

5 Thinking peace

Charles P. Weber

The importance of securing international peace was recognized by the really great men of former generations. But the technical advances of our times have turned this ethical postulate into a matter of life and death for civilized mankind today, and made the taking of an active part in the solution to the problem of peace a moral duty which no conscientious man can shirk.

Albert Einstein (1984: 43)

Nonviolence is a weapon of the strong. . . . The law of love will work just as the law of gravitation will work, whether we accept it or not. . . . The more I work at this law the more I feel the delight in life, the delight in the scheme of the universe. It gives me a peace and a meaning of the mysteries of nature that I have no power to describe.

M.K. Gandhi (1930/2002: 46)

And how long shall we have to wait before the rest of mankind becomes pacifists too? There is no telling. . . . But one thing we can say: whatever fosters the growth of culture works at the same time against war.

Sigmund Freud (1932/1959: 287)

Preface

For millennia, philosophers, religious thinkers and political activists have written about and demonstrated for 'peace' and decried war. Yet a 'philosophy' of peace is still in its infancy. And while theorists, strategists, tacticians and planners of war and 'security studies' dominate both the academy and the halls of power, philosophers who profess and march for peace do so outside the mainstream philosophical curriculum, far removed from those with the power to make and enforce important political decisions, and often to the dismay and castigation of their more 'echt philosophical' colleagues.

For over a century, psychologists and psychoanalysts have attempted to illuminate the often elusive and murky depths of the human psyche. But a 'depth psychology' of peace is also merely inchoate. Psychologists who research and teach peace, like their philosophical comrades, do so on the margins of their discipline, and usually as a supplement to more 'rigorous, scientific' investigations.

Philosophers and psychologists are all 'for' peace. But those who attempt to bring peace studies and peace research into their 'professional' work, at least in much of the Anglophonic

world, risk marginalization and even exclusion from their disciplinary practices, powers and perks. As a result, scholars who wish to study, research, teach and practice peace have begun in the past half century to create their own counter-institutions, where they may do so without the risk of continued academic and professional isolation.

And psychoanalysts, perhaps modernity's most acute probers of conflicts unconscious and interpersonal, are shunned almost entirely by the halls of academic learning and medical research and shun, almost entirely, a depth analysis of the emotional and cognitive hallmarks of inner peace (or harmony) and outer discord (or conflict). Unlike Freud, who engaged in an epistolary discussion with Albert Einstein about the depth-psychological origins of war and mass violence, most analysts in the mainstream 'object relations' and 'drive-theoretical' traditions are reluctant to stray from the inner sanctum of the clinical case conference and take a public stand on the unconscious sources of bellicose and peaceful behaviour. In contrast, an earlier generation of analysts, including Wilhelm Reich and Erich Fromm, actively sought to understand and transform the characterological and cultural sources of authoritarianism and militarism. But in our time, analytic 'silence' tends to extend far beyond the analytic hour with the analysand.

There are some hopeful contraindications, however. In the US and the UK, progressive and peace-oriented philosophers have banded together in such organizations as Concerned Philosophers for Peace, Radical Philosophy and International Philosophers for the Prevention of Nuclear War (created by John Somerville as a sister group of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War). Several journals and many conferences have been held by these organizations. And psychologists have their own division of 'Peace Psychology' in the American Psychological Association and have recently published two books about peace psychology (Christie et al. 2001; Macnair 2003).

Psychoanalysts, while speaking as individuals in favour of peaceful means of conflict resolution and in opposition to war in general and to recent wars in particular, still tend, at least in the English-speaking world, to shy away from 'politicization' of their 'science'. Many Latin American and European analysts are less reluctant to publicize their privately held pacifist sentiments. On the whole, however, most contemporary philosophers, psychologists and psychoanalysts remain publicly mute about war and peace.

Consequently, in large part because of the modernist and postmodernist shifting of peace analysis and research to the fringes of 'elite' professional discourse and outside the institutional reward structure of mainstream academia and politics, a philosophical theory of 'outer' peace and a depth-psychological comprehension of 'inner' peacefulness seem as desirable today as they did thousands of years ago. And just as evasive and elusive.

Hence we are confronted with a seeming paradox – peace is something we all desire, and yet, except for relatively brief intervals between wars, seem unable to attain (except on paper). And peace studies, peace research, peacekeeping and peacemaking are almost universally acclaimed to be laudable activities, but not for 'serious' scholars and clinicians doing their 'day' jobs.

Is an ontology, a metaphysics, of peace possible, or even desirable? If so, what might it look like? Can a deep psychological account of emotional well-being, and its opposite(s), be offered, possibly on scientific principles rooted in contemporary psychoanalysis and neuroscience? If so, what might this contribute to contemporary theories and practices of nonviolence and peacemaking?

What is, and might be, peace?

Perhaps 'peace' is like 'happiness', 'justice', 'health' and other human ideals – something every person and culture claims to desire and venerate but which few, if any, achieve, at least on an enduring basis. Why are peace, justice and happiness so desirable, but also so intangible and elusive? But perhaps peace is different from happiness, since it seems to require social harmony and political enfranchisement, whereas happiness appears, at least in Western culture, to be largely an individual matter.

Alternatively, perhaps peace does indeed resemble individual happiness – always there, implicit in our psychological make-up and intermittently explicit in our social behaviour and cultural norms. Peace is a pre-condition for our emotional well-being, but a peaceful state of mind is subject to cognitive disruptions and aggressive eruptions. Peace is a linchpin of social harmony, economic equity and political justice, but peace is also constantly ruptured by wars and other forms of violent conflict. Like happiness, peace remains so near . . . and yet, like enduring love, so far. . . .

Spiritual and religious leaders from the Buddha and Jesus to Gandhi and the Dalai Lama have been inclined to equate peace and love, both in their inner dimensions and in the manner in which people who are spiritually developed interact with others, most acutely with those who may hate and envy them. In the twentieth century, Freud and other depth psychologists explored the vicissitudes of our loving and hating feelings, both toward our 'selves', and to others both near and dear (especially our mothers), and to those distant and often dangerous (the 'enemy' within and without).

Eros and aggression, love and hate, are intermingled from birth to burial. Understanding and pacifying our conflicted inner worlds – our need for and flight from love of our selves and others – is an intellectual and political project of the highest and most urgent order. This undertaking must run in tandem with the necessity of comprehending and transforming the conflicts rampant in our interpersonal and political realms of interaction and division.

If peace, like happiness, is both a normative ideal in the Kantian sense (a regulative principle and ethical virtue indicating how we should think and act, even if we often fail to do so) as well as a psychological need (something of which we are normally unaware but sporadically conscious), then why are violence and war (the apparent contraries of social, or outer, peace), as well as unhappiness and misery (the expressions of a lack of inner peace), so prevalent, not just in our time but for virtually all of recorded human history? Given the facts of history and the ever-progressing understanding of our genetic and hormonal nature, is peace even conceivable, much less possible?

These are issues that have been addressed from time immemorial, in oral form since the dawn of civilization and in written form since at least the periods of the great Greek and Indian epochs. But they seem no closer, and perhaps even farther, from resolution than they were at the times of the *Iliad* and the *Mahabharata*.

What does peace mean?

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

Many philosophical, religious and cultural traditions have referred to peace in its 'positive' sense. In Chinese, for example, the word *heping* denotes 'world peace', 'peace among nations', while the words *an* and *mingxi* denote an 'inner peace', a tranquil and harmonious state of mind and being, akin to a meditative mental state. Other languages also frame peace in its 'inner' and 'outer' dimensions.

The English lexicon is quite rich in its supply of terms that refer to and denote peace. In Webster's *Third New International Dictionary*, for example, the meanings of peace are clearly defined.

Initially, in Webster's, peace is defined negatively, as 'freedom from civil clamor and confusion', and positively as 'a state of public quiet' (Webster's 1993: 1660). This denotes -peace and +peace in their political or 'outer' sense. Webster's proceeds further to define (political or outer) peace positively as 'a state of security or order within a community provided for by law, custom, or public opinion' (Ibid.).

Webster's second distinct definition of peace is a 'mental or spiritual condition marked by freedom from disquieting or oppressive thoughts or emotions' (-peace in its personal or 'inner' sense) as well as 'calmness of mind and heart: serenity of spirit' (+inner peace) (Ibid.). Third, peace is defined as 'a tranquil state of freedom from outside disturbances and harassment' (+inner peace resulting from -peace) (Ibid.). Fourth, peace denotes 'harmony in human or personal relations: mutual concord and esteem' (this is what I will call interpersonal or intersubjective peace) (Ibid.).

Next, peace is defined by Webster's as (1) 'a state of mutual concord between governments: absence of hostilities or war' (+outer peace caused by -outer peace) and (2) 'the period of such freedom from war' (-outer peace) (Ibid.). The sixth definition of peace is the 'absence of activity and noise: deep stillness: quietness' (+inner peace caused by -inner peace) (Ibid.). And the final lexicographical meaning of peace in the English language (American version) personifies peace as 'one that makes, gives or maintains tranquility' (as God being the ultimate cause of peace on earth and as identified with peace, or Peace, itself) - 'divine peace' (or Peace?) (Ibid.).

Dictionary definitions of abstract terms can only go so far. But in the case of the English lexicon, the semantics of peace gets us remarkably far. For in this important dictionary, the meanings of peace are clearly classified into both + and -, as well as 'inner and outer' components. Two additional denotations are what I am calling 'interpersonal or intersubjective' peace, and 'divine peace' or the divine peacemaker (God, or in polytheistic and mythological cosmologies, the gods). I will not go into various spiritual, theological and/or religious views of peace and Peace, but I will explore some aspects of intersubjective peace, especially in what I shall call its 'dialectical' determination. For it is in this intersubjective zone that some important contemporary and cutting-edge philosophical, psychological and psychoanalytic theories and research strategies converge.

A dialectical determination of peace

Peace is often defined or determined negatively. Peace is 'the absence of war'. Peace is 'non-violence'. Etc. *We know peace by its absence.*

We would agree that World War II was certainly not a time of peace, at least for much of the northern hemisphere. But what about much of the southern hemisphere from 1919 to 1945 - were sub-Saharan Africa, most of Latin America, and the homelands of the Anzacs countries 'at peace' because they were not battlegrounds? And what about the period of the 'Cold War' - was that a 'Cold Peace' as well?

These historical considerations lead us back to first, perhaps to 'ultimate', principles, regarding not just the meanings of peace, but its 'essence', its ontology. Is peace like other theoretical terms – justice, freedom, virtue and equality, to name a few? Something intangible but which virtually all rational people prize? Or is it even less tangible, less perceptible – an ideal without an essence, an 'ideal type' (in Max Weber's formulation) but still bearing a 'family resemblance' to other, more tangible human desiderata? *Perhaps peace is both an historical ideal and a term whose meaning is in flux, sometimes seemingly constant (as in 'inner peace of mind') but also noteworthy for its relative absence on the field of history (as in 'world peace').*

Peace is dialectical. In this world, peace is neither a timeless essence – an unchanging ideal substance – nor a mere name without a reference, a form without content. Peace should neither be reified by essentialist metaphysics nor rendered otiose by postmodernist and sceptical deconstruction.

Peace is also not the mere absence of war in a Hobbesian world of unending violent conflict. *Peace is both a means of personal and collective ethical transformation and an aspiration to cleanse the planet of human-inflicted destruction.* The means and the goal are in continual, dialectical evolution, sometimes regressing during periods of acute violent conflict and sometimes progressing nonviolently and less violently to actualize political justice and social equity. Like history and life, peace is a terrestrial creation struggling for survival in a constantly changing, and sometimes threatening environment.

Thinking peace

In thinking about and thinking peace, it is helpful to make clear distinctions between what peace is and might be, and what peace is not and should not be. Thinking 'negatively' (critically or dialectically), it is important to note that peace is not mere pacification: it is not active or subtle domination and manipulation of less by more powerful actors (or –pacification). Peace is also not quiescence and acquiescence by a 'pacified' population fed 'bread and circuses' by a 'benevolent' empire or autocrat.

On the contrary, peace in its progressive or dialectical mode denotes active individual and collective self-determination and emancipatory empowerment. Peace entails continuous peacekeeping and peacemaking. And peacemaking requires active and continual personal and collective transformation, pacifistic rather than pacifying in its means of psychological and political development.

Similarly, the belief system of those who both think and practise peace and who actively seek to attain it by peaceful (nonviolent) means – true pacifism – is not passivism. Genuine pacifism is transformative and activist, employing nonviolent means of social and personal change to resist oppression, war and injustice and to promote personal and social moral integrity and radical, peaceful means of transforming conflicts and actors.

Given the history of the recent past and the current parlous state of our world, one might understandably be tempted to be sceptical about the prospects for enduring peace on earth in an era (error?) of potential instantaneous global war with weapons of mass and vast destruction. But it is worth recalling that other political ideals once thought unachievable also came to pass.

It took centuries, even millennia, to outlaw slavery and legitimize human rights. It might take at least as long to delegitimize political violence, both from above (by the state) and from below (by non-state actors).

And 'peace on earth' might in fact be unachievable, at least for a sustained period of time. That does not invalidate the struggle to achieve a world with greater justice and equity and

without violence, or at least with significantly less violence, injustice and inequity. On the contrary, the nonviolent struggle to liberate humanity from its means of self-destruction and self-enslavement is its own end. The absence of a guarantee of 'success' in the effort to bring peace to humanity, and the real possibility of the failure of the human experiment, do not undermine the effort to pacify existence but instead bestow on it a kind of existential nobility and political virtue.

Peace and its antitheses: terror and terrorism

The antithesis of peace is not conflict. Conflicts appear historically inevitable and may be socially desirable if they result in personal and/or political progress. Conflicts may, perhaps paradoxically, promote and increase peace and diminish violence if the conflicting parties negotiate in good faith to reach solutions to problems that are achievable and tolerable, if not ideal.

And sometimes the antithesis of peace is not violence, even political violence, since violent means (such as World War II and wars of independence/national liberation) have sometimes historically helped to bring about periods of less violence and fragile peace. During the long Cold War from 1945–1991, for example, the major powers – the US and its NATO allies on the one hand, and the former Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies on the other hand – did not attack each other directly. Simultaneously, the defeated World War II axis powers – Germany, Italy and Japan – experienced unprecedented political and economic development with vastly less militarism than before 1939.

War-prone nations can become peace-prone (Switzerland, the Scandinavian countries and Costa Rica come to mind) if their real and perceived security and resource needs are met and their standing armies are dramatically reduced or are retired. Even the most striking personal example of the unification of peace thinking and peacemaking – M.K. Gandhi – believed that under certain circumstances it is preferable to act violently on behalf of a just cause than not to act at all. Gandhi said,

It is better for a man to be violent, if there is violence in our breasts, than to put on the cloak of nonviolence to cover impotence. Violence is any day preferable to impotence. There is hope for a violent man to become nonviolent. There is no such hope for the impotent.

(Gandhi, in Weber 2004/2007: 141)

Rather the polar opposite of peace is violence, or the threat of violence, employed either for its own sake – that is, on behalf of political and/or criminal terrorism – or for the primary purpose of achieving, maintaining and/or expanding personal and/or political power for the sake of conquest and domination. Peace and reflexive acts of interpersonal violence, perpetrated on the spur of the moment against real and/or perceived threats to one's or one's loved ones' existence, are not always mutually exclusive. Similarly, certain acts of political violence may at times advance peaceful ends, as during revolutionary struggles employing controlled and generally non-lethal violence against clear state representatives of tyranny and oppression. The less violence the better. But in a world of murder and murderers, it is often not possible, no matter how ethically desirable, simultaneously to have justice and 'clean hands'.

On the other hand, there is a kind of political and psychological violence that seems always to be reprehensible and avoidable. For this kind of violence – terrifying, terroristic violence – almost always increases human pain and suffering and usually diminishes personal safety and peace of mind, without accomplishing 'higher order' political goals, such as national liberation and political or socioeconomic emancipation.

Some kinds of violence may, especially if non-lethal and not directed intentionally or foreseeably at civilians and other non-combatants, at least in the short run, seem to augment national security or to promote 'just causes'. But in the long run, the chronic use of violence for political and/or criminal means turns back on those who deploy it (as the film *Munch* concretely illustrates at the international level and *A History of Violence* shows at the interpersonal level) and ultimately decreases both the psychological and political security of those who use violence ostensibly to protect themselves from real and/or perceived antagonists or as a means of retaliation to avenge attacks on them, their families and/or their property.

Peace and conflict are not antagonists, especially if the conflicting parties use nonviolent, less violent and non-lethal means of conflict resolution and transformation. Even peace and war are not always antitheses if parties who find themselves reluctantly pulled into war make every effort to reduce the incidence and lethality of violent conflicts and operations during a war and in good faith resolve to end the violence as expeditiously as possible and not to inflict violence on civilian and military non-combatants (*jus in bello*).

Terror and terrorism, however, are incompatible with peace, peacemaking and the struggle to pacify existence. Terrorism is a dual phenomenon, a tactic used by states (terrorism from above) and by non-state actors (terrorism from below) to induce fear in terrorized people for the purpose of influencing another, less vulnerable, population, such as government officials (Webel 2004; Barash and Webel 2009: 43–66; Webel and Arnaldi 2011). *To be at peace in our inner worlds means, inter alia, to be free from the anxiety and terror that are induced or threatened both from above and from below.*

Being at peace: toward a metapsychology of peace

'Metapsychology' is a term used by Freud to denote a number of essays he wrote just after the start of World War I, commencing with two papers written in 1915, 'Instincts and their Vicissitudes' and 'The Unconscious', and continuing two years later with 'Mourning and Melancholia'. In his 'Autobiographical Study', Freud said that what is meant by 'metapsychology' is

a method of approach according to which every mental process is considered in relation to three coordinates, which I described as dynamic, topographical, and economic, respectively; and this seemed to me to represent the furthest goal that psychology could achieve.

(Freud 1925/1995: 37).

Freud's 'metapsychology' was his theoretical effort to provide a three-dimensional portrait of the dynamics of emotional life, as 'determined' by mostly unconscious mental processes. Here, I am appropriating and revising the Freudian notion of 'metapsychology' and am using it to denote a three-dimensional portrayal of the political psychology of peace and conflict formation.

There are three dialectical, dynamic 'spheres' or 'spectra' of greater or lesser peace. The first is the realm of 'inner', or psychobiological peace (IP). I will use IP to correspond to the 'topographical' (or 'inner spatial') representation of Freud's metapsychological theory. Unconscious, pre-conscious and conscious thoughts, impulses, needs, desires and perceptions constitute the mental and emotional lives of sentient beings.

The second part of this spectrum is the 'outer' sphere of sociopolitical, domestic and international peace (OP). This is the 'economic' arena, both in the psychodynamic sense of 'economy' (drives, instincts and their vicissitudes operating, roughly, according to and beyond

the pleasure principle), and in the literal sense of the term. Macro-economic and political forces constitute the commonly understood field of global and local market and power-driven agents and agencies.

And the third, and least discussed, sphere in peace studies and conflict research, is intersubjective or interpersonal peace (ITP). This corresponds to the 'dynamic' element of Freudian metapsychological theory. It is the behavioural field of human interaction in daily life and work.

Like Freud's tripartite 'structural theory', in which the ego, the superego and the unconscious are in continuous interaction, IP, OP and ITP are similarly dynamic processes. States of inner peace, or psychological harmony and well-being, are characterized by low degrees of 'inner conflict' and malignant aggression (directed either against oneself, as in masochism, or against others, as in sadism), and by high ego functioning, successful sublimation and non-pathological object relations with significant (and even insignificant) others.

But even the most psychologically healthy persons have difficulty maintaining their equilibrium in pathogenic environments. Their tranquility may be undermined and even uprooted by pathology-inducing familial, organizational, social and political systems, ranging from conflict-laden interactions with kith and kin, bosses and subordinates, to such stress- and potentially violence-inducing structural factors as under- and unemployment, racism, sexism, injustice, need-deprivation, famine, natural catastrophes, poverty, exploitation, inequity and militarism. The intersubjective zone mediates and straddles the zones of inner and outer peace. It is accordingly the catalyst for environmental and interpersonal agents, energies and institutions that reinforce or subvert psychological equilibrium, or inner peace.

But being-at-peace is possible but improbable in an environment that is impoverished. Being peaceful is an enormous challenge when others with whom one interacts are hostile, aggressive, very competitive, and violent. And living in peace is almost inconceivable in desperately poor and war-ridden cultures.

Accordingly, the three zones of inner, outer and intersubjective peace are never static and are always in interaction. A metapsychology of peace would lay out the structural dynamics of these interactions (the descriptive component), assess the strengths and weaknesses of their current historical alignment (the analytic component), and propose a practicable strategy for remediating the inequities and infelicities in the respective spheres of IP, OP, ITP and their interactions (the prescriptive or therapeutic component).

A spectral theory of peace as a continuum

Peace is like light -- intangible but discernible either by its absence or by its sporadic and often startling appearances (like a flash of lightning against a black sky). *Peace is a background condition for the perception of everything else, a physical phenomenon affecting all sentient beings, something whose presence or absence is best measured on a continuum or spectrum.*

Peace ranges from what I shall call 'Strong, or Durable, Peace' (roughly equivalent to Johan Galtung's term 'positive peace' -- a condition in which there is relatively robust justice, equity and liberty, and relatively little violence and misery at the social level) -- to weak or fragile peace. *Strong, peaceful cultures and societies reflexively promote personal harmony and satisfaction.*

At the other end of the spectrum is what I will call 'Weak, or Fragile, Peace' ('negative peace' in Galtung's formulation), where there may be an overt absence of war and other widespread violence in a particular culture, society or nation-state, but in which there is also pervasive injustice, inequity and personal discord and dissatisfaction. Very few human cultures and societies historically have qualified for the designation of Strong Peace, while

very many tend toward Weak Peace. The spectrum that measures the relative presence or absence of the necessary and sufficient conditions for sociocultural and national Strong or Weak Peace illuminates what I call 'Outer Peace.'

At times of Weak Peace, peace is a background condition for social existence in general and of personal happiness in particular, something taken for granted – until it is no longer present. During times of war, people yearn for peace in ways they could not have imagined during less violent times. They imagine and desire an often idealized and all-too-evanescent 'peaceable kingdom', a blissful condition, a status quo *ante bellum*, to which they long to return and for which they would pay literally any price.

Personal survival is the absolutely necessary condition, the *sine qua non*, for peace at the personal level. And 'national security', or the collective survival of a culture, people or nation-*g*les, sometimes ruthless, unscrupulous and murderous during times of perceived and real threats to individual and familial existence.

This spectrum is also descriptive of the mental/emotional lives of individuals, which range from extremely conflicted, or Weak Harmony (similar but not identical to psychotic) to conflict free, or Strong Harmony (what ego psychologists once referred to as 'the conflict-free zone' of ego-syntonicity). This is a measure of an individual person's 'Inner Peace'.

Similarly, cultures and societies also range on a spectrum from 'very violent and warlike' to 'very nonviolent and warfree' in terms of their intercultural and international behaviour. The United States, especially since 1941, has vacillated between periods of Weak Peace and 'very violent and war-like' behaviour, both internally (domestically) and internationally. The spectrum that places nation-states and cultures on a continuum ranging from continual and high-casualty warfare to no warfare and no casualties is a measure of Outer Peace.

Finally, individual persons, when interacting with others, exhibit a range of behaviours ranging from 'very conflicted' to 'very unconflicted'. There are a variety of reasons and motivations, from the intrapsychic and hormonal to the sociocultural, why certain individuals behave in antagonistic and hyper-competitive ways on the one hand, to peaceable and cooperative on the other hand. And the continuum of personal feelings, needs, inclinations and desires manifested in behaviours ranging from very conflicted to very unconflicted is a measure of Inner Peace.

The zone of Intersubjective Peace comprises the public and familial spheres, in which people's most aggressive and compassionate qualities are elicited, reinforced or rejected by their peers and bosses. Inner peace can often be made or unmade by interpersonal and socioeconomic (or class) conflict.

But peace is also spectral in another way. Peace seems very illusory, almost ghost-like. It is sometimes fleeting and barely visible, like an apparition, especially during times of continual warfare and collective violence.

Peace is a future end-point and 'goal' of war in virtually all cultures and societies. War has been allegedly conducted 'for the sake of peace' from Homeric to present times. As such, *peace is a vision, often otherworldly, of a human and individual condition that is violence and terror free.*

Absolute peace, like absolute pacifism, may also be ghost-like in that it may not exist at all. It may be an illusion or delusion, something for which we are inclined by our natures and cultures to yearn for and idealize, but also something deeply resisted by those same natures and cultures.

Instead of desiring and idealizing what may be unachievable – 'Perfect Peace', or, in Kant's formulation, 'Unending Peace' – might it be more prudent and realistic to think of peace as what Kant sometimes called a 'regulative ideal', a norm (like the Platonic form of perfect

virtue or complete happiness) that ought to guide and regulate our behaviour but which is also unlikely to be universally observed? So instead of vainly trying to achieve the impossible – a world completely without war and violence – should we be willing instead to strive for ‘Imperfect Peace’?

Conclusion: imperfect but durable peace?

Peace is not and probably cannot be either perfect or unending – at least not on this island Earth as we now know it. But that does not imply that peace is also chimerical and ‘not in our genes’. *Rather peace, like justice and happiness, is an historically shifting condition of our individual and collective natures, of our psyches and politics, that at some times is less intangible and at other historical moments shines in the most distant horizons of our imaginations and desires.*

Peace is, like all desired and desirable human ideals and needs, always potentially within us, even if difficult to discern and seemingly impossible to accomplish. The quest for peace may seem quixotic, but that is part of it allure.

Peacemaking is and ought to be heroic. Peace is and must be the heroic quest of this new millennium – if we are to survive.

Bibliography

- Ackerman, P. and J. DuVall (2000). *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conduct*. New York: Palgrave.
- Barash, D. and C. Webel (2009). *Peace and Conflict Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Christie, D., R. Wagner and D. Winter (2001). *Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology in the 21st Century*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Einstein, A. (1984). *The World as I See It*. Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press.
- Fornari, F. (1974). *The Psychoanalysis of War*. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books.
- Frank, J.D. (1968). *Sanity and Survival: Psychological Aspects of War and Peace*. New York: Random House Vintage Books.
- Freud, S. (1959). *Collected Papers*, Volumes 4 and 5. New York: Basic Books.
- Galtung, J. and D. Ikeda (1995). *Choose Peace: A Dialogue between Johan Galtung and Daisaku Ikeda* (translated and edited by R.L. Gage.). London: Pluto Press.
- Galtung, J., C.G. Jacobsen and K.F. Brand-Jacobsen (2002). *Searching for Peace: The Road to TRANSCEVD*. London: Pluto Press.
- Gay, P., ed. (1989). *The Freud Reader*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Kant, I. (1983). *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays on Politics, History, Morals*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Kernberg, O.F. (1992). *Aggression in Personality Disorders and Perversions*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Macnair, R.M. (2003). *The Psychology of Peace: An Introduction*. Westport: Praeger.
- Merton, T., ed. (1965). *Gandhi on Non-Violence*. New York: New Directions Press.
- Reich, W. (1971). *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Rose, J. (1993). *Why War? Psychoanalysis, Politics, and the Return to Melanie Klein*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Somerville, J. (1954). *The Philosophy of Peace*. New York: Liberty Press.
- Thich Nhat Hanh in Kotler, A. (1991). *Peace is Every Step, the Path of Mindfulness in Everyday Life*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Webel, C. (2004/2007). *Terror, Terrorism, and the Human Condition*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Webel, C. and J. Araldi, J. (2011). *Fighting Fire with Fire: The Ethics and Efficacy of The Global War on Terrorism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged (1993). Springfield, ILL: Merriam-Webster, Inc.