SOCIAL SCIENCES AND PEACE STUDIES

Mohammad Abdus Sabur

บทคัดย่อ

บ่อยครั้งที่สันติศึกษามักจะมองข้ามญาณหยั่งเห็นของสังคมศาสตร์ในด้าน
ที่เกี่ยวข้องกับความสัมพันธ์ทางสังคม ความขัดแย้งเกิดขึ้นพร้อมกับความแตกแยก
ในเรื่องความสัมพันธ์ของมนุษย์ซึ่งสันติศึกษาพยายามจะแก้ไข สิ่งนี้เองที่ทำให้
มีความเป็นไปได้ที่สังคมศาสตร์และสันติศึกษาจะเสริมสร้างคุณค่าให้แก่กันและกัน
ในแนวทางที่มีต่อความขัดแย้งและสันติภาพ บทความนี้แบ่งออกเป็นสองภาคด้วยกัน
ภาคแรกเป็นการอภิปรายวิชาสังคมศาสตร์และทฤษฎีทางสังคมที่เลือกสรรมา
ภาคที่สองเป็นการทบทวนประวัติของความขัดแย้งและสันติศึกษา บทความนี้
ยังได้ศึกษาคุณูปการของผู้บุกเบิกสามท่าน อันได้แก่ Johann Galtung, Adam Curle และ
John Paul Lederach ที่มีต่อความขัดแย้งและสันติศึกษา และผลงานของสามท่าน
นี้ได้แสดงให้เห็นว่า สังคมศาสตร์และสันติศึกษาต่างเสริมสร้างเกื้อหนุนคุณค่า
ของกันและกันอย่างไร

Abstract

Peace studies often ignore the insights of the social sciences concerning social relationships. Yet conflict emerges with a break in human relations which peace studies tries to mend. That creates a possibility for social science and peace studies to mutually enrich one another in their approach to conflict and peace. This paper is divided into two parts. Part I discusses social science and selected social theories. Part II reviews the history of peace and conflict studies. The paper then goes on to discuss the contributions of three pioneers namely Johann Galtung, Adam Curle and John Paul Lederach in peace and conflict studies; and how their work demonstrates the enriching reciprocity of social science and peace studies.

Social Science as a discipline is much older than peace studies. It possesses vast deposits of resources from which peace studies can draw upon and develop further. The main task of social science is to study social relations. Peace studies as a discipline emerged only in mid fifties after the Second World War. The purpose of peace studies is to mend relationships so peace may prevail. This creates a possibility for social science and peace studies to mutually enriching engagement in the areas of common concern such as conflict and peace. Conflict exists at micro and macro levels and affects people worldwide. These common concerns lead to social actions. So the challenge is how both disciplines could contribute towards a process of peace building.

This paper will be divided into two parts. In part I, I shall discuss social science and selected social theories. Part II of this paper includes the history of peace and conflict studies. Then I shall illustrate contributions of three pioneers namely Johann Galtung, Adam Curle and John Paul Lederach in peace and conflict studies; and mutually enriching reciprocity of social science and peace studies.

PART I: SOCIAL SCIENCE AND SOCIAL THEORIES

Social scientists conduct a deep investigation of the sources and dynamics of the problems that exist in the society. They develop theories they believe most relevant to address those problems. Society is not static, it changes, and therefore social theories vary. Some of them remain relevant and applicable longer than others. But it is important for peace builders to understand works of social scientists as a building block. Here I shall first discuss the main points of the founders of social sciences and then move to selected theories for the interest of this paper.

Among the founders of the social sciences, Durkheim's consensus theory is based on the idea that our thoughts are *inherited not invented*. We learn through socialization and follow the social norms and order which leads to social solidarity. In pre-modern traditional societies, there was more homogeneity and the division of labor was simple. So the solidarity was achieved automatically. This is called *mechanical solidarity*. But in the modern society, division of labor is more complex. In this environment Individualism and

competition are obvious and the threat of disintegration becomes real. That makes it harder to achieve solidarity. Durkheim argues that in modern society human beings are required to be interdependent in order to survive. This is what he called *organic solidarity*. Solidarity enhances prospects for stability and peace.

The second major point of Durkheim is *functionalism*. He compares society with a living organism having various functional organs. In a society organs are structures such as cultural rules, belief and practices. Members of the society follow them and that gradually become institutionalized with political, educational and religious functions which leads to harmonious society. Society functions through a system which is called "social system". If system does not function then society becomes static. But in the present day of increasingly secular modern society, traditional ceremonial practices of religion remain but less powerful, whereas civil *religion* (Bellah) is on the rise. That means without being part of a hierarchical religious structures citizens still can possess and demonstrate religiousness. At the same time society tends to become more conservative.

A criticism of functionalism is that it does not explain adequately the process of social change. It over-emphasizes socialization and equates organism with human behavior but less on power structure that widen gaps between rich and poor and produces and reproduces conflict in a society. To address this shortcoming, there developed alternative theories of society.

Marxism believes that the fulfillment and freedom of individuals are linked to the progress of society and development of alternative social structures. In other words, it requires abolition of exploitative structures which support and sustain class-based capitalist mode of production. Because it exploits, dehumanizes and deprives the working class people from exploring their full potentials, the key to this process is the control of means of production by the dominant class. According to Marxist sociologists, the sustenance of this economic-based system is supported by non-economic structures such as ideas, belief and philosophies which they call *superstructure*.

Towards the change process of this exploitative capitalist system, Marxism emphasizes consciousness raising, organizing of working class and subordinate class and developing a political struggle. This objective is to replace old system and establish a system appropriate to new non-exploitative economic system.

The critiques of this brand of Marxist ideas call it *economic determinism*. Marxists of twentieth century argue that this is a misreading of Marxism. Marx did not mean that the social life of human beings is solely determined by economic factors. For example, according to Gramsci, the control of ideas allows the domination by the capitalist. The reason he suggested is that the capitalist maintains control not only by employing force and economic coercion but by the manufacture of consensus where the working class are made to feel that their wellbeing is closely tied to the prosperity of capitalist and bourgeoisie. This is what prevented revolt, and allowed the capitalist to maintain their power. Therefore there is a need for the working class to develop their own *counter culture* which would, on the one hand, eliminate the notion that the bourgeoisie values dominate the society, and on the other hand, unite both the intellectual and the working class for the same cause. Each class goes beyond its narrow economic interest in order to exert intellectual and moral leadership and build alliances with other social forces. We can see why critical theory calls attention to the *instruments of ideological domination*.

From the above discussion, we can see that both functionalism and Marxism have their own ways of analyzing modern society and how social change takes place. The third founder is Max Weber. He developed *Social Action Theory*. This theory refutes Durkheim's and Marx's analyses. Weber believes that exchange takes place in the society because of people's desired goals, their own perception and ways of making choices. They assess the situation of existing structure and take action. Weber sees reason behind the existing structures. He does not attach importance to class inequality as a central question but the values and market power which generates opportunities. With intellectual capacity an individual utilizes the opportunity rationally. That is the basis from which modern capitalism develops.

Weber also attaches importance to advantage and disadvantage of different religious traditions. He compared between Buddhist tradition which is seen as withdrawal from concerns of day-to-day life and strives for *nirvana* whereas *Protestant ethic and spirit of capitalism* encourages effective engagement and hard work. For example Calvinism and their practices of savings contributed to their economic strength and development.

From above discussion, we can see three main streams of thinkers and their works impacted upon many social scientists in 20th century. The second and third generation social scientists continued their work. Among

them Frankfurt School contributed to *Critical Theory* and other group worked on Weberian *Social Action Theorists*.

The Frankfurt School under the leadership of Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse, took up the challenge put forward by *Marx that the philosophers have hitherto interpreted the world --- the point however is to change it*. That is why they emphasized a shift away from philosophical abstraction to make philosophy more useful for social change. So, critical theory is rooted in change. It analyses the present to embark on the future. In other words, it examines differences and contradictions within modernity and sees to it that theorizing is developed with attention to its position as a part of history. Being conscious of criticism that philosophy is equally *distant from social action and empirical enquiry*, the Frankfurt School evolved four dimensions: (a) to have perception or an image of a society is not enough but there is a need to see distinctions of components within, (b) it is not merely what we see on the surface, underlying causes and conditions are also important, (c) not only application of social theory rather critical examination of theory itself is important. It helps to understand the limitations of theory as Marx did through an analysis of political economy. This is how theories can develop from one stage of society to another and (d) in order to achieve unity between theory and practice, critical engagement is an integral part of the process by which the gained knowledge enriches theory.

In absence of critical engagement and reflection, dogmatism arises. Frankfurt theorists drew this conclusion from observing the rise of Stalinism. In that case, the integration of the working-class in the system – instead of *functioning as a vehicle for liberation* – became a tool of totalitarianism.

Habermas in many ways carries influences from both Marx and Weber. Based on Marx's concepts of base and superstructure, he divides social existence into the *social realm* which is influenced by structure and *the life world*, and is considered as the space for meaningful action. Through Weber's works, Habermas sees the importance of modernity in promoting rationalization, as a motivation for two types of rational actions: (a) *achieving efficiency* in human life and (b) *determining value* in terms of right and wrong. That means when in the society the first person interacts with the second person, it is taken for granted that the person is communicating correct and right thing. So, when the second person communicates, the first person would expect the same. It is an effort of two persons, two communities, two parties

coming together to arrive at a consensus. From the perspective of *ethnomethodology* this is unique gift of human kind. This enables human beings to engage in collaborative projects and enterprise.

Habermas also recognizes the ability of human beings to undertake communicative action across cultures. This is necessary in order to identify common grounds, common causes, and common needs. Based on these, communities are able to achieve *consensus* for their actions. This gives hope that parties across political divides can come together as long as they are in dialogue with one another.

On the question of dialogue and effective communication, the sociologist Anthony Giddens introduces *Structuration Theory*. He believes that structures can constrain at the same time determine behavior. Structures can facilitate effective communication, but at the same time, can also impose limitations. Giddens calls this the *duality of structure*. But with the course of time, the context itself get regenerated and transformed. Therefore, it can be said that there is a dialectic relations between structure and actions. But it is also a fact that society is changing, new factors and conditions both from outside and inside of a particular society pose new challenges and risks. This affects everyone. Therefore, it has to be an ongoing process of *actions – reflections – actions*, in order for us to be effective in responding to new challenges.

I have discussed works of selected social scientists and their contributions in understanding social dynamics and social relations. Social and human relations are directly linked to peace. In part II, I shall discuss peace and conflict studies and its contribution.

PART II: HISTORY OF PEACE AND CONFLICT STUDIES, THE CONTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL SCIENCES IN PEACE STUDIES AND MUTUALLY ENRICHING RECIPROCITY

In this section I shall discuss history and development of peace and conflict studies. Then I shall examine the integration and contribution of social sciences in peace studies and reciprocity. I shall discuss works of Johann Galtung, Adam Curle and John Paul Lederach with an inbuilt critique of con-

flict resolution field and increasingly experience-based relevance of conflict transformation. Then I shall explore future challenges of peace studies.

Peace and conflict studies as an academic program initially was conceived under international relations as a sub-discipline. Peace studies focused on understanding structural issues and underlying causes of conflict. Conflict studies concentrated on implication and impact of conflict resolution theory. Both were based on the platform of enlightenment peace and created awareness that peace is necessary. In the course of time this sub-discipline has helped develop a ray of hope that inter-state peace is possible as the United Nations Charter expressed strong commitment for peace to be achieved through diplomacy and international relations.

International relations have been influenced by the theories of various philosophers. These have alternately supported both war and peace. Aristotle prescribed to *make war that we live in peace* (2008). For Erasmus, war has to be avoided at all cost because it serves only the interests of the powerful and leads to crime and brutality. Locke, being advocate for modern liberalism, emphasized on social contract between the rulers and subjects in favor of protection of lives and liberty. Bentham further added that there is a need to develop institutions through which international imperialism can be resisted. Immanuel Kant promoted the idea of *cosmopolitanism* anticipating international rules of conflict resolution executed through international mechanisms – such as today's United Nations. At that time, given the interstate nature of conflict and experiences of intensity of destructions and sufferings of the people, conflict resolution was a more obvious immediate response than peace studies as an academic discipline.

Conflict Studies and Conflict Resolution

Now I shall discuss contributions of pioneers of conflict studies and the field of conflict resolution. Among the pioneers, the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan in 1950s, founded by Kenneth and Elise Boulding, emphasized humanistic psychology. The International Peace Research Center, established in Norway in 1959 was founded by Johann Galtung. He made significant contributions in terms of research and evolving models of conflict resolution. Here I shall highlight Johann Galtung's works.

Johann Galtung developed a conflict resolution model known as the **ABC-Triangle**. **Attitude** refers to emotions and cognitions are interpreted as highest level of hatred to frozen level of apathy. **Behavior** ranges from extreme violence to apathy. Apathy is considered more dangerous than hatred and violence. Therefore for peace makers, it is a task to channel apathy into a creative work and engagement. **Contradiction** is the root of conflict. Due to incompatible goals of conflicting parties one may determine to eliminate the other. In conflict all three factors are present. Besides the ABC-Triangle, Galtung's theoretical and conceptual works include models of ways that conflicts emerge between people, communities and states. He also describes structural violence, seeing it as a system that produces poverty, and institutionalizes racism and discrimination. He distinguishes between *negative peace*, which suggests an absence of violence, and *positive peace*, which involves new and supportive relationships towards peace. Galtung's Transcend Actions advocate non-violence, creativity and empathy, which help conflicting parties to move beyond their respective positions and create new possibilities for achieving goals. This is sharp contrast to coercive and competitive diplomacy. Johann Galtung has been engaged in research, conflict resolution work and teaching work. His conflict resolution work has received recognition from the United Nation's agencies and other international institutes.

There has been research and documentation concerning the advantages and limitations of international relations and the role of the United Nations for conflict resolution.

The UN has succeeded in halting war and reaching peace agreement mostly at interstate level as a short-term goal. When conflict resolution fails then as a next step conflict management effort is undertaken mainly to control damage by sending peace-keeping forces. Between 1988-1998, 35 UN peace-keeping operations were conducted (Tamara Duffey 2001) with little or no substantial impact. The conflict resolution school considers that conflict is bad therefore there is a need to end conflict. Conflict management acknowledges that a conflict cannot be solved within a short time so they attempt to control damage. But both efforts have failed to address the root causes of the conflict. So the revival of the conflict occurs. The UN mission for peacekeeping has been criticized for not being able to fulfill its objective of restoring peace. Bosnia, Rwanda and Somalia are few examples of these failures.

Critics argue that the conflict resolution groups have become complacent and lost relevance. Bernard Mayer (2000) as an insider who has worked in this field many years claims that conflict resolution as a discipline is facing crisis. Professionals in this field are neither involved in major conflicts of our time such as the Middle East, Iraq, Afghanistan and Korea, nor engaged in environmental social policies. Conflict resolution organizations mostly come from a middle class orientation from the West which is often an impediment to reaching out to marginalized people and communities in order to establish dialogue with them on an equal basis. The identity and independence of this field is increasingly under attack. Relevance and impact of third party mediators has been limited and their objectivity is questioned. They are unable to engage those people who are bearing the brunt of conflict and wars. After this critical review of conflict resolution I would like to discuss peace studies towards conflict transformation.

Peace Studies and Conflict Transformation

Peace studies as an academic program was launched at the University of Bradford in 1973, chaired by Adam Curle. Adam's Curle's concept of peace was initially concerned with fulfilling human needs and liberating human potentials. With time, his concepts became more concerned with human relations and spiritual values. In 1960's and 1970's he was involved in *Track Two* or citizen's diplomacy in the Nigerian civil war and the India-Pakistan Conflict. But in 1990s he shifted to peace making from below and assisted local people of Osijek in their initiative for peace during the Balkan conflict.

Adam Curle's defined peace and conflict as a set of peaceful and unpeaceful relationships. He believed that if friendship is based on sufficiently strong understanding, then it is possible to overcome differences. From individual to social level its interpretation would be active organizations and movements, their planned and effective cooperation and intelligent and creative efforts would resolve conflict. For Adam peacemaking means effecting changes in relationships, which would ultimately lead to meaningful cooperation and development in fulfilling human needs. He further added that our main fault is our failure to recognize that the roots of conflict are largely in our minds. Therefore, one has to have desire to 'seek within' the human spirit. This realization helped Adam Curle remain associated with religious society, and

led him towards spiritual and mystical explorations. This process of self-education and training help peacemakers to become unbiased mediators and facilitators.

Adam emphasized that *mediators* (from the very name) remain *in the middle* and take no sides. Mediators are placed at the center of conflict and are deeply involved. They possess ability to establish communication with conflicting parties which is needed to be followed by skillful negotiation. Both tolerance and determination enable a process to reach an agreement for sustained relationships for nurturing peace. This is a value-based effort blended with knowledge and humanistic psychology.

John Paul Lederach has been appreciative of Adam Curle's ideas and his critique of the conflict resolution model of Johann Galtung. Within that conflict resolution model he sees a danger of manipulation, co-optation and a misunderstanding of conflict. Like Adam Curle, Lederach emphasizes *right relationship and a social structure* which is committed to human rights. Respect for human life and nonviolence, are his emphasis. Lederach believed peace is embedded in justice and he does not agree with concepts such as negative and positive peace. His main thesis is that there is a need to think critically at a much deeper level concerning both the content and process of conflict resolution.

Lederach prefers the concept of *conflict transformation* instead of *conflict resolution*. The transformation approach employs a process by which parties in conflict see their role in a deeper understanding of the nature and root causes of conflict. This process is an analytical and conceptual tool to enable community members to assume responsibility and be engaged in the process of long term change. Outside facilitators have a role to encourage and facilitate the self-empowerment of the community from within. In this approach the people themselves can employ their cultural resources and wisdom towards achieving self-sustaining harmony and peace.

In contrast to the field of conflict resolution, the school of conflict transformation believes that conflict is a natural phenomenon. According to Lederach, conflict can neither be controlled nor eliminated. But it can be transformed and human relationships can be mended. This concept may sound prescriptive depending on how one applies it. Conflict cannot always be transformed in a constructive way. That is where reciprocity of social science and peace studies could play critical role.

Integration and Reciprocity of Social sciences and Peace Studies

Lederach attaches importance of the body of knowledge of social sciences and its contribution to understand society, social relations, and resources available within, which enriches the approach of conflict transformation. Through the elicitive process, local, relevant and effective symbols, terms and language can be utilized as resources. This helps mobilize participation and find most desirable outcomes. In this process conflict transformation, reconstruction, rebuilding tasks can be accomplished and the process can be *owned* and directed by people themselves.

The nature, scale and dynamism of conflict have been shifting from interstate to intrastate. Such as conflict between ethnic, religious and cultural communities within a state, between people and promoter of development projects, transnational corporations, aid agencies and so on. Edward Azar termed them as protracted conflict. Azar's protracted social conflict theory refers to violent struggle of community groups in search of recognition, political participation and economic development. Denial and deprivation of such rights and needs lead to conflict. Around the common issues the struggling communities develop their own identity and negotiate with the state power. Failure on the part of the state and the government to recognize and address those issues create conditions for identity groups to engage in prolonged violent conflict. Therefore it is the responsibility of the government to enter into dialogue and initiate program development process genuinely *owned* by the people. This is one of the examples how conflict can be transformed to an opportunity for peace and development. This process requires enquiry and research at a deeper level in order to understand the underlying causes, not only at surface level. Generally, sociologists and anthropologist have been doing such research for a long time to understand human behavior and the social relations but not necessarily directly in connection with the concerns for peace. That has resulted in minimum or no contribution to the development of peace studies. It is increasingly being recognized that there is a need and opportunity for both disciplines to reflect, exchange and engage in identifying common ground and enrich each other. Considering the fact that society continues to evolve and change, actors and dynamics also change, and therefore, theoretically informed empirical research is needed on a continuing basis. On the other hand, Peace studies can play a role in sensitizing social sciences to

be proactive and practical in responding to conflict studies of various natures.

Lederach has been appreciative of *Paulo Freire's Pedagogy* of the Oppressed and has documented the conscientization process among peasants and workers to achieve in-depth understanding about social and political contradictions. It leads to empowerment of the oppressed to take action towards ending oppression. Lederach also talked about elicitive approach and a participatory process by which participants draw local knowledge and wisdom. In contrast prescriptive process is used for direct transfer of knowledge. It limits learner's creativity but provide space for cross-fertilization of ideas between learner and teachers or trainers. Therefore, Lederach prefers combination of both.

To add further inputs from social science in peace studies, Jean Piaget's constructive epistemology can be useful which refers to a process by which human beings generate knowledge and meaning through interaction between experiences and ideas and that leads to reform and change. Taking the lead from constructivism, Seymour Papert's theory of constructionism argues for reconstruction rather than the simple transmission of knowledge because learning can be more effective when a tangible object is created in the present world. Lederach from a practitioner's perspective cites Moore (1986) and emphasizes a multi-disciplinary perspective. He stresses the necessity of combining social knowledge and theoretical approaches in order to provide a role for knowledge in the change process. It is relevant in the sense that peacebuilding is a continuous process.

Lederach's contribution has been very significant in peace studies. At the same time it can be said that peace studies so far has not addressed the issue of caring the state of mind such as anger, anxiety, agony, grief and remorse as observed by Adam Curle. Healthy state of mind can get rid of mental roots of conflict and nurture healthy human relationship, which is peace.

CONCLUSION

The speed of change which Adam Curle illustrated in his book *Another Way*, is real and will continue for many years to come. It will create a more complex world where conflict will take multi-dimensional shapes and dynamics. This means the students of peace studies ought to keep their minds

and hearts open to study these new social phenomena. In this way both social sciences and peace studies can play mutually enriching role.

The development of both social sciences and peace studies, so far have been predominantly embedded in the Western concepts and their theoretical base. Therefore, it remains a major challenge for scholars of young generations from the rest of the world to bring cultural, religious and spiritual-based value perspective for peace building.

The right balance between (a) academic excellence and practical engagement (b) between paying attention and investment of energy to deal with macro conflicts with widespread devastating impact, for example, worldwide war against terrorism, climate change and responding to protracted conflict within the nation state and affected communities remain as a major challenge. Through from conflict transformation perspective, it is very clear that peace building is a continuing process and nothing is definitive, but it does not mean that the engaged communities, actors and facilitators should not make efforts and aim at tangible changes and results. In this change process moral dimension, prudence dependent virtues as well as prudence as a memory of future are of great importance to address the mental roots of the conflict and nurture sustainable human and social relationship for peace.

References

John. Pips, *Introducing Social Theory*, p11, p17, p33, p41, p51, p71, p169, 173, policy press, UK, 2003.

Bellah N Robert, *Beyond Belief: Civil Religion in America, Essays on Religion in a Post Traditionalist World*, Berkeley: University Press, 1991.

Calhoun. Craig, Josef. Karaganis, *Hand Book of Social Theory*, Critical Theory, Pp180-181, Sage Publication Ltd. India, 2003.

Williams. Raymond, *Marxism and Literature*, Pp110-111, Oxford University Press, 1997.

Ramsbotham. Tom. Woodhouse, Hugh Miall, *Conflict Resolution*, The prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflicts, PP3-9. Policy Press, UK. 2011.

Duffey. Tamara, *Cultural Issues in Contemporary Peacekeeping*, Interna-

tional Peacekeeping Journal, vol.7, Issue 1, published by Frank Cass, 2000.

Mayer S. Bernard, Beyond Neutrality, Confronting the Crisis in Conflict Resolution, Jossy-Bass, CA 94103-1741, 2004.

Woodhouse. Tom, *Adam Curle: Radical Peacemaker and pioneer of peace studies*. http" Journal of Conflcitology.uoc.edu, 2010.

Curle. Adam, Another Way, Positive Response to Contemporary violence, John Carpenter publishing, Oxford OXI 4PH, 1995.

Lederach. P. John, *The Little Book of Conflict Transformation*, Pp4-5, p15, pp29-31,Good Books, Pansalvania, 2003.

Lederach. P. John, *Preparing for Peace, Conflict Transformation Across Cultures*, p8, Pp74-77, Syracuse University Press,1996.

Comte-Sponville, *A Small Treaties on the Great Virtues: The Use of Philosophy in Everyday Life*, Metropolitan Book, 2001.