

Introduction

Charles P. Webel and Jorgen Johansen

Peace studies in higher education has come of age. As a trans-disciplinary enquiry into the nature of peace and the reasons for wars and other forms of human conflict, peace studies, or peace and conflict studies, has grown exponentially since its birth about a half-century ago. Since 2000, there has been a sharp increase in peace and conflict studies curricula, particularly in the number of postgraduate peace studies programmes. Peace studies journals, conferences and professional associations continue to proliferate and periodically to intersect movements for peace and social justice. And peace education and peace research, as complements to PCS, strive not just to study, but also to achieve peace.

Peace and conflict studies, incorporating anthropology, sociology, political science, ethics, theology and history, aims to uncover the roots of conflict, transform the underlying causes, develop preventive strategies, and teach conflict transformation skills. The field is growing and is ripe for a new book to meet the increasing demand for information on these topics. Our *Peace and Conflict Studies: A Reader* is designed to do just this.

Peace and Conflict Studies: A Reader is a comprehensive and intensive introduction to the field. It presents a range of theories, methodologies and approaches to understanding peace and to transforming conflict. Both classic and contemporary analyses are featured. And the selections include pieces by Kant, Tolstoy, Einstein, Freud, William James, Martin Luther King, Jr., Gandhi, the Dalai Lama, Hannah Arendt, Johan Galtung, Elise Boulding, Nigel Young, April Carter, Andrew Rigby, Richard Falk, Betty Reardon and Noam Chomsky.

The book has six general sections, commencing with 'Peace Studies, Peace Education, Peace Research and Peace', which provides seminal philosophical, religious, social-scientific and historical perspectives on the genealogy, history and somewhat contested nature of peace and its study. The second section surveys peace theories and movements, from Kant, Tolstoy and the Dalai Lama to contemporary, cutting-edge analyses of the history, strengths and weaknesses of past and present peace and other nonviolent social movements. In the third part of the book, we present important theoretical and empirical pieces that focus on the reasons for violent conflicts, wars and terrorism, including significant portions of the legendary Einstein – Freud correspondence and a new piece by Noam Chomsky.

The fourth section focuses on contending approaches to conflict management, resolution and transformation. New theories and ideas for understanding and acting in conflicts are presented. This section includes assessments of diplomacy, realpolitik, nonviolent revolutionary movements, disarmament and reconciliation.

The fifth section includes classic essays on nonviolence in theory and as a way of life, as well as contemporary assessments of nonviolence as a means of political transformation. The nonviolent social protest traditions stemming from Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. and their relevance today are explored.

And in the final part of the book, we look forward. The focus is on building institutions and cultures of peace via peacekeeping and peacemaking. Societies that have sustained peace are central elements in this analysis.

The *PCS Reader* is unique in a number of ways. First, it is specifically designed either to stand alone as the core text in PCS and related courses or to accompany other books in the field. Second, in addition to the sections on the nature, meanings and history of peace and conflict, the book prominently features classic and contemporary, cutting-edge readings on conflict management, resolution and transformation, as well as recent analyses of peaceful societies and cultures of sustainable peace. In other words, this book is not just about 'negative peace', or the avoidance of war, but also about the viability of 'positive' peace. In addition, there are in-depth, scholarly treatments, including empirical and quantitative measures, of the many topics covered, not just brief and sometimes superficial opinion-pieces. And finally, there are numerous contributions by outstanding women scholars, as well as a selection that focuses on ongoing Islamic struggles for peace and nonviolent political change.

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'. Inter- (or multi-) disciplinary approaches are also frequently employed, as are innovative pedagogical and scholarly techniques, which may also be contested by conventional disciplines, notably political science/international relations.

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. Some peace researchers decry the apparent focus on 'war studies' by PCS at the possible cost of understanding and building sustainable nonviolent cultures of peace. But the history of peace discourse and movements is intertwined with opposition to war and the advocacy of conflict reduction, 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. 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 transformation in order to learn how to handle similar conflicts in the future.

Within PCS there are, of course, disagreements. Many PCS observers and critics smile when they hear about conflicts between those studying conflicts. Just as doctors sometimes get diseases, researchers of PCS will of course now and then have conflicts and disagreements. If we use the ABC-triangle developed by Johan Galtung, conflicts have three main components: Attitudes, Behaviour and Contradiction/Content. Different schools of thought within PCS focus on different elements. Many will say that if we just can persuade people to have more tolerant and open-minded attitudes, conflicts will no longer be harmful or may even disappear. Others peace researchers focus on how people behave; it is their use of violent and aggressive means of trying to 'resolve' conflicts that is the problem. And some conflict transformers will argue that what matters is that the contradictions be resolved or transcended. All three schools have some 'fundamentalists', but a growing majority of PCS researchers and conflict specialists see the need to include all three perspectives.

One old debate regarding PCS is the relation between inner and outer peace; peace within yourself and/or God, or peace in society? Which comes first, 'healing oneself' to gain 'inner peace', or changing a violent to a peaceful world? Despite different views, many peace

researchers and activists view this as a 'false dilemma' and see the need for both inner and outer peace.

As in other social sciences, there is a serious debate about methodology within PCS. Do we focus on quantitative or qualitative studies in order to get the best understanding of a conflict? At present, the majority of those who are close to the 'political science/IR side' are using more quantitative methodologies, while the 'social movement/nonviolent side' publish more qualitative studies. There is no doubt that both contribute importantly to the field.

When initiatives are taken to have new PCS programmes at universities, there have often been spirited discussions about whether the 'best' way to create a PCS degree is to include PCS in already existing fields (like IR) and institutions (like departments of social science), or to set up separate PCS centres? What we see around the world is an expansion of both types.

Many academic fields have a theoretical focus – 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 full understanding of a complex political reality. As with most social sciences, PCS finds it difficult to do experiments and tests that can be repeated. That is not to say that empirical observation and facts are useless. The more and better case studies we have, the more accurate should be the theories based on these observations.

Comparing PCS with meteorology may help us to understand some of the problems we are facing. The complexity of weather forecasting is probably similar to understanding the complexity of many conflicts. Meteorologists today are pretty good at predicting a five-day weather forecast. By identifying, measuring and analysing the thousands of variables that influence the weather, they are able to forecast today the probability of how weather will develop in the near future. Early warning systems for predicting the development of conflicts face similar or even more difficult challenges. Humans significantly influence the Earth's climate, especially global warming, but have little influence on day-to-day weather. Natural forces create weather and human behaviour creates conflicts. To understand human behaviour is essential, but not sufficient, for students of PCS. For PCS is an ethical and applied social science as well as an analytical one. Peace scholars, researchers and students are encouraged to contribute to transforming the world, not just to understanding it.

Even very good theories are not enough to guarantee that action will be either good or wise. Even if you have read books and know all the theories on how to build houses, there is no guarantee that your first house will be of high quality. Experience and skills are often just as important as theoretical knowledge – for builders of houses and of peace. In addition to a good education in PCS it is good for those who want to act, in any capacity, to have good intentions. But good intentions are not enough! This is one reason why PCS instructors tell their students that they need to study diligently and develop good skills prior to acting in real conflicts. This is not to discourage students from being active; on the contrary, practice is essential for the learning process. But we are aware of the possible damage one can do if one acts before one has sufficient skills. For a medical student doing surgery this is obvious; we hope one day it will be for PCS students as well. Many soldiers are given at least a year of training prior to being sent to a conflict zone. We see no reason that a conflict worker with a toolbox of conflict resolution skills and nonviolent techniques should need less.

All tools, theories and kinds of knowledge can be misused. Medical science is a gift to humanity, but was misused by some doctors in Nazi Germany. Many of those who employ torture are using legally, psychologically and medically trained personnel to 'help them' be more efficient. There is a need to include a humanitarian ethic in the teaching of PCS. Johan

researchers and activists view this as a 'false dilemma' and see the need for both inner and outer peace.

As in other social sciences, there is a serious debate about methodology within PCS. Do we focus on quantitative or qualitative studies in order to get the best understanding of a conflict? At present, the majority of those who are close to the 'political science/IR side' are using more quantitative methodologies, while the 'social movement/nonviolent side' publish more qualitative studies. There is no doubt that both contribute importantly to the field.

When initiatives are taken to have new PCS programmes at universities, there have often been spirited discussions about whether the 'best' way to create a PCS degree is to include PCS in already existing fields (like IR) and institutions (like departments of social science), or to set up separate PCS centres? What we see around the world is an expansion of both types.

Many academic fields have a theoretical focus – 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 full understanding of a complex political reality. As with most social sciences, PCS finds it difficult to do experiments and tests that can be repeated. That is not to say that empirical observation and facts are useless. The more and better case studies we have, the more accurate should be the theories based on these observations.

Comparing PCS with meteorology may help us to understand some of the problems we are facing. The complexity of weather forecasting is probably similar to understanding the complexity of many conflicts. Meteorologists today are pretty good at predicting a five-day weather forecast. By identifying, measuring and analysing the thousands of variables that influence the weather, they are able to forecast today the probability of how weather will develop in the near future. Early warning systems for predicting the development of conflicts face similar or even more difficult challenges. Humans significantly influence the Earth's climate, especially global warming, but have little influence on day-to-day weather. Natural forces create weather and human behaviour creates conflicts. To understand human behaviour is essential, but not sufficient, for students of PCS. For PCS is an ethical and applied social science as well as an analytical one. Peace scholars, researchers and students are encouraged to contribute to transforming the world, not just to understanding it.

Even very good theories are not enough to guarantee that action will be either good or wise. Even if you have read books and know all the theories on how to build houses, there is no guarantee that your first house will be of high quality. Experience and skills are often just as important as theoretical knowledge – for builders of houses and of peace. In addition to a good education in PCS it is good for those who want to act, in any capacity, to have good intentions. But good intentions are not enough! This is one reason why PCS instructors tell their students that they need to study diligently and develop good skills prior to acting in real conflicts. This is not to discourage students from being active; on the contrary, practice is essential for the learning process. But we are aware of the possible damage one can do if one acts before one has sufficient skills. For a medical student doing surgery this is obvious; we hope one day it will be for PCS students as well. Many soldiers are given at least a year of training prior to being sent to a conflict zone. We see no reason that a conflict worker with a toolbox of conflict resolution skills and nonviolent techniques should need less.

All tools, theories and kinds of knowledge can be misused. Medical science is a gift to humanity, but was misused by some doctors in Nazi Germany. Many of those who employ torture are using legally, psychologically and medically trained personnel to 'help them' be more efficient. There is a need to include a humanitarian ethic in the teaching of PCS. Johan

Galtung has suggested a version of the Hippocratic Oath, which may as useful for students of PCS as it can be for medical students.¹

The future for PCS looks bright. More universities around the world are offering PCS programmes of some sort. The variety is impressive, and a wide range of perspectives courses, programmes and institutions are being implemented – from new introductory courses to doctoral programmes. Traditional academic disciplines, especially political science and international relations, include some PCS, and new independent institutions are being created. The combination of new programmes and methodologies has created a field bursting with creativity, energy, theories and skills – attracting a growing number of students.

And the job market for PCS grads is also expanding. State ministries, civil society actors, businesses and religious communities are just a few of those who today employ students from PCS. Almost all social constituencies are involved in conflicts of some sort. Skills and theories of how to act wisely in conflicts are, and will increasingly be, in demand. Conflicts are in most cases today seen as problematic, costly and disturbing. If we can learn how to act wisely, conflicts might be transformed into a resource for the future development of PCS.

The enormous expansion of PCS since the first early attempts to study wars and conflicts make a Reader like this one incomplete. It is not possible to give adequate space to all the relevant disciplines (like law, medicine and the biological sciences) and important and influential theoretical frameworks (like those of Albert Camus and John Burton) that have contributed to PCS cannot be included in a single volume without adding many more pages.

Still, you are reading a book we are proud of, and we hope will be useful for the students, scholars and activists who want to help the field progress.

So what can we expect from PCS in the years to come? Our conviction is that the field will continue to expand and PCS theories and skills will be refined and useful for more stakeholders in conflicts. Theories of conflicts are based on knowledge of what most conflicts have in common – from individual conflicts, via group and national conflicts, to international and global disputes. With new generations of students graduating from PCS and many moving on to Ph.D. programmes in peace and conflict, 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 the actual case. Critical evaluations of past conflicts will help us to act more appropriately to address future ones.

We look forward to a shift of the main focus of PCS from traditional war studies to a critical examination of nonviolent options in inter- and intrastate conflicts, as well as in global structural conflicts. When Gandhi said that he saw the theory and practice of nonviolence to be at 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 serious research, creative action and compassion, PCS educators, activists and students can better address future global challenges. We hope this Reader will be a useful tool for those taking that path.

Notes

1 <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/body/hippocratic-oath-today.html>