Peace Issues in the 21st Century Global Context

Peace Issues in the 21st Century Global Context

Edited by

Shreesh Juyal, D.Litt
and John Duncan, Ph.D.

Associate Editorial Committee

Rose Dyson, Ed.D.
Noemi Gal-Or, Ph.D.
Satish Sharma, Ph.D

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Peace Issues in the 21st Century Global Context

Edited by Shreesh Juyal and John Duncan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

This anthology represents the efforts of several years of seeking selected papers from the conferences of the Canadian Peace Research Association (CPRA) and from other scholars engaged in Peace Research. Peace Research, an interdisciplinary study within the spectrum of International Relations, endeavours to examine the sources of conflict and the avenues of conflict resolution. It jettisons the orthodox paradigm of power conflicts, and in John Burton's (1967) terms, signifies the difference between conditions of 'non-war' and of 'peace'. In one of his communications to the University of Toronto Physicist, Derek Paul, Norman Alcock (1986), an eminent Physicist and Peace Researcher, characterizes the goals of Peace Research as a compilation of war/peace facts, which could be used for the support of disarmament/arms control position; scientific theories of the causes of war; the legitimization of peace as a valid subject of study; stimulation of the war/peace debate; help for decision -makers through alternative direction; and elimination of the war system by showing its absurdity. The book is a humble attempt to partially address some of the issues of Peace Research, and since there was need for an updated treatment of some chapters, but not revision, this preface fills that gap. The volume opens with my chapter which highlights the consensus regarding a common definition of peace, yet to be achieved. Its conceptual framework will likely remain a challenge for academics and peace researchers for a foreseeable future. I also make distinction between two aspects of peace: positive and negative peace. Johan Galtung, a Norwegian Sociologist, Mathematician and Social Scientist, widely regarded as the Father of the modern Peace and Conflict Studies, elaborates the peace theory by advancing Maria Montessori's concepts of negative and positive peace. A number of contributions here cover the theoretical and interpretive issues. Lynn McDonald, a noted social theorist, and former member of Parliament of Canada, in her chapter on Women Theorists on Peace and War, investigates the less known, and yet highly substantial contribution of the early 'women writers to the core principles of peace studies and conflict resolution'. These authors 'range from the 15th-century Christine de Pisan on just war theory, through several Enlightenment theorists who de-glorified war, to the 19th-century Florence Nightingale, who showed how social institutions influenced the decision

to go to war or make peace, to the early 20th-century Jane Adams and Emily Green Balch. The latter two contributed not only to the women's peace movement directly, but (also) by proposing constructive measures for peaceful conflict resolution'. Rose Dyson and Anne Venton, in their chapter on 'Empowering Canadian Women as Peacemakers One person at a Time', pursue a similar theme that 'During the 20th century, Canadian women were not part of important dialogues focusing on war and peace', and lacked equitable representation in government, civil society and boardrooms. Once, women form a critical mass of about one-third among decision- makers, Dyson and Venton believe that more justice, fairness, less divisive approaches to facilitating peace and settling differences in society and among nations will begin to emerge. In his contribution, A Nonviolent Perspective on Peace, Ramin Johanbegloo, a former researcher at the French Institute for Iranian Studies, a fellow at the Center for Middle Eastern Studies at Harvard University, and author of 20 books, asserts that the tradition of peacemaking and cosmopolitanism are connected in the West at least from Augustine to Kant, but it would be wrong to imply that "nonviolent citizenship" and "cosmopolitan citizenship" are only thinkable in the context of Western civilization or Western thought'. Without seriously considering 'an intercultural approach to the idea of civilization' by such thinkers as Mahatma Gandhi and other non-Western peace researchers, protagonists and world leaders of non-violent national movements, 'it is an error to hope that we can ever achieve a truly cosmopolitan vision of peace'. To Toivo Koivukoski of Nipissing University in his contribution, 'The Question of Peace as Political Telos', the ideal of peace is cast in terms of the classical Greek term of a *telos*, that is a purpose that is once animus and end in action, both inspiration and moderating limit.' This plurality of concepts of peace is accentuated in the chapter in order to revitalize peace as a political question, and a necessarily contested one at that, as issues of power, inequality, and identity come to bear on the means and ends of collective action'. Satish Sharma, a University of Nevada philosopher and distinguished academic, analyses Henry David Thoreau's views on morality, justice and peace. He observes that foundational and operational values in societies and their practices by the people are important considerations in peace processes where morality and justice play crucial roles. He stresses that the intertwining of morality, justice and peace are acknowledged by all visionaries of the past and present modern thinkers including Mahatma Gandhi of India, Leo Tolstoy of Russia, John Ruskin of England, Nelson Mandela of South Africa, and Martin Luther King, Jr., and Henry David Thoreau of the United States of America. On a different

aspect of Peace Research, and its current status in Canada, H. Peter Langille observes that this scientific discipline has been under siege in recent decades. In his rigorous analysis of governmental policy options in Canada, Langille concludes that 'the military -industrial complex- a development that spread with the Cold War, accelerated with globalization and consolidated power with the global war on terror'- is quietly undermining and enfeebling Peace Research. From a different perspective, the causes of conflict are explored in the contribution of Theresa Man Ling Lee of the University of Guelph, who juxtaposes Freud the humanist, and Freud the humanist in the exploration of human as an organism driven by two basic instincts- life and death. Civilization as such represents human effort to sustain the tension through a dialectical engagement with both life and death. Lee concludes that such an understanding of conflict can in turn facilitate a holistic approach to peace as a human condition.

The book also contains a number of case studies. In the abstract of his profound study of Iran, John Duncan, director of the Ethics, Society and Law Program at Trinity College in the University of Toronto, pursues the premise that 'Iran is not an irrational terrorist state aimed at regional or global domination. Rather, a recent history of neo-colonial subjugation, failed secular nationalism, and powerful cultural- religious nationalism have made this large, strategically located and petroleum-rich state calculating and assertive regarding its interest in establishing itself as a major player in a hostile region and world system. Iran is therefore fixed in the crosshairs of the U.S. and the latter's regional allies', which engenders the question of nuclear non-proliferation. Abraham Weizfeld, in the chapter, The Nation- State and the Palestinian Nation, develops the hypothesis that the Nation-State concept allows for the Federal Principle in the constitutional foundation of the State, and for the conforming governmental structure in the evolution of a Civil Society that respects the identity of both Jewish and Palestinian constituents, and permeates a federated National-Cultural Autonomy.   On the other hand, Perry Cammack, Nathan Brown, and Marwan Muasher ("Revitalizing Palestinian Nationalism", Carnegie Endowment for Peace, 28 June, 2017), reveal that the Palestinian national movement seems to be at a crossroads, and the efforts to negotiate a Two-State solution have faltered. In their separate chapters, Kawser Ahmed, and Sara Skinner present interesting descriptive analyses and possible solutions to the current problems of the Western Sahara conflict, and the Sudan and South Sudan war. In another case study, 'Advancing peace: The Baha'i Faith in Nazi Germany and Present Day Iran', Leonard Naimi and Marcella LaFever of the University

of the Fraser Valley assess intercultural conflict and conflict resolution theory with documented practices. In an analytical study of weapons, Frederico Carvalho, a former Deputy Director General of Portugal's Nuclear Research Centre, and Director of the Centre's Department of Physics, the current Vice President of the Executive Council of the World Federation of Scientific Workers, and author of over 100 scientific papers, offers an extensive evaluation of the " war of the machines" especially, the development of military robots as 'the new faces of war', including armed Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs- Drones), and its consequences for warfare. His analysis of the war in disguise: overt and covert operations allude to ethical aspects, violations of human rights and international law. Craig Martin, in a recent article, 'A Means-Methods Paradox and the Legality of Drone Strikes in Armed Conflict' [19: International Journal of Human Rights (2015), page 3], also arrives at a similar legal conclusion that there are features inherent to the remotely controlled armed drone aircraft as a weapon system which may make it more susceptible to potential violations of International Humanitarian Law, and International Human Rights Law. Roger Dittmann, Professor Emeritus of Physics at the California State University, a former nuclear scientist at the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, University of California, and author of many scientific articles, in a further exploration of peace and security, delves into a historical review and systems analysis of the development of transnational financial corporations who have transcended national sovereignty of many a nation, and challenged international governmental institutions. Prof. Dittmann notes that peace and sustainable security are not merely the absence of war. They require institutionalization, rule of law, global management, justice and sustainability. A model of world peace through direct democracy is also presented in the book. The chapter by Honourable Mike Gravel, former U.S. Senator, and Speaker of the Alaska House of Representatives, and who released the Pentagon Papers (a secret Defence Study of U.S. political and military involvement in Vietnam until May 1967 prepared for the Defence Secretary, Robert McNamara), and led the first anti-nuclear demonstrations in the United States, considers modern liberal democracy as a dysfunctional polity. Through his alternative, the National Citizens Initiative for Democracy, the people can enact specific legislation in an electoral process that supersedes national governments. Since national governments have been thwarting 'the establishment of global federation, the people can directly enact legislation to reform and empower the United Nations to end war-making process of nation-states'. Saul Arbess, a Cultural Anthropologist and former professor at various Canadian

universities, and Balwant Bhaneja, a former Canadian diplomat and author of five books, in their contribution inquire into the gaps in the federal system and present a rationale for a Canadian department of peace. In a different area of Peace Studies, Geraldine Macdonald, Associate Professor of Nursing Education (Teaching Stream) at the University of Toronto 'identifies primary health care, health promotions and holistic health as three valid approaches to health that have explicit links to peace. She also associates social justice and equity as key social values that promote both health and peace'. Peter Venton's chapter in the book 'proposes the development of a "movement Progressive" that aims to reverse the excessive economic inequality in Canada'. , 'Corporate Media, Climate and Social Upheaval' is another chapter by Rose Dyson in which she warns about the demands for change in the media industry, and places a further warning about climate change. Finally, Martin Gaal of the University of Saskatchewan raises the question of Human Security Agenda of the 1990s advocated by the Canadian government, and the development of Canadian internationalism and global peace.

Acknowledgments

generous, accommodating, and responsive to the multitude of my requests during the last two years. I also wish to thank all twenty scholars who submitted their chapters for the book. This preface acknowledges their invaluable contribution. Finally, I owe by far the greatest debt to my dearest wife, Zillah, and our two lovely daughters, Anshumala and Malini, who have been a constant source of inspiration and invaluable assistance to me in innumerable ways.

Shreesh Juyal
Ottawa, Canada,

CHAPTER ONE

PEACE PERSPECTIVES

SHREESH C. JUYAL

Abstract

Climate change and environmental degradation, and the resurging perils of nuclear war are perhaps the most compelling crises that threaten the future of humanity. These challenges must be met with unprecedented and concerted global action. Peace Alliance (http://peacealliance.org/) informs us that the menace of terrorism alone claimed 20,000 lives in 2014, and since 2011 the Syrian civil war and the occupation of parts of Syria and Iraq by the Jihadist Islamic State (I.S.), has resulted in more than 500,000 civilian casualties and left over two million people homeless. Other regional conflicts remain unabated in Afghanistan, Sudan and South Sudan, and Pakistan. Numerous other issues of grave concern that continue to overwhelm global peacekeeping efforts include Israel's belligerence towards the creation of the Palestinian state, the Libyan civil war, the Iranian nuclear issue, the Ukrainian crisis and associated dangers of a new Cold War, the potential of a nuclear war between Russia and the United States, China's military build-up and assertive claims in the East and South China seas over the disputed Spratly Islands, the escalation of the nuclear-arms race, the failure of the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review, the new potential for epidemics like Ebola, the financial crisis of Greece, the continuing misery of some 60 million refugees and the constant flight of more than 60,000 migrants from Africa, the Middle East, South Asia and Central Europe into Western Europe. These, and many other unsettling crises threaten the prospects of global peace, making its possibility in the international arena seem, at best, elusive. This introductory chapter will not seek to analyze the causes of global disorder. Instead, it will delimit its scope through an understanding of the concept of peace and the field of peace research. A listing of academic institutions in pursuit of Peace Studies with be further provided.

Introduction

Amongst the proposals received for the 2014 annual conference of the Canadian Peace Research Association (CPRA) was an abstract submitted by Robert Chrismas entitled, "Globalization and Global Responsibility in the 21st Century." Mr. Chrismas is a Staff Sergeant with the Winnipeg Police Service in Canada, and a PhD student in the Peace and Conflict Studies Program of the Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice at the University of Manitoba. When asked whether the abstract represented an acceptable subject in Peace Research, and more specifically, if he thought that the concept of "Peace Research" was being stretched, Mr. Chrismas responded that his submission reflected the focus of his proposed PhD thesis on collaborative approaches to enhanced social justice for vulnerable people, and the application of Johan Galtung's model of positive peace[1]. In his recently published book, *Canadian Policing in the 21st Century: A Frontline Officer on Challenges and Changes* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013), Chrismas highlights the theme of social justice and how policing and justice play a substantial role in the spectrum of services that create positive peace and foster social justice. He points out that in a global context, responsibility for public security, social justice and positive peace are now intertwined and internationally shared. The book also contains segments related to restorative justice, diversity, and the issues of unresolved treaties with Aboriginal peoples of Canada, as well as how they are impacted by colonization. In his PhD thesis, Mr. Chrismas will demonstrate that community resilience and peaceful co-existence can be enhanced by established norms of public discourse, community building and other catalytic agents of peace.[2] In a very straightforward way, Mr. Chrismas' work reveals the wide range of issues involved in peace research and practice—from collaborative social justice to Galtung's model of positive peace and more—we face in the twenty-first century.

Shanti: A human and social concept

The above discussion invites us to consider what constitutes peace and peace studies and to better understand their forms. Since there is not a consensus on a definition of peace, its conceptual framework is likely to remain a challenge for academics and peace researchers for the foreseeable future.

To begin the discussion, we might consider the different aspects and dimensions of the concept of peace. Peace of mind, spiritual peace, individual peace, local/regional peace, and national/international peace are a few of the most prominent. The Hindi word *Shanti* means peace, rest, calmness, tranquility, harmony or bliss. In his poem 'The Waste Land', the poet T.S. Eliot translated *Shanti* as "the peace which passeth understanding." In Sanskrit, inner peace refers to a mental and spiritual state of being, with enough knowledge and understanding to keep oneself strong in the face of discord or stress.[3] In the Hindu Vedic literature, *Shanti* is integrated with the cosmic sound of 'Om'. The mantra "Om Shanti Om" represents a quest for achieving peace for humanity, peace for all living and non-living creatures, and peace for the universe. Christians and Buddhists contemplate peace with similar conceptual frameworks.

Dr. M.V. Naidu, an academic and peace scholar, views peace as a celebration of life, a human and social concept related to life preservation and life fulfilment on earth.[4] Arguing that the "[d]enial of fundamental freedoms, equality and human dignity, and economic exploitation... can destroy human well-being and deny human fulfilment"[5] Dr. Naidu sees peace as having five dimensions: (1) non-violence, involving the reduction or elimination of violence, especially military violence; (2) economic justice, which involves eliminating economic deprivation and hunger, poverty, unemployment and economic exploitation; (3) social equality, which aims to eliminate discrimination, prejudice and power hierarchy based on birth, sex, race, religion and wealth; (4) political liberty from slavery, serfdom and the removal of other inequalities; and (5) psychological fraternity, which binds together the other four factors.

Dr. Hossain B. Danesh, former Professor of Psychiatry and Family Medicine, University of Ottawa, and former chairman of the Executive Committee for the International Association for Baha'i Studies, interprets peace from within a unity paradigm.

> Peace is the fruit of the tree of human unity, and unity is the hallmark of humanity's coming of age. Humanity … has struggled to free itself from the evils of self-centeredness, aggression, injustice, tyranny, prejudice, and ignorance. The universal human yearning for love, peace, beauty, and knowledge has its source in human spiritual nature... The citizens of this united world will be engaged in the creation of a technology of peace, the organization of a cooperative and just society... In dealing with violence, a united world will depend on the constructive and life-engendering forces of love, growth, cooperation, and unity. Rather than the outdated practices based on hatred, rigidity, competition, and war... Then will spiritually-

enlightened and highly creative people of the united world harness the
forces of love and usher in the era of the 'Most Great Peace.'[6]

Robert Chrismas extends the conceptual frameworks of peace put forward
by Naidu and Danesh by introducing such elements as social justice for
vulnerable people, the spectrum of police services that create positive
peace, and the intertwining linkages between social justice, public
security, and positive peace.

People's power and peace

Dr. Hanna Newcombe, a chemist, Officer of the Order of Canada, and the
co-founder of the Peace Research Institute of Dundas, Canada, extends her
conceptualization of peace from the perspective of People's Power with
examples drawn from rapid political transformation in Central and Eastern
Europe and the Philippines in the 1990s. The presumption that mass
people power can be successfully applied to political transformation might
be similarly applied to promoting and securing peace, and preventing
conflict and war. On the premise of previously established studies,
Newcombe suggests four ways of transforming people's power for
promoting peace.[7]

(1) The first method involves "Citizen Exchanges," which are aimed at
"reducing enemy images and building friendship across national borders."

> The threat of war has two components: capability and intent. To lower the
> capability to make war, we want to promote disarmament; to lower hostile
> intent, we have to remove or transform enemy images. While disarmament
> is partly a technical problem, the lowering of hostility is primarily a
> psychological problem. Both are to a large extent political problems.[8]

To improve the milieu for potential direct negotiations or good offices of
neutral States/parties, contacts between citizens of two hostile parties can
lead to diminishing hostility perceptions.

(2) The second involves collaboration on such common projects as student
exchanges or cross-cultural contact in an attempt to strengthen prospects
of peace. Tourism may provide a marginal benefit.

(3) The third method is "The hostage plan," "for confidence building and
reassurance of peaceful intentions." Developed by Kenneth Smail,[9] the
hostage plan proposes the hosting of the children and relatives of national
political and military leaders of mutually hostile nations in the territories

of the opposite sides. To pursue the plan, Newcombe considers the diminishing likelihood of national leaders ordering the bombing of each other's territories. She alludes to the point that the proposal was designed specifically for the prevention of nuclear war between the Soviet Union and the United States, but it can also be applied to regional conflicts employing conventional lethal, chemical and biological weapons.[10]

(4) The fourth and final method is "Citizen Reporting," "for arms control verification." Dr. Newcombe points out that some weapons detection and identification (either their deployment or their manufacture) presents technical problems, and therefore, it is imperative to supplement the existing "methods by injecting the people's capability. Arms control verification is normally a highly technological subject. Locations of missile silos are pinpointed by satellites equipped with sensors; underground nuclear explosions are monitored by seismographic arrays; manufacture of chemical weapons might be detected by downstream or downwind microanalysis of chemical effluents or gas emissions."[11] The new instrument of arms verification proposed by Newcombe is 'citizen reporting', previously called 'inspection by the people'. She believes that information provided by the citizen reporting system would assist the arms control verification agency by monitoring any large-scale illegal weapons production and deployment. The citizen reporting mechanism will constitute an integral part of the 'people's peace' system.

Civil disobedience, non-violence, and the concept of *Satyagraha*

Newcombe also discussed "Civil Disobedience," "for resistance against injustice or militarism." The most potent legacy Mahatma Gandhi left was the technique of *Satyagraha* or passive resistance in the form of non-violent civil disobedience. The origin of civil disobedience goes back to the 16th century French philosopher, Etienne de la Boetie. In his work, *The Politics of Obedience: The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude*, he asserts that, "there is no need of fighting to overcome this single tyrant—for he is defeated when the country refuses to consent to its own enslavement. The people need not to act. They need not to shed blood. They conquer by willing to be free… Force was not necessary, and, hence, not morally justified."[12] There was in this instrument of action, power to effect change. In Gandhi's concept of *Satyagraha*, this action is a manifestation of people's power.[13]

It is important to recognize that "Satyagraha is not predominantly civil disobedience, but a quiet and irresistible pursuit of truth. On the rarest occasion, it becomes civil disobedience. But conscious and willing obedience must... precede it."[14]

In a 2004 article published by *Transcend*, Dr. Richard Falk (Albert G. Milbank Professor of International Law) prophesizes that a Gandhian Moment may be happening both with a global opposition to war and violence, and in the widespread struggle against the forces of oppression, for, "[i]n Gandhi's words, the responsibility to act is a human duty in such circumstances, not a mere political choice."[15] To advance his thesis, Falk provides examples of a series of developments in the late twentieth century: (a) the Iranian Revolution of 1978-79, during which a massive popular non-violent resistance toppled the military regime of the Shah, (b) the non-violent Philippines' People Power Movement which forced the collapse of the corrupt dictatorial government of Ferdinand Marcos, and (c) the end of the white racist apartheid regime of South Africa. Falk, nevertheless, cautions us against a rosy picture of the end of the twentieth century.

> There was evident in many parts of the world, especially in sub-Saharan Africa and the Balkans, instances of civil strife exhibiting extreme forms of indiscriminate violence. The world watched as genocide unfolded in Rwanda. The Asian democracy movements either crashed or achieved only minimal results. The cold war ended without the nuclear weapons states moving to negotiate a disarmament treaty or at least proclaim the prohibition of all weaponry of mass destruction. The negative effects of globalisation that were causing growing disparities in wealth and income, environmental decay, and a pervasive disregard of human suffering cast a dark shadow across the achievements.[16]

With his optimistic outlook, and while taking note of the adversities, Dr. Falk believes that "there are signs that we may be approaching the moment where the world will finally heed Gandhi's call to nonviolence."

Gwynne Dyer, (PhD., University of London), a freelance Canadian journalist based in London, U.K., maintains that non-violent revolutions continue to remain viable today. He cites Portugal in 1974, Philippines in 1986, East Germany in 1989, Russia in 1991, Indonesia in 1995, Yugoslavia in 2000, and Egypt in 2011 as examples of popular, non-violent revolutions that led to the collapse of oppressive authoritarian regimes. Dr. Dyer's findings suggest that, "non-violent revolutions can succeed when the great majority of a people in a country share the same

basic identity. So long as the rebels do not resort to force, it is surprisingly difficult for even a cruel and repressive regime to start using lethal force against peaceful protesters."[17]

In his review of Mark Kurlansky's 2006 book, *Nonviolence: Twenty-five Lessons from the History of a Dangerous Idea*, Nicholas Maes offers the essence of the book:

> Nonviolence is not pacifism; it is, instead a 'technique of political activism', 'a third way between pacifism and the deployment of brute force'. A defining characteristic of Cathars, Mennonites, Quakers and other religious sects, nonviolence has sometimes proven remarkably successful: Satyagraha, as Gandhi famously called it, enabled him to overcome the British in India, brought about the collapse of the apartheid system, fortified the U.S. Civil Rights Movement and inspired Maoris and Pathans to resist British rule.[18]

Maes ends up being unpersuaded despite the book's "fine intentions." However, in the analysis of 25 case studies of conflicts, Kurlansky demonstrates the general unsoundness of war, and believes that war will vanish when the individual refuses to fight.[19]

As Mahatma Gandhi wrote, "Civil Disobedience becomes a sacred duty when the state has become lawless or corrupt… There is only one sovereign remedy, namely, non-violent non-cooperation… Civil disobedience is the assertion of a right which law should give but which it denies." Newcombe points out that if conflicts are to be resolved without violence, they may nevertheless still require struggle. Gandhi's Satyagraha as a form of struggle and an applied socio-political action may, therefore, use any of several forms of non-violent action. Nonetheless, it should be noted that non-violence stipulates not only resistance to violence in nonviolent ways, but also a positive, constructive global strategy. Gandhi applied this strategy as his "constructive programme" involving different forms of sub-strategies.[20]

Positive and negative peace

Prof. Johan Galtung, a Norwegian Sociologist, Mathematician and Political Scientist, widely considered the "Father of Western Peace and Conflict Studies," who was honoured with the Right Livelihood Award (the Alternative Nobel Prize), expanded peace theory by advancing Dr. Montessori's concepts of negative and positive peace, on which please see below. These terms were used by Galtung in the Editorial of the founding

edition of the *Journal of Peace Research* in 1964. Peace research in the ensuing decades emerged as a discipline of academic study with the pertinence of peace theory linked to social and political philosophy. Citing Galtung in a 2003 essay, Dr. Baljit Singh Grewal of the School of Social Sciences, Auckland University of Technology, describes the principal differences between positive and negative peace as follows.

Positive Peace: "Structural integration, optimistic, preventive, peace by peaceful means." Galtung considers positive peace as a nobler and higher ideal. He points out that peace research

> should not merely deal with the narrow vision of ending or reducing violence at a direct or structural level but seek to understand conditions for preventing violence. For this to happen, peace and violence need to be looked at in totality at all levels of human organisation. So, inter-gender violence is no less important than inter-state violence and positive peace promotion has to address issues of violence at all levels. This requires an understanding of the civilisations, development, peace and conflict studies eclectically.[21]

Negative Peace: "Absence of violence, pessimistic, curative, peace not always by peaceful means."[22] Grewal notes that Galtung expanded the concepts of peace and violence to include indirect or structural violence. As a consequence, the definition of peace was also broadened. Negative peace, therefore, is the absence of violence, absence of war, and positive peace is the integration of human society.[23]

Prof. Grewal draws our attention to negative peace in the international arena as it is dominated by one nation or a group of nations or a coalition of defence alliances. [24] The domination of major players in the international arena includes overwhelming coercive military power and preparedness, and for this reason negative peace can be transformed into positive peace by integrating elements of the global community. Galtung believes that such integration is positive peace, but that it cannot be accomplished without achieving general and complete nuclear disarmament in the world. Positive peace will also encompass global covenants on a chemical and biological weapon-free world, a weapon-free outer space, deep cuts in conventional arms and arms production, and dissolution of military alliances. Further, this means that all nations and defence alliances shall adopt a policy of defence sufficiency and common security, based on conventional weapons at the lowest possible deployment levels. Such policies will also involve, inter alia, the adoption of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty and an agreement by existing

nuclear powers to not update existing nuclear systems pending their complete abolition.

Regarding the nuclear question, Dr. Roger Dittmann, nuclear physicist, author, and American professor, in delineating the Global Zero Action Plan for a world without nuclear weapons, presented the following phases in his address at the 2010 Canadian Peace Research Association (CPRA) conference (Montreal, Canada): (1) negotiate U.S.-Russia cuts to 1,000 warheads each and prepare for multilateral negotiations; (2) negotiate and ratify a multilateral accord, and strengthen fuel cycle safeguards; (3) negotiate and ratify the Global Zero Accord; (4) eliminate all remaining nuclear warheads; and (5) achieve Global Zero by the year 2030.

Grewal offers growing evidence of a trend towards general disarmament being enhanced by multilateral arms-control negotiations and treaties, through international disarmament legal instruments as Geneva conventions, the various balance of power mechanisms, and the emergence of Nuclear-Free Zones on various parts of the globe. He further mentions that examples of positive peace policies and proposals include improved human understanding through communication, peace education, international cooperation, dispute resolution, arbitration, and conflict management. Prof. Grewal concludes that Galtung's original concept of peace research is peace "search" and it values theoretical consistency of norms and more than empirical validation.

Montessori: Education and peace

Decades before Galtung's renowned theoretical dichotomy emerged in the literature of peace studies, Italian physician and educator Dr. Maria Montessori (1870-1952) analysed the various causes of war—capitalism, politics, military aggression and domination, racism, religion, ideology and other factors. She determined that the concept of peace as the cessation of hostilities was not an adequate description of genuine peace. History had demonstrated that peace really meant the forcible submission of the conquered to the dominant and as such, peace, resulting from the cessation of war, was a negative concept. Globally renowned for her philosophy of education and twice nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize (1949 and 1950), Dr. Montessori believed that peace was a goal that could be attained through common accord employing two means: (1) an immediate effort to resolve conflicts with recourse to violence (prevent war), and (2) a long term effort to establish a lasting peace among peoples

and nations. Dr. Montessori believed that peace (preventing conflict) is the responsibility of political leaders and decision-makers. It falls upon them to convince the world of the need for a universal, collective effort to build a foundation for peace.[25]

University lecturer and writer Christa Thomas points out that peace has been a concern for Western women since the 1820s.

> In 1820, American women formed the Female Peace Society, and in 1854, the European Women's Peace League, the first transnational peace group, was founded by Swedish feminist Frederika Bremer. By the 1890s, as European nationalism and armament grew, and as many thought war not only inevitable but a form of patriotism, women more and more connected their political activism—for the right to vote—to the need for an organized peacekeeping system. No vote meant no say in the matter of war while having to suffer its consequences, so suffrage and peace were quite naturally linked.[26]

The linkage between women and peace is further established by Thomas on four important pillars: (1) the maternal and typically feminine qualities of women for caring and nurturing, and seeking the protection of human life is by its nature pacifist and not prone to war; (2) the influence of Bertha von Suttner, author of *Lay Down Your Arms!*, through her long dedication to peace, and opposition to militarism; (3) the emergence of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom in the aftermath of the Hague Peace Congress of the European States, to which we shall return in a moment; (4) the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to women who are seen to strengthen the conditions of peace in the global society. This distinctly female dimension of the Peace Prize has been manifested in its being awarded to Bertha von Suttner, Malala Yosafzai, Mother Theresa, Shirin Abadi, Aung San Suu Kyi and Maired Corrigan. To Thomas, the Nobel Peace Prize is the recognition of the more than century-old history of Western women's struggle for peace,[27] focusing on institutionalizing a peaceful international system and in preventing or arresting war in general.[28]

The Hague Peace conferences, which were held in the aftermath of the Concert of Europe in 1899 and 1907, envisaged an important instrument for global peace. Although the first Peace conference held at the Hague, Netherlands, in 1899 at the initiation of Czar Nicholas II of Russia was attended by primarily twenty-six European states, the second conference of 1907 had representation from forty-four states. For the first time, a substantial number of non-European states (from Latin America) were

party to international issues of common concern. The Hague System also sought establishment of systematic multi-lateral institutions of conflict-resolution. In 1899, a Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes was adopted. Also, there was the establishment of the permanent Court of Arbitration, which had the availability of a long panel of arbitrators, whose services would be available on a regular basis. Furthermore, a Court of Arbitral Justice and an International Prize Court—the two comprehensive judicial organs—were also planned. The Hague System did not rule out war as a legal right of states, but it made modest progress in encouraging alternate means to resolve disputes through peaceful, diplomatic, and legal institutions. Hence, the Peace conferences were forerunners of related twentieth-century global organizations.[29]

Dr. Montessori's scientific studies underscore the significance of education for peace. She believed with conviction that only education will stand out in making it possible for humans to become the masters of the mechanical environment that oppresses them today. Developing an education capable of saving humanity is a major task for society. It involves the spiritual development of humans, the enhancement of their value as individuals and the preparation of young people to understand the times in which they live.[30] As the child's spiritual embryo is endowed with mysterious sensibilities that guide him or her with creative energies, the education must begin with children, whom Dr. Montessori saw as instruments for profound social and political change.[31] She realized that children had the potential to develop a much more humane approach to personal inter-relationships from groups to nations—a new kind of international diplomacy. She firmly believed that problems of conflict can never be satisfactorily resolved until we begin with the child—the foundation of international cooperation and co-existence founded on the premise of peace between nations.

My former colleague and friend, Dr. Ray L. Cleveland, an eminent Historian, views peace as a confluence of negative and positive peace. He describes it as a "condition in which there is a delicate equilibrium of conflicting impulses or forces in human society, requiring all parties to agree upon a balance of interests—a balance which is reasonable, fair, and workable according to some mutually agreed principles. Peace depends on a minimum of justice."[32] To advance his definition with empirically substantiated evidence, Dr. Cleveland provides a historical, legal, and analytical case of the conflict between the State of Israel and the Palestinians, where peace remains, so far, a yet to be attainable goal.

If one were to apply the dichotomy of the conceptual aspects of peace, Professor Naidu's concept would fit into the Montessori and Galtung nomenclature of negative peace. He considers peace as, 'first and foremost', the absence of war. "War and military violence, causing heavy destruction and a large number of deaths, is the enemy of human existence. Nothing else matters after death, and therefore, all other issues of economics, politics, ideologies and cultures are secondary, as they are relevant to life and become irrelevant after death."[33] An extension of negative peace is also illustrative in Prof. Naidu's remedies for the contemporary crises which seek the elimination, or at least the reduction, of the following seven causes of crisis: (1) militarization, (2) misuse of science, (3) over-industrialization, (4) concentration on materialism, (5) emphasis on statism, (6) colonization, and, (7) emphasis on violence.[34]

In terms of the Galtung thesis of negative peace, the founding of the Canadian Peace Research Institute (CPRI) in 1961 by Nuclear Physicist, Engineer, and Officer of the Order of Canada, Dr. Norman Alcock and his wife Patricia, the celebrated icon of the Voice of Women, was prompted by the shock of the proliferation and growing power of weapons of mass destruction. In creating CPRI, the two became warriors for peace. The CPRI`s goal was to research scientifically into the various causes of war, for example, its psychological, economic, historical and sociological factors. During its 20-year existence, CPRI was engaged in research on United Nations voting patterns, the arms race, and attitudes and military attributes of nations. The CPRI also had an active education programme, including summer schools in peace research.[35] The CPRI was considered the first scientific think-tank to study why there were wars and what conditions might lead to peace. Mathematician and Nobel Laureate Bertrand Russell, Prime Ministers Lester B. Pearson and Pierre Elliot Trudeau, Dr. Brock Chisolm, founder and first Director General of the World Health Organization, Prof. Linus Pauling, the Chemistry and Peace Nobel Prize Winner, and many other prominent scientists, all applauded the creation of CPRI.[36]

Two eminent dictionaries of the English language join many others in referring to the negative stream of defining peace. The Random House Dictionary defines peace as: (1) the normal, un-warring condition of a nation, group of nations, or the world; (2) an agreement or treaty between warring or antagonistic nations, groups, etc. to end hostilities and abstain from further fighting or antagonism; and (3) cessation of or freedom from any strife or dissension. Further, the phrase, 'At Peace' is defined as a state or relationship of non-belligerence or concord; to be not at war.[37] The New

Oxford American Dictionary defines peace in similar terms: (1) freedom from or cessation of war or violence; (2) support for a negotiated peace; and, (3) freedom from civil disorder; police action to restore peace.[38]

Prevention of war as a principal objective

The aforementioned attempt to understand the concept of peace, particularly in a global context, brings this essay to a vital issue: the prevention of war, and more significantly, nuclear disarmament, for the achievement of world peace. To this end, the foremost global treaty, the United Nations Charter (1945) was written while the world was still engulfed in World War II. Declaring the determination of the "Peoples of the United Nations… to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war," the Charter outlines the resolve of these Peoples to "live together in peace... and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure... that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest."[39]

The paramount organ of the UN responsible for maintaining or restoring peace and security in the world is the Security Council. Its functions, according to Charter articles 39-42, include the investigation of any disputes or situations which might lead to international conflict; to recommend methods of adjudication of such disputes or the terms of settlement; to formulate plans for the establishment of a system to regulate armaments; to determine the existence of a threat to the peace or act of aggression and to recommend what action should be taken; to call on Member-States to apply economic sanctions and other measures not involving the use of force in order to prevent or stop aggression; and, to take a military action against an aggressor.[40] Furthermore, UN peacekeeping activities are governed by Chapter VII of the Charter entitled, "Action with respect to Threat to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression." Professor Antonio Cassese aptly emphasizes the essence of the Charter in the following words: "The basic philosophy underlying the Charter is that every effort should be made to maintain peace and security... That whenever disagreements between States threaten to become explosive and to endanger peace, the UN must step in and endeavour to diffuse the situation." He further adds that "[t]he field of action of the UN thus becomes very broad, for any disagreement evidently may escalate into a major conflict."[41]

In his analysis, Professor Cassese concludes that the UN Charter has

tended to uphold a concept more of negative peace, or absence of war, than positive peace or the introduction of justice for the purpose of preventing as far as possible political tensions from degenerating into armed conflicts. This is not to say that the UN closed its eyes to political reality and refrained from suggesting political solutions calculated to prevent armed conflicts. Indeed, cooperation in the economic, social, and political fields was promoted, obligations were imposed on colonial powers and a role for the UN was also envisaged to further cooperation as regards disarmament. However, this part of the UN Charter proved rudimentary and weak. Particularly unsatisfactory were the provisions concerning colonies and economic relations.[42]

U.S. President John F. Kennedy hinted at the confluence of the positive and negative aspects of peace when he said: "Too many of us think that peace is impossible, unreal. But this is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable—that mankind is doomed— that we are gripped by forces we cannot control... Our problems are man-made. They can be solved by man."[43]

For decades, the conventional literature understood peace in its negative aspect. Perhaps, however, the word 'peace' was merely a misnomer. During the Cold War, U.S. foreign policy (and Canadian military and RCMP policy) used the word 'peace' as an ideologically-dosed, anti-Soviet and anti-progressive instrument. To illustrate, Canadian security and police agencies questioned Dr. Norman Alcock's loyalties because of his participation in a Moscow peace conference in the 1960s. "Interested in peace? I must have been a subversive," he laughed about the incident in 2004.[44] Also in the 1980s, Dr. Linus Pauling's passport was taken away by the U.S. government because he had been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. [45] One may even raise the question whether the word peace represents a term given to a strained relationship to indicate the submission of the vanquished. If it is a misnomer, does it lead us down an incorrect path of salvation? In the history of all nations, is peace a sort of periodic recurrence of unjust triumphs? If so, as long as that error remains with us, the seeking of genuine peace may lay beyond the reach of human possibilities. Prof. Johan Galtung concurs:

> Few words are so often used and abused—perhaps, it seems, because 'peace' serves as a means of obtaining verbal consensus—it is hard to be all-out against peace. Thus, when efforts are made to plead almost any kind of policy—say technical assistance, increased trade, tourism, new forms of education, irrigation, industrialization, etc.—then it is often asserted that that policy, in addition to other merits, will also serve the cause of peace.[46]

However, Galtung argues that such a "practice is not necessarily harmful. The use of the term 'peace' may in itself be peace-productive, producing a common basis, a feeling of communality."[47]

To conclude, notwithstanding that it has yet to reach an agreeable definition and theoretical framework, the word peace has both negative and positive dimensions. While polemology seeks the study of war from the perspective of the victor or victorious nations/entities, irenology (the study of peace) pursues ways toward conflict resolution, reconciliation, and sustained human relations, between nations and groups. Irenology, in fact, promotes peaceful co-existence of human societies and nations and fosters the concept of peace as an absence of dissension, violence, or war, and instead seeks harmony, tranquility and cooperation.[48]

Peace studies and peace research

In the remainder of this chapter, I attempt to present an understanding of Peace Studies and Peace Research.

With its beginning in the 1960s, Peace Studies has been recognized as an interdisciplinary field of Social Science, encompassing such subjects as Political Science, Sociology, Economics, Geography, Anthropology, Psychology, International Relations, Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, International Law, Education, Gender Studies, Religious Studies, Social Work, Philosophy, Law, International Organizations (including the United Nations System), Labour Studies, International Development, Human Security and Peace Building, Business and Public Relations Studies, Social Justice, and Criminology. A glance at the list of Nobel Prize winners (in all categories) will indicate that a number of eminent leading natural scientists have been leading advocates and researchers in Peace Studies: Marie Curie (Physics and Chemistry), Maria Montessori (Medicine and Education), Bertrand Russell (Mathematics and Literature), Linus Pauling (Chemistry and Peace), John Polanyi (Chemistry), and Joseph Needham (Physics). Traditionally, polemology has been heavily sponsored and funded by governments, industries and other private sectors. Irenology, on the other hand, has historically been discouraged by the establishment or deprived of its share of sponsorship and funding both in pedagogy and research. Notwithstanding the establishment's bias against Peace Studies, the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame informs us that "about 400 colleges and universities around the world offer peace studies programs of one kind or

another" indicating "a growing field that is increasingly drawn upon by scholars, foreign ministries, the United Nations, humanitarian agencies, government and military."[49]

The research domains of peace in some institutions are known as Peace and Conflict Studies. This field "identifies and analyses violent and nonviolent behaviours as well as the structural mechanisms attending conflicts… with a view towards understanding those processes which lead to a more desirable human condition." As a variation on Peace and Conflict Studies, "peace studies (irenology), is an interdisciplinary effort aiming at the prevention, de-escalation, and solution of conflicts by peaceful means, thereby seeking 'victory' for all parties involved in the conflict."[50]

The research scope of the peace studies field is a scientific inquiry striving towards peace from the micro-level of analysing internal conflict and peace in the individual human being to the macro-level of examining global peace matters, including social change and justice. The principal objective of peace research is an attempt to reach towards a world which is peaceful or at least free from violence.[51]

In his own summation, Dr. Norman Alcock considers the following to be the goals of Peace Research: (1) a compilation of war/peace facts, which could be used to support the disarmament/arms control position; (2) the development/establishment of scientific theories on the causes of war; (3) the legitimation of peace as a valid subject of study; (4) stimulation of war/peace debate; (5) help for decision-makers through alternative direction; and, (6) elimination of the war system by showing its absurdity.[52]

Some examples of peace studies institutions and associations: Canadian Peace Research Association (CPRA)

As one of the pioneers in Peace Studies, the CPRA, formerly the Canadian Peace Research and Education Association, was founded at the Learned Societies Conferences held at the University of Sherbrooke, Quebec, in June 1966.

Its objectives are to advance research and promote education in the study of the causes of war and the conditions of peace through: (1) the promotion of Peace Studies in Canada through interdisciplinary research activities and academic teaching; (2) the establishment of peace research