Chapter 1

Peace Studies, Peace Education, and Peace Research

Peace does not appear so distant as it did. I hope it will come soon, and come to stay; and so come to be worth the keeping in all future time.¹

—President Abraham Lincoln

Conflict is a theme that has occupied the thinking of men more than any other, save God and love.²

—Anatol Rapoport

Refugees arriving at the Greek island of Lesbos in 2015 after crossing the Aegean Sea in a small, dangerously crowded, inflatable boat.
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Peace studies is a child of its time, which in this case is the Cold War and the nuclear era from 1945 to the present. As a transdisciplinary inquiry into the nature of peace and the reasons for wars and other forms of human conflict, peace studies has grown exponentially since its birth during the mid-20th century.

Precursors of peace studies, peace education, and peace research go back to ancient times. But the systematic practice of peace education began in the early 20th century, partly in reaction to World War I. It took off after World War II, as did the earliest higher education–based peace studies programs. Similarly, although the origins of peace research date back to religious and ethical debates on peace and war scattered across various world cultures and traditions, and the forerunners of scientific approaches to investigating war and peace emerged in conjunction with World War I, peace and conflict research as a distinct scholarly discipline took off soon after World War II. It continues to be alive and vibrant today.

**Peace Studies, War Studies, and Peace and Conflict Studies**

How does one study peace? Whereas there have been different approaches to studying peace, contemporary Western peace studies (or *irenology,* from the Greek “eirene” or “Irene,” the goddess of peace) focuses on the analysis and prevention, de-escalation and solution of conflicts by primarily peaceful, or nonviolent means, thereby seeking victory for all parties involved in the conflict, rather than a winner-take-all outcome. This is in contrast to war studies (or what Johan Galtung, a founder of peace studies, calls *polemology,* from the Greek “polemos,” or “the spirit of war”) and security studies, which tend to focus on the factors leading to victory or defeat in conflicts waged principally by violent means and to the increased or decreased “security” of one or more, but not all, parties involved.

Importantly, since peace studies investigates the reasons for and outcomes of large- and small-scale conflicts, as well as the preconditions for peace, the discipline is also known as *peace and conflict studies* (PCS or PACS). PCS allows one to examine the reasons for and prevention of wars, as well as the nature of violence, including social oppression, discrimination, exploitation, and marginalization, or what Galtung and others call *structural violence.* Through the rigorous analysis of peace and conflict, one can also learn peacemaking strategies. Peace and conflict studies is accordingly an academic field that identifies and analyzes individual and collective violent and nonviolent behaviors as well as the structural mechanisms underlying social, political, and economic conflicts in order to understand and transform those processes that might lead to a more peaceful planet.

Peace and conflict studies also addresses the effects of political, cultural, and social violence, the causes of this violence, and what can be done to resolve conflicts peacefully. The rapid growth in these programs in colleges and universities in North America, Western Europe, and elsewhere reflects growing popular alarm about war violence, and other global perils (including the nuclear threat, low intensity conflict, the costs of arms races, environmental destruction, domestic violence,
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ethnic and regional conflicts, terrorism, etc.). People concerned about violence are turning to education as a means to heighten awareness about the causes of violence and to promote nonviolent alternatives to violent means of conflict resolution.

**Peace Education**

Peace education is the theory and practice of education about peace and nonviolence and a commitment to building a more cooperative society by utilizing the concepts and practices of peace studies, conflict resolution, and nonviolence. The first initiatives to develop peace education mainly focused on the horrors of war and statistics about weapon systems. Today, peace education comprises a wide variety of courses and programs aimed at giving students at all levels and of all ages the tools to reduce violence and oppression. These include strategies for avoiding bullying and increasing citizen empowerment.

According to Betty Reardon, a noted American peace educator,

the general purpose of peace education . . . is the development of an authentic planetary consciousness that will enable us to function as global citizens and to transform the present human condition by changing the social structures and patterns of thought that have created it.4

Like other progressive peace educators, Reardon takes “a transformational approach,” one, that, like peace studies, is based on peace research. The goal of peace education at all levels, from this point of view, is the development and transmission of pedagogy and practices that shift current conventional values, thinking, behaviors, and institutions away from violence and toward nonviolent solutions to interpersonal, social, and political disputes.

Toward this end, The Peace Education Foundation writes and publishes materials for conflict-resolution curricula currently in use in more than 20,000 schools around the world. Like others in the field, this nongovernmental organization (NGO) views its mission as the education of children and adults in the dynamics of conflict and the promotion of the skills of peacemaking in homes, schools, communities, nation-states, and the world.

There are also numerous United Nations (UN) declarations on the importance of peace education. Koichiro Matsuura, past director-general of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), has written that peace education is of “fundamental importance to the mission of UNESCO and the United Nations.” There has also been some recent integration of peace education with education for democracy; women’s, children’s, indigenous peoples’, and LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) rights, and human rights more generally; as well as nonviolent conflict resolution.

The Israeli peace educator Gavriel Salomon has presented some major challenges facing peace educators around the world today, especially those working in zones of ongoing and seemingly intractable conflict (such as Israel and Palestine).5 In addition to political opposition to their programs and severe socioeconomic
inequalities in the regions where they operate, peace education practitioners also face such challenges as conflicting collective narratives, historical memories, and contradictory beliefs. According to Salomon, additional challenges that appear to concern the heart of peace education [are] the need to create a societal “ripple effect” whereby the impact of peace education programs spreads to wider social circles... increasing the endurance of desired program effects... the need for diverse programs... [and] the need to find ways to bridge the gap that divides the cultivation of desired general dispositions, principles, and values and their application in specific situations.

To maximize the enduring social impact of peace education, effective programs of peace education should take ethnic and social differences into account and combine general dispositions to peace with specific context-sensitive applications of peace pedagogy and practice. Peace and conflict studies may be viewed, in part, as the dimension of peace education that is increasingly focused on institutions of higher learning.

The Dimensions of Peace and Conflict Studies

As a scholarly enterprise, PCS is multi- or transdisciplinary, incorporating important theories and research findings from anthropology, sociology, political science, international relations, psychology, biology and zoology, ethics and philosophy, theology, history, and aspects of contemporary neuroscience. PCS is also multilevel, since it examines intrapersonal (or inner) peace and conflict, as well as peaceful and conflictual ienric and polenic relations between individuals, neighbors, ethnic groups, organizations, states, and civilizations (or outer peace and conflict).

Central to peace studies, peace education, and peace research is a concern not just with understanding the world but with changing it. This is a bone of contention for academics who espouse “value neutrality and scientific impartiality,” especially by such more conventional disciplines as political science, international relations, and strategic or security studies.

PCS is both normative (or prescriptive) and analytic (or descriptive). As a normative discipline, peace and conflict studies often makes value judgments, such as peace and nonviolence are better than war and violence. But it makes these judgments both on the basis of ethical postulates (i.e., humans should resolve conflicts as nonviolently as possible) and of analytic descriptions (i.e., most violent efforts to resolve conflicts in fact result in less social stability than nonviolent means of conflict resolution).

The Canadian peace scholar Conrad Brunk argues that the explicit value commitment of peace studies to peace requires another “value central to the very definition of Peace Studies—that violence is undesirable, and that where the same human goods can be achieved by them, nonviolent means are preferable to violent ones.” Therefore, the normative components of PCS are no different from many other
scholarly endeavors. Accordingly, what distinguishes PCS from most academic fields are principally its subject matter—peace, violence, conflict, and power—its inter- (or multi-) disciplinary methodology, and its aim of identifying, testing, and implementing many different strategies for dealing with conflict situations.

Peace and conflict studies is both theoretical and applied. Johan Galtung, the Norwegian sociologist and pioneer of the field, founded Transcend Peace University, a website that offers certificate-level courses and a master’s degree in peace and conflict transformation. “Peace studies,” writes Galtung,

is about relationship repair on all levels, so it’s crucial that these programs include both theory and practice. The field is moving beyond conflict resolution toward the teaching and practice of conflict transformation and reconciliation, which includes healing past wounds and creating long-term, sustainable peace between antagonistic parties.

At the theoretical level, PCS aims to uncover the roots of conflict and cooperation by examining and proposing theoretical models to explain violent and nonviolent individual and collective behaviors, both historically and cross-culturally. By revealing the underlying structures that give rise to human conflict and that support conflict resolution, PCS also hopes to transform the underlying causes, develop preventive strategies, and teach conflict transformation skills.

Fieldwork is often an important part of peace studies, with students taking extended internships in conflict zones where they can learn and apply dialogue, negotiation, and mediation skills. The fruits of peace studies may sometimes be difficult to see and take long to come to fruition, but that does not discourage Mary King, a professor at the University for Peace (in Costa Rica), who has stated, “When you are dealing with millennia during which war has been the ultimate arbiter of conflicts, you can’t expect change in a decade or two.”

Peace and conflict studies also aspires to be multicultural and cosmopolitan, in part citing the lives and works of Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. as its paragons. However, true multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism remain more an aspiration than a reality for the field, since most peace studies programs and centers are located in the West (although their influence is increasing elsewhere, particularly in Australasia).

Peace and conflict studies is both a pedagogical activity, in which teachers and learners come together to understand the roots of peace and conflict, and a research enterprise, in which researchers propose rigorous theories and methods for formulating and testing hypotheses about the sources of conflict and the institutionalization of lasting cultures of peace.

PCS teachers, students, and researchers are a key component of the more generic field of peace education, which ranges from primary school to postdoctoral pedagogical activities. And they may also interact with peace and antiwar activists and political movements engaged in “peace work.” This reflects the dual nature of PCS as a scholarly enterprise and as a force for the pacification of the Earth. Peace education and peace research, as complements to peace studies, strive not just to study but also to achieve peace.
PCS as Pedagogical Activity

Everyday citizens, teachers, and students have long been motivated by an interest in peace. American student interest in what is today considered peace studies first appeared in the form of campus clubs at U.S. colleges in the years immediately following the Civil War. Similar movements appeared in Sweden at the end of the 19th century and elsewhere in Europe soon after. These were usually student-originated discussion groups, not formal courses included in college curricula.

Because of its destructiveness, World War I, or “The War to End All Wars,” was a turning point in many Western attitudes to war. When the leaders of France, Britain, and the United States (led by Georges Clemenceau, David Lloyd George, and Woodrow Wilson, respectively) met to sign the Treaty of Paris in 1919, and to decide the postwar future of Europe, President Wilson proposed his famous Fourteen Points for peacemaking. These included breaking up European empires into nation-states and the establishment of a League of Nations. These proposals were the background to a number of developments in the emergence of PCS as an academic discipline, such as the founding in 1919 of the first chair in International Relations (at Aberystwyth University in Wales).

As the noted peace scholar Elise Boulding has pointed out, peace studies was initiated by scholars who were consciously separating themselves from the older, more established discipline of international relations. Other peace studies educators have argued that the field of international relations itself was initially developed with a peace studies focus to avoid war. Peace studies started out on most American college campuses within departments emphasizing international relations, which, to many scholars and activists, had reneged on the study and promotion of war avoidance. To address this pedagogical gap, peace studies began to develop a broader base on colleges and universities throughout North America.

Just after World War II, many university courses on peace and war were established. The first undergraduate academic program in peace studies in the United States was created in 1948 at Manchester College in Indiana. It was not until the late 1960s in the United States that student and professorial objections to the Vietnam War stimulated more universities to offer courses about peace, whether in an undergraduate major or postgraduate degree program, or as a course within such traditional majors as political science and sociology. For example, Manhattan College, a Catholic college in New York City, began its peace studies program in 1968, while Colgate University started one in 1969.

In England, the first school of peace studies was founded at Bradford University in 1973. Like many others, Bradford’s program defines peace not just as an absence of large-scale conflict and violence—known as negative peace—but also as structural cooperation that fosters justice and freedom, also known as positive peace, based on human rights, equal access to education, and just social and political structures.

In the 1970s, many North American universities offered courses about the war in Vietnam. Many faculty who created these programs were responding to student demands to create courses that “had relevance to their lives.”
Growth in peace studies programs accelerated during the 1980s, as students and the general public became increasingly concerned about the prospects of nuclear war. Their concern about the fate of the planet spurred the creation of a host of new courses and programs aimed at promoting global survival. Key components of peace studies during this period included courses on violence and war, the nuclear arms race and the threat of nuclear destruction, international conflict, alleged aggressive tendencies in human nature, disarmament, discrimination against minorities, group conflicts, nonviolent action, defense policy, group dynamics, environmental damage, cultural integration, the unequal distribution of wealth, women's roles, Central America, and structural violence.

With the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the formal end of the Cold War in 1991, the emphasis of peace studies courses at many North American colleges shifted somewhat from international politics to the domestic scene, emphasizing structural, domestic, and civil violence. In 1991, the United States Institute of Peace published Approaches to Peace: An Intellectual Map, which listed the following headings for the study of peace: traditional approaches (collective security and deterrence); international law approaches (international law, interstate organizations, third-party dispute settlement); new approaches (transnationalism, behavioral approaches, conflict resolution); and political systems approaches (internal systems and systemic theories/world systems). Many international organizations, agencies, and NGOs, from the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), and the World Bank to the International Crisis Group, International Alert, and others, began to draw on PCS research. By the mid-1990s, peace studies curricula in the United States had somewhat shifted from research and teaching about negative peace to positive peace.

Since the beginning of the new millennium, course offerings in peace studies have expanded to include topics such as: north-south relations; development, debt, and global poverty; the environment, population growth, and resource scarcity; feminist perspectives on peace, militarism, and political violence; and nonviolent alternatives to terrorism. There is also an increasing emphasis on conflict resolution and transformation.

**PCS Today**

Peace and conflict studies today is widely researched and taught in a large and growing number of institutions. The number of universities offering peace and conflict studies courses is hard to estimate, mostly because courses may be taught in different departments and have different names. The International Peace Research Association website (http://www.iprafoundation.org) provides one of the most authoritative listings available.

A 2008 article in the *International Herald Tribune* mentioned over 400 programs of teaching and research in peace and conflict studies, noting in particular those at the United World Colleges, The Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), the American University (Washington, D.C.), the University of Notre Dame, George Mason
University (Virginia), Syracuse University, the University of Bradford (which may have the largest and most comprehensive university-based peace studies program), the UN-mandated Peace University (UPEACE in Ciudad Colón, Costa Rica), Lund and Uppsala Universities (Sweden), the Universities of Queensland and Sydney (Australia), Innsbruck and Klagenfurt Universities (Austria), Universitat Jaume I in Castellón de la Plana (Spain), and the Universities of Oslo and Tromsø (Norway). Other notable programs can be found at the University of Waterloo (Canada), University of Hiroshima (Japan), King’s College (Department of War Studies, University of London), London Metropolitan University, Sakarya University (Istanbul, Turkey), Marburg University (Germany), Sciences Po (Paris), University of Amsterdam (Netherlands), the University of Otago (New Zealand), St Andrews University (Scotland), and the Universities of Coventry and York (England), and Chapman University (California). The Rotary Foundation, the Joan B. Kroc Foundation, and the UN University (Tokyo) support several international academic teaching and research programs.

Of the several hundred North American colleges and universities with peace studies programs, about one-half are in church-related schools, about a third are in large public universities (such as the University of California at Berkeley), approximately one-fifth are in non-church-related private colleges, and a smaller number are in community colleges. About half of the church-related schools that have peace studies programs are Roman Catholic. Other religious denominations with more than one college or university with a peace studies program are the Mennonites, Quakers, United Church of Christ, and Church of the Brethren. About 80% of these programs are at the undergraduate level and the rest at the graduate level. Only about 10% of these North American colleges and universities have both undergraduate and graduate programs.

Under the auspices of the Kroc Institute, the University of Notre Dame offers a number of doctoral programs in peace studies and related disciplines. Other institutions of higher education responding to the burgeoning interest in the field include the University for Peace—established by the United Nations in demilitarized Costa Rica in 1980. Peace studies programs are noticeable by their absence at elite private universities, where departments of political science and government hold sway along with programs in security and international studies (although the University of Oxford has approved the creation of a senior-level faculty position in peace studies).

PCS programs and international security and diplomacy research agendas have also become common in institutions located in conflict, postconflict, and developing countries and regions, for example, the National Peace Council (Sri Lanka), Centre for Human Rights (University of Sarajevo, Bosnia), Chulalongkorn University (Thailand), National University of Timor (Timor-Leste), University of Kabul (Afghanistan), Makerere University (Uganda), Tel Aviv University (Israel), the University of Sierra Leone, and so on.

At the present time, PCS is somewhat shifting its focus from interstate rivalry to intrastate conflict, as well as to problems caused by interpersonal violence. Whereas peace studies faculty used to come mostly from international relations and political science, they now are drawn from many different fields, including social welfare
and education, such conventional disciplines as psychology, philosophy, and sociology, and recently minted graduate-degree programs in PCS itself. While the original emphasis of PCS in the United States was on the cessation of war (most specifically the war in Vietnam), today, the field is addressing such hot-button issues as intrapsychic and interpersonal conflicts as well as wars, terrorism, trafficking, refugees, treaties, climate change, and international efforts to curtail war and to promote an ecologically sustainable future. Additionally, many scholars on university campuses are trying to apply the insights of principled and strategic nonviolence (to be discussed in Chapter 23) to diverse settings.

**PCS as Research**

Although such individual thinkers as Plato and Kant long recognized the centrality of peace for inner and outer harmony, it was not until the 1950s and 1960s that peace studies began to emerge as an academic discipline with its own research tools, a specialized set of concepts, and such forums for discussion as conferences and journals. Peace research institutes were established in Europe in the 1960s, although many of these do not offer formal peace studies courses. Some of the oldest and most prominent peace research centers include PRIO in Oslo, founded in 1959; the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University in Sweden; and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). The work of such peace researchers as Johan Galtung and John Burton, and the establishment of such scholarly journals as *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* and *The Journal of Peace Research* in the 1950s and 1960s, reflected the growing interest in and academic stature of the field.

In 1963, the Peace Research Society was founded in Sweden. The group of initial members included Walter Isard, Kenneth Boulding, and Anatol Rapoport. In 1973, this group became the Peace Science Society. Peace science was viewed by these academics as an interdisciplinary and international effort to develop a set of theories, techniques, and data to better understand and mitigate conflict. Peace science attempts to use quantitative techniques developed in economics and political science, especially game theory and econometrics, otherwise seldom used by researchers in peace studies. The Peace Science Society website makes available the *Correlates of War*, one of the best-known collections of data on international conflict. The society also publishes two scholarly journals: *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* and *Conflict Management and Peace Science*.

In 1964, the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) was formed at a conference organized by Quakers in Switzerland. The IPRA holds a biennial conference. IPRA research typically focuses on qualitative, comparative, institutional, and historical research.

In 2001, the Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA) was created after the merger of two precursor organizations. The PJSA is the North American affiliate of IPRA. It publishes a newsletter (*The Peace Chronicle*), lists programs in peace, justice, and conflict studies, and holds annual conferences on themes related to the organization’s mission “to create a just and peaceful world” through research, scholarship, pedagogy, and activism.
Some Contributions of PCS

Scholars and others working in peace and conflict studies have made significant contributions to the policies of many nongovernmental organizations, development agencies, international financial institutions, and the UN system, as well as to human knowledge more generally. Specific scholarly contributions have been made to conflict resolution and citizen diplomacy; economic, social, and political development and reform; peacekeeping, mediation, early warning, prevention, statebuilding, and peacebuilding; and the causes of war and the reasons for peace, among others.

More recently, social scientists and other peace researchers, while still in part focusing on assessing historical trends in warfare and violence, have also increasingly analyzed the comparative efficacy or failure of violent and nonviolent strategies and tactics of revolutionary and other movements of social and political change. This represents a shift in interest from conflict management approaches, or a negative peace orientation to conflict resolution, to peacebuilding approaches aimed at a positive peace. This shift started at the end of the Cold War and was encapsulated in the report of then–UN secretary-general Boutros Boutros-Ghali, An Agenda for Peace. What has been called liberal peacebuilding or statebuilding, is based largely on the work that has been carried out in this area. A notable case of bringing theory to practice has involved applying specific techniques for nonviolent revolution to the “Arab Spring” and other potentially prodemocracy movements. These techniques, initially developed by peace researcher Gene Sharp, have been so widely (and sometimes successfully) adopted that Sharp has been called a godfather of some of these stunning events, especially in Tunisia.

Peace researchers also investigate, catalog, and analyze arms production, trade, disarmament, and their political and economic impact comparing them with those of peace.

After the limited successes of liberal peacebuilding or statebuilding in places as diverse as Cambodia, Colombia, the Balkans, Timor-Leste, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Nepal, Tunisia, and Burma/Myanmar, some PCS scholars have advocated an emancipatory form of peacebuilding, based upon an international “responsibility to protect” (R2P), human security, local ownership, and popular participation in democracy-building processes. Ultimately, however, the success or failure of PCS will depend on the impact it has on you, students of the field, and—optimally—purveyors of peace as well.

Conflicts Within PCS

Not surprisingly, there are disagreements within PCS. Although many PCS observers and critics smile when they hear about conflicts among those studying conflicts, the reality is that just as doctors sometimes get diseases, PCS scholars and practitioners now and then have disputes. (Thus far, however, they have all been resolved nonviolently.)

For example, as we have noted, peace studies is now often referred to as peace and conflict studies, reflecting the integration of studying peace and understanding
the nature of conflict. But some leaders in the field believe that by doing so, peace studies risks becoming more like war studies, because much attention in peace research is devoted to war research and conflict resolution rather than to building peace and transforming conflicts by peaceful and not bellicose means.9

The inclusion of the analysis of (violent) conflict within peace studies has sparked a debate not only with mainstream international relations and its dominant Realpolitik orientation but also in the field of peace studies itself. Most research on large-scale conflicts is focused on armed ones. Wars have been studied from many different perspectives since the first works in this field were published. This tradition, from pioneers such as Lewis Richardson and Quincy Wright, has dominated most conflict research ever since. The exceptions are few but very important.

The history of peace discourse and movements is intertwined with opposition to war and the advocacy of conflict reduction and war cessation, dating back to the ancient Romans and Chinese. Accordingly, for PCS, analysis of the reasons for war and other forms of violent conflict is linked to its aspiration for violence prevention, reduction, and possible elimination.

Also, some PCS researchers and activists claim that if we could simply persuade people to be more tolerant and open-minded, conflicts would no longer be harmful, or may even disappear altogether. Others focus on how people behave, maintaining that the problem is humanity’s use of violent and aggressive means of trying to resolve conflict. And some conflict transformers argue that what matters is that existing social and economic contradictions be resolved or transcended. All three perspectives have some “fundamentalists,” but a growing majority of PCS researchers and conflict specialists see the need to include them all.

An old controversy within PCS concerns the relation between inner and outer peace. Should one first strive to achieve peace within one’s self or initially try to create greater peace in society at large? Which comes first, healing one’s self to gain inner peace, or changing a violent world to gain outer peace? Despite different views, many peace researchers and activists view this as a false dilemma and see the need for both inner and outer peace.

Some peace scholars and educators are absolute pacifists (as proponents of “principled nonviolence,” opposing the use of military force in virtually all circumstances), but many are not, advocating what is called “strategic nonviolence,” and there is no limits test to decide the matter. Scholars and peacebuilders are united not by ideology but by a commitment to finding nonviolent solutions rooted in justice. Many see themselves as contributing to a body of knowledge and practice that historically has been neglected in favor of the study and practice of war. But peace studies is not antimilitary. Many peace scholars are in conversations with the military, and many in the military are supportive of peace studies.

As in other social and human sciences, there is considerable debate about methodology within PCS. Should the emphasis be on quantitative or qualitative studies in order to get the best understanding of a conflict or a peace movement? At present, the majority of those who are close to the political science and international relations side tend to use more quantitative methodologies, while the social movement and nonviolent side usually conducts more qualitative studies. Both approaches contribute importantly to the field.
When initiatives are taken to have new PCS programs at universities, there have often been spirited discussions regarding whether the best way to create a PCS degree is to include PCS in already existing fields (like international relations) and divisions (like social science), or to set up separate PCS centers. Around the world there is now an expansion of both types.

Many academic fields have a theoretical component—PCS included. Good theories are essential for anyone who wants to understand the world. The complexity of conflicts makes it a challenge to have a complete understanding of such a multifaceted political reality. As with most human sciences, PCS finds it difficult to do experiments and tests that can be repeated. This is not to say that empirical observation and facts are without significance for PCS. The more and better case studies available to the researchers, the more accurate should be the theories based on these observations.

Comparing PCS with meteorology and the early history of public health may help clarify some of the challenges faced by the field. The complexity of weather forecasting is probably similar to the complexity of many conflicts. Meteorologists today are pretty good at predicting a five-day weather forecast. By identifying, measuring, and analyzing the many variables that influence the weather, they are able to forecast the probability of how weather will develop in the near future. However, it is almost impossible to accurately predict the more distant future. Early warning systems for predicting the development of human conflicts face similar or even more difficult challenges. Human beings significantly alter the Earth's climate, especially global warming, but have little influence on day-to-day weather. Natural forces create weather and human behavior creates conflicts.

To understand human behavior is essential, but not sufficient, for students of PCS, because PCS is an ethical and applied social science as well as an analytical one. Like public health professionals who were trying about a century ago simultaneously to forge a disciplinary identity separate from the medical establishment as well as scientifically to analyze and treat epidemics, contemporary peace scholars, researchers, and students attempt not merely to understand the world but to improve it. But before acting, one must have sufficient knowledge and skills. For a medical student doing surgery or for a public health worker combating a mass infection, this is obvious. Many soldiers are normally given at least a year of training prior to being sent to a conflict zone. Similarly, peace and conflict workers should be equipped with a comparable toolbox of conflict resolution skills and nonviolent techniques before they intervene in a conflict.

All tools, theories, and kinds of knowledge can be misused. Medical science is a gift to humanity, but it was misused by some doctors in Nazi Germany. Governments and individuals employing tactics of torture often use legally, psychologically, and medically trained personnel to help them be more efficient. Many PCS scholars and activists feel a need to include a humanitarian ethic in the teaching of PCS. Johan Galtung has suggested a version of the Hippocratic Oath, which may be as useful for students of PCS as the Hippocratic Oath has been for medical students and physicians. 10
Criticisms of PCS and Responses

Critics of the field have sometimes claimed that PCS research is diffuse, imprecise, and insufficiently rigorous. Such views have been strongly opposed by scholars who have done interdisciplinary, theoretical, methodological, and empirical research into the causes of violence and dynamics of peace.

Some academics and nonacademic critics have asserted that peace studies approaches are not objective, are derived from mainly leftist and/or inexpert sources, are not practical, support certain forms of violence and terrorism rather than reject them, or have not led to useful policy developments.

PCS defenders respond that other social and human sciences are also normatively oriented and involve subjective choices; sociology, political science, psychology, and even economics, for example, are not neutral, value-free sciences. They typically value, for example, social stability (in the case of sociology), democracy and freedom (political science), sanity (psychology), and capitalism (economics). The sources on which PCS educators and researchers rely are often the same books, journals, and databases as other academic fields and reflect the full range of ideological and political orientations. PCS action proposals are almost entirely nonviolent and antiterrorist in orientation. And while these proposals may or may not be operationalized, they are neither more nor less practical than action plans drawn up outside PCS.

Furthermore, the development of UN and major donor policies (including the European Union, United States, United Kingdom, Japan, Canada, Norway, etc.) in conflict and postconflict countries has been heavily influenced by PCS. Since roughly the year 2000, a range of key policy documents has been developed by these governments, as have such UN (or UN-related) documents as “agenda for Peace,” “Agenda for Development,” “Agenda for Democratization,” the “Millennium Development Goals,” and the “Responsibility to Protect.” PCS research has also been influential in the work of, among others, the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the UN Peacebuilding Commission, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the World Bank, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

PCS also influences such international NGOs as International Alert, International Crisis Group, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and many local NGOs. And major databases have been generated by the work of PCS scholars, such as “The Correlates of War” by the Peace Science Society at the University of Michigan, and also by PRIO, SIPRI, and the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict in Washington, D.C.

Finally, peace and conflict studies debates have generally confirmed, not undermined, a broad consensus (Western and beyond) on the importance of human security, human rights, equitable and sustainable economic development, democracy, and the rule of law (though there is a vibrant debate ongoing about the contextual variations and applications of these frameworks).

A necessary but insufficient condition for peace is the absence of war. The main task for peace researchers should be to help in building peace with peaceful means. It seems natural for avowed peace researchers to study the most peaceful cases of conflict resolution and transformation in order to learn how to handle all forms of conflict.
The Future of PCS

The growth of peace studies programs in Canada, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, China, India and the developing world, Western and Central Europe, and elsewhere indicates a concern for the future of life on this planet. Faculty members are using their professional skills to educate students about the causes of war while pointing out concrete alternatives to violent behavior. PCS programs vary considerably as to their scope, content, and structure. More conventional programs emphasizing the study of treaty arrangements, alliance systems, deterrence theories, and the study of war between sovereign nation-states have been complemented by newer programs focusing on subnational groups and movements that cut across the boundaries of nation-states.

PCS programs, especially at the graduate level, increasingly require a core curriculum comprising the history of PCS theories and movements; qualitative and quantitative research methodologies; ethics, philosophical, and religious contributions to the field; and case studies and other applications of conflict resolution methods to current conflicts, including peacebuilding and fieldwork.

Many PCS faculty members work with peace and social justice organizations in their communities. Such efforts at peacebuilding may help build a support base for academic peace studies programs. Institutional and increased financial support is needed to give PCS programs both an ongoing identity and a continuing vitality on college and university campuses. Without institutional support, these programs tend to rely too much on the good will of a few committed faculty members, who can easily become burned out as they try to juggle peace studies with their existing academic and personal commitments.

As we move further into the 21st century, there is a danger that many peace studies courses and programs will disappear as faculty and administrators who were attracted to peace studies as a result of the war in Vietnam, the original Cold War between the Soviet Union and the West, and/or the nuclear threat, retire. Many graduate programs produce young scholars, committed to peace paradigms, but quite a few of these recent PhDs have trouble finding work in universities that are downsizing and whose faculty and administrators are committed to traditional subject matter. Younger scholars, originally attracted to the idealistic visions of peace education, may become frustrated and disappointed at the academy's inability to incorporate them. Many budding and even established multidisciplinary scholars feel they are peripheral to traditional academic disciplines and funding agencies.

Scholarly debate about the value of multidisciplinary programs also provides a challenge for PCS. Most scholars are accustomed to looking at the world through the lenses of the disciplines in which they were trained. Peace studies, rather than relying on a unidisciplinary perspective, can provide a potentially unifying center for political scientists, educators, sociologists, theologians, psychologists, biological scientists, lawyers, anthropologists, economists, diplomats, historians, and philosophers seeking to use their academic skills to shed light on how peace and conflict affect humanity and the Earth. Nonetheless, although colleges and universities typically pay lip service to interdisciplinary studies, the reality is that such programs are difficult to establish and to maintain; in this regard, PCS, sadly, is no exception.
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Studies of the causes of and remedies for violence are so multifaceted that they should not be limited to one discipline. PCS students are frequently educated in multidimensional and rigorous ways not often rewarded in traditional academic settings. Many peace studies programs are student centered, based upon dialogue (and not lecture) and group and experiential learning, value-laden in their commitment to justice, and passionate in their aversion to violence. Such pedagogy has brought forth critics who accuse PCS of being soft or lacking in rigor, as well as champions, especially among the graduates of PCS programs, who frequently laud their educational experiences.

The recent re-emergence of peace, social justice, antiwar, and democracy movements, most notably the Arab Spring and Occupy movements (despite their respective shortcomings), has created new opportunities for PCS programs. With energized peace and nonviolent democracy movements demanding that attention be paid to problems of violence and injustice, PCS may gain wider acceptance by the West and the rest of the world, as citizens looking for solutions to violent conflict, ecological destruction, and socioeconomic inequity turn to peace researchers and activists for education and support.

Nonetheless, in spite of the tremendous carnage of the 20th and early 21st centuries, and the worldwide renaissance of nonviolent movements for social and political change, PCS is still in danger of academic and political marginalization. The mass media’s and mainstream politicians’ emphasis on responding to violence with greater violence makes it hard to build a foundation of support for peace studies among citizenries and decision makers who see the pursuit of peace by peaceful means as idealistic, unglamorous, impractical, and/or unprofitable.

The pursuit of peace is often labeled idealistic because it is assumed that human beings will always be violent due to “human nature,” and any talk about building a peaceful global community is seen as dangerous and naive. It is also considered unglamorous in the sense that bloody and dramatic events make headlines; an old saying in journalism is that “If it bleeds, it leads.” Peacemaking successes are usually not covered by mainstream mass media seeking to titillate an audience that has been raised on glamorous and unrealistic images of violence promoted on television, in novels, movies, video games, and popular music. News reports obsessively cover the protagonists and antagonists in violent conflicts but generally ignore the peacemakers who may be present and trying to resolve conflicts nonviolently. And the business of war and preparations for war (aka the military-industrial complex) is a multitrillion dollar global enterprise whose economic and political clout currently dwarfs that of PCS. Accordingly, PCS needs to find ways to dramatize the work of peace heroes and heroines and to signal the successes of nonviolent movements for social, political, and economic equity. It is crucial that the struggle to build a peaceful world be a dynamic part of the public debate, so that the rest of the 21st century will not be as dominated by violence and war as were much of the 20th century and the first two decades of this one.

PCS faces problems of definition, influence, continuity, legitimacy, status, and funding, but it does so with hundreds of programs, thousands of graduates, and an immense global need for peaceful conflict resolution.
What are some possible futures for PCS? The field may collapse entirely (which at the present time is unlikely), may plateau (which is possible), or may continue to expand. Theories of conflicts based on the knowledge of what most conflicts have in common—from individual conflicts to group and national conflicts to international and global disputes—are increasingly being developed, tested, and refined. With new generations of students graduating from PCS and many moving on to graduate-level programs or the helping professions, recognition of the field as a legitimate, evidence-based discipline should grow. For judicious and effective action to take place, theories need to be combined with in-depth knowledge of actual cases. Informed critical evaluations of past conflicts will help peace activists to act more appropriately to address future ones.

**A Final Note on Peace and Conflict Studies, Education, and Research**

When Gandhi said that the theory and practice of nonviolence was at the same level as electricity in Edison's day, he was probably right. "Peace by peaceful means" has taken the first step on the long road from being a slogan to becoming a reality. With disciplined research, creative action, and compassion, PCS educators, activists, and students can better address future global challenges. We hope this textbook will be a useful tool for those taking that path. At the same time, we note with alarm and regret that violence continues to plague the world, such that the need for a PCS approach has never been greater.

Like peace itself, peace studies, peace research, and peace education are very much works in progress. We invite you to discuss and debate the values and methods used by these fields to propagate their vision and mission of creating more peace on earth via violence reduction, peacemaking, conflict transformation, and lifestyle change.

**Notes**

3. "Peace Studies is an interdisciplinary field encompassing systematic research and teaching on the causes of war and the conditions of peace. It focuses on the causes of . . . violence. While there is disagreement of the exact content of the field, and even on the definition of peace, most would agree that peace studies began to be identified as a separate field of inquiry during the first few decades after World War II . . . the field is multidisciplinary . . . international . . . policy oriented . . . and . . . value explicit." Carolyn M. Stephenson. 1999. "Peace Studies, Overview." In *The Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*, eds. L. Kurtz and J. Turpin. San Diego: Academic Press, Vol. 2, 809–10.


7. The United States Institute of Peace (USIP) was established in 1984 by Congress as a publicly funded national institution chartered to “serve the American people and the federal government through the widest possible range of education and training, basic and applied research opportunities, and peace information services on the means to promote international peace and the resolution of conflicts among the nations and peoples of the world without recourse to violence.”


**Questions for Further Reflection**

1. From what you’ve now read about peace and conflict studies, what would you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of this field?

2. If you were to design a peace education program for your community/nation, what would you include?

3. Do you think global peace is achievable in your lifetime? Why or why not?

4. What are the most and least fruitful areas of PCS research?

5. How do you envision the future of PCS?

**Suggestions for Further Reading**


**Journals**

Journal of Conflict Resolution: http://jcr.sagepub.com/
Peace Review: http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/10402659.asp*

**Websites**

*Correlates of War (University of Michigan): http://www.correlatesofwar.org/
International Peace Research Association (IPRA): http://www.iprafoundation.org/
Peace Research Association Oslo (PRIO): http://www.prio.no/
Peace Science Society: http://pss.la.psu.edu/
PUGWASH: http://www.pugwash.org/
Transcend International: http://www.transcend.org/*