

A Sociology for Peace Curriculum in International Relations?¹

Hazel M. McFerson

Introduction

The 20th century is ending, and has ushered in a period of world disorder, unprecedented in its scope and challenge to problem-solvers. Conflict now characterizes the world, and no region is spared. There are renewed waves of political and ethnic violence, genocide and ethnic cleansing in Rwanda, Kosovo and Somalia.

Ethnicity is reappearing in startling dimensions fueling conflict at all levels of societies. Ted Robert Gurr and Mary Harff identified twenty-three hot wars being fought around the world (Gurr and Harff 1994). All but five were ethnic conflicts. There were over 18 million refugees and 24 million internally displaced persons fleeing ethnic violence and state repression. Estimates predicted that the refugee numbers could rise to 100 million by the year 2000 (Montville 1997:170). Some 4 million people, almost entirely civilians, have died, 700,000 in 1992-1993 alone. Multi-national peace-keeping forces have emerged to protect citizens against violent repression by their own governments, and to keep warring nationals from killing each other. Death and destruction by indiscriminate uses of anti-personnel land mines daily add to the toll. At the end of the 1990s, the world seems fatigued

by all of the events of the past years. Such a world would benefit from the construction of a sociology of peace, a key goal of which is to transform conflict.

No region of the world is immune from turmoil, as recently demonstrated in a World Conflict List issued by the National Defense Council Foundation, which for 1997, counted 67 conflicts up from the total of 64 in 1996.² As of 1998, according to the *Human Rights Watch World Report*, identity issues of ethnicity and religion were instrumental in fueling conflict as illustrated in the following regional breakdown. In addition to the now universally known ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia, just consider the following partial list of conflicts, most with ethnic causes or religious overtones. Many predate the end of the Cold War, of course. However, it is not until the end of the political science discipline's preoccupation with superpower rivalries that these conflicts were recognized for what they are: not proxy battles by the superpowers, but ethnic and religious hostilities.

Much of this conflict is rooted in identity issues of ethnicity, language, and religion. The resulting civil or internal wars are becoming a central concern for students of international

relations. Although war has always been at the center of international relations, internal war has become by far the most common form of conflict. But until recently, internal conflicts received little scholarly attention. This will no longer do, for other contemporary trends have made internal conflicts the source of contagion and danger for international affairs. Sociology can help to illuminate the root causes as many are sociological in nature, although they do influence political variables such as power-sharing.³

- In North Africa, Algeria and Egypt are experiencing anti-government and anti-foreigner violence, mainly by the Armed Islamic Group (GIA), and other extremist groups.

Sub-Saharan Africa. The year 1997 saw a major political realignment of the African continent, with the sudden collapse of the dictatorship of Mobutu Sese Seko in Zaire before the troops of the Alliance of Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Congo-Zaire (ADFL), led by Laurent Kabila.⁴ As the 20th century ends, a series of rebellions and counter rebellions have emerged to challenge the new order promised by Kabila.

- Angola continues to experience an ideology-based civil war, which has strong ethnic dimensions. The United Nations brokered peace in 1991, yet the civil war resumed in 1993. As of this writing serious

human rights violations are being carried out primarily by the opposition Union for the Total Liberation of Angola (UNITA), against the government of the Movement for the Popular Liberation of Angola (MPLA).

- Burundi has, since its independence, experienced violent ethnic conflicts between the majority Hutu and the dominant minority Tutsi. These were accompanied by military coups (1976, 1987, 1995), Hutu massacres of Tutsis (1972, 1988), Tutsi massacres of Hutus (1997), presidential assassinations (1995), and the total disintegration of civil society in 1998.
- Ethiopia, has, since the overthrow of its brutal dictator Col. Mengistu Haile Mariam in 1991, experienced nationwide bombings by the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF). Further, it continues to suffer from ethnic unrest by a number of other Somalia-based groups, including the Ogaden National Liberation Front (ONLF), and the religious-based Islamic Front for the Liberation of Oromia and Al Ithad Al-Islami (Islamic Unity).
- Somalia, on the Horn of Africa, remains the epitome of a "failed" state. Following the overthrow of dictator Mohamed Siad Barre in 1991, the country has steadily deteriorated as clan conflicts emerged in the aftermath of war

with Ethiopia. As the 21st century dawns, there is no central government. Seeking protection in the absence of a state, the clan-based citizenry have returned to their home regions, as clan conflict continues unabated. Northern Somaliland, which declared its independence in 1991, has not been recognized by a single nation as of late 1998.

Sudan has experienced almost continuous civil war, since it gained independence in 1956. Although the country has nineteen major ethnic groups (and almost 600 subgroups), the major social divisions in the ethno-religious war are between the Muslim Arabs in the north and the largely Christian and animist Africans in the south.

Southeast Asia. War, work, and religion were three themes running through human rights development, along with the issue of government accountability, in the region during 1997. The list of ethnic conflicts includes:

Burma, which involves ethnic tension between the Burman majority and the smaller ethnic groups: the Shans, Karens, Kachins, Mons, Karennis and Chins. Political conflict is characterized by obdurate military rule with little regard for human rights. The pro-democracy leader, Aung San Suu Kyi, a 1991 Nobel Peace Prize

recipient, has been under house arrest since that time.

- **In Cambodia**, still reeling from the genocidal Khmer Rouge years, Cambodian hostility against all things Vietnamese underlines the current legacy of the 1975-79 rule of the late Pol Pot. Political instability is pitting Hun Sen of the Cambodian People's Party (CPP) against Norodom Ranariddh of the Front Uni National pour un Cambodge Independent, Neutre, Pacifique, at Cooperativ (FUN-CINPEC).
- **In Indonesia**, severe and brutal communal clashes have re-emerged, targeting economically-successful ethnic Chinese.
- **Sri Lanka** is beset by conflict between the Tamil LTTE, now in its 25th year.
- **Even in the Philippines**, kidnapping and violent acts, such as rape, disproportionately target the Chinese.

And, of course, the United States is hardly immune. Indeed, in many ways the remaining superpower continues to be one of the world's most violent countries. Racial violence and hate crimes are common with militant white groups bombing federal buildings, the car-dragging murder of a black man by white skinheads in Jasper, Texas, the beheading and burning of a black man

by a white man in Independence, Virginia, and an increase in violence against Asian-Americans.⁵

**The realist approach to conflict:
A bit of realpolitik**

A major revolution is underway today from the end of the Cold War, increased globalism, and the extra-ordinary advances in information technology. Yet, it is therefore necessary to reassess the validity of the realist approach which has dominated political science.⁶

For years, realists dismissed the moral and ethical considerations of conflict. Until international events intervened to prove them, political theorists viewed the world from the perspective first enunciated by Aristotle's observation that "We make war so that we may live in peace" (ca. 325 B.C.).⁷ Thucydides' [455-400 B.C.] analysis of the Peloponnesian War, and the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli [1532] and Thomas Hobbes [1651] continued in this tradition. It argued that force was the *ultima ratio*, might makes right. In anticipation of Darwinism [1808-1882], the *Melian Dialogue* [Thucydides] offered a view consistent with the survival of the fittest concept. In contemporary times, neo-realists, such as Kenneth Waltz, Henry Kissinger and others, along with game theorists, were concerned with finding solutions to world problems based on win-lose propositions. The human equation and normative concerns were

dismissed as utopian or idealistic, and, as such, were out of place in the real world. Perhaps this outlook was influenced by the fact that many of the realists, such as Hans J. Morgenthau and Kissinger were Germans, who sought asylum in the United States after coming face to face with evil. Undoubtedly, this guided their thinking and their realpolitik outlook. But, as a result, they under-estimated the durability of many of the human factors which have now re-appeared to propel groups into violent conflict, and to confound analysts.

The word realpolitik, which itself is of German origin, rejected moral concerns in favor of hard-nosed military responses to perceived and actual threats. Among the assumptions—now deemed faulty—was the view that ethnicity and nationalism, in particular, could be kept in check by a powerful state and the development of equally strong group loyalties to the nation. This would follow the evolution of robust civic cultures, and economics would take precedence over primordial interests of identity, religion, race, class, and gender. This also suggests a particular pessimism about human nature in the realist perspective. The scale of conflict, chaos and violence in the post-Cold War period, although gloomy, should not preclude the search for more positive premises and teaching methods to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

According to the often-quoted Francis Fukuyama, the "end of history" would witness not just the end of the Cold War, or the passing of a particular period of postwar history, but the end of history, as such; that is, the end of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of western liberal democracy as the final form of human government. (Fukuyama 1989). This has not happened. Rather, nations throughout the world are wrought with discord, and beleaguered citizens of failed states seem particularly mindful of history as they resume their fight to settle long-smoldering disputes. As a result, there is renewed attention among political scientists in the social sciences to issues of race, ethnicity, religion, class, and culture.⁹ It is against this background that the following proposal to develop a sociology of peace, and the centrality in that undertaking of nonviolent methods in conflict transformation and management, is offered.

The contribution of sociology to international conflict

Since the end of the Cold War, social scientists have struggled to determine the consequences for the new emerging world order. With its "opportunistic" nature, sociology can make a contribution. P.F. Lazarsfeld's description remains apt:

sociology has not developed around a positive subject matter but as a residual activity, filling in the blank spots in an intellec-

tual map. The metaphor is not an idle one because it highlights a feature characteristic of contemporary sociology. Empty spaces may be filled or bridge, and indeed the task of the sociologist is often viewed in two ways, both of which are properly applicable to his work. Some sociologists look at society as a whole, and in so doing, look for the interrelations between its major parts and institutions: the polity, the economy..., etc. Others are more interested in elements common to all these subsystems: choice behavior, be it of the voter or the consumer... [1970: 63]⁹

Political scientists were generally unprepared for the resurgence of ethnic conflict and internal wars. Perhaps sociologists might fare better, because they have at the core of their analysis people and the human relations which now feature so prominently in global politics and conflicts. Perhaps it can be hypothesized, therefore, that if sociologists (and anthropologists) assume a dominant role in helping establish early-warning systems about potentially violent conflicts, they might be prevented.

Why is sociology recommended for such a task? First, with its attention to human relationships, the discipline has an intuitive appeal. Second, sociology is an optimistic discipline, in contrast to realism, with its negative views of human nature. Third, sociologists are

engaged in the study of social change and the variables that affect and cause this change. Fourth, there is a normative aspect to the discipline, which explicitly rejects the notion that analysis can be value-free.¹⁰ Sociologists have long played key roles in informing people of real issues, in a way that compels people to make moral choices. A sociology of peace curriculum would specifically recognize the importance of trying to change minds and establish new ways of thinking about international relations, based on adherence to principles of nonviolence, and inculcating values which harness the positive aspects of human nature.

Finally, of all of the social sciences, sociology is the most oriented to help in the constructive transformation of conflict, and to guide the individual in a positive direction. This may sound utopian, but a sociology of peace should at least be given an opportunity to succeed or to fail. We've tried realism and negativism. Let us now try a more positive approach based on an optimistic assessment of human nature and the possibility of harnessing the human potential for good. Thus, a sociology of peace curriculum is not value-neutral, but purposely seeks to bring ethical issues into the analysis of situations. As Louis Coser noted, sociologists view themselves as change agents: The self-image of many a sociologist has changed from that of a self-conscious advocate of reform to that of a troubleshooter and expert in human relations.¹¹ It was precisely this

orientation that labeled sociology a "soft" science, out of touch with the real world. This thinking must be reversed, as the real world demonstrates its inability to handle real social problems.¹²

A. Some core concepts in a sociology of peace

Among the core concepts which would provide the intellectual foundation for a sociology of peace in international relations are the following:

In the 1950s and 1960s, conflict theorists such as Ralf Dahrendorf, and Lewis Coser gained influence in sociology.¹³ Conflict theory views social phenomena as the result of conflict between individuals or groups. The attention of the sociologist is on conflict at both the macro and the micro levels. This entails an analysis of the individual and the role of human nature, and of the social context. Concrete examples are widely available to facilitate a comparative analysis of different countries. For example, examining the list of conflict-ridden countries referenced earlier raises the question of why this happen in particular social systems.

The social system is another important concept. It is related to functional analysis which was influenced by anthropology, and has characterized

the work of political scientists Gabriel Almond, J. S. Coleman and others.¹⁴ What are the characteristics of particular social systems and sub-systems? What is the significance of latent and manifest functions for conflict?¹⁵ How do these interact and contribute either to establishing equilibrium or instability? What are the self-regulatory mechanisms? Social systems are characterized by a number of entities, and include the political, economic, religious and even nations and the family. Systems are complex and can be classified in terms of levels (higher to lower), depending on performance of certain functions.

The notion of systems function facilitates an analysis of performance, regardless of the structure of the social system. Social change and distribution of power occur in all societies, and individuals and groups covet power in most societies.¹⁶ Lewis Coser saw conflict in terms of its positive social functions (1956). Ralf Dahrendorf, in contrast, was critical of functionalism and concerned with how a society derives new goals from old conflicts (1958). He was more interested in emphasizing change, conflict and constraint, as a balance to the emphasis on equilibrium, harmony, and consensus in analyzing societies.¹⁷

The range of conflicts: social conflicts vary in terms of the issues being contested. Coser sees this in terms of a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources, in which the aims of...opponents are to neutralize, injure or eliminate their rivals (*ibid*). Two groups may compete for scarce status, power, or resources, but it only becomes a conflict situation, when there is explicit acknowledgment that what is being contested is scarce and is desired by both. This is also related to perceptions, which play an important role in conflict (Mitchell 1981). Perception is a process and a pattern of response to stimuli. It is a function of the situational field, of the total configuration of stimuli, as well as of previous social and cultural conditioning (Theodoroson *op. cit.*, p. 295).

Social conflict, social change, and social structures are central concepts in sociological theory. Coser is among those giving attention to the relationship among conflict, social change, and social structures. Conflict can be both a result of change, and a cause of change (*ibid*). With reference to the countries mentioned earlier, how many of the conflicts resulted from major social and political changes? What are the types of social and political changes? What is the impact on society? What are the many dimensions involved (subjective/objective)?

What types of values underlie the conflict? Is there a particular ideology propelling certain values to the center of the conflict? Can conflict ever be resolved with finality? Or is the best that can be hoped for a level of conflict management and transformation?¹⁸ An example of transformation would be the transition from violent conflict to nonviolent conflict; the latter is still a form of waging conflict, but instead of guns and bullets, voting, boycotts, picketing, marching, etc., would be utilized.

Social structures also influence patterns of group conflict and the levels of violence involved in social change. Coser suggests that conflict in a society differs according to whether the social structure/system is rigid (closed), or more open (flexible). This, too, has application for comparative analysis of conflict in different societies. The present author utilized this line of analysis in formulating the concept of racial traditions, in which the struggle for socioracial status among racial groups in plural societies determined levels of conflict and degrees of violence. Violence and conflict for socioracial status were more common in rigid racial traditions such as the United States and pre-Democratic South Africa. Conversely, flexible racial traditions, while not completely free of discrimination, foster a belief that socioracial mobility is possible under certain conditions (McFerson 1979a; 1979b).¹⁹

Unlike the realist school, the sociology of peace does not assume that states are the main actors, neither are they, necessarily, rational entities. The sociological perspective emphasizes the state as a political form of human association by which a society is organized under the agency of a government that claims legitimate sovereignty over a territorial area, authority over all of the members of the society, and the right to use physical force when necessary to insure the effective exercise of its legitimate control (Theodorson and Theodorson 1969:412). It was accepted that the primary function of the state was to protect its citizens from non-citizens. Today, in countries in conflict the world over, the state is often the aggressor in declaring war on its own citizens.

B. Political sociology in a sociology of peace curriculum

Many forms of conflict are highlighted in the concepts of political sociology. This sub-sector of sociology, emphasizes the social dimensions of power and politics, and is central in the sociology of peace curriculum. Political sociology is concerned with the social causes and consequences of power distribution within or between societies, and social groups, and with the social and political conflicts that result therein. Included in this perspective are the state, and legitimacy by which leadership and authority are analyzed. These, in turn, are

morally sanctioned by one of three sources, according to Max Weber: traditional, charismatic and the rational-legal. People obey leaders on one of these grounds.²⁰ Weber was a German sociologist, who was also concerned with conflict. Perceptions of legitimacy, or doubts that legitimacy exists in a social and political context, play a central role in much of the conflict that has erupted, as dissident groups challenge the moral authority of one ruler over another to make binding decisions over them. Perceptions of legitimacy also play a role in the theory of nonviolent political change. Much of the contemporary conflicts in Africa and in parts of Asia are rooted in crises of legitimacy.

Religion is also a concern of political sociology, inasmuch as it has implications for conflict, both as a cause and as a conflict management tool. Johann Galtung has created a typology of the peace potential of religions in terms of their inclination to condone or reject violence.²¹ He distinguishes between direct violence (intended by actors) and structural violence (built into social structures). To the extent that both condone or legitimize it, aspects of religions then become cultural violence. Among the factors associated with direct violence:

There seem to be two factors that would predispose for aggressive violence when built into the very nucleus of the system of religious faith. First, the idea of being a Chosen People, which could

instill in believers a high level of self-righteousness, which, in turn, may lead to the concepts of Holy War or at least Just War.[The other factor is aggressive missionaryism]

He identifies as examples of Chosen People the Jews and the Japanese.²² He conjectures: "...how about a possible re-interpretation of Choseness as being Chosen for peace, by peaceful means? Imagine 1.25 billion Christians and/or 1 billion Muslims interpreting their special relation to the Almighty that way!"

Political sociology utilizes all methods of sociological analysis, including ethnology, case-studies and social scenarios at various levels of state and society. Analysis of cultures are also important in political sociology in that they facilitate or decrease the likelihood of violent conflict in political change, as this author demonstrated in a recent analysis of the role of culture and conflict in Fiji and Somalia (McFerson 1996).²³ The study emphasized that:

Conflict levels and conflict management mechanisms are also influenced by ingrained cultural patterns, not only by race and ethnicity. ...the Somalia experience indicates that strife within an ethnic *family* can be every bit as intense and destructive as conflict between different ethnic groups. This is mainly because Somalia, although ethni-

cally and religiously homogeneous, is characterized by a culture of confrontation typical of pastoral societies. Fiji society, although segmented by different races, is distinguished by a culture of avoidance and accommodation (p. 18).

Cultures are also important in Marc Howard Ross's analysis of groups such as the Yanomani of Brazil and Venezuela, which, as he notes are particularly violent.²⁴ In addition, the Yanomani are particularly violent toward their women.

C. Some issues for a sociology of peace curriculum

1. Human Rights

With the demise of realism, values such as respect for human rights are being revisited, as further symbolized by the United Nations celebration in 1998 of the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. International human rights are consistent with the principle of universality, the fundamental premise being that they apply equally to all nations, cultures, and peoples without exception and are not culturally determined. Violations of human rights are a cause and effect of social and political conflicts. Many of the countries referenced in the above score-card are those whose governments have violated the human rights of their citizens.

The universality of human rights came under sustained attack in 1997 (Human Rights Watch 1998).²⁵ Many governments seeking to justify their authoritarian conduct found it convenient to challenge universality, usually in circumstances where repression precluded the rebuttal by the people in whose name they claimed to speak. This is also consistent with the selective behavior of the remaining superpower, the United States. Along with the former Soviet Union, they chose to ignore human rights when they proved inconvenient to economic or strategic interests. This also characterizes European countries, particularly in their failure to prevent and resolve conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Fortunately, as the powerful governments in Europe and the United States waver in their defense of human rights, a new set of governmental as well as non-governmental actors has emerged. The Ottawa Agreement [1996] secured a global ban on the production and sale of anti-personnel landmines. Further, the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. These developments apparently signal a new era in which non-governmental organizations, working closely with sympathetic governments from the developed and developing world, can raise social justice issues to a new level.²⁶

The creation of an International Criminal Court in 1998 is also a victory for non-governmental actors.

2. Religion

A recent study on conflict and religion in Mindanao, the Philippines is illustrative, particularly in the arena of challenging conventional wisdom about what many perceive as the hard perspective of Muslims toward Christians. In *Roots of Conflict*, Rosalita Tolibas-Nuñez [1997] examined the cultural differences between Muslims and Christians, and identified a real obstacle to lasting peace.²⁷ This is the negative perception which the various groups have of one another, particularly the Muslim image held by Christians in Mindanao.²⁸ Citing research undertaken by Rodolfo Bulatao on the attitudes of Chinese, Muslims, and Christian Filipinos, she writes:

The Muslim image that emerged from the semantic differential scales was almost negative through and through. Muslims led all groups in being perceived as bad, troublesome, hostile, stupid, poor, tradition-bound, and dirty. The social distance scales revealed the Chinese as the most undesirable as government officials, the Muslims second. Muslims led all groups in undesirability as boss, neighbor, and son-in-law; the Chinese were second (p. 37)

What was surprising to this writer is Tolibas-Nuñez's observation: [Muslims] looked more favorably upon Christians than

Christians looked upon them, whether as personal acquaintances or as associates at work (p. 84). She concludes ... if conflict begins in the minds of men, that is where solutions should first be aimed. The biases and prejudices between Mindanao's Muslims and Christians can be reduced by developing a better understanding and appreciation of the culture of the Muslims through education and sustained personal interaction. (p. 89).

3. Gender

Gender is now receiving unprecedented attention in social and political analyses of violence and conflict at both domestic and international levels.²⁹ Sociologists were among the first to recognize the importance of gender in social analysis. The pioneering work of Ann Oakley introduced the term to sociology.³⁰ She distinguished between sex and gender. The former she defined as referring to the biological division into male and female; the latter refers to the parallel and socially unequal division into femininity and masculinity. Gender highlights the socially constructed aspects of differences between women and men (Marshall *op. cit.*, p. 197). In the 1970s, sociology was paramount in demonstrating that gender exists, and that there are cross-cultural variations shaping the roles of men and women. This highlighted the role of socialization in cultures and

in child-rearing. Sociological gender analysis also applied to the structural level (e.g. the labor market and in international development).

Gender, however, was ignored by the realists. In many ways, realism was masculine in orientation, as suggested by the tone of the key concepts of analysis. These include terms such as force and endemic struggle. Even the terms of reference highlighted the contributions of men: Thucydides (455-400 B.C.) Peloponnesian War and the *Melian Dialogue* evoked a male view, particularly the emphasis on power to the exclusion of justice. In an often-quoted observation, he noted that "... into the discussion of human affairs the question of justice only enters where there is equal power to enforce it...", and that "... the powerful exact what they can, and the weak grant what they must." The term "war" itself is a primary patriarchal concept, which, according to one source, was almost absent from the matriarchal societies of the Neolithic and early Bronze Ages. Cooperation rather than exploitation was the matriarchal rule (Walker 1996: 1058).³¹

Centuries later, the Italian statesman, Niccolo Machiavelli wrote of war: "There is simply no comparison between a man who is unarmed and one who is not. It is unreasonable to expect that an armed man should obey one who is not or that an unarmed man should remain safe and secure when his servants are armed" (*The Prince* 1532).³² In a blatantly

sexist passage, Machiavelli wrote in a discussion of fortune that:

...fortune is a woman and if she is to be submissive it is necessary to beat and coerce her. Experience shows that she is more often subdued by men who do this than by those who act coldly. Always, being a woman, she favors young men, because they are less circumspect and more ardent, and because they command her with greater audacity (Chapter 25, p. 133).

How would gender be handled in a sociology of peace curriculum? First, the concept would examine the roles of socialization and learned behavior based on a comparative cross-cultural analysis of child-rearing in selected societies, such as those referenced above. African societies, for example, with their numerous sub-cultural groupings provide a rich bases for subsequent comparison with Asian societies. Is there a culturally influenced gender orientation propelling African males to act as they do in choosing to settle conflict through violence? This would entail an examination of selected sub-cultures from among the many groups. Why have certain groups, such as the Twa of Central Africa, not been particularly combative? How do they compare with other groups, such as the various Somali clans? How do each compare with selected Asian cultures and sub-groups?

These issues would also introduce into the debate the "nature versus nurture" question, which suggests an innate male tendency of aggression and violence, and, conversely, that women are, by nature, more peaceful. Second, this type of approach would also facilitate an analysis of the role of gender in a cross-cultural western/non-western context. Are men always dominant in war in all societies? Are there, in real life, the counterparts of the mythical Amazons?³³

4. Women and the feminization of peace

The emerging attention on the role of women in conflict, management and transformation is long overdue. Even today, civilians and women are essential participants in the new peacekeeping. Yet so far they have left the field mostly to the military and to male officials (Stiehm 1997).³⁴ Historically, however, women have been stalwart activists for peace all over the world. This was immortalized by Aristophanes, the Greek comedy dramatist, in *Lysistrata*, a plea for pacifism. The history of the organized women's peace movement can be traced back to the 1820s and 1830s, when American and European women joined forces in women's peace societies.³⁵ Women actively participated in various international peace organizations and meetings. In the mid-nineteenth century, and in 1852 the first international women's magazine, *Sisterly Voices* was published by women's

peace groups, the Olive Leaf Circles, in the United States and England (Karl 1995:25). The inspiration for the Nobel Peace Prize, and the first recipient in 1905, was a woman, Bertha von Suttner of Austria, an anti-war activist (*ibid*).³⁶

Francis Fukuyama writes in a recent article in *Foreign Affairs* that to some degree, biology is destiny (Sept/Oct. 1998:24-40). In his view a truly matriarchal world would be less prone to conflict and more cooperative than the one we now inhabit. He observes that while some gender roles are socially constructed, virtually all reputable evolutionary biologists today think there are profound differences between the sexes that are genetically rather than culturally rooted, and these differences extend beyond the body into the realm of the mind. World politics have seen women make tremendous strides in voting and in political participation in both developed and developing countries. He cites data supporting the view that American women are less willing to use military force than are men, and concludes:

It is unnecessary to know the reason for the correlation between gender and anti-militarism, however, to predict that increasing female political participation will probably make the United States and other democracies less inclined to use power around the world as freely as they have in the past.

5. Women and a culture of peace

In 1990, the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women (UNCSW) announced a program of Education for Peace. This has evolved into a comprehensive program to create a culture of peace in the post-Cold War world. The issue of peace has been one of the main concerns of the United Nations and International Women's Year in 1975. Three themes of the United Nations Decade for Women are inextricably linked, and has provided the basic mandate for the CSW with regard to peace, equality and development. What role would women play in creating a culture of peace? How would this blueprint be incorporated into a sociology of peace curriculum in international relations?

Women's roles in key areas would provide the foundation for their participation in creating a culture of peace: the family, including early child development, formal education, and increased participation in decision-making in bodies concerned with international peace, conflict and disarmament.³⁷ At the end of the cold war, some countries reduced their interest in women and peace because they felt it was no longer politically valid. Others have begun to pay more attention to gender analyses at all levels of international relations and global politics. This has focused attention on feminist peace scholars, and their gender specific theoretical approaches.³⁸ More attention is also being given to the issue

of war-related violence against women and the realization that in certain armed conflicts women are subjected to rape and forced prostitution as a weapon to humiliate adversaries.

The specific focus on women and education for peace raises the question of how the existing culture of violence can be changed into a culture of peace and how women can be involved in the process. Arising from this concern are the following questions which would be incorporated into the research agenda of the curriculum.

1. What are the main differences between women's and men's attitudes to peace, security, peace-keeping, peacemaking and conflict resolution which, if taken advantage of, might help to create a more peaceful international environment, and what further research is needed?
2. What policy measures should be undertaken to ensure the integration of women's perspectives into all mainstream national and international peace and security activities?
3. What women's initiatives for peace and conflict management can be identified across cultures?
4. What is the relationship between democratization, the status of women in a society and the peaceful management of conflict? To

what extent are women being involved in democracy-building initiatives in societies in conflict?

5. What public policy initiatives are necessary to transform existing cultures of violence into cultures of peace across societies?
6. What kinds of international public policy initiatives can help to de-legitimize violence, particularly against women and in general?

These questions have implications for public policy at the highest national and international levels, and calls for international organizations to assist governments and inter-governmental organizations in preparing gender-sensitive codes of conduct through policy-oriented research. Sociological research would provide answers.

6. Women, children and global violence

As noted, increasing international attention is being directed to women and children in violent conflict situations globally. This was recently addressed in a compelling statement of support for the creation of an International Criminal Court. The statement underscores the importance now given to moral and ethical issues in international relations. The signatories were Carol Bellamy, Executive Director of UNICEF; Sadako Ogata, UN High Commissioner for Refugees; Olara

Otunnu, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict; Mary Robinson, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and Sergio Fieira de Mello the UN Emergency Relief Coordinator. Their views are also an important expression of the new mood in international organizations, which seem less willing to subordinate welfare issues and the plight of brutalized people to national security and state sovereignty. Even the creation of the office for Children and Armed Conflict is an unprecedented humanitarian development.

Citing the current crisis in the West African nation of Sierra Leone, which the statement characterized as a brutal reminder of the urgent need for an effective international court to provide justice for the appalling violations of human rights, it noted that the perpetrators of atrocities worldwide fail to heed appeals from the international community.³⁹ As a result, there is a need for a standing international criminal court which is empowered and resourced to take action when national systems are either unable or unwilling to punish perpetrators of violence. The statement concludes that the International Criminal Court would be the first effective weapon against the culture of impunity which has fuelled cycles of violence in every part of the world over the past decades. Clearly, this cycle was abetted by realism, the cold war and the unlimited access to weapons of destruction.

A sociology of peace studies curriculum

What would the actual curriculum of a sociology of peace in international relations look like? First, it would be interdisciplinary and would draw from the traditional disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences—sociology and allied disciplines, such as anthropology, history, political science, and psychology. Second, the emphasis would be on issues related to human rather than national security, such as social justice, poverty alleviation, and nonviolent methods of social and political change.⁴⁰ Third, a deliberate attempt would be made to avoid replicating peace and world security studies which, in fact, continue to focus on issues such as war, the arms race, chemical warfare issues, militarism, nuclear proliferation and related issues. In the process of transformation to a culture of peace, security has to be understood in the context of the human potential. These issues are at the core of transforming conflict and creating a culture of peace.

Peace and conflict studies with implications for international relations, international and global studies are emerging fields in the post-cold war period. Already, in the United States, there are over three hundred academic programs concerned with issues of peaceful conflict resolution on all levels, ranging from the interpersonal to the global.⁴¹

The assumption of the strategic nonviolent approach is that conflict is present, but that it is transformed from violent to nonviolent methods of struggle. Conflict is viewed as a process, which requires a thorough understanding of its many dimensions, causes and manifestations before it can be managed or transformed.⁴² Non-violent social movements through which conflict is waged, are highlighted in the work of sociologists such as David F. Aberle (1966) and Neil Smelser (1963), Oberschall (1973), and Lauer (1976).⁴³

A sociology of peace curriculum is value-specific in that it aims to foster values and attitudes which uphold justice and tolerance for all nations and peoples, through the application of nonviolent strategies for social and political change. Transforming existing values of violence and militarism requires a fundamental change in the way people are socialized, beginning at an early age. This entails undertaking activities in values education and transformation at many levels. One of the most important activity is to analyze how violence is conveyed and reinforced through, for example, children's fairy tales, stories and cartoons. The emphasis on children is important; they should be introduced at an early age to nonviolent methods of conflict management and mediation. Such is currently being done in the Montgomery County Maryland School system, starting at the elementary level through

high school. Children are engaged as peer-mediators, among other activities. Many of today's adults probably remember with dread, just how difficult childhood can be, for example, at the hands of school yard bullies. Unlike in years past, however, the school bully is likely to be armed with an assault weapon, and this has introduced a new drill into American schools; alongside fire drills there are now drills on procedures to follow in the event of assault weapons attacks by classmates. The significance of childhood in American culture is becoming a focal point for scholars engaged in research on the meaning of children in culture.⁴⁴ Finally, a new organization called Civitas emerged in 1994. With support from the U.S. government, the European Union and the Council of Europe, Civitas is set to foster civic education throughout the world. It subscribes to the concept that civic education is the foundation of a strong civil society, and as such, is the only effective inoculation against the virus of ethnic hatred and bigotry.

As change agents, sociologists can play a leading role in educating students about the practical and applied implications of weak civil societies and ethnic hatred. Sociology is dynamic and constantly changing. The concept of civil society is defined as the set of intermediate associations which are neither the state nor the extended family; civil society therefore includes voluntary associations and firms and other corporate bodies (McLean 1996).⁴⁵

A. Nonviolence in a sociology of peace curriculum

A key component of a sociology of peace curriculum would consist of examining alternative methods to violence in social transformation and structural change. This would entail studying the principles of strategic nonviolent action, as influenced by M. H. Gandhi, Gene Sharp and others. Thus, a key assumption of the curriculum would be that nonviolent social and political change is a desirable and feasible goal.

The interest in nonviolence in America was given renewed emphasis by the events of the 1960s, including the Vietnam War, and the rash of political and racial violence which saw the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., President John F. Kennedy, and Presidential candidate Robert Kennedy, among others. My own political and social values were shaped during this period, when I was actively involved in social issues in my hometown of Boston, Massachusetts, where racial discrimination was being peacefully challenged. I marched with Dr. King in Boston and at the 1963 March on Washington. I was an activist in the nonviolent protest movements against the war "on" Vietnam. My own experience validates the importance of nonviolence as an alternative to violence, provided that one is truly committed and has a deep understanding of the nature of methods and techniques of nonviolent struggle for political change. It takes a lot more

courage to turn the other cheek, than is generally recognized.

Political and social change through nonviolent action is not pacifism, nor is it based on cowardice, or religious principles. Rather, Gene Sharp has written:

Nonviolent action is a means of wielding social and political power, even though it does not involve its practitioners in the use of violence (Sharp 1973: 451).

The writings of this author would provide the core of this key section of the curriculum.

Among the recommended readings on nonviolence:

Gene Sharp. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (1973), 3 volumes, which are classics in the field, and in which he emphasizes that in a conflict situation:

... the opponent is usually well equipped to apply military and other violent means of combat and repression, as well as to fight violent and military means of struggle. Instead of meeting him directly on that level, where he is strong, nonviolent activists rely on a totally different technique of struggle, or weapons systems, which is designed to operate to their advantage. The

combatants are fighting but they are using very different types of weapons (p. 452).

Additional readings would include:

Gene Sharp. *Social Power and Political Freedom*. Boston: Porter Sargent, 1980.

R.K. Prabhu and R.R. Rao, eds. *The Mind of the Mahatma*, 2nd ed. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing, 1967.

Louis Fischer, ed. *The Essential Gandhi*. New York: Vintage/Random House, 1962.

Martin Luther King, Jr. *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

_____. *Why We Can't Wait*. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

_____. "I Have A Dream." *March on Washington*, August 28, 1963, Washington, D.C.

Peter Ackermann and Christopher Kruegler. *Strategic Nonviolent Conflict: The Dynamics of People Power in the Twentieth Century*.

Neil H. Katz. "Conflict Resolution and Peace Studies." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 504 (July 1989), 14-21.

Henry David Thoreau. "On the Duty of Civil Disobedience," excerpt from *Walden and On the Duty of Civil Disobedience*. New York: Signet, New American Library 1960.

B. Conflict and human nature

Students would be required to write a short essay in which they would describe a particular instance of conflict. They would indicate how they would transform or settle the conflict, indicating the means they would use, and explaining why. The exercise could be based on personal experience, history, or current events, and could range from personal, family to global conflicts.

Readings on the following topics would familiarize students with the sociological and psychological perspectives of classical political theorist, including:

Thucydides. *The Melian Dialogue*, which developed in the context of the Peloponnesian War.

Niccolo Machiavelli. *The Prince*.

Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*.

Emile Durkheim, *Suicide*, 1897.

To introduce theories of social structure and conflict and to facilitate a comparison, the curriculum would examine the views of nineteenth

century sociologists including excerpts from:

Max Weber. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (1946).

Louis Coser. *The Functions of Social Conflict* (1956).

Ralf Dahrendorf. *The Modern Social Conflict* (1988).

Hazel M. McFerson. "Racial Tradition and Comparative Political Analysis: Notes Toward a Theoretical Tradition" (1979), analyzes the role of social structures and racial traditions, (either rigid or flexible), in contributing to conflict in multiethnic plural societies.

C. Culture and conflict

Because culture is important in socialization into a peaceful or a violent orientation, the following readings would be included in the curriculum:

Marc Howard Ross. *Cultures of Conflict* (1993). Ross argues that the culture of conflict refers to culturally specific norms, practices, and institutions associated with conflict in a society. Culture defines what people value and what they are likely to enter into disputes about, suggests appropriate ways to behave in particular

kinds of disputes, and shapes institutions in which disputes are processed. Culture affects conflict behavior, and conflict can also be understood as cultural behavior.

Donald L. Horowitz. *Ethnic Group Conflict* (1985). University of California. This is an encyclopedic compendium of ethnic conflicts discussed in terms of their causes, attempts at transformation, resolution, or accommodation in divided societies in Asia, Africa and the Caribbean.

Hazel M. McFerson. "Rethinking Ethnic Conflict," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 40, No. 1, September 1996, examines the role of culture in influencing group dispositions toward violence or accommodation in ethnic conflict in Fiji and Somalia.

Hazel M. McFerson. "Ethnicity, Conflict and Unstable Equilibrium in Fiji: The Roots of the 1987 Coups," Routledge Dennis, ed., *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations*, JAI Press, Vol. 7, 1994, traces the inherent roots of conflict between Fiji Indians and ethnic Fijians in Fiji to British colonial policies. Examines the breakdown of unstable equilibrium which resulted in two military coups.

D. A research agenda

The curriculum would also include a research agenda to develop case studies and theories based on comparative research of societies in conflict.

Among the suggested research questions are:

1. How and why did the conflict evolve?
2. What is the role of history in the development of the conflict? Culture? Gender? Ethnicity/Race? Class? Religion?
3. Why did the conflict escalate? At which point could it have been ended, accommodated, transformed, resolved? Were there brakes to further escalation? Were they operative?
4. Why did the participants resort to violence?
5. Were there alternatives to using violence?
6. What is civilian-based defense? What are the problems and possibilities? Where has it been tried? Where has it succeeded?

Readings would include:

Ronald M. McCarthy and Christopher Kruegler. *Toward Research and Theory Building in the Study of Nonviolent Action*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Albert Einstein Institution, 1993.

Ronald J. Fisher. "Generic Principles for Resolving Intergroup Conflict." *Journal of Social Issues* 50, no. 1 (1994); 47-66.

Christopher Mitchell and Michael Banks, *Handbook of Conflict Resolution: The Analytical Problem-Solving Approach*, New York: Pinter, 1996.

Dean G. Pruitt and Peter J. Carnevale. *Negotiation in Social Conflict*. Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole, 1993.

Jeffrey Z. Rubin. "Models of Conflict Management." *Journal of Social Issues* 50, no. 1, (1994); 33-46.

Gene Sharp with Bruce Jenkins, *Civilian-Based Defense: A Post-Military Weapons System*.

Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Ashley J. Tellis, Thomas S. Szayna, James A. Winnefeld. *Anticipating Ethnic Conflict*. Santa Monica, California: Rand, 1997.

These are only some among the possible building blocks of a sociology of peace curriculum. Understandably some may turn out to be peripheral, and other important contributions may have been appropriately included and others may have been missed. I claim no certainty on this score. I do claim, however, that the potential relevance of good sociology will be much greater in the 21st century than since the end of WWII, provided that it addresses the real issues of concern and does so in an intelligible, specific, communicative way. A social science, the French economist Frederic Bastiat argued over 100 years ago, has the singular responsibility of communicating effectively to society. One might add from a more contemporary perspective: and to help evolve strategies for the peaceful management and transformation of conflict.

Notes

¹An earlier version of this article was presented at a lecture-symposium (Re) Imagining Sociology in the 1990s and Beyond: Trends and Prospects for the Discipline in the Coming Millennium,

University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City August 18, 1998.

²See: <http://www.ndcf.org/97List.html>

³For a discussion of small wars, as international wars are sometimes classified, see Steven R. David, "Internal War: Causes and Cures," *World Politics* 49, (July 1997), 552-76; William J. Olson, special ed., "Small Wars," September 1995, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*; Chester A. Crocker and Fen Olser Hampson with Pamela Aall, *Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict*, Washington: United States Institute of Peace, 1996.

⁴The installation of Kabila as Head of State of the renamed Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) brought to international attention a political trend underway since the late 1980s. Kabila joined President Museveni of Uganda and the rulers of Rwanda, Ethiopia and Eritrea as the newest representatives of a new generation of African leaders.

⁵James Byrd, Jr., was beaten and fatally dragged behind a pickup truck driven by three white supremacists in July, 1997; Garnett Paul Johnson, Jr., was doused with gasoline, burned alive and then his charred body was beheaded in Elk Creek, Virginia in June of that year. Hate crimes perpetrated against Asians by both blacks and whites are on the rise, and increased 17 percent in 1997 over 1996, according to a new report by the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium.

⁶The Industrial Revolution broke up an old order and increased the wealth-

creating capacity of modern societies compared with traditional systems. The consequences were far-reaching, and attracted the attention of sociologists interested in social change, and this focus continues to characterize sociology. Auguste Comte [1798-1857], offered a theory of social dynamics, which proposed that societies progressed through a series of predictable stages. Herbert Spencer [1820-1908], offered an evolutionary theory of change, based on population growth and structural differentiation. Karl Marx [1818-1883] contended that the most significant social changes were revolutionary in nature, and were brought about by the struggle for supremacy between classes. Contemporary sociologists have continued this line of analysis. Neil J. Smelser [1963] conceptualized social change as a value-added course in which a number of conditions or stages are sequentially combined, producing a particular social change (1963).

⁷Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*, 325 B.C.

⁸Among the recent titles which indicate that international relations theorists, too, are now cognizant of the virulence of ethnicity, religion and nationalism, are: Michael E. Brown, ed. *Ethnic Conflict and International Security*. Princeton University Press, 1993; Raymond C. Taras and Rajat Ganguly. *Understanding Ethnic Conflict: The International Dimension*. New York: Longman, 1998; Ashley J. Tellis, Thomas S. Szayna, James A.

Winnefeld. *Anticipating Ethnic Conflict*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand/Arroyo Center, 1997.

⁹P.F. Lazarsfeld. Sociology, in *Main Trends of Research in the Social and Human Sciences*. Part I. Mouton/UNESCO 1970.

¹⁰ See Richard Falk, *On Humane Governance*, University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995, 304 pp.

¹¹ Cf. P.F. Lazarsfeld, *Main Trends of Research in the Social and Human Sciences*, Part One: Social Sciences. Mouton/UNESCO 1970, p. 108.

¹² Sociology made its mark as a people-oriented, problem-solving discipline during the late 1800s, when industrialization, the rapid growth of cities and the arrival of waves of European immigrants made the need for sociological information especially urgent. As a result, sociology became part of the university curriculum in the United States, and thousands of sociologists were trained at a time when European countries had only a few. The same need is present today.

¹³ Cf. Lewis A. Coser, *The Functions of Social Conflict*. Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1956 and; Ralf Dahrendorf, *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*, London: Routledge & Keagan Paul, 1961.

¹⁴ A.R. Radcliffe Brown, *Structure and Function in Primitive Society* (1952,

reissued 1965, reprinted 1968), a British social anthropologist, gave the concept of social structure a central role in his work, and connected it to the concept of function. Structural functionalism was developed further by Talcott Parsons, *The Social System* (1951, reprinted 1964), Anthony Giddens, *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis* (1979, reprinted 1983), and Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure: Toward the Codification of Theory and Research*, new ed. (1968), to name a few.

¹⁵ Manifest functions are recognized, intended results of human activities. Latent functions are unrecognized and unintended results. See Merton, *op.cit.*

¹⁶ An exception appears to be among the Twa in Central Africa. See Colin Turnbull, *The Forest People*. New York: Doubleday, Anchor, 1961.

¹⁷ Cf. Louis A. Coser, *The Function of Social Conflict* (1956; repr. 1964); Ralf Dahrendorf *American Journal of Sociology*, September 1958.

¹⁸ For a discussion of the concept and models of conflict management, see Marc Howard Ross, *The Management of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

¹⁹ Hazel M. McFerson, "Racial Tradition And Comparative Political

Analysis," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 2 No 4, October 1979, pp. 477-497, and "Plural Society in the U.S. Virgin Islands," *Journal of Plural Societies*, Vol. 10 no. 1, Spring 1979, pp. 59-78

²⁰R. Bendix, Max Weber, Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1960.

²¹Johann Galtung, *Religions, Hard and Soft. CrossCurrents*: <http://www.aril.org/galtung.htm>

²²Cf. Johann Galtung, "Cultural Violence," Chapter 4, *Peace By Peaceful Means*, London: Sage 1995.

²³Hazel M. McFerson. "Rethinking Ethnic Conflict," *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 40, No. 1, September 1996, 18-32.

²⁴Marc Howard Ross, *The Culture of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993, and *The Management of Conflict: Interpretations and Interests in Comparative Perspective*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

²⁵*Human Rights Watch World Report 1998*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

²⁶The United States declined to sign the declaration. Thomas McNamara, head of the U.S. delegation to the conference, said that the country is committed to a ban but would continue to use the weapons. He noted that a call

by the International Campaign to Ban Land Mines to stop using the devices by the year 2000 was unrealistic. An estimated 110 million mines are buried in more than 60 countries. Nations with the worst problems include Cambodia, Angola, Afghanistan, Mozambique, Iraq, Kuwait, Sudan, Somalia and Bosnia.

²⁷Rosalita Tolibas-Nuñez. *Roots of Conflict: Muslims, Christians, and the Mindanao Struggle*. Makati City, Philippines, Asian Institute of Management, 1997.

²⁸Cf. Bulatao, *Ethnic Attitudes in Five Philippine Cities*. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council, 1973, mimeographed, pp. 1-80.

²⁹Cf. Charlotte Bunch and Roxanna Carillo, "Global Violence against Women: The Challenge to Human Rights and Development," in Michael T. Klare and Yogesh Chandrani. *World Security: Challenges for a New Century*. New York: St. Martin's 3rd ed., 1998.

³⁰Cf. Ann Oakley, *The Sociology of Housework*. Martin Robertson & Company, 1974; *Sex, Gender and Society*, Maurice Temple Smith, 1972.

³¹Barbara G. Walker, *The Women's Encyclopedia of Myths and Secrets*. Edison, New Jersey: Castle Books, 1996, pp. 1058.

³²Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 1532. Translated with an introduction

by George Bull. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1961, repr. 1975, p.

³³"Amazons" is the Greek name for goddess-worshipping tribes in North Africa, Anatolia, and the Black Sea area. Scholars now say the word Amazon meant *moon-woman*. Gaius Tranquillus Seutonius, Roman biographer and historian, ca. 70-122 A.D. wrote: *Amazons once ruled over a large part of Asia*. As late as the 5th century A.D., the Black Sea was still known as the Amazon Sea. Libya, which used to mean all of North Africa except Egypt, was also Amazonian. Herodotus, a Greek historian of the 5th century B.C., spoke of Libyan Amazons. Diodorus, first century Greek historian, called them *the warlike women of Libya*. To this day, north African Berbers call themselves Amazigh. Cf. Walker, op. cit., pp. 24-28.

³⁴Cf. Judith Hicks Stiehm, "Peacekeeping and Peace Research: Men's and Women's Work," *Women and Politics*, Vol. 17 No 1, 1997, pp. 27-51.

³⁵*Women and Empowerment: Participation and Decision Making*. Prepared by Marilee Karl. London: Zed Books, 1995.

³⁶Other Women Nobel Peace Prize Laureates are the following:

+1931 Jane Addams (1860-1935). Social worker and international women's peace activist.

+1946 Emily Green Balch (1867-1961). International women's peace activist.

+1977 Mairead Corrigan and Betty Williams. Co-founders of the Community of Peace People in Northern Ireland.

+1979 Mother Theresa (1910-1997). Founder of a women's religious order devoted to relief work.

+1982 Alva Myrdal. Researcher and activist on disarmament.

+1991 Aung San Suu Kyi. Political leader of the non-violent struggle for democracy in Burma.

+1992 Rigoberta Menchu Tum. Indigenous peoples leader and social justice worker in Guatemala.

³⁷United Nations Economic and Social Council, *Monitoring the Implementation of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women/Education for Peace* January 30, 1996. Among the women who have reached high levels in international decision-making are Mary Robinson, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Sadako Ogata; and American Secretary of State Madeline Albright.

³⁸Feminist writers such as Betty Reardon have written that the usual definition of peace *is the absence of violence* (1985). She suggests a concept of positive peace, which implies both the cessation of violence

and the establishment of a secure society in which there is protection from future attack and an environment in which the basic needs of all members of society can be met. That is: *A society in which there is social justice, economic equity and ecological balance*. Other more radical feminist writers, such as Brock-Utne (1989) claim that liberation from patriarchy is essential in making real peace in a divided society. These views, notes Valerie Morgan, are *helpful to establish a wider definition of the areas to seek evidence of women's role in peace-making*. See Valerie Morgan, *Peacemakers? Peacekeepers? - Women in Northern Ireland, 1969-1975*, Incore, Londonderry 1996. <http://www.incore.ulst.ac.uk>

³⁹HR/98/40 June 17, 1998. <http://www.unhcr.ch/hurricane.ns>

The level of violence in Sierra Leone is such that, since April 1998, 500 people have been admitted to hospitals after brutal rebel attacks. Most victims receiving treatment are men, aged eight to 60, but there are also female victims. The preferred method of brutality is to amputate limbs and the youngest amputee is a six year old girl whose arm was severed. Other victims report babies being taken from their mother's arms, doused with petrol and set alight. There are numerous reports of rape, including the multiple rape of a 12 year old girl, and lacerations on the head of a 60 year old woman, according to doctors, was the result from a failed attempt to behead her.

⁴⁰This would be in contrast to peace studies along the following lines: [P]eace studies analyze the causes of war, violence, and systemic oppression, and explores the processes by which conflict and change can be managed so as to maximize justice while minimizing violence. Dan Thomas, *Careers and Graduate Education in Peace Studies*. Amherst, Mass.: Five College Program in Peace and World Security Studies, 1987, p. 407.

⁴¹At my home university, George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR), is a free-standing entity which offers a program of study leading to the Ph.D. and the M.S. in conflict studies. The program is interdisciplinary and reflects the institute's mission to advance the understanding and resolution of significant and persistent social conflicts, through developing the processes leading to the peaceful resolution or transformation locally, nationally and internationally.

Another institution with which I am also affiliated, is the Albert Einstein Institute (AEI) for the study of strategic nonviolent political change, Cambridge, Massachusetts. The mission of AEI is to *expand the understanding and use of nonviolent [actions] to advance group interests in conflicts worldwide* (McCarthy and Kruegler, 1993). The Institute sponsors research on the uses of nonviolence through its Fellows Program, which funds

academic research on a variety of issues. The Institute also funds an outreach program to train participants in nonviolent strategies for political and social change through its Burma project, among others.

⁴²Social movements and nonviolence as a strategy of waging conflict have several things in common. First, social movements, in common with nonviolence as a tactic, are purposeful and organized, whereas collective behavior is random and chaotic. Examples of social movements include civil rights and other movements, which are based on principled nonviolent action. Second, social movements have specific goals, formal organization, and a degree of continuity. They operate outside regular political channels of society, but may penetrate deeply into political power circles. Finally, social movements are classified in terms of: the locus of change sought (society and power relations), and the amount of change sought (partial or total). In common with non-violent political change, social movements are often aimed at the complete restructuring of society, or reforming some aspect of the social order.

⁴³Cf. David F. Aberle, *The Peyote Religion Among the Navaho* (1966), classifies social movements along two dimensions: the locus of change sought, and the amount of change sought. He identifies four categories: transformative, reformatory, redemptive, and alternative. Neil Smelser, *Theory of Collective Behavior* (1963), identified

five sequential determinants of development. These are: the structural strain (a sense of injustice or malaise); the growth and spread of a generalized belief (such as an ideology which offers answers to people's problems); precipitating factors (events that trigger action); mobilization of participants for action; and the operation of social control (the social processes by which the behavior of all individuals or groups is regulated). Also see: Anthony Oberschall, *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1973; and Robert H. Lauer, *Social Movements and Social Change*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 1976.

⁴⁴Some of the area which has attracted the attention of Children's Studies researchers include: kidnapping and the extent to which this has become a great fear of American parents. A recent book on this topic is: Paula S. Fass, *Kidnapped: Child Abduction in America*, New York: Oxford, 1998, which traces key episodes in the history of kidnapping in America. Another area of research is family values and how these shape American politics in later years. This is the focus of Henry Jenkins, ed., *The Children's Culture Reader*, New York: New York University Press, forthcoming. The two-volume book will include essays which range from Dr. Spock to kiddie consumers to the politics of dollhood. In discussing the role of family values, Jenkins notes that: All of our politics are shaped by the category of the child and the image of the innocent

child. But this view is changing as greater attention is given to the tobacco industry's focus on children, the vulnerability of adolescents meeting pedophiles over the internet, and the peril of children in conflict situations. This subject is the topic of Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Carolyn Sargent, *Small Wars: The Cultural Politics of Childhood*, University of California Press 1998, which is a collection of essays that present a picture of the state of the world's children as the

century closes. The book describes how economic restructuring worldwide has generally worsened children's lives in countries as diverse as Croatia, Brazil, and in pockets of poverty in America. For a discussion of the emerging discipline of childhood studies, see: Scott Heller, *The Meaning of Children in Culture Becomes a Focal Point for Scholars*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 7, 1998, pp. A14-A17.