CHAPTER TWO

CONCEPT OF PEACE

It is well known that human beings pay much interest in peace from the ancient time until now. Because the word "peace", apart from being a pleasant word, also refers to the peaceful society and the beautiful world. It can be stated that peace is the greatest and highest goal or hope that everyone wishes to achieve personally and expects to be created in society and in the world. People have been trying by all means to gain peace. Therefore history of human beings, in one aspect, is the history of searching for peace. Peace has been talked, thought, taught and studied in many ways and many aspects.

2.1 Meanings of peace

In order to have a deep understanding of the issue, it is necessary to know its true meaning. Therefore, before knowing peace in various aspects, first of all, let us know the true meaning of peace.

What is peace? The term 'peace' is used in a wide sphere. It seems that peace has a variety of meanings that are different in accordance with the context of usage.

Literally, the word 'peace' is derived from the original Latin word 'pax', which means a pact, a control or an agreement to end war or

any dispute and conflict between two people, two nations or two antagonistic groups of people.[1]

According to the American military history, the word peace essentially means "the absence of war."[2] Therefore, by militaries' views, they fight wars to win the peace, or they use force to maintain peace. In military paradigms, peace is seen as an ultimate or ideal goal rather than a means to an end.

Historically and politically considering in accordance with the American military history's point of view, it is understood as to why peace is mostly defined as an absence of war. This is because in the history of human society, wars of various kinds were fought. Whenever wars occur, people need peace and ask for peace. Peace that people needed and asked for is the state of the absence of wars, the state of having no fights.

However, many peace scholars do not agree with giving an emphasis on peace in the sense of an absence of war only. Peace, in their opinions, is something more meaningful, valuable and important than that.

According to Albert Einstein's view, peace is not only an absence of war, but it means or includes the presence of justice, law, order or government in the society as he said "Peace is not merely the absence of war but the presence of justice, of law, of order – in short, of government."[3]

Martin Luther King, Jr., a famous human rights activist is the one who was not satisfied with the definition of peace focusing only on the

---

[1] Bloomsbury, *Dictionary of Word Origins, p. 387,* quoted in 'Buddhism and Peace' written by Ven. B. Khemanando, (Calcutta: Lazo Print, 1995).

[2] www.Answers.com :US Military History Companion/peace, accessed:13-01-2008

[3] P. Aarne Vesilind, *Peace engineering: when personal values and engineering careers converge*, (USA: Lakeshore Press, 2005), p. 43.

absence of the unhappy situations. In his view, peace must include justice in society too as in his saying "True peace is not merely the absence of tension: It is the presence of justice."[4]

His Holiness, the 14th Dalai Lama, said "Peace, in the sense of the absence of war is of little value…peace can only last where human rights are respected, where people are fed, and where individuals and nations are free."[5] From his point, we can say that peace means respect for human rights, well-being of people and freedom of individuals and nations.

Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677), one of the famous philosophers in second half of 17th century gave his point of view on peace that peace was not an absence of war, it was a virtue, a state of mind, a disposition for benevolence, confidence and justice.[6] He gave importance to a virtue and a state of mind.

Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964) emphasized peace in the sense of a state of mind. Here is his view "Peace is not a relationship of nations. It is a condition of mind brought about by a serenity of soul. Peace is not merely the absence of war. It is also a state of mind. Lasting peace can come only to peaceful people."[7]

According to Johan Gultung, Norwegian peace scholar, the term 'peace' and 'violence' are linked. Peace is the absence of violence and should be used as the social goal.[8] Gultung further stated that like a coin

---

[4] Coretta Scott Kin , *The Words of Martin Luther King, Jr.*, Newmarket Press, 2008, p. 83.

[5] *The Words of Peace: Selections from the speeches of the winners of the Noble Peace Prize*, ed. Irwin Abrams, (New York: New market Press, 1995), p. 16.

[6] *Dictionary of Quotable Definitions*, ed. Eugene E. Brussell, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, INC., 1970), p. 426.

[7] Quoted from "*Peace in Our Hearts, Peace in the World: Meditations of Hope and Healing*" By Ruth Fishel, (New York: Sterling Publishing Co. Inc., 2008), p. 318.

[8] Johan Gultung, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research", *Essays on Peace: Paradigms for Global Order*, ed. Michael Salla, Walter Tonetto &Enrique and Martinez, (Central Queensland University press,1995), p. 1.

peace has two sides: negative peace and positive peace. Negative peace is the absence of personal violence; positive peace is an absence of structural violence or social justice.[9]

The meanings of peace in accordance with the peace scholars, obviously, are same in some point and different in another point depending on their personal views. Now let us see what is the meaning of peace according to books like encyclopedia, dictionary and so on.

According to the definitions or the explanations of Wikipedia encyclopedia, peace can be a state of harmony or the absence of hostility. "Peace" can also be a non-violent way of life. "Peace" is used to describe the cessation of violent conflict. Peace can mean a state of quiet or tranquility— an absence of disturbance or agitation. Peace can also describe a relationship between any people characterized by respect, justice and goodwill. Peace can describe calmness, serenity, and silence. This latter understanding of peace can also pertain to an individual's sense of himself or herself, as to be "at peace" with one's own mind.[10]

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English defines peace as follows:

1. No war: a situation in which there is no war or fighting
2. No noise/interruptions: a very quiet and pleasant situation in which you are not interrupted
3. Calm/Not worried: a feeling of being calm, happy, and not worried[11]

The online Merriam-Webster dictionary gives the explanations of peace as follows:

---

[9] ibid, p.15.

[10] "Peace"> http://www.wikipedia encyclopedia.com, accessed: 16-01-2008

[11] Peace in "Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (paperback) with CDROM (4th Edition)", USA, 2006, p. 1281.

1: a state of tranquility or quiet: as a: freedom from civil disturbance b: a state of security or order within a community provided for by law or custom

2: freedom from disquieting or oppressive thoughts or emotions.

3: harmony in personal relations

4 a: a state or period of mutual concord between governments b: a pact or agreement to end hostilities between those who have been at war or in a state of enmity

5—used interjectionally to ask for silence or calm or as a greeting or farewell— at peace: in a state of concord or tranquility[12]

Another explanation of peace from the online source is that peace is the state prevailing during the absence of war, harmonious relations; freedom from disputes, the absence of mental stress or anxiety, the general security of public places, and a treaty to cease hostilities.[13]

The definitions and explanations given by encyclopedias, dictionaries or similar sources like that seem to include all of the meanings of peace. This is common thing for those books and sources that must try to include all the meanings that peace is used and concerned.

As per the definitions and explanations shown above, peace is defined and explained in different ways. It has various meanings depending on the context of usage namely, peace literally defined seems to be something as a tool or means to end war or conflict. Peace if discussed and desired during the wartime or the time after war is the thing that is opposite to war. It means an absence of war and/or other hostilities. Peace in this sense seems to be a main definition undeniably. However, even during the time without war it does not mean people are at peace and society is peaceful. Problems or hostilities are still there. That is why some peace scholars are not satisfied with only that meaning. From their own views, peace is a presence of more other good things like

---

[12] http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/peace, accessed: 16-01-2008

[13] http://www.definitions.net/definition/peace, accessed: 16-01-2008

virtue, justice, order, good law, good government, good relationship, well-being, freedom, respect for human rights, security etc., or an absence of violence. On the other hand, if we focus on the state of mind, peace is calm, serenity, tranquility or peacefulness of mind. Furthermore, if we refer to the state of a place or an atmosphere, peace means quietness and silence.

2.2 Types of peace

Generally, peace is classified into two types: Internal peace and External peace.

Internal peace is called by another word 'inner peace' is peace of mind or soul. It is a state of calm, serenity and tranquility of mind that arise due to having no sufferings or mental disturbances such as worry, anxiety, greed, desire, hatred, ill-will ,delusion and/or other defilements. Internal peace is peace within oneself; it is derived from practicing or training of mind of an individual. Sometimes, a man can create and maintain his inner peace in the noisy surrounding or in the un-peaceful society. Internal peace is stressed in the field of religion, especially religions in the East. In the view of religions, this type of peace can be reached by means of prayer, meditation, wisdom and other ways. Internal peace is essential; it is generally regarded as true peace and as a real foundation of peace in society or peace in the world.

According to Lao Tzu's famous saying:
If there is to be peace in the world,
there must be peace in the nations.
If there is to be peace in the nations,
there must be peace in the cities.
If there is to be peace in the cities,
there must be peace between neighbors.

If there is to be peace between neighbors,

there must be peace in the home.

If there is to be peace in the home,

there must be peace in the heart.[14]

It clearly shows that internal peace influences external peace. It is like a big building which has to be grounded or constructed by the first brick. Peace is also built likewise. World peace and other levels of external peace, if we wish it to become a permanent one, should be grounded on the real internal peace of man's heart. Also the famous statement of UNESCO—Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.[15] — reminds us to realize the real cause of war and peace. It refers to the importance of internal peace as a true foundation of peace in society. In this point, Dalai Lama too said the same thing: "We can never obtain peace in the outer world until we make peace with ourselves."[16]

External peace is peace that occurs in society, nations and the world; it is a normal state of society, countries and the world and it is a state of peaceful and happy co-existence of people as well as nature. External peace, in order to see it clearly, can be described in its negative and positive sense as follows; negative sense: the absence of war, hostility, agitation, social disorder, disturbances, social injustice, social inequality, violence, violation of human rights, riot, terrorism, ecological imbalance, etc., positive sense: a state of social harmony, social justice, social equality, friendship or friendly relation, concord, public order and security, respect for human rights and ecological balance, etc.[17] Herein,

---

[14] Quoted from "CosMos: A Co-creator's Guide to the Whole World" By Ervin Laszlo, Jude Currivan, (USA, 2008), p. 102.

[15] Preamble of UNESCO Charter, 1946 quoted from *"Peace education"* By Ian M. Harris, Mary Lee Morrison, Mcfarland&Company, Inc., North Calorina, USA, 2003. p. 9

[16] Alon Biran, *What Are You Doing to Your Body?: 13 Simple Changes Can Make the Rest of Your Life*, (USA, 2009), p. 74.

[17] Ven. B. Khemanando, *Buddhism and Peace*, (Calcutta: Lazo Print, 1995), p. 6.

external peace is the absence of all social evils as well as the presence of all social virtues.

Internal peace and external peace are interrelated. Both are interdependent and help support each other. Internal peace represents individual's peace while external peace represents peace in society.

It is well known that society is a combination of each individual. Society depends on how an individual is. On the contrary, society influences an individual. If society is good, it is useful for the development of the individual's life quality. We have known that 'environments influence human life'.

Peace is also likewise. Internal peace is the core, the essence and the firm foundation of external peace. The former guarantees and sustains the latter. If each individual is at peace, society combined with each peaceful individual, has peace too. On the contrary, external peace in the sense of peaceful society or good society has an important role in supporting an individual to get inner peace. That is, if there are no wars, conflicts, violence, harming, killing and so on in the society, people in such society will have peace within themselves. It is because there is nothing to disturb their minds. They have a good society or a good environment to develop themselves in order to obtain inner peace. Hence, Gandhi said "Each one has to find his peace from within. And peace to be real must be unaffected by outside circumstances."[18]

Therefore, internal peace and external peace are interrelated; both are mutually beneficent.

However, types of peace, according to the World Council of curriculum and instruction, can be sub-classified into nine as follows:

1. Intrapersonal peace: the state of peace within man himself that means there is no conflict inside one's mind.

---

[18] Anthony St Peter, The Greatest Quotations of All-Time, Xlibris Corperation,USA, 2010,p.476.

2. Interpersonal peace: the state of peace between a man and men; there are no conflicts between a man and men or one another.

3. Intragroup peace: the state of peace within groups; the state of having no conflicts in groups.

4. Intergroup peace: the state of peace between group and group; the state of having no conflicts among groups.

5. Intraracial peace: the state of peace within race; the state of having no conflicts in each race.

6. Interracial peace: the state of peace between race and races; the state of having no conflicts among races.

7. Intranational peace: the state of peace within nations or countries; the state of having no conflicts in each nation or country.

8. International peace: the state of peace between a nation and the nations; the state of having no conflicts among nations.

9. World peace: peace of the world. It means that the countries throughout the world are said to be in the state of normalcy, absence of wars and conflicts, presence of justice and balance of control.[19]

The classification of the World Council of curriculum and instruction is extending or showing the sub-characteristics of the internal peace and the external peace in details. It makes us know the beginning and the end of peace and how internal peace and external peace interrelate clearly.

Furthermore, peace is still characterized into another two types according to its aspect 'negative peace' and 'positive peace'.

Negative peace means an absence of war, conflict, hostility, agitation, disturbance, disagreement or quarrel, struggle, violence,

---

[19] Prachoomsuk Achava-Amrung, Peace Research, International Association of Educators for World Peace, Bangkok, 1983, pp. 4-5.

terrorism, civil strife or civil commotion, social disorder, etc., and an absence of mental disturbance such as anxiety, worry, restlessness etc.

Positive peace means a state of tranquility, calm, repose, quietness, harmony, friendship, amity, concord, peaceful or friendly relation, public order, pacification, spiritual content, reconciliation, serenity, security, social justice and bliss.[20]

The characterizing peace as positive and negative is trying to find a positive or creative meaning of peace. Because there is a discussion between peace scholars that an emphasis of the meaning of peace on the absence of war or hostilities is not enough; and it is narrow. Peace shown only in negative side is not creative. Peace is a beautiful word and a valuable thing; it should have a positive and creative aspect too. This is because even there is no war, it does not mean peace is there. With the presence of peace (no war), then, what more can peace do to help create a beautiful society. That is the derivation of the issue of negative peace and positive peace.

In conclusion, peace is classified into two types—internal peace and external peace—that can be sub-divided in details. Both internal peace and external peace are interrelated. Moreover, peace can be characterized as negative peace and positive peace so that its meaning and extent will be more wide, positive and creative.

2.3 A brief history of Peacemaking and Peace movement

Peacemaking, generally, is a form of conflict resolution which focuses on establishing equal power relationship that will be strong enough to prevent future conflict, and establishing some means of agreeing on ethical decision within a community that has previously had

---

[20] Prayoon Meererk, *A Buddhist Approach to Peace*, (Bangkok: Amrin Printing Group Ptd.,1989), p.16.

conflict. But here peacemaking means efforts to create peace by all means of peace lovers. Whereas, peace movement has been applied to a variety of social movements such as pacifism, an antiwar movement, an anti-arm race movement, social justice and human rights movement, that seek to affect peace between two or more countries. More precisely, a peace movement is a sustained, organized attempt by groups of people to prevent a war from breaking out, to end an ongoing war, to build a peaceful and just society, and/or to build a peaceful world order.

Because peacemaking and peace movement can go together. Therefore, here the researcher will not state separately in order to obtain an overview of movements or a history about peace from the ancient time to the present day.

2.3.1 Peace efforts through the years

A) Ancient Greece and Rome

Ancient Greece consisted of many independent regions called city-states. The city-states frequently waged war on one another. As a result, several of them banded together and formed an organization that made one of the first attempts to limit warfare. This organization, called the Amphictyonic League,[21] prohibited any member from destroying another or cutting off another's water supply. Once every four years, the Olympic Games united the city-states. A truce created temporary peace throughout Greece so the games could take place. For a month, no one could bear arms or make war.

The Roman Empire maintained peace throughout a large part of the world during a period known as the Pax Romana (Roman peace). This peace lasted more than 200 years, from 27 B.C. to A.D. 180. During the Pax Romana, the Roman Empire extended over much of Europe, the

---

[21] Adel Safty, *Leadership and Conflict Resolution: The International Leadership Series (Book Three)*, Universal Publisher/upublish.com, USA, 2003, pp.104-105.

Middle East, and northern Africa. At that time, no other nation was powerful enough to attack the Romans. This great achievement was possible because of the two principles on which government was conducted. The first is inheriting from Greece the conception of the "philanthropy" of the ruler that the Roman Empire had as its ideal the welfare of the people, and the extending of the benefits of civilization to all people within its territories. The second is Stoic philosophy with its teaching of natural law, of the brotherhood of man, and of the duties of the governing classes and of the emperor.[22]

B) The middle Ages

After the Roman Empire weakened during the A.D. 400's, small wars raged throughout Europe. The Christian church became the greatest force for peace. A church custom called the Truce of God limited fighting in private disputes to certain days of the week. A ruling called the Peace of God forbade fighting in such holy places as churches and shrines. But the church permitted "just" wars, such as those in defense of Christianity or a people's homeland.[23]

C) From the 1400's to the 1700's[24]

Many people proposed various plans to achieve lasting peace. In the early 1600's, for example, the French statesman Maximilien de Bethune, Duke of Sully, developed a "Grand Design" for peace in Europe. Sully's plan called for the formation of a council of representatives of all European countries. The council would settle disagreements between nations.

In 1625, the Dutch statesman Hugo Grotius proposed international rules of conduct in a book called On the Law of War and Peace. For

---

[22] K. Satchidananda Murty and A. C. Bouquet, *Studies in the Problems of Peace*, (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1960), p. 307.

[23] See more "Peace and Truce of God" > http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peace_and_Truce_of_God , accessed: 29-01-2008

[24] Encyclopedia of "World Book 1999", deluxe edition version 3.00 (CD multimedia)

example, nations should guarantee certain rights to neutral nations, which took no part in a war. Grotius' ideas formed the basis of international law.

The Thirty Years' War was the fight of the countries of Europe during 1618–1648, ended with the Peace of Westphalia. This treaty tried to ensure peace by establishing a balance of power. Such a plan maintains an even distribution of military and economic power among nations. As a result, no nation or group of nations is strong enough to conquer any other nation or group of nations.

About 1647, the English religious leader George Fox founded the Society of Friends, most commonly known today as the Quakers. This group believed that the teachings of Jesus Christ prohibited war. Throughout their history, the Quakers have opposed war and supported peace movements. The Quaker leader William Penn, who founded the colony of Pennsylvania, proposed a peace plan similar to Sully's "Grand Design." Penn wrote a book called An Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe (1693). In it, he called for an international council to settle disputes between nations.

The Project for Perpetual Peace, written by a French clergyman, the Abbe Charles Irenee Castel de Saint-Pierre, was published in 1713. It called for a "Senate of Europe" composed of 24 delegates from the European nations. The French philosopher Voltaire criticized this plan because the member nations would have been monarchies. Voltaire believed the world could not have peace unless all nations became democracies.

D) The 1800's and early 1900's

In 1815, two peace societies were formed in America. The first was the New York Peace Society formed by David Low Dodge in August. It was absolutely pacifist that opposed to all warfare and had a religious basis. The second was the Massachusetts Peace Society formed by Noah

Worcester in December. They are the first two organizations of the nation dedicated to preserving peace. Other pacifist groups followed, including the American Peace Society in 1828 and the Universal Peace Union in 1866.[25] Referring to the Peace Society, the London Peace Society was also formed in Britain in 1816. Besides the France Peace Society was established in 1889 and the German Peace Society was founded in 1892.

During the 1800's, many international conventions discussed peacekeeping. The first World Peace Conference met in London in 1843[26] and then Peace conferences met in many places: Brussels, Belgium, in 1848; Paris in 1849; and Frankfurt, Germany, in 1850. In 1898, Czar Nicholas II of Russia called for an international meeting to discuss arms limitation. As a result, peace conferences took place at The Hague in the Netherlands in 1899 and 1907. These conferences did not succeed in limiting armaments. But they did establish the Permanent Court of Arbitration to handle legal disputes between nations.[27] And in that 1899, Andrew Carnegie donated 1.5 million (dollars) for the building of the Peace Palace in the Hague in order to provide a proper home for the Permanent Court of Arbitration.

On 27 November 1895, the Swedish chemist Alfred B. Nobel[28] (1833-1896), who invented dynamite, regretted the wartime death and injury caused by his invention. In his will, he set up a fund to award annual prizes, including one for outstanding work in promoting world peace. The first Nobel Prize for peace was awarded in 1901 to Jean Henri Dunant (Swiss) for founding the Red Cross and originating the Geneva Convention, and to Frederic Passy (French) for founding a French peace society.

---

[25] Charles Chatfield Ed. with an introduction, *Peace Movements in America*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1973), p. x-xi.

[26] http://www.ppl.nl/100years/peacemovement, accessed: 05-02-2008

[27] Shabtai Rosenne (copiled and edited), *The Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907 and international arbitration: Reports and Documents*, (The Hague: T-M-C Asser Press, 2001), p. xv.

[28] See more in Irwin Abrams, *the Noble Peace Prize and the Laureates: an illustrated biographical history 1901-2001, Centennial ed.*, (USA: Science History Publications, 2001), pp. 3-10 .

To show the destructive nature of warfare to oppose wars and to promote peace, the Polish-Russian entrepreneur Jean De Bloch founded the International Museum of War and Peace in Lucerne (Switzerland), the first museum of peace, in 1902.[29]

The World Peace Foundation[30] was created in Boston of America in 1910 by the imagination and fortune of Edwin Ginn to encourage international peace and cooperation. The Foundation seeks to advance the cause of peace through study, analysis, and the advocacy of wise action.

The outbreak of World War I (1914-1918) was both a tragic setback for all peace activists and a catalyst for the emergence of the modern peace movement. Because World War I radically split the peace movement. Existing peace societies either wavered or supported the Allied cause. However, to end the war, restless pacifists formed several new peace movement organizations including the Fellowship of Reconciliation in 1914, the Women's Peace Party in 1915(later, it led to the formation of the Women's International Peace and Freedom, the first feminist-pacifist organization to emerge in the transnational drive for peace and justice), the American Union Against Militarism in 1916 and the American Friends Service Committee in 1917.[31]

After ending of World War I in 1918, the Versailles Peace Treaty was signed on 28 June 1919 and it led to the establishing the League of Nations in January 1920, with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. This international association had the goal of maintaining peace throughout the world. Disputes between nations would be settled by the League Council or by arbitration, a decision by a third party. But the League of Nations had little power, partly because the United States and some other major

---

[29] Peter van den Dungen "Peace Education: Peace Museums" in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict, Volume 2*, Lester Kurtz editor-in-chief, (California: Academic Press, 1999), p. 692.

[30] http://www.worldpeacefoundation.org/about.html, accessed: 05-02-2008

[31] Robert D. Benford and Frank O. Taylor IV, "Peace Movements", in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, Conflict, Vol. 2*, Lester Kurtz editor-in-chief, (California: Academic Press, 1999), p.776.

nations never joined. In addition, League members failed to cooperate with one another.[32]

2.3.2 Current efforts to ensure peace

Since the end of World War II in 1945, many attempts have been made to assure lasting peace among all nations. Here the researcher will present only the prominent events about peace in the chronology of year.

After ending of World War II, an attempt to establish an international organization that works for the peaceful settlement of disagreements between nations was renewed. In 1945, 50 countries created the United Nations (UN), the major international organization dedicated to world peace. The League of Nations was dissolved in 1946. The UN Security Council investigates quarrels between nations and suggests ways of settling them. If any nation endangers the peace, the council may use economic sanctions (penalties) against it. For example, member nations might stop trading with the offender. If such measures fail, the council may ask UN members to furnish troops to enforce its decision. The UN has achieved some success in keeping the peace. But it has failed to prevent local wars in several regions, including Africa, Southeast Asia, and the Middle East.[33]

The peace studies movement arose from the ashes of World War II as an academic field of study. In 1948, at Manchester College in North Manchester, Indiana, the first academic program in peace studies began at this small liberal arts college sponsored by the Brethren church. At the same time in India scholars and professors at universities were promoting

---

[32] Encyclopedia of "World Book 1999", deluxe edition version 3.00 (CD multimedia)

[33] See more in Jean E. Krasno "Founding the United Nations: Evolutionary Process" in *The United Nations: confronting the challenges of a global society*, ed. Jean E. Krasno, (USA: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Ins., 2004), pp. 19-43 and *Basic facts about the United Nations* published by the News and Media Division United Nation Department of Public Information(New York: United Nations Publication, 2000),pp. 3-5.

Gandhian studies as a way to teach youth to value nonviolence.[34] Also in the same year the U.S. government established the U.S. Institute of Peace to give official recognition to peace studies.[35] In 1959, Galtung founded the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO). PRIO is an international research institute, whose overarching purpose is to conduct research on the conditions for peaceful relationships between states, groups and people. The institute is organizationally independent and methodologically diverse, effectively combining multiple disciplinary traditions to explore issues of peace and conflict.[36]

In 1961, John F. Kennedy established the Peace Corps, the independent overseas volunteer program of the United States government. Men and women in the Peace Corps work with people in developing countries to help them improve their living conditions. The chief goals of the corps are (1) to help the poor to obtain everyday needs, (2) to promote world peace, and (3) to increase understanding between Americans and the people of other nations.[37]

During the Vietnam War (1957-1975) in 1960s to early 1970s, there was a coalition of American peace groups in strident opposition to protest the war and seek for peace. Those organized oppositions to the Vietnam War came from a variety of sources including traditional pacifists, clergy, university students, civil rights movement leaders, feminist activists, politicians, ordinary citizen, and the war's own veterans. The movements affected the policies of Presidents Johnson and Nixon as well as the policies of North Vietnam and South Vietnam. It prevented the Pentagon from expanding the war as far as envisioned, pressured into negotiations, and eventually halted U.S. intervention in

---

[34] Ian M. Harris, "peace Education: Colleges and Universities" in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, Conflict, Vol. 2*, Lester Kurtz editor-in-chief, (California: Academic Press, 1999), p. 680.

[35] See more at http://www.usip.org/about-us/our-history, accessed: 13/02/2008

[36] PRIO Strategy 2010-2013 >http://www.prio.no/About/, accessed: 13/02/2008

[37] Cereste Peters, *Peace Corps*, (USA: Weigl Publishers Inc., 2003), pp. 4-8.

Vietnam.[38] And in Vietnam on May 16, 1967, a Buddhist nun named Nhat Chi Mai immolated herself to plead for ending the war and bringing peace back to Vietnam.[39]

To realize the dangers and horrors of nuclear weapons and arms-race, in 1968, the UN approved a nonproliferation treaty to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. This treaty, which took effect in 1970, bars the nuclear powers from giving nuclear weapons or knowledge to other nations.[40] The UN also won approval of arms-control treaties during the 1970's.

In the field of religion for peace, except the struggle for peace in the name of each religion, there is an attempt to cooperate to help create peace in the international level. This attempt was organized in the name of the World Conference on Religions and Peace. The first World Conference on Religions and Peace was held at the International Conference Hall, October 16-21, 1970 in Kyoto, Japan.[41] Then its missions are continued in the form of a new interreligious world body called the "World Conference of Religions for Peace" (WCRP). The World Conference of Religions for Peace is an interfaith-religious international organization that promotes religious cooperation and dialogue. It is the largest international coalition of representatives from the world's major religions dedicated to promoting peace. Their members are from many faiths including, Baha'i, Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, Multi-faith, Indigenous, Sikh and Zoroastrian, religious

---

[38] Robert D. Benford and Frank O. Taylor IV, *op. cit.*, p. 776.

[39] Loc. cit.

[40] see more in "Nonproliferation of nuclear weapons", *Encyclopedia of the United Nations and International Agreements Volume 3: N-S*, by Edmund Jan Ozmanczyk, ed. Anthony Mango,(New York: Taylor & Francis Books, Inc., 2003), pp. 1629-1632.

[41] Nikkyo Niwano, *A Buddhist Approach to Peace*, (Tokyo: KOSEI Publishing Co., 1982), p. 106.

women's organizations. The WCRP meets in an international conference every five years to discuss contemporary issues.[42]

In 1980, to make an academic symbol in the name of University and to praise Costa Rica as a country that tries to create peaceful atmosphere and conditions in various ways,[43] the United Nations established the University for Peace (UPEACE) in Costa Rica in order to provide humanity with an international institution of higher education for peace and with the aim of promoting among all human beings the spirit of understanding, tolerance and peaceful coexistence.[44] And at the same year in 1980, UNESCO set up the UNESCO Prize for Peace Education to promote all forms of action designed to "construct the defences of peace in the minds of men and to alert public opinion and mobilize the conscience of mankind in the cause of peace". The UNESCO Prize for Peace Education has been awarded annually since then.[45]

To promote peace and provide an opportunity for individuals, organizations and nations to create practical acts of peace on a shared date, the United Nations has established the International Day of Peace or the Peace Day in 1981 by regarding September, 21 of every year as the International Day of peace. The first Peace Day was celebrated on the next September of 1982.[46]

By 1984, peace movements around the world had managed to get their countries or states declared as "nuclear free zones." The nuclear free zone movement was particularly successful in the Pacific. A Nuclear Free

---

[42] See more at http://www.wcrp.org/ accessed: 20-30-2008

[43] Costa Rica abolished the death penalty in 1882, and its army in 1948. Since 1865, Costa Rica has offered asylum to those facing persecution for political reasons. From 1907 to 1918, Costa Rica hosted the Central American Court of Justice, which was the first permanent international tribunal that allowed individuals to take legal action against states on international law and human rights issues.

[44] http://www.upeace.org/about/history.cfm, accessed: 20-30-2008

[45] Peter van den Dungen, "Peace Prizes" in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, Conflict, Vol. 2*, Lester Kurtz editor-in-chief, (California: Academic Press, 1999), p.799.

[46] http://internationaldayofpeace.org/about/background.html, accessed: 20-30-2008

and Independent Pacific Movement led an international campaign against the deployment of sea-launched cruise missiles by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. The movement in New Zealand was so successful that it persuaded a new administration to refuse to allow U.S. ships from entering its ports despite intense pressure from U.S. officials. While some of the nuclear disarmament's campaigns were directed at international and transnational targets, the bulk of their resources were directed at national and local level targets.[47]

In 1993, 125 countries signed a UN-sponsored treaty banning the manufacture, use, transfer, and stockpiling of chemical weapons. The treaty took effect in 1997. In 1996, the UN approved the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which was designed to end the testing of nuclear weapons. To officially go into effect, the pact must be ratified by the legislatures of all countries that have nuclear reactors (devices for producing nuclear energy). Two of these countries--India and Pakistan--oppose the treaty. However, the countries that have approved the pact are expected to abide by it even if India and Pakistan do not ratify it.[48]

After the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in the United States (often referred to as 9/11) on Tuesday of 2001, the United States responded to the attacks by launching a " War on Terrorism" leading to Afghanistan war. There was considerable opposition to the War in Afghanistan in the United States and the United Kingdom. Opposition was organized locally by the "Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan Anti-war" and internationally in the form of "Protests against the invasion of Afghanistan" by various "List of anti-war organizations" who went on to organize much larger protests against the 2003 Iraq War.[49]

---

[47] Robert D. Benford and Frank O. Taylor IV, "Peace Movements", opt. cit. p.777.

[48] *Arms Control* in Encyclopedia of "World Book 1999", deluxe edition version 3.00 (CD multimedia)

[49] See more in "The World Says No to War: Demonstrations Against the War on Iraq" By Stefaan Walgrave, Dieter Rucht, Editors, University of Minnesota Press, USA, 2010.

From the above-mentioned shown in chronology, it is obvious that people have been trying by various ways from the past to the present in order to create peace in society and in the world. People founded the organization in small group to prevent fighting between states in Greece age. During Roman age people tried to maintain peace by establishing the strong kingdom. In middle ages Christianity dominated the European society, people applied religion to create peace under the name of Truce of God. In the latter age to the modern time, people tried to create peace, both individually and collectively, from proposing a plan for peace, writing books presenting how to establish perpetual peace, setting the peace prize and peace museum to establishing peace societies, launching World Peace Conference that led to founding Permanent Court of Arbitration, setting World Peace Foundation and establishing League of Nations. At the end of World War II to the present time, people have been trying to maintain and create peace in many ways. By referring to the international organization, they established the United Nations that has been operating peace mission until now. In the field of education, they started putting peace studies into the departments of many colleges and universities, set up the institutes concerning peace studies and peace researches, and even founded the University of Peace. In the religious movement, they held World Conference on Religion and Peace to unite cooperation between religions to create peace. In terms of getting rid of dangerous weapons that is harmful to peace in society, they drew many treaties prohibiting spreading and proliferating general arms, nuclear weapons and chemical weapons. They also managed to get their countries or states declared as "nuclear free zones." Moreover, there the date of September, 21 was declared as the International Day of Peace or the Peace Day so that people will pay more attention to peace. And above all else, they protested to end war whenever it occurred from the Vietnam War to war on terrorism and Iraq war.

2.4 Peace Concepts and peace Theories

Peace is a thing that interests all. Peace is understood by all; if it prevailed on earth, our world would have had only happiness and would have become a heaven for human beings. Therefore, people think deeply about peace and try to study peace in order to understand it and finally bring it into this world. The study and search for peace caused varieties of peace concepts and peace theories. In this topic, the researcher will present peace concepts studied in various fields and some only prominent peace theories.

2.4.1 Peace concepts

Since peace is not something that exists alone by not being related to anything and people study peace in depth and widely, eventually there are varieties of concepts and perspectives on peace. Here, concept of human rights for peace, concept of justice for peace, concept of non-violence for peace, concept of peace education, concept of peace culture, concept of peace gender, concept of peace media, and concept of peace environment are presented to understand those concepts that peace is related to and those fields that peace is studied in.

2.4.1.1 The concept of human rights for peace

Human rights are "basic rights and freedoms that all people are entitled to regardless of nationality, sex, national or ethnic origin, race, religion, language, or other status."[50] Human rights are conceived as universal and egalitarian, with all people having equal rights by virtue of being human. These rights may exist as natural rights or as legal rights, in

---

[50] "Amnesty Basic Definition of Human Rights." Amnesty International. http://www.amnestyusa.org/research/human-rights-basics. Retrieved 19 June 2011.

both national and international law.[51] The doctrine of human rights in international practice, within international law, global and regional institutions, in the policies of states and the activities of non-governmental organizations has been a cornerstone of public policy around the world. It has been said that: "if the public discourse of peacetime global society can be said to have a common moral language, it is that of human rights."[52]

Many of the basic ideas that animated the movement developed in the aftermath of the Second World War and the atrocities of the holocaust, culminating in the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Paris by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948. The modern concept of human rights developed during the early Modern period, alongside the European secularization of Judeo-Christian ethics.[53] The true forerunner of human rights discourse was the concept of natural rights which appeared as part of the medieval Natural law tradition, became prominent during the Enlightenment with such philosophers as John Locke, Francis Hutcheson, and Jean-Jacques Burlamaqui, and featured prominently in the political discourse of the American Revolution and the French Revolution.

From this foundation, the modern human rights movement emerged over the latter half of the twentieth century. Gelling as social activism and political rhetoric in many nations put it high on the world agenda.[54] By the 21st century, Moyn has argued, the human rights movement expanded beyond its original anti-totalitarianism to include

---

[51] Nickel, James (July 29, 2006). "Human Rights" *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Stanford University. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2009/entries/rights-human/

[52] Beitz, Charles R. (2009). *The idea of human rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p.1.

[53] Ishay, Michael (2008). *The History of Human Rights: From Ancient Times to the Globalization Era*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: University of California Press. pp. 64.

[54] Moyn, Samuel (2010). *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History*. Harvard University Press.

numerous causes involving humanitarianism and social and economic development in the Third World.[55]

Peace and human rights are necessary for each other: peace cannot be achieved without human rights being protected and realized, and human rights cannot be achieved in the absence of peace. Peace without human rights would be a weak and flawed peace. People cannot be said to be living in peace if their human rights are violated, as the structural and institutional violence inherent in human rights abuse is the antithesis of peace. Similarly, human rights cannot be realized in the absence of peace; war is itself a human rights abuse for both the military personnel involved and for civilians, and it also creates other human rights abuse from censorship, and the denial of civil liberties, to torture, rap, and summary executions.[56]

In the sense of applicably studying of human rights, right to peace is one of human rights.[57]That is, people have the right to live in peace without any form of harming. Furthermore, the aim of human rights work and of peace work become the same and in the process the methods of peace work and human rights work also coalesce. Therefore, human rights and peace, indeed, cannot be separated; each is heavily dependent on the other.

2.4.1.2 Concept of justice for peace

Justice is the concept of moral rightness based on ethics, rationality, law, natural law, religion, fairness, or equity.[58] Justice concerns itself with the proper ordering of things and people within a

---

[55] McLemee, Scott (December 8, 2010). "The Last Utopia". *Inside Higher Ed* (Washington DC).

[56] "Handbook of peace and conflict studies" Edited by Charles Webel, Johan Galtung, Routledge, (Now York:2007), p.160.

[57] Ibid, p.167.

[58] Konow, James. 2003. *"Which Is the Fairest One of All? A Positive Analysis of Justice Theories."* Journal of Economic Literature 41, no. 4: page 1188.

society. As a concept it has been subject to philosophical, legal, and theological reflection and debate throughout our history.

According to most contemporary theories of justice, justice is overwhelmingly important: John Rawls claims that "Justice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of systems of thought."[59] Justice can be thought of as distinct from and more fundamental than benevolence, charity, mercy, generosity or compassion. Justice has traditionally been associated with concepts of fate, reincarnation or Divine Providence, i.e. with a life in accordance with the cosmic plan. The association of justice with fairness has thus been historically and culturally rare and is perhaps chiefly a modern innovation (in western societies).[60]

There are variations of justice. *Utilitarianism* is a form of consequentialism, where punishment is forward-looking. Justified by the ability to achieve future social benefits resulting in crime reduction, the moral worth of an action is determined by its outcome. *Retributive justice* regulates proportionate response to crime proven by lawful evidence, so that punishment is justly imposed and considered as morally correct and fully deserved. The law of retaliation (lex talionis) is a military theory of retributive justice, which says that reciprocity should be equal to the wrong suffered; "life for life, wound for wound, stripe for stripe."[61] *Restorative justice* is concerned not so much with retribution and punishment as with (a) making the victim whole and (b) reintegrating the offender into society. This approach frequently brings an offender and a victim together, so that the offender can better understand the effect his/her offense had on the victim. *Distributive justice* is directed at the proper allocation of things — wealth, power, reward, respect — among different people.

---

[59] John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (revised edn, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 3

[60] Daston, Lorraine (2008). "Life, Chance and Life Chances". *Daedalus*: 5–14.

[61] Exodus 21.xxiii-xxv.

Understandings of justice differ in every culture, as cultures are usually dependent upon a shared history, mythology and/or religion. Each culture's ethics create values which influence the notion of justice. Although there can be found some justice principles that are one and the same in all or most of the cultures, these are insufficient to create a unitary justice apprehension.

Justice concerns itself with the proper ordering of things and people within a society; justice, therefore, is one essential thing that helps create peace in society and in the world. Without justice, there will be a lot of problems and there will be no peace in society. Really, true peace cannot be achieved until there is justice for all. This is what Pope Paul VI meant when he said, "If you want peace, work for justice".[62] Working for justice means working for peace. Gandhi also said in the same way, "Peace will not come out of a clash of arms but out of justice lived and done by unarmed nations in the face of odds".[63] Peace will come out of justice only. Peace cannot be separated from justice because of the fact that a presence of justice, according to many of peace scholars, is a definition of positive peace.[64] Moreover, it is generally accepted that peace and justice are two sides of the same coin.[65] That is why we cannot apprehend peace unless we act first in justice. Peace cannot be one sided. If we really seek peace, then we must pursue what is justice. When justice is attained, peace always follows. Thus justice and peace are interrelated. To work for one means to work for another too.

---

[62] Margherita Marchione. *Shepherd of souls: a pictorial life of Pope Pius XII*, Paulist Press, USA, 2002, p.109.

[63] Anand Sharma. *Gandhian way: peace, non-violence, and empowerment*, New Delhi, Academic Foundation, 2007p. 117.

[64] Steven Lee, "Sovereignty and positive peace", in Peacemaking: lessons from the past, visions for the future By Judith Presler and Sally J. Scholz (editors), USA, Editions Rodopi B.V., 2000, p. 191.

[65] Mae Elise Cannon. *Social Justice Handbook: Small Steps for a Better World*, USA, Inter Varsity Press, 2009, p. 24.

2.4.1.3 Concept of non-violence for peace

Nonviolence has two closely related meanings. (1) It can refer, to a general philosophy of abstention from violence because of moral or religious principle. (2) It can refer to the behaviour of people using nonviolent action.[66] Much of the general philosophy of nonviolence has 'active' or 'activist' elements, in that they accept the need for a means of struggle to achieve political and social change. Thus, for example, the Gandhian *ahimsa* is a philosophy and strategy for social change that rejects the use of violence, but at the same time sees nonviolent action (also called civil resistance) as an alternative to passive acceptance of oppression or armed struggle against it. In general, advocates of an activist philosophy of nonviolence use diverse methods in their campaigns for social change, including critical forms of education and persuasion, mass noncooperation civil disobedience and nonviolent direct action and social, political, cultural and economic forms of intervention.

The forms of nonviolence draw inspiration from both religious or ethical beliefs and political analysis. Religious or ethically based nonviolence is sometimes referred to as *principled, philosophical,* or *ethical* nonviolence, while nonviolence based on political analysis is often referred to as *tactical, strategic,* or *pragmatic* nonviolence. Commonly, both of these dimensions may be present within the thinking of particular movements or individuals.[67]

Love of the enemy, or the realization of the humanity of all people, is a fundamental concept of *Philosophical* nonviolence. The goal of this type of nonviolence is not to defeat the enemy, but to win them over and create love and understanding between all. According to Mark Kurlansky, "all religions discuss the power of nonviolence and the evil of

---

[66] Gene Sharp. *Sharp's Dictionary of Power and Struggle: Language of Civil Resistance in Conflicts*, New York , Oxford University Press, 2011, p. 268.

[67] Senthil Ram and Ralph Summy. *Nonviolence: An Alternative for Defeating Global Terror(ism)*, New York, Nova Science Publisher, Inc, 2008, p. 228.

violence."[68] Such principles or tenets can be found in each of the major Indian religious traditions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism and Sikhism) as well as in the major Abrahamic religious traditions (Judaism, Christianity and Islam). The Chandogya Upanishad, which is part of the Upanishads, one of the principal scriptures of Hinduism that dates to the 8th or 7th century BCE, bars violence against "all creatures" (*sarva-bhuta*) and establishes nonviolence as a code of conduct for Hindus.[69] Examples of nonviolence found in religion and spirituality include the Sermon on the Mount in which Jesus urges his followers to "love thine enemy," in the Taoist concept of *wu-wei,* or effortless action, in the philosophy of the martial art Aikido, in the Buddhist principle of *metta*, or loving-kindness towards all beings, in the principle of *ahimsa*, or nonviolence toward any being, shared by Buddhism, Jainism and Hinduism.[70] Additionally, focus on both nonviolence and forgiveness of sin can be found in the story of Abel in the Qur'an; liberal movements within Islam have consequently used this story to promote Jewish ideals of nonviolence. Nonviolence is also part of modern pagan traditions.[71] American author Henry David Thoreau (1817–1862) had a major impact on the philosophy of nonviolence. Leo Tolstoy, Mohandas Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. were influenced by Thoreau.

In modern times, nonviolent methods of action based on the philosophy of nonviolence have been a powerful tool for social protest and revolutionary social and political change.[72] There are many examples of their use. Mahatma Gandhi led a decades-long nonviolent struggle against British rule in India, which eventually helped India win its

---

[68] Mark Kurlansky. *Nonviolence: twenty-five lessons from the history of a dangerous idea*, Modern Library Publisher, New York, 2006, p. 183.

[69] Tähtinen p. 2-5; English translation: Schmidt p. 631.

[70] Mark Kurlansky, *Nonviolence: The History of a Dangerous Idea*, New York, Random House, 2008, pp. 7-13.

[71] Kristen Madden, Raven Grimassi, Starhawk. *Exploring the Pagan Path: Wisdom from the Elders*, New Jersey, Career Press, 2005, p. 259.

[72] Ronald Brian Adler, Neil Towne, *Looking Out/Looking In: Interpersonal Communication*, Boston, Cengage Learning Inc., 2010, p. 416.

independence in 1947. Martin Luther King's adopted Gandhi's nonviolent methods in the struggle to win civil rights for African Americans. César Chávez conducted the campaigns of nonviolence in the 1960s to protest the treatment of farm workers in California. The 1989 "Velvet Revolution" in Czechoslovakia that saw the overthrow of the Communist government is considered one of the most important of the largely nonviolent Revolutions of 1989. Most recently the nonviolent campaigns of Leymah Gbowee and the women of Liberia were able to achieve peace after a 14-year civil war.

Because of nonviolence is an effective way for social struggle in recent centuries, it, therefore, has become an important way to deal with problems. And when nonviolence is the essential way to deal with problems for social change, nonviolence is also related to peace and regarded as means to peace. That is why nonviolence and peace go hand-in-hand. Nonviolence is an important step in the process of peace.[73] And peace, accept an end to be reached, can be used as a way when it is brought to get involved with nonviolence. It is called 'peaceful means'. Peaceful means, in some aspect, are equal to nonviolent methods or nonviolent acts. In this sense, peaceful means and nonviolent methods can be used as a synonym.

Nonviolence called 'peaceful means' in another term is emphasized even in the UN Charter stated in Article 2 No. 3 of Chapter 1 : 'All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered'.[74] It is regarded as the means to settle international disputes to secure international peace.

---

[73] Zeki Saritoprak, **"*Peace and Nonviolence: A Turkish Experience*"** from "The Muslim World," Vol. 95 No 3 July 2005, pp. 413-427.

[74] Quoted from "International law in the 21st century: rules for global governance" by Christopher C. Joyner, USA, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005, p.122.

In his 1967 "Beyond Vietnam" speech, Martin Luther King, Jr. boldly asserted that the core principles of nonviolent action ought to be the guiding force behind foreign policy. He passionately believed that relationships built on nonviolent principles would be essential to sustainable world peace.[75] King understood how nonviolent action could be applied to international relationships and recognized nonviolence as the only foundation upon which sustainable world peace could be built.

Having recognized importance of nonviolence as a strategy for peace, Mel Duncan, David Hartsough and their fellow founders constituted Nonviolent Peaceforce in the 2002 Convening Event in Surajkund, India with peace advocates from 49 countries in attendance.[76] Nonviolent Peaceforce (NP) based in Brussels, is a nonpartisan unarmed peacekeeping organization that works to protect civilians and reduce violence in areas affected by armed conflict. In partnership with local groups, Nonviolent Peaceforce members aim to apply proven strategies to protect threatened individuals and communities, deter violence, and help create space for local civil society actors to build sustainable peace. Nonviolent Peaceforce with the first mission in Sri Lanka currently works in Philippines, South Caucasus and Sudan.

As shown above, it indicates that nonviolence, whether based on religious principle or political analysis, is a general philosophy of abstention from violence that is very powerful for struggling for social change and making as a strategy to win peace.

2.4.1.4 Concept of peace education

Peace education is a broad field and can be difficult to define. Very simply, peace education empowers learners with the knowledge,

---

[75] 'Nonviolent Peacekeeping: Pursuing King's Dream' quoted from *EPISODE 2: MLK: A Call to Conscience* < http://www.pbs.org/wnet/tavissmiley/tsr/mlk-a-call-to-conscience>, accessed: 06/02/2009.

[76] Kent D. Shifferd. *From War to Peace: A Guide to the Next Hundred Years*, USA, McFarland & Company Publisher Inc., 2011, p.181.

skills, attitudes and values necessary to end violence and injustice and promote a culture of peace.

Ian Harris and John Synott have described peace education as a series of "teaching encounters" that draw from people:[77] their desire for peace, nonviolent alternatives for managing conflict, and skills for critical analysis of structural arrangements that produce and legitimize injustice and inequality.

James Page suggests peace education be thought of as "encouraging a commitment to peace as a settled disposition and enhancing the confidence of the individual as an individual agent of peace; as informing the student on the consequences of war and social injustice; as informing the student on the value of peaceful and just social structures and working to uphold or develop such social structures; as encouraging the student to love the world and to imagine a peaceful future; and as caring for the student and encouraging the student to care for others" .[78]

Often the theory or philosophy of peace education has been assumed and not articulated. Johan Galtung suggested in 1975 that no theory for peace education existed and that there was clearly an urgent need for such theory.[79] More recently there have been attempts to establish such a theory. Joachim James Calleja has suggested that a philosophical basis for peace education might be located in the Kantian notion of duty.[80] James Page has suggested that a rationale for peace

---

[77] Harris, Ian and Synott, John. (2002) 'Peace Education for a New Century' *Social Alternatives* 21(1):3-6.

[78] Page, James S. (2008) *Peace Education: Exploring Ethical and Philosophical Foundations*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing. p. 189.

[79] Galtung, Johan (1975) *Essays in Peace Research, Volume 1*. Copenhagen: Eljers. pp. 334-339.

[80] Calleja, Joachim James (1991) 'A Kantian Epistemology of Education and Peace: An Examination of Concepts and Values'. Unpublished PhD. Thesis, Bradford University.

education might be located in virtue ethics, consequentialist ethics, conservative political ethics, aesthetic ethics and the ethics of care.[81]

Since the early decades of the 20th century, "peace education" programs around the world have represented a spectrum of focal themes, including anti-nuclearism, international understanding, environmental responsibility, communication skills, non-violence, conflict resolution techniques, democracy, human rights awareness, tolerance of diversity, coexistence and gender equality, among others[82]. Some scholars have also addressed spiritual dimensions of inner harmony, or synthesized a number of the foregoing issues into programs on world citizenship. While academic discourse on the subject has increasingly recognized the need for a broader, more holistic approach to peace education, a review of field-based projects reveals that three variations of peace education are most common: conflict resolution training, democracy education, and human rights education. New approaches are emerging and calling into question some of theoretical foundations of the models just mentioned. The most significant of these new approaches focuses on peace education as a process of worldview transformation.

2.4.1.5 Concept of a culture of peace

The concept of a Culture of Peace arose at the end of the Cold War. For the first time, the objective for which the United Nations was founded, the abolition of war, had become feasible. The United Nations Organization for Education, Science and Culture, UNESCO, had engaged in activities to promote a Culture of Peace from its beginnings, when it was founded in the aftermath of the Second World War to construct the defences of peace in the minds of men and women. The concept of a Culture of Peace was formulated by the International Congress on Peace in the Minds of Men that was held in Africa. In its final declaration, the

---

[81] Page, James S. (2008) *Peace Education: Exploring Ethical and Philosophical Foundations*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.

[82] See Harris, I.M. (1999). Types of peace education. In A. Raviv, L. Oppenheimer, and D. Bar-Tal (Eds.), How Children Understand War and Peace (pp. 299-317)

Congress recommended UNESCO to "[...] help construct a new vision of peace by developing a peace culture based on the universal values of respect for life, liberty, justice, solidarity, tolerance, human rights and equality between men and women".

A culture of peace aims for the transformation of values, attitudes and behaviors within each individual, leading to a culture shaped by peace, rather than by war and violence. A culture of peace is one where the definition of security will have changed from just national security to include human security. The criteria for the agenda and success of our leaders will have shifted from wealth, power and domination to harmony, inclusiveness, respect, integrity and healing (of self, family, community and nation). There will have been a shift away from low citizen political involvement, combined with powerful non-democratic institutions, including the military, information industry and corporations, toward regular, well subscribed elections, a code of ethics for government, a comprehensive justice system, public participation (civic engagement), a sustainable global economy based on localism, education for everyone, and a compassionate health and welfare system. We will have redefined the value system from power as a reference point (combined with a "poverty of vision") to community as a reference point, with the well-being of all citizens coming before the self interest of the few. The concept of community will have expanded beyond people to include: animals, fish, birds, plants, air, water, earth and wind, all seen as interconnected, interdependent, cooperative and mutually supportive.[83]

A culture of peace represents an everyday attitude of non-violence, and fierce determination to defend human rights and human dignity. Peace will be a permanent feature of all social institutions, especially schools, the economy, and the political scene. The media, sports and relationships will all be premised on peace. Hope, persistence, solidarity, inclusiveness and morality will be the norm. Principles of

---

[83] Nota, B. (2000). *Creating a culture of peace in the face of economic globalization*. Retrieved December 30, 2005 from http://www.peace.ca/creatingacultureofpeace.htm

tolerance, open mindedness, sustainability, participation and democracy are paramount. A global awareness and perspective, cooperation and a deep respect for interdependency are key features of this culture. Responsibility and accountability, the sharing and free flow of information and notions of empowerment and emancipation are central tenets of a culture of peace.[84]

Intercultural understanding leading to sustainable dialogue, cross-cultural exchanges and a shared vision of peace are cornerstones of a peaceful culture. Mutual support, empathetic listening and unwavering respect for human rights and dignity are solid anchors for peaceful cultures. Constant striving for justice, freedom, non-violence, equity, equality and ongoing, rigorous critique of the status quo are the roots of a culture of peace. Respecting the role of history, the arts and peoples' lived stories is central to creating a peaceful culture.[85]

2.4.1.6 Concept of peace gender

One key area of great importance to contemporary research into peacebuilding concerns gender relations. Feminist scholars have long argued that organized violence is primarily a functional of gender imbalance and of patriarchal social relations. They point to the fact that in those few societies where women have held significant cultural and spiritual power, organized group violence has been relatively rare. Although the details of such claims are disputed among anthropologists, historians, and sociologists, what is undeniable is that often women are the unfortunate and unwitting victims of violence and warfare, suffering death, torture, rape, dehumanization, and the loss of their homes. Whereas in earlier centuries, codes of chivalrous behavior in warfare attempted to protect the lives of women during time of war, in the 20th century, with its technological mass-scale bombings, total warfare,

---

[84] Adams, 1997Adams, D. (Ed.). (1997). *UNESCO and a culture of peace: Promoting a global movement.* Paris: UNESCO Publishing, Culture of Peace Series.

[85] Ibid

holocausts, guerrilla and terrorist attacks, and fratricidal civil wars blurring the distinction of battlefield and home front, such codes of chivalry seems to have broken down.[86]

Women and men alike were herded into the gas chambers of Auschwitz without distinction, or suffered in the bombings of Hiroshima, Dresden, and Coventry, or under the napalm raids of Vietnam. Many scholars argue that while male prowess at violence may indeed be a result of the time when the human species was carving out its dominant niche in the zoological pecking order, it is now an outmoded and atavistic characteristic that needs channeling and reorienting toward socially useful and spiritually beneficial activities. Women's studies as an academic discipline of recent development has made significant contributions toward the history of women as peacemakers and peace-builders, recognizing that often women have pioneered alternatives to violence and have urged their male colleagues to take routes other than violence toward the achievement of their cultural and political goals. Much of the work and successes of the peace movement would have been unthinkable without this guiding role supplied by women pioneers, in many forms and ways, from Florence Nightingale, to Bertha Von Suttner, to Fannie Andrews, and the formal structures such as the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Many profound studies have been made of the tragic violence that women often suffer in the domestic context, which points to an urgent need to highlight the interrelatedness of women's rights issues and those of peacemaking.[87]

Other scholars working in the related field of men's studies are trying to analyze the pressures and dynamics of male behavior that lead them to violent behavior, be it in armed gangs and vandalism, in

---

[86] Tony Jenkins and Betty A. Reardon. "Gender and peace: Towards a gender inclusive-hositic perspective" in Handbook of peace and conflict studies, Charles Webel, Johan Galtung(Editors),New York, Routledge, 2007, p. 227.

[87] Betty Reardon. *Women and peace: feminist visions of global security*, New York, State University of New York Press, 1993, pp.107-144.

dysfunctional family roles, in organized military groups, or in secret fraternities of violent criminals. Those involved in the men's movement argue that it is possible to construct an alternative ethic of nurturing and generative compassion for a new masculine self-image that seeks self-worth and gender fulfillment not through violence and the desecration of the feminine, but rather in creative co-partnership and responsibility between the sexes. This pioneering work is carried out both in formal academic contexts as well as in informal extra-curricula workshop contexts where a number of innovative organizations have concerned themselves with peacemaking between the genders, as both men and women seek to heal the brokenness and abuse that exist around the whole issue of gender relations and sexuality and to recover the capacity for love, creativity, compassion, and mutual respect which lies at the very foundation of the covenant of human life itself.[88]

2.4.1.7 Concept of peace media

The role of the mass media as a major player in the formation of attitudes to war, violence, and peace-building is a 20th-century phenomenon, with the paramount role played by television and, to a lesser but still vital extent, by radio, both products of advanced technological communications systems.[89] Spreading anti-enemy propaganda through controlling the media has become a feature of modern warfare and was a key element of the Second World War and in the subsequent Cold War on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Democracies and dictatorships alike recognized the power of public opinion and the power of the media in shaping this inchoate force and therefore exerted strenuous efforts, whether by covert or explicit means, to exercise intellectual and cultural hegemony over the attitudes of the general

---

[88] Caron Hagemann-White. "A comparative Examination of Gender Perspective on Violence" in *International handbook of violence research, Volume 2*, Wilhelm Heitmeyer, John Hagan (editors), the Netherlands, Kuwer Academic Publisher, 2005, pp. 97-119.

[89] Lester R Kurtz, Jennifer E Turpin. *Encyclopedia of violence, peace & conflict Volume 2 F-Pe*, California, Academic Press,1999, p. 764.

public. Not surprisingly, therefore, many responsible voices have likewise been raised for utilizing the tremendous communication and information facilities afforded by the modern media toward peacebuilding.

Television program-makers have not shrunk from their duties in exposing the horrors of war, whether in Vietnam or in subsequent conflicts, and due to such graphic accounts successfully created a public mindset that led eventually to the ending of the Cold War per se with the Treaty of Paris in 1990. The motion-picture industry has likewise played an important role in attitude formation both by churning out endless war films and films of violence that do little but glorify the more aggressive aspects of human nature and by producing the rarer but highly significant films that seek to reveal the futility and horror of warfare and the urgent need for peacebuilding in the modern era. Films like ''Oh, What a Lovely War,'' ''Gandhi,'' ''Dances with Wolves,'' ''The Shadowmakers,'' ''All the Presidents Men,'' and many others have drawn on the powers of the medium to convey to mass audiences something of what goes on behind the scenes of organized carnage and to reveal alternative modalities for peacebuilding as being within the grasp of the human will and imagination.[90]

The question of the negative effects of violent videos and films on impressionable minds is something that academics, media specialists, and policy-makers are actively debating. What is undoubtedly the case is that a far greater proportion of the films, videos, and television programs made and shown give a pseudo-heroic gloss to violence and warfare than their opposite, while the proportion of those that genuinely attempt to show alternative approaches, extolling peacemaking rather than conquest and victory, are few and far between. Here then is an as-yet underexplored country in which peacemakers and peace-builders would do well to colonize more effectively.

---

[90] Ibid.

2.4.1.8 Concept of peace environment

The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development was signed by 178 countries. It signifies that the global community of states formally acknowledges that there is a connection between peace, human welfare and environmental protection. Environmental security and peace have a common intellectual and policy foundation in investigations of the intersection between peace and development, which peaked in the 1980s through the works of Galtung (1989), Hettne (1983) and Sørensen (1985), for example, and through processes such as the Brandt Report (Independent Commission on International Development Issues [ICIDI] 1983) and Palme Report (Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues [ICDSI] 1982) that investigated the costs of the military-industrial complex. These processes merged with parallel efforts to include environmental considerations in development. This arguably began with the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (UNCHE) held in Stockholm in 1972, which initiated a number of intergovernmental investigations and summits that merged at times with parallel investigations into development and common security, culminating in the World Commission on Environment and Development's (WCED) 1987 report titled Our Common Future. The WCED report popularized the term 'sustainable development', introduced the term 'environmental security', and led to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in 1992.[91]

Environmental factors do not, and are unlikely to, trigger war between countries, even in the case of rivers whose waters are shared by

---

[91] Paul Ekins. *A new world order: grassroots movements for global change*, London, Routledge,1992, pp. 14-17.

more than one country.[92] Rather, environmental changes can increase the risk of violent conflict and social instability within countries where governance systems are in transition, levels of inequality are high, and social-ecological systems are highly sensitive to environmental change. Many studies suggest that 'strong states' with a high trade/GDP ratio tend to be simultaneously more capable of managing environmental degradation, less dependent on primary resources for income and employment, and less prone to internal conflicts.[93] In resource dependent societies governed by weak states, environmental changes can alter the distribution of natural and economic capital among people and local groups in ways that can stimulate grievances, which may ultimately lead to violence. These grievances often form along the lines of pre-existing vertical (class-based), horizontal (spatially-based), and age-based inequalities. For example, Bobrow-Strain has described how declining agricultural production caused by changes in political and market conditions did not affect all people in a district of Chiapas equally, and that this changing social landscape led to land conflicts.[94] Timura has also argued that unequal access to economic and political resources was a factor in conflicts in Mexico, as well as the 'Guinea Fowl' war in Ghana, and conflict in Para, Brazil.[95]

It has been reasonably well demonstrated, therefore, that environmental change can increase the risk of direct violence within if not between states and, inasmuch as this is true, it follows that freedom from direct violence requires that environmental change be avoided or people's abilities to adapt to it be enhanced, at least in resource dependent

---

[92] Wolf, A. (1999). 'Water wars' and water reality: Conflict and cooperation along international waterways. In S. Lonergan (Ed.), Environmental change, adaptation, and security (pp. 251– 265). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

[93] Hauge, W., & Ellingsen, T. (2001). Causal pathways to conflict. In P. Diehl & N. Gleditsch (Eds.), Environmental conflict (pp. 36–57). Boulder: Westview Press.

[94] Bobrow-Strain, A. (2001). Between a ranch and a hard place: Violence, scarcity, and meaning in Chiapas, Mexico. In N. Peluso & M. Watts (Eds.), *Violent environments* (pp. 155–188). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

[95] Timura, C. (2001). Environmental conflict and the social life of environmental security discourse. *Anthropological Quarterly*, *74*(3), 104–113.

societies in weak states. However, because environmental change does not increase the risk of violent conflict in isolation from other important social factors that are typically associated with structural violence, addressing these factors is also important.

Furthermore, there is a link between environmental change and positive peace. One of the defining trends of the course of Western civilization has been a progressive alleviation of the constraints that local environmental conditions impose on security of individuals and societies.[96] The impacts of animals, droughts, floods, frosts, pathogens, storms, and other environmental perturbations on mortality, morbidity and social disruption are now far less in modern societies because of the influence of technology, trade, industrialization, the use of fossil fuels, occupational specialization, and higher levels of social organization. Yet this does not mean that the risks that environmental change poses to human security have been eliminated. Decreases in primary forest cover, biodiversity losses, depletion of fish stocks, land degradation, water pollution and scarcity, coastal and marine degradation, the contamination of people, plants and animals by chemicals and radioactive substances, and climate change and sea level rise all pose risks to the security of people in developed and developing countries— although vulnerability to these changes is far higher in developing countries.

There is now considerable evidence that environmental change impacts on human well-being in ways that justify its identification as a form of structural violence. The development of advanced industrial capitalism has placed historically unprecedented demands on the earth's natural systems, and has created social inequalities of a magnitude and scale that are equally unprecedented. The result has been excess consumption and waste generation in the industrialized world, poverty and debt in the industrializing world and environmental changes of a scale and magnitude that put at risk the economic, cultural, spiritual and

---

[96] Boyden, S. (1987). *Western civilization in biological perspective: Patterns in biohistory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

social needs and values of communities. The kinds of environmental changes that societies now contend with include, but are not limited to, deforestation, land degradation, water pollution and scarcity, biodiversity losses, climate change, and coastal and marine degradation (including coastal erosion, coral loss and coral bleaching, contracting artisanal fisheries, pollution of lagoons, and overfishing of oceanic stocks). These changes can exacerbate existing structural violence such as poverty: for example, a change in soil moisture can undermine nutrition in income-poor subsistence farming households; a decline in fish abundance can undermine nutrition and income for small scale fishers; and a decline in surface or groundwater quality can undermine maternal and child health in communities without reticulated water supply. Many studies show that environmental changes such as these can impact on positive peace in significant ways. For example the World Health Organization estimates that climate change is already causing some 154,000 deaths each year (to compare, 155,000 people were killed in war in 2002)[97], and case studies from Northern Pakistan, South Asia, the Niger Delta, the Pacific Islands and Ethiopia all show how environmental changes impact on livelihoods and communities.

Peace and environmental security are therefore intimately related, and neither can be achieved without the other. To avoid environmental insecurity the causes of environmental change need to be addressed, since it is these that expose groups to changes in the distribution, abundance, and quality of resources on which they depend. Further, both direct and structural violence need to be addressed, as both are powerful drivers of vulnerability to environmental changes, and both are causes of environmental change.

2.4.2 Peace Theories

Peace theories can be classified into two categories—one in the name of theory and one according to an individual's view. Here, only

---

[97] World Health Organization. (2002). *The world health report 2002*, Geneva: Author, p.72.

some prominent theories are presented, namely the democratic peace theory and Johan Galtung's peace theory.

2.4.2.1 The democratic peace theory

The idea that representative liberal governments can diminish the occurrence of war is one of the most appealing, influential, and at the same time, controversial ideas of our time. For centuries, thinkers have proposed that a world of democratic countries would be a peaceful world. As early as 1795, Immanuel Kant wrote in his essay *Perpetual Peace* that democracies are less warlike. Within the United States, this idea has held particular sway. Presidents like Woodrow Wilson have embraced this idea and advocated the creation of democracies to create a less belligerent world. Harry S. Truman once said, "Totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples…undermine the foundation of international peace and hence security of the United States."[98]

The Democratic Peace Theory is based on several premises. The first argues that in democracies, populations will restrain elected leaders. This is to say that given the choice, people will be reluctant to bear the costs of war in terms of human life and financial treasure. Second, many think that democracies will use political institutions to settle their domestic disputes. Therefore, when conflict arises with another democracy, they will be more apt to use international institutions (i.e., the United Nations, International Court of Justice, G-8 Summits, etc.) to resolve their international disagreements. Others believe that democracies produce a political culture of negotiation and conciliation, claiming that people in democracies are taught that violence is not an appropriate means of conflict resolution. The argument holds that if a war-prone leader comes to power in a democracy, other institutions (e.g., Congress) will present cross-pressures (here checks and balances) and prevent an aggressive head of state from moving a country to war. Finally, people in

---

[98] Mark Rupert, (2000) Ideologies of Globalization: Contending Visions of a New World Order. Routledge; London: p. 27.

democracies are believed to be more sympathetic and tolerant of people in other democracies.[99] Thus, whether it is common norms, institutional constraints, mutual respect, or popular will—democracy is viewed as a treatment for war**.**

In the 1970s, scholars began using the tools of social science to explore this thesis and have uncovered a significant amount of empirical research that supports these claims. Today there are over a hundred authors who have published scholarly works on the Democratic Peace Theory. One study examined 416 country-to-country wars from 1816-1980 and found that only 12 were fought between democracies.[100] Bruce Russett writes that "Established democracies fought no wars against one another during the entire twentieth century."[101] Another proponent found that that the probability of any two democracies engaging in war is less than half of 1%![102] This is not to say that democracies have not gone to war, but when considering pairs (or dyads) of democracies, there are almost no instances of war between two democracies. Four decades of research consistently finds significant support for this position. Moreover, the findings remain robust as the number of democracies in the world continues to grow. In fact, as Jack Levy points out, Democratic Peace Theory is "as close as anything we have to an empirical law in international relations."[103]

Beyond academics, the last two presidential administrations have particularly embraced this research as a policy objective and a way to

---

[99] Spencer R. Weart, (1998), *Never at War*, Yale University Press.

[100] Michael Doyle, (1996) "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs," in Sean Lynn-Jones, Michael Brown and Steven Miller, eds., *Debating the Democratic Peace*. Cambridge: MIT: 3–57.

[101] Bruce Russett, (2000) "How Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations Create a System for Peace," in Charles W. Kegley Jr. and Eugene Wittfopk (eds.) *The Global Agenda* 6th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill: 235

[102] R.J. Rummel, (1997) *Power Kills: Democracy as a Method of Nonviolence*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.

[103] Jack S. Levy, (1988) "Domestic Politics and War," in Robert I. Rotberg and Theodore K. Rabb, eds., *The Origin and Prevention of Major Wars*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press: 88.

63

build world peace. President Clinton in his 1994 State of the Union Address proclaimed, "Ultimately, the best strategy to ensure our security and to build a durable peace is to support the advancement of democracy elsewhere. Democracies don't attack each other." More recently, current President George W. Bush stated, "And the reason why I'm so strong on democracy is democracies don't go to war with each other. And the reason why is the people of most societies don't like war, and they understand what war means… I've got great faith in democracies to promote peace. And that's why I'm such a strong believer that the way forward in the Middle East, the broader Middle East, is to promote democracy."[104] This discussion has generated considerable excitement and promoted growing expectations by both policy makers and Western publics that this is something we should be pursuing.[105] This theory has come close to conventional wisdom and served as a foundation for both moral and political missions. Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger writes, "[a] majority of the American leaders were convinced then as they are now that America has a special responsibility to spread its values as its contributions to world peace."[106]

Just as the Democratic Peace Theory has its supporters, it has also generated considerable criticisms. Alexander Hamilton presents an early rejection of this idea in Federalist No. 6, writing: "Sparta, Athens, Rome, and Carthage were all republics; two of them, Athens and Carthage, of the commercial kind. Yet were they as often engaged in wars, offensive and defensive, as the neighboring monarchies of the same times. Sparta was little better than a well regulated camp; and Rome was never sated of carnage and conquest."[107]

---

[104] George W. Bush, (2004) "President and Prime Minister Blair Discussed Iraq, Middle East, The East Room" November 12, 2004, http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/11/20041112-5.html.
[105] Alynna Lyon and Christopher Dolan, (2007) "American Humanitarian Intervention: Toward a Theory of Coevolution," *Foreign Policy Analysis* 3 (1):146–78.
[106] Henry Kissinger, (1994) *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster; New York: 33.
[107] Alexander Hamilton (1787) *The Federalist No. 6* http://www.law.emory.edu/cms/site/index.php?id=3138

In terms of the current research, establishing the correlations have been relatively easy; however, establishing causation is more problematic. In fact, most scholars do not agree on why democracies are more peaceful. In addition, the research itself has come under heavy criticism with scholars claiming that the evidence changes depending on how you define "democracy," "war," and "peace." One rebuttal to the democratic peace theory is found in the Big Mac Peace Theory; this cheeky modification points out that no two countries with a McDonald's have ever gone to war.[108] The argument claims that what the scholars are actually measuring is economic development, not democracy. Here some argue that a stable middle class (people who like their current status) will not support a war that may jeopardize their standard of living. Alternatively, the causal factors may be powerful economic elites who block any move towards aggression against a country where they hold financial ties and where war puts their economic interests at risk. Along these lines, one compelling study finds that the Democratic Peace Theory only holds true between two democracies that have reached high standards of economic development. Here the research finds that poor democracies are more likely to fight each other.[109] So, perhaps it is economic development, global capitalism, and the interdependence of foreign trade that impedes war, not democracy.[110]

Stronger opponents actually argue that "good science" is creating dangerous policy. There are those that fear that the research provides justification for countries to go on democracy crusades. One issue they raise concerns the assumption that democracies create peaceful peoples.

---

[108] Thomas Friedman, (2000) *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Anchor Books. This has recently been updated as The Dell Theory in which Friedman argues that "no two countries that are both part of a major global supply chain, like Dell's, will ever fight a war against each other as long as they are both part of the same global supply chain." Thomas Friedman (2005) *The World is Flat*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux: 421.

[109] Michael Mousseau, (2005) "Comparing New Theory with Prior Beliefs: Market Civilization and the Democratic Peace," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22(1): 63–77.

[110] Erich Weede, (2004) "The Diffusion of Prosperity and Peace by Globalization," *The Independent Review* 9(2).

Here, scholars question the idea that popular will can mitigate war, particularly since war seems to be rather popular in certain democracies.[111] The United States presents an interesting example of this as public approval ratings of U.S. presidents tend to skyrocket during war. For example, President George H.W. Bush saw his public approval ratings rise to an unprecedented 89% during the 1991 Persian Gulf War when Americans "rallied around the flag."

Perhaps the most problematic aspect of the Democratic Peace Theory concerns implementation—how do you create a world of democracies? Here we find two minds, one that advocates the active pursuit of a globe full of democracies and one that promotes a more passive policy. The latter view is found in the early writings of Thomas Jefferson as he proclaimed, "A just and solid republican government maintained here will be a standing monument and example for… people of other countries."[112] Jefferson held that leadership by example (where Western and American governments practice virtue, self-restraint, and rule of law) would be contagious. The second, stickier position involves the active or even forceful pursuit of democratic political systems. This position assumes that democracy will be welcomed across the globe and can be transplanted with relative ease. However, we are beginning to see that some people do not see democracy as desirable. In fact, there are people who view the Democratic Peace Theory and its policy implications as thinly veiled imperialism. In effect, they view the spread of democracy as an effort to homogenize the world, rejecting local culture, indigenous institutions, and even popular preferences. Thus, rather than viewing themselves as liberated, people and their leaders in many non-democratic countries hear this policy mandate as smug rhetoric. This also touches on the very contentious debate about whether

---

[111] Sebastian Rosato, (2003) "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory," *American Political Science Review* 97(4): 585–602.

[112] Sebastian Rosato, (2003) "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory," *American Political Science Review* 97(4): 585–602.

"gunpoint democracy" will work or whether this actually presents a contradiction to the ideas of conflict resolution through nonviolence.

Another thorny issue is that democratically elected governments may not guarantee peaceful interests. Here "one must be careful what one wishes for" as democratically elected leadership may not always be benign and/or may pursue agendas in contrast to American interests. For example, during the Iraqi war Turkish voters pressed their government not to provide support to the U.S. invasion of Iraq. The newly elected Hamas majority in the Palestinian National Authority has also demonstrated its agenda is far from peaceful.

In conclusion, there is strong support on both sides of the debate. One finds the quest for democratic universalism as a powerful panacea to interstate war, while the other sees it as a misguided and dangerous foreign policy. What the debate does point out is that creating democracies is enormously complicated and requires significant time. One cannot just set up ballot boxes, hold elections, and create moderate Democrats and Republicans. Issues like rule of law, civic culture, a stable and committed middle class, and legitimacy of a democratic system may take years, if not decades, to build. Furthermore, in *Electing to Fight: Why Emerging Democracies Go to War*, Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder point out that transitional states or "semi-democratic regimes" may be extremely dangerous and actually more likely to start wars.[113] There is no guarantee that the introduction of democratic institutions will be smooth, permanent, or accepted by either the political elites in a country or by the masses. In fact, some scholars point out that in most cases of newly created democracies (the third-wave democracies) the political institutions are weak, frail, and easily reversible.[114]

---

[113] Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder, (2005) *Electing to Fight: Why Emerging Democracies Go to War*: MIT Press.

[114] Georg Sorensen, (1993) *Democracy and Democratization: Processes and Prospects in a Changing World*. Boulder: Westview Press: 62.

Perhaps it is helpful to remember that in the United States (typically regarded as the democratic success story) it took almost 200 years, a civil war, a woman's suffrage movement, and a violent civil rights movement before we had universal suffrage and granted most citizens of the country the right to participate in politics. Thus, it may take decades or even generations to establish embedded norms of tolerance, compromise, and the value of power sharing in transitional countries. One thing remains clear: the ideas and debate on Democratic Peace Theory will persist in both academic and policy circles. This is particularly true as the United States attempts implementation of these ideas in Iraq. In fact, Presidential candidate Senator John McCain recently affirmed his support for this view, calling for a "new League of Democracies [to] form the core of an international order of peace based on freedom."[115]

The research is exciting and leads this author to optimism. At the same time, this is a guarded optimism, as the scholarship needs to be implemented with a sophisticated understanding and a fine instrument. Forcibly pulling the weeds of non-democratic regimes by their roots and bluntly transplanting western democracy into areas where the soil may not be fertile may be ineffective and actually promote violence. A fact that policymakers tend to overlook is that in order for the Democratic Peace Theory to hold, democracy itself must be authentic, robust, stable, and accompanied by economic development.

2.4.2.2 Johan Gultong's peace theory

Galtung's theory of peace is based on one underlying principle – that 'peace is the absence of violence'[116]. In this sense, Galtung's is as much a theory that defines violence as it is a theory about peace. This peace/violence dualism tends to simplify the continuous nature of social

---

[115] John McCain, (2007) *Address to The Hoover Institution*, May 1. http://www.johnmccain.com/informing/news/Speeches/43e821a2-ad70-495a-83b2-098638e67aeb.htm.
[116] Galtung, Johan, 1969. 'Violence, Peace, and Peace Research', *Journal of Peace Research* 6(3): 167.

conditions to polar opposites and so lacks sensitivity to the rather more dialectical (or in Boulding's [1977] terms 'evolutionary') character of social change. So, a theory of peace may be based not on the contradistinction to violence, but on a statement of what peace is (as opposed to what it is not).

Galtung's theory of peace therefore hinges on his definition of violence. Violence, he says, is 'the difference between the potential and the actual, between what could have been and what is'[117]. This is obviously appropriate for crude violences that create, say, physical harm to people's bodies or mental harm to children, yet it ultimately requires some measures of what is possible in order to determine the extent to which violence occurs. For example, if we take the life expectancy of Japanese women and the income of men from Luxembourg to be the measure of what is possible for women, we find that violence act on almost all women. Further, the measures may change, since what is ultimately possible is determined by the applications of science, technology and governance, all of which have pushed out the boundaries of possibility in most societies over time.

So, what is possible – Galtung's potential – is the best that humans can do, and anyone who is not a beneficiary of the best that can be done is the subject of violence. Yet, if peace is a universal goal, then everyone, everywhere, now and into the future, should be able to reach the same level of attainment (live as long as a Japanese woman and be as wealthy as a male from Luxembourg). In practice, this seems impossible, since the process of accumulation that leads to highest standards of attainment may not be sustainably (I mean ecologically) replicated in all societies. Given existing inequalities in income and health (to continue with just these two metrics), a sustainable set of possibilities will require some contraction in the levels of attainment of the wealthy and healthy and an increase in those for the poor, to reach some point of convergence. It follows, then, that pathways to a universal sustainable set of

---

[117] Ibid. p. 168.

possibilities can be construed as violence to those whose current conditions are above the sustainable possibility.

This is not to say that Galtung's definition of violence is not instructive. His intention is nothing more than to outline 'theoretically significant dimensions of violence', and he acknowledges the problematic nature of his criteria of 'potential'[118] and, indeed, the problematic nature of the concept of 'peace' itself (Galtung, 1985). Rather, it is to say that a theory of violence based on the difference between the actual and the potential is hard to operationalize at the point at which peace is more rather than less prevalent (though this is a point we are very far from, even now). It also suggests that a theory of violence based on the differences between people here and now may be more instructive, as it would be based on what is currently possible. Further, such a theory needs to explicitly consider what is sustainably possible for all people given existing resources.

Galtung's is a theory that speaks more of structures than agents[119]. He explains this as trying to 'liberate myself from the built in actor oriented perspective of so much Western social science'[120]. His theory of violence accommodates the military–industrial complex, for example, but says little about the choices that people within these processes make; for example, is an unemployed migrant who joins the army in the absence of alternative career prospects an agent of violence? If (s)he smokes and this causes her to have a reduced life expectancy (a difference between the actual and potential), is this a product of structure (circumstance, environment, tobacco marketing) or agency (personal choice)? These questions point to the limitations of many theories of violence, which tend to be concerned with structures rather than agents.

---

[118] Galtung, Johan, 1969. 'Violence, Peace, and Peace Research', *Journal of Peace Research* 6(3): 168.

[119] Boulding, Kenneth, 1977. 'Twelve Friendly Quarrels with Johan Galtung', *Journal of Peace Research* 14(1): 75–86.

[120] Galtung, Johan, 1985. 'Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses', *Journal of Peace Research 22(2)*: 145.

Yet, as much as structures influence agents, agents can also change structures, and so there is a need to seek to situate individuals in relation to the process and f lows that influence them, and which they reflexively influence in turn[121].

Galtung (1969) decomposed violence into two types: personal and structural.5 Personal violence occurs when there is an actor and/or a tangible action such as war or domestic violence that does injury to people. This speaks to the common view of 'peace' as the absence of war and other violations of personal sovereignty. Galtung calls the absence of this direct violence 'negative peace'. This is the most straightforward and least problematic aspect of his theory of peace (leaving aside the question of 'just war').

Galtung's theory of peace says that there is more to violence than the absence of direct violence. Structural violence, he says, is violence caused not by direct somatic harm, but by systems of unequal power that structure unequal life chances such that a person's potential is unrealized. So, in that racial or sexual discrimination, declining terms of trade, malnutrition, famine and unemployment all affect people's life chances such that realization of their potential is constrained, these (and many other processes) can be said to be forms of structural violence. These structures have histories and geographies and manifest themselves on different people, through different systems, in various ways. Structural violence, then, is about social justice and equality (called positive peace), and a limitation to Galtung's theory is that while perfect equality is its goal, this is not practically possible and, indeed, may not be desirable. Structural violence is perhaps best understood as a 'metaphor' rather than a theory[122].

---

[121] Giddens, Anthony, 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

[122] Boulding, Kenneth, 1977. 'Twelve Friendly Quarrels with Johan Galtung', *Journal of Peace Research* 14(1): 75–86.

Structural violence as formulated by Galtung is a 'maximalist' agenda[123], the function of which is to highlight the negative consequences of the uneven distribution of power and resources and to understand these as largely avoidable, highly destructive social processes. It leaves open the question of pathways to redistribute power and resources, and Galtung is silent on this matter, which Boulding (1977) implies is because engaging with the nature of transformation demands some consideration of steering, hierarchy and some recognition of inequality in capabilities – all of which are anathema to Galtung's strong preference for equality.6 To be sure, this lack of consideration of the reform of structures is not a problem unique to Galtung's view of structural violence, and, indeed, it is desirable in as much as suggestions may lead to manifestos that may lead to violence. Nevertheless, structural transformation towards peace is an area that could be better informed by other theories of social change, including those associated with development studies.

In Galtung's formulation, then, peace is the absence of both direct and structural violence. He notes that negative and positive peace are contiguous with each other, and this is clearly the case, as revealed by recent research into the linkages between war (direct violence), absolute poverty and vertical and horizontal inequalities (structural violence), famine (structural violence) and famine relief (which affects another form of structural violence)[124]. Nevertheless, the positive/ negative peace dualism constrains thinking about peace by reducing its diverse and contingent nature into another dualism, which Boulding (1977) suggests is not overly useful. Underlying Galtung's notion of structural violence[125] is a concern for 'basic human needs' provision, informed by the basic needs approach to development that emerged in the mid-1970s. Thus, for

---

[123] Rogers, Paul & Oliver Ramsbotham, 1999. 'Then and Now: Peace Research – Past and Future', *Political Studies* 47(4): 740–754.

[124] Goodhand, Jonathan, 2003. 'Enduring Disorder and Persistent Poverty: A Review of the Linkages Between War and Chronic Poverty', *World Development* 31(3): 629–646.

[125] Galtung, Johan, 1985. 'Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses', *Journal of Peace Research* 22(2): 146.

Galtung, structural violence 'could just as well be taken as a point of departure for development studies as for peace studies. The two are very similar, and should be regarded as two sides of the same coin'.[126] This represents an initial point of departure for considering development in relation to peace.

2.5 The United Nations and Peace

Having faced with the largest catastrophes in human history, men and women around the planet began to dream of a better, peaceful world. Thus, shortly after World War II, on October 24, 1945, 51 States ratified the United Nations Charter with the hope of freeing our world from the possibility of war.[127] The UN was thus created and equipped with instruments that its predecessor lacked. The UN established several programs intended to reduce, as much as possible, all the factors leading to outbreaks in conflicts. These programs did not only focus on peace keepers, who intervene after a conflict has erupted, but also on economic and social development, human rights, and the struggle to end world poverty and hunger. Indeed, all of these United Nations programs contribute directly or indirectly to the prevention of conflicts and thus to peace on earth. It is certainly true that, in the last 50 years, not everyone in the world has known peace, but it is gradually gaining ground. The dream of peace in the world is becoming less and less utopian and more and more attainable.

This topic discusses peace at the international level. It describes the role of United Nations agencies, programs and departments in the prevention and peaceful resolution of international conflicts. In addition to these institutions, other international organizations are contributing to

---

[126] Ibid, p. 147.

[127] Rumki Basu. The United Nations: structure and functions of an international organization (revised edition), New Delhi, Sterling Publisher Pvt. Ltd, 2004, p. 20-25.

peace on earth, such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and regional organizations.

The Preamble to the United Nations Charter clearly stipulates the mission of this organization. The Preamble states that the United Nations was founded to prevent and resolve international conflicts and help build a culture of peace in the world.[128] These intentions are reflected in the different agencies, departments and programs of the United Nations.

2.5.1 The United Nations and Conflict Prevention

Under the supervision of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), specialized programs and agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR), the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), and many others are trying to prevent deadly conflicts from proliferating by attacking the roots of these conflicts and not only the acts of violence that are the symptoms.

The UN is taking aim at everything that could be at the source of conflicts. The prevention of conflicts and the promotion of peace therefore take quite varied forms. This UN work has become all the more necessary given that, since World War II, weapons have become ever more deadly. And though there is greater wealth in the world, its distribution is unequal. This gap between rich and poor is visible everywhere and in all countries, and is increasing, in particular, between "Northern" and "Southern" countries.

The UNDP was created to help solve this problem. Indeed, conflicts grow well in the fertile ground of poverty. The UNDP is mandated to contribute to the elimination of poverty, the social mobilization of women, respect for the environment and the

---

[128] See more at http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/preamble.shtml, accessed:13-01-2009

reinforcement of democratic institutions.[129] The supervision of elections illustrates this quite well. The UNDP is not alone in attempting to accomplish its mission, as thousands of non-government organizations (NGOs) are likewise contributing in one way or another.

Illiteracy also contributes to the birth of new conflicts. Societies whose members have a minimal level of education are less able to understand for whom it is voting or the decisions made by its leaders. Indeed, illiteracy often creates a rift between those in a society who are educated and those over whom, consequently, the educated have power. It can likewise create a gulf between the State and its citizens if the latter can be more easily controlled because they ignore the goings-on of the society. UNESCO is there to promote and give access to education, science, culture and communication.[130] UNESCO is also there to ensure that justice, the law, human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected, irrespective of race, sex, language or religion.

The breakout of modern-day conflicts can also be related to the control of natural resources. Better management of these resources could help avoid the breakout of future conflicts. For example, the consequences of pollution can rapidly degenerate and require greater international cooperation. Pollution rarely takes into account the borders mapped out by men. The acid rain in the United States and Canada, the pollution of a chemical factory that flowed down the Danube River through several European countries, and the oil spills that so often occur in the ocean after a ship wreck, these are but a few of many sad examples. The last oil spill in Canada occurred in 1988 off the shores of Newfoundland and involved a tanker named Odyssey. These ecological catastrophes are often due to the inability of countries to adopt common rules for safety and the environment. This inability encourages certain

---

[129] Quoted from "NGO's role in World Peace" (the online article), http://sittingondafence.wordpress.com/2010/10/13/ngos-role-in-world-peace/ accessed: 09-02-2009
[130] "Introducing UNESCO". Unesco.org. http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/about-us/who-we-are/introducing-unesco/. Retrieved: 2011-08-08.

countries to adopt lenient regulations in order to encourage companies to run part or all of their business from these countries. Nonetheless, the most regular and largest oil spills occur in straits between several countries. The English Channel, for instance, has seen many substantial spills, as has the Bosporus Strait in Turkey, which is part of a passage linking the Black Sea to the Mediterranean Sea. It goes without saying that these spills create numerous problems between States.

This is the context in which the UNEP is working around the world to change mentalities about ecology. It initiates and organizes multilateral conventions on the environment and thus tries to further the international legal framework for environmental protection. Greater international cooperation will hopefully mean fewer catastrophes and, consequently, fewer potential, environmentally related conflicts.[131]

Respect for human rights is a condition sine qua non for the establishment of peace on earth. On December 10, 1948, the members of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This declaration establishes basic rights for all human beings. Though human rights are rarely observed in times of war, respect for human rights can keep difficult situations from degenerating into armed conflict. The role of the UNHCHR is thus to promote respect for human rights. This organization must demonstrate, through concrete actions, the international community's will and determination to ensure that human rights are respected. Moreover, it tries to have international conventions for human rights signed and ratified. For example, the "Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms" was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 9, 1998. UNHCHR does not only inform us about the necessity to respect human rights. It also works in the field to provide technical cooperation or help in the training

---

[131] Felix Dodds, Andrew Higham and Rechard Sherman(editors). *Climate Change and Energy Insecurity: The Challenge for Peace, Security and Development*, UK, MPG Books Ltd., 2009, P. 157.

of police or the military. The UN is not the only organization to work for the promotion of human rights. Just to name two of many NGOs, there are IFHR, the International Federation of Human Rights, and AI, better known as Amnesty International.[132]

It goes without saying that the counterpart of all conflicts is the availability of arms, especially firearms. Since the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki on August 6 and 8, 1945, nuclear bombs have sadly made gigantic progress, as has the technology of arms in general. In his millennium report, Kofi Annan called on States to work towards the elimination of all nuclear risk.[133] The majority of States spend too much on arms, and for some States, arms represent the main part of their budget, to the detriment of other sectors such as education and agriculture. The UN has a role to play in promoting disarmament, which is essential for peace. The UN's department for disarmament affairs reports on the state of the armament race in the world and establishes disarmament standards and goals in cooperation with other UN organisms. UNIDIR is conducting research into the potential for a safer future and the possibility of organizing seminars and conferences whose goal is to reach disarmament agreements.

2.5.2 The Other UN Organizations That Contribute to Peace

There are other UN organizations that help promote a culture of peace. UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund, helps to protect the rights of children. It carries out both preventive initiatives to help promote the education of children in developing countries and protective actions to help children in times of war, when they are often the most vulnerable victims. Indeed, if the future is to be ensured, it is important that children be educated and not be mistreated. Children ensure a

---

[132] Roberta Arnold and Noelle Queniver (editors). *International humanitarian law and human rights law: towards a new merger in International law*, Netherlands, IDC Publishers, 2008, pp. 572-573.

[133] See more in "We the peoples: the role of the United Nations in the twenty-first century" the Millennium Report of the Secretary-General, United Nations A/54/2000

country's future. Ensuring that children are not mistreated helps both to develop a country's capacities and to prevent, as much as is possible, the outbreak of future conflicts.[134]

UNFPA, the United Nations Population Fund, also helps to promote a culture of peace by developing information programs for women, especially with regard to sex education. It provides women in particular with all the necessary information and resources. This allows them in turn to make fully informed decisions and thereby contribute to a better management of the planet's population.[135] WHO, the World Health Organization, promotes scientific cooperation in health matters, helps reinforce health systems and assists governments which ask for emergency aid. The provision of care to populations in distress alleviates many ills, whether they be physical or psychological.[136] The WFP, the World Food Programme, promotes better nutrition by using food aid to support economic and social development.[137] It is helped in this by the FAO, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which sets up programs to help foster greater agricultural productivity, thereby fighting hunger and poverty around the world. Hunger and poverty are two important factors in the outbreak of conflicts.[138]

All of these UN programs are attempting, with the means that are available to them, to prevent conflicts and have a world that is free of violence. However, it will be some time before we reach this enviable state on our planet. This being true, the UN will have to continue to separate belligerents by intervening through peacekeeping missions.

---

[134] Karin Landgren, "Protection: The United Nations Children's Fund's Experience" in *The human rights field operation: law, theory and practice* by Michael O'Flaherty (editor.),UK, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007, pp.183-185.

[135] See more at http://www.unfpa.org/public/home/about, accessed: 10-02-2010

[136] See more at http://www.who.int/about/en/ accessed: 10-02-2010

[137] See more at http://www.wfp.org/about, accessed: 10-02-2010

[138] See more at http://www.fao.org/about/en/ accessed: 10-02-2010

2.5.3 The United Nations and Peacekeeping

The UN Security Council is the main organization of the United Nations dedicated to the resolution of conflicts and peacekeeping. It is composed of fifteen members, five of whom are permanent, namely China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States, and ten of which are elected by the General Assembly every two years.

When the Security Council is confronted with a problem that can represent a threat for international peace and safety, it must first try to resolve the problem peacefully. In the past, the Security Council has acted as mediator or, in cases of armed conflict, proposed a cease-fire. The Council can also reinforce its decisions by enacting sanctions. According to the report " 'We the Peoples'...", sanctions are a way for the Council to apply its decisions, constituting a step between a simple condemnation and armed intervention. Sanctions can include an arms embargo, trade and finance restrictions, the ceasing of air and sea contact, or diplomatic isolation.[139] Furthermore, the council can also opt for measures that call for more people and material.

Peacekeeping missions allow the Security Council to watch over the cease-fire and participate in the creation of conditions for peace. On a few rare occasions, the Security Council has authorized member States to use all the necessary means to keep the peace, including collective military action.

General Indar Jit Rktye, the former president of the International Peace Academy who has participated in several peacekeeping missions, defines peace keeping as being "the prevention, limitation, moderation and cessation of hostilities between or within States due to the

---

[139] See more in "We the peoples: the role of the United Nations in the twenty-first century" the Millennium Report of the Secretary-General, United Nations A/54/2000

intervention of a third party, which is organized and directed at the international level and which calls upon military, police and civilian personnel to restore peace."[140]

Up until the end of the Cold War, the UN only intervened in the majority of cases if the conflict involved two or more States. This is known as the principle of non-interference. The principle of State sovereignty was "officially" adhered to more than it is today. The first UN mission began in 1948 in Palestine and is still in place. It was baptised UNTSO, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine. The missions have changed considerably since then. Indeed, UNTSO was only made up of observers mandated to observe whether the truce was obeyed. However, with the insistence of Lester B. Pearson, UNEF I, the fist United Nations Emergency Force, was set up during the Suez Canal crisis in 1956. It was the start of veritable peacekeeping missions supported by military, police and civilian contingents.[141]

Since the end of the Cold War, peacekeeping has undergone a new change. The operations now occur more and more often within one country. There are several reasons behind this. First of all, due to a greater access to information, international public opinion and governments are more aware of what is happening in a country than in the past. Now when images of extraordinary violence reach us, we no longer accept that such barbarous conflicts take place, be they religious or ethnic in origin and whether or not they occur within a single country. This was the case for Rwanda, Bosnia, Kosovo, East Timor and, more recently, Sierra Leone. Not so long ago, we would not even have been aware of conflicts such as these, which occur within a single country.[142]

---

[140] Quoted from "essay-on-the-united-nations-and-peacekeeping" at http://www.shareyouressays.com/376/, accessed: 10-02-2010

[141] Andrzej Sitkowski. *UN peacekeeping: myth and reality*, USA, Greenwood Publishing Group Inc., 2006, pp. 21-25.

[142] Ibid. pp. 28-30.

The other reason comes from the establishment by former colonial powers of State models in countries that had no tradition of this kind. Totally arbitrary borders were laid down, bringing together different ethnic groups, some of which were able to impose their will on others due to their number and education. The UN can no longer allow the powers that be of a State to dictate to other minorities. The UN must establish or impose peace so as to stop belligerents from committing greater massacres. However, this demands a stronger, more interventionist approach in defiance of State sovereignty and the principle of non-interference. To accomplish this, peacekeeping missions must have greater capabilities. They must be able to rebuild, disarm, supervise elections and ensure that human rights are respected. Intervening is no longer enough. After such missions, democratic institutions that have never existed or that were destroyed must be rebuilt and be capable of ensuring equal rights for all citizens. This is the type of mission that took place in Kosovo and East Timor.

Still, it may be very difficult to establish a durable peace if justice has not first been obtained. There is often no judicial apparatus left in a country coming out of a conflict. The UN is therefore working to equip itself with the effective institutions needed to fill the institutional void in countries that are rebuilding after a conflict.

2.5.4 Post Conflict, International Justice and Other Organizations

The creation of the ICC, the International Criminal Court, would allow the UN to fill this void. Indeed, if this court is not created, the horrible actions committed by certain individuals during conflicts will never be subject to legal proceedings. The creation of ad hoc tribunals, such as those for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda based on the post-World War II Nuremberg Tribunal, have made it possible to judge people who have committed crimes against humanity. Sometimes, however, these tribunals have been accused of not being completely impartial. It is true that these tribunals were established for specific conflicts. Perhaps,

given the fact that the UN has been considering the creation of the ICC for more than 50 years now, these ad hoc tribunals will, some day soon, no longer be necessary.[143]

In addition to the ICC is the ICJ, the International Court of Justice. This court was created to resolve conflicts between States, whereas the ICC deals exclusively with the responsibility of individuals. However, because there are so few States that are ready to bring their differences before this court and accept its authority, this institution has had little impact. In fact, only 20 cases per year are submitted to it, whereas the Supreme Court of Canada handles at least 10 times more cases per year.[144]

In post-conflict situations, all the above-mentioned UN organizations are naturally present in the field, offering relief to local populations, rebuilding infrastructures, training civil servants and trying to ensure respect for human rights. UNHCR, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, is responsible for the relocation of refugees, and supervises the work conducted in the field.[145] Humanitarian NGOs are there as well and help the local populations to live peacefully.[146] The Canadian Red Cross, the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, OXFAM, Care Canada and Ingénieurs sans frontière (engineers without borders), these are but a few of the thousands of NGOs of this type.

Because most international organizations participate in the prevention and resolution of international conflicts, they help to build a culture of peace. It is worth noting, moreover, that to be successful, conflict prevention and resolution operations require cooperation among

---

[143] See more at http://www.icc-cpi.int/Menus/ICC/About+the+Court, accessed: 10-02-2010

[144] See more at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Court_of_Justice, accessed:10-02-2010

[145] See more at http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646cbc.html, accessed: 10-02-2010

[146] Mary Anderson, "Humanitarian NGOs in Conflict Intervention" quoted from www.droit-international-humanitaire.org (accessed: 10-02-2010)

States, national organizations and individuals. Organizations such as OAU, the Organization of African Unity, the Organization of American States, the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and many others play a major role at the regional level in the prevention of conflicts.

Individual people also play an essential role in the culture of peace, even at the international level. Indeed, national organizations and institutions are composed of men and women who produce standards that can be changed to meet new needs. It is up to each citizen to establish a culture of peace, beginning at home and working up to international institutions. Peace in the world is possible and is progressing everywhere. However, we must all continue to strive to ensure that the progression of peace continues.

2.6 Religions and Peace

Religion is one of the great driving forces in human nature, both individually and socially. It gives occasion for celebrate institutional assembly. It provides a reference for the explanation of many events in human life which seems obscure and demands a meaning.

Religion is an important social factor. It is an ideology. In every religious ideology, belief is the core idea including belief in God or goddesses, or any other Supernatural being or beings. The reflection of this belief is revealed in the practice of religion. Through this belief system religion laid its importance on its followers from both, inner and outer aspect. Religion offers certain standard of conduct for himself and others. He expects certain action from others and is expected to make counter-response.

Throughout the ages religion has served as both catalyst to conflict and inspiration for peace. The ambivalence of the sacred, as Scott Appleby termed it, is one of history's great enigmas. Many of the most

vicious and intractable wars have been cloaked in religious garb. Yet religion also provides valuable resources for peacemaking. Within each of the great religions there is "a moral trajectory challenging adherents to greater acts of compassion, forgiveness, and reconciliation," Appleby wrote, an "internal evolution" that offers hope for religiously inspired peacemaking.[147]

All major religions have imperatives to love others and avoid the taking of human life. In Buddhism the rejection of killing is the first of the Five Precepts. Hinduism declares "the killing of living beings is not conducive to heaven."[148]2 Jainism rejects the taking of any form of life: "if someone kills living things . . . his sin increases."[149] The Qur'an states "slay not the life that God has made sacred."[150]4 The Bible teaches "you shall not murder."[151] This reverence for life and desire to avoid harm is the first of what theologian Mark Juergensmeyer identified as the three major aspects of nonviolence within world religions. The second is the ideal of social harmony and living peacefully with others, frequently emphasized in the Old Testament and the Qur'an. Third is the willingness to sacrifice and suffer for the sake of expiating sin and avoiding injury to others, which is common in the Abrahamic traditions.[152]

At the core of the great religions is the injunction to care for the other, especially for the one in need. Buddhism and Hinduism are founded on principles of compassion and empathy for those who suffer. Islam emerged out of the Prophet's call to restore the tribal ethic of social

---

[147] R. Scott Appleby. *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), p. 31.

[148] Manusmrti 5.48.

[149] Sutrakritanga 1.1.

[150] Qur'an 6:151. All Qur'an translations from Reza Aslan, No god but God: The Origins, Evolution, and Future of Islam (New York: Random House, 2005).

[151] Exodus 20:13 (all Biblical scripture quoted from the New International Version).

[152] David Noel Freedman and Michael J. McClymond, "Religious Traditions, Violence, and Nonviolence," in vol. III of Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict, ed. Lester Kurtz, 229–39 (San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1999), p. 236.

egalitarianism and to end the mistreatment of the weak and vulnerable.[153]7 In the New Testament Jesus is depicted throughout as caring for and ministering to the needy. Compassion for the stranger is the litmus test of ethical conduct in all great religions. So is the capacity to forgive, to repent and overcome past transgressions. The key to conflict prevention is extending the moral boundaries of one's community and expressing compassion toward others.

There are many other religious principles that provide a foundation for creative peacemaking. Nonviolent values pervade the Eastern religious traditions of Buddhism, Hinduism, and Jainism and echo through the Gospel of Jesus. The religious emphasis on personal discipline and self-restraint also has value for peacemaking. It provides a basis for constraining the impulses of vengeance and retaliation that arise from violent conflict. The power of imagination within religion provides another basis for peacemaking. The moral imagination, to use John Paul Lederach's term, is necessary to envision a more just and peaceful order, to dream of a society that attempts to reflect religious teaching.[154]

2.6. 1 Hinduism and Peace

Hinduism, which is the oldest of the world religions, had its origin in India, and is still professed by the majority of its people. There is no date and founder to regard as the beginning or beginner of Hinduism. The Vedas, *Rigveda*, *Yajurveda, Samaveda,* and *Atharvaveda* are the foundational scriptures of the Hinduism.

The main characteristic of Hinduism is that it does not condemn other religions and beliefs. It allows everyone to think and reason for himself. Hinduism does not condemn even those who do not believe in

---

[153] Aslan, No god but God, pp. 29, 40.

[154] John Paul Lederach, The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005); Marc Gopin, Between Eden and Armageddon: The Future of World Religions, Violence, and Peacemaking (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp.20–23.

God. It teaches to worship God in the manner that best suits the person. It allows person to choose the right and wrong by examining and experiencing and if the person likes he/she can accept the teachings. There is freedom in Hinduism for choosing the religion and god as per the need of the individual. Hinduism has respects the all other religion of the world and it welcomes other idea and ways which lead to the divinity. This essence is found in Upanishads and Vedas. All paths lead to the same God, just as cows of different colors all give us the same white milk. *Rigveda* declares, "Truth is one; wise men call it by different names."[155]

Vedas, Upanishads and *Gita* are the foundation of the Hinduism. The knowledge of these scriptures is developed from the concept of Nature and peace. The teachings of these scriptures are universal. That is why Hinduism is not bounded in any certain geographical, racial, national and ethnical boundary – it is universal.

The main aim of Hinduism is to make an individual conscious about life, world, and God. If one becomes conscious about himself, he will not pamper in worldly pleasures and can get redemption in life. It ignores the worldly pleasures which remain for the short period giving the pain and suffering in the mind and body. It advocates the truth and the way of truth so that one can get peace and happiness.

The Vedas are the main sources of Hinduism. *Rigveda, Samaveda, Yajurveda* and *Atharvaveda,* all teach peace and universal brotherhood. Truth is the basic element of peace. *Atharvaveda* says, "The cementing forces that can sustain the peace of the earth are Truth, the irrevocable and inexorable law, Vow for the service of mankind, living a simple and austere life, Faith is the universal divine power and selflessness to the extent of sacrificing one's interests for the welfare of

---

[155] *Rig-Veda* I.164.46

others. Conversely, untruth, lawlessness, selfishness, luxury, denial of the supreme power and violence destroy the earth."[156]

If one sees others as oneself, there will not be any war and there will be happiness and peace all around the world. *Yajurveda* declares, "One who see all creatures as if they were his own selves and himself in others – his mind rests in peace with doubts to disturb it."[157] *Atharvaveda* says – "I am not one but am millions; myself I see in millions of beings. These million upon millions of eyes, ears lives are but my eyes, my ears, my lives. I see myself at one with the countless lives of the earth – they are me and I am they."[158]

Veda emphasizes in the global brotherhood. *Atharvaveda* says - "In whatever direction I turn my eyes I look upon every one as my friend".[159] What personal and individual attachment there can remain in one to who all becomes one and one becomes all. Personal attachment, selfish interest and ambition only cause sorrow and suffering. When one is for all, and all are for one, there can be nothing but peace.[160]

Veda converses peace not only for the human society but for the whole universe. "May sky be peaceful, May atmosphere be peaceful, may earth be peaceful, may waters be peaceful, may medicinal herbs be peaceful. May plants be peaceful. May all the learned person be peaceful, May God an the Vedas be peaceful. May all the objects be peaceful; may peace itself be peaceful. May that peace come unto me."[161] "May the shining firmament be peace showering to us. May the earth be peace-giving and the vast midregions be blissful, may the waters of the ocean with high tides peaceful and the herbs may also a source of calmness for

---

[156] *Atharva Veda* 12,1,1

[157] *Yajurveda* 40-6

[158] *Atharvaveda* 19,5,1

[159] *Atharva Veda* 19. 15. 6

[160] *Yajurveda* 40.7

[161] *The Yajurveda,* 36.17

us."[162] Herb in my heart, are these five sense-organs with mind, as the sixth ones, which are strengthened and sharpened by Vedic lore and celibacy. By these very organs, by which are created terrific situations, may peace and happiness be brought to us.[163] May oxygen, with a great affinity to combine with other elements like a friend be peaceful to us. May hydrogen, the source of water, be comfortable to us. May the sun, making the living of all creatures possible, be pleasant to us. May death be possible. All the atmosphere be peaceful. May all the planets, moving in the heavens shower peace and tranquility on us.[164]

Adding to the universal peace, Vedas emphasizes on the brotherhood and love. "Let the earth, the atmosphere, the heavens, the waters, the herbs, the plants and trees all the radiant things be each a source of peace and comfort for me. May all the learned people bless me with peace, comfort and happiness, through all means of pacification. May I attain perfect state of calmness by all and sundry means of peace. Whatever there is in this world, terrific, whatever there is cruel in this world, whatsoever there is evil in this world; let all that be harmless for us.[165] O God, the dispeller of ignorance and darkness, strengthen me, may all beings regard me with the eye of a friend. May I regard all beings with the eye of a friend. With the eye of a friend do we regard one another.[166]

Veda talks for the control of mind or self-control for the peace. Cause of the war and conflicts are passion caused by the sense organs. *Samaveda* says, "These lovely organs, longing for the proximity of the soul, in their search for essence, strengthen knowledge. Thy create

---

[162] *The Atharvaveda ,* 19.9.1

[163] *The Atharvaveda ,* 19.9.5

[164] *The Atharvaveda ,* 19.9.7

[165] *The Atharvaveda,* 19.9.14

[166] *The Yajurveda*, 36.18

asceticism, the killer of desires. The soul forces reside in it, under its brilliant control.[167]

Upanishad also discusses about the world peace and humanity – "Together may he protect us: together may passes us: together may we make un to us strength and virility! May what we have studied be full to us of light and power! May we never hate! Om Peace! Peace! Peace!"[168]

Mainly Upanishads are concerned with the truth of the world. It focuses in the ultimate unity of all realities in the universal factors. It is more concerned with harmony and peace. Man cannot be at peace without conquering the divisions and diversity in the society. One should understand the real unity of being for the eternal peace. It says, "For where there is duality as it were, there are smells, another, there one smells another, there one sees another, there one hears another, there one speaks to another, there one thinks of another, there one understands another.[169]

Gita is known as the culmination point of the Vedas and Upanishads. It is known as the conclusion of human knowledge. *Gita* also focuses on the self-realization. When one realizes the truth, there will be no war and conflict in human world.

Gita emphasizes on the self-control for getting peace and happiness. Self-control leads to Peace and Happiness. The self restrained man moving among objects with senses under the control of his own self, free from attachment and aversion, attains to tranquility. In tranquility comes the end of all his sufferings; for the understanding (Buddhi) of him whose mind is tranquil quickly becomes well-settled (in Wisdom).[170] He, who is not selfcontrolled, has no understanding (Buddhi), nor has

---

[167] *Samaveda,* 1006

[168] Sri Aurobindo, *The Upanishads*, Pondicherry, Sri Aurobindo Ashram Trust, 1981, p. 440.

[169] *Brihadaranyak. Upanishad*. II: 4,14

[170] *Bhagvad Gita*: II 64-65

meditation. There is no peace for those who do not do meditation. For, without peace where is happiness? As the whirling wind turns the course of a boat on water, so when mind follows towards objects of senses, the senses destroy the faculty of discrimination of the uncontrolled men and make mind attached to the worldly objects.[171] Krishna Says to Arjuna in *Gita*, "O warrior, whose courses of senses have been stopped or controlled, he is known as a sthitaprajna, i.e. jnani (who has wisdom). Those (objects or knowledge) which are not known to the wise i.e. the enlighten soul, remove the darkness of ignorance and realize the Brahman (Truth).[172] As the ocean which is full of water, is not swelled if water of the rivers enter into it, so anything cannot disturb a self-realized man, because he is contented and satisfied al the time. So a man who lives in this world after controlling his senses, desires and egoism, remains ever-contented, and enjoys eternal peace. It is known as the brahmasthiti, (True attainment in knowledge) and when a man attains to this sublime state, he is never deluded, and in the end i.e. after dissolution of his material body, he enters into brahmarirvana or self-realization.[173]

The realization of oneness is the spiritual, and the only sound, basis of world peace. It is useless to talk about peace before one realizes the spirit of oneness. This is the wonderful message which the ancient sages of India have professed and preached.

"When one sees with an equal eye God residing in every being he does not kill the self by the self." The meaning is: when the unity underlying all phenomenal diversity is realized then comes real love, universal brotherhood. Then all becomes the self. We have to become a samadarshi, or a perceiver of oneness.[174]

---

[171] *Bhagvad Gita*: II 66-67

[172] *Bhagvad Gita*: II 68-69

[173] *Bhagvad Gita*: II 70-72

[174] Swami Gyaneswarananda, The *Spiritual Basis of World Peace and Brotherhood ofMan,* The Vedanta Kesari, Madras, Sri Ramkrishna Math,1966, p. 312.

The world today is surely in need of peace which is eluding its grasp simply because we applaud truth but practice falsehood, we exhort others to honour the law but break the self – same law where we are concerned, we preach our fellowmen to take a vow of service but ourselves we are saturated with selfishness, we admonish others to live an austere life but we roll in luxury. This contrariness in our character is due to the fact that we have faith in the spiritual power which supervises over all that lives and moves and has its being.[175]

Hinduism has got more depth knowledge about life, world and has universal quality. It teaches peace. In fact, we can say that Hinduism is not just a religion; it is a philosophy of peace as well a way of true life. It has shown the self-realization as the way to peace.

Fundamentally, peace has to be viewed as a matter of over-all perception of life, in all its diverse, multifarious dimensions and ramifications - realizing and understanding oneself and one's real identity, understanding the essentials, goals and objectives of life, grasping fully one's role and position in the entire set-up and, above all, one's relationship with the rest of one's fellow beings. If one went about it in all seriousness and sincerity, one would find two things standing out most conspicuously, namely, that man is a far richer and bigger entity than he imagines himself to be and that he is joined with the whole mankind in unbreakable bonds of unity and togetherness. With this realization is bound to dawn on the mental horizon a new awakening, a new approach and outlook on life. As such, one would shake and shed much of one's selfishness and petty-mindedness and start functioning on a much higher and bigger plane. One would adopt an attitude of perfect understanding and sympathy with one's fellow beings and the whole environment would don the apparel of amiability to such a being.[176]

---

[175] Siddhantalankar, Satyavrata, *Exposition of Vedic Though*t, New Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd, 1980, pp. 340.

[176] Gupta, Badlu Ram, *Hinduism The Gospel of Humanity*, Bombay, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1986, pp. 78-79.

By slow but sure training he should keep free himself from the influences of speculative intellect as well as from pure impressions. When that happens, the soul will realize the eternal essence, "I am Brahman". It is this realization that is called knowledge (jnana). This knowledge of Brahman is not discursive but intuitive and experiential. It means freely and truly becoming and partaking of the essence of Brahman, becoming one with Brahman. To become one with Brahman means to be free from any outside influence likely to cause fear or sorrow. The obstacles to self-realization are the stresses of the personal will. They can be overcome only by replacement of the selfish will by one that is personal and universalized. This stage is vidya (Knowledge). And vidya is moksha, attainment of perfect peace.[177]

There are certain obvious requisites of peace. The greatest requirement of peace is that we be at peace with our own selves first. It is given only to a few to exercise control and domination over province to rule and govern ourselves. Yet paradoxically it is something that is the most difficult. We are soon caught in the whirlpool of passions and prejudices and become abject slaves in the hands of wrong habits and an uncultivated mind. There is neither proper balance nor co-ordination between the various activities of life; between physical and mental work, between social engagements and religious and spiritual pursuits, and, above all, between work on the one hand and rest and recreation on the other. The natural consequence of these manifold irregularities is all manner of maladjustment, disharmony, tension and friction in life. Mental peace is the inevitable big casualty in the process.[178]

There is an incurable dissatisfaction in the world which is being realized by the people of the present civilization. Every man realizes it at some stage of his life that there is no meaning to live this life in the

---

[177] Pushparajan, A., *Struggle for Peace,* Journal of Dharma, Vol. xi. No. 2, Madras, Dharma Research Association, 1986.

[178] Gupta, Badlu Ram, *Hinduism The Gospel of Humanity*, Bombay, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1986, pp. 80-81.

conflict. Such feelings come because of the life in material world. There remains a sense of non-fulfillment in life while living with the material pleasures of the world. However, every religion has realized this factor and their teachings are directing for peace and harmony. Religious conception of the life is different than the political and material conception. Religion advocates the mental peace and inner happiness in an individual and ultimately in the world. The essence of a religion consists in awakening men to consciousness of the uncertainty of worldly things and in initiating him to struggle for attaining a real happiness and peace in life.

2.6.2 Christianity and Peace

The doctrinal basis for the Christian commitment to pacifism is explicitly stated in various New Testament passages:

You have heard that it was said, "Love your neighbor and hate your enemy." But I tell you: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you.[179]

Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.[180]

These and related passages have been the subject of endless exegesis by countless theologians and religious teachers over the centuries, but to the earliest Christians and many since, they stand as an unequivocal command to love all unconditionally and are a prohibition against war. Early Christians rejected the bearing of arms and military service even at the cost of a martyr's death. According to Bainton, there is no evidence of Christians serving in the emperor's army prior to the years 170–80 CE.[181] References to participation in the military increase in the years after that, but it was not until the conversion of Constantine in the early fourth century that military service was fully accepted among

---

[179] Matthew 5:43–4.

[180] Romans 12: 21.

[181] Bainton, Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace, pp. 71-72.

Christians. Citations advocating pacifism can be found in the writings of Tertullian, Origen, and Lactantius, and in the testimonies of martyrs Justin, Maximilian, and Marcellus.[182] The early Christians opposed war not only on the basis of Christ's love commandment, but because they considered the oath to the emperor that was required of soldiers a form of idolatry.[183] On a more practical level many early Christians found it difficult to justify serving in an army that persecuted the followers of Jesus.

As the Christian Church crystallized into an established institution the early commitment to pacifism fell by the wayside. When Christianity became a state religion through Constantine, the Church accepted military service as a duty of citizenship. The role of Christianity changed from that of persecuted sect to official belief system. The emergent Church hierarchy fully embraced the imperial system, and only baptized Christians could serve in the Roman army. Ambrose and Augustine codified this accommodation with power into the doctrine of just war, which Grotius and Aquinas later developed further. The classical Roman code of conduct in battle, inherited from Cicero, was reinterpreted in a Christian context to serve as a justification for war. Christians were taught to distinguish between the commitment to love at a personal level and the acceptance of the use of force in political affairs. Augustine claimed on the basis of Old Testament teachings that war is an instrument of divine judgment upon wickedness. He reconciled this with the obviously divergent teachings of the New Testament by insisting that the commandment of love can only be applied in personal relations. The tradition of pacifism was kept alive, but it was confined to the margins of society where minority sects sought to live by Jesus's nonviolent creed. These included the Waldensians beginning in 1170, St. Francis of Assisi (1181–1226) and his Franciscan order, the Lollards of fifteenth-century

---

[182] J. R. Burkholder and Karl Holl, "Pacifism," in The Encyclopedia of Christianity, vol. IV, ed. Erwin Fahlbusch et al. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), p. 2.

[183] David G. Hunter, "A Decade of Research on Early Christians and Military Service," Religious Studies Review 18, no. 2 (April 1992): pp. 87–93.

England, the Hussites and Taborites in the Czech Republic, and their Moravian successors. The most significant of these minority movements were the Anabaptists and Quakers.

The Protestant reformation unleashed a torrent of separatism and violence within Europe, but it also gave birth to the Anabaptist tradition and a movement to recapture the irenic principles at the heart of the Christian Gospel. In the sixteenth century Conrad Grebel, Menno Simons, and other Christian reformers created a distinct religious community based on the practice of adult baptism and a commitment to the literal interpretation of Christ's call to "resist not evil." They were greatly influenced by Erasmus, whose famous Complaint of Peace (written in 1516) railed against the wickedness of war and the "sinister spectacle" of bishops and cardinals arousing the faithful to battle.[184] Erasmus combined religious analysis and rational humanism in an eloquent rebuke of war and defense of Christ's message of peace. "When one considers the whole life of Jesus," he wrote, "what is it if not an uninterrupted lesson in peace and mutual love?"[185] Erasmus's interpretation of Christ inspired the Mennonites, who used his translation and Annotations of the New Testament as their Gospel text.[186] The Anabaptists rejected all forms of armed violence as a sin against God and refused to serve as soldiers or to participate in war. Because government authority is based on coercion and the threat of violence, they believed, the affairs of state were inherently sinful and corrupt. They were deeply pessimistic about human nature and had little faith in the possibility of secular social reform. They rejected the established political order but made little attempt to change it. Most withdrew from state affairs in quasi-anarchist fashion into mostly agricultural communities.

---

[184] José Chapiro and Desiderius Erasmus, Erasmus and Our Struggle for Peace (Boston, The Beacon Press,1950), p. 161.

[185] Quoted in 'Chapiro and Erasmus, Erasmus and Our Struggle for Peace', p. 145.

[186] Abraham Friesen, *Erasmus, the Anabaptists and the Great Commission* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans,1998), p. 38.

After their emergence in northern Switzerland and southern Germany in the sixteenth century and the persecution they suffered in the religious wars of that era, the Mennonites emigrated in considerable number to North America in search of land and religious freedom. As they settled in the United States and Canada over the centuries, they remained a people apart, carefully sustaining their pacifist beliefs and their rejection of the state's war-making authority. They preferred to live a quiet existence as farmers in rural communities and to register as conscientious objectors to military service. By the second half of the twentieth century, however, withdrawal from the challenges of war and armed violence became less viable. Mennonite communities were no longer as isolated as they once were. Their lives increasingly intertwined with mainstream society. Some Mennonites became uncomfortable with the limitations of the traditional doctrine of nonresistance. Standing aside from the epic struggle against fascism during World War II, or from the movements for civil rights and peace in subsequent decades, no longer seemed morally justified. J. Lawrence Burkholder and others questioned the pursuit of moral perfectionism in an imperfect world. The problem with traditional Mennonite ethics, Burkholder wrote, was that it "had failed to come to terms with this social reality."[187] In 1972 John Howard Yoder published his provocative and highly influential book, The Politics of Jesus,[188] which argued that Christians were called to act against injustice and violence. Mennonites became increasingly engaged in working for peace. Some participated actively in antiwar movements, while others became mediators and created international conciliation programs. In recent decades Mennonites have become a major force in organized movements for peace and conciliation around the world.

The Quakers, or the Society of Friends, shared the Mennonite commitment to uncompromising Christian love, but they sought to

---

[187] J. Lawrence Burkholder, "The Limits of Perfection: Autobiographical Reflections," in The Limits of Perfection: A Conversation with J. Lawrence Burkholder, ed. Rodney J. Sawatsky and Scott Holland (Waterloo, Ontario: Institute of Anabaptist and Mennonite Studies, Conrad Grebel College, 1993), pp. 32–33.

[188] John Howard Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972).

transform the world rather than withdraw from it. Arising in Cromwell's England in the mid-seventeenth century, the Friends stressed the inner light of personal revelation, guided by the Christian Gospel, as their basis for the rejection of war and violence. They sought to reform society and bring moral principles into the public square. Through the teachings of founder George Fox and other early Friends, the Quakers developed a distinct religious tradition that included a strong pacifist commitment. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the Friends adopted a biblically oriented emphasis on the Christian teaching of nonresistance and uncompromising love. In the twentieth century Quaker pacifists renewed their emphasis on the Inner Light as the primary basis for their rejection of war and armed violence.

Unlike other pacifists Quakers did not shy away from confronting social evil. Theirs was an outward looking creed that sought to influence politics and social policy.[189] From their earliest origins, they developed a tradition of "speaking truth to power." William Penn, the Quaker founder of Pennsylvania, said that "true godliness" does not turn men out of the world but "excites their endeavours to mend it."[190] From 1682 until 1756 the Quakers dominated the political life of provincial Pennsylvania in the so-called "holy experiment," a partly successful attempt to establish government on the basis of Christian principles of love and charity. Penn and his successors were particularly effective in maintaining cordial relations with the native first American communities of the colony. Quakers in England and the USA were leaders in major social reform movements for free trade, the abolition of slavery, and women's suffrage. They were active in rejecting the military encroachments of the Crown and speaking out against war. William Penn's 1693 Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe was one of the earliest treatises on international peace. In the early nineteenth century Quakers in Britain and

---

[189] Peter Brock and Nigel Young, *Pacifism in the Twentieth Century* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1999), pp. 7- 9.

[190] Quoted in Marjorie Sykes, *Quakers in India: A Forgotten Century* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1980), p. 106.

the USA were among the first to promote the cause of peace and war prevention, and they were founders and leaders of the earliest peace societies. Quakers have been at the forefront of nearly every major peace movement in modern US and British history. They have been pioneers in the field of peace research and helped to establish some of the earliest conciliation and conflict transformation programs.

2.6.3 Islam and Peace

Islam lacks a consistent teaching or practice of pacifism and is often misunderstood as a religion of the sword that justifies the use of violence to spread the faith. While the principles of nonviolence are not well developed within Islam, a few minority pacifist sects exist, including the Maziyariyah and Ahmadiyah movements. Concepts of peace are at the core of Muslim teaching. The term salaam, etymologically related to the Hebrew shalom, envisions a peaceful, harmonious social order of justice toward all without violence or conflict. In Arabic salaam is translated as peace and is considered one of the holy names of God.[191] The Sufi tradition of mysticism embodies many principles that are compatible with nonviolence. The Sufis emphasize the inner struggle to perfect one's love of God and to achieve harmony and compassion with others. To be one with nature and God is to be in a state of peace. Sufis consider Islam a religion of universalism, tolerance, peace, and reconciliation.

Islam teaches that life is sacred and that the believer has a duty to uphold truth and justice. Egalitarianism and social justice are core principles of Islam. As writer Reza Aslan noted, "benevolence and care for the poor were the first and most enduring virtues preached by Muhammad in Mecca."[192] According to the Qur'an piety lies:

---

[191] Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *The Heart of Islam: Enduring Values for Humanity* (San Francisco, CA: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002), p. 217.

[192] Aslan, No god but God, p. 60.

"…not in turning your face East or West in prayer . . . but in distributing your wealth out of love for God to your needy kin; to the orphans, to the vagrants, and to the mendicants; it lies in freeing the slaves, in observing your devotions, and in giving alms to the poor."[193]

Pursuing justice in the face of oppression and suffering is the personal and collective duty of every Muslim. It is impossible for a Muslim to practice his or her faith without a commitment to social welfare. The concept of withdrawal from the concerns of society has no place within Islam. For Muslims peace is not merely the absence of war or organized violence. It is also the presence of justice and the creation of conditions in which humans can realize their full potential.[194]

No concept in Islam is more frequently misunderstood and misinterpreted than jihad. The term literally means struggle or striving, an exertion or great effort. Its primary religious connotation is the struggle of the soul to overcome evil and sin, to submit completely to God's will and strive for moral perfection. This inward or spiritual struggle is defined as greater jihad. Because the inner struggle for holiness is inseparable from the outward struggle for social justice, jihad also has a secondary connotation. This lesser jihad calls the believer to struggle against oppression and tyranny, by military means if necessary. This concept of militant struggle is used by contemporary Islamic extremists to justify armed violence and terrorism for the supposed purpose of defending Islam. Al Qaida and other extremist groups manipulate and exploit Islam, wrote Aslan, "to give religious sanction to what are in actuality social and political agendas."[195] This was not how Mohammed intended the term, nor how many Islamic scholars through the ages have interpreted it. Jihad cannot be simply equated with military struggle, although its association

---

[193] Qur'an 2:177.

[194] Abdul Aziz Said, Nathan C. Funk, and Ayse S. Kadayifci, "Introduction: Islamic Approaches to Peaceand Conflict Resolution," in Peace and Conflict Resolution in Islam: Precept and Practice (Lanham,MD: University Press of America, 2001), p. 7.

[195] Aslan, No god but God, p. 81.

with violence is undeniable.[196] Its primary meaning is spiritual struggle to achieve complete submission to God.

The Qur'an clearly allows the use of force, as evident in passages instructing believers to "slay the polytheists wherever you confront them"[197] and "carry the struggle to the hypocrites who deny the faith."[198] Not just the Qur'an but also the sunnah and hadith provide ample foundation for a tradition of justified violence.[199] So does the experience of the Prophet as military leader during the Medina period. These traditions have been used by some Islamic scholars to assert the principle of religious war to convert unbelievers. Over the last century Islamists have seized upon this interpretation to promote a militant interpretation of jihad. In Saudi Arabia Palestinian scholar Abdullah Azzam (1941–1989) taught a violent version of jihad that influenced the founding of the Palestinian militant group Hamas and that had exceptional impact on one of his students in particular, Osama bin Laden.[200]

Many Islamic scholars have contested this justification of holy war as a distortion of the Prophet's teachings. They point to the cardinal principle in the Qur'an that "there can be no compulsion in religion."[201] On this point the Qur'an is unequivocal: "The truth is from your Lord; believe it if you like, or do not."[202] The message to non-Muslims is, "To

---

[196] In about two-thirds of the instances in which the verb jahada or its derivatives appear in the Qur'an, it is associated with warfare. Freedman and McClymond, "Religious Traditions," 235.

[197] Qur'an 9:5.

[198] Qur'an 9:73.

[199] According to Ronnie Hassan, the Sunnah was "established during [the Prophet Muhammed's] life for all to follow and to pass on for generations . . . a set of practices that the Prophet taught the Muslims to follow;" and Hadith "is a narration of the words or acts of the Prophet, as perceived and transmitted by one or more persons who heard or saw the Prophet saying or performing these acts." See Ronnie Hassan, "Hadith and Sunnah – Two Different Concepts," Understanding Islam, 28 March 2003. Available online at Understanding Islam, www.understanding-islam.com/related/text.asp?type= article&aid=186&ssc (accessed: 8/03/2007).

[200] Aslan, No god but God, p. 86.

[201] Qur'an 2:256.

[202] Qur'an 18:29.

you your religion, to me mine."[203] These passages counsel tolerance and patience toward other faiths and in no way provide justification for religious war. The Qur'an places limits on the use of force. The concept of lesser jihad can be considered a rudimentary just war theory.[204] According to this interpretation, the Qur'an prohibited aggression and all but strictly defensive wars. It established previously unrecognized distinctions between combatants and noncombatants. The Qur'an teaches "do not begin hostilities; God does not like the aggressor."[205] Killing is permitted only in response to murder or in the case of "villainy in the land." Permission to fight is given only to those who are oppressed or who have been driven from their homes.[206]

Although violence is permitted for just cause in Islam, some Muslim reformers have interpreted jihad in the context of nonviolence and have advocated the use of peaceful means to overcome oppression. They find inspiration for this approach in Qur'anic teachings that extol patience and forgiveness. TheQur'an acknowledges the right of retribution but states "those who forgive the injury and make reconciliation will be rewarded by God."[207]

One of history's most important Muslim practitioners of nonviolent action was Abdul Ghaffar Khan, a prominent ally of Gandhi from the Pashtun region of northwest Pakistan who led a significant mass movement of nonviolent direct action among people with a fierce warrior ethic. Khan was inspired by Gandhi, but he was committed to nonviolence before he met the Mahatma. He was motivated primarily by his interpretation of the Qur'an and hadith.[208] He combined the principle

---

[203] Qur'an 109:6.

[204] Aslan, *No god but God*, p. 81.

[205] Qur'an 2:190.

[206] Qur'an 22:39.

[207] Qur'an 42:40.

[208] Mukulika Banerjee, *The Pathan Unarmed: Opposition & Memory in the North West Frontier* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2000), 146.

of struggling against injustice with the call for patience and endurance. He told his followers:

> I am going to give you such a weapon that the police and the army will not be able to stand against it. It is the weapon of the Prophet, but you are not aware of it. That weapon is patience and righteousness. No power on earth can stand against it . . . tell your brethren that there is an army of God, and its weapon is patience.[209]

Khan created the Khudai Khidmatgar, the "Servants of God," as a nonviolent army of determined nonviolent resistance against British rule. Eventually numbering some 100,000 members, the Khudai Khidmatgar employed rigorous training methods to instill discipline, physical stamina, and courage. Members wore military-style uniforms with distinctive red shorts and marched in regimental-style formations, while maintaining strict nonviolent discipline. The Khudai Khidmatgars participated in resistance campaigns, performed poverty relief and humanitarian services, and contributed significantly to the ultimate success of the freedom movement.[210] When Khan died in 1988, vast crowds gathered in his honor throughout northwest Pakistan. Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi attended the funeral, and a one-day ceasefire was declared in the Soviet-Afghan war raging nearby.[211] All came to pay homage to the person who channeled the Muslim principle of jihad into a Remarkable movement of nonviolent resistance against injustice. The example of Khan and the Khudai Khidmatgar stands as a model for those who would seek to struggle for justice while remaining true to the meaning of salaam.

---

[209] Abdul Ghaffar Kahn quoted in Robert C. Johansen, "Radical Islam and Nonviolence: A Case Study of Religious Empowerment and Constraint among Pashtuns," Journal of Peace Research 34, no. 1 (February 1997): 58.

[210] Eknath Easwaran, *A Man to Match His Mountains: Badshahkhan, Nonviolent Soldier of Islam* (Petaluma, CA: Nilgiri Press, 1984), 111–13, 121–8, 168–9.

[211] Banerjee, The Pathan Unarmed, p. 8.

Now a word about Buddhist religion of peace in the discussion of the contribution of the main living religions to peace, Buddhism is not brought to discussion. How does Buddhism talk about, teach and show the ways to peace? It will be presented in the next chapter.