security discourse and embrace an integrated approach that values ecological balance as a foundation for human flourishing. In the African context, where environmental degradation intersects with poverty, displacement, and weak governance, the adoption of peace ecology represents both a moral and pragmatic imperative. Sustainable peace is not merely the absence of war, but the presence of ecological harmony, social justice, and intergenerational responsibility.

References

Aall, P., Milante, G., & Weiss, T. (2021). Environmental peacebuilding: Theory and practice for sustainable peace. United States Institute of Peace Press.

Adedeji, A. (2020). Climate-induced conflicts and the quest for environmental justice in Sub- Saharan Africa. African Journal of Peace and Development Studies, 9(2), 45–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/ajpds.2020.002

African Union Commission (AUC). (2022). The African Union Climate Change and Resilient Development Strategy and Action Plan (2022–2032). Addis Ababa: African Union.

Barnett, J., & Adger, W. N. (2019). Climate change, human security, and violent conflict. Political Geography, 43(3), 27–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.04.007

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Carius, A., Dabelko, G. D., & Wolf, A. T. (2004). Water, conflict, and cooperation. Washington, DC: United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

Conca, K., & Dabelko, G. D. (Eds.). (2018). Environmental peacemaking. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dabelko, G. D., & Simmons, P. J. (2020). Environment and security: Core ideas and U.S. government initiatives. Environmental Change and Security Program Report, 25(1), 5– 15.

Gleditsch, N. P., & Nordås, R. (2021). Climate change and conflict: The migration link. Environmental Research Letters, 16(5), 054020. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748- 9326/abdf90

Ide, T. (2020). The dark side of environmental peacebuilding. World Development, 127(1), 104777. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104777

Krampe, F. (2017). Toward sustainable peace: A new research agenda for post-conflict natural resource management. Global Environmental Politics, 17(4), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1162/GLEP_a_00435

Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC). (2023). Annual report on environmental degradation and regional stability in the Lake Chad Basin. N'Djamena: LCBC Secretariat.

Le Billon, P. (2022). Environmental conflict. In P. Le Billon (Ed.), Wars of plunder: Conflicts, profits, and the politics of resources (2nd ed., pp. 125–148). Oxford University Press.

Matthew, R. A., Barnett, J., & McDonald, B. (2022). Global environmental change and human security. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Okonkwo, C. N., & Ezeani, E. O. (2021). Environmental degradation and peacebuilding challenges in the Niger Delta. African Security Review, 30(1), 78–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/10246029.2021.1884195

Onuoha, F. (2020). Resource conflicts and ecological insecurity in the Sahel: Rethinking intervention strategies. African Journal on Conflict Resolution, 20(2), 55–79. https://doi.org/10.4314/ajcr.v20i2.3

Swain, A., & Öjendal, J. (2018). Environmental governance and peacebuilding: The challenge of operationalization. Journal of Peacebuilding & Development, 13(3), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/15423166.2018.1498129

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2021). Sustaining peace through climate action in Africa: Policy brief. New York: UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa.

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). (2023). From conflict to cooperation: Environmental pathways to peace in Africa. Nairobi: UNEP Publications.

Westing, A. H. (2019). Environmental degradation as both cause and consequence of armed conflict. Environmental Conservation, 46(2), 91–97. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892919000192

Zhu, X., & Kimani, M. (2020). Climate change, displacement, and peacebuilding in East Africa: Emerging frameworks for ecological security. Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning, 22(5), 633–651. https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2020.1795087