

# Journal of Peace Research

<http://jpr.sagepub.com/>

---

## **Peace and Development: Towards a New Synthesis**

Jon Barnett

*Journal of Peace Research* 2008 45: 75

DOI: 10.1177/0022343307084924

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://jpr.sagepub.com/content/45/1/75>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



International Peace Research Institute, Oslo

**Additional services and information for *Journal of Peace Research* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://jpr.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://jpr.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations:** <http://jpr.sagepub.com/content/45/1/75.refs.html>

## Peace and Development: Towards a New Synthesis\*

JON BARNETT

*School of Anthropology, Geography and Environmental Studies,  
University of Melbourne*

This article develops a theory of peace as freedom that explains some important relationships between peace and development. It does this by critically examining and then synthesizing Johan Galtung's theory of peace as the absence of violence and Amartya Sen's theory of development as freedom. Galtung's theory of peace is clear on the meaning and causes of direct violence, but vague on the details of structural violence. Sen's theory helps overcome many of the problems associated with structural violence, although its focus on agents and the state tends to downplay the importance of larger-scale political and economic processes. In the theory of peace as freedom, peace is defined as, and in praxis is enlarged through, the equitable distribution of economic opportunities, political freedoms, social opportunities, transparency guarantees, protective security and freedom from direct violence. The institutions required for peace as freedom are considered, and it is suggested that the pluralist state is the best model for providing and maintaining peace as freedom. Some implications of this theory for existing and future analyses of the causes of violent conflict are discussed.

### Introduction

This article is concerned with the intersection of peace and development theories. Efforts to formally relate the two concepts date back to the rise of both the idea of 'development' and growth in concern about nuclear war after World War II.<sup>1</sup> Academic thinking about the intersections of peace and development arguably reached its zenith in the 1980s (Galtung, 1989; Hettne, 1983; Sørensen, 1985). At the same time, the international policy community was investigating similar issues, for example through the

Brandt (ICIDI, 1983) and Palme (ICDSI, 1982) reports, which investigated the economic and social opportunity costs of the military–industrial complex and the relationships between economic growth and military spending.

These early explorations of peace and development sought to answer the question 'what kind of development would facilitate the emergence of more peaceful economic, social and political structures?' (Hettne, 1983: 340). To answer this question, Hettne (1983) and Sørensen (1985) drew from the 'Another Development' view proposed by the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation (1975), which defined development as need-oriented, endogenous, self-reliant, ecologically sound and based on structural transformation. Yet this, like Galtung's (1985) 'six cosmologies' approach to peace and development, is

\* Thanks to three anonymous reviewers and *JPR* editor Nils Petter Gleditsch for their extremely helpful suggestions on ways to improve this article, which was completed with the assistance of an Australian Research Council Discovery Grant DP0556977. E-mail: [jbarn@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:jbarn@unimelb.edu.au).

<sup>1</sup> Although thinking about social order (peace) and social progress (development) is arguably as old as human thought itself.

somewhat abstract and offers little in the way of steps towards transformation. This article seeks to offer a somewhat more evidence-based and policy-oriented answer to Hettne's question.

So, there is a history of efforts to link peace and development. However, since the end of the Cold War, the concept of 'peace' has been notably absent in the development literature. In peace research, there has been a marked absence of any new theory of peace beyond ongoing debates about the democratic peace, and there has been no theory and almost no reference to a wider idea of peace that includes development issues. But, at the same time, both peace and development researchers have focused on the causes and consequences of civil wars. Many of the possible causes identified by peace research, such as resource endowments (de Soysa, 2000), poverty (Fearon & Laitin, 2003), democracy (Hegre et al., 2001), rent-seeking (Weede, 1996), financial flows (Gartzke & Li, 2003), and economic and political transitions (Esty et al., 1999), are central concerns of development studies. Surprisingly, the impacts of civil wars on development are not as central to development studies as they ought to be (but see Collier, 2003; Stewart & Fitzgerald, 2001), although there has been much research into the causes of and solutions to complex political emergencies that involve both violent conflict and humanitarian crises (Goodhand, 1999). This has, in turn, led to a growing interest in the broader connections between development and security (Duffield, 2001; Thomas, 2001).

These post-Cold War studies suggest that there is a confluence of problems in the world that justifies some new thinking about the connections between peace and development in theory. Weede (1996: 4) also identifies this confluence, writing that 'the problems of economic development and prosperity, social order and liberty, and international relations and war are ... closely interdependent'. This

confluence seems to be more prevalent in developing countries, suggesting a *prima facie* case for linking development with peace. Further, as the international community increasingly engages in various interventions to restore peace and provide humanitarian relief and reconstruction in conflict-prone developing countries, the success of these interventions to some extent 'depends on how the problems of "conflict" and "crisis" and the desired goal of "peace" are conceived at a more general level' (Nathan, 2000: 188). This latter argument suggests that there may be some practical advantages to rethinking peace in terms of the structural conditions – such as are associated with the development agenda – that enable it.

This article therefore seeks to articulate some important relationships between peace and development in theory. It does this by linking Galtung's (1969) theory of 'peace as the absence of violence' with Sen's (1999) theory of 'development as freedom'. A focus on these two theorists is justified, because both are recognized as leaders in their respective fields of peace studies and development economics – as recognized by their peers,<sup>2</sup> and by the major international awards they have received.<sup>3</sup> Through this process, the article constructs a theory of 'peace as freedom' that accommodates concern for both peace and development.

The theory of peace as freedom that is developed here is a wider notion of peace that includes more than the absence of direct physical violence. However, it does not advocate an open-ended approach such as that associated with Galtung's (1969) classic formulation of 'structural violence', which has been criticized

<sup>2</sup> According to the ISI Web of Science database, Galtung's (1969) *Journal of Peace Research* article has been cited 160 times in listed journals, while Sen's (1999) *Development as Freedom* has been cited 698 times (checked on 20 December 2006).

<sup>3</sup> Galtung was awarded the Right Livelihood Award (the 'Alternative Nobel Prize') in 1987; Sen was awarded the Nobel Prize in economics in 1998.

for being so broad that 'violence' becomes so ubiquitous as to be meaningless (Bufacchi, 2005; Lawler, 1995).<sup>4</sup> In contrast, this article expands the idea of peace to include a limited set of additional criteria drawn from Sen's notion of development as freedom. This offers a somewhat post-hoc framework that may help consolidate existing findings from research on civil conflicts and development. It may also help systematize further empirical investigations into conflict and development, and some suggested ways forward are outlined prior to the conclusions of this article. The idea of peace as freedom can also be seen as a 'boundary object' that facilitates interfaces between diverse and often otherwise disconnected intellectual and policy communities (Star & Griesemer, 1989). It may help bring peace and development researchers closer together. Finally, in constructing its theory of peace as freedom, this article hopes to offer some of the 'new theoretical ideas' that Patomäki (2001: 726) sees as necessary to redefine peace research.

### Peace According to Galtung

Galtung's theory of peace is based on one underlying principle – that 'peace is the absence of violence' (1969: 167). In this sense, Galtung's is as much a theory that defines violence as it is a theory about peace. This peace/violence dualism tends to simplify the continuous nature of social conditions to polar opposites and so lacks sensitivity to the rather more dialectical (or in Boulding's [1977] terms 'evolutionary') character of social change. So, a theory of peace may be based not on the contradistinction to violence, but on a statement of what peace *is* (as opposed to what it is not).

Galtung's theory of peace therefore hinges on his definition of violence. Violence, he

says, is 'the difference between the potential and the actual, between what could have been and what is' (1969: 168). This is obviously appropriate for crude violences that create, say, physical harm to people's bodies or mental harm to children, yet it ultimately requires some measures of what is possible in order to determine the extent to which violence occurs. For example, if we take the life expectancy of Japanese women and the income of men from Luxembourg to be the measure of what is possible for women, we find that violence acts on almost all women. Further, the measures may change, since what is ultimately possible is determined by the applications of science, technology and governance, all of which have pushed out the boundaries of possibility in most societies over time.

So, what is possible – Galtung's potential – is the best that humans can do, and anyone who is not a beneficiary of the best that can be done is the subject of violence. Yet, if peace is a universal goal, then everyone, everywhere, now and into the future, should be able to reach the same level of attainment (live as long as a Japanese woman and be as wealthy as a male from Luxembourg). In practice, this seems impossible, since the process of accumulation that leads to highest standards of attainment may not be sustainably (I mean ecologically) replicated in all societies. Given existing inequalities in income and health (to continue with just these two metrics), a sustainable set of possibilities will require some contraction in the levels of attainment of the wealthy and healthy and an increase in those for the poor, to reach some point of convergence. It follows, then, that pathways to a universal sustainable set of possibilities can be construed as violence to those whose current conditions are above the sustainable possibility.

This is not to say that Galtung's definition of violence is not instructive. His intention is nothing more than to outline 'theoretically significant dimensions of violence', and he acknowledges the problematic nature of his

<sup>4</sup> Yet, there were some fascinating early attempts by Galtung & Høivik (1971), Høivik (1977) and Kohler & Alcock (1976) to quantify 'structural violence' in the form of measuring loss of life years.

criteria of 'potential' (1969: 168) and, indeed, the problematic nature of the concept of 'peace' itself (Galtung, 1985). Rather, it is to say that a theory of violence based on the difference between the actual and the potential is hard to operationalize at the point at which peace is more rather than less prevalent (though this is a point we are very far from, even now). It also suggests that a theory of violence based on the differences between people here and now may be more instructive, as it would be based on what is currently possible. Further, such a theory needs to explicitly consider what is sustainably possible for all people given existing resources.

Galtung's is a theory that speaks more of structures than agents (Boulding, 1977; Patomäki, 2001). He explains this as trying to 'liberate myself from the built in actor-oriented perspective of so much Western social science' (1985: 145). His theory of violence accommodates the military-industrial complex, for example, but says little about the choices that people within these processes make; for example, is an unemployed migrant who joins the army in the absence of alternative career prospects an agent of violence? If (s)he smokes and this causes her to have a reduced life expectancy (a difference between the actual and potential), is this a product of structure (circumstance, environment, tobacco marketing) or agency (personal choice)? These questions point to the limitations of many theories of violence, which tend to be concerned with structures rather than agents. Yet, as much as structures influence agents, agents can also change structures, and so there is a need to seek to situate individuals in relation to the process and flows that influence them, and which they reflexively influence in turn (Giddens, 1984).

Galtung (1969) decomposed violence into two types: personal and structural.<sup>5</sup> Personal violence occurs when there is an actor and/or a tangible action such as war or domestic violence that does injury to people. This

speaks to the common view of 'peace' as the absence of war and other violations of personal sovereignty. Galtung calls the absence of this direct violence 'negative peace'. This is the most straightforward and least problematic aspect of his theory of peace (leaving aside the question of 'just war').

Galtung's theory of peace says that there is more to violence than the absence of direct violence. Structural violence, he says, is violence caused not by direct somatic harm, but by systems of unequal power that structure unequal life chances such that a person's potential is unrealized. So, in that racial or sexual discrimination, declining terms of trade, malnutrition, famine and unemployment all affect people's life chances such that realization of their potential is constrained, these (and many other processes) can be said to be forms of structural violence. These structures have histories and geographies and manifest themselves on different people, through different systems, in various ways. Structural violence, then, is about social justice and equality (called positive peace), and a limitation to Galtung's theory is that while perfect equality is its goal, this is not practically possible and, indeed, may not be desirable. Structural violence is perhaps best understood as a 'metaphor' rather than a theory (Boulding, 1977).

Structural violence as formulated by Galtung is a 'maximalist' agenda (Rogers & Ramsbotham, 1999), the function of which is to highlight the negative consequences of the uneven distribution of power and resources and to understand these as largely avoidable, highly destructive social processes. It leaves open the question of pathways to redistribute power and resources, and Galtung is silent on this matter, which Boulding (1977) implies is because engaging with the nature of transformation

<sup>5</sup> Galtung (1990) later added a third type – 'cultural violence' – that refers to the symbolic aspects of social life that justify or normalize violence. Largely for reasons of cogency, this article limits its concerns to the material manifestations of violence.

demands some consideration of steering, hierarchy and some recognition of inequality in capabilities – all of which are anathema to Galtung's strong preference for equality.<sup>6</sup> To be sure, this lack of consideration of the reform of structures is not a problem unique to Galtung's view of structural violence, and, indeed, it is desirable in as much as suggestions may lead to manifestos that may lead to violence. Nevertheless, structural transformation towards peace is an area that could be better informed by other theories of social change, including those associated with development studies.

In Galtung's formulation, then, peace is the absence of both direct and structural violence. He notes that negative and positive peace are contiguous with each other, and this is clearly the case, as revealed by recent research into the linkages between war (direct violence), absolute poverty and vertical and horizontal inequalities (structural violence), famine (structural violence) and famine relief (which affects another form of structural violence) (De Waal, 1997; Goodhand, 2003; Østby, 2005; Stewart & Fitzgerald, 2001). Nevertheless, the positive/negative peace dualism constrains thinking about peace by reducing its diverse and contingent nature into another dualism, which Boulding (1977) suggests is not overly useful.

Underlying Galtung's (1985: 146) notion of structural violence is a concern for 'basic human needs' provision, informed by the basic needs approach to development that emerged in the mid-1970s. Thus, for Galtung, structural violence 'could just as well be taken as a point of departure for development studies as for peace studies. The two are very similar, and should be regarded as two sides of the same coin' (1985: 147). This represents an initial point of departure for considering development in relation to peace.

<sup>6</sup> Even if he embraces equality, Galtung disavows Marxism. He is more an anarchist egalitarian.

## Development According to Sen

The modern (post-1945) history of development theory is one of abstract theories of structural processes leading to programmes of action implemented across large and often diverse populations assuming – as neoclassical economics does – that people behave in common ways (to maximize material gain) regardless of location, and ignoring the particularities of *in situ* institutions (Brohman, 1995). Programmes to modernize, industrialize, revolutionize, liberalize and adjust have all been implemented, and, because of their scale and insensitivity to place, they have tended to benefit some, marginalize many and create much environmental damage.

It is in the context of the failures of these meta-theories and their programmatic manifestations to *do* development that Sen (1999) has proposed his alternative theory of development. The book *Development as Freedom* contains a vision of the good life as a valuable goal and an explanation of how it might be achieved, supported by arguments synthesized from both economics and philosophy. It is the culmination of much of Sen's previous work, all of which points towards an alternative to the utilitarianism that underpins economics and much moral philosophy (Stewart & Deneulin, 2002).

At the heart of *Development as Freedom* lies Sen's claim that development is not so much something that can be done to others, but is instead something that people do *for themselves*. This claim is based on his studies of famine (Sen, 1981), his observations about the preconditions of the success of the East Asian economies, and his observations about the enhanced freedoms and opportunities afforded to most people in liberal democratic societies. So, for Sen, people will 'develop' as they see fit given sufficient 'economic opportunities, political liberties, social powers, and the enabling conditions of good health, basic education, and the encouragement and

cultivation of initiatives' (1999: 4). These opportunities are, in Sen's words, 'freedoms', and it is freedom, he argues, that should be both the means (how to attain) as well as the ends (the goal) of development.<sup>7</sup>

Sen's approach to development moves away from specifying outcomes (such as Galtung's difference between the potential and the actual). This is justified in the case of development, as policies and programmes often entail the imposition of values (such as increased utility or increased production) on societies at the expense of good processes, and often at the expense of some groups. For example, the building of dams for irrigation, flood control and electricity generation may serve the national interest by facilitating increased production, yet the processes by which dams are built often entail displacement and social and environmental costs to some communities. In arguing that freedom is both the means and the ends of development, Sen is, in effect, saying that prescribing outcomes as the goal of policy is not possible, since there are potentially as many different kinds of lives that people value as there are people. This is what a focus on freedom entails, as Marcuse explains: 'the subsequent construction of the new society cannot be the object of theory, for it is to occur as the free creation of the liberated individuals' (Marcuse, 1969: 135).

Sen's theory of development as freedom rests on an explication of what freedoms are, what they do, and which ones matter most. Freedoms are seen as both processes that allow free actions and decisions, and opportunities that people have available to them. As an example of a procedural unfreedom, Sen gives the violation of voting privileges (the denial or impairment of free political choice); as an example of opportunity unfreedom, he gives the example of hunger (the lack

of opportunity to avoid premature death). What freedoms do, in Sen's view, is allow people to take initiatives to pursue outcomes that are valuable to them. Sen's theory, therefore, speaks to agency in ways that Galtung's does not. However, it is not a grand theory of the way agents will behave (other than to say they are likely to act to pursue the things that they value), but rather a theory that seeks to create the conditions in which agency can be exercised. In this respect, it offers much to redress the lack of agency in Galtung (and others') peace theory.

The freedoms that most matter for development, or what Sen (1999: xii) calls 'the crucial instrumental freedoms', include: economic opportunities (for example, the freedom of women to seek employment and the freedom of individuals to interact to seek mutually advantageous outcomes in terms of consumption and production); political freedoms (for example, freedom of speech, freedom of the media, civil liberties and the freedom to vote); social opportunities (for example, the opportunity to access education and health care and to participate in social life); transparency guarantees (the procedures to ensure openness and accountability in transactions to militate against corruption and other inappropriate dealings); and protective security (arrangements as typically associated with social security to protect people from misery). These freedoms are interconnected, and they 'supplement' and 'reinforce' each other (1999: 40).

Sen (1999) ultimately sees liberal institutions as the best means to deliver well-being (defined not merely in terms of utility). This is based on recognition of the ability of liberal democracies to create conditions where people are free to function as they wish, and where the power and control aspects of freedom can be balanced through democratic structures of governance (Sen, 1985). While faith in liberalism may be unpopular in some circles of development thinking (Sandbrook, 2000), Sen is not alone

<sup>7</sup> Sen's theory of freedom incorporates both positive freedoms, understood as people's control over their own lives (their sovereignty), and negative freedoms, understood as the absence of coercion (see Sen, 1985, for his exposition of this).

in his optimism about the ability of liberal democracies to deliver the good life (Donnelly, 1999; Giddens, 1994; Habermas, 1996).

The explanatory power of Sen's theory, therefore, depends on the extent to which one thinks that the benefits afforded to people in liberal democratic societies are a function of the structures of those societies (Sen's view), or a function of the systems of unequal exchange that these societies have historically controlled (through colonization) and continue (through capitalist political-economy processes) to control (Sandbrook's [2000] view). For his part, Sen, like Habermas (1990), has faith in the power of communication and reason to determine private and collective action towards the good life, given appropriate structures of governance. In this view, authority is accorded solely on the basis of a reasoned and persuasive argument, and policies have to be continually justified in and of themselves rather than on the basis of the power of the proponents. Democracy is essential in this process, as it requires enabling institutions and practices that are non-discriminatory and transparent, in which freedom of speech and the freedom of the press are guaranteed.

While it bridges structure and agency, Sen's theory of development as freedom does not offer much of an explanation of how the power of structures and agents creates and sustains unfreedom. This is the most common and persuasive critique of *Development as Freedom* (Navarro, 2000; Sandbrook, 2000; Evans, 2002). For example, while Sen argues convincingly that states should provide procedural freedoms and opportunities, he does not say why they do not, other than saying that institutions that allow for freedom can deliver freedom. This quixotic character of freedom as both means and ends is not unique to Sen's account; for example, Marcuse (1969) sees freedom as the ability of free people to continually be able to create and recreate themselves and society as they see fit, where the extent of freedom is the extent to which this is possible.

Perhaps the greater limitation to Sen's theory is that it does not account for the difficulties of achieving some semblance of equity and sustainability. Sen is not silent on these issues; he argues that reason 'is no enemy of valuing equality of well-being' (1985: 194), thereby pointing to the aforementioned transformative character of political freedoms; he argues that the pursuit of well-being does not always entail the accumulation of material; and he suggests there are 'capitalist virtues' that can constrain the excesses of market processes. He also stresses the responsibilities that attend freedom and acknowledges the difficulties of value pluralism that make it possible for people to value being 'well-off', even if available information suggests that one person's material circumstances occur at the expense of another's. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to argue, as Streeton (2000) and Sandbrook (2000) do, that in a world of interdependencies where capitalism is the near-universal economic order and has been able to sustain itself despite its widely recognized and undeniable social and environmental costs, Sen's trust in the ability of reason, communication, capitalist ethics and enhanced information to deliver equity is insufficient.<sup>8</sup> Crudely put, Sen's theory can be read as saying that good systems, and good people, can deliver good outcomes for everyone. But, the inverse of his positive view of agency is that not-good people defend and sustain not-good systems, even when available information highlights that there are not-good processes and outcomes.

Sen's oblique recognition of the power of malign structures and agents perhaps arises

<sup>8</sup> On the issue of interdependence, Galtung (1985) offers 'self reliance' in the form of use of only locally owned factors of production and internalization of the externalities of production wherever possible. When not possible, he advocates the fair sharing of externalities (which would seem to be 'violence' in his terms), horizontal exchanges and South-South cooperation. This, perhaps, amounts to a fairer system of trade, but it is not one that would be likely to produce the degree of prosperity that Weede (1996), among others, considers necessary for democracy and peace.

because his focus is largely on individuals and states as the locus of governance. There is less focus on the international system and its political, economic and environmental flows. Yet, the problem of control to sustain freedoms also concerns global processes, hence the interest in global governance (Young, 1997; Rittberger, 2001; Thomas, 2001). This agenda includes more than interventions in sovereignty to protect human rights; it also includes issues of intragenerational inequity arising from the operation of global markets, as well as the opportunities available to future generations (intergenerational equity). It is an issue that Galtung's theory of peace recognizes, even if his notion of structural violence is no more descriptive of the processes, and even less prescriptive with respect to solutions.

The problems of unfreedom, then, arise from structural power operating at many scales and through diverse systems. If the worst we can say of Sen's theory of development as freedom is that it does not account and prescribe for everything and somewhat disregards the importance of some structures, then this still renders it superior to most of the best theories of social change. It offers much to a theory of peace, and of development, in that it: focuses on agents; focuses on the state and acknowledges the benefits of political and economic liberalism, but does not argue that either is sufficient; is prescriptive about transformation and social change; and is rooted in observations of processes that deliver well-being in both developed and developing countries. Further, it articulates a vision and a set of institutional conditions without recourse to contradistinctions and dualisms.

### Synthesis: Peace as Freedom

There are, therefore, strong compatibilities between peace and development. They are, in Sørensen's (1985: 70) terms, 'structurally interlocked'. However, given the diversity of

views on the meaning and practice of peace and development and, in the wake of the end of the Cold War, the shifting set of problems to be addressed in peace studies (Rogers & Ramsbotham, 1999), it is even less obvious now that 'everybody immediately understands what it [peace and development] implies' (Hettne, 1983: 329). Hence, the following seeks to synthesize Galtung's and Sen's theories in order to produce a rough sketch of a theory of peace as freedom.

Synthesizing Sen's development as freedom with Galtung's theory of peace leads to a definition of peace as *the goal and process of expanding people's freedoms*.<sup>9</sup> In this definition, peace is not defined in contradistinction to violence or any other set of bads (although, of course, one could talk of unfreedoms, as Sen sometimes does). Sen's (1999) account of freedoms and opportunities as processes that enable people to lead the lives they value offers a detailed and more satisfying substitute for that which Galtung calls 'structural violence'. However, from the previous discussion, at least two additions to his list of five important freedoms (economic opportunities, political freedoms, social opportunities, transparency guarantees and protective security) seem necessary for a larger theory of peace as freedom. These are: freedom from direct violence, and the equitable allocation of freedoms within and between generations. Direct violence is taken here to be 'where there is an actor that commits the violence', including both the actual act and the threat of an act (Galtung, 1969: 170). This notion of freedom from direct violence is self-evident.

'Equity guarantees' are taken here to mean the equitable distribution of the previous six freedoms and opportunities among all people within current generations and between future generations. These pertain to processes that

<sup>9</sup> This is, perhaps, not such a radical departure from Galtung's view of peace, which has long included passing references to – but not an exposition of – freedom as an important need relevant to peace.

restrict freedoms and opportunities. For example, in the area of resource extraction by multinational companies (such as of minerals in Africa or timber in Asia), equity guarantees would result in: the allocation and enforcement of property rights; transactions that are transparent to third parties and which are subject to a independent legal system; and vendors being free from threats to their civil liberties, free to choose among buyers, free to choose how to use the resources to which they are entitled, and free from the need to sell resources to pay for basic social opportunities. In this example, were everyone entitled to the same freedoms and opportunities, holders of property rights would be free to sell but would do so only if it were their reasoned calculation that it was in their interests to do so, rather than having resources 'plundered' or selling because they were compelled to by extreme poverty or threats of violence.

In a world where people are free to choose, where political freedoms are universally upheld, and where information is more freely available, individuals with freedoms and opportunities may act consciously to affect structures to enhance the opportunity freedoms of others. Giddens (1991) describes this possibility as 'life politics', which is seen to involve people's choices to be active participants in events that affect their own and others' lives. Individuals may choose, then, to take charge of political issues that defy the limitations of contemporary political processes to generate new or reform existing structures of authority and governance. Exactly what these will look like depends on exactly how people participate in political life.

In as much as people cannot exercise control over all the important aspects of their lives, their freedom can be served even if they have not exercised direct control over policy implementation.<sup>10</sup> Thus, some institutions are required to provide the freedoms and opportunities necessary for peace and development, and this includes equity guarantees.

The principal, if to varying degrees imperfect, institution that has emerged to provide freedoms and opportunities is the state. It is not possible here to even briefly review the contested meaning of 'the state' or to consider its effectiveness (let alone the hundreds of so-called states) in providing freedoms and opportunities (Strange, 1996; World Bank, 1997). However, it is only in the idea of a pluralist and 'civil association' state – where the state is the product of a social contract between individuals (Oakeshott, 1962; Schwarzmantel, 1994) – that it seems possible for the state to control freedoms and opportunities without any substantive violations of those same freedoms and opportunities.

There is evidence to suggest that the more states are of the pluralist type, the more freedoms and opportunities are upheld. The relative successes of the liberal democratic welfare states of Western Europe in balancing freedoms with opportunities and guarantees suggest that peace and development are indeed matters of institutional design (Donnelly, 1999). Liberal political systems are generally better at providing economic opportunities for their citizens, and they also seem to be better at providing protective security (Donnelly, 1999; Tavares & Wacziarg, 2001). Democratic countries also clearly show a stronger commitment to domestic and global environmental problems than non-democracies (Neumayer, 2002). This is arguably due to the interacting effects of freedom of information, freedom of speech, freedom to lobby and vote, regime responsiveness and learning arising from the electoral system, and the use of green consumerism to change supply (Payne, 1995). There are also links between liberal democracies and freedom from direct violence (see the next section).

The pluralist state offers the most practicable basis for peace as freedom through its

<sup>10</sup> Sen (1985) gives the example of freedom from mugging requiring government to exercise control.

ability to balance freedoms, opportunities and guarantees.<sup>11</sup> Yet, institutions that promote freedoms and opportunities are imperfect in even the most advanced of pluralist states, creating a range of 'democratic deficits', where there are slippages between public demands for control to ensure freedoms and the inadequacy of policies to achieve these. Such deficits, however, do not point to the inevitable failure of the pluralist state to provide freedoms and opportunities, but rather to the incompleteness of the liberal democratic project. The important issue is that the potential exists for a process of ongoing refinement, because liberal democratic states are more rather than less responsive to the exercise of political agency. In undemocratic states, this potential is curtailed, but the widespread exercise of agency can begin a process of expanding freedoms, as people's revolutions from France to the Philippines have shown.

Whereas pluralistic states can potentially provide and maintain freedoms and opportunities for all people within their sovereign domains, the extent to which they can manage global processes that structure inequity within and between generations is less obvious. There are at least two reasons to suggest that a system of pluralist states can better manage these processes. First, given sufficient information about the effects of the actions that emanate from a pluralist state (for example, from its foreign policy or from one of its companies), it could act to curtail those actions.<sup>12</sup> Second, these flows exploit places where, for example, labour markets are not free; labour and resource owners are vulnerable to capital, because protective security is not guaranteed and economic opportunities and political freedoms are restricted; the

threat of violence is compelling, because human rights are not upheld; and transparency about transactions is restricted. So, in a world where freedoms and opportunities are universally upheld, these places of exploitation cease to be particularly vulnerable to global flows.

However, most states are largely unwilling to manage most of the global processes that structure inequality within and between generations. Even seemingly elementary flows, such as the arms trade or trafficking in women, are largely unregulated. To be sure, some progress towards global governance has been achieved through the multilateral organizations such as the United Nations and its various organs and treaties. Furthermore, processes associated with globalization also seem to increase the prospects for peace and development. For example, the emergence of human rights organizations like Amnesty International, coupled with the proliferation of harder-to-contain communications technologies such as mobile telephones and the Internet, have increased transparency and made it harder for human rights violations to go unnoticed (Brophy & Halpin, 1999; Cleaver, 1998). It also seems that increasing integration of markets can lead governments to respect political freedoms and human rights (Hafner-Burton, 2005).

Nevertheless, if freedoms and opportunities are to be equitably distributed across space and time, it seems undeniable that a modified process to address global problems is required. The form of a system of global governance that is capable of managing global problems has been much discussed (COGG, 1995; Gordenker & Weiss, 1995; Griffin, 2003). Desirable attributes of such a system include increased participation from actors other than states, enhanced channels of communication and space for reasoned

<sup>11</sup> This is not to say that it is the only institution capable of providing peace as freedom, but rather, given the existing set of institutions in the world, it seems to be the institution that has the most potential. From the pluralist state can come the possibility for alternative institutions.

<sup>12</sup> This is one of the positives of sovereignty; all processes have some origin in space (even if it is a person using a computer), and sovereign states control space.

dialogue, improved coordination of policy implementation, respect for human rights, receptiveness and a more flexible approach to the limits of sovereignty. The goal of such a system should be to make states less the arbiters of power, and more brokers, facilitators and conduits for the representation of people.

### Peace as Freedom as an Analytical Tool

Although the theory of peace as freedom as proposed here speaks to a larger gamut of problems than freedom from direct violence, it also offers a potentially useful framework for consolidating existing strands of research on direct violence and guiding further research. It suggests that there are six factors that may be important in explaining the causes of direct violence: the provision of economic opportunities, political freedoms, social opportunities, transparency guarantees, protective security and equity guarantees.

Each of these six variables can be captured through indicators, for example the Fraser Institute's Economic Freedom Index, Freedom House's Political Rights and Civil Liberties ratings, World Bank indicators of access to health care and education, Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index, various indicators on social security spending from the International Labour Organization, and indicators of income inequality between countries, within countries, and between regions within countries, such as are available from the World Bank. These indicators can (and have been) used to test important relationships between variables. They could also be used to develop a multivariable or composite indicator of peace as freedom.

There is, of course, a considerable amount of research that explores the links between some of the variables identified in the theory of peace as freedom and direct violence (a full review of which is beyond the scope of this article). Most of this research examines cor-

relations between one or two variables and direct violence. The concentration of effort has been on research exploring the links between interstate war and democracy (the democratic peace proposition). This research shows that freedom from direct violence due to civil and international war and state repression is greater in liberal democracies where there are economic and political freedoms (Davenport & Armstrong, 2004; Hegre et al., 2001; Owen, 1994; Ward & Gleditsch, 1998). There is an older and now much revived effort to examine the links between political freedoms, economic freedoms and direct violence (the capitalist peace proposition), which suggests that there are strong causal relationships between free markets and open trade, growth and prosperity, democracy and freedom from direct violence (Gartzke, 2007; Mousseau, 2003; Weede, 1996). There has been relatively far less research examining the links between transparency and violence, but it has been argued that a lack of transparency in the political and economic actions of states can create disaffected populations and generate organized groups to capture the state using force, causing the state to defend itself (Le Billon, 2001; Munslow, 1999). There is also some evidence to suggest that a lack of economic opportunities and/or a lack of protective security can lead some individuals to join armed groups because the opportunity costs of doing so are low (Goodhand, 2003; Keen, 2000; Ware, 2005). On the issue of equity within a country, some argue that the unequal distribution of freedoms and opportunities can lead to the generation of grievances that can escalate into violence (Cramer, 2003; Stewart, 2000); and a lack of social opportunities can lead young people to join armed groups (Hage, 2003; Maclure & Sotelo, 2004). This and other research suggests that there is some analytical value to the theory of peace as freedom and some scope for further research to explore to the connections between the variables it identifies.

## Conclusions

Peace as freedom suggests that the means and ends of peace and development practices should be to ensure the equitable distribution of economic opportunities, political freedoms, social opportunities, transparency guarantees, protective security and freedom from direct violence. It is a theory that merges some of the most useful aspects of both Galtung's and Sen's theories and, hopefully, avoids some of their pitfalls. It is a view that merges peace and development into a single framework. It is more than, and avoids the dangers in, defining peace as the opposite of violence and/or the absence of war and, instead, offers a theory of peace based on peace per se. It also has close parallels to the notion of human security in which freedom from fear and want are central tenets (UNDP, 1994), and it has strong synergies with a rights-based approach to peace and development (Bhatia et al., 2000).

By moving away from a theory based on what peace is not, by articulating the complex and interdependent characteristics of peace as freedoms and opportunities, and by focusing as much on processes as outcomes, the theory of peace as freedom facilitates a more nuanced and multivariate assessment of peace based on its contingent nature. In this view, it is not the case that there is either peace or violence, because peace is not constructed in such dualistic terms. Rather, peace as freedom suggests that peace is more or less present based on the degree to which each important freedom and opportunity is present and the degree to which they are collectively present. The focus is on what exists now, shifting the terms of discussion away from potentiality and its inherent problems.

The peace as freedom view considers both agents and structures. It means a partial re-focusing on the structures that can create freedoms and guarantee opportunities – principally, but not entirely, this means a concern for the state. This is justified in terms of

freedom from direct violence, because states have murdered four times as many people in the 20th century than warfare within or between states (Rummel, 1995). It is justified in terms of development, because the state as sovereign has the power to resist and adapt to global flows and the power to provide freedoms and entitlements to its people. This refocus on the state is also a feature of the critical peace studies called for by Patomäki (2001). The focus on agents offers much to peace studies, since most contemporary research into the cause of violent conflict focuses on the structural conditions that increase the risk of conflict rather than the decisions of actors to engage in violent acts.

Understanding peace as freedom in this way offers a framework for assessments and re-assessments of peace and development at any scale and in any place. It also offers a basis upon which the causes of armed conflicts may be systematically identified and then examined. Indeed, if such linkages between the denial of freedoms and opportunities and violent conflict can be determined in a more systematic and robust way, then a theory of peace as freedom may have the potential to become a theory that unifies many areas of peace studies.

## References

- Bhatia, Gurcharan; John O'Neill, Gerald Gall & Patrick Bendin, eds, 2000. *Peace, Justice and Freedom: Human Rights Challenges for the New Millennium*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Boulding, Kenneth, 1977. 'Twelve Friendly Quarrels with Johan Galtung', *Journal of Peace Research* 14(1): 75–86.
- Brohman, John, 1995. 'Economism and Critical Silences in Development Studies: A Theoretical Critique of Neoliberalism', *Third World Quarterly* 16(2): 297–318.
- Brophy, Peter & Edward Halpin, 1999. 'Through the Net to Freedom: Information, the Internet and Human Rights', *Journal of Information Science* 25(5): 351–364.

- Bufacchi, Vittorio, 2005. 'Two Concepts of Violence', *Political Studies Review* 3(2): 193–204.
- Cleaver, Harry, 1998. 'The Zapatista Effect: The Internet and the Rise of an Alternative Political Fabric', *Journal of International Affairs* 51(2): 621–640.
- COGG (Commission on Global Governance), 1995. *Our Global Neighbourhood: The Report of the Commission on Global Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collier, Paul, 2003. *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy*. Washington, DC & New York: World Bank & Oxford University Press.
- Cramer, Cristopher, 2003. 'Does Inequality Cause Conflict?', *Journal of International Development* 15(4): 397–412.
- Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, 1975. *What Now? Another Development: An Independent Proposal in Preparation for the UN General Assembly's 7th Special Session on Development and International Cooperation*. Uppsala: Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation.
- Davenport, Christian & David Armstrong, 2004. 'Democracy and the Violation of Human Rights: A Statistical Analysis from 1976 to 1996', *American Journal of Political Science* 48(3): 538–554.
- de Soysa, Indra, 2000. 'The Resource Curse: Are Civil Wars Driven by Rapacity or Paucity?', in Mats Berdal & David Malone, eds, *Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas and Civil Wars*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner (113–136).
- De Waal, Alex, 1997. *Famine Crimes: Politics and the Disaster Relief Industry in Africa*. Oxford: International African Institute, with James Currey.
- Donnelly, Jack, 1999. 'Human Rights, Democracy, and Development', *Human Rights Quarterly* 21(3): 608–632.
- Duffield, Mark, 2001. *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security*. London: Zed.
- Esty, Daniel; Jack Goldstone, Ted Gurr, Barbara Harff, Marc Levy, Geoffrey Dabelko, Pamela Surko & Alan Unger, 1999. 'State Failure Task Force Report: Phase II Findings', *Environmental Change and Security Project Report* 5: 49–72.
- Evans, Peter, 2002. 'Collective Capabilities, Culture, and Amartya Sen's Development as Freedom', *Studies in Comparative International Development* 37(2): 54–60.
- Fearon, James & David Laitin, 2003. 'Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War', *American Political Science Review* 97(1): 75–90.
- Galtung, Johan, 1969. 'Violence, Peace, and Peace Research', *Journal of Peace Research* 6(3): 167–191.
- Galtung, Johan, 1985. 'Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses', *Journal of Peace Research* 22(2): 141–158.
- Galtung, Johan, 1989. *Peace and Development in the Pacific Hemisphere*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Institute for Peace.
- Galtung, Johan, 1990. 'Cultural Violence', *Journal of Peace Research* 27(3): 291–305.
- Galtung, Johan & Tord Høivik, 1971. 'Structural and Direct Violence: A Note on Operationalization', *Journal of Peace Research* 8(1): 73–76.
- Gartzke, Erik, 2007. 'The Capitalist Peace', *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 166–191.
- Gartzke, Erik & Quan Li, 2003. 'War, Peace, and the Invisible Hand: Positive Political Externalities of Economic Globalization', *International Studies Quarterly* 47(4): 561–586.
- Giddens, Anthony, 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Giddens, Anthony, 1991. *Modernity and Self Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Giddens, Anthony, 1994. *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Goodhand, Jonathan, 1999. 'From Wars to Complex Political Emergencies: Understanding Conflict and Peace-Building in the New World Disorder', *Third World Quarterly* 20(1): 13–26.
- Goodhand, Jonathan, 2003. 'Enduring Disorder and Persistent Poverty: A Review of the Linkages Between War and Chronic Poverty', *World Development* 31(3): 629–646.
- Gordenker, Leon & Thomas Weiss, 1995. 'Pluralising Global Governance: Analytical Approaches and Dimensions', *Third World Quarterly* 16(3): 357–387.

- Griffin, Keith, 2003. 'Economic Globalization and Institutions of Global Governance', *Development and Change* 34(5): 789–808.
- Habermas, Jurgen, 1990. *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Habermas, Jurgen, 1996. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie, 2005. 'Right or Robust? The Sensitive Nature of Repression to Globalization', *Journal of Peace Research* 42(6): 679–698.
- Hage, Gassan, 2003. "Comes a Time We Are All Enthusiasm": Understanding Palestinian Suicide Bombers in Times of Exigophobia', *Public Culture* 15(1): 65–89.
- Hegre, Håvard; Tanja Ellingsen, Scott Gates & Nils Petter Gleditsch, 2001. 'Toward a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816–1992', *American Political Science Review* 95(1): 33–48.
- Hettne, Björn, 1983. 'Peace and Development: Contradictions and Compatibilities', *Journal of Peace Research* 20(4): 329–342.
- Høivik, Tord, 1977. 'The Demography of Structural Violence', *Journal of Peace Research* 14(1): 59–73.
- ICDSI (Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues), 1982. *Common Security: A Blueprint for Survival*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- ICIDI (Independent Commission on International Development Issues), 1983. *Common Crisis North–South: Cooperation for World Recovery*. London: Pan.
- Keen, David, 2000. 'Incentives and Disincentives for Violence', in Mats Berdal & David Malone, eds, *Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas and Civil Wars*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner (19–41).
- Kohler, Gernot & Norman Alcock, 1976. 'An Empirical Table of Structural Violence', *Journal of Peace Research* 13(4): 343–356.
- Lawler, Peter, 1995. *A Question of Values: Johan Galtung's Peace Research*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Le Billon, Philippe, 2001. 'Angola's Political Economy of War: The Role of Oil and Diamonds 1975–2000', *African Affairs* 100(398): 55–80.
- Maclure, Richard & Melvin Sotelo, 2004. 'Youth Gangs in Nicaragua: Gang Membership as Structured Individualization', *Journal of Youth Studies* 7(4): 417–432.
- Marcuse, Herbert, 1969. *Negations: Essays in Critical Theory*. London: Allen Lane.
- Mousseau, Michael, 2003. 'The Nexus of Market Society, Liberal Preferences, and Democratic Peace: Interdisciplinary Theory and Evidence', *International Studies Quarterly* 47(4): 483–510.
- Munslow, Barry, 1999. 'Angola: The Politics of Unsustainable Development', *Third World Quarterly* 20(3): 551–568.
- Nathan, Laurie, 2000. 'The Four Horseman of the Apocalypse: The Structural Causes of Crisis and Violence in Africa', *Peace and Change* 25(2): 188–207.
- Navarro, Vicente, 2000. 'Development and Quality of Life: A Critique of Amartya Sen's Development as Freedom', *International Journal of Health Services* 30(4): 661–674.
- Neumayer, Eric, 2002. 'Do Democracies Exhibit Stronger International Environmental Commitment? A Cross-Country Analysis', *Journal of Peace Research* 39(2): 139–164.
- Oakeshott, Michael, 1962. *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays*. London: Methuen.
- Østby, Gudrun, 2005. 'Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict', paper prepared for the 46th Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Honolulu, HI, 1–5 March ([http://www.polarizationandconflict.org/bcn04/7%D8stby\\_Horiz.pdf](http://www.polarizationandconflict.org/bcn04/7%D8stby_Horiz.pdf)).
- Owen, John, 1994. 'How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace', *International Security* 19(2): 87–125.
- Patomäki, Heikki, 2001. 'The Challenge of Critical Theories: Peace Research at the Start of the New Century', *Journal of Peace Research* 38(6): 723–737.
- Payne, Rodger, 1995. 'Freedom and the Environment', *Journal of Democracy* 6(3): 41–55.
- Rittberger, Volker, ed., 2001. *Global Governance and the United Nations System*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Rogers, Paul & Oliver Ramsbotham, 1999. 'Then and Now: Peace Research – Past and Future', *Political Studies* 47(4): 740–754.

- Rummel, Rudolph, 1995. 'Democracy, Power, Genocide and Mass Murder', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 39(1): 2–26.
- Sandbrook, Richard, 2000. 'Globalization and the Limits of Neoliberal Development Doctrine', *Third World Quarterly* 21(6): 1071–1080.
- Schwarzmantel, John, 1994. *The State in Contemporary Society*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Sen, Amartya, 1981. *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Sen, Amartya, 1985. 'Well-Being, Agency and Freedom: The Dewey Lectures 1984', *Journal of Philosophy* 82(4): 169–221.
- Sen, Amartya, 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor.
- Sørensen, Georg, 1985. 'Peace and Development: Looking for the Right Track', *Journal of Peace Research* 22(1): 69–77.
- Star, Susan & James Griesemer, 1989. 'Institutional Ecology: "Translations" and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39', *Social Studies of Science* 19(3): 387–420.
- Stewart, Frances, 2000. 'Crisis Prevention: Tackling Horizontal Inequalities', *Oxford Development Studies* 28(3): 245–263.
- Stewart, Frances & Severine Deneulin, 2002. 'Amartya Sen's Contribution to Development Thinking', *Studies in Comparative International Development* 37(2): 61–70.
- Stewart, Frances & Valpy Fitzgerald, eds, 2001. *War and Underdevelopment: Volume 1, The Economic and Social Consequences of Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strange, Susan, 1996. *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Streeten, Paul, 2000. 'Freedom and Welfare: A Review Essay on Amartya Sen, Development as Freedom', *Population and Development Review* 26(1): 153–162.
- Tavares, Jose & Romain Wacziarg, 2001. 'How Democracy Affects Growth', *European Economic Review* 45(8): 1341–1378.
- Thomas, Caroline, 2001. *Global Governance, Development and Human Security: The Challenge of Poverty and Inequality*. London: Pluto.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Program), 1994. *Human Development Report 1994*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ward, Michael & Kristian Gleditsch, 1998. 'Democratizing for Peace', *American Political Science Review* 92(1): 51–62.
- Ware, Helen, 2005. 'Demography, Migration and Conflict in the Pacific', *Journal of Peace Research* 42(4): 435–454.
- Weede, Erich, 1996. *Economic Development, Social Order, and World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- World Bank, 1997. *World Development Report 1997: The State in a Changing World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Young, Oran, ed., 1997. *Global Governance: Drawing Insights from the Environmental Experience*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

JON BARNETT, b. 1971, PhD in Resource Management and Environmental Science (Australian National University, 1999); Australian Research Council Fellow, School of Anthropology, Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Melbourne (2005– ); member of the Scientific Steering Committee of the Global Environmental Change and Human Security (GECHS) Project; main research interests: environment, security, development and climate change. Most recent book: *The Meaning of Environmental Security* (Zed, 2001).