



*Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article*

## CHANGE, TRANSFORMATION, AND TRENDS IN PEACE STUDIES

**Burak ERCOŞKUN<sup>1</sup>**  
**Emrah KONURALP<sup>2</sup>**

### Abstract

Although the themes of peace and conflict have been the central area of interest in almost all religions, cultures, and ethnic debates, the historical and empirical reality of peace has remained utopian when actual wars and conflicts are considered. This situation led to a limited number of thinkers who directly discussed peace. Their evaluations had been stuck into ideological boundaries and lost their connection with the empirical world. Departing from the hypothetical assumption that the content of “peace” has changed along with the modernity, the main objective of this study was to come to terms with the theme of peace from the works of the Enlightenment thinkers up to pioneers of Peace Studies. In this respect, methodologically speaking, this study examined the conceptualizations of peace in reference to the political philosophers like Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, and Kant and their contextual evolution through and in the contemporary era. In the final analysis, this examination sheds light on the transformation of peace understanding that no more interstate rivalry through the actions of political actors inspires the way out for peace. Nonetheless, a more comprehensive analysis of the social phenomena, including social change, justice, and structural violence, gives spirit to real peace.

**Keywords:** Conflict, peace studies, negative peace, positive peace.

## BARIŞ ÇALIŞMALARINDA DEĞİŞİM, DÖNÜŞÜM VE EĞİLİMLER

### Öz

Barış ve çatışma temaları neredeyse tüm dinlerin, kültürlerin ve etnik tartışmalarının esas ilgi alanı olsa da barış kavramının tarihsel ve ampirik gerçekliği, yaşanan savaş ve çatışma olgularıyla karşılaştığında oldukça ütopyik kalmıştır. Bu durum ise barışı doğrudan tartışan düşünürlerin sayısının sınırlı oluşuna ve değerlendirmelerinin genellikle ideolojik sınırlar içine sıkışıp pratikle bağının kopmasına yol açmıştır. Modernite ile birlikte “barış”ın içeriğinin de değiştiği varsayımından yola çıkarak, bu çalışmanın temel amacı Aydınlanma düşünürlerinin eserlerinden Barış Çalışmaları öncülerine kadar barış temasını kavramaktır. Bu bağlamda, metodolojik olarak konuşursak, bu çalışma, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau ve Kant gibi siyaset filozoflarının barış kavramsallaştırmalarını ve bunların günümüze doğru ve günümüzdeki bağlamsal evrimini incelemiştir. Son tahlilde, barış anlayışının dönüşümüne ışık tutan bu incelemede artık siyasi aktörlerin eylemleri yoluyla vuku bulan devletlerarası rekabetin barışa çıkış yoluna ilham vermediği; ancak, sosyal değişim, adalet ve yapısal şiddet gibi sosyal fenomenlerin daha kapsamlı bir şekilde değerlendirilmesinin gerçek barışa ruh verebileceği sonucuna ulaşmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Çatışma, barış çalışmaları, negatif barış, pozitif barış.

<sup>1</sup> Öğr. Gör., İstanbul Yeni Yüzyıl University, ORCID: 0000-0003-1163-3906

**Sorumlu yazar** (Corresponding Author): burak.ercoskun@yeniyuzyil.edu.tr.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Iğdır University Department of Local Government, ORCID: 0000-0003-3667-8107

**Başvuru Tarihi** (Received): 18.05.2020 **Kabul Tarihi** (Accepted): 16.10.2020

## Introduction

One of the most critical capabilities that we urgently need to strengthen as humanity is to change the way we think about war and violence radically. We have to develop a multi-disciplinary perspective of solving the problems and conflicts with constructive and peaceful means at individual, social, local, national, and international levels. This quest does not mean that humankind has not developed a sense of peace up until now. However, we cannot treat peace as a stagnant concept. Instead, coming to terms with peacebuilding necessitates a wholesome transformation in methodological and practical realms together with examining its evolution throughout the history of political thought.

Although the traditional disciplines of social sciences have explored the issues of violence and conflict within their boundaries, each of them is concerned with a narrow section of human behavior that is of interest. For example, economists focus on game theory and decision-making, psychologists investigate interpersonal conflicts, sociologists examine status and class conflicts, and political scientists concentrate on domestic and international disputes. However, as a point of departure, interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary approaches, which may be the peaceful solution of conflicts, should be produced, discussed, and applied, rather than appealing to violence and war. This step requires a severe mindset and paradigm shift. Today, an academic disciplinary initiative that claims to meet this need is the Peace Studies (Arslan, 2018: x).

It is a common approach to deal with the issue of peace based on the concepts of conflict and violence, to produce principles and norms, and to discuss their applicability and sustainability. At this point, “making peace with whom and for whom” emerges as the central problematic. Peace must be addressed not only for sovereign and official units but also for peoples, societies, social groups, and individuals. At this juncture, this study aims to analyze the vision and main theses of Peace Studies holistically.

Accordingly, the study is divided into six sections. Since the contractarian approach celebrates peace as the state of affairs in which contradicting interests and expectations are harmonized, the first part of this article departs from the peace debates within social contract theory in particular emphasis on political philosophers like Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Immanuel Kant. The second part mentions the scholars who discuss the theme of peace from a different perspective due to the developments of the late nineteenth century such as the nation-state building, imperialist rivalry, the spread of nationalist movements, the disappearance of physical boundaries between people as a result of technological-scientific-intellectual flourishing, the change of meaning and importance of conflicts and wars between states. The third part elaborates on the functionalist and integrative approaches that emerged immediately after the Second World War. The fourth part focuses on the transformation of the theme of peace departing from Johan Galtung, the pioneer of the terminology of Peace Studies, and the scholars who lived through the trauma of the Second World War and examined peace as a reality, not as hope. The fifth part includes conflict resolution theorists and methodologists, focusing on empirical research and discussing the means for peace-making. The final part examines the discussion of peace in areas such as human rights, democracy, freedoms, gender, religions. As a general remark, this study analyzes the change, transformation, and trends of the peace theme to provide a perspective. It should also be noted that only the scholars who left their distinguishing mark on Peace Studies are taken into account, although many others contributed to the field.

### 1. Classical Thinkers on Peace

Realist philosopher Waltz, in *Man, the State, and War*, reveals differences of opinion among philosophers about the causes of war. Some of these philosophers point to human nature as the cause of war, while others either emphasize the anarchic structure of the international system or draw attention to the structure of states (Waltz, 1954: 38-40). These differences reflect the

fundamental difference between “realist” and “idealist” philosophies. These two schools are based on the Hobbesian (pessimistic) and Kantian (optimistic) traditions of social contract theory. Also, the Grotiusian approach stands in a middle way. The Hobbesian school believes that it is not possible to go beyond the violent world we live in. The Kantian approach argues that it is possible to overcome violent conflicts and moves towards a more peaceful way of life. The Grotiusian middle way, on the other hand, acknowledges that it is challenging to eradicate violence and war in its entirety. Still, it is possible to develop rules and norms that would reduce the excesses of violence and war (Baylis, 2008: 70).

In *Leviathan*, Hobbes perceives that man was the wolf of man in the state of nature where people were together, but they were not living through a society, and there was no moral or legal rule or property. There was a war among people. The only right that applied here was the natural right. Natural rights recognize no rules and limits. This situation made people think about the laws of nature. So, Hobbes lists nineteen laws of nature that make coexistence possible. People made a contract between themselves to put an end to this war. This contract transferred the power to the sovereign, who was not a party to the right to secure life and property, to govern, and to distinguish right from wrong. This sovereign is the state. For social peace and stability, the state must penetrate all areas of social life and be ready and present everywhere (Hobbes, 2007: 93-95).

Like Hobbes, Locke addresses the issue of naturally granted rights, emphasizes the importance of the protection of freedom and private property, and attempts to link the understanding of peace with the theme of the protection of property. The issue of private ownership is an integral part of Locke’s political philosophy, and he evaluates ownership as a naturally granted right such as individual liberty and equality. Locke describes the private property as the labor that human beings expose with their body and hands. In other words, the property is a fruit of human labor and a natural right (Locke, 2010: 46). He wants to base the relationship between private property and the establishment of the state in the context of contract theory. According to Locke, the purpose of establishing the state is to protect the property of individuals who are not safe in their natural state, and the contract would provide peace and trust to the community (Locke, 2010: 114).

Rousseau seeks answers to how the administration should be able to create a good, virtuous people. He proposes a new contract on how people can live equal and free again under the conditions of that time. According to him, there are two powers: the ability to choose freely and make decisions and develop. For Rousseau, the emergence of private property and the bourgeoisie deprives people of freedom. It is entirely irreversible to the conditions of the natural, free man. Only a new contract could create a social freeman (Rousseau, 2004: 110). With such a contract, human beings stand together and become people. People, as a whole, transform themselves into the public. As a part of the political authority, it is transformed from an individual (i.e., a monarch) to the citizen. A man is a free man as long as he obeys the rules, which are a product of his own will. The “general will” is the will that one has in reasoning as a citizen. Citizens should have sufficient knowledge of the subject, and there should be no parties or organizations that act as spokespersons for special interests in society. In sharp contrast to Hobbes, Rousseau warns the public against the government regardless of its forms. The government is the most crucial threat to popular sovereignty because it tends to put its own will ahead of the general will. For this reason, Rousseau emphasizes the need for citizens to remain vigilant and to protect their will in the form of popular sovereignty. The most fundamental concepts in Rousseau’s theory are equality, freedom, and general will. Rousseau draws attention to the common interest rather than the individual interest in establishing conditions of social consensus and peace (Rousseau, 2005: 13-15). This approach predicts that what is good for the majority will be good for everyone. It is assumed that the general will, which also refers to the

national will in today's political understanding, is aimed at public interests and is always right. In this respect, it has been debated whether Rousseau's theory is liberal or totalitarian.

In *Perpetual Peace*, Kant emphasizes the importance of human reason by stating that human life is still peaceful. Fights, violence, and wars throughout history are the ways that people resort to satisfy their ego and ambitions. Politicians who act with arrogance and passions have caused people to die and drift into hunger and misery (Kant, 1968: 315). Therefore, real peace can only be achieved by showing the will to seek peace by using one's mind for good. In Kant's philosophy, peace is a future-time theory, and making this goal is possible through reforms. According to him, turning to peace is one of the essential tasks of the intellectuals (Arendt, 2005: 352). If people become aware of this task, nature will mobilize to achieve this goal. The realization of this theory is described as a duty of humanity. Kant argues that the idea of lasting peace is not an empty ideal but an assignment of humankind (Kant, 1968: 386). It is possible to provide social awareness about peace by organizing in a political sense thanks to the importance attached to education. Therefore, Kant's proposals for the formation of a state of peace were path-breaking.

Grotius, on the other hand, requires a legal system for the relations between states. He tries to explain this relationship with the principles derived from natural law. For him, a state cannot behave as it wishes in its relations with the other states. The states must act following certain legal principles (Grotius, 1967: 51). This prerequisite reduces conflicts and creates a more peaceful order. Grotiusian approach is like an early precursor to the different approaches that set out to analyze relations between states.

As in every academic discipline and scientific activity, original ideas in the field of international relations have enabled the development of theories. Integrating the empirical world and the abstract world with practice and theory has made it easier to define, explain, and understand the phenomenon of peace as well as international relations. In this context, one of the international relations theories that take its philosophical foundations from the approaches of classical thinkers, peace in realism is generally based on the perception of power balances that would prevent conflict and the rule of domination, threat perception, and military power. In idealism, peace is perceived as a national and international peace based on social, political, and economic harmony. It focuses on the kind of institutions that could achieve a peaceful order. In idealism, there is still the regulation of power balances through institutions. Liberalism bases the concept of peace on individualism, freedom, social, political, economic rights and responsibilities, and justice (Richmond, 2006: 369-370).

## **2. Idealist Thought and Peace at the Early Twentieth Century**

The traces of idealist debates were observed at the *Hague Peace Conference* that took place as a result of the rivalry and arms race since the 1870s. The realization of the idealist principles was possible with the peace treaties after the First World War. In this context, a political scientist and the US President Woodrow Wilson, who developed both intellectual and political efforts to construct peace as a normative and organizational order, came to the fore.

To construct a world order based on peace and human rights, Wilson explained the program of world peace in the interests of all nations following the First World War along with fourteen principles. The first five articles contain the basic principles that should be valid in the new world order. Article six states the obligation to withdraw from the territory of Russia. Articles from seven to thirteen cover the conditions for determining post-war national borders. The last article includes a proposal to establish an international organization that would ensure national sovereignty and territorial integrity (Gaines, 2009: 66-67). Generally speaking, Wilsonism, with its features such as the development of democracy and the substitution of colonialism, has a universal character and does not accept class, sect, and gender discrimination in any region.

Wilson's thoughts are identified with Kant's liberal ideal. Indeed, Kant's ideal of peace is based on the view that people-elected rulers who pay the price of war in democracy-ruled countries would naturally prefer peace. In this respect, peace and democracy are two sides of the same coin (Doyle, 2004). As a result, Kant came up with a liberal idea based on these two essential elements. Wilson tried to apply such an idea through fourteen principles and the League of Nations. Established after the failure of the League of Nations, the United Nations and other organizations reflect the projection of Wilsonism (Türkmen, 2018: 82). Their goal is to promote the development of the liberal international order, from human rights protection mechanisms to free trade agreements, from conflict resolution formulas to disarmament. Besides, the post-Cold War phenomena (humanitarian interventions, developing responsibility for protection, post-intervention peacebuilding, nation-building, international justice mechanisms) can be examined within the framework of New Wilsonism, which is based on the preconditions for stability and peaceful domestic and foreign policy through political and economic liberalization (Belloni, 2007: 101).

Norman Angell is another influential scholar who was both a critic and utopian of the same era, addresses the debates in European political culture by linking free trade to peace. Angell states that free trade would enable a model of interaction in a globalizing world and that the specialized industries of the developing economies would move the world towards such a phase, based on Adam Smith's liberal understanding. For Angell, they are the state structures that do not want to be aware of this situation, and they cannot produce a suitable role for realizing a goal. Also, nationalism resorted to by the states is an attempt to return to mercantilism, and it disrupts the natural course of peace (Angell, 1911: 3-14).

Angell was influenced by classical utilitarians like Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. Therefore, for him, the states direct people to conflict via imperialist and nationalist policies. However, societies are not prone to war within their rationality. The states of nationalist and militaristic characters stand as obstacles to human rationality and the path that this rationality should follow (Angell, 1911: 15-28). Angell emphasizes war as a process that can be avoided and treated as an unnecessary or outdated tool. He seeks to reveal the content of the great fallacy of his era and to show that this fallacy is the result of the world that cannot be modernized. However, the evaluations made by ignoring the conditions of his time led to criticism of his anti-war ideas as reflecting a utopian set-up.

### **3. Post-World War II Integrationist Theories and Peace**

With the institutional rise of political realism in the aftermath of the Second World War, peace was presented as a system that can only be provided by the strong states or utilizing diplomacy. Therefore, it has become essential to construct co-operation structures in areas where interest partnerships can be made. Integrative approaches have also come to the fore with the idea of providing stability, security, and social welfare. These approaches suggest that the states can form an order that can provide security and peace by building integrated communities. Accordingly, the interdependence and co-operation based on the mutual interest that the integration process creates would reduce the possibility of conflict among the members of the community and preserve the collective will for peaceful resolution of international disputes (Sandıklı & Kaya, 2012: 141).

According to Karl Deutsch, integration is the relationship between units that are interdependent and able to act together to maintain community qualities and dynamics. The existence of these units, apart from each other, would not give rise to the same dynamics. The individual movement of the units would differ according to the movement styles within the group (Deutsch, 1968: 198). Integration has the effect of bringing the member states of the community into the goal of peacekeeping. Deutsch states that peace can be achieved by promoting international integration

into a pluralistic security community. This community can take place in conditions where the fundamental political values are compatible, decision-makers can make mutual sensitivity, and the parties can predict each other's ways of action. Among the members of this community, the tendency to resolve conflicts by resorting to armed force would be kept to a minimum. Pro-cooperation public opinion would be formed. Peace would be maintained through communication and mutual sensitivity (Deutsch, 1968: 244-251).

On the other hand, David Mitrany predicted that with the increase in the number of independent states in the post-World War II era, common areas of need would expand. He stated that particular interstate organs could be developed in these areas of need. For a world society where wars can be prevented, the states must act together. It is necessary to prioritize the elements that would connect the states and to engage in constructive co-operation. The adoption of a functionalist approach in international co-operation would serve to overcome the difficulties that may arise from the principle of equal sovereignty of states. Functionalist co-operation is not based on the transfer of sovereignty, but the transfer of authority to international organizations focused on specific functions (Mitrany, 1948: 356-359). The scope of activities of the international organizations to be determined in line with shared interests and needs would be extended to different areas as a result of the co-operation process. Interstate trust can be established through the organizations, in which the states would delegate their powers in certain areas and expand their scope of activity.

#### **4. The Emergence of Peace Studies**

Peace Studies are influenced by liberal theory set out in such an intellectual environment with the challenging aim of resolving or minimizing the interstate conflicts. Johan Galtung and Kenneth Boulding can be cited as founders of this field. With the contributions of these scholars, under the Cold War conditions, where the threat of nuclear war and military-strategic fields of study began to take place in universities, the Peace Studies function as a critique or even antithesis of this general situation. The scholars of Peace Studies both reject realist models of conflict and conflict management and avoid addressing the framework of the concepts used by realists. They rarely responded to the analyses and ideas of Hobbes, Waltz, and other realists, and sought to produce concepts and theories through the models they tried to create (Steinberg, 2007: 789).

The distinctive feature of Peace Studies is that this field is not just a school of international relations. Instead, Peace Studies have an interdisciplinary methodology. According to the nature of the research question, sociology, psychology, anthropology, political science, economics, law, history can be used. For example, psychology can reveal the motivations that lead people to violence while they are unaware of them. Anthropology can report the cultural diversity of humanity in solving problems. Political science can raise awareness of the elements of hard and soft power. Economics may offer knowledge about alternatives that would enable peace in more than one economic model. Law can design the future's peaceful society by asking the main questions about cultural and structural problems (Galtung, 2010: 24-25). The basic idea here is that since the Peace of Westphalia, the state and the international system have been taken as the primary source of political conflict; however, the problems may also arise from different points that are not directly related to politics. Therefore, it is not reasonable to refer solely to international relations for the solution of these problems.

In short, Peace Studies has an intellectual basis for shifting the focus of international relations from the interstate domain to a broader understanding of social relations. In this sense, it does not look at war and peace based only on the states or system. It investigates a wide range of social phenomena, including individual responsibility, economic inequality, gender aspect, intercultural relations. Because real peace in the understanding of Peace Studies is not a result of

the actions of the state leaders, it can be achieved by a complete transformation of societies as a result of a mentality revolution (Goldstein, 2001: 146).

Galtung's distinctive approach can be more easily understood by referring to his formulation. For him, the absence of personal violence and war is negative peace. The lack of structural violence (social injustice) is expressed as positive peace. Galtung's definition of violence is the effect applied to people who lag behind their physical and mental potential. His approach provides a comprehensive framework from violence to economic inadequacies, wars, ideological pressures, and threats (Galtung, 1969: 167-173). Negative and positive peace form the basis of the concept of building peace, which Galtung first addressed in 1976. According to Galtung, peace should be modeled after eliminating the problems caused by structural violence. Therefore, positive peace should be targeted instead of negative peace (Galtung, 1976: 297-298). Therefore, to understand the concept of peace, it is necessary first to examine how Galtung defines violence. Galtung maintains that the elements he deals with within a cycle of direct, structural, and cultural violence cause visible and invisible conflicts (Galtung, 1990: 291-292). He states that structural violence is caused by political mechanisms, processes, and institutions that satisfy the needs of identity, reputation, and security. He argues that cultural violence is fed by anger, fear, and hatred when the parties do not understand or misunderstand each other. Invisible conflicts turn into direct violence and become visible (Galtung, 2004: 18). In this context, conflict is a variable process in which structural, cultural, and direct violence affect each other. The conflict arises when the relationship between the parties is worn out, or conflicts of interest occur. In those cases, the parties start to show hostile attitudes towards each other, and conflict becomes spreading. The process of conflict, which has deepened by engaging other parties, becomes more complex than the initial state of affairs. This makes it difficult to direct conflict in the nucleus. In addition, it is believed that peace is an order that can be maintained through a "social contract." At this point, peace is a state of non-war based on contractual, conscious and mutually agreed relationships (Özerdem, 2013: 7).

Kenneth Boulding contributes to Peace Studies with the concept of "stable/sustainable peace." Boulding simply defines peace as a state of non-conflict or the opposite of war. He admits that a world without conflict is a dream while embracing a non-hot conflict order as a more achievable goal. He calls this stable peace (Boulding, 1978: 41). The main factors for developing stable peace are as follows: (1) habits of acceptance of peace; (2) establishment and development of an integrated network of relations or communication between political leaders, as well as professional expertise such as mediation, conciliation, diplomacy; (3) increasing the travel and mutual communication opportunities of individuals within the system; (4) economic interdependence; (5) mutually coherent perceptions that exclude the use of force; (6) creating taboos to prevent the use of violence (Boulding, 1978: 62-66).

In short, the Peace Studies emerged when the need for peace was most intense, but the belief in its achievability was weak. However, the concepts developed by Galtung and Boulding opened this subfield in the field of international relations. Peace Studies, focusing on establishing a new mechanism of functioning at both the state and international system levels, have not achieved the results it once expected. However, these studies have managed to raise a certain level of awareness of peace issues. Simultaneously, it serves as a functional bridge between the theses presented by the Peace Studies and the classical liberal theories in academic terms and the arguments of the peace concept of globalization.

## **5. Conflict Analysis and Resolution Approaches**

Conflict analysis and resolution offers important methods in peace and reconciliation-based research and helps generate original discussions. It is also open to disciplines other than political science and international relations with the support of branches such as social psychology,

communication, and cognitive approaches. This area, which has been discussed and developed since the 1960s, occupies an important place in Peace Studies.

In this context, it is John Burton's need theory that led the theoretical quests in Peace Studies. This theory brought the "problem-solving" approach to the field. At the core of Burton's contribution lies the argument that human behavior is shaped according to needs. These needs, like security, identity, family, and development, are irrepressible. Long-term real social relationships cannot be achieved without meeting the basic needs of the individual. A human being struggles to meet them without caring about the consequences. She/he does not avoid conflict when prevented from obtaining them. Generally, in every society, some elites control the resources necessary to maintain the status quo. These elites resist the demands of other groups. In other words, the conflict is not caused by the needs but the boredom arising from the failure to meet them. The problem-solving method should be adopted to determine what these needs are. Academic, informal, small discussion groups communicate the parties directly by identifying basic needs. To put it briefly, peace can be achieved by providing basic needs.

According to peace research expert Celia Cook-Huffman, the issue of universal needs is also a matter of survival. So people will make great efforts to satisfy them (Huffman, 2009: 22). Survival can mean, for example, the extreme violence in genocide incidents aims to destroy a particular group in whole or in part. It may be understood that the culture or language of the elderly may be lost or can no longer be passed on from generation to generation, or can be understood in their symbolic meaning.

Herbert Kelman developed an interactive problem-solving approach inspired by Burton's work. According to him, international conflicts should be handled scientifically by social psychological analysis. The aim is to provide an analytical and interactive study of the problem between the parties to the conflict. Thus, a perspective can be provided to resolve the dispute (Kelman, 1991: 261). Like Burton, Kelman thinks that meeting human needs has a vital role in resolving conflicts. The workshops are the main elements of his approach. Here, representatives of the parties to the conflict participate in a moderated meeting with social science researchers who are experts in the subject. In this context, problem-solving workshops are specially designed third-party approaches. It is an informal model of diplomacy. With the knowledge and skills of the moderator social scientist in interactive process management, the parties engage in constructive communication. Unlike mediation, the third-party social scientist does not propose solutions. She/he aims to initiate a satisfactory settlement of the parties and establish an official diplomacy mechanism. In this approach, individuals are the most appropriate units of analysis to understand the nature of the conflict without ignoring other levels. If the individual's psychological needs like identity, security, recognition, participation, justice, dignity are appropriately analyzed, the character of the discrepancies also becomes apparent. This means analyzing the needs or fears of decision-makers or citizens in conflict, not personal fears or needs (Kelman, 1991: 265).

As William Zartman (2000: 225) puts it, "negotiation plan, which is the process of incorporating conflicting positions into a common agreement, is synonymous with conflict resolution. It is also the most common way to prevent, manage, resolve, and transform conflicts." The ripeness theory developed by him points to the significance of timing in the resolution of disputes. Aware of the fact that timing cannot be the only reason for success, the theory argues for the efforts that would be futile in solving the problems before they get mature. Thus, the maturation condition is presented as a critical but not sufficient condition for the successful solution of the conflicts. (Zartman, 2000: 225). In theory, maturation is bound to several circumstances: the first is the deadlock in the question, the second is the perception of a starting point, and the third is the presence of competent people to manage these processes. As can be seen, the maturation process offers a more holistic method to make sense of processes by incorporating both objective



conditions such as deadlock point and subjective conditions with emphasis on competent people and perceptions.

## 6. Contemporary Peace Studies

Since the 1970s, peace and conflict studies have been nurtured by different disciplines and thought centers within the pluralistic discussion trends and methodologies of the contemporary world. The starting point is based on the coexistence of themes of war/conflict and peace. Therefore, at a thesis/antithesis spectrum, the research, structuring, and institutionalization of peace with the claim and wish to resolve disputes in question at this stage require side arguments like beliefs, resistance, self-devotion, democracy, international organizations, justice, ethics, individual rights and freedoms, and emancipation. In such debates, it is now the case that society and individual actors are evaluated as the states. Peace is no longer a longing but a reality.

Peter Wallensteen contributes to the Peace Studies by addressing the peaceful paths and mechanisms to be followed in interstate conflicts and civil wars. On the other hand, he focuses on defining peace conditions and addressing the functionality of international sanctions. According to him, the first stage of the conflict resolution is that the arms are no longer used between the parties; in other words, the process of ceasefire and demilitarization is initiated. Then, the fundamental issues of a peace agreement to be agreed on must be implemented and tested (Wallensteen, 2002: 50). Moreover, he states that international communities have a crucial role in conflict resolution in the post-Cold War period. He also divides international communities into United Nations-oriented communities and values-and-power-oriented communities. In his view, the partnership or co-operation of actions between these communities will help prevent, eliminate, or reduce violence in the world (Wallensteen, 2002: 263-264). Under the leadership of the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, he analyzes the data obtained from conflicts. With the concept of quality/quality peace, he emphasizes the peacebuilding process, including human rights violations, lack of democracy, and the need for transparency. He emphasizes the importance of peace agreements. For Wallensteen, international sanctions to be implemented by official decision-makers to change policies may also prevent armed conflicts (Wallensteen, 2011: 77).

Regarded as one of Kant's representatives in the contemporary era, Michael Doyle's understanding of liberalism in carrying out Peace Studies includes a perspective that provides for interventionist rather than mere peace-loving, enlarging effects, and some compelling measures. Doyle responds to liberal imperialism and aggression-oriented criticism with the ethical dimension of responsibility for protection and interventionism. He tries to explain how peace can be made technically possible again. In this context, he aims to prove how the departure from liberal values creates human tragedies. On the one hand, achieving liberal peace depends on the existence of three essential elements at the same time: (1) republican representation; (2) ideological commitments to fundamental rights and freedoms; (3) existence of transnational interdependence (Doyle, 2005: 463). Holsti, on the other hand, questions failed attempts to adapt the Western-style democratic model to failed states. He emphasizes the importance of being a strong state. He argues that the democratic model based on popular sovereignty should not be considered the sole source of legitimacy. Because he states that countries like Malaysia, Singapore, and Taiwan show that peace can be achieved even though they lack Western-style democracies (Holsti, 1996: 208-209).

Sharp focuses on nonviolence, where there is no need for violence in a dispute process. The main factor that constitutes the power of the other party in a social or political relationship is the co-operation with it. If this co-operation is withdrawn, the power of the other party will disappear. Therefore, there would be no chance of getting results from transactions with his actions. For him, this is the logic of civil disobedience (Sharp, 1990: 25-27). In addition to achieving the

desired ends without the use of force in disputes, Sharp also believes that nonviolence has ethical and strategic aspects. Ethical nonviolence is always superior to violence. It is for any reason unacceptable to punish a person physically or to take away her/his right to life. A person who is a sacred being with her/his personal and bodily integrity should be respected. From the strategic point of view, he argues that violence gives birth to destruction, and therefore no lasting peace can be achieved through violence (Sharp, 2011: 345-346). Nonviolence can be considered a peace paradigm where the problems faced for a more peaceful world should be solved through peaceful channels, and the social culture should make a positive development and be implemented.

Lederach explores the process of reconciliation between the conflicting parties, addressing obstacles in this path, and how to overcome them. He links this process to a long journey of faith. He notes that the first thing a peace practitioner should learn is determining how and through which processes hatred occurs in humans. Then, it is necessary to know that the perception of the other occurs very easily and that reconciliation means reconstructing the broken relations (Lederach, 1999: 42-64). Lederach considers the reconciliation effort within the framework of truth, compassion, justice, and peace. Evaluating the concept of conflict transformation comprehensively during the peacebuilding process, he provides practitioners with in-depth perspectives. Comprehending and defining problem-centered dynamics of conflict, he maintains that it is more important to ensure that this is evolved into the reconciliation phase. He argues that resolving conflict is not enough and that the reconciliation and the sustainability of the peace order would be incomplete without transforming the dynamics of the conflict in harmony with each other in terms of structure and process. He proposes a process and a structure of relations that would involve all layers of society to create a basis for reconciliation towards peacebuilding.

Considering the past and future of Peace Studies, Galtung and Webel (2007: 397) foresee that this field is becoming a new science of well-being, in which conflict analysis plays an essential role by going beyond examining relations between states with a more left-wing perspective. In other words, based on conflictology, this field of research is advocating peace as a value more important than national interests by transcending state borders. While state-centred “security and strategic” studies bring about global insecurity, the Peace Studies develop the approach of “security through peace” to serve all humanity (Galtung & Webel, 2007: 398). This requires the field of Peace Studies to challenge “the traditional notion of peace as harmonized national interests, brought about by negotiating ratifiable documents” and to bridge “the gap between peace movement moralism and foreign policy pragmatism” (Galtung & Webel, 2007: 399).

## **7. Conclusion**

Peace, which has an essential place to sustain human life in security, is one of the highly debated topics of our time. Peace among human communities in the past and present eras is one of the leading research questions of social sciences. Similarly, the problem of peace has occupied philosophers throughout the history of thought. Should we consider peace as a purely intellectual or empirical phenomenon, or seek to construct platonic structures by interpreting it as the antithesis of war, conflict, and violence? While the thoughts about peace were related to the thinkers’ primary philosophical orientations, it is not to be disregarded that their thoughts interacted with the dominant way of thinking and political structure of that time.

On the other hand, it is possible to say that the classical thinkers’ thoughts about peace transformed and evolved, resulted in the understanding of peace. For example, Rousseau’s emphasis on the republic regarding the understanding of peace based on the protection of the freedom of individuals significantly increased the quality of the conceptualization of peace.

Also, Grotius's understanding of international law based on natural law paved the way for discussing peace in the international arena.

Today, efforts to reach the concept of peace are not just about telling warring parties to sit down at the table or asking for a ceasefire, as in the past. Nevertheless, the important thing is that human beings can achieve peace at lower costs. (Ensaroğlu & Akyeşilmen, 2014: 459). There are many more ways to remind the parties of what issues they need to talk about, to guide them about how they can find a middle ground, and to enable them to take steps that will change the way they relate. The field of Peace Studies is the equivalent of this new understanding. Peace efforts are far-reaching efforts to prevent or mitigate violence arising from factions and interstate conflict and resolve disputes.

In this context, it should be emphasized that Peace Studies do not worry about being neutral, unlike classical thinkers. They instead have a different, value-based understanding of objectivity. These theorists try to engage in their values in the field with the idea that they are researching and defending "what should be" not just "what it is." This normative paradigm of Peace Studies is based on the idea that the way to understand the object of inquiry better is through the active participation of the researcher. Therefore, not only directly participating in the steps towards achieving permanent but also leading these attempts would mean researching the correct way by combining theory and practice.

In the past, in negotiations, one party was considered to be the winner and the other party as the loser. The main methods were traditional diplomatic (deterrence, coercive diplomacy, defense alliances), military (force-based, threat-based), and economic (such as withdrawal, arms control efforts). Negotiation meant balancing or changing interests. The main common interest during the Cold War was the prevention of nuclear war. In today's peace work, the situation is different. In contemporary Peace Studies, not only the prevention of war or the ceasefire, but a broader understanding of peace is fictionalized. Emphasis is placed on concepts such as social change, justice, and the reduction of structural violence, that is, positive peace. However, the fact that the balance of military and political power is overlooked between the parties during this process often leads to miscalculations between the parties, and even if a peace agreement is concluded, it does not come to life.

As a result, the Peace Studies have an intellectual basis for shifting the focus of international relations from an interstate level to a broad understanding of social relations, and "the focus on mobilization, reintegration and reconciliation processes involves issues of agency, choices, decision-making, subjective experiences and identity transformation that can have both negative and positive impacts both for conflict and peacebuilding" (Özerdem & Podder, 2015: 9). In terms of the importance of the social dimension in peacebuilding, the contribution of the rehabilitation process, for example, to the preservation of peace through the social reconciliation of the communities in the conflict zone during the transformation phase of the conflict cannot be ignored (Çınar, 2019). In this sense, Peace Studies investigate war and peace not only on a state or a system basis but also on a network of social phenomena encompassing individual responsibility, economic inequality, gender relations, intercultural relations, and many other issues. Therefore, real peace in the confines of Peace Studies is to be achieved not by the political leaders' actions, but by the societies experiencing a holistic transformation coming with a mentality revolution.

## References

- Angell, N. (1911). *The great illusion a study of the relation of military power in nations to their economic and social advantage*. New York and London: The Knicker Press.
- Arendt, H. (2005). *Kant'ın siyaset felsefesi üzerine dersler*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

- Arslan, H. K. (2018). Neden barış çalışmaları. In E. Büyükkıncı (Eds.), *Barış çalışmaları* (pp. ix-x). Ankara: Adres Yayınları.
- Baylis, J. (2008). Uluslararası ilişkilerde güvenlik kavramı. *Uluslararası ilişkiler*, 5(18), 69–85.
- Belloni, R. (2007). Rethinking “nation-building:” The contradictions of the neo-wilsonian approach to democracy promotion. *The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, 97–109.
- Boulding, K. E. (1978). *Stable peace*. University of Texas Press.
- Çınar, Y. (2019). *Çatışmayı dönüştürme safhasında rehabilitasyon süreci: Kuzey İrlanda örneği*. İstanbul: Bilgesam Yayınları.
- Deutsch, K. (1968). *The analysis of international relations*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Doyle, M. W. (2004). *Liberal internationalism: peace, war and democracy*. Accessed on 08 April 2020 from <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/themes/liberal-internationalism-peace-war-and-democracy>
- Doyle, M. W. (2005). Three pillars of liberal peace. *The American Political Science Review*, 99(3), 463–466.
- Ensaroğlu, Y., & Akyeşilmen, N. (2014). Sonuç yerine: Barış sürecinde yoldaki işaretler. In N. Akyeşilmen (Eds.), *Barışı konuşmak , teori ve pratikte çatışma yönetimi* (pp. 449–460). Ankara: ODTÜ Yayıncılık.
- Gaines, A. (2009). *Woodrow Wilson great American presidents series*. Infobase Publishing.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191.
- Galtung, J. (1976). Three approaches to peace: Peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding. In *Peace, war and defense: essays in peace research* (pp. 282–304). Copenhagen: Ejlers.
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27, 291–305.
- Galtung, J. (2004). Violence, war, and their impact: On visible and invisible effects of violence. *Forum for Intercultural Philosophy*, 5, 12–32. Accessed on 15 May 2020 from <https://them.polylog.org/5/fgj-en.htm>
- Galtung, J. (2010). Peace studies and conflict resolution: The need for transdisciplinarity. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 47(1), 20–32.
- Galtung, J., & Webel, C. (2007). Peace and conflict studies: looking back, looking forward. In *Handbook of peace and conflict studies* (p. 423). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Goldstein, J. S. (2001). *International relations*. New York: Longman Publishers.
- Grotius, H. (1967). *Savaş ve barış hukuku*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Hobbes, T. (2007). *Leviathan - Bir din ve dünya devletinin içeriği, biçimi ve kudreti*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Holsti, K. L. (1996). *The state, war, and the state of war*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Huffman, C. C. (2009). The role of identity in conflict. In D. J. D. Sandole (Ed.), *Handbook of conflict analysis and resolution* (pp. 19–31). London and New York: Routledge.

- Kant, I. (1968). *Zum ewigen frieden*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kelman, H. C. (1991). A behavioral science perspective on the study of war and peace. In *Perspectives on behavioral science: The Colorado lectures* (pp. 245–275). Westview Press.
- Lederach, J. P. (1999). *The journey toward reconciliation*. Scottsdale: PA: Herald Press.
- Locke, J. (2010). *Hükümet üstüne ikinci tez*. İzmir: İlya Yayınları.
- Mitrany, D. (1948). The functional approach to world organization. *International Affairs*, 24(3), 350–363.
- Özerdem, A. (2013). *Barış insası kuram ve uygulaması*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Özerdem, A., & Podder, S. (2015). *Youth in conflict and peacebuilding: Mobilization, reintegration and reconciliation*. Hampshire: Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Richmond, O. P. (2006). Patterns of peace. *Global Society*, 20(4), 367–394.
- Rousseau, J. J. (2004). *İnsanlar arasındaki eşitsizliğin kaynağı*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Rousseau, J. J. (2005). *Ekonomi politik*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Sandıklı, A., & Kaya, E. (2012). Uluslararası ilişkiler teorileri ve barış. In *Teoriler ışığında güvenlik, savaş, barış ve çatışma çözümleri* (pp. 133–164). İstanbul: Bilgesam Yayınları.
- Sharp, G. (1990). *Civilian-based defense: A post-military weapons system*. Princeton: NJ: Princeton University.
- Sharp, G. (2011). *Sharp's dictionary of power and struggle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steinberg, G. M. (2007). Postcolonial theory and the ideology of peace studies. *Israel Affairs*, 13(4), 786–796.
- Türkmen, F. (2018). Woodrow Wilson. In E. Büyükkakıncı (Eds.), *Barış çalışmaları* (pp. 63–85). Ankara: Adres Yayınları.
- Wallensteen, P. (2002). *Understanding conflict resolution: War, peace and the global system*. London: SAGE.
- Wallensteen, P. (2011). *Peace research: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Waltz, K. (1954). *Man, the state and war: A theoretical analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Zartman, W. (2000). Ripeness: The hurting stalemate and beyond. In *International conflict resolution after the Cold War* (pp. 225–250). National Academies Press.