

ENVIRONMENTAL PEACEBUILDING. PROSPECTS, SOCIAL AND GENDER ASPECTS

Marina Chichua^{1*} 

¹Caucasus School of Media, Caucasus University, Tbilisi, Georgia

*Corresponding email: mchichua@cu.edu.ge

Received: 12.08.2025; **Accepted:** 17.09.2025; **Available online:** 20.09.2025; **Published:** 30.09.2025

Cite this article: Chichua, M. (2025). Environmental Peacebuilding. Prospects, Social and Gender Aspects. *Trends in Ecological and Indoor Environmental Engineering*, 3(3), 20–27.

Background: The peace-building process is an essential tactic for addressing the social, political, and economic issues that arise during and following conflicts. These approaches also address environmental issues, empowering them to confront ecological damage as well as stress the causes of resource-related conflicts. **Objectives:** The main objective of current study was to assess the environmental, social and gender aspects of the environmental peace-building processes in the turbulent world today full of conflicts and wars. Recent research has focused on peace paths that link political, socioeconomic, and environmental aspects of peace-building approaches. **Methods:** This current study is based on an evaluation of peer-reviewed academic works. It aims to identify, explain, and comprehend the potential paths that environmental peace-building processes may follow in societies impacted by armed conflicts. The article presents a theory-based analytical framework outlining the pathways that originate from the incorporation of environmental issues in peace-building initiatives, leading to environmental and societal outcomes of these efforts, as well as opportunities for enduring peace. The current research also envisages a modest analysis of the women's role and importance in the process of environmental peace-building. The study offers some examples from several countries, including Georgia. **Results:** Environmental peace-building represents an important evolution in the study of peace and conflict, suggesting innovative strategies to highlight the interconnected issues of environmental decline and conflicts. This approach emphasizes collective environmental responsibilities, provides a constructive alternative for peaceful solutions, and views environmental change primarily as an amplifying risk. **Conclusion:** The research determines that both power dynamics and prevailing descriptions considerably affect how environmental peace-building can take place. Nevertheless, the discipline is still evolving, requiring more extensive research, a deeper understanding of the complex driving forces, and careful consideration of the potential for environmental cooperation or change in existing conflict dynamics.

Keywords: environmental peace-building; security; climate change; women for environmental peace-building; sustainable development.

INTRODUCTION

Environmental peacebuilding is established on an open and impactful concept - a basis for adopting the peace (Conca, 2002). This wide-ranging perception exceeds a constricted viewpoint that the environment is exclusively a source of conflict, as an alternative identifying it as a resource, challenging issues associated with basic violence and social inequity (Conca, 2002; Ide, 2019).

The field of environmental peacebuilding is rapidly growing and connecting the areas of conflict, peace, security, and environment: environmental concerns are dominant in international politics, while the predominance of armed conflicts continues to be important, creating chances for the establishment and maintenance of peace (Ide et al., 2021).

Environmental peacebuilding signifies a shift in thinking from a focus on environmental scarcity to one centered on environmental peace. In this context, environmental peacebuilding advocates for cooperation as a mutually beneficial approach, breaking free from the win-lose dynamics associated with conflict. Nonetheless, there is a deficiency in a cohesive framework for environmental peacebuilding as well as empirical support illustrating the existence of the connection between environment and peace (Dresse et al., 2018).

In March 18, 2024, the Council of the European Union approved conclusions on Green Diplomacy (2024) (Figure 1).

LITERATURE REVIEW

General approaches

The concept of peacebuilding is progressing over time and continues to be a key focus within the theory and practice of Peace and Conflict Studies. Recently, there have been two primary shifts in the discussion and implementation of peacebuilding that have largely remained separate from one another. The first shift contains tactics from traditional

peacebuilding attitudes to an agenda focused on sustaining peace, while the second involves determinations to incorporate environmental concerns, particularly climate change, into peacebuilding processes (Hardt & Scheffran, 2019).

Environmental peacebuilding offers methods aimed at developing more harmonious relations over cooperation linked to the environment, management of natural resources, adaptation to climate change, and reduction of disaster risks. This part of the research is evolving and can congregate several elements of environmental security studies. Additionally, the approach of environmental peacebuilding has been widely practiced by practitioners working on conservation issues, environmental management/development, and peacebuilding, including individuals working directly within local communities and civil society representatives (Ide & Tubi, 2020).

In recent years, environmental peacebuilding has brought noteworthy academic and political attention; however, there is partial acceptance concerning the link between education and environmental peacebuilding. Outcomes from three environmental peacebuilding initiatives in Israel and Palestine pointed out that partnership on environmental issues can have a spill-over consequence, and that argumentative processes of depoliticization and neoliberalization can positively affect the environmental collaboration, education, and efforts of peacebuilding (Ide & Tubi, 2020).

The field of environmental peacebuilding developed as a response to the concept that violent conflict is an inevitable result of environmental changes/concerns. Environmental peace-making suggests that ecological inter-dependencies can influence a tool for peace (Conca & Dabelko, 2002). Other distinguished early works from this period observed the peace opportunities related to biodiversity conservation (Matthew & Gaulin, 2002) and trans-boundary protected areas (Brock, 1991; Ali, 2007). Since then, a significant part of research and practice has developed around these perceptions (Conca, 2024).



Figure 1. Council of the European Union on Green Diplomacy (2024)

Huseynov & Mitchell (2024) contend that the applications of blockchain in water management could play a role in achieving environmental peacebuilding goals. This research is among the first to investigate the theoretical application of blockchain technology for water management within the framework of environmental peacebuilding. The prevailing narratives that overlook nature, exploit it, and view it through an extractivist lens exert considerable influence on the course of peace initiatives. Controlling the inequalities is an essential step for environmental peacebuilding, and it is significant to challenge narratives that deem nature to unlock new ways for sustainable peace (Zelli & Krause, 2025).

Despite the growing interest in the process of environmental peacebuilding, there remains a remarkable gap in practical research dedicated to the interstate/national environmental peacebuilding (Balinskaia, 2024).

Conflict, post-conflict and environmental peacebuilding approaches

Environmental destruction is frequently observed as a significant aspect of violent conflict or migration generated by conflict. Significant environmental damage has happened in many regions, including Africa, South Asia, and Central America, as a consequence of civil wars in those regions. Environmental changes have considerably diminished the damage to arable land, forests, freshwater, clean air, and fish resources (Swain & Öjendal, 2018).

For international and domestic stakeholders, post-conflict peacebuilding is recognized as one of the most complex policy areas to navigate and engage with. The paper outlines three ways in which enhanced governance of natural resources in post-conflict settings is believed to positively influence peace (Krampe et al., 2021).

Since the conclusion of the Kosovo Conflict in 1999, UNEP has begun to address the environmental aspects of insecurity and

has shifted its focus towards peacebuilding. This has been precarious, as it approaches areas of conflict prevention, identification, or resolution, which are beyond UNEP's official responsibilities. Building on the UN's Peacebuilding Architecture, UNEP sought to advance environmental peacebuilding by emphasizing three interconnected knowledge-building activities: knowledge accumulation, strategic interpretation, and implementation (Dalmer, 2021).

The release of the Routledge Handbook titled "Environmental Conflict and Peacebuilding" (Swain & Öjendal, 2018) is promoted as "the first" to provide a comprehensive framework of environmental peacebuilding for "policymakers and students/researchers alike." The UNDP is dedicated to integrating crisis prevention, including conflict, into its development strategies (McArthur, 2018).

Natural resources and peacebuilding

One of the significant obstacles in any peacebuilding initiative is ensuring not only the cessation of armed conflict and the prevention of its resurgence but also assisting the war-affected nation in reconstructing its society, governance, and institutions to attain lasting peace. In various peacebuilding contexts, it is essential to consider natural resources and environmental factors. As Das (2023) explains, environmental peacebuilding refers to "the incorporation of natural resource management and environmental safeguarding within conflict resolution and recovery approaches to avert the return of conflict and lay the groundwork for enduring peace and development".

Natural resources and other environmental aspects are frequently important, if not essential, to the dynamics of conflict and peace. One of the major risks to sustainable peace in the 21st century appears from disagreements over natural resources, including minerals, petroleum, gas, land, and water. These conflicts can, and often do, accelerate into violence. Natural resources, from diamonds and minerals to bananas and

cocoa, are used to finance armed conflicts, and the environment often "suffers" as a consequence of wars. In opposition, the environment can also "make a foundation" as a promoter for peace. Ever more, peace agreements have involved several environmental issues and concerns, while post-conflict recovery is influenced by natural resources, to promote integration of former fighting sides, restore livelihoods and the economy, deliver essential services, and inspire collaboration and reconciliation processes. Environmental peacebuilding suggests a broad agenda for understanding the diverse roles and interactions connecting the environment, conflict, and peace through the conflict life cycle (Bruch et al., 2021).

A 2009 UN report indicates that over the past six decades, 40% of conflicts between nations or states have connections to disputes over natural resources. As the demand for resources rises alongside the global population, coupled with challenges like climate change, it is anticipated that conflicts will become more intense. For instance, as the River Jordan flows between Israel, Palestine, and Jordan, disease-causing microbes that thrive in sewage-contaminated water cross geopolitical boundaries without any form of identification or border control. By consuming or bathing in that polluted water, children on both sides of the border fall ill. However, the proposed resolutions offer a chance to stress more than just healthcare topics. Investments near boundaries (in water treatment) can be described as a "profit" for encouraging peace. It presents the attitude behind environmental peacebuilding as a promising field in natural resource management that point to the growing understanding that while natural resources can provoke conflict, they can also generate opportunities for collaboration (Ogden, 2018).

Environmental sustainability, climate change, and peacebuilding

International organizations are increasingly calling for ways to connect climate, peace, and security in their operations. The group of researchers (Medina et al., 2023) described the social learning theory which assessed the development of strategies of the environmental peacebuilding aimed at climate-related security risks' mitigation. This method was appraised in nine rural sites in Kenya, Senegal, and Guatemala, including 221 participants. Through a thorough assessment of this method, the study explores both the opportunities and challenges of utilizing social learning approaches to shape environmental peacebuilding programs. Findings reveal that processes of collective reflection during appraisals can foster shared and context-specific understandings of climate-related security risks. The results will help the locals to improve sustainable peacebuilding process via adopting the strategies for climate change.

Science diplomacy and the interfaces between science and policy serve as instruments that science can use to tackle the major challenges facing the world today. The scientific community must enhance its ability to translate this scientific knowledge into action for society and decision-makers to create new governance frameworks for the Earth's systems, leading to a more resilient society. Climate change poses one of the most pressing challenges facing the globe today (Cuellar-Ramirez, 2021).

The sustainable development (SD) concept envisages developmental and exploitative approaches with social and environmental considerations, creating the post-conflict peacebuilding stage for establishing the foundation for SD. It should be underlined, that SDG 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions, creating the link between SD and peace within the significant address on sustainable development. Highlighting

the environmental peacebuilding approach, UNEP claims that SDG 16 can foster enhanced governance/management of natural resources through well-informed and comprehensive decision-making processes, therefore exploiting peace "bonuses" and decreasing the chances of social dissatisfaction and violent conflict (Das, 2023).

On one hand, environmental peacebuilding observes the relationships between environmental sustainability and peace initiatives, but current studies overlook the significance of 'power dynamics' and inequalities. The authors oppose that achieving the 'virtuous cycle' of positive peace and environmental sustainability necessitates the active transformation of power structures (Davis et al., 2023).

Land is a (natural) resource for promoting peace and mitigating climate change. It is frequently associated with sources of greenhouse gas emissions and factors that drive (violent) conflict. Consequently, both climate mitigation and peacebuilding strategies are focused on collaboratively designing sustainable land-use systems (SLUS) with impacted communities to combine land-based climate mitigation efforts with peacebuilding goals (Morales Muñoz et al., 2023).

Bargués-Pedreny (2018) supposes that "sustaining peace requires a continual and enduring commitment, where the criteria for withdrawal remain adaptable". Some scholars criticize this alteration and oppose the idea that it may indicate the rejection of the concept of achieving peace; the peacebuilding process is now observed as having no "final deadline" (Bargués-Pedreny, 2018; Jahanbegloo, 2017). Other scholars identify this strategic alteration as an essential change to the understanding that peacebuilding is a multi-layered, multidisciplinary, and long-term attempt, similar to the multifaceted concept of human/social security. The concept of "sustaining peace" should not be combined with the idea of sustainable peace.

The authors observe an increasing recognition of the difficulties that environmental issues, particularly climate change, pose for the field of peacebuilding (Hardt et al., 2019).

Women for environmental peacebuilding

Environmental vulnerabilities, which include environmental risks, environmental susceptibility, environmental sensitivity, and environmental fragility, as well as the impacts of conflict, are mainly handled by women, girls, and other marginalized parts of communities. General gender discrimination, biased legislation, and unfavourable gender standards delay their ability to manage crises caused by conflicts and climate change, as they frequently lack an equal right to control over land, property, and other natural resources (Ahmadnia et al., 2022).

The women's involvement in peacebuilding processes began in the 1990s and early 2000s. Mead & Jacobsson (2023) underlined that currently, a 'gender mainstreaming' attitude is broadly envisaged at all levels of innovative programs.

Research has indicated that women have played crucial roles in conflict resolution and prevention, peace negotiations, peacebuilding, peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and the reconstruction process following conflicts (Eshofonie, 2024).

Nevertheless, the climate crisis poses not only challenges to the Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) agenda but also presents potential opportunities. The environmental and human health, as well as the sustainability of peace of our planet, is knotted, demonstrating that realization of the WPS agenda requires changes in social, political, and economic configurations, which are so important for preventing severe climate disasters (Cohn & Duncanson, 2021).

Women's involvement in the peacebuilding processes proves the significance of gender in the process of fostering the modern peace. By giving emphasis to the financial empowerment of women, which can diminish the harmful impacts of neo-liberalism in post-conflict circumstances, feminists may discover ways to achieve these goals (Duncanson, 2016).

Some reports draw connections between gender and peacebuilding yet overlook environmental considerations. On the other hand, there are articles that neglect the significance of gender roles in the process of regulating the relationship between conflict and the environment (Mead & Jacobsson, 2023).

Georgia at a glance

For more than twenty years, the Russian invasion and subsequent occupation have led to the permanent displacement of around 250,000 Georgians who previously lived in the so-called South Ossetia (now referred to as Samachablo) and the Autonomous Republic of Abkhazia, further adding to the existing population of over 200,000 Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) (Chichua, 2023). Ethnic Georgians remaining in the occupied regions face systematic discrimination and harassment, especially in the Autonomous Republic of Abkhazia, which has the highest concentration of Georgians among the two territories (Chichua & Matchavariani, 2024).

Abkhazia and Samachablo are rich in natural resources and feature a diverse range of flora and fauna. It should be underlined, that Abkhazia locates alongside the Black Sea coast.

However, peace and force are two "attitudes" for conflict resolution. Most people prepare the peaceful approaches. To accomplish this, an impartial institution is needed – an intellectual resource to back the chosen strategy for conflict management in political arenas and to promote understanding of the necessity to improve relationships between the conflicting parties (Khonelidze, 2021).

Women in Georgia have a different role than men, as they contribute significantly to the community by providing unique insights into the challenges faced by their communities. "Women from occupied territories are eager to partner with women from other regions of Georgia and engage in discussions on various subjects beyond policy," noted Mamuka Kuparadze, a conflict resolution expert from the NGO Studio Re. Initiating dialogue was most effectively done through urgent environmental issues. A collective of environmental activists from Tbilisi, Georgia, and Sokhumi, Abkhazia, leveraged the Zoom platform to produce a series of documentaries that highlighted environmental challenges. The concept of "gender, environment, and peace-building" is proving to be effective in Georgia, as evidenced by the existing literature reviews.

DISCUSSION

General overviews

In recent years, the approach of environmental peacebuilding has become increasingly distinguished not only among scholars but also among practitioners. Unfortunately, little information is available in this direction, and further development is needed.

Environmental peacebuilding remains as a key approach for peace and conflict studies – as a tool to go from peacebuilding to peacekeeping and the challenge to add environmental topics, especially climate change in peacebuilding, tries to build peaceful ties via different directions, like environmental collaboration, natural resource management, climate change adaptation and mitigation, conservation and involving scientists

environmental NGOs and those who are working local communities. As a good example, the Good Water Neighbors project aims to build peace between Israelis, Palestinians, and Jordanians and, at the same time, improve the quality of the River Jordan and sanitation. Some scientists also claim that blockchain applications in water management can promote environmental peacebuilding processes.

Environmental peacebuilding mainly focuses on cooperation with shared environmental challenges, but some serious approaches should be taken into consideration. Firstly, it is important to carefully use ecological problems for political purposes. Secondly, for long-term success, it should be taken into consideration that addressing environmental peacebuilding initiatives could promote peace instead of deepening the existing conflict. Additionally, environmental cooperation can immediately launch collaboration and dialogue, but in the long term can drive many/new conflicts, particularly in the direction of climate change.

Connections between conflict, post-conflict, and environmental peacebuilding approaches

The most demanding challenges of modern times are the connections between environmental degradation and conflicts because both delay sustainable development. Environmental peacebuilding addresses solid challenges via better natural resources management and reconstruction efforts for post-conflict cases.

Civil wars and armed conflicts in Central America, South Asia, and Africa resulted in extensive environmental degradation (deforestation, land depletion, air and water pollution), putting human and environmental health at risk, impacting basic livelihoods for survival and recovery, as well as sustainable development approaches.

The above-mentioned harmful impacts can continue the conflicts, because of natural resources being degraded, losses of agro-products, and searching for alternative (can be illegal or criminal) livelihoods that include additional destabilization. Furthermore, damage to the environment in most cases provoked destabilization, criticism, and affected the most vulnerable parts of the local population.

An environmental peacebuilding approach based on the idea that enhanced natural resources management can promote sustainable peace. Krampe et al. (2021) recognized key mechanisms that could operate in post-conflict situations: 1) environmental collaboration can assist former conflict sides to launch confidence-building processes; 2) safeguarding equal access to natural resources and minimizing competition-driven strains; 3) enhanced management of natural resources and restoration of the environment can provide economic growth and post-conflict recovery.

The UNEP's role in the process of peacebuilding is crucial. The Kosovo conflict confirmed that environmental problems cannot be discussed separately from broader peace and security approaches. These acknowledgments made a strategic axle on the road of environmental peacebuilding by UNEP. Dalma (2022) determined UNEP's three interconnected knowledge-building practices – data collation on the state of the environment in post-conflict situations, and full recognition of the connections between environmental degradation and insecurity. This institutional approach affected wider apparitions within the UN system and proved that environmental issues cannot be isolated from peace and security concerns.

The environmental peacebuilding approach has substantial obstacles during the understanding as well as in the

implementation periods. The post-conflict period is characterized by a lack of strong institutions, partial funds, a wide range of priorities, and existing strains. Environmental interferences must avoid these strains, not aggravate conflicts. Environmental interventions can cause challenges – immediate intervention can possibly manage security issues over environmental ones, and late actions can allow worsening and miss opportunities to improve the peace processes via environmental collaborations. To find the balance, a careful analysis of the existing situation is needed.

Diverse institutions (national governments, international organizations, local communities, private and civil groups, etc) are involved in the environmental peacebuilding processes. To achieve a comprehensive approach, a coordinated approach is needed to coordinate multiple actors' resources and mandates.

The UNDPs are obliged to convert conflicts into development initiatives with a clear understanding that environmental peacebuilding and sustainable development are equally emphasized. Environmental degradations can cause productivity reduction, promote migration processes, and increase anxiety and threats among locals. Additionally, environmental programs should include conflict-sensitive approaches, avoid escalation of new conflicts, and promote building peace processes.

Unfortunately, climate change increases the pressure in many regions where conflicts already exist, for example, landslides, sea levels, or rising precipitation levels can activate and worsen existing conflicts.

However, we cannot describe the environmental and peace issues separately; it is very important to find the interconnection between them as well as the full resolution. So, development of environmental peacebuilding methods and initiatives in both theory and practice can form further real instruments for coordination of diverse stakeholders, increase institutional capacities that can address those multifaceted tasks at an appropriate balance.

Conflict over natural resources and peacebuilding

It is a fundamental paradox, but natural resources can catalyze conflict and paths to peace as well. The "duality" elevates questions for debate. The "hunting" for resources can catalyze the conflict – oil-rich countries are involved in corruption, economic instability, and even civil conflicts during the active conflict period, but in the post-conflict period, the same natural resources serve as essential tools for peacebuilding. Climate change can stand as a conflict multiplier, mixing resource-related conflicts and offering exceptional tasks for peacebuilding. As we discussed above, climate change distresses natural resources globally, forming tensions that exceed traditional margins and devastate existing peacebuilding instruments. Resource conflicts caused by climate change often envisage disagreements between present resource needs and future sustainability. It is difficult to find a balance between post-conflict recovery needs and long-term environmental sustainability. Climate change pressures population migrations, making new systems for natural resource competition in the newest areas. The environmental peacebuilding process should discuss those demographic changes.

The Jordan River case demonstrates that environmental challenges logically surpass political frontiers, generating chances for common resolutions. Environmental obstacles frequently affect all parties similarly, irrespective of political views. Shared problems can generate a joint background for collaboration where political resolutions were unsuccessful. Environmental obstacles may stand for more technical, less

political methods to collaborate, for instance, treatment technologies can be invented on a scientific basis rather than on political principles.

Links between environmental sustainability, climate change, and peacebuilding

The study, involving 221 participants in nine rural locations in Kenya, Senegal, and Guatemala, assessed the social approaches of the environmental peacebuilding program. The research illustrated that collaborative reflection processes can become a means of appropriate consideration of climate-associated security risks. These collective approaches allow local communities to develop climate adaptation strategies and promote sustainable peacebuilding processes. The study also defines substantial obstacles for effective collaborations – refusal of conflicting parties to participate in dialogues and low political legitimacy.

The literature review also underlines some theoretical approaches dedicated to environmental peacebuilding, particularly the equal relationships between environmental sustainability and peacebuilding processes. However, the research, as well as practices, frequently do not pay sufficient attention to the issues of power relations and inequality, which are critically important for achieving a virtuous cycle of positive peace and environmental sustainability.

The concept of "sustaining peace" observes peacebuilding as a long-term and ongoing engagement without secure exit standards. Some scientists criticize the approach, but others view it as a natural and multidisciplinary approach.

As for the concept of "science diplomacy", a group of scientists named it as a bridge between climate change and the Earth system governance.

The post-conflict peacebuilding stage offers exclusive chances to create the basics for sustainable development (SD). SDG 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions) demonstrates the connection between sustainable development and peace, through UNEP stressing its possibility to support visible natural resource governance and diminish risks of conflict.

Land-related issues occur as a serious source, assumed to be linked to both greenhouse gas emissions and conflicts. Climate mitigation measures and peacebuilding strategies are gradually concentrating on developing sustainable land-use structures with local community involvement.

The role of women in the environmental peacebuilding process

Women and girls, as well as marginalized groups, are vulnerable during conflicts and environmental crises due to basic gender discrimination, inequitable laws, and partial admission to natural resources (e.g., land) and property.

Women's role and importance in the peacebuilding process were recognized only in the 1990s and 2000s. Gender issues have since become a typical line in the diversity/development programs.

The literature review determines the women's considerable contributions in many diverse fields like conflict resolution, peace negotiations, peacekeeping operations, humanitarian assistance, and post-war reconstruction efforts. Some authors discussing the approaches for women, peace, and security claimed that environmental protection and sustainable peace need the same variations to social, political, and economic configurations. Some opinions describe the economic enabling of women as a vital issue for addressing the negative results of neoliberalism in post-conflict circumstances. The existing

literature has a tendency to address gender, peacebuilding, and environment separately and seldom observes them together.

Briefly about Georgia

The current situation in Georgia exposes important visions and the possibility of women-headed environmental initiatives as an instrument for peace-building in the setting of the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict. The dislocation of about 250,000 Georgians from occupied territories (Abkhazia and Samachablo), totalling the remaining 200,000 IDPs, creates not only a humanitarian crisis but also obstacles for diplomatic approaches to conflict resolution. The regular tensions faced by ethnic Georgians in occupied territories, particularly in Abkhazia, call attention to the crucial need for different paths to discussion and reunion.

The dialogues on environmental problems can serve as a bridge between separated communities, proving the strengths of common anxieties that go above political frontiers. The natural reach of both regions, including Abkhazia's strategic Black Sea coastline, forms shared environmental tasks that disturb populations regardless of origin or political view. The neutral dialogues can be launched on climate change, pollution, resource management, etc.

The women's role in the peace-building process looks particularly important. As underlined by conflict resolution expert Mamuka Kuparadze, women from occupied territories establish a readiness to be involved in dialogues that stands above political approaches. It should be stressed that women's roles in peace-building propose that women frequently arrange community welfare and sustainability in the long term over instant political improvements. The achievement of the Tbilisi-Sokhumi joint documentary project via the Zoom platform demonstrates how modern technologies can promote cross-boundary collaboration when physical meetings are impossible to arrange because of political restrictions.

The theory of "gender, environment, and peace-building" demonstrates that it is principally applicable in the Georgian situation, where traditional tactics of conflict resolution have failed. Women's exceptional perceptions on community issues, coupled with their aptitude to launch discussions on common environmental problems rather than conflict-ridden political issues, form chances for structuring confidence and considerations among conflicting sides.

However, some restrictions must be recognized. If conflicting sides want to achieve sustainability of such initiatives, they should keep/continue political tolerance and clearly understand that environmental collaboration alone may not express basic issues, stressing the conflict. Moreover, the efficiency of virtual partnership may create a long-term strategy for significant commitment.

CONCLUSION

Environmental peacebuilding signifies a noteworthy development in peace and conflict studies, proposing original tactics to illustrate the connected tasks of environmental degradation and conflicts. This tactic stresses shared environmental tasks, offers a positive alternative for peaceful approaches, and observes the environmental change principally as a multiplier risk.

However, the field continues to develop, needs larger research, more sophisticated empathizing dynamic forces, and watchful consideration of the possible environmental collaboration or change present conflict configurations. New technologies and educational approaches propose favorable paths for novelty, but success will depend on balanced, realistic collaboration

between environmentalists and transformative approaches to both environmental problems and conflict resolution.

The discussions on environmental approaches continue globally, while the environmental peacebuilding consequences are only developing. Environmental co-dependence can assist as a basis for peace and will define its impact on the most demanding tasks currently existing.

Environmental peacebuilding also embodies a significant development in how the international community's attitudes develop during the post-conflict recovery and conflict prevention. By addressing the essential connections between environmental security and human security, this attitude proposes paths for recognizing the original reasons of conflict, while supporting sustainable development. However, understanding this is an overwhelmingly important application task and provides investment in gaining the basic knowledge and institutional abilities essential for effective environmental peacebuilding involvement.

Social learning approaches illustrate hope in generating common considerations on climate security risks, but their efficiency is determined gradually by local political settings and the readiness of interested parties to act fruitfully.

Environmental peacebuilding cannot reach its full success without building a joint confident understanding of the link between environmental sustainability and peace.

Low-slung political legality and confrontational relationships between conflicting parties create major obstacles for operational programming. This proposes that climate-peace-security involvements require arrangements for the construction of confidence and acceptability before trying multiphase environmental peacebuilding approaches.

The "sustaining peace" task reveals an advanced approach that peacebuilding is not a clear endpoint project, but a continuing process needed to sustain commitment, flexibility, and suggestions for funding, institutional redesign, and assessment tools.

The developing interconnections between climate challenges in the field of peacebuilding underline the necessity for solid science-policy crossing points. The scientists should create better instruments and research-based practical approaches for decision-makers and practitioners.

The current observation makes a convincing case for incorporating gender issues into environmental peacebuilding approaches. Unfortunately, women's contributions to peacebuilding processes remain underused because of existing systemic obstacles. The climate issues increase vulnerabilities for marginalized groups as well as for women. Additionally, it often produces possibilities to follow the basic changes essential for gender equality and environmental sustainability. However, research as well as policy should accept innovative approaches connected to gender, environment, and peace, rather than discussing these approaches as separate topics.

The current observation proves that environmental initiatives led by women characterize a hopeful pathway for peace building in the Georgian situation, presenting completely different approaches to traditional ones that could make changes in the conflict process that has lasted more than two decades. The continuing discrimination of 200,000 IDPs from the occupied territories needed innovative tactics for launching dialogue and incorporating new initiatives for reconciliation.

The successful example of cooperation between environmental activists from Tbilisi and Sokhumi via digital platforms

demonstrates that common environmental problems could be promoted as a real starting point for cross-boundary collaboration. The role of women in "smoothing" these discussions, motivated by shared-focused viewpoints and aptitude to exceed political separations, proposed valued visions for practitioners working on conflict resolution issues.

It should be underlined that the incorporation of gender, environmental, and peace-building tactics seems well-matched to the Georgian situation, where plentiful natural resources and environmental challenges share grounds for launching the dialogues. The Black Sea ecosystem problems create an additional platform for both sides for cooperation despite political views.

However, politicians, decision-makers, and international organizations should take into consideration supportive and ascending women-led environmental approaches as a promising strategy for conflict resolution. Putting together three approaches – modern technologies, women activists' capacity building, and environmental protection- can serve as a significant effort in the process of cross-boundary environmental peacebuilding.

The Georgian case illustrates that when traditional diplomatic methods did not work out, "green initiatives" headed by women with fixed common environmental obstacles can build ways for discussions and considerations. These approaches may not solve the problems instantly, but can create community trust for ultimate politically aware resolutions. The realization of these approaches illustrates that even in prolonged conflicts, chances for positive commitment happen when they come up via new, wide-ranging, and environmentally focused agendas.

Future research should observe these kinds of strategies for long-term sustainability and duplication in other conflict settings where environmental tasks exceed politically aware frontiers.

Acknowledgement

The only author contributed to all aspects of the current study and preparation of the manuscript.

Author's statements

Contributions

Not applicable.

Declaration of conflicting interest

Not applicable.

Financial interests

Not applicable.

Funding

Not applicable.

Data availability statement

Not applicable.

AI Disclosure

The author declares that generative AI was not used to assist in writing this manuscript.

Ethical approval declarations

Not applicable.

Additional information

Publisher's note

Publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadnia, S., Christien, A. M., Spencer, P., Hart, T., & Caio, D. A. B. (2022). Defueling conflict: Environment and natural resource management as a pathway to peace. *World Bank*. Available: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/ab58ea75-36ad-5d97-8c9a-ce48c443d682/content>.
- Ali, S. H. (Ed.). (2007). *Peace parks: Conservation and conflict resolution*. MIT press.
- Balinskaia, A. (2024). Interstate environmental peacebuilding: A systematic review. *Environment and Security*, 27538796241287366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/27538796241287366>.
- Bargués-Pedreny, P. (2018). Deferring peace in international statebuilding: Difference, resilience and critique. *Routledge*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351174985>.
- Brock, L. (1991). Peace through parks: the environment on the peace research agenda. *Journal of Peace Research*, 28(4), 407–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343391028004006>.
- Bruch, C., Jensen, D., & Emma, M. (2021). Defining environmental peacebuilding. In *Routledge Handbook of Environmental Security* (pp. 9–25). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315107592>.
- Chichua, M. (2023). Role and Importance of Public Participation in the Environmental Decision Making Process in Georgia. *Scientific and Theoretical Almanac Grani*, 26(2), 55–60. <https://doi.org/10.15421/172327>.
- Chichua, M., & Matchavariani, L. (2024). Public Voices in the Environmental Decision-Making in Georgia. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 13(1), 356–356. <https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2024.v13n1p356>.
- Cohn, C., & Duncanson, C. (2021). Women, peace and security in a changing climate. In *The Women, Peace and Security Agenda* (pp. 258–278). Routledge.
- Conca, K. (2002). The case for environmental peacemaking. *Environmental Peacemaking*, 1–22.
- Conca, K. (2024). Environmental peacebuilding: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *The Journal of Social Encounters*, 8(1), 4–12. <https://doi.org/10.69755/2995-2212.1236>.
- Conca, K., & Dabelko, G. D. (Eds.). (2002). *Environmental peacemaking*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press. <https://doi.org/10.56021/9780801871924>.
- Cuellar-Ramirez, P. (2021). Science diplomacy for climate action and sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean: how important is the early career perspective to new governance?. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 6, 657771. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2021.657771>.
- Dalmer, N. (2022). Building environmental peace: The UN environment programme as a knowledge actor. *Springer Nature*. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00617.
- Das, O. (2023). Sustainable development and environmental peacebuilding. In *Research Handbook on International Law and Environmental Peacebuilding* (pp. 17–41). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789906929.00009>.
- Davis, K., Peters, L. E., Van Den Hoek, J., & Conca, K. (2023). Power in environmental peacebuilding. *World Development Sustainability*, 3,

100110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wds.2023.100110>.

Dresse, A., Fischhendler, I., Nielsen, J. Ø., & Zikos, D. (2019). Environmental peacebuilding: Towards a theoretical framework. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 54(1), 99–119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836718808331>.

Duncanson, C. (2016). Gender and peacebuilding. *John Wiley & Sons*. Available: <https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/gender-and-peacebuilding>.

Eshofonie, D. I. (2024). Social-cultural environment and women inclusion in peace-building: the implementation of un security council resolution 1325 in Nigeria and Ghana. *Sapientia Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Development Studies (SGOJAHDS)*, 7(2), 181–193.

Evans Ogden, L. (2018). Environmental Peacebuilding: Natural resources often stimulate conflict. Can they spark cooperation as well?. *BioScience*, 68(3), 157–163. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/bix159>.

Hardt, J. N., & Scheffran, J. (2019). Environmental peacebuilding and climate change: peace and conflict studies at the edge of transformation. *Policy Brief*, 68, 1–20. Available: https://toda.org/assets/files/resources/policy-briefs/t-pb-68_hardt-and-scheffran_environmental-peacebuilding-and-climate-change.pdf.

Huseynov, F., & Mitchell, J. (2024). Blockchain for environmental peacebuilding: Application in water management. *Digital Policy, Regulation and Governance*, 26(1), 55–71. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DPRG-06-2023-0080>.

Ide, T. (2019). The impact of environmental cooperation on peacemaking: definitions, mechanisms, and empirical evidence. *International Studies Review*, 21(3), 327–346. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viy014>.

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

Ide, T., & Tubi, A. (2020). Education and environmental peacebuilding: Insights from three projects in Israel and Palestine. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 110(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2019.1613954>.

Ide, T., Bruch, C., Carius, A., Conca, K., Dabelko, G. D., Matthew, R., & Weinthal, E. (2021). The past and future (s) of environmental peacebuilding. *International Affairs*, 97(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iaa177>.

Jahanbegloo, R. (2017). A Nonviolent Perspective on Peace. Peace issues in the 21st century global context, *Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne*, 24–34. Available: <https://www.cambridgescholars.com/resources/pdfs/978-1-4438-9884-3-sample.pdf>.

Khonelidze, Z. (2021). Georgian Paradigm of Peace (University Diplomacy). *Zeszyty Naukowe WSG, seria: Edukacja – Rodzina – Społeczeństwo*, 6(39), 287–297. Available: <https://open.icm.edu.pl/handle/123456789/20745>.

Krampe, F., Hegazi, F., & VanDeveer, S. D. (2021). Sustaining peace through better resource governance: Three potential mechanisms for environmental peacebuilding. *World Development*, 144, 105508. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105508>.

Matthew, R. A., & Gaulin, T. (2002). The ecology of peace. *Peace Review*, 14(1), 33–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402650220118170>.

McArthur, A. L. (2018). Environmental change and peacebuilding. In *Integrated Peacebuilding* (pp. 173–197). *Routledge*. Available: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780429493669-8/environmental-change-peacebuilding-ashley-laura-mcarthur>.

Mead, S., & Jacobsson, M. (2023). Integrating gender, peace and environment: The gender dimension of environmental peacebuilding. In *Research handbook on international law and environmental peacebuilding* (pp. 381–400). *Edward Elgar Publishing*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789906929.00026>.

Medina, L., Ensor, M. O., Schapendonk, F., Sieber, S., Pacillo, G., Laderach, P., ... & Bonatti, M. (2024). Community voices on climate, peace and security: A social learning approach to programming environmental peacebuilding. *Environment and Security*, 2(1), 75–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/27538796231207>.

Morales Muñoz, H., Martens, L., Löhr, K., Bonatti, M., Chara, J., Perez, L., ... & Castro-Nunez, A. (2023). Integrating climate mitigation and environmental peacebuilding objectives through sustainable land use systems: Theory of change and indicators. *PLOS Climate*, 2(5), e0000075. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000075>.

Swain, A., & Öjendal, J. (2018). Environmental conflict and peacebuilding: An introduction. In *Routledge handbook of environmental conflict and peacebuilding* (pp. 1–13). *Routledge*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/978131547377>.

Zelli, F., & Krause, T. (2025). The nature of peace: trajectories of environmental peacebuilding between dominant narratives and power relations. *Ecology and Society*, 30(2). <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-15971-300205>.