

The Growing Peace Research Agenda

Kroc Institute Occasional Paper #21:OP:4

December 2001

Peter Wallensteen

American Scandinavian Foundation Visiting Fellow at the Kroc Institute (spring 2001); Dag Hammarskjöld Professor of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, Uppsala Sweden

The aim of peace research is to understand the causes of violence and find ways to reduce and remove violence. Peace research, thus, incorporates topical research, university-level teaching and practical applications. Peace research is also sensitive to historical changes and local circumstances, though it certainly should and can retain its autonomy and core direction. Sometimes, societal changes constitute challenges to existing paradigms of peace research and lead to new fields of inquiry. At other times, historical developments confirm the existing agenda. Either way, the dialogue with the realities of peace and unrest remains formative and affects the growth of peace research. It takes on a different profile under different circumstances. Global historical changes (world wars, the Cold War, the end of the Soviet era, global terrorism) will, of course, affect a discipline devoted to the study of war. It will also be exposed to the changes of methodology in sciences. Regional foci will differ, as regions have different priorities relating to conflict and conflict resolution. Research milieus will appear divergent, although they are united in the same basic concern. Together these influences lead to a varied impact of peace research on societies. This article explores the continuous growth of the peace research agenda.¹

As an organised activity, peace research has existed since the middle of the 1950s. At that time the first institutions concerned with concepts such as “conflict analysis”, “conflict resolution” and “peace research” were formed. Notable were the peace research centers in Groningen, Ann Arbor and Oslo (see Wiberg 1988). However, the roots of peace research go deeper.

There were activities in the 1920s and 1930s that qualify as peace research, both in content and program. Earlier peace movements also included analytical aspects. Philosophers and political thinkers throughout history have been concerned with the issues of war and peace.

¹ Although the scope in this essay is global, practical examples will be given from the area most known to the author, Scandinavia. Examples are given in the footnotes.

As an organized, purposeful scholarly activity, however, it is the trends through the 20th century that are of particular interest - since it was one of the most violent centuries of humankind.

Today, there are peace research institutes inside universities as well as outside.² The organizational forms vary considerably. There are full-fledged educational programs (B.A., M.A., Ph.D.) as well as concentrations and special advanced programs.³ The number of institutions ranges in the hundreds, as do the various training programs. From a small beginning, peace research has become a large and established enterprise. It is chiefly found in the social sciences, but humanities and natural sciences have many examples of peace research activities.⁴

A fundamental feature of peace research is the union of "peace" and "research" into an integrated activity. The agenda for peace research has influenced the development of research topics, the way the field has set priorities and how they have shifted. Some topics have been particularly relevant at particular times. Topical relevance, in the societal sense, is an important element in the development of peace research. Peace research aspires to be relevant to the political conditions of the time. At the same time, research requires an element of detachment, a broader look and a focus on methodologies, analysis, review and critique. Thus, we can follow the historical formation of peace research along two broad lines: the creation of the "Peace Agenda" and the forming of the "Analytical Agenda." Together these lines constitute peace research. Together they also form the paradigms of peace research. They show us where to look, how to look, how to evaluate the evidence, how to be relevant. All these questions give rise to the paradigms of peace research. This also provides a background to consider the difficult issues of the impact of peace research on society. Let us follow these two lines to reach an understanding of where peace research finds itself today.

² In Sweden, Uppsala and Göteborg Universities have departments of peace research, and there are institutes such as SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute) and the Life and Peace Institute. In Finland, TAPRI (Tampere Peace Research Institute) is now included in Tampere University. In Norway, PRIO (International Peace Research Institute, Oslo) remains outside the university. In Denmark, COPRI (Copenhagen Peace Research Institute) has an independent affiliation with the University of Copenhagen.

³ Both at Uppsala and Göteborg Universities, there are Ph.D. programs. In Uppsala the degree is in Peace and Conflict Research; in Göteborg, it is in Peace and Development Research. Both run separate Master programs with international recruitment.

⁴ At Chalmers Technical University, Göteborg, there is a separate peace research unit.

Formation of the Peace Research Agenda

The Impact of Traumatic and Encouraging Events

It is relevant to begin with the development of the Peace Agenda which constitutes the objects of study. Table 1 shows that peace research has developed fields of study from traumatic experiences of the 20th century, but also from encouraging developments that are a constituent part of the historical flow of events (Wallensteen 1988).

Table 1. **Traumas and Encouraging Events Forming the Agenda of Peace Research**

<i>Event</i>	<i>Understanding of Event</i>	<i>Peace Research Topics</i>
World War I: Trauma	Loss of Crisis Control	History, Causes of War
League of Nations: Encouraging	Aggression, Need for Rules	International Law
World War II: Trauma	Again: Lost Control	Strategic Study vs Peace Research
Hiroshima: Trauma	Science used for War	Disarmament, Arms Control
Gandhi in India: Encouraging	Use of Nonviolent Means	History, Cases of Nonviolence
United Nations: Encouraging	Cooperation, Decolonization	International Organization
Holocaust: Trauma	Genocide, Ethnic Violence	Human and Collective Rights
Cold War: Trauma	Danger of Escalation, Militarization	Conflict Theory, Conversion
European Unity: Encouraging	Overcoming Ancient Enmity	Integration and Democracy Theory
Vietnam War: Trauma	Dependence, Imperialism	Structural Violence
Totalitarian Dissidents: Encouraging	Popular Moves to Democracy	NGOs, Popular Attitudes
Détente: Encouraging	Confidence-Building	Cooperation, Common Security
Environmental Threats: Trauma	Fear of Disaster and Conflict	Scarcity, Conflict and Cooperation
Bosnia: Trauma	Clash of Identities	Ethnic Dilemmas, Prevention
Peacemaking: Encouraging	Ending of Wars	Conflict Resolution

Table 1 presents fifteen major themes that have served to enlarge the agenda of what was originally a limited topic. Peace research arose as a field devoted to understanding the causes of war by systematic analyses of the historical experiences of war. However, already the earlier studies integrated many dimensions, notable for instance in the works by Sorokin (1937) and Wright (1942, 1965). The focus was on the causes of war, and that remains, to this day, a fundamental question for peace research. The solution of the problem of the origins of war has since become enlarged, involving a vast area of analytical questions. Table 1 indicates how such issues have come to take a central role.

In Table 1, there are equal numbers of traumatic, negative experiences, and aspirations or creative events that point to new possibilities. A distinction between "negative" and "positive" peace was made early in the history of peace research (Galtung 1964). In this table, these concepts are given an additional meaning. The traumas were connected with human suffering, and large, negative events affecting many parts of the world. The same was true for the encouraging developments, which are not only discrete events, but also positive advances that have drawn global attention. The common feature for traumatic and encouraging events is that they challenge established wisdom, disrupt trends, and even cause paradigmatic shifts. Traumas remind us that there are limits to the established "wisdom" concerning the ways things work. This mindset has to be overcome, and this is where research could play a role. The encouraging events we see indicate that reality offers many surprises. Some of them stem from utopian visions which suddenly take material form. This proximity between reality and research is a feature of social research in general. But in peace research in particular, a culture of openness and willingness to challenge established assumptions has been essential and central.

Certainly, all the topics listed in Table 1 are not exclusively covered under the heading of peace research. Peace research per se continues to be organizationally a distinct and smaller field within the broad study of war and peace, international relations, foreign policy, sociology,

economics, law, theology, technology, etc. Increasingly, however, leading, “cutting edge” inquiry is found in milieus carrying labels of “peace,” “conflict resolution,” “the UN,” “justice,” “development” or the like in front of the words “research” or “studies.” Many peace research topics are also organizationally and intellectually linked to other disciplines. However, the existence of special institutes or departments insures that the issues are not lost in the academic setting or in the public discussion. In fact, organizational independence of peace research programs has proved to be vitally important. The ability of peace researchers to develop and direct their own programs, hire their own faculty and staff, and recruit their own students has helped maintain the strength and viability of the field.⁵

The debate during the Cold War, which pitted strategic studies against peace research, has subsided today. More comprehensive concepts of security are widely discussed and accepted. An understanding about peace research has grown to the point where there are few critics portraying such efforts as extreme or idealistic. If there is one concern still commonly heard among world powers, however, it has to do with the distance between peace researchers and those charged with political decision-making, including decisions about the use of force. The calculated use of violence remains, as a strategy, alien to peace research. Instead, the idea is to search, as far as is possible, for “peace with peaceful means” (Galtung 1996). It goes without saying that war strategies are not likely to be developed at peace research institutions. Of course, the possibility of humanitarian intervention based on moral arguments and “just war” thinking is discussed in peace research institutions; however, there is no room for the formulation of practical military strategies for such operations.⁶

Looking once again at Table 1, we can see seven distinct Traumas relating to war or armaments where high death tolls occurred: World War I and II, Hiroshima, the Holocaust, the

⁵ This is the experience of peace research at Uppsala University in Sweden. The Department of Peace and Conflict Research was set up as an independent unit at the same time as Development Studies was begun as a program, housed within political science. By objective criteria, the former has gained a stronger position within and outside the university, over a period of 30 years of existence.

⁶ The September 11, 2001 attacks on New York and Washington again gave rise to such divisions, raising the problem of how to respond to terrorist actions or threats. These events may turn into a new trauma, to be added to the list in Table 1.

Cold War, Vietnam War, Bosnian War. Thus, the incidence of humans systematically killing other humans remains a tragic and modern phenomenon. The traumas in Table 1 span the entire 20th century, indicating that organized violence has been pervasive and global. In spite of many efforts in the 20th and 21st centuries, violence repeats itself in varied and unpredicted forms. Outbreaks of war in our own times remain a central human concern and also a fundamental focus for peace research.

Nonetheless, another look at Table 1 should focus on the many historical aspirations which are modern initiatives for controlling war and building security without violence. In Table 1 this relates to the League of Nations, UN, EU, and the many peacemaking efforts since 1989. Efforts at peace are as pervasive as war experiences. Without these peace efforts, the world would have been even less hopeful.

However, Table 1 makes it clear that peace research draws on a wider set of aspirations, not just those associated with the absence of war. There is a concerted interest in non-violence, peaceful resistance, democracy and emancipation of all sections of the society. Non-violent action has managed to change some societies without the use of force (Sharp 1973). There is also the observation that democratic states seldom engage in war with each other, thus giving an argument for the promotion of democracy (Russett 1993). But these interests go much further. They point to the more comprehensive concept of "structural violence" which makes peace not only a matter of removing war, but also of ridding society of other obstacles to basic human aspirations (Galtung 1969). Thus, since the late 1960s, development has been seen as part of the peace agenda.⁷ It also gave rise to questions of how structural and direct violence relate to each other and whether inequities in society generate wars and revolutions. The use of armed forces for maintaining structural inequities has additionally been recognized as an important concern.

⁷ The Department at Göteborg University is called PADRIGU, *Peace and Development* Research Institute at Göteborg University.

Table 1 also presents fears or challenges to peace which have not yet materialised. Thankfully, there has been no large-scale nuclear war or global environmental catastrophe. Peace research and peace thinking may have played a preventive role in this, particularly in the arena of nuclear threat. The idea of proactive prevention, bolstered with peace research, is vitally important. The 1990s have drawn increasing political interest to the field of conflict prevention, and peace researchers have played a role in this. The emancipation of oppressed groups has also become particularly significant in the field of gender relations and adds a new topic of study for peace researchers. (Tickner 1992). The study of emancipated groups has implications for the work of peacekeeping operations. (See the Windhoek Declaration 2000).⁸

Regional, Local and Institutional Peace Research Concerns

Although Table 1 reviews peace research from a global perspective, regional and local peace issues may be shaped by different particular traumatic or encouraging events. Naturally, there are varying degrees of concern and emphasis in peace research around the world. For instance, the experience of being the only nation to suffer a nuclear attack undoubtedly colors peace research in Japan.⁹ Gandhi's legacy has likely affected the agenda of peace research in India, but India's war with China has probably also had its impact on the nation's psyche.¹⁰ Peace research in Africa has been affected, naturally, by the struggles against apartheid, colonialism, neocolonialism and poverty.¹¹ In Latin America, peace researches typically concerned itself with US hegemony, with military regimes and the pervasive impact of a society structured by class.¹² For Middle East scholars, the dangers of war and the hopes for peace are undeniably tied to the Arab-Israel conflict and the complications of oil resources.

⁸ This was also brought up in the UN Security Council, see its resolution 1325 (2000).

⁹ There is a peace studies institute in Hiroshima, for instance.

¹⁰ There are a number of Gandhian institutes in India, but also other milieus are important and build on other thinking, notably in Benares Hindu University, Varanasi, and the Institute of Development and Communication, Chandigarh, Punjab.

¹¹ There are several initiatives to create African peace research associations.

¹² A most recent initiative is the Latin American Network for Research on Peace and Conflict Resolution Network, University of Zulia, Venezuela, formed in December 2000.

In the United States, the Vietnam War had a particularly strong impact on peace theorizing, but so too did the long threat of nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union. Indeed, the first peace institutes in the West were founded in the middle of the 1950s under the fear of nuclear development. A second wave of peace programs, particularly oriented to teaching, emerged in the 1980s.

For Europe, the Cold War division of the continent brought totalitarianism in the East and fears about becoming a new world war battlefield.¹³ In the post-Cold War period, Europe faces new concerns about prospects for peace. For instance, the notion of a security community has become an important preoccupation. (Deutsch et al 1957, Adler & Barnett 1998). However, global and regional --- rather than local -- concerns probably account for most contemporary peace research.

Today, we also recognize that there is a new need for the scholarly study of international peace and security institutions. Although the UN has been an important actor, the study of international organizations still remains limited, particularly outside the United States, and outside the field of international law.¹⁴ ACUNS (Academic Council on the UN System) now serves to direct empirical and theoretical study toward this topic – international peace institutions. Critical analysis of the performance of NATO or other Western organizations in international conflict management is also a topic that deserves more attention. On the other hand, the operations of governmental intelligence agencies and transnational corporations have been low on the list of research priorities.¹⁵ In the last several decades, the advent of the Internet, space technologies, mobile phone systems and other technological advancements has generated new arenas of power and influence, and thus presents new issues for peace research.

¹³ A number of the still functioning milieus were created in the 1960s and 1970s, in the midst of Cold War threats.

¹⁴ In a UN-friendly country such as Sweden, there is no milieu specialising in UN affairs. Academic training on the UN is also surprisingly limited. The UN Studies Unit at Yale University has few counterparts around the globe.

¹⁵ Now, the SIPRI yearbooks have standard sections on corporations involved in military production, however.

It would be a mistake to assume that all peace research is initiated under duress. There has been an enthusiastic growth in the study of the European Union, often sponsored by the European Union itself. The Jean Monnet programs for teaching and research provide an example of how this is done. There are also Centers for European Studies in an increasing number of universities. Sometimes, these centers have a peace research component, but more typically, they are tied to political science departments or law faculties. These centers where peace is just one among many academic interests could be seen as a challenge to the long-term vitality of peace research. But topics of great relevance to peace studies abound, as do theoretical issues. (e.g. agenda setting, political representation, implementation, etc). In the final analysis, peace research has certainly expanded as an academic discipline, but it is not usually found as a free-standing peace studies program. There is plenty of room for further scholarly development in the arena of peace studies and peace research.

Peace Studies and Its Relationship to Political Life

Even a cursory review of peace studies issues shows that peace research has an obvious relationship to political life, which is distinct from the traditional field of strategic studies. Peace studies is also distinct from peace activism or advocacy. A peace studies program is also typically based on a wider set of organizational connections than most strategic institutes, which are often satisfied with links to government defense and foreign affairs ministries. Peace research typically works with media, parliamentarians, non-governmental organizations and educational institutions. It has a more narrow approach than do action groups and action institutes, in the sense that it enters into public debates based on research and not on values. The contribution of peace research to peace strategies lies in its ability to span research and action, and then include general theory as well as political practice. Peace research assumes a more difficult position than other scholarly fields. It is, nevertheless, the way peace research has grown and earned respectability -- even among opponents. Peace research in itself may help to build bridges in society, thereby enhancing a necessary but often absent element for global integration.

The Analytical Agenda of Peace Research

A particularity of peace research is its openness to new methodologies. Conversely, a basic, critical overview of the conditions of peace and conflict in society makes peace research sceptical of established methodologies of scholarship. Approaches which tend to be too traditional and disconnected from modern social developments are also carefully critiqued by peace researchers. They ask: How can social science inquiries that are undertaken for human improvement – a value underlying most research – be so ineffective in interpreting the roots of violence in society? If these research approaches cannot capture such fundamental tendencies towards violence, are they worthy scientific research tools? This preliminary review of methodology and critical thinking results in a new starting point for peace researchers. They develop an ability to incorporate methodological challenges, take up new questions and turn them into researchable propositions. One part of this methodology, of course, is determining what is the appropriate unit of analysis. Let us begin by looking at methodological developments and later return to this question.

Methodological Developments in Peace Research

Just as the peace agenda has become increasingly diversified, so too have research methodologies used in peace studies. Some changes are more important than others, however. The first challenge to traditional research in the field of international politics and international relations was statistical methodology.

The early studies by Sorokin and Wright on the history of war included quantitative measures, such as the numbers of wars, intensities of war and other dimensions. These projects attempted to show correlations between societal developments and the onset of war. Sorokin was interested in basic cultural elements (e.g. "sensate" vs. "ideational" cultures) whereas

Wright was concerned with the absence of a central authority which prevents international law from being more effective. In Wright's view, there was a discrepancy between developments in real life and the legal-political institutions.

The methodological approach has been taken further in a series of projects, most notably in the Correlates of War Project (Singer & Small 1972, Small & Singer 1982, Geller & Singer 1998, Vasquez 2000). This project excelled in finding quantifiable indicators for war but also for polarity, capabilities, and other factors in a way that which allows for broad historical comparisons. This research has created an important resource base for other types of studies as well. Consequently, the use of statistical methodology remains a strong and useful tool.

Statistical methodology was also initially tied to an understanding that behavior was the central factor to be studied. In other words, the intentions and capabilities of those involved with violent outbreaks were less crucial as topics of study.

During the Cold War, conflict analysis through game theory became an important tool in the analysis of the relations of major powers. It was possible to use game theory to demonstrate the dangers of the confrontation and the need to find another "game" (Rapoport 1960, Axelrod 1984). It could also be used in established institutions to evaluate policies rational actors should pursue in a conflict. However, game theory built on particular assumptions of rationality and on the ways parties would be expected to act without any assurance that the participants would ordinarily act that way. By using game theory with living humans, more insights would invariably be gained. This could either fuel the arguments of game theory critics or the arguments of the establishment.

Behavioral and simple statistical methodologies have been challenged by many critics for being too empirical. These methodologies assumed that what is observable is the reality, and what could be observed also could be counted. Opponents of this view argued that structures are as important as behavior but cannot be easily measured. This assertion was made in the Marxist challenge although many of the early Marxists (notably Lenin) used much statistical evidence to prove their points. In this case, statistical information was used more for description

than for analysis. However, the basic theory pointed to more qualitative phenomena that were difficult to capture in an equation. This led to an interest in case studies, analysing the effects of particular phenomena in selected cases. In this way, useful historical narratives could be generated. However, the danger in this approach was that cases could be chosen so as to fit the models for which they were selected. A strong theoretical framework, building on considerable internal logical coherence could sacrifice the integrity of a project to an ambition to fit reality into a framework. Data or cases that did not follow the predictions of the model could be explained away as aberrations or unique features and thus of limited value.

Methodologically, this state of affairs is potentially a serious problem. If cases are selected to fit a model, the generalizations that follow are of no value beyond those particular case descriptions. Even these could be disputed as biased. The choice of cases, in other words, becomes central. Thus, a move towards “comparative approaches” emerged and developed. This methodology developed and ways were created to select cases that could objectively challenge a model, giving critics the chance to contest its assumptions or findings. Only in this way was it possible to develop generalizations about peace and conflict that are necessary starting points for research. Interest in comparative studies for theory building is strong today, requiring new types of insights and, thus, new methodologies (George 1979). Indeed, the theoretical selection of particular cases has again become interesting, particularly as issues of ethnicity have created a need for anthropological insights which are also of interest to statistical studies (Gurr 1993, 2000). The first set of conflict resolution studies drew on such comparative approaches (e.g. Azar & Burton 1986, Touval & Zartman 1985).

Largely, what we have seen in peace research has been an empirical approach, where evidence was highly important. The constructivist approach was the next challenge to appear (Wendt). It argued that reality itself is in the mind of the analyst; one sees what one wants to see. Evidence is subjectively selected no matter what one does since it is done by a particular researcher. Another researcher may find entirely different information as evidence. Taken to the

extreme, this research approach would argue that generalization is impossible as all science rests in the eyes of the observer.

In a more limited version, it would argue that there are relevant phenomena that are not observed and are consequently not even considered. Thus, there is a bias, but in this case a bias that can be corrected; new dimensions in the research approach can be added or can replace some of the original ones to correct for bias.

Contemporary debates over post-modernist thinking and feminist theory are examples of these new and fresh research approaches (Tickner 1992). In both cases, new dimensions previously overlooked are now being given a new emphasis. Peace research itself made war a focus of analysis. Marxist analysis added the study of development. Today's challenges add gender and other previously invisible dimensions.

The Units of Analysis in Peace Research

Another aspect in the development of peace research has been a shift in the unit of research analysis. Two units of study have been paramount in peace research: the state and the system. The state was an obvious choice since it is the state that holds power even as it exists as a unit which could potentially be influenced. For instance, decisions on military expenditures and military interventions are made by states, and are the subject of domestic debate. An interest in the conversion of resources into peaceful uses has brought forth discussions about the significance of the military industry and local communities. The powers behind the state's actions were discovered.

Historically, states have always excused their actions (i.e. the purchase of new arms, or the making of new alliances) with reference to the actions of other states. What state A did was a reaction to what state B had just done or was about to do or was likely to do in the future if A did not act now. There were also relationships between states which at the same time claimed they were sovereign. For the analysts, the system of states became important. System analysis, which emerged on the research scene in the 1960s, moved into peace research as well as into

strategic studies. For some, the system was an absolute, determining force. To others, it appeared almost as a fiction. The Marxist challenge had already attacked the hierarchical and economic aspects of a "world system" (Wallerstein 1974). Questions of dependence and development were not only a topical addition to peace research, but were accompanied with new methodologies. Often these were strong on theory and weak on data. They focused on a different set of actors, however. Later challenges have emphasised the "whiteness" and "patriarchal" character of many systems. In this manner, other aspects of the system were made visible, open for scrutiny, debate and new forms of change.

These developments in the understanding of the appropriate units of analysis made attention to the global and regional levels an integral part of peace research thinking. This was also combined with the obvious difference in regional agendas of peace. To many, the remedy was to be found on the system level. For instance, this made international organizations – especially the UN -- important objects for analysis. The UN was characterized by a number of the features making it, as we have seen above, a symbol of hope. However, the analysis of such institutions either as arenas for conflict or as actors for peace remains limited. On this topic, there is a unity of interest for peace research and international law. For others, there is a preference for the study of development policies and changing global economic relations. To many observers, all of this growth has represented a merger between peace research and development studies. For the European peace research community, the European Union has generated considerable debate. Many people are wondering what it will mean and what its future potential will be. Will the European Union emerge as a hope or a threat where peace is concerned?

In addition, the state and inter-state levels of peace research have been severely challenged by the emergence of a host of transboundary non-state actors. Chief among these are the transnational corporations. Discussions about whether wars are created by greed or grievance have been common. These discussions have often been additionally colored by such concepts as "warlordism" (Duffield 1998, Reno 1998, Berdal & Malone 2000).

As issues of the implementation of economic sanctions and peace have been considered, questions have often been raised about the contributions vs. the damaging effects of corporate activity. The same sort of dialogues have focused on matters relating to arms trade, and, more recently to small arms trade. And so, peace research studies have often been practical and investigative, rather than theoretical and oriented to the creation of general propositions. Until such global and visionary approaches can be further developed, some issues are likely to remain underdeveloped in peace research.

The influence of the NGO community on prospects for peace has also frequently been an issue of some concern. NGOs can be strong and influential in some societies, particularly where the state is weak. In stronger states, they are likely to act as pressure or lobby groups. In this way, they act and are perceived in quite a different light. This role of the NGO in different settings has not yet resulted in much systematic research. In fact, the peace research community itself constitutes such an actor.¹⁶ Thus, it would not be difficult to analyze the interactions and impact of NGOs, at least with the respect to the actions of peace researchers. Many researchers would find this a comfortable level for personal investigative involvement in international affairs.

It is surprising that the analysis of NGOs is still underdeveloped. Their impact is seldom studied or appreciated, even in peace research work. Actually, there are several reasons for this. One is the fact that it turns the spotlight in the "wrong" direction. Instead of critically scrutinising the one who holds power, it gives attention to those challenging the powerholders. We can ask: Who benefits from this kind of research? Some say that it only or mostly benefits the power holders. But there is a more positive corollary. That is that research methodology can also be improved by self-assessment.

At the same time, another question has been raised about whether development assistance in fact contributes to conflict. It is possible that this might be the case since those

¹⁶ Examples are the International Peace Research Association, the Peace Science Society (International) and sections of the International Studies Association.

giving development funds are often unaware of the importance of existing conflicts (Anderson 1999). This has also become a prominent question in the field of conflict resolution. Evaluations have been made of problem-solving workshops, a peacemaking exercise of potential political relevance. Peace researchers have wanted to know if these could enrich the development of this approach to conflict resolution. Knowledge of the issues, of course, is important. This variety of peacemaking practice has the added blessing of helping participants learn from their own mistakes. This again suggests that peace research may benefit as well from an analysis of its own field.

A final note on the forming of the analytical agenda is of relevance both for methodological developments and the choice of unit of analysis. The sources for peace research have expanded dramatically. The end of the Soviet empire and Communist control in Eastern Europe made it possible to analyze conflicts with new perspectives. First among these were studies on the origins of the Cold War, new perceptions of the Cuban missile crisis and the Berlin crisis. Later came credible documentation about the repressive character of the Soviet regime, particularly under Stalin's leadership. The archives give insights that can solve old mysteries, such as the capturing of Raoul Wallenberg in 1945. The extent of conflict in the Soviet system –especially in the Ukraine -- in the 1940s is also a new subject of analysis. New self-understanding is developing and is likely to give impetus for many re-evaluations of conflict management. The new technologies of course speed the information search and give new means for the production of research. The possibility of grasping a larger reality increases. Peace research has been quick to use these possibilities.

The Impact of Peace Research on Society

It would be easy to argue that peace research is strongest where peace is also strong. There is a concentration of peace institutes and departments in Northern and Western Europe, and in North America, Japan, Korea, and India. The picture, however, is not that simple. There are also peace studies programs in the midst of conflict. Examples would be in the Middle East,

Southern Africa, and Southeast Asia, to name a few. This scattered picture of peace centers may reflect more the inequitable distribution of research resources than the status of peace or conflict in an area. Peace research has also been found to be strong where social sciences are strong and where economies are diversified.

There are other factors which give peace research a broader, more global vision. Researchers in these peace studies programs are not necessarily recruited from the countries in which the institutions are located. In addition, many of the stronger institutions are supporting programs in economically less fortunate places. In many ways, the internationalist or globalist ethos pervades peace research.

So, how does peace research impact on society? Institutions, which are typically located in universities, have their impact through research and teaching. Institutes outside universities more strongly emphasize research reports, special seminars, and yearbooks. Organizationally, the location of institutions – within or outside universities – is important, since the daily preoccupation of the employees is different. Also the research climate inside these settings diverges, and the criteria for success shifts. In a university environment, acceptability and respectability build on standard academic criteria (publications, citations, assignments, etc). In an institute-milieu, these two factors are very important, but so too is accessibility and policy relevance. Continuing education in the midst of the educational work of the institution is also beneficial. Well organised, teaching tasks can complement research, and induce new generations to venture into the field with new ideas. This is a challenge often not given to institutions outside universities.

Making an Impact through Teaching

The impact of peace research, in other words, has a long-term and a short-term dimension. In the long-term, university research milieus are stronger in sharpening the institute's focus on peace perspectives. The teaching program is central to this. It is likely that former students (alumni) will bring with them a larger array of investigative tools when they operate in

positions of influence and power than will those students coming from traditional disciplines. This professionalism will shape the way these peace advocates give priority to issues. This impact is certainly not measurable, but will be mixed or blended with other influences. Still, there is likely to remain a vivid and enduring impact from basic training. As peace education is still in its infancy, there is little investigation into the long-term effects of thorough and broad training in peace studies students, but it could be well worth further study. If quality training is truly this important, it means that peace education could contribute to the strengthening of peace alternatives in decision-making in a profound way.

The number of programs in peace studies is now impressive.¹⁷ As the university programs vary greatly, one from another, they are not always easy to compare. For instance, in the US, a Master's program is offered within "graduate" studies programs, often within a program leading to a Ph.D. In contrast, a Swedish Master's degree is the highest level of basic education ("grundutbildning"). It provides a springboard for the application to a Ph.D. program, for instance. The academic levels in Denmark and Norway, in turn, are entirely different. Thus, courses will be different not only in focus but also in the way they are structured by the university systems. Academic comparisons are also difficult to make. But, within one particular system, much can be gained through co-operation.¹⁸ Diversity within peace education programs does make it complicated to move from one system to another.¹⁹ In peace education, however, such mobility should be encouraged, and, thus, close scrutiny of the needs of the students is necessary.²⁰ Mobility is very important as it enriches the experience of meeting students from other areas and concerns. It also strengthens the impact the training will have once students are

¹⁷ As could be expected, they have different titles. The basic university program at Uppsala University is known as 'peace and conflict knowledge', whereas the international Master-program is in 'international studies' (UPIS), at Göteborg University it is "international relations'. University of Notre Dame, Indiana, uses "international peace studies", George Mason University has "international conflict analysis and resolution" (ICAR), American University has MA-programs in "ethics and peace" as well as in "international peace and conflict resolution".

¹⁸ The Peace Studies Association brings together a number of programs, largely within the US system.

¹⁹ Not much seems to have been done within the field on this, IPRA for instance, has an active peace education section but it is devoted to pedagogical development rather than administrative solutions.

²⁰ There is also an 'EU-Master's degree. Uppsala University is part of a seven-university network for training in "humanitarian assistance" (NOHA) leading to such a Master-degree.

found in different occupations. The network established by each student is likely to remain as an invaluable resource for life. At the moment, there is no international institution responding to the need for more information on programs. We must find ways to analyze and compare their size, funding or general strengths. Such a research challenge could require a stronger mandate for UNESCO, but it could also be a task assigned to other parts of the UN system.

At present, new teaching programs are proliferating more quickly than research activities. This may be beneficial for the enlistment of donors since results are more quickly visible if there is an output of students. However, there is a need to keep a balance between peace education and research. Good training will require good trainers, and good trainers will have to rest on good research. Thus, teaching cannot be expanded without also expanding research. High-quality research takes time to complete, and may appear slow. Still, without it, the training of new students will suffer. Thus, for universities and donors alike, it is important to contribute to both training programs and research funding. Only in this way can training of new students live up to the expectations that are correctly associated with it. The best advertisement for a training program is a student who is satisfied with the training, and the use he or she can make of it in professional life.

Contemporary Peace Research Milieus

In fact, there seems today to be three types of peace research milieus developing. One emphasizes the development of research capacity. It is researchers who lead these peace research groups, and the high-level research seminars that they offer. These seminars constitute an important intellectual engine that moves research along much more quickly. Students of this peace research milieu are expected to become researchers or professionals who can generate important data and background analysis for decision-makers. This function is much needed in governmental and non-governmental institutions alike. This undiluted research focus is very much the original focus of many peace research programs. It remains the dominant trait, for instance, of programs in Scandinavia.

A second type of peace research milieu focuses on conflict resolution training. Again, basic research in the field guides the program, but the program also involves providing skills for use in contentious situations. Researchers, teachers and students all gain experiences in particular conflict situations as mediators, facilitators or other third party representatives. The increasing use of such techniques is having greater impact on international conflicts ("Track II diplomacy") but also within organizations and corporations. Training that includes hands-on skills in mediation, negotiation and, even mobilization, as suggested in the conflict resolution literature would be required. Research milieus with this particular focus may be needed for the future. This approach would contribute greatly to a long-term impact on peace research as well. It may even require new organizational forms.²¹

A third type of peace research milieu is the advocacy institute. This organization builds on advances in nonviolence studies and campaigning. This is likely to be a milieu that emphasizes justice, human rights, fair trade and sustainable environment as an integral part of the agenda. It requires insights into particular issue areas, as well as an understanding of nonviolent techniques. Institutions of social work have a stronger record on this score, as social workers are trained to get involved in local situations. In this case, it involves providing welfare and the empowerment of vulnerable groups, but that is only part of what peace studies is all about. So far, there are few peace studies institutions with these types of social action as the sole objective. With the unequal impact of globalization, however, there might be a greater need for such milieus in the future. They can bring together an orientation to development and peace in an action-oriented framework.

It goes without saying that the focus of a particular milieu will impact on its research strategy as well as on its influence in society. Assessing impact, in other words, has to take account of the different orientation of peace research institutions.

²¹ An example is the recent Transcend network for conflict resolution.

The Impact of Global Issues on Peace Research Milieus

NGOS –whether temporary or durable and well established -- will naturally surface peace themes that require expertise from those in peace research. In recent global campaigns against land mines and against "illicit" trade in small arms, those in the lead have drawn on the expertise and professional input of peace research milieus. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), for instance, strives to bring impartial knowledge on disarmament and armaments to international negotiations. Thus, there has been a close relationship between the two groups. However, the experience also shows that peace action and peace research are distinct and complementary activities. Activists are not necessarily good at research; researchers are not often good at political action. Thus, a division of labor has developed where professional peace research is likely to be the best basis for peace action, whatever form it takes.

In the short-term, the researcher who can present a particular action plan that is timely and relevant may have a stronger impact in his or her field. Action may follow from this plan, even though the researcher is only building on his/her knowledge and reputation without having prior connections in relevant government departments or NGOs. This is where many peace research institutes find an important niche. There is experience in this from the fields of disarmament, peace commissions and international organizations, for instance. Increasingly, peace researchers have become involved in conflict resolution activities. The growth of think tanks worldwide suggests the importance of drawing academic knowledge into policy decisions.

Decision-makers, pressure groups, NGOs, are all looking for possible and concrete action alternatives. Researchers can provide such insights. Indeed, researchers may themselves form action teams for particular issues, even becoming, at some point, political actors. Some former researchers have even ventured into political life. This means, however, that one role is changed for another, and the way back to the academy may be more complicated than anticipated.

The Impact of Peace Research Milieus on Public Debate

Between long-term and short-term effects, there are many other levels of impact Public debate provides one of these. The ability of a researcher to participate and, thus, give voice to a peace perspective can shape the spectrum of political options. The input of a research professional can help to shine the spotlight on issues of concern, and can help to bring in aspects not considered previously. Since the peace researcher does this from a peace perspective, the perceived options in the debate are enlarged. It is increasingly clear that public debate of options and the peace issue is crucial to the formation of important decisions in open societies.

In these situations, decision-makers are more likely to see the polar extremes of the issues, not just the voting blocks or the positions that square with their own interests. Peace research has the experience of participating in public debate on issues ranging from national defence to global justice, from local base closures to international trade issues. The creativity and openness to new ideas that characterize research in general and peace research in particular, also provides a service to society at large. Based on scholarly standards, the contributions of peace researchers can be unique, significant and increasingly more important.

Peace Research Ethics

There is always an issue of peace research ethics, which, in particular pertains to the work on action alternatives and on engagement in public debate. This necessitates drawing practical conclusions from research findings. It is part of the peace research tradition. It also requires acute awareness to the fact that the researcher is entering into a novel arena for action and discussion. The expertise of the researcher rests on his/her ability to do research and training, not necessarily on an ability to formulate policy or debate strategic points. Historically, the issues of research ethics were important for initiating peace research work on matters of armaments and disarmament. The Manhattan Project and the resulting nuclear weapons stand out as a development that changed the course of history. This development was not possible without resort to the most eminent scholars of the time. It also taught lessons for scientists with

humanist values. It is, consequently, surprising to find that there is now little debate on ethics in the peace research circles. The Uppsala Code of Ethics from the early 1980s remains an important attempt to establish ethical guidelines. (Gustafsson 1984). Time has passed, however, and some conditions have changed. Some revision of guidelines appears warranted. For instance, matters of contemporary conflict resolution and peace advocacy bring in serious ethical considerations. Peace researchers may risk hurting exposed groups or promoting actions that are insensitive to dominant cultural understandings when they participate in settlements. Particularly in the field of peace research, the ethical debate needs to be kept alive.

Conclusion

What we have seen in this paper is that the history of peace research is long enough to have provided us with many lessons. Today, peace research is a global activity, with institutions, institutes, departments, groups and networks in all regions of the world. Its global reach makes it necessary to consider what its agenda is or should be. The proliferation of issues and institutions also makes it imperative to think how it can optimally contribute to the furthering of its explicit goals -- peace and security. Should there be a division of labor with respect to the agendas of problems and analysis?²² Should there be a division between research and training? Should there be different milieus for different methodologies? How can the reorganization of distinctive and far-flung peace research programs be accomplished, and is this desirable? Or should peace research, like so many other activities in the global village, be encouraged to take root, mature and flower freely on its own?

From a pragmatic point of view, it is not possible to make an agreement on who does what and what is truly desirable. Creativity in the field of peace research should not be stifled by administrative bureaucracy. Nonetheless, new institutions should be cautioned to carefully

²² The two departments at Swedish universities consciously departed from different foci on violence, thus, one carries the name "peace *and conflict*" research (Uppsala), the other was named "peace *and development*" research (Göteborg). Furthermore, SIPRI has had a traditional focus on armaments and the Life and Peace Institute builds on it being an ecumenical institution.

analyze what they can specifically contribute to the research pluralism that already exists. Older institutions, in the same vein, need to constantly re-evaluate what they do, and must also be prepared to leave some fields for others. Dialogue and interaction among peace researchers is reasonable and healthy. An element of challenge and competition is productive. There may also be a need for maintaining the status quo for institutions that perform tasks important for all. Among these tasks are keeping information on research and educational programs. Such service functions would help to strengthen the field and be useful to those interested in its activities.

The most important lesson to be learned about peace research is that a clear profile for any milieu (whether a program, an institute, an independent research group, a department) is necessary to make an impact in the scholarly community as well as in political life. Each milieu will have to find its own, appropriate mix of research approaches and will have to be prepared to adapt that mix. Flexibility is the lifeblood of peace research, as long as adaptations do not cause it to lose its soul.

References

- Adler, Emanuel & Michael Barnett (eds) 1998. *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, Mary B. 1999. *Do No Harm. How Aid can Support Peace – or War*, Boulder, Co.: Lynne Rienner.
- Axelrod, Robert 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*, Basic Books, New York.
- Azar, Edward E. & John W. Burton (eds) 1986. *International Conflict Resolution. Theory and Practice*, Wheatsheaf, Sussex, Lynne Rienner, Boulder, Co,
- Berdal, Mats & David Malone (eds) 2000. *Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas in Civil Wars*, International Peace Academy, Lynne Rienner, Boulder, Co. and London.
- Deutsch, Karl W. et al. 1957. *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- Duffield, Mark 1998. 'Post-Modern Conflict: Warlords, Post-Adjustment States and Private Protection', *Civil Wars*, Vol 1 (1): 65-102.
- Galtung, Johan 1964. 'An Editorial', *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 1. No 1.
- Galtung, Johan 1969. 'Violence, Peace and Peace Research', *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 6 (3), 167-191.
- Galtung, Johan 1996. *Peace by Peaceful Means. Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*, Sage, London.
- Geller, Daniel S., & J. David Singer 1998. *Nations at War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- George, Alexander L. 1979. Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison, in Lauren, P. G. (ed). *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory and Policy*. New York: Free Press.
- Gurr, Ted R. 1993. *Minorities at Risk*, United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington, D.C.
- Gurr, Ted R. 2000. *Peoples Versus States. Minorities at Risk in the New Century*. United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington, D.C.
- Gustafsson, Bengt et al. 1984. The Uppsala Code of Ethics for Scientists, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 21 (4) 19984, pp 311-316.
- Rapoport, Anatol 1960. *Fights, Games and Debates*, Ann Arbor, Mi: University of Michigan Press.
- Reno, William 1998. *Warlord Politics and African States*. Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner.
- Russett, Bruce M. 1993. *Grasping the Democratic Peace*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- Russett, Bruce M. (ed) 1997. *The Once and Future Security Council*. Macmillan, London.
- Sharp, Gene 1973. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Boston, Ma.; Port Sargent.
- Singer, J. David & Melvin Small 1972. *The Wages of War, 1816-1965: A Statistical Handbook*. New York: Wiley
- Small, Melvin & J. David Singer 1982. *Resort to Arms*. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. 1937. *Social and Cultural Dynamics. Volume Three. Fluctuations of Social Relationships, War and Revolution*, New York: American Book Company.
- Tickner, J. Ann 1992. *Gender in International Relations. Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Touval, Saadia & I. William Zartman (eds) 1985. *International Mediation, Theory and Practice*. Boulder, Co.: Westview Press.

- Vasquez, John A. (ed) 2000. *What Do We Know About War?* Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Wallensteen, Peter 1988. 'The Origins of Peace Research', in Wallensteen, P. (ed). *Peace Research: Achievements and Challenges*, Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, pp 7-29.
- Wallensteen, Peter (ed) 1998. *Preventing Violent Conflicts, Past Record and Future Challenges*. Uppsala, Sweden: Department of Peace and Conflict Research.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel 1974. *The Modern World-System. Capitalist Agriculture and The Origins of the European World Economy*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wendt, Alexander 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge Studies in International Relations, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiberg, Håkan 1988, 'The Peace Research Movement', in Wallensteen, P. (ed), *Peace Research: Achievements and Challenges*, Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, pp 30-53.
- Windhoek Declaration and The Namibia Plan of Action on 'Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Multidimensional Peace Support Operations'*, Windhoek, Namibia, 31 May 2000.
- Wright, Quincy 1942, 1965. *A Study of War*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.