

## PEACE STUDIES: A BRIEF PHILOSOPHICAL OUTLINE

N. Ramthing

### Abstract

*Peace is vital for mutual and harmonious global existence. Avenues for academic and practical discourse on international peace are not irrelevant. Peace studies as an engaging discipline, having a global outlook, theoretical, practical, and normative, can be a promising platform for addressing issues concerning conflicts and violence through peaceful means. The enumeration and adumbration of various theories can set a perspective for pragmatically understanding peace for perpetual peace. Peace is not only an abstract idea; practical aspects are woven throughout the ideas. The unfolding of conceptual relevance to practical platforms is generated through the prism of inquiry into widely divergent spheres related to the issues. In light of the critical role of peace studies in fostering constructive conflict resolution to crises and conflicts, this study emphasizes the necessity of bolstering peace studies as an essential tactic for achieving global peace. Any endeavor for a peace strategy that aims to transform and resolve conflicts calls for a nonviolent approach since achieving peace is just as vital as the desired outcome: a peaceful international order. This paper is divided into three sections: the first defines and adumbrates the term, the second identifies and analyses numerous concepts, and the third highlights the discipline as one of the key facets of human enterprise.*

**Key Words:** *Violence, Nonviolent, Ahimsa, Peace, Conflict, War, Peace Studies*

### I

Humanity's history is replete with violent confrontations. Violence has rarely stopped throughout human history, with the first recorded instance occurring in the book of Genesis when Abel is killed by his brother Cain. Violence is undeniable, though, that there have been rare instances of peace. It is necessary to comprehend ideas of violence to comprehend peace. Peace studies is a human endeavour to shed light on the possibility of fostering peace; as Xenophanes said, "Not from the beginning did the gods reveal all things to mortals, but in time they find what is better by seeking" (J.H. Leshner 1991:229). Peace studies is the pursuit of understanding that human endeavors hold the key to achieving peace. An innovative and creative synthesis of concepts and theories from different subjects is what makes peace studies an interdisciplinary or

transdisciplinary discipline. Even if the goal is a component of the totality, it goes well beyond the constrained parameters of a specific area of expertise. Peace studies as an academic discipline is primarily concerned with de-escalating violent conflicts by palliating their causes, promoting peaceful methods of conflict resolution, and building peace through nonviolent means. The concept of peace is as old as human civilization and that all the religions speak about peace as an inalienable tenet. Conflict, violence, and peace are meta-disciplines, rendering it transdisciplinary. Discourse on conflict and peace penetrates across disciplinary boundaries. Numerous academic fields have a stake in understanding violence's nature, causes, and effects, including political science, sociology, anthropology, psychology, history, geography, economics, law, international relations, gender studies, religious studies, tribal studies, and development studies. True to its name, the discipline explores a range of academic fields that address problems of violence and peace in diverse domains. The studies of peace and its periphery are philosophical, like politics, other social sciences, and related fields of study. Establishing what could make up a whole aspect of peace studies is a contentious question, rendering the definition of peace challenging.

This paper aims to provide a brief philosophical introduction to highlight the vital need for bolstering peace studies and research as one of the main facets of human enterprise. It is not a broad historical genesis of peace studies, an endeavor to establish argument and justification, or an attempt to discern hitherto unknown theories.

The term 'peace' is derived from the Anglo-French *pes* and the Old French *pais*, meaning peace, reconciliation, silence, and agreement. However, *pes* itself originates from the Latin *pax*, meaning "peace, compact, agreement, treaty of peace, tranquillity, absence of hostility, harmony." Peace in Hebrew is *shalom*, meaning to be safe, sound, healthy, perfect, complete, etc., a sense of well-being and harmony both within and without: a state of completeness, wholeness, tranquillity, fullness, absence of discord, calm and serene. Peace is intangible but discernible by its absence or sporadic (occasional) appearance. It is like happiness, justice, health, and other human ideals. In Weber's dictionary, peace is defined negatively as 'freedom from civil clamor (make loud demand) and confusion and positively as a state of public quiet.' Webster's second distinct definition of peace is a 'mental or spiritual condition marked by freedom from disquieting or oppressive thoughts or emotions as well as 'calmness of mind and heart: serenity of spirit.' Thirdly, peace is a tranquil freedom from outside disturbances and harassment. Fourthly, peace denotes 'harmony in human or personal relations: mutual concord and esteemed.' Peace is also defined as 'a state of mutual concord between government: absence of hostilities or war, the period of such freedom from war'. The

sixth definition of peace is the 'absence of activity and noise: deep stillness: quietness, or 'divine peace' or positive inner peace.'

Patrick M. Ragan, in his Presidential address to the Peace Science Society, says, "We cannot be adequate problem solvers or social scientists if we cannot articulate a definition of or the condition of peace" (Patrick M. Ragan 2014:348). According to Charles Webel, peace is dialectical. Peace is neither a timeless essence- an unchanging ideal substance- nor a mere name without a reference, a form without content. Peace is both a historical ideal and a term whose meaning is in flux but sometimes seemingly constant (as in 'inner peace of mind') but also noteworthy for its relative absence in the field of history (as in 'world peace')." For him, "peace is both a means of personal and collective ethical transformation and an aspiration to cleanse the planet of human-inflicted destruction" (Charles Webel 2007: p.7). He further says, "Peace in its progressive or dialectical mode denotes active individual and collective self-determination and emancipator empowerment" (Charles Webel 2007: p.8). Barash and Webel defined positive peace as "[...]a social condition in which exploitation is minimized or eliminated. There is neither overt violence nor the more subtle phenomenon of underlying structural violence. It denotes the continuing presence of an equitable and just social order and ecological harmony" (Barash, David & Charles: 2014).

Kenneth Boulding introduced the term "stable peace," which, according to him, is "a situation in which the probability of war is so small that it does not really enter into the calculations of any of the people involved. War is much more common between political organizations [bands, tribes, city-states, nations, and empires] than between any other kind of social organization" (Boulding, Kenneth E., (1978:7,13).

In the words of Mahatma Gandhi, "Not to believe in the possibility of permanent peace is to disbelieve in the godliness of human nature" (Emily Cohen: 37). The world cannot experience perpetual peace unless we understand the spirit nature in human beings. Animal nature is violent and dominates over the spirit nature unless humanity is awakened to it.

In 1964<sup>th</sup>, in his founding edition of the *Journal of Peace Research*, Johan Galtung came up with two typologies of peace- positive and negative peace: negative peace is the absence of overt violence, and positive peace is the integration of human society.<sup>1</sup> He emphasizes the importance of violence in understanding the crux of peace by dissecting violence into three kinds: direct, structural, and cultural. The absence of

---

<sup>1</sup> Johan Galtung (1964) "An Editorial" *Journal of Peace Research*, p.2.

the various types of violence in society can be understood as positive peace, which is challenging to attain.

### **Some of the Main Characteristics**

The scope and characteristics of peace studies require being thoroughly defined to include every potential characteristic that could advance the discipline's competence to identify the critical elements in mitigating and eliminating violence and conflict. In this era of rapid technological development, integrating technology into peace studies is also essential to reaping practical benefits. Innovative technological initiatives can make the message of peacebuilding and peace restoration more rapid, stable, and effective. An in-depth understanding of peace studies requires expertise in the critical features of the topic at hand. The discipline's distinctive qualities come from its multilayer and meta-level methods, which make it wildly vast and varied. "Metalevel" refers to the breadth of perspectives available for comprehending peace. To achieve lasting peace, understanding the concept of peace requires understanding conflicts, violence, and conflict resolution. Yet first, some fundamental components essential to comprehending the idea must be fully revealed to establish the foundation for peace and its initiative.

Peace studies is multidisciplinary, meaning the area of studies within which discourses are generally held is a wide-ranging discipline. Discourses on peace and conflict are not limited to a specific discipline but are every human being' concerned. It will not be out of place to state that peace is the eternal ideal of humanity. Ideals may not necessarily get through with all possible efforts. Nonetheless, the yearning to have stable or perpetual peace is of ageless relevance as long as humans exist. Peace is also not culture-specific, but it is transcultural. Peace is multilevel, ranging from individual, societal, state, nation, regional, and international. Peace can be interpersonal, intrapersonal, political, cultural, and spiritual. The nature of peace studies is analytic as well as normative. It is a symbiosis of both the essential elements. Analyzation of conflicts and violent acts, such as murder and war, is not sans normative goals. The essence of peace studies and the strength upon which the discipline is founded are the theoretical aspects derived from various backgrounds. However, the theoretical elements that play an essential role in understanding the nature and impact of conflicts and violence are ineffective without practicability. Both theoretical and application are equally crucial in the domain of peace studies. The comprehensiveness of the features of the discipline presupposes the entirety of perspectives of human existence and its relation to nature. Peace and conflict are not just about human beings per se but also their relations with nature. Hence, the fundamental essence of peace studies is to analyze the nature, causes, scope, and impact of crises and violence to facilitate

channels of various ideas for framing and reframing schema of peaceful solutions to myriad crises and violence by nonviolent.

It is evident from the foregoing definitions that there cannot be a fixed definition. However, the ultimate goal of peace studies is to prevent, de-escalate, and mitigate conflicts and violence that contaminate mutual relations in national and international arenas. It may not be out of place to state that there has been a significant leap in peace studies over the past 50 years. The availability of resources in peace and research with diverse inputs from different backgrounds profoundly shapes the scopes and boundaries of peace studies as a robust academic discipline. Understanding world peace is a tremendous task because when we think of perpetual world peace, it is a developmental process and not a quick-fix approach. As Paul Wehr pointed out: "stable peace is a developmental process, not merely the absence of visible violence" (Paul Wehr 1979:16).

### **Brief Genesis of the Evolution of Peace Studies**

Skeptics can believe that peace studies is still in its infancy as an academic field, yet given the discipline's history, this is untrue as the field has matured. Within the social sciences, peace studies is a well-established field that includes numerous academic journals, departments at colleges and universities, centers for peace research, conferences, and outside acknowledgment of the value of peace and conflict studies as a methodology. In 1888, Swarthmore College introduced the first-ever peace studies course in higher education. In reality, establishing the UN system during World War II served as an additional impetus for the emergence of increasingly stringent peacekeeping strategies. Many university courses in schools of higher learning worldwide began to develop, which touched upon questions of peace, often concerning war, during this period.

Nonetheless, the inception of peace studies as a distinct field of study stretches back to 1948, when Manchester University's Liberal Arts Collect hosted the first undergraduate peace studies program, developed by Gladdys Muir. (Abrams, Holly:2010-11-13). The students, mainly from the United States, who have concerns about the Vietnam War forced more universities to offer courses about peace, whether in a designated peace studies course or as a course within a traditional major. The 1980s saw an acceleration in the growth of global studies as students' concerns about the possibility of nuclear war and their comprehension of intricate themes like political violence, human rights, etc., grew. Johan Galtung and his colleagues founded the *Peace Research Institute Oslo* (PRIO) in 1959. Another significant advancement in peace studies is the *Journal of Peace Research*, founded in 1964 by Johan Galtung, the father of peace studies. Since its founding in 1998, the journal has published academic works

in international security, conflict resolution, peace and conflict studies, and book reviews. The field, which had a humble beginning, is now one of the fast-emerging interdisciplinary subjects in the academics of the 21st century. It is widely and numerously researched and taught variously in a large and ever-increasing number of institutions worldwide. It is not only increasing in its number but is ever increasing in its relevance to the world. Peace studies as an academic discipline is a vibrant, dynamic, and promising field in understanding violence and its impact in facilitating a discourse on peace for peaceful solutions to human crises.

## II

### **Theoretical Concepts**

Theoretical aspects of peace studies are crucial to understanding the concept undertaken. As stated, there are various theories in philosophy, politics, international relations, sociology, psychology, etc., but not all available are equally applicable. Essential concepts from the works of Gandhi, Kant, and Johan Galtung concerning peace are pivotal in ushering in the idea of perpetual peace. Theories in International relations are essential because power and politics are critical in understanding global peace and harmony. Structural realism, idealism, constructivism, negative and positive peace, and concepts of nonviolence are some challenging theories that play an essential role.

### **Classical Realism**

Realism is a critical theory in international relations. Power is the central force for realism, and is skeptical about morality's relevance in politics. For realism, in general, human nature is egoistic and self-centered. The genesis of the theory can be traced back to the ancient Greeks. Thucydides, a fifth-century Athenian historian and general, was a vital realist who laid the paradigm of realism. He authored the account of the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta. He emphasizes two essential factors: power politics and human nature. Power is the central idea of all forms of political realism. In the words of Thucydides, "As the world goes, is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can, and the weak suffer what they must" (Thucydides 1977:64). Human nature is the genesis of the political realism. He says, "Of the gods, we believe, and of men, we know, that by a necessary law of their nature, they rule whatever they can. And it is not as if we were the first to make this law or to act upon it when made: we found it to make use of it, knowing that you and everybody else, having the same power as we have, would do the same as we do" (Thucydides 1977:226).

In his work, *The Art of War*, Sun Tzu, a Chinese strategist, argues that moral reasoning was not very useful to the state rulers of the day, faced with armed and dangerous neighbors. He showed rulers how to use power to advance their interests and protect their survival" (Sun Tzu:1963). Niccolo Machiavelli, the author of *The Prince*, criticizes the moralistic view of authority in politics. There is no moral basis for judging the difference between legitimate and illegitimate uses of power. The only real concern in politics is the acquisition and maintenance of power.<sup>2</sup> Machiavellianism could be a radical political authenticity connected to residential and worldwide issues. Realpolitik is a term used to describe a school of thought that rejects the importance of morality in legislative matters and maintains that any measures, corrupt or otherwise, should be used to further particular political goals. Thomas Hobbes is another influential 17th-century philosopher who played a substantial role in extending classical realism. People in the state of nature are in constant fear and rivalry. People seek their own self-interest without government, which he calls the state of nature. Hobbes held the view of strong monarchy and said the law of the sovereign was an ultimate authority. He believes that "human beings, extremely individualistic rather than moral or social, are subject to "a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceases only in death" (Thomas Hobbes:1994).

### **Neorealism/Structural realism**

Structural realism or neorealism is a theory of international politics that believes power is central to international politics. According to structural realism, the system of international relations is defined by the principles of anarchism and the distribution of capabilities. There is no world government to govern in the international relations. There are two forms of structural realism: defensive realism by Kenneth Waltz and offensive realism, advocated by John Mearsheimer.

In his book, *Theory of International Politics*, Kenneth Waltz argues that the anarchical structure of the international system encourages states to maintain moderate and reserved policies to attain national security (Kenneth, N Waltz 1979:126). States are encouraged by the anarchic system to adopt defensive and moderate measures. They contend that "the first concern of states is not to maximize power but to maintain their position in the system" and that states are not inherently aggressive. Rather than hegemony and dominance, the ideology supports a balance of power.

John Mearsheimer is the principal advocate of offensive realism. Offensive realism holds that the anarchic nature of the international system is responsible for promoting aggressive state behavior in international politics, as there is no international

---

<sup>2</sup> Niccolo Machiavelli (2021) *The Prince*.

law. The system of international relations is anarchic. Unlike defensive realism, the theory emphasizes domination and hegemony. The central tenets of the theory are based on five assumptions: The international system is anarchic; states inherently possess some offensive military capability, which gives them the ability to hurt and possibly destroy each other; states can never be certain about the intentions of other states, the basic motive driving states is survival, and states think strategically about how to survive in the international system.<sup>3</sup>

### **Liberalism**

The term liberalism is derived from the Latin word *liber*, meaning "*free*." Liberalism is an approach whose doctrine is based on international law, morality, and international organization rather than merely emphasizing power alone. The primary concern of liberalists is to foster and achieve lasting peace and cooperation in international relations. The liberalists do not deny the anarchic system of international relations. However, Liberals believe that international institutions play a crucial role in collaboration among states via interdependence (Shirayev, Eric B., Vladislav M. Zubok 2014:86). Liberals place a strong emphasis on nations' shared interests and see the foundation of the international order as a community of states that can work together on international affairs. Unlike realists, liberals think that human nature is positive. The two most well-known liberal thinkers are John Locke and Immanuel Kant.

John Locke is regarded as one of history's most influential philosophers and political theorists and is widely considered the father of liberalism. His ideas of natural law, natural rights, human nature, and limited form of government hugely contributed to the concept of political liberalism. In his work, *Two Treatises of Government* (John Locke 1988), Locke talks about natural rights, such as the right to life, liberty, and property. The government or society does not sanction these rights, but they are inherent to human beings, and therefore, states cannot take away their natural rights. It is a revolutionary doctrine of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries used to justify resistance to unjust laws and tyrannical governments. Locke's idea of the rights of men well states thus: "The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every one: and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions: for men being all the workmanship of one omnipotent, and infinitely wise maker; all the servants of one sovereign master, sent into the world by his order, and about his business; they are his property, whose workmanship they are, made to last during his, not one another's pleasure: and being furnished with like

---

<sup>3</sup> Mearsheimer, John J., "The False Promise of International Institutions", pp.5-49



faculties, sharing all in one community of nature, there cannot be supposed any such subordination among us, that may authorize us to destroy one another... Everyone, as he is bound to preserve himself and not to quit his station wilfully, so by the like reason, when his own preservation comes not in competition, ought he, as much as he can, to preserve the rest of mankind, and may not, unless it is to do justice on an offender, take away, or impair the life, or what tends to the preservation of the life, the liberty, health, limb, or goods of another" (Locke, Second Treatise of Government, Chapter II).

Immanuel Kant is another influential Enlightenment philosopher who tremendously influenced political philosophy. His conception of peace has had a noticeable impact on all previous peace discussions. In his work *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay*, Kant makes the case that a stable peace can only exist when every country on the planet is a republic. Only by allowing every politician in the republic to make their own decisions will peace be achieved and preserved. Kant, therefore, insists on republican governments being in place everywhere. Kant contends that decent governments should work towards achieving worldwide peace based on international law to promote peace in the global order. Kant's preliminary articles present the structure for the necessary conditions of perpetual peace among states. These preliminary articles preclude peace treaties with secret reservations, acquisition of states as if they were private property, standing armies, the incurrence of national debt for purposes of foreign adventures, interference with the constitution or politics of other states, and, in general, all acts of hostility that would make mutual trust impossible. The second part of the article, which is known as the definitive article, insists that "the civil constitution of each state shall be republican., insists "the law of nations shall be founded on a federation of free states," and the third definitive article insist on "the rights of men, as citizens of the world, shall be limited to the conditions of universal hospitality" (Immanuel Kant (1903:120-37).

Kant's ideas on peace are vital resources for peace research. He laid the foundation of how world peace can be thought of with a definite schema. His emphasis on federalism and world government adumbrated his concern for interstate relations based on states' autonomy grounded on non-interference. His peace proposal is rich and resourceful for present and future peace studies and research on international relations theory.

### **Constructivism**

Constructivism is a theory coined by Nicholas Onuf, an American scholar in international relations, in his work, *World of Our Making* (Nicholas Onuf 1989). Constructivism aims to explain and illustrate how the fundamental concepts and actors in international relations are products of social construction. To explain international

politics, constructivists concentrate on the norms, rules, practices, and ideas that make up identity. Constructivists oppose the premise that power politics alone determines all aspects of international relations because they believe socially built concepts are important. Wendt contends that "the causal power attributed to "structure" by neorealists are not "given," but rests on the way in which structure is constructed by social practice" (Alexander Wendt 1999:1-4).

Elizabeth Kier, Alexander Wendt, Kathryn Sikkink, and Peter J. Katzenstein are well-known constructivists. Constructivism comes in three flavors: critical radical constructivism, thin constructivism, and critical constructivism. However, all interpretations agree that neorealism and neoliberalism neglect to focus on social construction in global politics. Alexander Wendt proposed two essential features of constructivism, which are accepted as basic tenets of constructivism: "that the structures of human association are determined primarily by shared ideas rather than material forces, and that the identities and interests of purposive actors are constructed by these shared ideas rather than given by nature" (Alexander Wendt 1999:1-4).

For the constructivist, identities, interests, and norms are crucial in analyzing how they behave. Abram Chayes and Antonia Handler Chayes define "norms" as a broad class of prescriptive statements- rules, standards, principles, and so forth- both procedural and substantive" that are prescriptions for action in situations of choice, carrying a sense of obligation, a sense that they ought to be followed" (Abram Chayes; Antonia Handler Chayes 1994:65).

In a nutshell, constructivism as a theory has shown an alternative approach to neorealism and neoliberalism. It has enriched the discipline of international relations by moving beyond the boundaries of traditional international relations theories.

### **Peace by Peaceful Conflict Transformation- the Transcend Approach**

Peace studies without a mechanism for conflict transformation will be incomplete and insufficient. And to understand the concept of peace necessitates the need to delve into the concept of violence. Johan Galtung, the founder of peace studies, is inescapable in peace studies. He founded "The International Peace Research Institute," the first on peace studies, in Oslo in 1959. He also founded "The Transcend International Foundation" in 1993 and the "Transcend Peace University" in 2000, the world's first online peace studies university. Johan Galtung understands violence as any avoidable assault on basic human needs. For him, people's basic needs are survival, well-being, freedom, and identity. The threat of violence against these basic human needs can also be defined as violence because individuals can establish a meaningful relationship with their environment only by meeting their basic needs. This relationship

with the environment can also be at an emotional and spiritual level outside of the physical level.<sup>4</sup>

Johan Galtung distinguished between two sorts of peace: positive and negative, in the *Journal of Peace Research's* inaugural edition from 1964. Positive peace is defined as the integration of human society—the predominance of justice, harmony, and equality—while negative peace is defined as the absence of violence. He presented three types of violent typologies—structural, cultural, and direct—and clearly distinguished them all in his conflict triangle. According to Johan Galtung, the root cause of invisible conflicts is structural and cultural violence, which then manifests itself as violence. In this perspective, conflict is a dynamic process wherein direct, structural, and cultural violence influence one another. It is a dynamic process in which attitudes, behaviours, and structure always interact. A period of violence, a post-violence phase, and connected pre-violence are some of the stages that he claims conflicts go through (Johan Galtung 2004: 18).

Johan Galtung rightly enumerated values such as the presence of cooperation, freedom from fear, freedom from want, economic growth and development, absence of exploitation, equality, justice, freedom of action, pluralism, and dynamism, which I consider worth adopting in the search for peace in a global scale.

In his work, *Peace by Peaceful Conflict Transformation- the Transcend Approach*,<sup>5</sup> in row 4, Johan Galtung talks about mediation/dialogue in which he brings out crucial stages for conflict transformation. The three essential characteristics of the model are mapping, legitimizing, and bridging. Mapping means identifying the parties involved in the conflicts and their goals. Legitimizing means knowing which goals are legitimate, and in searching for legitimization, three criteria are crucially significant: law, human rights, and morality. Bridging means creativity. Conflict transformation aims to change the circumstances, people, and interpersonal ties that lead to conflict. Conflict transformation emphasizes the collaborative appraisal of the conflict's interpersonal, social, structural, and cultural aspects to redefine relationships between disputing parties. Johan Galtung also recognizes the importance of integrating human rights as key to successful peace-building worldwide. He highlighted the importance of the two Conventions, the UDHR and fundamental human needs, for successful conflict transformation. As his experience grows, so does the significance of Johan Galtung's contribution to peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peace building.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>5</sup> Johan Galtung (200) “Peace by Peaceful Conflict Transformation- the Transcend Approach”, p.17.

### **Gandhian principle of Ahimsa**

Gandhi's influence on peace studies is unavoidable. He is the proponent of nonviolence as embodied in the Satyagraha ideal. Truth, soul force, forgiveness, tolerance, and nonviolence are the cornerstones of his vision of global peace. In Gandhi's view, war can never be just or unjust. Every conflict is unfair. He firmly believes that "war is not a morally legitimate means of achieving anything permanent" (Rashmi-Sudha Puri 1987:19). Gandhi says that war, with all its glorification of brute force, is essentially a degrading thing. It demoralizes those who are trained for it. It brutalized men of naturally gentle character. It outrages every beautiful canon of morality. Its paths of glory are foul with passion and lust and red with blood of murder. This is not the pathway to our goal" (Emily Cohen:35). War is all about violence and it degrades and corrupts man and increases man's progressive degeneration. Ahimsa is not a policy for the seizure of power. It is a way of transforming relationships to bring about a peaceful transfer of power, effect freely and without compulsion by all concerned because all have come to recognize it as right. For Gandhi, "Ahimsa is one of the world's great principles which no force on earth can wipe out. Thousands like myself may die in trying to vindicate the ideal, but ahimsa will never die. And the message of ahimsa can be spread only through believers dying for the cause" (M. K. Gandhi 2007:77). Gandhi says, "The cry for peace will be a cry in the wilderness, so long as the spirit of nonviolence does not dominate millions of men and women. An armed conflict between nations horrifies us. But the economic war is no better than an armed conflict. This is like a surgical operation. An economic war is prolonged torture. And its ravages are no less terrible than those depicted in the literature on war. We think nothing of the other because we are used to its deadly effects. ... The movement against war is sound. I pray for its success. But I cannot help the gnawing fear that the movement will fail if it does not touch the root of all evil — man's greed ( M.K. Gandhi: 5 October 1926).

Gandhi was a man of peace who valued using pure methods to achieve lofty goals. To achieve any goal means and ends are equally crucial. Violence is not the way to achieve world peace. According to him, violence can never bring true and lasting peace. He believed true peace meant abolishing all forms of tyranny, not only the absence of bloodshed. Men who are spiritually awakened are necessary for peace. As Gandhi says, "Man as animal is violent but as spirit is nonviolent. The moment he awakes to the spirit within, he cannot remain violent. Either he progresses towards ahimsa or rushes to his doom" (M. K. Gandhi 2007:72). For Gandhi peace is never the end but a nobler goal to attain just world order. Gandhi and his ways to achieve peace

have eternal relevance to the world. As French historian and philosopher Voltaire wrote, "Perpetual peace can only be established and achieved through tolerance" (Forcey, Linda Rennie 1988:13).

### III

Peace studies is a panoptic activity encompassing peace thinking, peacemaking, peace building, research, reflection, dialogue, and negotiation concerning the causes of war, conflict, and violence and the orientation necessary to establish peace conflict resolution through nonviolence or peaceful means. The field explores fundamental issues surrounding cooperation, conflict resolution, human behaviour, and relationships. It is a field with its own theory, scholarship, and applications derived from discussions, debates, and other studies. It is an analytical, normative, regulative, dynamic, and transformative interdisciplinary academic field with broad theoretical and pragmatic approaches exploring global peace by studying, exploring, and excavating into the causes of violence through the prism of nonviolent and peaceful means. Peace studies adumbrates theories from various fields and disciplines to understand and explain conflicts and violence at multiple levels and stages. To bring a thorough understanding of the complex issues within a discipline, which is by nature a conglomeration of various fields, demands theories from numerous theories existing in different fields. However, the question remains as to which theories are better suited and appropriate for comprehending the causes and effects of violence and conflicts, and how to make practical application relevant for conflict transformation or resolution requires continuing research to address newer issues.

Johan Galtung, the father of peace studies, says, "if we begin with the need to survive, we immediately see that peace is a primary requirement of the human condition itself" (Johan Galtung and Daisaku Ikeda 1995:110). Moreover, in the words of Dalai Lama, "Although attempting to bring about world peace through internal transformation of individuals is difficult, it is the only way... Peace must first be developed within an individual. And I believe that love, compassion, and altruism are the fundamental basis for peace. Once these qualities are developed within an individual, he or she is then able to create an atmosphere of peace and harmony. This atmosphere can be expanded and extended from the individual to his family, from the family to the community, and eventually to the whole world" (Thich Nhat Hanh 1991: vii). The world requires peace, love, and harmony. Peace studies can be a potential discipline in navigating the possibility of discourse on peace the world needs through peaceful dialogue. As aptly pointed "the most disadvantageous peace is better than the

most just war."<sup>6</sup> It is evident from the discussion that peace studies approaches the notions of conflict, violence, conflict transformation, and peace from an integrative perspective to bring about world peace by appraising issues through nonviolent methods. Peace studies is dynamic, collaborative, integrative, and transforming.

### References:

Abram Chayes and Antonia Handler Chayes (1994) *Regime Architecture: Elements and Principles*, in Janne E. Nolan, ed., *Global Engagement: Cooperation and Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Washington D.C, Brookings.

Alexander Wendt (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Boulding, Kenneth E., (1978) *Stable Peace*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Charles Webel (2007) "Toward a Philosophy and Metapsychology of Peace", *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*, ed. Charles Webel and Johan Galtung, Routledge, London.

Emily Cohen, *Gandhi's Concept of Nonviolence in International Relations*.

Forcey, Linda Rennie, editor (1988). *Peace: Meanings, Politics, Strategies*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Gene Harp (1973) *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, Extending Horizons Books, USA.  
<https://news.un.org/en/story/2014/09/476992>.

Immanuel Kant (1903) *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay*, trans. M. Campbell Smith, LSwan Sonnenschein & Co, LIM, London.

Johan Galtung (1969) "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.6, No.3.

Johan Galtung and Daisaku Ikeda (1995) *Choose Peace: A Dialogue between Johan Galtung and Daisaku Ikeda* (trans. and ed. By R.L. Gage, Pluto Press, London.

Johan Galtung (2004) "Violence, war, and their impact: On visible and invisible effects of violence," *Forum for Intercultural Philosophy*.

---

<sup>6</sup> Desiderius Erasmus, *Adagio*.

- Johan Galtung (2007) "Peace by Peaceful Conflict Transformation- the Transcend Approach," *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*, ed. Charles Webel and Johan Galtung, Routledge, London.
- John Locke (1988) *Two Treatises, Two Treatises of Government*, Peter Laslett (ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- J.H. Leshner (1991) "Xenophanes on Inquiry and Discovery: An Alternative to the 'Hymn to Progress' Reading of Fr. 18", *Ancient Philosophy 11*, Mathesis Publication.
- Kenneth E. Boulding (1963) *Conflict and Defense: A General Theory*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Kenneth, N Waltz (1979) *Theory of International Politics*, McGraw Hill, New York
- Mearsheimer, John J., "The False Promise of International Institutions" *International Security* 19:3 (1994–1995).
- M.K. Gandhi (5 October 1926) "Nonviolence — The Greatest Force" in *The World Tomorrow*.
- M. K. Gandhi (2007) *Gandhi on Nonviolence*, ed. Thomas Merton, Mark Kurlansky.
- Nicholas Onuf (1989) *World of our Making*, University of South Carolina Press.
- Niccolo Machiavelli (2021) *The Prince*, trans. W.K. Marriott, FB. Classic.
- Patrick M. Ragan, *Presidential address to the Peace Science Society* (Regan 2014:348).
- Paul Wehr (1979) *Conflict Regulation*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rashimi-Sudha Puri (1987) *Gandhi on War and Peace*, Praeger Publishers, USA.
- Shirayev, Eric B., and Vladislav M. Zubok (2014) *International Relations*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Sun Tzu (1963) *The Art of War*, trans. By Samuel B. Griffith, Oxford,
- Thomas Hobbes (1994) *Leviathan*, Edwin Curley (ed.), Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Thucydides (1977) *The History of the Peloponnesian War*, tran. Richard Crawley.