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INTRODUCTION

The origins of “peace studies” as an academic discipline can be traced to the late 1940s, and the field has been developing steadily since then. The peace studies approach to international relations and conflicts was founded by a group of scholars with backgrounds in economics and the social sciences, including Kenneth Boulding, Howard Raiffa and Anatol Rapaport. The backdrop of the Cold War and the political reaction against the threat of nuclear war provided a major impetus for the growth of peace studies, which many people saw as an antidote to programs in war studies, strategic studies, etc. that also developed on many campuses during this period. In the early 1960s, during the Kennedy Administration in the U.S., in particular, new emphases in the government that were reflected in the creation of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), in order to “balance” the influence and power of the Defense Department and Pentagon. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, and the concern that the policies of strategic deterrence had brought the world to the brink of nuclear annihilation, accelerated the growth of peace and conflict resolution studies in academic frameworks.

In parallel, the concept of peace and disarmament studies began to develop in Scandinavia, including the establishment of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRI), and related programs at a number of universities. Alva Myrdal, a prominent Swedish diplomat, who wrote The Game of Disarmament (1976), played a central role in the founding of SIPRI and the promotion of this area of research and analysis. In addition, the controversies and political upheaval over the Vietnam War, including large scale protests centered on university campuses contributed to the growing interest in peace studies. The late 1960s and early 1970s saw a major increase in research projects and courses related to "Problems of War and Peace", and these often evolved into full-fledged degree granting
peace studies programs. One of the first, at Colgate University, explicitly noted the link between the founding of a peace studies program on campus and “the continuing nuclear arms race and the protracted war in Indochina”. In other instances, the role of religious institutions in the development of academic programs was central. For example, the Department of Peace Studies at Bradford University in England was established in the early 1970s, under the influence of the Quaker denomination (Society of Friends).

Funds from philanthropic organizations such as the Institute for World Order, and the Ford and McArthur foundations were allocated to the development of courses and research programs on conflict resolution on many campuses, particularly in the U.S. This process reinforced the links between policy, politics, and academic activities in the realm of peace studies. The trend continued during the era of negotiations between East and West during the 1970s, including the SALT agreements, as well as the Helsinki process, with its emphasis on confidence building measures (CBMs) and links between the three baskets – security, economic interdependence, and civil society (democracy, human rights, press freedom, etc.) In these processes, academic involvement in the negotiations, as well as track two meetings and publication of analyses, was very significant. Quasi-academic groups such as Pugwash provided informal and unofficial frameworks for discussions that were designed to influence public policy. At the same time, the academic community published analyses, developed theories and held conferences based on these activities. Major universities in different countries opened such programs; some based on the discipline of international relations or international law, others in the framework of political studies or psychology and yet others as interdisciplinary programs. Over the years, these programs became independent, offering advanced degrees and hiring specialized tenured faculty. In addition, a number of journals in this field have been established, such as the Journal of Conflict Resolution, the Journal of Peace Studies, International Negotiation, etc. The creation of the government-funded U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP) in the 1980s marked a further landmark in this process.

In this period, a number of theories and models have been developed and are used widely in research activities. These research frameworks include approaches based
on game theory, “reconciliation”, pre-negotiation, “ripeness”, and mediation. A wide research literature has developed focusing on these frameworks and their applications. Many of these publications seek to apply the models and analytical frameworks to real cases of international conflict, such as Israeli-Palestinian conflict resolution, India and Pakistan, Cyprus, Northern Ireland, etc. However, as the continuing conflicts in most of these areas illustrate, the field of peace studies has not been able to make much of a difference, in terms of providing empirically useful description or realistic prescription. Further, peace and conflict studies are subject to increasing criticism reflecting the impact of ideological and subjective political positions that go far beyond the boundaries of careful and value-free academic discourse.

MEANING OF PEACE

“Peace” is a word that is uttered almost as frequently as “truth,” “beauty,” and “love.” It may be just as elusive to define as these other virtues. Common synonyms for “peace” include “amity,” “friendship,” “harmony,” “concord,” “tranquility,” “repose,” “quiescence,” “truce,” “pacification,” and “neutrality.” Any attempt to articulate the nature of peace and peacemaking, therefore, must address those conditions which are favorable to their emergence. Freedom, human rights, and justice are among such prerequisites. Also included are proactive strategies such as conflict resolution, nonviolent action, community building, and democratization of authority.¹

The English Lexion is quite rich in its supply of terms that refer to and denote peace. In Webster’s Third New International Dictionary, peace is initially defined as “freedom from civil clamour and confusion” and positively as “a state of public quite”. This denotes “Negative” and “Positive” peace in their political “outer” sense. Webster’s proceeds further to define (political or outer) peace positively as “a state of security or order within a community provided by law, custom or public opinion.” The second definition of peace, according to Websters, is a “mental or spiritual condition marked by freedom from disquieting or oppressive thoughts or emotions.” This is peace in its personel or “inner” sense, “peace of mind,” as well as “calmness of mind and heart: serenity of spirit” (inner peace). Third, meaning of peace is “a tranquil state of freedom from outside disturbances and harassment.” Fourth, meaning of peace is “harmony in

¹ http://oz.plymouth.edu/~lsandy/peacedef.html, Accessed on 17.07 12
human or personel relations: mutual concord and esteem.” This is what we might call 
interpersonnel and intersudjective peace. Fifth meaning of peace by Webster’s is “a 
state of mutual concord between governments and absence of hostilities or war.” The 
sixth meaning of peace is “absence of activity and noise: deep stillness or quietness ,” or 
what may be called positive inner peace. And in seventh and final Lexico-graphical 
meaning, peace is personified as “one that makes, gives and maintains tranquility.” This 
is what might be called divine or perpetual peace, with God being the ultimate cause of 
peace on earth and as identified with peace, or peace itself.

Peace like many theoretical terms is difficult to define. But like happiness, 
harmony, justice, and freedom, peace is something we recognize by its absence. 
Consequently, Johan Galtung, a founder of peace studies and peace research, has 
proposed the important distinction between positive and negative peace. Positive peace 
denotes the simultaneous presence of many desirable states of mind and society, such as 
harmony, justice, equity, etc. Negative peace has historically denoted the absence of war 
and other forms of large-scale violent human conflict. 

Within peace studies, “peace” is defined not just as the absence of war , but also 
the presence of the conditions for a just and sustainable peace, including access to food 
and clean drinking water, education for women and children, security from physical 
harm, and other inviolable human rights. This idea is rooted in the understanding that a 
“just peace” is the only sustainable kind of peace; an approach that seeks merely to 
“stop the guns” while ignoring the denial of human rights and unjust social and political 
conditions does not work in the long run.

# CONCEPT OF PEACE AND VIOLENCE

The concept of peace is more clearly understood in comparison with the concept of 
violence.

**Direct and Structural violence**

The most obvious form of violence is an act to do physical harm to other people. As 
various conditions exist to cause human suffering, the structural and institutional 
conditions for violence began to draw attention from peace researchers. As an opposite
concept of peace, therefore there are two types of violence, direct and structural. Both forms of violence are present in various social relations.

**Direct violence**

Direct violence is referred to as physical injuries and the infliction of pain that is caused by a specific person. Thus killing and beating, whether they happen in war or interpersonal situations, represent direct violence. Direct violence may also take the form of verbal and psychological abuse. In direct violence, clear subject-action-object relationships are established, as we observe someone who hurts other people by a violent act. Direct violence generally works fast and dramatically. It is personal, visible, manifest and non-structural. It is carried over time by traumas left behind by its effects of harming the body, mind and spirit. 

The use of physical force happens even randomly or intentionally in diverse types of social setting. Whereas violence in interpersonal relations may be employed as an instrument for robbery, revenge or honour, states use organized violence to achieve foreign policy goals. 

Mass violence such as war and revolution brings about social change and a power imbalance. At a group level, the infliction of physical injury or death on other people is a deliberate policy that serves particular interests. Such physical violence as imprisonment and torture is often used for political purposes. The capacity for violence is institutionalized in prison systems, concentration camps, military forces and militia.

Recent history is filled with various forms of genocide in which one group carefully applies violent tactics to eliminate another. Nazi Germany killed millions of European Jews and other ethnic minority groups. More than one million Indonesians were accused of being communists and were executed or tortured by the Suharto regime in the mid-1960s. The majority of indigenous populations in America have been wiped out for the last several centuries by systematic policies to occupy their land. Genocide.

**Structural violence**

---

Poverty, hunger, repression and social alienation constitute another way to characterize situations causing human misery. Quality of life is reduced by denial of educational opportunities, free speech and freedom of association. These conditions are associated with uneven life chances, inequitable distribution of resources and uneven decision-making power. Given its indirect and insidious nature, structural violence most often works slowly in eroding human values and shortening life spans. It is typically built into the very structure of society and cultural institutions. Inegalitarian and discriminatory practices can be imposed on individual or groups in systematic and organized ways by political institutions.  

Structural violence is apparent in social systems maintained by exploitative means (slavery) throughout human history. Oppression is embedded in a situation in which one person exploits another person or hinders his or her pursuit of self-affirmation as a responsible person. Such a situation in itself constitutes violence even when sweetened by false generosity, because it interferes with the individuals ontological and historical vocation to be more fully human. Thus oppressions, as a form of structural violence, can be maintained by manipulations of relations.

Discrimination results in denying people important rights such as economic opportunities, social and political equality and a sense of autonomy and freedom. The gross violation of human rights and dignity prevents the optimum development of each human being. The lack of an opportunity for self-fulfillment can be based on race, religion, gender, sexual preference, economic status or age. If a young female’s need for education is not provided adequately because of gender differences, it constitutes inequitable life conditions. When poor starve to death because of lack of food (which is abundant to others), an exploitative economic system contributing to the monopoly of wealth by a few becomes a source of structural violence. Certain types of economic structure perpetuate a situation where most basic standards necessary for staying alive are not met. According to some statistics, the loss of life attributed to malnutrition and starving exceeds the number of people who have been killed by war. In many societies, some people are dying of lack of protein or health care while a few enjoy a

7 A.Wenden, Defining Peace: Perspectives from Peace Research in Schaffner, A.Wenden, Language and Peace, Dartmouth, Aldershot, 1992, p.3-16
luxurious way of life. Social stability based on law and order without providing the means for survival is regarded as only privilege for a select few.

If human beings are denied decent education, housing, an opportunity to work and freedom to express themselves, they become marginalized. Conditions for social fragmentations are created by a lack of equity and freedom. In some societies, an oppressive structure is maintained simply by its ability to put down revolts and other types of challenges. Organized struggle against political repression is very difficult under tight social control of fear and prosecution. At an international level, a lack of war for an extended period does not mean the existence of harmonious relations in the sense that it can be sustained by hegemonic order imposed by an empire or a powerful state.

The absence of direct violence does not necessarily mean the satisfaction of conditions for maintaining decent human life. The concept of structural violence helps us understand deep causes of conflict ingrained in political oppression and economic despair. Given that gross social injustice can be maintained by personal violence, structural violence is more easily noticed in a society that is governed by fear and repression. When coercive mechanisms are effective, structural violence is not challenged for a long time. However, prolonging exploitative conditions eventually produces violent resistance like liberation movements during the western colonial domination in Africa and Asia.

Dominant relationships are often established as a result of military conquest. Destructive means are employed to force other people to accept unjust conditions or economic inequality. At the same time, coercion can be sustained by a psychological process. Threats of injury may bring complacency and repress a demand for change. The asymmetric power relationship can become latent, impersonal, subtle and unintentional once the will of one side is imposed on the other by the organized use of force.

**Cultural violence**

Cultural violence is seen as the source of other types of violence through its production of hatred, fear and suspicion. Religion, ideology, art, empirical science, as they touch upon ‘the symbolic sphere of our existence’ can be pointed out as possible sources of
cultural violence. 10 More specifically, crosses, crescents, military parades, flags, inflammatory speeches and posters have instigated certain groups of people to kill and harm those who belong to other groups. In many societies, these symbols or events have also been used to create barriers to discriminate against people who do not share them. Certain cultural elements are linked to direct and structural violence through their value justification and the legitimization of their instruments. In religion, there is a sharp distinction between chosen people and outsiders beyond its accepted boundaries. Nationalism justified through state ideology or ethnicity has been promoted for war. Limitations of someone’s right may derive from cultural principals of marginalization imposed by oppressors. 11 Some rules of structural violence such as authoritarianism or discrimination based on gender and race are typically condoned by cultural norms. In the hierarchical social values of a modern industrial society, some people are more valued because of their class or professional qualification. The elements do not necessarily represent the entire culture but are particular aspects of the culture. Distortion of knowledge and images about other people is maintained by a socialization process. As both manifest and latent violence have a cultural layer, cultural practice is not strictly separated from the two main types of violence. Minimization of cultural violence goes along with reduction in structural and direct violence. 12

NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE PEACE

Contrary to the traditional definition of peace as absence of war, the concept of peace is now broadly understood to include many situations that guarantee positive human conditions. The realization of peace prevents the loss of life and human capacity. Thus, peace ultimately has to be obtained by changing social structures that are responsible for death, poverty and malnutrition.

NEGATIVE PEACE

Negative peace focus on the absence of direct violence such as war. It can be brought about by various approaches. The prevention and eliminating of manifest use of violence require resolving differences through negotiations and mediation rather than

resorting to physical force. Nonviolent means foster the avoidance of physical force. Total disarmament reduces the potential for future armed struggle. Social and economic interdependence discourages the use of force in conflict situations. The notion of a stable social order is form of negative peace.\textsuperscript{13} In real politik, international stability and order are often brought about by dominant military force. The idea of imposing peace has also been reflected in many international arrangements. The mechanisms of collective security included in the League of Nations and the United Nations reflect the notion of guaranteeing peace approach. Preventing war also requires a large array of international agreements and institution that can support stable relations among nations.

Given that imposed order contributes to sustaining the status quo, it does not seriously question the causes of recurring violence in existing social relations. Negative peace policies may focus on a present, short or near future term. Due to the fact that stability and order can be maintained by an oppressive system, negative peace is compatible with structural violence. In the situation, the absence of physical violence can derive from deterrence strategies to punish enemies. Lasting condition of peace is not synonymous with the preservation of intervals between outbreaks of warfare. War cannot be eradicated as long as militarism remains a prevalent value. The system that prepares society for war has to be changed in such a way to construct a more humane world order.

Throughout history, people have recognized the absurdity and horror of war, even as they have engaged in it. There has been no shortage of proposed solutions to the problems posed by war. The simplest solution, perhaps, is to say no to war. But this turns out to be no solution at all, if only because it is difficult to say no. Although seemingly straightforward moral judgments and outright condemnation undeniably are appealing to many people, most nations have not able to say no to war still to prevent war, many different solutions have been proposed, and some have even be implemented.\textsuperscript{14} Negative peace persists in the form of:

(i)\textbf{Peace enforcement}

\textsuperscript{13} A.Wenden, Defining peace: Perspectives From Peace Research, A.Wenden, Language and Peace, Dartmouth, Aldershot, 1995, p. 3-16.

\textsuperscript{14} David P. Barrash, Charles P. Webel, Peace and conflict Studies, Sage, United Kingdom, 2009, p.219
Operations undertaken to end military or violent exchanges or acts of aggression, with or without the consent of one or more parties to the conflict, to create a permanent and viable environment and guarantees for such conditions. Peace enforcement is typically associated with the employment of military forces in order minimally to generate ‘negative peace’, or the absence of violent conflict engagement. Such activities are usually considered as a phase in more extensive operations, including peacekeeping and peace building, but attempts to distinguish and define the interplay among such initiatives remain controversial. Although peace enforcement is predominantly understood in terms of military interventions, a broader interpretation includes the use of a wide range of collectively enacted sanctions by any party to a given conflict in order to end the violent hostilities. A general set of objectives for such an operation may include the following: forcible compliance of cease fires, separation of belligerents, isolation of a particular party or parties to the conflict establishment of buffer zones or safe havens, decommissioning of arms and demobilization of combatants, protection of human rights, and assistance with humanitarian aid. The difficulty of conceptualizing ‘peace enforcement’ is exacerbated by the legal interpretations that define the mandates, means, and evaluations of operations. Chapter VII of the UN Charter is commonly cited as providing the legal provisos of peace enforcement operations. Arguments have been put forward, however, on behalf of Articles 42, 43, and 47. Until recently, peace enforcement operations have typically been led and commanded by specified members of the United Nations, although the forces themselves are normally multinational and rotational. Efforts have been increased to ensure the neutrality of forces so as not to precipitate or encourage the pursuit of strategic or other interests on the part of those intervening or their respective governments. During the cold war, the stipulations for peace enforcement primarily lay dormant, with some limited exceptions, including in Korea (1950–52) and in the Congo (1960–63). The 1990s saw a considerable expansion of peace enforcement operations and a concurrent growth of interest in refinement of its theory and practice. Recent examples include northern Iraq (1991), Angola (1991–94), Liberia (1992–93), Bosnia (1992–95), Somalia (1992–95), Haiti (1993–94), Rwanda (1994–96), Zaire (1995–96), and Kosovo (the southernmost province of the former Yugoslavia) (1999). As a result, confusion and deficiencies emerged in this expanded
interpretation as well as perplexity over peacekeeping operations and peace building. Nonetheless, the protection of civilians has remained the essential element of all peace enforcement operations, and failures to accomplish this most basic provision have generated extensive criticism, particularly regarding Rwanda and Bosnia.

(ii) Peace building

Policies, programs, and associated efforts to restore stability and the effectiveness of social, political, and economic institutions and structures in the wake of a war or some other debilitating or catastrophic event. Peace building generally aims to create and ensure the conditions for ‘negative peace’, the mere absence of violent conflict engagement, and for ‘positive peace’, a more comprehensive understanding related to the institutionalization of justice and freedom. The UN peace building operations in Namibia in 1978 were then understood primarily as a form of post-conflict reconstruction. The conceptualization of peace building, however, has since expanded, as can be seen in the 1992 and 1995 editions of former UN secretary-general Boutros Boutros-Ghali’s An Agenda for Peace. Although speaking in relation to post-conflict situations, Boutros identified a range of peace-building programmes, including ‘cooperative projects that not only contribute to economic and social development but also enhance the confidence that is so fundamental to peace’. More specifically, he mentions activities focusing on agriculture, transportation, resource management, cultural exchanges, educational projects, and simplification of visa regimes. The United Nations has launched several initiatives that involve elements of peace building, including the peace building Support Offices under the Department of Political Affairs, first operative in Liberia in the late 1990s and later in Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic. Yet peace building involves a wide range of international donors, aid agencies, and international, regional, community, and grassroots civil society organizations. Such initiatives have revolved around several foci. The following represents a small selection of them: assisting an end to military or violent exchanges through the decommissioning of arms, the demobilization of combatants, and rehabilitation and reintegration programmes providing humanitarian relief to victims protecting human rights ensuring security and related services generating an environment of trust in order for social relations to function properly, establishing non-violent modes of resolving present and
future conflicts, fostering reconciliation among the various parties to a conflict, providing psycho-social or trauma healing services to victims of severe, Atrocities, repatriating refugees and resettling internally displaced persons, aiding in economic reconstruction, building and maintaining the operation of institutions to provide such services, and co-coordinating the roles of numerous internal and external parties involved in such interrelated efforts. Although isolated or partial elements of such a conception of peace building have been implemented to alleviate the consequences of past wars and acute conflicts, the integration of this complex model of processes is a relatively new phenomenon. The changing nature of war, and the increasing frequency of wars within nation states as opposed to between them, has also complicated peace-building initiatives.

To date, no comprehensive formula for peace building exists. Such efforts have been developed and implemented mostly on an ad hoc basis, and they vary widely from case to case in accordance with local and temporal circumstances. As an extremely broad concept encompassing democracy, development, gender, human rights, and justice peace building can be thought of as a bridge from conflict resolution to ‘positive peace’. Peace building aims to create and foster stability and adequate functioning of a region or society. Attempts to refine and implement peace building have encountered several difficulties, including the following: failures to address the underlying or root causes of the conflict, lack of legitimacy in the eyes of recipients and target groups, particularly in, relation to newly formed institutions, lack of agreement over the acceptance of roles and implementation of responsibilities by all parties to the conflict, limits on leadership in times of political transition or extreme crisis, over-reliance on external parties, aspirations to build a society that functions generally better than it did prior to the conflict In addition to noting such complications, practitioners and commentators have raised theoretical criticisms and questions as well. First, the activities of relief and development have usually been conducted and studied separately, and their intersections are not well defined. Peace building bridges this traditional divide, but a reformulation is needed for integrating the theory and practice of these interconnected disciplines. Second, peace building seems to suggest long-term, extensive effort and commitment by parties to the conflict and external partners.
Conceptualizing a timeframe for such efforts has generated considerable debate. Third, peace building is often understood as the final phase of a conflict, yet some argue that such processes can begin in the midst of a violent conflict. Fourth, the importance of gender in relation to conflict and peace building continues to be overlooked, often completely. The sufferings resulting from conflict affect men and women differently and their subsequent roles in peace building differ as well.

(iii) Conflict management

 Interventionist efforts towards preventing the escalation and negative effects, especially violent ones, of ongoing conflicts. Rarely are conflicts completely resolved. More often, they are reduced, downgraded, or contained. Such developments can be followed by a reorientation of the issue, reconstitution of the divisions among conflicting parties, or even by a re-emergence of past issues or grievances. Conflict management when actively conducted is, therefore, a constant process. A variety of techniques have been identified and employed in conflict management efforts. The following are the most prominent: First, conflicting parties are brought together to establish a mutual agreement. Second, governments or third parties to the strife may directly intervene to introduce or impose a decision. Third, new initiatives, programmes, or institutional structures (for example, elections) are implemented to address the conflict in question. Fourth, contending parties are compelled or coerced to utilise previously established means of resolution or containment. Fifth, government or another third party may use coercion to eliminate or instill fear among one or all those engaged in a given conflict, leading to subsidence. Conflict management should not be viewed as a simple, linear or structured process. Those assuming or charged with such a task must usually overcome an intensely chaotic situation. Conflicts are frequently managed directly by the society in which they occur. When not possible or when conflicts become national in scope, government normally assumes the task, provided it is not a party to the conflict. In cases where a government is unable or unwilling to intervene, international organisations increasingly assume the role of conflict manager.

(iv) Conflict prevention

 The anticipation of conflict that seeks to redress causal grievances to avoid the escalation of violent forms of conflict engagement or to curtail the re-occurrence of
violent exchanges or some combination of these elements. The term ‘conflict prevention’ can be misleading, because theoretically none of the aforementioned aspects aspire to ‘prevent’ conflict as such. Instead, the aim is often to resolve a conflict at hand or more typically to prevent escalation or violent manifestations. Although at times referred to as ‘preventive diplomacy’ and ‘crisis prevention’, such activities usually involve maintaining the status quo due to potential threats associated with crises or the anticipated outcomes from engaging in a dispute. Conflict prevention, however, recognizes that in order to avoid the catastrophes associated with strife, particularly violent upheaval, change is usually necessary, for example, through new institutions, revitalized processes, or the sharing of power. In any case, conflict prevention as an approach relies heavily on accurate analysis of any latent or minor disputes in the hopes of identifying appropriate strategies for resolution or intervention. Such efforts are collectively categorized as ‘early warning systems’, which vary in complexity and approach. They may include fact-finding missions, consultations, inspections, report mechanisms, and monitoring. The predictive nature of conflict prevention raises several issues, particularly regarding the timing of intervention and the possibility of precipitating pre-emptive action by parties beyond the conflict. Humanitarian and moral concerns are often insufficient for initiating effective conflict prevention efforts, even in the face of egregiously violent circumstances. As a result, numerous arguments are put forth on behalf of conflict prevention, for example, geo-strategic concerns, security interests, cost-benefit analyses, and refugee issues. Despite the increasing technical capacity and human ability to identify deadly conflicts before they erupt, as well as the likelihood of extreme costs in life, social cohesion, and regional instability, conflict prevention remains in the realm of theory more than practice. Conflict prevention has predominantly been viewed as the task, if not the responsibility, of international organizations or nation-states neutral to the given conflict. It, however, does not necessarily rely nor should it depend solely on external parties. The most effective method of conflict prevention, although not described as such, is accountable governance, whereby citizens and groups have access to effective avenues and mechanisms for resolving the range of disputes and conflicts that ordinarily arise within societies. Such access not only involves governmental structures, but also requires the
cooperation of civil societies and business communities. This is particularly true in settings where violent conflict has already occurred and conflict prevention focuses on inhibiting recurrences, for example through some form of reconciliation.

(v) Conflict resolution
A variety of approaches aimed at resolving conflicts through the constructive solving of problems distinct from the management or transformation of conflict. Conflict resolution is multifaceted in that it refers to a process, a result, and an identified field of academic study as well as an activity in which persons and communities engage every day without ever using the term. The antagonisms in question may involve interpersonal relationships, labour-management issues, business decisions, intergroup disputes, disagreements between nation-states, or international quarrels. Not all conflicts are harmful. Some may ultimately result in positive social change. As noted by Nigerian sociologists Onigu Otite and Isaac Olawale Albert (1999: 17), ‘although conflicts have negative connotations [many] constitute an essential creative element for changing societies and achieving the goals and aspirations of individuals and groups’. Conflict resolution involves recognition by the clashing parties of one another’s interests, needs, perspectives, and continued existence. The most effective forms identify the underlying causes of the conflict and address them through solutions that are mutually satisfactory, self-perpetuating, and sustaining. Conflict resolution can also be practised with a variety of emphases, including but not limited to cooperation, non-confrontation, non-competition, and positive-sum orientation. Serious challenges are found when parties at times favour, for various reasons, continuation of conflict over its resolution. In such cases, the role of external parties can be critical in creating a balance of power, enacting sanctions or incentives, or acting as neutral mediators or invested facilitators. Not all conflicts lend themselves to conflict resolution techniques.

(vi) Conflict transformation
Changes in all, any, or some combination of the following matters regarding a conflict: the general context or framing of the situation, the contending parties, the issues at stake, the processes or procedures governing the predicament, or the structures affecting any of the aforementioned. Conflict transformation may occur through the unintended consequences of actions taken by parties internal or external to the conflict, yet
deliberate attempts at transformation may also be made. The latter aims to generate opportunities for conflict resolution or conflict management and ultimately more equitable outcomes, particularly where a given conflict is considered intractable or where it has encountered a seemingly insurmountable impasse. Conflict transformation requires that the parties involved alter their previous strategies of handling or avoiding the discord in order to implement new approaches towards ameliorating the situation. The non-violent transformation of conflict and the weaponry of non-violent struggle are desirable for those who seek non-lethal means of conflict engagement, which can improve the odds for reconciliation.  

**TOOLS TO BUILD NEGATIVE PEACE**

**Diplomacy**

From the Greek word diploun, in reference to an official, folded document, the official means by which sovereign nations conduct affairs with one another and develop agreement on their respective positions. Issues faced include war and peace, alliances, boundaries, and trade, among many others. Somewhat of an art and a science, diplomacy is a tool of foreign policy that involves representation, bargaining, negotiation, and other peaceful means. Such arrangements may be conducted publicly or out of view, but once mutual interests and consensus are recognized, official policy formulation proceeds. Extreme flexibility and tact are commonly attributed to successful diplomatic efforts, which are regulated by law and custom. Accredited agents are assigned the task of conducting diplomacy, and tremendous emphasis is placed on individual capacities and talents in addition to the actual official stances offered or defended. In more recent times, use has been made of unofficial, non-traditional diplomatic agents, including business executives, religious figures, non-governmental organizations, academicians, and citizens. Such efforts are referred to as Track II diplomacy or multi-track diplomacy. UN secretary-general Dag Hammarskjöld coined the term ‘preventive diplomacy’ in the 1950s to refer to the resolution of disputes before they escalate or the persuasion of parties to desist from allowing such escalation to occur.

---

**Negotiation**

Negotiation talks about the communication, usually governed by pre-established procedures, between representatives of parties involved in a conflict or dispute. As a technique in the management and resolution of conflict, negotiation is conducted on various grounds: to identify common interests and develop unilateral or multilateral initiatives in pursuit of objectives, to de-escalate a conflict situation, or to formulate mutually satisfactory solutions towards resolution of a given conflict. The voluntary nature of negotiation grants the parties direct control over the process and outcome, both of which can vary widely. The process involves numerous skills and tactics, including bargaining, compromise, and concessions, among others. Outcomes may range from authorized documents to informal agreements to new or adjusted procedures to institutional arrangements. Negotiation may also be employed as a stalling technique, although unstated, where concrete results are not expected by a participating party. Certain conflicts e.g., those where the parties possess an interdependent relationship or value their future relationship with one another lend themselves more readily to negotiation. Such conditions do not automatically eliminate or reduce adversarial or confrontational attitudes, even during a negotiation process, but reductions in tension and mutual confidence provide considerable advantages over more hostile encounters.

**Mediation**

A voluntary, informal, non-binding process undertaken with an external party that fosters the settlement of differences or demands between directly invested parties. Mediators often have a general interest in the resolution of a given conflict or dispute, but theoretically they are able to operate neutrally and objectively. Lacking the authority to coerce or impose judgments, conditions, or resolutions, such facilitators aim to transform the dynamics of the conflict situation by introducing new relevant knowledge or information, especially regarding the negotiation process between the disputants, and by revealing common interests and suggesting possible directions towards settlement. In acute situations, mediation acts as a means of facilitating communication, commonly termed ‘good offices’, through the consent of the vested parties that are unable to formulate mutually satisfactory resolutions on their own. The process is usually initiated by the intended external mediator such as an international organization, government, or
non-governmental organization or by the relatively weaker party of the conflict. Mediators often spend time with each party to the conflict through what has come to be known as ‘shuttle diplomacy’, or ‘caucusing’, especially when the parties are unwilling to meet each other or joint meetings is not leading to progress. The contending parties nonetheless maintain considerable control over the process and the outcome. Two theories explain how mediation can be successful. The first focuses on the personal skills and characteristics of the mediator(s), and the other emphasizes the environmental and contextual factors relevant to the conflict in question. In either case, assessing the process or agent of mediation can be difficult in that protracted conflicts often involve extended mediation efforts, which in turn entail multiple third parties and an ever-changing environment. Meditation has a long, if informal, history. Examples can be cited from ancient Greece and the Bible and during early Chinese dynasties and the Persian Empire. In modern international relations, mediation first received explicit recognition during a conference held in The Hague in 1899. Although disarmament the primary aim of the meeting basically failed, the secondary goal sought ideas for settling international disputes. The latter resulted in a series of declarations focusing on resolving conflicts without resort to military weapons or exchanges.

**Reconciliation**

A process that attempts to transform intense or lingering malviolence among parties previously engaged in a conflict or dispute into feelings of acceptance and even forgiveness of past animosities or detrimental acts. Reconciliation may involve recourse to justice, particularly where one party has suffered egregiously relative to or at the hands of the other party. In such cases, compensation for victims might be offered as an emollient. If proffered sensitively, compensation has tremendous healing capacity for the injured party as well as for the perpetrators of harmful acts. Although reconciliation is far from being standardized or even fully understood, the process usually involves the oppressors’ acknowledgement of their actions; their sincere expression of regret and remorse; and elements of forgiveness on the part of the victims for such acts. Therefore, it involves much more than telling, or a simple realisation, of truthful facts. Reconciliation is often considered essential to creating conditions for durable resolutions and stability, especially since the trauma of extensive violence is often
passed on to future generations, contributing to perpetual cycles of retributory violence. In this sense, reconciliation is needed not only for psychological or social healing, important as they may be, but also for political stabilization or renewal in the pursuit of much broader goals or ideals.

**Disarmament**
The near elimination of military arsenals and forces, usually by a nation-state, through bilateral or multilateral agreements or unilaterally. Although complete disarmament is deemed idealistic, the concept is often considered interchangeable with arms control, which is viewed as more practical and refers to restraints on specific weapons or forces. More of a process than an event, disarmament theoretically speaking contributes to a reduction in tensions, de-legitimizes the reflexive turn to military force in conflict, and redirects military expenditures and resources towards other endeavours. The first attempts towards international disarmament were discussed at conferences in The Hague in 1899 and 1907, but neither produced positive results. The most significant instances are associated with compulsory disarmament policies proposed for societies after defeat in war.

**Arms control**
Bilateral or multilateral measures, usually facilitated through international organizations, to mutually reduce military capacities—armaments, armed forces, deployment zones, and general usage—particularly aimed at reducing conventional and nuclear war, but also intended to alleviate tensions that could escalate into military confrontations. Often negotiated in the midst of conflict, arms control does not attempt to resolve (or even address) the grievances or demands of the contending parties. Generally undertaken between antagonistic parties for whom the likelihood of military confrontation is perceived to be high, arms control can contribute to building mutual confidence and ease the tensions associated with conflict situations. Most arms control agreements are specific in enumerating acceptable levels of production, possession, and deployment of arms. Such intricate arrangements are also meant to prevent arms races. Other forms of such agreements attempt to limit the potential effects of war and avoid accidental or surprise attacks. Brought to prominence by academician in the 1950s, the
term ‘arms control’ has often been used interchangeably with disarmament, but it can be used to denote a much more comprehensive concept.

Compromise
An outcome to a conflict in which the parties involved concede in order to obtain only a portion of their objectives. Such results often occur when the contending parties lack the strength or ability to achieve a complete victory, seek to avoid escalation because of mutual interdependence, or value a future relationship with one another. Compromises may be internally or externally proposed, with external propositions more likely to be received favourably when the third party is seen as neutral or trusted by both sides.

Bargaining
Concessions, incentives, and threats issued by parties are engaged in a process of negotiation. Bargaining should not overshadow the process of negotiation, yet it offers insight into one aspect of how negotiations are conducted. Such exchanges may occur over a single concern or multiple issues, but the parties often tend to offer initially what they view as less valuable in order to obtain what they consider to be more valuable, an approach known as Homans’ Theorem. Bargaining, however, is not a straightforward exercise of mutual exchanges. In sophisticated applications, comparisons are drawn between the respective parties’ manoeuvres, which are monitored in order to identify patterns that may be exploited as the bargaining continues. Such practices, derived from social psychology, attempt to recognize and understand the behaviours of others.

Arbitration
A mechanism for resolving conflicts whereby the disputants identify their grievances and demands, fix a procedural process, and willingly submit the decision of outcomes, which are to be final and binding, to an external entity. The contending parties often select the majority of the members of the third party, which normally takes the form of a tribunal. The third party is usually presented with arguments and evidence from both sides, but the process can vary according to the pre-established procedures. Although similar to adjudication, arbitration is informal, private, economical, and relatively quick.

Appeasement
A policy of granting concessions in response to aggressive or hostile demands with the intent of gaining some greater good or asset. Appeasement is usually portrayed as a
willingness to accede to an immoral actor or entity. In extreme cases, practitioners may even be accused of cowardice. Prior to World War II, a policy of appeasement was fashionable and widely pursued, particularly on the part of Great Britain and France towards Germany and Italy. Derogatory connotations of appeasement became widespread after it came to be epitomized by the 1938 Munich Agreement that ceded part of Czechoslovakia to Nazi Germany. Since then, ‘No more Munics’ has served as the rallying cry against excessive cooperation or appeasement in various international conflicts, including the 1950–53 Korean War, the 1956 Suez crisis, Gulf crisis and war. Although some people view appeasement predominantly as capitulation, others perceive it as a necessary process or tool of international relations.

**Deterrence**

Deriving from the French for ‘to frighten from’, the dissuasive means of preventing an impending or projected action of others through instilling fear of repercussions or by an understanding that the negative consequences of such actions will outweigh the benefits. The actions in question, as well as the threatened repercussions, are usually anticipated (direct or indirect) military attacks, but they may also include political or economic actions. Deterrence differs from other forms of persuasion in that it aims to prevent future actions of others, as opposed to halting those that are ongoing. Measures taken against those in progress are referred to as compellance. Successful deterrence depends on a credible capacity and willingness to follow through on one’s threats and on convincing the targeted party of the likelihood of the projected negative outcome they will suffer. Determining success, however, is much more difficult in that it requires identifying or measuring actions not taken by others, which involves understanding others’ intentions. Deterrence, therefore, is more a theoretical construction (as the basis for a doctrine of strategic defence) than a program of concrete actions. Given the unique significance of nuclear weapons, deterrence does not speak to how much is enough to deter an adversary’s ‘first strike’. If an opponent is willing to undertake self-annihilation along with extermination of the adversary, then it cannot be deterred. The manufacture of new generations of nuclear weaponry creates a perpetual desire and system for continuing production of nuclear weaponry. Moreover, a strategic doctrine of deterrence overlooks human psychology and assumes rationality on the part of all players. It
presupposes that leaders possess absolute control over their emotions, as well as their nuclear forces, and that nuclear weaponry is sufficiently secured.

**Intervention**

Requested or imposed unilateral or multilateral actions by external parties conducted in relation to an ongoing process between parties. Intervention assumes one of three forms: actions by external nation-states in pursuit of policy objectives or favourable conditions to achieve those objectives; actions taken to uphold internationally accepted values or laws; or efforts to alter the dynamics or outcomes of a process under way. The first type of intervention is widely understood as the unprovoked interference by one nation-state in the internal affairs of another. Such intervention is normally unilateral and coercive and includes an array of examples, such as military force, covert operations, dissemination of propaganda, or cultural domination. The principle of non-intervention that has historically helped to define international relations generally deems such actions to be illegitimate. Recent developments in humanitarian intervention have, however, had the effect of condoning and in some cases encouraging external parties to become involved in the alleviation of suffering of peoples within a nation-state, geographic area, or region. In such cases, moral or legal concerns (such as protection of human rights) may overshadow other factors. The second type of intervention—humanitarian intervention—is a tool available to the international community and is particularly encouraged where human suffering occurs at the hands of a host government or where the state system is unwilling to address such conditions. In cases where a nation-state is simply unable to relieve trauma and suffering, humanitarian intervention is often requested by the authorities in power. Successful intervention requires a secure geographical area within the region in question and, therefore, in instances of warfare, necessitates a military component to ensure a degree of security. Given increasing assumptions about the validity of humanitarian intervention and the growing establishment of standards for implementation, non-interference in cases of severe human suffering or atrocities is now widely deemed unjustifiable. The third form of intervention is typically referred to as third-party intervention, in which the external party attempts to either influence a party (or parties) involved in conflict engagement,
conflict management, or conflict resolution or seeks to manipulate any such processes already under way.

**POSITIVE PEACE**

As the absence of direct violence does not explain how to deal with unacceptable social order, changing human conditions has become an important goal of peace. Peace is not only concerned about the overt control or reduction of violence but also about vertical social developments that are responsible for hierarchical relationships between people. The concept of positive peace, based on a broad understanding of social conditions, means the removal of structural violence beyond the absence of direct violence.

Positive peace would not be obtained without the development of just and equitable conditions associated with the elimination of inegalitarian social structures. Equality is an essential element of peace because its absence perpetuates tensions of all types. The elimination of various forms of discrimination (based on class, ethnic, tribal, age, religion, racism and sexism) is a precondition for human realization. Equality, as social and legal rights, is both a means and a goal of positive for individuals and groups. All groups of people also ought to have equitable access to the economic benefits of society as well as enjoying social, cultural and political development. For marginalized groups of people, equality means overcoming obstacles related to institutional, cultural, attitudinal and behavioural discrimination. The elimination of repression and of poverty is an essential element of peace. Equal opportunities allow people to develop their talents and skills so that they can participate in various aspects of development. Economic obstacles for the poor both at national and international levels must be overcome to obtain viable and just peace.

The goals of positive peace touch upon many issues that influence quality of life, including personal growth, freedom social equality, economic equality, solidarity, autonomy and participation. This comprehensive notion of peace is widely accepted internationally; peace entails, beyond violence and hostilities at the national and international levels, “the enjoyment of economic and social justice, equality and the
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entire range of human rights and fundamental freedoms within society’. 17 Conditions for harmonious relations derive from minimization of all forms of exploitation. As the earth is recognized as the object of exploitation, positive peace is now extended to embrace the notion of respect for nature. 18

Preventing war is a necessary conditions for establishing real peace, but it is not sufficient world without war is certainly desirable. But even this would not really produce a world at peace. It is not enough to be against something, namely war. We need, as well, to be in favour of something, and that something should be positive and affirmative, namely peace. Of necessity, therefore, positive peace must be a part of a broader, deeper effort to rethink the relationship of human brings to each other and to their planet. As difficult as it will be to obtain negative peace, the prevention of war, it may be even more of a challenge to achieve positive peace, since a world without violence would be a significant challenge to our basis way of living, not just our ways of occasionally dying and killing.

The study of peace and conflict is unusual not only in its transdisciplinary approach to the understanding and prevention of war but also in its efforts to envision and help establish a desirable and attainable peace. But if war seems difficult to define, as evidenced by disagreement about the role of formal declarations, number of causalities, nature of the combatants, level of violence, and so on, peace can be even more elusive. Nonetheless, it is possible to sketch the outlines of a just and sustainable peace, recognizing that in a world that relies on violence and on the structures of violence, efforts toward such a peace may be not only visionary but also what conventional society may deem “radical”.

It is increasingly clear that ideologically based political and military competition is outdated, dangerous, and also irrelevant to humanity’s fundamental needs. Arden militarists seem more and more to be ideological dinosaurs, formidable but dated, moving clumsily and even stupidly across a rapidly changing landscape. Militarized competition should cease, but we must not stop there. Conflicts that have so preoccupied the post-world war-II world should give way to planetary issues (many of

which reveal tensions along a North-South axis) concerning human rights, poverty, the environment, the fundamental principles of non-violence in politics and in personal life.

Much important has been attributed to the “just wars” doctrine. The conditions for a “just peace” are no less important. For many in the west (those who are relatively affluent and well educated), hope for a peaceful world is often equated with continuing the status quo, with some improvements around the margins, such as guaranteed health care. Children in good college, and as ever—increasing stock portfolio; whereas many in the lesser developed countries, it is reflected in basic aspirations for human rights, national autonomy, and economic well being. For a growing number of people around the globe, just peace also entails achieving a viable relationship with the natural environment. Positive peace persists in the form of establishment of the following:

(i) Structural peace

The structural dimension of peacebuilding focuses on the social conditions that foster violent conflict. Many note that stable peace must be built on social, economic, and political foundations that serve the needs of the populace. In many cases, crises arise out of systemic roots. These root causes are typically complex, but include skewed land distribution, environmental degradation, and unequal political representation. If these social problems are not addressed, there can be no lasting peace.

Thus, in order to establish durable peace, parties must analyze the structural causes of the conflict and initiate social structural change. The promotion of substantive and procedural justice through structural means typically involves institution building and the strengthening of civil society.

Avenues of political and economic transformation include social structural change to remedy political or economic injustice, reconstruction programs designed to help communities ravaged by conflict revitalize their economies, and the institution of effective and legitimate restorative justice systems. Peacebuilding initiatives aim to promote nonviolent mechanisms that eliminate violence, foster structures that meet basic human needs, and maximize public participation.

To provide fundamental services to its citizens, a state needs strong executive, legislative, and judicial institutions. Many point to democratization as a key

way to create these sorts of peace-enhancing structures. Democratization seeks to establish legitimate and stable political institutions and civil liberties that allow for meaningful competition for political power and broad participation in the selection of leaders and policies. It is important for governments to adhere to principles of transparency and predictability, and for laws to be adopted through an open and public process. For the purpose of post-conflict peacebuilding, the democratization process should be part of a comprehensive project to rebuild society's institutions.

Political structural changes focus on political development, state building, and the establishment of effective government institutions. This often involves election reform, judicial reform, power-sharing initiatives, and constitutional reform. It also includes building political parties, creating institutions that provide procedures and mechanisms for effectively handling and resolving conflict, and establishing mechanisms to monitor and protect human rights. Such institution building and infrastructure development typically requires the dismantling, strengthening, or reformation of old institutions in order to make them more effective.

It is crucial to establish and maintain rule of law, and to implement rules and procedures that constrain the powers of all parties and hold them accountable for their actions. This can help to ease tension, create stability, and lessen the likelihood of further conflict. For example, an independent judiciary can serve as a forum for the peaceful resolution of disputes and post-war grievances.

In addition, societies need a system of criminal justice that deters and punishes banditry and acts of violence. Fair police mechanisms must be established and government officials and members of the police force must be trained to observe basic rights in the execution of their duties. In addition, legislation protecting minorities and laws securing gender equality should be advanced. Courts and police forces must be free of corruption and discrimination.

But structural change can also be economic. Many note that economic development is integral to preventing future conflict and avoiding a relapse into violence. Economic factors that put societies at risk include lack of employment opportunities, food scarcity, and lack of access to natural resources or land. A variety of social structural changes aim to eliminate the structural violence that arises out of a society's economic system.
These economic and social reforms include economic development programs, health care assistance, land reform, social safety nets, and programs to promote agricultural productivity.

Economic peacebuilding targets both the micro- and macro-level and aims to create economic opportunities and ensure that the basic needs of the population are met. On the microeconomic level, societies should establish micro-credit institutions to increase economic activity and investment at the local level, promote inter-communal trade and an equitable distribution of land, and expand school enrollment and job training. On the macroeconomic level, the post-conflict government should be assisted in its efforts to secure the economic foundations and infrastructure necessary for a transition to peace. 20

(ii) Cultural peacebuilding
The culture of peace must find its matrix in every cultural domain. The desire for peace as a value worth pursuing should be cultivated within societies as culture bearers. In other words, the construction of a culture of peace must begin "at home." If peace is indeed a universal human value, then it should be introduced as such within every cultural domain. This is to say that the construction of a culture of peace is feasible, if it is founded on a global matrix of cultures. Cultural diversity should not lead us towards conceiving bipolar discrepancies such as the still ongoing East-West bifurcation or "the West and the rest" as discussed by Samuel Huntington (1996) in his well-known treatise concerning the clash of civilizations. It should rather invite us towards active cultural encounters aimed at the promotion of reciprocal understanding and tolerance, and above all the enhancement of mutual trust and respect.

(iii) Peace movements
In a just social order there is least possibility of generation of social tension and disorder. Humanities throughout the world strive to bring such a situation, in which, war is not possible. A large number of social workers are working day and night to bring a just social order in the present strife-torn world. They are working for a society, free from social wants and hunger. By their such actions they hope to build a society, free from war and social disorder. Their actions aims at eradication of causes of war and

social disorder. Their actions aims at eradication of causes of war and social disorder. Such workers are real peace workers. All such activities like poverty alleviation, eradication of illiteracy, providing shelter and employment to the have-nots are peace work and the people engaged in such activities are peace workers. We may rightly term their activities as peace movement. The millions of silent hands engaged in these activities are the multiple streams of peace movement. The activities of such social workers are directed towards removal of the causes of peacelessness. Peace is also a social state of delicate equilibrium between the tense and explosive opposing social poles. The balanced multipolarization in such conditions, often prove to be very short lived. As a result of loss of social equilibrium, the danger of breach of peace always exists. The peace workers also work for theoretical analysis and understanding of such a situation. They create public opinion generating the balancing force, which does not allow the loss of equilibrium between multipolarized conflicting social and world interest. The peace makers endeavour for just social order where the very root of war and violence is absent.  

**TOOLS TO BUILD POSITIVE PEACE**

**Civil society**

A sphere of society distinct and independent from the state system, the means of economic production, and the household. This collective realm, or ‘public space’, includes networks of institutions through which citizens voluntarily represent themselves in cultural, ideological, and political senses. The term ‘civil society’ is often employed in the context of mutual rights and responsibilities. From the mid nineteenth century onwards, distinctions between civil society and the state became more pronounced, reflecting the view that independent sectors (within civil society) can defend themselves from a state. More recently, the notion of capitalist endeavours being at the heart of civil society has been replaced with a central concept of a sphere in which social activity protects the substance of democracy. Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) are often considered the backbone of civil society, yet informal social institutions, professional associations, and interest groups constitute further examples. Although the degree of institutionalization among civil societies may vary widely, the
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21 N. Radhakishnan, Multiple Streams of Peace movement, Emerald Publishers, Madras, 1986, p.6
strength of civil society is generally considered critical in providing protection and institutional hedges for individuals and groups against potential authoritarianism or intrusive government. Under such circumstances, governments and civil society groups commonly find themselves at odds with one another. The ineffectiveness or failure of some developing nation-states to provide their citizens with basic services has sometimes resulted in suggestions that entities outside the government might better perform such tasks. Civil society has proven effective in some instances at performing such responsibilities, with environmental groups working to clean and maintain public spaces, some organizations providing social services, and others playing roles in governance, such as the community based groups in Thailand that assisted in drafting the constitution. More often than not, however, civil society has been cherished in theory, rather than in actuality. A proliferation of NGOs is not necessarily an indicator of the strengthening of civil society. For example, some of the NGOs and other groupings that have emerged in developing countries cannot truly be considered part of civil society, as they were not formed independently or do not operate autonomously from state structures or governments.

**Civilian-based defence**

A policy designed to accomplish a full range of defensive objectives, including deterrence as well as preparations to defend against internal and external acts of aggression. The term is quite literal, indicating planned defence by citizens (as opposed to military personnel). Various methods of non-violent resistance are employed in place of military or paramilitary operations. Successful non-military civilian defence requires that general populations be provided with appropriate training, equipment, and funding to enact the policy. Such civilian defense has only been adopted in limited cases and degrees. It works as follows: in the face of an attack, invasion, or military occupation, civilian defenders work to deny their opponent’s objectives. Through non-cooperation measures, political defiance, and control of key social and political institutions, they make it difficult or impossible for their home country or territory to be ruled by the aggressor. Civilian-based defence has also been variously referred to as ‘civil resistance’, ‘non-military defence’, ‘non-violent defence’, and ‘social defence’.

**Gender equity**
Social, historical, and cultural constructions and conditioning indicating acceptable and preferable forms of behaviour and attitudes for men and women. ‘Gender’ as a term originates with the Old French gender and until the contemporary period pertained mainly to the linguistic and grammatical ‘kinds’ of words in three classes (or, in some languages, two categories) denoting masculine, feminine, or neuter. Validity in the field of gender studies requires that focus be given to feminist analyses as well as to the emerging field of masculinities, both of which are sub-fields of gender studies. ‘Sex’ refers strictly to biological determinations and chromosomes. ‘Feminism’ refers to the emancipator project for women and pertains to the pursuit of equity between men and women. The study of masculinities concerns itself with social constructions of what it means to be a man, with the understanding that there is no single form of masculinity. Gender and the building of peace is a rapidly growing interdisciplinary subject that straddles gender studies and peace and conflict studies. The linkage is important because the social institutionalization of gender is central to politics and, therefore, to peace. In the field of peace and conflict studies, gender is explored as an obstacle to peace or as a positive and influential asset. An indisputable body of evidence proves that the uplift and empowerment of women beneficially affect all aspects of society. The UN Charter, signed in San Francisco in 1945, includes the phrase ‘equal rights of men and women’. When the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) was adopted and proclaimed by the General Assembly in 1948, the word ‘everyone’ rather than the male personal pronoun was used in most articles. Coterminous with gender studies gaining credence, a number of multilateral evolutions sought gender parity, starting with the rights of women. Two agreements of major multilateral significance coaxed governments into examining issues that would otherwise have been ignored: the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), adopted by the General Assembly on 18 December 1979, and the 1985 Nairobi Forward Looking Strategies. CEDAW covers civil, political, economic, and social rights, and in 1980, with ratification obtained, it became known as the international women’s human rights treaty. A series of UN-sponsored World Conferences on Women began in 1975 in Mexico City. It continued in 1980 in Copenhagen and in 1985 in Nairobi, giving legitimacy to the work of women’s
organizations around the world. In Vienna at the 1993 World Conference on Human Rights, the previously unmentionable issue of violence against women came to the fore. The 1994 International Conference on Population and Development, held in Cairo, stressed gender equality. Gender mainstreaming emerged as a global strategy for promoting gender equality in the Platform for Action at the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995. In March 2001, Secretary-General Kofi Annan told a University for Peace meeting in New York City that he hoped that within ten years UPEACE would have succeeded in mainstreaming gender studies worldwide.

**Human rights**
The universal, indivisible, equitable, and indispensable claims and entitlements that are endowed to all persons simply by the sake of being human. In its contemporary sense, the term ‘human rights’ was first used by U.S. president Franklin Delano Roosevelt in a 1941 speech delivered to Congress in what was then seen as a secular expansion of what had historically been referred to as ‘natural rights’. Natural rights had been advocated in the treatises of the British philosopher John Locke (1632–1704), perhaps the most influential natural law theorist of modern times, and the works of eighteenth-century philosophers working in Paris, including Montesquieu, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Voltaire. Such philosophers and others sought to discern universally defensible principles governing nature, humanity, and society, including certain inalienable rights. Human rights derive from these philosophical traditions as well as from the deeply rooted concepts of several non-Western traditions. Legally recognised internationally as applying to individuals and collectivities, human rights were enshrined by the United Nations General Assembly in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) on 10 December 1948. Yet, the principles enunciated in the declaration are not enforceable; rather, they offer guidance that is now universally admired and increasingly accepted. Although the legal interpretations and developments associated with human rights are largely derivative of practices descending from Greco-Roman theories of law, basic standards of human behaviour and concepts of entitlements are found in cultures across the globe. Several attempts have been made to additionally incorporate the protection of human rights in post-colonial contexts. For example, the African Charter on Human and
Peoples’ Rights, also known as the Banjul Charter, was adopted in June 1981 by the Organization of African Unity (later the African Union) and enacted in October 1986. In July 2003, the Assembly of Heads of States and Governments of the African Union adopted the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa. The protocol addresses the gender dimension of human rights and entitlements. It offers thus far the most comprehensive protection to African women of any international or regional human rights instrument. It calls for an end to all forms of violence against women in the public and private spheres. In addition to addressing equality in marriage before the law and the right to participate in political and decision-making processes, the protocol goes so far as to express the right to peace, including the entitlement of women to participate in the promotion and maintenance of it. The protocol notes the limits to legislative prescriptions alone and takes a holistic approach to women’s rights. It calls for states to ‘commit themselves to modify the social and cultural patterns of conduct of women and men, with a view to achieving the elimination of harmful cultural and traditional practices[that are] based on the idea of the inferiority or the superiority of either of the sexes, or on stereotyped roles for women and men’. Although no clear divisions exist among the categories, or generations, of rights, the following distinctions are generally recognized: First generation: civil and political rights defining predominantly negative obligations. For example, the right to life imposes the duty not to kill persons indiscriminately. Other civil and political rights include freedom of movement, thought, religion, opinion, and expression; freedom of peaceful assembly and association; freedom from slavery, torture, inhumane treatment, political persecution, and arbitrary interference in personal life. Second generation: socioeconomic rights establishing positive obligations. Such rights include equal access before the law to legal institutions, public services, and cultural life; choice of employment, quality work conditions, unemployment safety nets, equal pay for equal work; adequate living standards, social security, free education through designated stages, and protection of private and intellectual production and one’s good name. Third generation: rights generally conferred upon collectivities. These include the right to development, peace, and self-determination. Several state systems have incorporated aspects of the UDHR into their constitutions, providing legal
provisions in their respective justice systems, and private individuals and corporations are increasingly being recognized as bearing responsibility for ensuring human rights.

**Ahimsa**

It’s the word from Sanskrit meaning ‘non-harm’, the principled, often religious, renunciation of physical or mental violence against the self, others, animals, and nature. This ideal originates within Jainism, a reforming sect of Hinduism and a faith prominent in the region of India where Mohandas K. Gandhi grew to adulthood. Ahimsa is commonly translated into English as ‘nonviolence’, but in the original Sanskrit it conveys a more strict and comprehensive meaning that encompasses non-injury to all aspects and forms of life.

**Civil disobedience**

It is about the conscious, individual or collective violation of a law, regulation, or edict. The order violated is usually deemed to be immoral or unjust by those undertaking the action. Civil disobedience also includes disobeying neutral orders, which serve as symbols of more general opposition. Henry David Thoreau, well known for his writing on ‘civil disobedience’, did not use the term so far as anyone knows. He did, however, present a lecture that was published in 1849 as a collection entitled Resistance to Civil Government and has since become known as *On the Duty of Civil Disobedience*. For Thoreau, the intentional breaking of immoral laws represented a form of remaining true to one’s beliefs. Some scholars assert that he was influenced by the ideas of Granville Sharp, who in the 1770s resigned from the London War Office rather than authorise arms to put down the colonial rebellion in North America.

**Idealism (philosophical and metaphysical)**

An approach to politics based on the possible and essential application of particular principles and values, such as justice, peace, and international law. Idealism holds a view of human nature as amenable to change and subject to individual will and contains within it a viewpoint that organizations and societies can alter their circumstances, primarily with regard to international relations. The school of philosophical, or political, idealism asks whether it is possible to build a better world. Peace studies stands on the grounds of philosophical idealism. Idealism can be approached in philosophical or metaphysical terms, advancing the belief that only ideas exist. Reality and perception in
this view can only be understood in reference to consciousness and categories of thought that are then imposed on the external world. Proponents of philosophical idealism (and the field of peace studies) have proposed various strategies that call on international law and multilateral organizations to address or even eradicate the tragedies resulting from a militaristic international system. Idealism is thus reformist in seeking to strengthen international organizations, multilateral diplomacy, and international tribunals of law in order to ensure a global peace. Metaphysical idealism has left impressions upon its political counterpart, including the ebbing of the importance and relevance of strictly empirical investigation and analysis. With the decline of behavioralism—the belief that societies and individuals can only be understood and analyzed in terms of their behaviours—the influence of idealism on political philosophy is experiencing a resurgence. Nonetheless, political idealism has been criticized on the grounds that as a school of thought it suggests or encourages the pursuit of unrealistic or impossible goals. Also, values and norms are not universally defined or accepted and are in fact contested. Moreover, the most caustic critiques emanate from the school of realism, suggesting that philosophical idealism ignores national interests, security dilemmas, and the weight of history. By far the most well known advocate of idealism is the German philosopher

Immanuel Kant, who was born in 1724 in Prussia (what is now Kaliningrad, Russia). Kant’s work on theories of knowledge, ethics, and in aesthetics profoundly influenced philosophical studies. He believed that the increasingly destructive nature of war would eventually lead to the realization of the need for peace through international cooperation, institutions, and law. Closely associated with the liberal tradition of the nineteenth century, idealism peaked in the 1920s in the wake of World War I, culminating with the formation of the League of Nations. After the war, debate raged (primarily between idealists and realists) over whether international cooperation was even possible. Throughout the cold war and thereafter, the school of philosophical idealism remained a counterpoint to the dominance of realism. It is perhaps most visible in the rapid growth of peace studies as an interdisciplinary field and in such contemporary movements as environmentalism, anti-globalization, and various nonviolent mobilizations worldwide.
Non-cooperation
A conscious and deliberate, partial or total, non-engagement in activities that can impede the objectives or interests of a particular person, group, institution, bureaucracy, or state system. Encompassing a large class of methods in the repertoire of non-violent direct action, non-cooperation may assume social forms (boycotts and stay-at-homes), economic forms (strikes and lockouts), and political forms (civil disobedience and mutiny). Non-cooperation rests at the core of non-violent action and is based on all systems of government relying on cooperation from their respective populations, whether through consent, acquiescence, or duress. Individuals may refuse to provide such cooperation and withdraw their support.

Pacifism
A doctrine and historical school of thought that rejects war as the means of resolving conflict. Pacifism reflects several perspectives, all of which consider that conflicts should be settled through peaceful means. The term ‘pacifism’ is but a century old—having first been used in 1902 at the tenth Universal Peace Conference at Glasgow, Scotland—but the concept has existed for centuries. Persons choose pacifism for any number of reasons, including religious faith, non-spiritual conviction on the sanctity of human life, or practical belief that war is ineffective and obsolete. To some, pacifism includes action to promote justice and human rights in addition to opposition to war. Pacifism is often confused with non-violent resistance, but it is not a pre-condition for the practice of non-violent struggle as a form of engagement in conflicts.

A differentiation must be made between the morality of pacifism as practiced by an individual and the application of such morality to the behaviour of a society. Failure to appreciate this difference can lead to problems in discussing pacifism. An absolute pacifist may believe that it is never right to take part in war, even in self-defence, and that human life is so valuable that nothing justifies killing another person intentionally. Conditional pacifists oppose war and violence in principle, yet recognize that there may be circumstances when war is the least bad option. Selective pacifists believe that pacifism is a matter of degree and may oppose wars involving weapons of mass destruction—atomic, nuclear, chemical, and biological—because of the significance of such devastating weapons or because a war utilizing such weaponry is not ‘winnable’.
Pacifists are often deeply involved in political efforts to promote peace and argue against particular wars. Some pacifists refuse to fight. Others will take part in non-combat activities that seek to reduce the harm of war, such as attending the wounded, bearing stretcher, or driving ambulances. Still others refuse to take part in any activity that might support a war. Some pacifists have chosen punishment, even execution, rather than go to war. Many democratic countries accept the principle that citizens have the right of conscientious objection to military service, but they usually expect the objector to undertake public service as an alternative. Pacifism is as much a factor in Western thinking as the theory of just war, yet pacifism as national policy is rare. The ideals of pacifism, however, have played an important part in twentieth-century international politics and inform the work of the United Nations. Pacifism surged in reaction to the horrors of World War I and universal male conscription, and it gained renewed support after the advent of nuclear weapons. The Holocaust of World War II, however, and other gross abuses of human rights, have caused many to reconsider whether war is not sometimes the least objectionable course of action. Two major pacifist organisations that emerged from World War I are still at work: the International Fellowship of Reconciliation and the War Resisters League. Some religions, including Buddhism, promote pacifism. Others, for example Christianity, have strong pacifist roots but have accepted the possibility of war and seek to provide moral guidance in decision making concerning war and in its conduct. The ‘historic peace churches’ have long propounded pacifism and are sometimes known as ‘prophetic minorities’. These include the Society of Friends (Quakers), Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, the Mennonites, and the Brethren. Judaism is historically opposed to violence and has traditionally considered that where force is necessary, the minimum should be used.  

**CONCLUSION**

Thus, in order to establish durable peace, one must analyze the structural causes of the conflict and initiate social structural change. The promotion of substantive and procedural justice through structural means typically involves institution building and the strengthening of civil society. Peacebuilding measures also aim to prevent conflict
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from reemerging. Through the creation of mechanisms that enhance cooperation and
dialogue among different identity groups, these measures can help parties manage their
conflict of interests through peaceful means. This might include building institutions
that provide procedures and mechanisms for effectively handling and resolving conflict.