
UNIT 15 PEACE RESEARCH AND PEACE MOVEMENTS

Structure

- 15.1 Introduction
- 15.2 Concept of Peace
- 15.3 Building and Making Peace
- 15.4 International Peace Systems
- 15.5 World Peace Systems
- 15.6 Peace Movements
 - 15.6.1 Historical Development
 - 15.6.2 Peace Movements in the Post World War Phase
- 15.7 Peace Research
- 15.8 Summary
- 15.9 Exercises

15.1 INTRODUCTION

Social science has uncovered more knowledge about war than about peace, just as psychology probably has yielded more insights into negative deviance (such as mental illness) than into positive deviance (such as creativity). It has been noticed that studies tend to be focused on wars as units of analysis rather than on periods of peace, and there is a tendency to define peace simply as "non-war". The conditions believed to foster peace and the very conception of peace, however, have varied in different periods and cultures. Peace thinking, that has influenced both the peace movements as well as peace research worldwide, thus has had a tendency to become speculative and value loaded rather than analytical and empirical. It is our effort here to understand contemporary scholarly understandings of peace and how to achieve and maintain peace along with to mark trends in peace movements and peace research. But before we proceed let's have an understanding of the concept of peace.

15.2 CONCEPT OF PEACE

Two concepts of peace should be distinguished: negative peace, defined as the absence of organised violence between such major human groups as nations, as also between racial and ethnic groups because of the magnitude that can be reached by such conflicts; and positive peace, defined as a pattern of cooperation and integration between major human groups. Absence of violence should not be confused with absence of conflict; violence may occur without conflict, and conflict may be solved by means of non-violent mechanisms. The distinction between these two types of peace gives rise to a fourfold classification of relations between two nations: war, which is organised group violence; negative peace,

where there is no violence but no other form of interaction either and where the best characterisation is "peaceful passive coexistence"; positive peace, where there is some cooperation interspersed with occasional outbreaks of violence; and unqualified peace, where absence of violence is combined with a pattern of cooperation.

The conception of peace as "non-war" is neither theoretically nor practically interesting: as used, for instance, in describing the relationship that obtains between Norway and Nepal, it can often be explained in **terms** of a low level of interaction resulting from geographical distance and thus will hardly be identified by many as an ideal relation worth striving for. For peace, like health, has both cognitive and evaluative components: it designates a state of a system of nations, but this state is so highly valued that institutions are built around it to protect and promote it. It is the concept of positive peace that is worth exploring, especially since negative peace is a *conditio sine qua non* and the two concepts of peace may be empirically related even though they are logically independent.

15.3 BUILDING AND MAKING PEACE

A large body of writing about building peace examines the education and socialisation of members of a society or group in ways that promote peace. This includes research and theorizing about the ways this has been done and about the ways that it might be done.

Since conflicts **are** inherent in social life, the role of social structure and culture in shaping how conflicts are waged is highly **significant** for building peace. Analysts are giving increased attention to variations in the repertoire of methods used to conduct conflicts, including constructive ones that are available for different people in different historical periods. Efforts to study and to train people in the methods of non-violent action and **problem-solving** conflict resolution methods therefore contribute to building peace internationally and domestically.

One long-standing area of peace studies has been the effect of integration between societies and of sectors within societies. Integration is indicated by the high rate of exchange of goods, peoples, and ideas across societal and group lines, relative to exchanges within. Research findings support the generalisation that integration improves communication and exchanges between the integrating parties and more important enhances mutual security and reduces the probability of countries' waging wars or threatening each other's identity, particularly, when such an integration is perceived to be equitable.

Considerable evidence has been reported indicating that democratic countries do not make war against each other. Although the finding and particularly its interpretation **are** contested, such finding seems robust, given particular definitions of democracy and war.

The concepts of positive peace and structural violence help in understanding the relationship between social context and peace. Unlike personal violence, structural violence is indirect. It refers to the "avoidable denial of what is needed to satisfy fundamental needs." Such inequities are built into the global order and constitute negative peace. This influential idea has stimulated various studies, particularly regarding conditions in peripheral or underdeveloped regions.

The recent transformation and settlement of protracted international and societal conflicts and the radical transformation of previously authoritarian and repressive societies have heightened attention to the challenges of building post-conflict relations that are enduring and just.

A fundamental change in ways of **thinking** among members of one or more antagonistic sides can be a powerful factor in producing an enduring peace between them. This does sometimes happen. For example, most Germans after the defeat of Nazism repudiated what they themselves had believed and done; instead, they welcomed beliefs, values, and institutions shared with the victors. To some extent, a similar transformation occurred among Russians as the Cold War ended.

Traditionally, efforts to restore peace after a conflict ends include policies to redress the grievances that were viewed as the conflict's source. For communal differences within a country, this **may entail** more autonomy for citizens with different languages or religions and provisions for popular participation in determining the form and degree of autonomy.

In recent years, peace workers have been giving considerable attention to fostering mutual understanding and tolerance among peoples with different cultural backgrounds living in the same society. This attention extends to reconciliation between peoples who perpetrated gross human rights violations and peoples who suffered profound losses during periods of repression or of violent struggle. A variety of recent developments contribute to reconciliation among the different peoples making up the United States. The truth about discrimination, violent repression, and other injustices regarding Native Americans, African Americans, and other groups has been more frequently acknowledged.

Furthermore, international organisations are increasingly expected to play critical roles in keeping and restoring peace. The United Nations' peacekeeping forces have undertaken many more such tasks since the Cold War ended. Regional organisations and individual countries, particularly the US, have intervened to restore and sustain peace (Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan, and Iraq to mention a few).

15.4 INTERNATIONAL PEACE SYSTEMS

Most peace **thinking** has centred on the problem of how power shall best be distributed among the nations of the world. The **first** model is that of minimum equality of power which is based on the theory that the international system is best served by making power the monopoly of one nation or system, just as it is monopolised by some states in the international system. Examples are the *Pax Romana*, *Pax Ecclesiae*, and *Pax Britannica*. These are instances of Roman Empire, the Catholic Church and Britain maintaining law and order over large areas in the globe

The second model focuses on maximum equality, or what is usually referred to as a 'balance of power' in the sense that no nation or alliance is strong enough to defeat another nation or alliance. A modern version of this is the 'balance of terror', in which a nation may defeat other nations, but only at the risk of itself being completely destroyed.

A **third** model views military power as best stabilised at a low level; this refers to all kinds

of arms control efforts, especially those that have taken place from the Hague Peace Conference of 1899 to the present day, including contemporary **thinking** that aims at subtracting from a Hobbesian dictum *bellum omnium contra omnes* both some means of violence and some objects of violence. The idea is to rule out general and complete war.

Finally, there is the model that views power as stabilised at a zero level; this refers to the general and complete disarmament advocated by pacifists. Pacifism **asserts** that this **state** may be **obtained** unilaterally by the effect of example, because weapons become **meaningless** when they do not encounter similar weapons, and by the refusal of soldiers to use arms, as well as by governmental decisions.

None of these models are **free** from limitations. Take the model of **minimum** equality. While there might perhaps be agreement among nations about the appointment of a policing nation in the world there is no unanimity about its consequences, **i.e.**, that coercive power usually will be accompanied by other kinds of influence. The major difficulty in the model of maximum equality **seems** to be that **the** system, although in momentary **equilibrium**, is not in stable equilibrium. It is based on the relative evaluation of two power potentials, and since military power is many dimensional, this evaluation may be far from consensual. There will always be room for the idea that one's own power is not sufficiently **developed**. **Thus**, the basis is laid for arms races, and it is difficult to see any good theoretical justification for the thesis that there will be points of stability – for instance, that major technical breakthroughs will not occur. The need for sufficient retaliatory power after an enemy's first strike also makes the **terror** balance unstable.

One major difficulty in the model that focuses on arms control is the arbitrariness of **all** borderlines between permissible and illegitimate weapons. For such border lines to be consensually accepted they must be protected by some **kind** of discontinuity, such as the clear line that existed between conventional and nuclear weapons before the overlap in destructive power became too conspicuous with the introduction of the variety of tactical atomic weapons.

As far as the model of general and complete disarmament is concerned, one major objection is its failure to consider the need for countervailing power. One evader of an agreement may dominate the total system if he has an absolute weapon at his disposal. For this reason, general and complete disarmament can preserve peace only if the distribution of power in the system accords with the **minimum-equality** model, or if provision is made in the system for the effective use of non-military forms of power, against those who evade disarmament agreements.

15.5 WORLD PEACE SYSTEMS

All of the following models of world systems have in common a certain resemblance to a nation-state. The idea is that since many nation-states have obtained reasonable security and equity for their inhabitants, there must be something in their structure that is **worth** copying at the world level. Of the many dimensions that can be used to describe such models, let us examine the two important ones.

First, models of world systems can be described in terms of the type of the main constituting

unit on which the system is based. When the basic unit ~~is~~ the individual, the world system is conceived as a world **state**, with a very low level of autonomy for intermediate levels such as the nation. With nations as units the world system becomes a confederation, with the nation as a political level interposed between the individual and the world government. Congruence between the authority structures of nation and **confederation** may have a stabilising effect on the system as a whole.

The difference between these two models is rarely argued in terms of their relevance for peace. Rather, the world confederation is seen as an intermediate step in a more gradualist approach toward the world state or as a system with the built-in protection of some internal autonomy. Also, there is the idea that ~~border~~ lines should be preserved to some extent, precisely because they slow down **cultural** diffusion and influence and thus contribute to the preservation of socio-cultural pluralism – which many fear might disappear in a world state because of the homogenising effect of a strong nucleus of decision making.

Secondly, models of the world systems can be described in terms of their scope and domain. By “**scope**” we refer to the variety of needs satisfied by the world system; and by “**domain**”, we refer to how many receive need-satisfaction from the system.

Classification in terms of these two system functions produces two basic models. The first model rates high on scope but low on domain. It is the form taken by the regional **confederation**, which gives much in terms of **scope** to its members but is exclusive in terms of membership; a leading example of this is European Union or erstwhile European Economic Community. The second model rates high on domain but low on scope. It is the form taken by the functionally specific organisation, which sets no limits, at least in principle, to the **number** and type of people whose needs it may serve but is able to do this only because both the needs and the type of service provided are of a limited type. The specialised agencies of the UN are good examples of this model.

15.6 PEACE MOVEMENTS

The tremendous disparity between the different approaches to peace that have been described may be interpreted as a sign of basic confusion in thinking on the topic. But it is more likely to be a reflection of the complexity of the problem itself. It may be that in this respect, peace is somewhat like health: the phenomenon is extremely difficult to grasp as a whole, and one's approach therefore tends to be determined by the kind of peace – or health – he is interested in obtaining. Clearly, there are good reasons for these differences of interest; in fact, a peace plan can be classified not only according to its content but also according to who put it forward.. This may be a person or an organisation, located either in the decision-making nucleus of the world system or in the centre of a society or on the periphery of a society. If the last is the case, the proposal is likely to bear some of the imprints of marginality; an absolutist and a moralistic leaning, as opposed to a gradualist **and** pragmatic, approach; and a tendency toward single factor, as opposed to multiple-factor thinking; and a tendency to confuse **organisational** levels, so that the training and capacity of ~~the~~ plan's author are made to seem more **important** than the possible merits of the plan itself.

At the other end are the decision makers in the centre of society, who have a gradualist,

pragmatic approach and employ **multiple** factor thinking. In their effort not to confuse organisational levels their approach becomes so slow, so careful, and so withdrawn from the public eye, that the tension between centre and periphery becomes high enough to produce impatience and conflict, leading to demonstrations, party **formation**, and other forms of protest. The result is the traditional dialogue between centre and periphery. The periphery gradually becomes like the centre as it gains in power and leaves a certain imprint on the total system; however, in turn, a new protest movement is created at the periphery. In other words, peace movements, like other social movements, follow the "church-sect" cycle. Since the periphery – the peace movement – is split into single-factor organizations, the world does not get a multiple approach impact from the movement.

15.6.1 Historical Development .

Although organised peace societies did not develop until early in the nineteenth century, the aspirations and programs of these societies had found previous expression in religious and political literature. Utterances of the Hebrew prophets and the Sermon on the Mount had inspired the pacifist doctrine and behaviour of religious sects. For example, the Truce of God which grew of the Pax Dei (God's Peace) and was first put forward at the Synod of the Elne in 1027 had prohibited all acts of private warfare for certain specified periods. In the fourteenth century Dante had proposed a world empire for ending war, and Pierre Dubois later proposed a permanent tribunal of attrition.

The fact that there are now around 1500 groups working for disarmament and peace suggests, among other things, an enormous democratisation of the struggle for peace; even though their total membership may be small, these organisations do provide open forums for expressions of public opinion. Such forums are relatively new. Although the organised peace movement can be said to have begun in the United States in 1815, with the founding of three peace societies, the first in New York by David Low Dodge, followed by the **Massachusetts** society formed by Noah Worcester, and one in Ohio by two Quakers, it was not until 1843 that the first international peace congress was held in London. In 1816, the British Society for the Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace was founded in London; it was designed to print and circulate tracts and to diffuse information showing that war is inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity and the true interests of mankind point out the means best calculated to maintain permanent and universal peace on the basis of Christian principles. The Society was extremely active; in the first year of its existence it distributed 32000 tracts and its members delivered 4000 addresses throughout England.

In 1828, the local American societies were joined together by William Ladd, the most influential of the early American pacifists, into the American Peace Society on the broadest program of opposition to war though not specifically condemning defensive wars. **Because** of the insistent pressure from peace workers who demanded an uncompromising stand, it revised its constitution in 1837 to express opposition to all wars, defensive as well as offensive.

International Peace Congresses helped to direct public attention to the early peace movement. The first of these congresses, held at London in 1843, under the direction of the conservative elements in the peace movement, adopted resolutions **seeking** peace by effective propaganda against war and by the control of the manufacture and sale of munitions and advocated a congress and court of nations and arbitration clauses in international treaties.

Peace work in the United States waned after 1853. The American Peace Society had **failed** to expand into the west and south or to enlist new forces in the east. At first it evaded the impending Civil War by stating that its concern was only with international conflicts; when the war broke out the society declared the war to be a rebellion against the Union which could not be countenanced by loyal citizens. Protest against the support of the war by the American Peace Society led to the formation of the Universal Peace Union in Boston in 1866; in the same year the American Friends founded a peace association in Baltimore. The American Peace Society remained practically defunct until 1873, when it began widespread propaganda for arbitration of disputes between nations.

The second phase of the peace movement began in 1867 with the arbitration and later a more systematic discussion of international law as its central **aspects**. **During** this period there was wider support among the masses, and the threat of a general strike, favoured by the International **Working Men's** Association at its congress at Brussels in 1868, gained an important place in peace agitation.

Side by side with the movement for arbitration proceeded efforts for the improvement of international law. Two academic juridical societies were founded in Europe at the end of 1873, the Institut de Droit International at Ghent, devoted to the study of arbitration and **private** international law, and the Association for the Reform and Codification of the Law of Nations, known after 1895 as the International Law Association, formed at Brussels to **promulgate** a code.

Peace societies were increasing in number and activity **during** this period. Van Eck established the Netherlands Peace Society in 1870, and in 1874 Edward Lowenthal formed a peace committee in Berlin; in 1875 the latter advocated a universal parliamentary peace union, which was **not** realised until some years later. **E.T.** Moneta established the first Italian peace society in 1878. The first Scandinavian peace society was founded in Denmark in 1882. **Two** pacifists led an anticonscription campaign in Belgium in 1881. In 1880, Hodgson Pratt, maintaining that the London Peace Society would remain **handicapped** so long as its standpoint was primarily spiritual and Christian, formed the International Arbitration and Peace Association, which set up branches in nine European countries.

During these crowded years of peace activity the entire peace movement of the world was being brought into closer touch with parliaments and governments and had increasing influence upon governmental policy. This development was facilitated by **inter-parliamentary** conferences on peace first held in 1889 and by the Inter-Parliamentary Union organised in 1892, composed of peace advocates in the parliaments of Europe and designed to discuss the most practical means of organising world peace by simultaneous concerted agitation within parliaments of all countries.

Each year saw some addition to the general power of the peace movements. The first Women's Peace League was established in 1895. The Nobel Peace Prize, instituted in 1897, also stimulated much interest in the problem of peace. The nineteenth century finally closed with 425 peace organisations in existence throughout the world. But it also closed with the outbreak of the Boer War, the resurgence of an aggressive imperialism that **shook**

the British peace societies, which had heretofore constituted the main element of the European peace movement.

The pre-war official peace movement had developed from an aspiration of religious mystics, based almost exclusively on the principle of the wickedness of all wars, into a movement favouring the creation of actual political machinery cooperating with the legal profession for the reform and administration of international law and had become respectable by the support by other peace movements and above all the Churches. Although it is difficult to estimate the extent of their influence, the peace societies, through their work in familiarising the public with the idea of international cooperation, must in some measure have prepared the way for the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand Pact for the outlawry of war. Since the World War a large part of the work done by the pre-war peace societies has been pursued in Europe by the League of Nations Societies established in each country. In Great Britain, for instance, the League of Nations Union, founded to carry on advocacy of the League of Nations, and which conducts an active campaign in favour of disarmament, is necessarily compelled to defend the ideal of peace. The membership of the Union, which had about 3000 branches in 1933, was in the neighbourhood of 1,000,000; the main effect of its missionary work has been to bring to the support of one aspect of the peace movement of conservatively inclined people who before the war would almost certainly have declined membership in a peace organisation.

The peace movement received a terrible shock when World War I proved how much stronger was attachment to the nation than adherence to internationalist and pacifist principles and how much stronger was the fear of the sanctions of one's own government and compatriots than of the sanctions of fellow members of organisations. The resolutions passed at the Universal Peace Congress in Geneva in 1912 and at the Congress of the Second Socialist International in Stuttgart in 1907 were strongly pacifist, but the weakness of the peace movement then is also its weakness today: loyalty to the peace movement is based on normative compliance alone not on contractual or coercive compliance. In times of crisis, only extremely idealistic or very peripherally located people are likely to remain faithful to their ideals. World War II provided peace movement with a new abundance of examples of this fact. However, this does not mean that the peace movement has no impact. Indeed, it serves as an imperfect substitute for a foreign-policy national assembly, since public opinion probably has less influence on foreign policy than on domestic-policy decisions in many countries.

15.6.2 Peace Movements in the Post World War Phase

In the 1950s, there was concern about environmental issues surrounding atmospheric nuclear tests, a worsening of Cold War, and changes in weapon technology which led to an appreciation that Europe had become the major target area. In the 1980s, the breakdown of détente and the deployment of first-strike weapons in Europe revived the dormant fear of nuclear war. In both periods, the protests originated from vast coalitions ranging from the absolute pacifist to what might be described as the defence pragmatist who could be on the Right of the political system.

The greatest achievement during this phase is that the peace movements have raised public

awareness of nuclear issues across international boundaries. The peace movements created mass protest; an unintended consequence was that it taught governments how to successfully deflect and neutralise mass protest. The peace movements were able to activate the very best in humanitarian, liberal, and moral feeling. Yet governments' skilful use of the psychopolitical backlash as comfortable psychological norms were disturbed, may well have aided the election of governments of the Right, for example the anti-Vietnam War protest destroyed President Johnson and it certainly helped Richard Nixon, while in the UK the Labour Party's espousal of an antinuclear defence policy seemed to be counterproductive.

The peace movement has engendered an upsurge in internationalism as exemplified by the European Nuclear Disarmament movement; the rise of the Swords into Ploughshares movement in the German Democratic Republic; improved appreciation of the North-South dilemma; and giving a fillip to international studies of peace. Yet government's ability to quickly utilise the worst in nationalism was amply demonstrated in the Argentine-British conflict over Falkland Islands. Peace is always on the defensive.

15.7 PEACE RESEARCH

Though much of the literature does not make clear distinctions between "peace research," "peace studies," and "peace education," it is useful to make clear distinctions between these related, but separate fields. Only by making clear the distinction between peace research and peace studies can we understand how and why they relate to each other in time, as well as in related concerns. Peace research is concerned with the development, accumulation and discovery of knowledge about the causes of war and condition of peace; peace education is concerned with the development of the processes of education in and about peace; while peace studies is an area of concern that relates to the substantive issues regarding the purposes and problems of the dissemination of knowledge of peace as a process. A final point, however, should be added before moving on to substantive issues. The distinctions outlined here are for many people artificial and unnecessary. Often the terms are used interchangeably. Nevertheless, it is important to recognise that developments in peace research must necessarily precede the debate about, and development of, peace studies.

Peace research began to develop in mid-1950s and early 1960s as there has been an intensification of the more academic study of peace and a drive toward professionalisation of the peace movement. The *Repertory on Disarmament and Peace Research Institutions* lists close to one hundred institutions in twenty countries as being active in the field; and two scientific quarterlies, the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (edited at the Centre for Conflict Resolution, University of Michigan) and the *Journal of Peace Research* (edited at the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo), are devoted to research in this interdisciplinary field.

By the early 1970s, after almost 20 years of peace research, the prospects for peace studies found a place on the agenda of debate. Now that research had become possible, the next stage could be addressed. In truth, these early efforts were necessarily hesitant and cautious, not least because the issue of peace itself has been the subject of intense

debate. To take but one example, in September 1974, the First World Conference of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction was held at the University of Keele in the United Kingdom. The proceedings were published in 1975 with the title *Education for Peace: Reflection and Action*. The editor opens the book with the remark, "many readers will probably be curious about the contents of a book with such a title. And they have reasons to be, because the title implies education for something that could involve a number of contradictory things depending upon who defines it." The remark was both cautious and far-sighted for its time, since it highlighted the potential for debate and confusion that surrounds, then as now; the notion of peace studies. At that Keele Conference, issues addressed included the parameters of education for peace, peace education in relation to the world, and reports on action projects.

One major difficulty with peace research is the problem whether the future will be a continuous extrapolation of the past or qualitatively different. For instance, it can be argued that the model for the disarmament process currently under discussion – the model that presupposes balance and control – probably has few, if any, counterparts, in the history of the past. Another set of models for peace preservation, namely, balance-of-power models and collective security systems, have shown very severe limitations in the past. But can one assume that if a structure has not appeared in the past, it is because it is not viable or that if a structure has failed in the past, it will also fail in the future? Or if one studied how city-states and nation-states have successfully reduced their armaments in the past, could this be a guide to future action? However, acceptance of this simple inductive approach might mean that peace research would become a scientific-sounding pretext for imposing the past on the future.

15.8 SUMMARY

The quest for peace is concerned with reduction of both types of violence; both the violence that flares up and subsides, and the violence that has the less dramatic character, but precisely for that reason may be even more destructive. Strictly speaking, this is only the negative side of peace studies, peace movements or peace research, that is, how to avoid violence. There is also the positive side which would focus more on the "peaks of joy" as mentioned above. This is an untilled field; peace talks softly. As we have seen, although desire of the human beings to live peaceably has been an eternal one, the concerted efforts towards restoration of peace took shape only in the early nineteenth century. But it was not until the end of the World War II that the need was felt to give peace and peace movements a place of research in international politics. It was only then that the academic interest in peace was ordained and thus came into being the concept of peace research. What started as a movement for maintaining and restoring peace today is a subject matter of discussion and debate in academic circles, worldwide. Peace work and the ways of thinking about peace have greatly expanded in recent decades. Peace is increasingly understood to be multidimensional and dynamic. Consequently, the ways of promoting peace are also manifold, and they vary in different settings for different actors. Theory and research about aspects of peace and their promotion draws from and contributes to social theory and social practice. Recent applied and scholarly peace work is based on past

experience, but the realities of the current world necessitate fresh thinking and innovative practices.

15.9 EXERCISES'

- 1) Critically examine the models of international peace systems based on the distribution of power among nations.
- 2) Examine the nature and features of peace movements in the pre war period.
- 3) Write a critical note on peace movements in the post war period.
- 4) Trace the evolution of peace research in *the* post-war period bringing out the issues confronting peace research.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Units I to 3

- Adler J. Mortimer. (1995). *How to Think About War and Peace*. New York: **Fordham** University Press.
- Barash** P David. (ed.). (2000). *Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Barouk** A Charles. (1985). *Marxist Thought on Imperialism: Survey and Critique*. London: **Macmillan**.
- Bok, Sissela. (1989). *A Strategy for Peace: Human Values and the Threat of War*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Boulding, Kenneth. (1978). *Stable Peace*. Austin & London: University of Texas Press.
- Branson, Leon & George W. Goethals**. (1968). *War: Studies from Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brown, Seyon. (1987). *The Causes and Prevention of War*. New York: St. Martin Press.
- Clauswitz, Von Karl**. (1954). *On War*. (Translated by Anatola Rapoport). London: **Penguin** Books.
- Dedring**, Juergen. (1976). *Recent Advances in Peace and Conflict Research: A Critical Survey*. London: Sage Publications.
- Esposito, L. John. (2002). *Unholy War: Terror in the Name of Islam*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Howard, Michael. (1948). *Clausewitz: A Very Short Introduction*. London: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (2000). *The Invention of Peace: Reflection on War and International Order*. Massachusetts: Yale University Press
- Huntington, S. P** (1996). *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of the World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Jeong, Ho-Won. (2000). *Jeong Peace and Conflict Studies: An Introduction*. Aldershot: **Ashgate**.
- Juergensen, Mark. (2002). *Gandhi's Way: A Handbook of Conflict Resolution*. Mass: University of California.
- Keane, John. (1998). *Civil Society: Old Images, New Visions*. California: Stanford University Press
- _____. (ed.) (1988). *Civil Society and the State*. London, New York: **Verson**.
- Kurtz, Lester. (ed.) (1999). *Encyclopaedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*. San Diego, California: Academic Press.
- Kuper, Adam & Jessica Kuper. (eds.). (1996). *The Social Science Encyclopaedia*. London: Routledge.
- Learson Arthur. (1963). *A Warless World*. New York: **McGraw Hill** Book Company.
- Linklater, A. (1990). *The Transformation of Political Community: Ethical Foundations of the Post-Westphalian Era*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Lorenz, Konrad. (1966). *On Aggression*. New York: **Hawcourt** Brace & Company.
- Martin, **Kingsly**. (1959). *War, History and Human Nature*. **Kuala Lumpur**: Asia Publishing House.
- Minogue**, Kenneth. (1995). *Politics: A Very Short Introduction*. London: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (ed.) (1986). *World Encyclopaedia of Peace. Vol.2*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Reaves, Emery. (1946). *The Anatomy of Peace*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers.
- Robertson, David. (1987). *A Dictionary of Modern Defence and Strategy*. London: Europa Publications.
- Ropp, Theodore. (1962). *War in Modern World*. Durham: Duke University Press
- Schell, Jonathan. (2001). *The Unfinished Twentieth Century: The Crisis of Weapons of Mass Destruction*. **London: Verso**
- Small, Melvin & David Singer. (ed.). *International War: An Anthology and Study Guide*. Homewood: Dorsey Press
- Smoker, Paul, Ruth Davies & Barbara Munske (eds.) (1990). *A Reader in Peace Studies*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Stevenson, Leslie & David **L. Haberman**. (1998). *Ten Theories of Human Nature*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Stiglitz, Joseph. (2002). *Globalisation and Its Discontents*. New York: Allen Lane.
- Suganami, H. (1989). *The Domestic Analogy and World Order Proposals*. Cambridge. Cambridge **University** Press.
- Thomas, C. Daniel & Michael T. **Klare** (eds.) (1989). *Peace and World Order Studies: A Curriculum Guide*. Boulder, Colorado: **Westview** Press,
- Tolbott, Strobe & **Nayan Chanda**. (2001). *The Age of Terror: America and the World After September 11*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ury**, L. William. (1999). *Getting to Peace: Transforming Conflict At Home, At Work, and in the World*. London: Viking Adult.
- Waltz N. Kenneth (1954). *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New **York: Columbia** University Press.
- Waltzer, M. (1977). *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. **Jarmondsworth**: Penguin and New York: Basic Books.

Units 4 to 6

- A World Atlas of Military History, 1945-1984*. (1984). London: Lee Cooper
- Atlas of 20th Century Warfare*. (1986). London: Bison Books.
- Baudrillard**. J. (1993) *The Transparency of Evil: Essays on Extreme Phenomena*. London: Verso.
- Baylis** John & Smith Steve. (1997). *The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to World Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- _____, Booth Ken, Garnett John, & Williams Phil. (1987). *Contemporary Strategy: Theories and Concepts* Vol. I. London: Groom Helm.
- Bobbitt Philip, et al. (ed) (1989). *US Nuclear Strategy: A Reader*. New York: New York University Press.
- Elias, Robert & Jennifer Turpin. (eds.) (1994). *Rethinking Peace*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Garnett John (ed) (1970). *Theories of Peace and Security: A Reader in Contemporary Strategy*. Bristol: Macmillan.
- Giddens, Anthony. (1985). *The Nation State and Violence*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Holsti, K. J. (1996). *War, the State, and the State of War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson Robert & George Sorensen. (1999). *Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kaldor, Mary. (1999). *New and Old Wars: Organised Violence in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kegley Charles W. Jr., & Whittkopf Eugene R. (1989). *World Politics: Trends and Transformation*. Hampshire: Mac Millan.
- Lenin, V.I. (1966). *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism: A Popular Outline*. 13th edn. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Money-Kyrle, R.E. (1951). *Psychoanalysis and Politics: A Contribution to the Psychology of Politics*. London: Duckworth.
- Morgenthau, H.J. (1948) *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Knopf.
- Paret Peter (ed) (1986). *Makers of Modern Strategy: From Machiavelli to Nuclear Age*. Oxford.
- Smoker, Paul. et.al. (eds.) (1990). *A Reader in Peace Studies*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Thucydides. (1954). *History of the Peloponnesian War*. trans. R. Warner. London. Penguin.
- Williams Mare (ed) (1989). *International Relations in the Twentieth Century: A Reader*. London: Macmillan
- Wright, Q. (1990). *A Study of War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zeigler David. (1981). *War, Peace and International Politics*. Boston: Little Brown & Co.

Units 7 to 10

- Arend, A.C. & Beck R.J. (1993). *International Law and the Use of Force*. London: Routledge.
- Browner, N. Charles & J. K. Sharpe. (2003). International Arbitration and the Islamic World: Third Phase. In *A.J.I.L.* 97. pp 641-66.
- Evan Luard. (1994). *The United Nations*. 2nd ed. N. D. Heater. London, Macmillan Press
- Ganguly, Sumit & Ted Greenwood. (ed.) (1997). *Mending Fences: Confidence and Security Building Measures in South Asia*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

- Goldstein, S. Joseph. (1994). *International Relations*. New York: **Harper Collins**.
- Kegley W. Charles. (2001). *The Global Agenda: Issues and Perspectives*, 6th ed. New York: **McGraw-Hill**
- _____ & Eugene R. Wittkopf. (2001). *World Politics: Trend and Transformation*. 8th edn. Boston, MA and London: St. Martin's and Macmillan
- Law M. David. (1995). *Regional Security in South Asia*. Kingston; Center for International Relations, Queen's University.
- Masahiko Asada. (1988). Confidence-Building Measures in East Asia. *Asian Survey*. 27 (5).
- Max Sorensen. (1968). *Manual of Public International Law*. London: Macmillan & Co.
- Murty, B. S. (1989). *The International Law of Diplomacy*. New Haven: New Haven Press.
- Michael Krepon & Amit Sevak (eds.) (1995). *Crisis Prevention, Confidence Building and Reconciliation in South Asia*. London: **McMillan**.
- Navnita Chadda-Behra, Paul Evans, & Gawher Rizvi. (1997). *Beyond Boundaries: A Report on the Non-Official Dialogues on Peace, Security, & Cooperation in South Asia*. Toronto: University of Toronto-York University Joint Centre for Asia-Pacific Studies.
- Noorani. A.G. (1994). Easing the Indo-Pakistani Dialogue on Kashmir: Confidence Building Measures for the Siachen Glacier, Sir Creek and the Wular Barrage Dispute. *Occasional Paper 16*. Washington DC: **Henry Stimson Center**.
- Oye, K.A. (1986). *Cooperation Under Anarchy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pauwelyn, J. (2003). The Role of Public International Law in W.T.O. How Far Can We Go. In. *A.J.I.L.* 95. pp. 531-57.
- Sahadevan. P. (ed.) (2001). *Conflict and Peacemaking in South Asia*. New Delhi: Lancers Books.
- Samina Yasmeen & Aabha Dixit. (1995). Confidence Building in South Asia, *Occasional Paper*. Washington DC: Henry Stimson Center.
- Singh, Swaran. (2002). India-China Post Nuclear CBMs. *CSNS Paper 4*. New Delhi: Core Group on National Security Programme, JNU.
- Sarr, H. (1999). *Anarchy, Order, and Integration: How to Manage Interdependence*. (np): The University of **Michigan Press**.
- Sorensen, Max (ed.) (1968). *Manual of International Law*. London: The **MacMillan Press**
- Tan Chung. (ed.). (1998). *Across the Himalayan Gap*. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
- Wedgewood and H.K. Jacobson. (2001). Symposium: State Reconstruction after Civil Conflict. *A.J.I.L.* 95.
- White, N.D. (1997). *Keeping the Peace: The United Nations and the Maintenance of International Peace and Security*. 2nd. ed., Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Zhen Ruixiang. (1993). Shifting obstacles in Sino-Indian relations. *The Pacific Review*, 6 (1).

Units 10 to.15

- Anadkat, Nalin. (2000). *International Political Thought of Gandhi, Nehru and Lohia*. Delhi: **Bharatiya Kala Prakashan**.
- Burton, John. (1990). *Conflict: Resolution and Prevention*. New York: St. Martin's
- Buzan**, B. (1991). New Patterns of Global Security, in the 21st Century. *International Affairs*. 67(3). pp. 431-451.
- _____. (1983). *People, States and Fear*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- David **A.Lake** & Patrick M. Morgan (eds.). (1997). *Regional Orders: Building Security in a New World*. Pennsylvania: **The Pennsylvania State University Press**.
- David Mitrany, David. (1966). *A Working Peace System*. 2nd ed. Quadrangle Books: Chicago.
- Diwakar**, R. R. (1969). *The Saga of Satyagraha*. New Delhi: Gandhi Peace **Foundation**.
- Fischer, Louis. (ed.) (1967). *The Essential Gandhi*. New York: **Vintage/Random House**.
- Gangal, S. C. & Gangal, Anurag. (1995) *Contemporary Global Problems: A Gandhian Perspective*. **Jammu**: Vinod.
- Hampson**, Fen Osler. (1996). *Nurturing Peace: Why Peace Settlements Succeed or Fail*. Washington DC: US Institute of Peace Press
- Hilaire McCoubrey** & Justin Morris. (2000). *Regional Peacekeeping in the Post-Cold War Era*. Boston: **Kluwe Law International** Nye, S. Joseph. (ed.). (1968). *International Regionalism*. Little Brown & Co. Boston.
- Joseph, Paul. (1993). *Peace Politics: The United States between the Old and New World Orders*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Keck, M & K. Sikkink. (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Transnational Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: **Cornell University Press**.
- Lederach, John Paul. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington DC: US Institute of Peace.
- Mandaza, I. (1995). Peace and Security, Regional Cooperation and Economic Integration. **SAPEM** 8(7), pp. 29-31.
- Marullo**, Sam, & Jon **Lofland**. (eds.) (1990). *Peace Action in the Eighties*. New **Brunswick**: Rutgers University Press.
- Mathews, J. (1994). 'Re-defining Security' in Olson W & Lee J. (eds.). *The Theory and Practice of International Relations*. 9th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Mattli, W. (1999). *The Logic of Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mingjie**, Y. (2001). Global Military Trend in the Early 21st Century' *Contemporary International Relations*, 11(3), pp. 7-15.
- Misra, K. P. & S. C. Gangal. (1981). *Gandhi and the Contemporary World: Studies in Peace and War*. Delhi: Chanakya Publications.
- Owens, Heather & Barbara **rneil**. (1999) "The Human Security Paradigm Shift: A New Lens on Canadian Foreign Policy". *Canadian Foreign Policy*, 7(1). Fall pp. 1-12.

- Prabhu, R.K. & **R.R.Rao** (eds.) (1967). *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*. 2nd edn. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House.
- Power, Paul F. (1961). *Gandhi on World Affairs*. Bombay: The Perennial Press.
- Puri**, Rashrni-Sudha. (1987). *Gandhi on War and Peace*. New York: Praeger.
- Regehr, **Ernie**. (nd). *Defense and Human Security*, Project Ploughshares Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, Conrad **Grebel** College, Waterloo..
- Rosamond. B. (2000). *Theories of European Integration*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Rouch, Douglas. (2003). *The Human Right to Peace*. Ottawa: Novalis.
- Thomas, C. (2000). *Global Governance, Development and Human Security*. London; Pluto.
- Tickner, J. A. in Booth K & Smith S (eds.). *Revisioning Security International Relations Theory Today*. London: Blackwell, 1995.
- United Nations Development Programme. (1994). *Human Development Report*. New York: UNDP.
- Van der Merve, Hendrick. (1989). *Pursuing Justice and Peace in South Africa*. New York: Routledge.
- **Weiss,G** Thomas, David P. Forsythe & Roger A. Coate. (1994). *The United Nations and Changing World Politics*. Boulder: **Westview** Press.