A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF NEGATIVE PEACE, PACIFISM, POSITIVE PEACE, NON-VIOLENCE, MOHANDAS K. GANDHI. THE INDIVIDUAL AND GLOBAL PEACE BUILDING: IMPORTANT PRINCIPLES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BY

DR. ALFRED ABHULIMHEN – IYOHA

CHIEF MAGISTRATE, EDO STATE JUDICIARY, BENIN CITY, NIGERIA.

PhD LAW, PhD INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (STRATEGIC STUDIES), DIPLOMA CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

AUGUST, 2019

ABSTRACT

Negative peace, pacifism, positive peace, non-violence, Mohandas K. Gandhi, individual and global peace building are separate and indispensable principle in international relation. This paper is an in-depth analysis of the above principles. The paper also proffers some constructive policy recommendations and intervention strategies. There is increasing interest in promoting peace and security at all levels of society, particularly in volatile conflict-prone and war-affected societies. This paper has been mainly conceived to help strengthen the growing body of policy-relevant knowledge on the useful application of peace research and peace education globally.

The paper utilizes secondary materials such as journal, books, magazines, internet etc. It was the findings of this paper amongst others that there is no alternative to peace building as the various peace study theories are still useful in the contemporary world in achieving global peace, security and development.

It was recommended that individuals, nations, international organizations should tackle the challenges that leads to global insecurity. Good governance should be encouraged in the nations of the world. There should also be a holistic effort globally by international organizations to foster international peace and security by harmonious as well as pragmatic international relation practitices.

INTRODUCTION

International relations, peace researcher's proponents of peace education have increasingly focused on understanding the potential contributions that can be made to long-term peace-building and the most impactful strategies they could adopt internationally. From the experience of diverse research and capacity-building projects completed in recent years in a number of post-conflict countries in Africa like Liberia, Sierra Leone, DRC, northern Uganda, Burundi, and South Sudan.

Consequently and too often, the idea of conflict-sensitive education and peacebuilding is further limited to students enrolled in some of the new emerging courses like peace studies, conflict resolution, security studies, governance and leadership studies, and so forth.

This restrictive approach ostensibly misses the mark as it tends to exclude the vast majority of university students enrolled in mainstream social sciences (e.g. sociology, political science and economics) and the considerably non-cognate courses such as the natural and applied sciences, from the vital knowledge and skills of conflict-sensitive education and peacebuilding. Based on an exploratory analysis of the evolution of peace research and peace education in Africa, this paper aims to elucidate the challenges and limitations of embedding conflict-sensitive and functionally relevant peace education in the universities on the African continent.

The Evolution of Modern Peace Research and Peace Education Peace research emerged as a response to the destructiveness of violent conflicts, especially in the Western world. Conflict is as old as human society and research into how to mitigate and stem the tide of violent conflict has engaged the attention of philosophers, statesmen and public intellectuals of all ages. These philosophical, scholarly and policy intervention-oriented inquiries of the past are a major part of the intellectual heritage of modern peace research and peace education. Many peace, conflict and social science theories have emerged from this robust intellectual heritage.

Until the end of World War II (precisely, late 1950s through early 1960s) the dominant preoccupation in peace research was practically limited to elimination of war and active violence. Various internationalist movements emerged in Europe and North America after World War I to help prevent future wars. The occurrence of World War II and the added threat posed by nuclear weapons created an additional impetus for peace research and the need to transcend the preoccupation with management and termination of armed conflict.

The existence of peace remained associated with the absence of violent conflict. Prior to the famous studies of the Norwegian peace researcher, Johan Galtung, beginning from the 1960s, peace was definitionally linked to absence of war or organised violence. Social policy and peace activism were mostly informed by this perspective. Pacifists and activists of different intellectual orientations (notably international law, diplomatic history, social psychology, and political philosophy) completely abhorred and condemned the instrumentality of the use of force or violence in society. Galtung described this dominant approach as "negative peace," which he consequently distinguished from "positive peace." Galtung (1996) defined negative peace as the absence of war and direct violence which inflict human suffering at individual, national, regional and international levels. Negative peace is essentially status quo-oriented, and its purposes and intents, at any rate, are often mediated by the interests of hegemonic power. In situations of conflict settlement and war-to-peace transition, negative peace in most cases corresponds to "victor's peace," which may result in the sequestration of the vanquished opponents and an unsustainable peace that could unravel sooner or later. To guarantee sustainable peace and an equitable social order, Galtung (1996) proposes the need for positive peace, which he defines as working towards the elimination of unjust structures, inequitable relationships at inter-personal, group, national, regional and international levels (see also, Galtung & Jabsen, 2000). He associates positive peace with the progressive and systematic elimination of structural violence in society – i.e. subtle violence embedded in the structures of society and state policies which cause human suffering and avoidable gradual death. In other words, peace goes beyond the absence of war, to encompass economic, social, and cultural justice, as well as freedom from discrimination based on race, class, gender, or religion (Husin ed. 2002). Galtung advocates that peace research should, as a matter of necessity, be value-driven and his predilection is for values of positive peace as opposed to negative peace.

Experts differ considerably on whether or not peace research should be value-driven and on what values and whose values should be preeminent. Some of the core values favoured by positive peace proponents include: social justice, freedom, peace by peaceful means (non-violence); environmental protection, human security and policy relevance (whose policy?). Some more critical pundits include values of supposedly "positive" or "constructive" violence – supporting violent struggles for freedom from oppression, exploitation, domination, colonization and discrimination. Consequently, some scholars have argued that peace research should be driven by such goals as

intellectual and practical knowledge production, value and culture transmission, and the more policy-oriented utilitarian function of serving the peace, conflict and security industry.

Peace study is inter-alia distinguished by:

1. A recognition of the multifaceted nature of violent conflicts and need for an inter-disciplinary response.
2. Search for peaceful strategies for dispute settlement, including the debate on whether the use of force could be an option.
3. Espousal of multi-level of analysis of conflict (individual, group, state, inter-state, etc), de-emphasising the undue dichotomy between internal and external factors.
4. Adoption of a global multi-cultural approach with emphasis on the values of peace and non-violent social transformation across cultures.

Modern peace education is predicated on the progressive achievements of peace research and has been popularly defined as “the process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values needed to bring about behaviour changes that will enable children, youth, and adults to prevent conflict and violence, both overt and structural; to resolve conflict peacefully; and to create the conditions conducive to peace, whether at an intra-personal, inter-personal, inter-group, national or international level.

THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

Many different theories of "peace" exist in the world of peace studies, which involves the study of de-escalation, conflict transformation, disarmament, and cessation of violence.[19] The definition of "peace" can vary with religion, culture, or subject of study. One definition is that peace is a state of balance and understanding in yourself and between others, where respect is gained by the acceptance of differences, tolerance persists, conflicts are resolved through dialog, people's rights are respected and their voices are heard, and everyone is at their highest point of serenity without social tension.

Game theory

The Peace & War Game is an approach in game theory to understand the relationship between peace and conflicts. The iterated game hypotheses was originally used by academic groups and computer simulations to study possible strategies of cooperation and aggression.[20]

As peace makers became richer over time, it became clear that making war had greater costs than initially anticipated. One of the well studied strategies that acquired wealth more rapidly was based on Genghis Khan, i.e. a constant aggressor making war continually to gain resources. This led, in contrast, to the development of what's known as the "provokable nice guy strategy", a peace-maker until attacked, improved upon merely to win by occasional forgiveness even when attacked. There exists a strategy of multiple players who can continue to gain wealth cooperating with each other while bleeding a constantly aggressive player.

Balance of power theories

The classical "realist" position is that the key to promoting order between states, and so of increasing the chances of peace, is the maintenance of a balance of power between states - a situation where no state is so dominant that it can "lay down the law to the rest". Exponents of this view have included Metternich, Bismarck, Hans Morgenthau, and Henry Kissinger. A related approach - more in the tradition of Hugo Grotius than Thomas Hobbes - was articulated by the so-called "English school of international relations theory" such as Martin Wight in his book Power Politics (1946, 1978) and Hedley Bull in The Anarchical Society (1977).

As the maintenance of a balance of power could in some circumstances require a willingness to go to war, some critics saw the idea of a balance of power as promoting war rather than promoting peace. This was a radical critique of those supporters of the Allied and Associated Powers who justified entry into World War I on the grounds that it was necessary to preserve the balance of power in Europe from a German bid for hegemony.

In the second half of the 20th century, and especially during the cold war, a particular form of balance of power - mutual nuclear deterrence - emerged as a widely held doctrine on the key to peace between the great powers. Critics argued that the development of nuclear stockpiles increased the chances of war rather than peace, and that the "nuclear umbrella" made it "safe" for smaller wars (e.g. the Vietnam war and the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia to end the Prague Spring), so making such wars more likely.

Democratic peace theory

The democratic peace theory holds that democracies will never go to war with one another.

Free trade, interdependence and globalization

It was a central tenet of classical liberalism, for example among English liberal thinkers of the late 19th and early 20th century, that free trade promoted peace. For example, the Cambridge economist John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946) said that he was "brought up" on this idea and held it unquestioned until at least the 1920s. During the economic globalization in the decades leading up to World War I, writers such as Norman Angell argued that the growth of economic interdependence between the great powers made war between them futile and therefore unlikely. He made this argument in 1914.

These ideas have again come to prominence among liberal internationalists during the globalization of the late 20th and early 21st century. These ideas have seen capitalism as consistent with, even conducive to, peace.

Socialism and managed capitalism

Socialist, communist, and left-wing liberal writers of the 19th and 20th centuries (e.g., Lenin, J.A. Hobson, John Strachey) argued that capitalism caused war (e.g. through promoting imperial or other economic rivalries that lead to international conflict). This led some to argue that international socialism was the key to peace.

However, in response to such writers in the 1930s who argued that capitalism caused war, the economist John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946) argued that managed capitalism could promote peace. This involved international coordination of fiscal/monetary policies, an international monetary system that did not pit the interests of countries against each other, and a high degree of freedom of trade. These ideas underlay Keynes's work during World War II that led to the creation of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank at Bretton Woods in 1944, and later of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (subsequently the World Trade Organization).[23]

Theory of 'active peace'

Borrowing from the teachings of Norwegian theorist Johan Galtung, one of the pioneers of the field of Peace Research, on 'Positive Peace',[24] and on the writings of Maine Quaker Gray Cox, a consortium of theorists, activists, and practitioners in the experimental John Woolman College initiative have arrived at a theory of "active peace". This theory posits in part that peace is part of a triad, which also includes justice and wholeness (or well-being), an interpretation consonant with

scriptural scholarly interpretations of the meaning of the early Hebrew word *shalom*. Furthermore, the consortium have integrated Galtung's teaching of the meanings of the terms peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding, to also fit into a triadic and interdependent formulation or structure. Vermont Quaker John V. Wilmerding posits five stages of growth applicable to individuals, communities, and societies, whereby one transcends first the 'surface' awareness that most people have of these kinds of issues, emerging successively into acquiescence, pacifism, passive resistance, active resistance, and finally into *active peace*, dedicating themselves to peacemaking, peacekeeping or peace building.

International organization and law

One of the most influential theories of peace, especially since Woodrow Wilson led the creation of the League of Nations at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, is that peace will be advanced if the intentional anarchy of states is replaced through the growth of international law promoted and enforced through international organizations such as the League of Nations, the United Nations, and other functional international organizations. One of the most important early exponents of this view was Sir Alfred Zimmern, for example in his 1936 book *The League of Nations and the Rule of Law*.

Trans-national solidarity

Many "idealist" thinkers about international relations - e.g. in the traditions of Kant and Karl Marx - have argued that the key to peace is the growth of some form of solidarity between peoples (or classes of people) spanning the lines of cleavage between nations or states that lead to war.

One aspect of this is the idea of promoting international understanding between nations through the international mobility of students - an idea most powerfully advanced by Cecil Rhodes in the creation of the Rhodes Scholarships, and his successors such as J. William Fulbright. Another theory is that peace can be developed among countries on the basis of active management of water resources.

Peace without weapons

The theory of peace without weapons is as old as philosophy and human consciousness. This theory holds that weapons in and of themselves are causative of violence, aggression, and other non-peaceful activities, and the removal of all weapons and the military, would therefore be a means of

preventing such activities, thereby inducing peace. Some philosophical and legal manifests have been written and distributed on this theme in several languages, for select and privileged groups of highly respected and experienced experts in philosophy and law, in many countries in all continents, worldwide.[*citation needed*] These philosophical peace manifests would be suitable for public lectures at universities in many countries in all continents, worldwide.[*citation needed*] Some pacifist religious denominations, such as the Quakers, the Amish, and the Mennonites traditionally renounce the ownership of weapons, and routinely lobby against their manufacture and distributuon.

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

Negative Peace: Negative peace is defined as a peace without justice. It is a false sense of "peace" that often comes at the expense of justice. In a negative peace situation, you may not see conflict out in the open, but the tension is boiling just beneath the surface because the conflict was never reconciled.

Pacifism: Pacifism is the categorical opposition to the behaviors of war or violence as a means of settling disputes or of gaining advantage. Pacifism covers a spectrum of views ranging from the belief that international disputes can and should all be resolved via peaceful behaviors; to calls for the abolition of various organizations which tend to institutionalize aggressive behaviors, such as the military, or arms manufacturers; to opposition to any organization of society that might rely in any way upon governmental force. Such groups which sometimes oppose the governmental use of force include anarchists and libertarians. Absolute pacifism opposes violent behavior under all circumstance, including defense of self and others.

Positive Peace: Positive Peace is defined as peace with justice for all. Often times, "peace" is mistaken simply as the absence of some negative force, such as tension or violence. But Dr. King reminded us that peace is not only the absence of tension, but the presence of justice.

We live in a society filled with violence, and in an effort the curb the levels of violence we see, we are often misled into believing that we can use violence and injustice ourselves to attain a "peaceful" society. We often times use unjust methods to create a false sense of "peace." Throwing every single young person in this country into a prison cell may prevent a lot of violence, but it would not mean that we would be creating peace since that "peace" (absence of tension) was created by an act of injustice.

Positive Peace is a true, lasting, and sustainable peace built on justice for *all* peoples.

Non-Violence: Nonviolence is the personal practice of being harmless to self and others under every condition. It comes from the belief that hurting people, animals or the environment is unnecessary to achieve an outcome and refers to a general philosophy of abstention from violence. This may be based on moral, religious or spiritual principles, or it may be for purely strategic or pragmatic reasons.

Mohandas K. Gandhi (The Greatest Force): Gandhi who is a great leader and a Mahatma at the same time is a challenge to all intellectuals and scholars who try to define him in one or the other way.

The Individual Peace Building: Peacebuilding is an intervention technique or method that is designed to prevent the start or resumption of violent conflict by creating a sustainable peace.

Global Peace Building: This involves efforts at international level to promote peace and development worldwide.

AN EVALUATION OF NEGATIVE PEACE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATION

Negative peace simply refers to the absence of violence or war. The peace which prevails during the ceasefire is a good example of negative peace. However, positive peace is not only mere absence of violence, it also entails justice for all.

Understanding the Structural Impediments

One of the strongest impediments to peace in many African countries, especially in volatile conflict-prone states and countries emerging from armed conflicts is the legacy of violence, which actively feeds a deep-rooted perception among antagonistic communities and large sections of the populations that violence is a legitimate instrument for conducting public affairs and pursuit of goals. Social psychologists have shown that when people are exposed to a prolonged culture of violence and armed conflict, they are left with a twisted worldview that tends to perceive the use of violence; aggressive behaviour and resort to disorder as a normal way of life. The consequences of perpetuating a culture of violence in society are more blatant for children and people who have lived all the cognitive stages of their lives under conditions of embedded hostilities, abuse and armed violence.

An analysis of the embedded culture of violence in many countries of Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) certainly makes greater sense against the backdrop of Africa's population dynamics. In terms geo-demographic base factor, Africa's population has witnessed a rapid increase since the 1970s. Africa's population has grown from about 221 million in 1950 to 408 million in 1975, 796 million in 2000 and 1.1 billion in 2013.

Both within and in the aftermath of the conflict life span, the observed embedded culture of violence is what largely shapes the mentality, attitudes, temperament, behavioural patterns and idiosyncrasies of large sections of the populations. It is further solidified and perpetuated by informal agencies of political socialization such as the family, religious and cultural institutions, mass media, and political parties. The practical challenge of peace education in these circumstances is how to foremost deconstruct the endemic culture of violence and in its place construct and embed a culture of peace. It is apparent that peace education planners in most of these volatile countries do not appreciate the deep-rootedness of a virulent culture of violence among their populace, hence studying the phenomenon with a view to designing appropriate remedial interventions has been scarcely reflected in existing peace education curricula.

There are two major factors that have either in isolation or combination contributed to an aggravation of the culture of violence in many countries of SSA. The first is the impact of prolonged dictatorship, political repression and a culture of impunity in national politics. Virtually all the volatile conflict-prone and war-affected African states have been victims of prolonged dictatorship and political repression partly due to the weak institutionalisation of the state, including its key regulatory and governance apparatuses, tempered by its instrumentalization for promoting sectional interest and prebendal accumulation. Institutionalization, from a neo-Weberian standpoint, is a process by which the state organs, agencies and structures acquire value and stability over time through a political culture based, not on politics of patronage, but on constructive juridical or constitutional (rational-legal) norms. Weak or low state institutionalization in itself is not a sufficient condition for political violence. Weak institutionalization culminates in political violence when it is challenged or strongly contradicted by high level of countervailing political mobilisation and participation. From African political history, mobilization by sections of the disaffected elite or groups to challenge a lawless regime that takes undue advantage of weak institutionalization is often organized along ethno-communal lines, which further polarizes and fragments the state, provoking

authoritarian crackdown from the top and heightening the prospect of rebel insurgency from below. As Africa's post-colonial history has amply demonstrated, the motives behind rebel insurgencies in most states marred by weak institutionalization, prolonged dictatorship and prebendal corruption has hardly risen above the lust for power, and the perquisites of political office. In the case of natural resource-rich states, the outbreak of armed conflict and rebel insurgencies have been particularly aggravated by the allure of shadow economies, including both "lootable" and "obstructible" conflict goods, notably diamond, oil, cobalt and timber. It is pertinent to point out that it is not only rebels and militias that exploit the problem of weak institutionalization by resorting to armed violence at the slightest opportunity. Both the governing elite and rebel forces are often mutually engaged in the "political instrumentalization of disorder" for self-serving aggrandizement. The evidence from the history of rebel and militia insurgencies against the prolonged dictatorships in Liberia, Sierra Leone, DRC, Sudan, Nigeria, Chad, and CAR more or less lends credence to this point.

The second factor that has aggravated the culture of violence in many countries of SSA is the structural feature of micro-level communal conflicts within and between states, most of which have a protracted history that dates back to (pre-)colonial times. A large number of the micro-communal conflicts in SSA are linked to ambiguities surrounding the issue of land tenure in many states (notably issues about who has the right to own, use, and expropriate lands); the age-old tradition of cattle raiding and blood feuding between the youth of various affected tribes and communities (notably in the Great Lakes region and the Horn of Africa), as well as the fact that many feuding ethnic communities straddle between national borders leading to cross-border mobilization of ethnic combatants and retreating/reinforcing of fighting forces.

AN EXAMINATION OF PACIFISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATION

Pacifism covers a spectrum of views, including the belief that international disputes can and should be peacefully resolved, calls for the abolition of the institutions of the military and war, opposition to any organization of society through governmental force (anarchist or libertarian pacifism), rejection of the use of physical violence to obtain political, economic or social goals, the obliteration of force, and opposition to violence under any circumstance, even defence of self and others. Pacifism "in the sense generally accepted in English-speaking areas" as "an unconditional rejection of all forms of warfare".

Moral considerations

Pacifism may be based on moral principles (a deontological view) or pragmatism (a consequentialist view). Principled pacifism holds that at some point along the spectrum from war to interpersonal physical violence, such violence becomes morally wrong. Pragmatic pacifism holds that the costs of war and interpersonal violence are so substantial that better ways of resolving disputes must be found. Pacifists generally reject theories of Just War.

Absolute pacifism

An absolute pacifist is generally described by the British Broadcasting Corporation as one who believes that human life is so valuable, that a human should never be killed and war should never be conducted, even in self-defense. The principle is described as difficult to abide by consistently, due to violence not being available as a tool to aid a person who is being harmed or killed. It is further claimed that such a pacifist could logically argue that violence leads to more undesirable results than non-violence.

One common argument against pacifism is the possibility of using violence to prevent further acts of violence (and reduce the "net-sum" of violence). This argument hinges on consequentialism: an otherwise morally objectionable action can be justified if it results in a positive outcome. For example, either violent rebellion, or foreign nations sending in troops to end a dictator's violent oppression may save millions of lives, even if many thousands died in the war. Those pacifists who base their beliefs on deontological grounds would oppose such violent action. Others would oppose organized military responses but support individual and small group self-defense against specific attacks if initiated by the dictator's forces. Pacifists may argue that military action could be justified should it subsequently advance the general cause of peace.

Still more pacifists would argue that a nonviolent reaction may not save lives immediately but would in the long run. The acceptance of violence for any reason makes it easier to use in other situations. Learning and committing to pacifism helps to send a message that violence is, in fact, not the most effective way. It can also help people to think more creatively and find more effective ways to stop violence without more violence.

In light of the common criticism of pacifism as not offering a clear alternative policy, one approach to finding "more effective ways" has been the attempt to develop the idea of "defence by

civil resistance", also called "social defence". This idea, which is not necessarily dependent on acceptance of pacifist beliefs, is based on relying on nonviolent resistance against possible threats, whether external (such as invasion) or internal (such as coup d'état).

AN APPRAISAL OF POSITIVE PEACE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATION

The Pillars of Positive Peace is an eight part taxonomy that describes the factors of Positive Peace. These factors were derived through statistical analysis by identifying which measures had the strongest statistically significant relationship with peace and then grouping them according to what the measures represent.

A well-functioning government delivers high-quality public and civil services, engenders trust and participation within the community, demonstrates political stability and upholds the rule of law.

Such a government legitimately represents society, is responsive to its needs and effectively engages with citizens, regardless of their affiliation with or identity as part of a particular group. The measures of judicial independence and revenue collection and service delivery come from the Institutional Profles Database (IPD), which is a database of 130 indicators of institutional characteristics.

A sound business environment refers to the conditions that enable businesses to perform well and to operate efficiently. The strength of the economic conditions as well as the formal institutions that support the operation of the private sector determine the soundness of the business environment. Business competitiveness and economic productivity are both associated with the most peaceful countries, as is the presence of regulatory systems which are conducive to robust business operation.

Equitable distribution of resources measures how society distributes essential resources and opportunities. Peaceful countries tend to ensure equity in access to resources like education and health, as well as adequate access to opportunity.

NON-VIOLENCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATION REVISITED

Nonviolence

Some pacifists follow principles of nonviolence, believing that nonviolent action is morally superior and/or most effective. Some however, support physical violence for emergency defence of self or others. Others support destruction of property in such emergencies or for conducting symbolic

acts of resistance like pouring red paint to represent blood on the outside of military recruiting offices or entering air force bases and hammering on military aircraft.

Not all nonviolent resistance (sometimes also called civil resistance) is based on a fundamental rejection of all violence in all circumstances. Many leaders and participants in such movements, while recognizing the importance of using non-violent methods in particular circumstances, have not been absolute pacifists. Sometimes, as with the civil rights movement's march from Selma to Montgomery in 1965, they have called for armed protection. The interconnections between civil resistance and factors of force are numerous and complex.

Nonviolence also has 'active' or 'activist' elements, in that believers generally accept the need for nonviolence as a means to achieve political and social change. Thus, for example, the Tolstoy and Gandhian non violence is a philosophy and strategy for social change that rejects the use of violence, but at the same time sees nonviolent action (also called civil resistance) as an alternative to passive acceptance of oppression or armed struggle against it. In general, advocates of an activist philosophy of nonviolence use diverse methods in their campaigns for social change, including critical forms of education and persuasion, mass noncooperation, civil disobedience, nonviolent direct action, and social, political, cultural and economic forms of intervention.

In modern times, nonviolent methods of action have been a powerful tool for social protest and revolutionary social and political change. There are many examples of their use. Fuller surveys may be found in the entries on civil resistance, nonviolent resistance and nonviolent revolution. Here certain movements particularly influenced by a philosophy of nonviolence should be mentioned, including Mahatma Gandhi leading a successful decades-long nonviolent struggle against British rule in India, Martin Luther King's and James Bevel's adoption of Gandhi's nonviolent methods in their campaigns to win civil rights for African Americans, and César Chávez's campaigns of nonviolence in the 1960s to protest the treatment of farm workers in California. The 1989 "Velvet Revolution" in Czechoslovakia that saw the overthrow of the Communist government is considered one of the most important of the largely nonviolent Revolutions of 1989. Most recently the nonviolent campaigns of Leymah Gbowee and the women of Liberia were able to achieve peace after a 14-year civil war. This story is captured in a 2008 documentary film Pray the Devil Back to Hell. In an essay, "To Abolish War," evolutionary biologist Judith Hand advocated the use of nonviolent direct action to dismantle the global war machine.

The term "nonviolence" is often linked with or used as a synonym for peace, and despite being frequently equated with passivity and pacifism, this is rejected by nonviolent advocates and activists. Nonviolence refers specifically to the absence of violence and is always the choice to do no harm or the least harm, and passivity is the choice to do nothing. Sometimes nonviolence is passive, and other times it isn't. For example, if a house is burning down with mice or insects in it, the most harmless appropriate action is to put the fire out, not to sit by and passively let the fire burn. There is at times confusion and contradiction written about nonviolence, harmlessness and passivity. A confused person may advocate nonviolence in a specific context while advocating violence in other contexts. For example, someone who passionately opposes abortion or meat eating may concurrently advocate violence to kill an abortionist or attack a slaughterhouse, which makes that person a violent person. "Nonviolence is a powerful and just weapon. Indeed, it is a weapon unique in history, which cuts without wounding and ennobles the man who wields it."

Methods

Acts of protest

Nonviolent acts of protest and persuasion are symbolic actions performed by a group of people to show their support or disapproval of something. The goal of this kind of action is to bring public awareness to an issue, persuade or influence a particular group of people, or to facilitate future nonviolent action. The message can be directed toward the public, opponents, or people affected by the issue. Methods of protest and persuasion include speeches, public communications, petitions, symbolic acts, art, processions (marches), and other public assemblies.

Noncooperation

Noncooperation involves the purposeful withholding of cooperation or the unwillingness to initiate in cooperation with an opponent. The goal of noncooperation is to halt or hinder an industry, political system, or economic process. Methods of noncooperation include labour strikes, economic boycotts, civil disobedience, sex strike, tax refusal, and general disobedience.

Nonviolent intervention

Compared with protest and noncooperation, nonviolent intervention is a more direct method of nonviolent action. Nonviolent intervention can be used defensively—for example to maintain an institution or independent initiative—or offensively- for example, to drastically forward a nonviolent

struggle into the opponent's territory. Intervention is often more immediate and effective than the other two methods, but is also harder to maintain and more taxing to the participants involved.

Gene Sharp, a political scientist who seeks to advance the worldwide study and use of strategic nonviolent action in conflict, has written extensively about the methods of nonviolent action. In his book *Waging Nonviolent Struggle* he describes 198 methods of nonviolent action. In early Greece, Aristophanes' Lysistrata gives the fictional example of women withholding sexual favors from their husbands until war was abandoned. A modern work of fiction inspired by Gene Sharp and by Aristophanes is *A Door into Ocean* by Joan Slonczewski, depicting an ocean world inhabited by women who use nonviolent means to repel armed space invaders. Other methods of nonviolent intervention include occupations (sit-ins), blockades, fasting (hunger strikes), truck cavalcades, and dual sovereignty/parallel government.

Tactics must be carefully chosen, taking into account political and cultural circumstances, and form part of a larger plan or strategy. Successful nonviolent cross-border intervention projects include the Guatemala Accompaniment Project, Peace Brigades International and Christian Peacemaker Teams. Developed in the early 1980s, and originally inspired by the Gandhian Shanti Sena, the primary tools of these organisations have been nonviolent protective accompaniment, backed up by a global support network which can respond to threats, local and regional grassroots diplomatic and peacebuilding efforts, human rights observation and witnessing, and reporting. In extreme cases, most of these groups are also prepared to do interpositioning: placing themselves between parties who are engaged or threatening to engage in outright attacks in one or both directions. Individual and large group cases of interpositioning, when called for, have been remarkably effective in dampening conflict and saving lives.

Another powerful tactic of nonviolent intervention invokes public scrutiny of the oppressors as a result of the resisters remaining nonviolent in the face of violent repression. If the military or police attempt to repress nonviolent resisters violently, the power to act shifts from the hands of the oppressors to those of the resisters. If the resisters are persistent, the military or police will be forced to accept the fact that they no longer have any power over the resisters. Often, the willingness of the resisters to suffer has a profound effect on the mind and emotions of the oppressor, leaving them unable to commit such a violent act again.

Revolution

Certain individuals (Barbara Deming, Danilo Dolci, Devere Allen etc.) and party groups (e.g. Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism, Pacifist Socialist Party or War Resisters League) have advocated nonviolent revolution as an alternative to violence as well as elitist reformism. This perspective is usually connected to militant anti-capitalism.

Many leftist and socialist movements have hoped to mount a "peaceful revolution" by organising enough strikers to completely paralyse the state and corporate apparatus, allowing workers to re-organise society along radically different lines. Some have argued that a relatively nonviolent revolution would require fraternisation with military forces.

AN ASSESSMENT OF MOHANDAS K. GANDHI IN INTERNATIONAL RELATION

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi 2 October 1869 – 30 January 1948) was an Indian activist who was the leader of the Indian independence movement against British rule. Employing nonviolent civil disobedience, Gandhi led India to independence and inspired movements for civil rights and freedom across the world.

Principles, practices and beliefs

Gandhi's statements, letters and life have attracted much political and scholarly analysis of his principles, practices and beliefs, including what influenced him. Some writers present him as a paragon of ethical living and pacifism, others present him as a more complex, contradictory and evolving character influenced by his culture and circumstances.

On wars and nonviolence

Support for Wars

Gandhi participated in South African war against the Boers, on the British side in 1899. Both the Dutch settlers called Boers and the imperial British at that time discriminated against the coloured races they considered as inferior, and Gandhi later wrote about his conflicted beliefs during the Boer war. He stated that "when the war was declared, my personal sympathies were all with the Boers, but my loyalty to the British rule drove me to participation with the British in that war". According to Gandhi, he felt that since he was demanding his rights as a British citizen, it was also his duty to serve the British forces in the defence of the British Empire.

Nonviolence

Although Gandhi was not the originator of the principle of nonviolence, he was the first to apply it in the political field on a large scale. The concept of nonviolence (*ahimsa*) has a long history in Indian religious thought, with it being considered the highest dharma (ethical value virtue), a precept to be observed towards all living beings (*sarvbhuta*), at all times (*sarvada*), in all respects (*sarvatha*), in action, words and thought. Gandhi explains his philosophy and ideas about *ahimsa* as a political means in his autobiography *The Story of My Experiments with Truth*.

Gandhi was criticised for refusing to protest the hanging of Bhagat Singh, Sukhdev, Udham Singh and Rajguru. He was accused of accepting a deal with the King's representative Irwin that released civil disobedience leaders from prison and accepted the death sentence against the highly popular revolutionary Bhagat Singh, who at his trial had replied, "Revolution is the inalienable right of mankind".

Gandhi's views came under heavy criticism in Britain when it was under attack from Nazi Germany, and later when the Holocaust was revealed. He told the British people in 1940, "I would like you to lay down the arms you have as being useless for saving you or humanity. You will invite Herr Hitler and Signor Mussolini to take what they want of the countries you call your possessions... If these gentlemen choose to occupy your homes, you will vacate them. If they do not give you free passage out, you will allow yourselves, man, woman, and child, to be slaughtered, but you will refuse to owe allegiance to them."

International influence

Gandhi influenced important leaders and political movements. Leaders of the civil rights movement in the United States, including Martin Luther King Jr., James Lawson, and James Bevel, drew from the writings of Gandhi in the development of their own theories about nonviolence. King said "Christ gave us the goals and Mahatma Gandhi the tactics." King sometimes referred to Gandhi as "the little brown saint." Anti-apartheid activist and former President of South Africa, Nelson Mandela, was inspired by Gandhi.

In his early years, the former President of South Africa Nelson Mandela was a follower of the nonviolent resistance philosophy of Gandhi. Bhana and Vahed commented on these events as

"Gandhi inspired succeeding generations of South African activists seeking to end White rule. This legacy connects him to Nelson Mandela...in a sense Mandela completed what Gandhi started."

Gandhi's life and teachings inspired many who specifically referred to Gandhi as their mentor or who dedicated their lives to spreading Gandhi's ideas. In Europe, Romain Rolland was the first to discuss Gandhi in his 1924 book *Mahatma Gandhi,* and Brazilian anarchist and feminist Maria Lacerda de Moura wrote about Gandhi in her work on pacifism. In 1931, notable European physicist Albert Einstein exchanged written letters with Gandhi, and called him "a role model for the generations to come" in a letter writing about him. Einstein said of Gandhi:

Mahatma Gandhi's life achievement stands unique in political history. He has invented a completely new and humane means for the liberation war of an oppressed country, and practised it with greatest energy and devotion. The moral influence he had on the consciously thinking human being of the entire civilised world will probably be much more lasting than it seems in our time with its overestimation of brutal violent forces. Because lasting will only be the work of such statesmen who wake up and strengthen the moral power of their people through their example and educational works. We may all be happy and grateful that destiny gifted us with such an enlightened contemporary, a role model for the generations to come.

Generations to come will scarce believe that such a one as this walked the earth in flesh and blood.

US President Barack Obama in a 2010 address to the Parliament of India said that:

I am mindful that I might not be standing before you today, as President of the United States, had it not been for Gandhi and the message he shared with America and the world.

Obama in September 2009 said that his biggest inspiration came from Gandhi. His reply was in response to the question 'Who was the one person, dead or live, that you would choose to dine with?'. He continued that "He's somebody I find a lot of inspiration in. He inspired Dr. King with his message of nonviolence. He ended up doing so much and changed the world just by the power of his ethics."

A DISCUSSION ON THE INDIVIDUAL AND GLOBAL PEACE BUILDING

Approaches to peace-building

There are two broad approaches to peace building; First, peace building can refer to *direct work* that intentionally focuses on addressing the factors driving or mitigating conflict. When applying the term "peace building" to this work, there is an explicit attempt by those designing and planning a peace building effort to reduce structural or direct violence.

Second, the term peace building can also refer to efforts to coordinate a multi-level, multisectoral strategy, including ensuring that there is funding and proper communication and coordination mechanisms between humanitarian assistance, development, governance, security, justice and other sectors that may not use the term "peace building" to describe themselves. The concept is not one to impose on specific sectors. Rather some scholars use the term peacebuilding as an overarching concept useful for describing a range of interrelated efforts.

While some use the term to refer to only post-conflict or post-war contexts, most use the term more broadly to refer to any stage of conflict. Before conflict becomes violent, preventive peacebuilding efforts, such as diplomatic, economic development, social, educational, health, legal and security sector reform programs, address potential sources of instability and violence. This is also termed conflict prevention. Peacebuilding efforts aim to manage, mitigate, resolve and transform central aspects of the conflict through official diplomacy; as well as through civil society peace processes and informal dialogue, negotiation, and mediation. Peacebuilding addresses economic, social and political root causes of violence and fosters reconciliation to prevent the return of structural and direct violence. Peacebuilding efforts aim to change beliefs, attitudes and behaviors to transform the short and long term dynamics between individuals and groups toward a more stable, peaceful coexistence. Peacebuilding is an approach to an entire set of interrelated efforts that support peace.

Components of peacebuilding

The activities included in peacebuilding vary depending on the situation and the agent of peacebuilding. Successful peacebuilding activities create an environment supportive of self-sustaining, durable peace; reconcile opponents; prevent conflict from restarting; integrate civil society; create rule of law mechanisms; and address underlying structural and societal issues. To

accomplish these goals, peacebuilding must address functional structures, emotional conditions and social psychology, social stability, rule of law and ethics, and cultural sensitivities.

Preconflict peacebuilding interventions aim to prevent the start of violent conflict. These strategies involve a variety of actors and sectors in order to transform the conflict. Even though the definition of peacebuilding includes preconflict interventions, in practice most peacebuilding interventions are postconflict. However, many peacebuilding scholars advocate an increased focus on preconflict peacebuilding in the future.

There are many different approaches to categorization of forms of peacebuilding among the peacebuilding field's many scholars.

Barnett *et al.* divides postconflict peacebuilding into three dimensions: stabilizing the post-conflict zone, restoring state institutions, and dealing with social and economic issues. Activities within the first dimension reinforce state stability post-conflict and discourage former combatants from returning to war (disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, or DDR). Second dimension activities build state capacity to provide basic public goods and increase state legitimacy. Programs in the third dimension build a post-conflict society's ability to manage conflicts peacefully and promote socioeconomic development.

Ongoing efforts

The UN Peacebuilding Commission works in Burundi, Central African Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia and Sierra Leone[35] and the UN Peacebuilding Fund funds projects in Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guatemala, Haiti, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Liberia, Nepal, Niger, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, South Sudan, Timor-Leste and Uganda.[36] Other UN organizations are working in Haiti (MINUSTAH),[37] Lebanon,[38] Afghanistan, Kosovo and Iraq.

Civil society organisations sometimes even are working on Peacebuilding themselves. This for example is the case in Kenya, according to the magazine D+C Development and Cooperation. After the election riots in Kenya in 2008, civil society organisations started programmes to avoid similar disasters in the future, for instance the Truth, Justice and Reconciliation Commission (TJRC) and peace meetings organised by the church and they supported the National Cohesion and Integration Commission.

Global Peace System is a concept of global conflict resolution dependent on nonviolent processes to eradicate war. It relies upon a multi-strand approach to conflict resolution, incorporating broad social and political solutions. In contemporary peace and conflict studies, the concept of a global peace system has been evolving since the 1940s around the theory that there is a global infrastructure of peacebuilding and that there is a need for systems thinking in peacebuilding. The term "global peace system" was coined from the work of Robert Johansen, who explored the concept in 1978's *Toward a Dependable Place*.

CONCLUSION

Peace is the concept of harmony and the absence of hostility. In a behavioral sense, peace is a lack of conflict and freedom from fear of violence between individuals and heterogeneous social groups. Throughout history some of the most extraordinary and benevolent leaders have used peace talks to establish a certain type of behavioral restraint that has resulted in the establishment of regional peace or economic growth through various forms of agreements or peace treaties. Such behavioral restraint has often resulted in de-escalation of rhetorical and physical conflicts, greater economic interactivity, and consequently substantial prosperity. The avoidance of war or violent hostility can be the result of thoughtful active listening and communication that enables greater genuine mutual understanding and therefore compromise. Leaders often benefit tremendously from the prestige of peace talks and treaties that can result in substantially enhanced popularity.

“Psychological peace” (such as a peaceful thinking and emotions) is perhaps less well defined yet often a necessary precursor to establishing "behavioral peace." Peaceful behavior sometimes results from a "peaceful inner disposition." Some have expressed the belief that peace can be initiated with a certain quality of inner tranquility that does not depend upon the uncertainties of daily life for its existence. The acquisition of such a "peaceful internal disposition" for oneself and others can contribute to resolving of otherwise seemingly irreconcilable competing interests.

Because psychological peace can be important to Behavioral peace, leaders sometimes de-escalate conflicts through compliments and generosity. Small gestures of rhetorical and actual generosity have been shown in psychological research to often result in larger levels of reciprocal generosity (and even virtuous circles of generosity). Such benevolent selfless behavior can eventually become a pattern that may become a lasting basis for improved relations between individuals and groups of people. Peace talks often start without preconditions and preconceived notions, because

they are more than just negotiating opportunities. They place attention on peace itself over and above what may have been previously perceived as the competing needs or interests of separate individuals or parties to elicit peaceful feelings and therefore produce benevolent behavioral results. Peace talks are sometimes also uniquely important learning opportunities for the individuals or parties involved.

Because all of life is interconnected, our fear, hatred and anger decreases the peace in the world, whereas our love, joy and gratitude increases the peace. ... We have the potential to create a world at peace and become what I like to call "Homo Ahimsa" — the nonviolent human.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Pacifism, positive peace, nonviolence, dialogue and other peaceful mean of conflict resolution at the international level should be greatly encouraged and utilized in global peace building.
2. Good governance in nations of the world should be encouraged to remove conflict.
3. Breaches of the peace that threaten individual and global peace building efforts should be sanctioned by the UN and other international bodies.

REFERENCES

Holmes, Robert L. and Gan, Barry L. editors. Nonviolence in Theory and Practice 3rd, edition. (Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press, 2012).

"South Sudan Tops List of World's Fragile States - Again". VOA.

A clarification of this and related terms appears in Gene Sharp, Sharp's Dictionary of Power and Struggle: Language of Civil Resistance in Conflicts, Oxford University Press, New York, 2012.

"A Welcome Effort". The Hindu. Archived from the original on 2 February 2014. Retrieved 24 January 2014.

"Constitution does not permit any titles". The Times of India. Archived from the original on 7 January 2017. Retrieved 21 September 2016.

"Constitution doesn't permit 'Father of the Nation' title: Government" Archived 7 January 2017 at the Wayback Machine., The Times of India, 26 October 2012.

"Einstein on Gandhi (Einstein's letter to Gandhi – Courtesy:Saraswati Albano-Müller & Notes by Einstein on Gandhi – Source: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)". Gandhiserve.org. 18 October 1931. Archived from the original on 17 January 2012. Retrieved 24 January 2012.

"Mahatma Gandhi – The religious quest | Biography, Accomplishments, & Facts". Encyclopædia Britannica. 2015. Archived from the original on 13 May 2017. Retrieved 3 June 2017.

"Mandate of the Peacebuilding Commission". United Nations. Retrieved 18 March 2012.

Wikipedia.org, 2018. 31-7-2018, at 3.00pm.