
UNIT 4 CULTURE OF PEACE

Structure

4.1 Introduction

Aims and Objectives

4.2 Need for Peace

4.2.1 Peace and Aggression

4.3 What makes Peace Possible?

4.3.1 External Measures of Compliance

4.3.2 Internal Measures of Compliance

4.3.3 Culture of Peace Defined

4.4 Pillars of the Culture of Peace

4.4.1 Cosmology, Worldview and Belief System

4.4.2 Enculturation

4.4.3 Education

4.4.4 Institutional Mechanisms

4.5 Summary

4.6 Terminal Questions

Suggested Readings

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Just as war begins in the minds of men, peace also begins in our minds.

Preamble, UNESCO

Societies, irrespective of their position on the scale of material prosperity and richness of culture, can be or have ever been fully peaceful. It is claimed by many that as the level of material well-being rises and human beings would enjoy the fruits of escalating well-being, morality would gain in strength; it would be quite possible to control, if not completely eradicate, man's aggressive behaviour. As a matter of fact, the whole thrust of the worldview grounded in liberalism underlines the need for economic development for ensuring eternal peace. However, the fact remains that the belief in economic development as the sure promoter of peace is misplaced. As Galtung points out,

...there is nothing that seems to confirm the widely held idea that a major increase in the standard of living of the world population or a fairer distribution of the fruits of man's labour would contribute significantly to a more peaceful world. A better distribution may solve internal problems but at the same time free resources for external aggression.¹

Insofar as interrelation between nation-states is concerned, the rising standard of living poses, as Galtung underlines, a threat perhaps only to peace at the international level. However, there is no guarantee that increasing wealth is an effective means of suppressing aggressive behaviour. It is not the riches that make a society peaceful. History offers numerous examples of peaceful societies that stand at the bottom of the scale of material well-being; it also confirms that as men grow rich, they tend to be more aggressive. Thus, the question of what sustains peaceful

behaviour has to be explored not in terms of rising standard of living but in terms of other factors.

The search of such factors must begin from the recognition that all societies are characterised by peaceful as well as aggressive behaviour. More generally, peaceableness and aggression coexist in clusters of attitudes and behaviours present in varying proportions in most societies. It reflects the basic human need for bonding, on the one hand, and the equally important need for autonomy, for personal space, on the other. Violent and nonviolent behaviour characterise every society; it displays a pattern of intermittent violence alternating with relative periods of peace.

The alternation of intermittent violence and periods of peaceful existence is testimony to the fact that culture of peace is not that strong to prevent this alternation. But what does the term “culture of peace” signify? What are the factors that create and sustain culture of peace? Both peace and aggression find their place in the minds of men. To make the culture of peace stronger involves the training of mind. However, man lives in society and society’s character and process have a great bearing on what an individual person thinks or does. It is, therefore, necessary that there must exist in the society certain institutions and practices that induce men to be peaceable or prevent a fractious situation to arise or to bring to an earlier end when it has arisen.

Aims and Objectives

This Unit would enable you to understand

- The meaning of culture of peace
- The modes of controlling aggression
- Supportive structures of culture of peace
- Institutional mechanisms of keeping peace

4.2 NEED FOR PEACE

All through the ages, human beings have hoped and worked for a situation that would make peace a durable, if not an eternal phenomenon. The need for peace as well as aggression arises from the very conditions of man’s existence in this phenomenal world. Man needs peace because its absence does not auger well for the realisation of his life purposes. A person, who wants to concentrate in order to think about or remember something, will find it very difficult to do so if he is placed in an extremely noisy environment. Similarly, the pursuit of daily routine requires a peaceful atmosphere in which stable functional relations could enjoy reliability and durability. Excessive disturbance in social relations, either functional or emotional, upsets the smooth flow of life activities. A disturbed social situation generates frustrations and frustration causes injury to individual psyche and collective well-being. Stability is a necessary condition for salubrious and fruitful social existence.

Undoubtedly stable social relations are necessary but not a sufficient condition of social existence. Stability, if it is frozen, tends to fix particular social relations for eternity. It does not allow innovations, deviance from settled ways of thinking and doing, and blocks change at its source. However, people want to do something new, something different from what they have been living with, and experiment with ideas and things that differ qualitatively from the prevailing ideas and existing things. The need to innovate is a call for change. And ruling out change that

frozen stability implies, is the source of frustration and therefore aggression. Thus stability and peace are as necessary for keeping society on an even keel as change is essential for pushing society forward on the path of development.

4.2.1 Peace and Aggression

For a benign social order, both stability and change are necessary. Change is upsetting and disturbing. It disturbs established modes of thinking and doing and shatters the sense of continuity and certainty. It is, therefore, necessary to neutralise the consequences of change to gently stir established patterns of personal existence and social interactions. If the pace of change is rough and faster, its consequences might prove dysfunctional; they might radically alter the character of different social groups, completely upset established patterns of inter-group relations and consequently, unhinge settled patterns of motivation and behaviour. These changes are likely to trigger aggression and pave the way for violence. While peace and stability are preferred, change and violence cannot be ruled out, if circumstances conspire to make them inevitable. Both continuity and change are necessary for the health of society and its members.

The important question in this regard is not the perpetuity of peace but the peaceful, nonviolent resolution of conflict as and when it raises its ugly head. People often clamour for social change. They identify some aspect of their society, including its institutions, as problematic and in need of alteration, paving the way for social change. If peaceful methods of bringing about the required change is resisted and frustrated, violent methods of change may be adopted. The occurrence of change, especially loaded with the potentiality of breaking peace, creates situations that may turn out to be violent. However, the capacity of any society to deal with such situations nonviolently, peacefully, without a resort to violence, is what can be called balance in movement. It is this balance in movement that makes for peace and forges culture of peace. Such a peace does not block change and, when the pressure for change becomes irresistible, it does not lead to violence and shake the social order to its roots. As a result, society becomes peaceful.

4.3 WHAT MAKES CULTURE OF PEACE POSSIBLE?

The culture of peace is desirable but how it can be achieved must be squarely faced. Every society has certain norms of behaviour that emphasise peaceful, proper conduct and develops certain mechanisms to control, regulate and, if possible, eliminate or neutralise the tendency towards aggression and violence. Broadly speaking, two classes of such mechanisms- internal and external- can be identified for the purposes at hand. Both internal and external mechanisms of controlling individual motivation and behaviour aim at promoting and ensuring compliance with certain standards of personal and social behaviour so that interpersonal, inter-group and international relations do not turn out to be violent and that if and when contestation promises to transform itself into violent conflict, whether organised or not, best counsel would block this transformation from taking place.

4.3.1 External Measures of Compliance

These two kinds of control mechanisms are found in every society; however, they differ from each other in the sense that while some authority outside the individual himself imposes external mechanisms, internal control mechanisms depend for their efficiency essentially on internalised norms of behaviour. Ridicule, reprimand, punishment – these are some of the examples of external mechanisms; they are expected to instill in the individual a sense of shame and regret for the infraction of norms of behaviour that society has accepted and expects its

members to adhere to. For example, Jainism, a religion that does not approve violence in any form, relies on ridicule and reprimand and sanctions the use of such derogatory words as “dhik”, “ha-ha” etc. to generate a sense of shame and guilt in the person guilty of some improper conduct.

We all are familiar with the use of slaps and rods in the case of those children who are supposed to be guilty of quarreling and for their recourse to violent acts. The methods of controlling and regulating behaviour may not be socially sanctioned, but they are usually socially practised. In addition, there are certain institutionalised mechanisms that every society, whether primitive or modern, has access to for enforcing compliance. There are informal methods of settling violent conflicts. These methods range from mediation to informal methods of settling conflicts such as caste panchayat and village panchayat. Their efficacy depends on the fear of social boycott that may leave a person on the limbo of isolation and stoppage of social relations if milder punitive measures fail to be effective. This method is known as boycott. A person unfortunate enough to invite collective punitive action of this kind virtually becomes a non-person.

Besides informal methods of social control, there are institutionalised methods that derive their sanction from centralised political authority. It is this centralised political authority that prescribes the lawful, if not moral, behaviour in social interaction and what punishment may follow if a person is found guilty of infringing the code of conduct formulated by the state. These methods are legal methods, which derive their sanctity from laws that the legislative assembly of a particular country enacts. As such, only that infraction comes under legal scrutiny that has been recognised by law as unlawful behaviour. The police and judicial system are the principal agencies that are concerned with passing judgments whether the person or persons, suspected of committing a violent crime, is guilty or not and what punishment must be meted out to him, if he or they is/are found guilty.

Mechanisms of control seek to emphasise refraining from doing what the society or the centralised political authority considers to be improper and, therefore, harmful to nonviolent, peaceful social relations. All these methods imply threat; if the implied threat fails to deter a person from taking recourse to violence, then punishment follows. Reliance on threat followed by punishment is integral to external mechanisms of control. Compliance based on coercive methods is undoubtedly compliance obtained through the use or threat of force, especially against those who are defined as aggressors. In essence, methods of control based on coercion exemplify a model of seeking compliance that is based on deviance, detection, conviction, adjudication and sanctions, whether physical, economic, social and legal. While social methods presuppose a body of unwritten normative principles and adhoc methods of detection, determination, sanction, the formal methods presuppose a nucleus of institutions specially set up for this purpose. Since all these methods imply coercion, Galtung characterises them as structural violence.

A distinctive characteristic of external mechanisms of ensuring compliance is that they become relevant *post facto*, that is, only after a particular activity comes or brought to notice and is declared as an infringement- lawfully sanctioned behaviour. The punishment it invites is supposed to be educative in the sense that it will forcefully bring to the consciousness of the aggressor the fact that he has done wrong and he must not do it again. This is supposed to induce the aggressor to refrain from repeating it in the future. Thus coercion is treated as a means of reform which, when accomplished, is supposed to be permanent.

Such a supposition is however based on a very tenuous logic. We all are familiar with the term

“hardened criminal”, who goes on repeating his crimes no matter how severely or how often he is punished. Coercion, in his case, proves quite ineffective. The reason is that there is something like rational commensuration, which signifies that people compare the gain with the cost they have to pay for a particular action they plan to take. If the cost is lower than the gain, people would go on infringing approved codes of conduct whether social or political. The phenomenon of rational commensuration should alert us to the fact that external mechanisms of ensuring compliance with peaceful means of resolving differences that, when left unattended, are certain to lead to violence, are by no means sufficient. They need to be supplemented and strengthened by the cultivation of attitudes that refuse to use violent methods for resolving conflicts.

4.3.2 Internal Measures of Compliance

The talk of the training of disposition and attitude for sustaining peaceableness underlines the supreme importance of internal mechanisms of control for not only cultivating peaceableness but also for making external mechanisms of control more effective, but less frequent, if not quite redundant. A compliance system based on internal mechanisms of control receives its relevance from the internalisation of certain values that inculcate and support peaceful behaviour by suppressing aggression. These values underline the power of peace and are instrumental in altering patterns in people’s mind based on the violent ways of behaving. They aim at replacing violent ways of dealing with conflict situations. They induce and prompt people to replace aggressiveness with peace consciousness that values cooperation, kindness, honesty, compassion, tolerance, charity and justice. Once internalised, these values prove durable and are capable of inoculating the people against the attractiveness of violence. Internalisation of values that engender peaceableness creates an internalised desire to comply with the norms of peaceful behaviour. It is a behaviour that is institutionally necessary and is internalised as a need disposition in the personal system.

4.3.3 Culture of Peace Defined

It is now possible to define the meaning of culture of peace. When external measures of compliance are gradually replaced by internal measures, a society deserves to be called as peaceful. This movement from external measures of control to internal measures may ultimately succeed in banishing violence; however, it does not guarantee that society will never experience conflicts. However, as long as there is a diversity of looking at the world and doing things, as long as a plurality of social groups exists, and as long as a multiplicity of interests goads people to act, there will be differences. But when people learn to resolve these differences nonviolently and act accordingly, it can be said that culture of peace prevails.

Culture of peace signifies not only the training of mind to resist the seduction of violence but also the manifestation of such a trained mind in sustaining peaceful social relations. What is very essential for the flourishing of the culture of peace is a mentality that does not treat any difference as a confrontation; rather it underlines that any difference of views should be treated as an emergent problem that needs to be solved cooperatively. The term “cooperatively” here refers to the involvement of the larger group of which the contestants are a part. Such an involvement ensures a cooperative search for a solution that satisfies the contestants as well as preserves social harmony and peace. This makes it clear that the internal attitude of peaceableness must be supported by the external institutional arrangement of society. This will assure culture of peace to remain vital and vibrant. Thus, culture of peace signifies a state of mind that abjures violence as well as measures and structures, which promise to solidify and build trust and interaction among people for avoiding a relapse into conflict.

4.4 PILLARS OF THE CULTURE OF PEACE

Culture of peace is cultivated and nurtured in the minds of men. However, it is kept alive in civil society, which institutionalises principles and procedures that play an active role in preventing a social situation from becoming violent. It is thus clear that culture of peace is not synonymous with a peaceable mind nor it is identical with civil society alone. It is the combination of both that engenders and sustains culture of peace. Both the peaceable mind and the appropriately structured civil society are interdependent. Culture of peace is strongly related to civil society. However, stronger emphasis must be placed on the skills, processes and institutions that enable non-violent solutions in the face of serious differences and on the attitude and values that make peaceful behaviour possible. Culture of peace, it is clear, is dependent on two essential props, self-cultivation that makes internalisation of values supportive of peacefulness and skills, structures and practices immanent in social order favourable to the maintenance of peace and nurturing of peace-supporting values.

Given the interconnectedness of self-cultivation for engendering values favourable to peaceful ways of social relations and skills, structures and practices characterising a society, several questions need to be answered. First, how does one go about training the mind so that it develops the capacity to resist and overcome the attractiveness of aggression and violence? Second, what are the institutional structures and practices that must be successfully activated to preclude the possibility of differences turning into violent confrontation, on the one hand, and to peacefully resolve conflicts if they have taken place, on the other? And, lastly, there have been, of late, several serious attempts to suggest ways and means of generating culture of peace to assist conflict societies to resume work of reconciliation, begin the necessary enterprise of building peace, and enjoying peace. One of such programmes is UNESCO's Culture of Peace Programme, initiated in 1995.

This programme consists of six components and it is expected that if all these components are embraced by nations, war-torn societies will turn into harmonious, peaceful societies. The six components are helpful in elucidating the goals and methods of intentional development of peace culture. The first component refers to the need to redefine power not in terms of violence or force, but that of active nonviolence. Peace, as active nonviolence, is considered not only as a means of controlling aggression but also treated as the instrument of peaceful change. The second component underlines the need to demolish the structures of hierarchical vertical authority and the installation of an egalitarian democratic system in its place. Democratic system is to promote participation by people in making decisions that affect their lives. While the third component calls for doing away with secrecy and control of information and insists on the free flow and sharing of information, the fourth component concerns gender inequality and male domination. It insists on power-sharing between men and women, promoting especially the caring and nurturing capabilities traditionally associated with and developed by women.

Two more components relate particularly to the need, on the one hand, to call an end of exploitation that has characterised the culture of violence and war, and on the other, to infuse in the minds of men the value of initiating the process of mobilisation of people that aims at promoting understanding rather than defeating an enemy. It is hoped that if all the components of the programme are embraced without any reservation by people, societies and nations, culture of peace will supplant culture of violence and consciously and actively pursues a course that will allow a peaceful society to flourish.

It must, however, be pointed out that all these six components of the UNESCO's Culture of Peace Programme are simply goals to be achieved. However, it is not clear how these goals

are to be achieved. They are goals worthy of pursuit by human beings if they are to live in peace. However, without pointing to the ways and means of realising them, they do not serve any significant purpose except to direct us to some ideals that we must live by. There is a fundamental difference between “knowing virtue” and “having virtue”. We may know what virtue is; however, our own limitations and situational compulsions, such as the lack of opportunity could make us unable to actively pursue them. It is also possible that a social order is so diseased that it does not allow a person to rise above the sunken morality pervading it. It is important to internalise a process of living that allows a person to illumine the nooks and crannies of his existence by the light of these ideals.

To live according to the ideals contained in the six components is not possible by embracing Immanuel Kant’s principle of categorical imperative. The principle does not allow of any exception to the rule of sticking fast to the norm of behaviour a person has chosen as a guide to his action in all circumstances. However, life is full of compromises and exceptions have to be made not for convenience but for preserving peace and harmony. Moreover, a person is forced by circumstances to choose between competing values and may find it well nigh impossible to adhere to the principle of action he has committed himself to follow without wavering. These two factors underline the limitations of drawing a list of virtues worthy of pursuit by human beings without pointing to the way these values must be cultivated and made an integral part of one’s existence.

Further, there seems to be confusion between the means and goals in the UNESCO’s Culture of Peace Programme. Take, for example, the component that stresses the need to redefine power not in terms of violence or force but as active nonviolence. Man as an economic man requires him to compete with others for satisfying his material needs. He has necessarily to rely on his capacity to outrun others in the race of life. It is this need that makes power as violence or force so central in man’s life today. Without doing away with this conception of man and mitigating the consequences of the activities of man qua economic man, power in terms of active nonviolence cannot be redefined.

Also there are such components as pulling down hierarchical structures and erecting egalitarian democratic structure in their place. However they are, if anything, conditions in which nonviolent action gets a fillip. Democratic structures, in themselves, are not enough to instill in man the virtue of active nonviolence. The attitude of nonviolence is prior to democracy and sustains it in real life situations. It is enough to show the limitations of the UNESCO’s Culture of Peace Programme. What needs to be emphasised is, as UNESCO itself recognises, defence of peace is cultivated in mind; the mind is moulded primarily in family and secondarily in society; and social life and relations are imbued with and under-girded by a world view. Thus there is a chain that links three factors in close interaction insofar as culture of peace is concerned. The first link in this chain is the worldview that posits the idea of man. Since the idea of man is creative, not scientific, man becomes what he considers himself to be. Influenced by this particular idea of who man is, man creates his world which, in turn, defines what and how he should or should not do.

In order to apprehend and appreciate the nature of the culture of peace, it is necessary to identify the type of worldview that shapes the mind to act in nonviolent ways eschewing aggression and violence. Worldviews generate belief systems, which, in turn, influence man’s orientation and action. Belief systems engender conceptions that are held and shared by the members of a society, both implicitly and explicitly, about the nature of humans, the world, divinity, and the world beyond. Belief systems do not emerge out of nothing, nor do they find their origin in mere practices, as Michael Oakeshott wants us to believe. They are grounded in cosmology, which performs three functions at one. First, cosmology offers an imaginative

account of what lies in the world that is beyond the phenomenal world. Usually, it posits a divine entity as the creator and preserver of the visible world. On this account, the created world exhibits order, the source of which is, again, the divine entity. Secondly, it tells us about our place in and relationship with the larger conceptual world. And, lastly, it identifies this larger conceptual world as the source from which human beings derive their sense of truth, meaning and value.

Religious beliefs find their origin in cosmology of one kind or the other. Usually, such beliefs project a vision of world presided over by a benign God and underline the need of man to attune his soul to this divine being as the necessary condition of rising above one's own contingent, narrow experiences and relating oneself with the larger world. This divine being is treated not as something apart or as the other; instead it must be treated as a kindred soul who allows us to share the majesty of the divine being. Religious beliefs teach the important lesson of *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam* (the whole world is one family) and bring to man's consciousness the central importance of love as the strong basis of bonding in society and sharing in a commonality. Thus these beliefs underline the value of love and caring for one another for all human beings. They constantly remind us that the nonviolent way is a better, higher and preferable way and that violence must be abjured to assure human well-being.

Individuals hold religious beliefs. It is not at all necessary that these beliefs may be widespread or strongly held by all. Moreover, the sage, the philosopher, or the seer who happens to be the originator of particular religions can be ignored, forgotten and their teachings rejected, unless their message is accepted and institutionalised if it is to live long and retain its vitality for shaping man's orientation and guiding man's action. For the institutionalisation of religious beliefs, four important measures and processes are usually relied upon. These measures and processes are: enculturation, celebrations of religious beliefs through rites, rituals, different types of public celebrations, functions etc., education, and institutionalised mechanisms of mediation, reconciliation and arriving at negotiated compromise. The presence of a belief system that promotes nonviolence and/or social harmony and does not easily condone aggression is perhaps the most critical feature in the sustenance of the culture of peace.

Of these four different modes of creating and sustaining the culture of peace, the most important is the process of enculturation whose primary setting is the family. It is in the family that children are socialised into certain values of personal conduct and proper norms of interpersonal interaction. Each household, in a particular society, inherits a worldview and a belief system and develops its own strategies to suppress aggression. These strategies are uniquely rooted in indigenous culture and are passed on from one generation to the next. Similarly, each society has its own fund of adaptation, built on the knowledge of local environment and the historical memory of times of crises and change. Such knowledge and experience are represented in the individual familial households that make up a community. The community at large shares this knowledge and the experience of applying this knowledge to concrete situation.

The second factor that keeps alive the belief system, even if only dimly, involves the performance of certain rites, rituals and periodical religious celebrations. The knowledge of the cosmology and the personal and social practices derived from it are woven into religious teachings, ceremonies and celebration in the world of work, of play, in environmental lore, in the saga of times past. These are the hidden peace-building strength of every society. Their contribution to peace-building assumes basically three forms. Firstly, the performance of rites, rituals and ceremonies keeps people committed to the worldview and its derivative, the religious belief. This commitment, again, is passed from generation to generation.

Secondly, the remembrance of one's linkage to a primordial world-view is acted upon in the pragmatic affairs of human beings; this keeps alive the ideal of doing as Gods did in conducting personal lives and social relations. Thirdly, performance of rites, rituals and ceremonies also provides the occasions when people meet cordially, even if they are divided by jealousy, animosity and enmity. On these occasions gifts are exchanged, the point is sharply made that people are interdependent and share the same cultural heritage and belief system, and the necessity of reciprocity and cooperation is highlighted. Since celebrations are usually patterned on rituals, they forge a connection with creation itself, a remainder of the oneness of all living things. All these factors go a long way in serving to inhibit aggression and, therefore, they prove to be useful in sustaining culture of peace.

The third factor in the vitalisation of culture of peace is education. It is necessary to make a distinction here in two important processes of educating the mind to become peaceful. This distinction refers to an informal process called learning and a formal process known as education in schools, colleges and universities. Learning takes place in informal settings, such as, the family, the peer groups, and the larger society. People learn in these settings the value of peaceful ways of behaving and dealing with other people. Children learn from their elders appropriate norms of behaviour that are transmitted mainly through examples, stories, and verbal instructions. In contradistinction to learning, curricula in schools, colleges and universities are so constructed and textbooks are prepared in such a way that they emphasise the importance of peace. They are aimed at instilling in the students appropriate values and training them in skills that forge a mindset favourable to culture of peace.

Even if all these factors are active and engender culture of peace, situations arise when the possibility of violence stares the community in its face. In such cases, attempts are made to avoid violence and preserve peace. Two kinds of mechanisms are, therefore, developed to manage situations that are charged with the possibility of violence. One of these mechanisms is informal that underlines the important role of a third party intervention in bringing the contestants to a satisfactory negotiated peace. This is done basically through mediation and reconciliation involving an individual, a group of individuals or the entire adult population of a community. What is essential to the process of mediation and reconciliation is clarifying the issues involved in a particular situation of conflict, evaluation of the merits of the contestants' views or claims, exploration of the ways and means of finding a peaceful solution. This process aims at safeguarding equity. In contradistinction to this, there is a formal process involving legally established panchayats. These are statutory bodies armed with the authority of deciding the cases brought before them. The panchayats give their verdicts, which can be appealed in higher courts, on the basis of legality, not equity. Then there are judicial and criminal courts, which take cognizance of certain crimes or claims of entitlements and give their verdicts, which are binding unless reversed by higher courts.

4.5 SUMMARY

It is clear from the discussion above that culture of peace has a very crucial role in keeping a society free of violence. It is also clear that culture of peace involves primarily training the mind so that it can eschew violence and develop both the capacity and the habit of behaving nonviolently. Culture of peace grows in the minds of men, to be sure; it needs nourishment from certain elements in the society at large. However, society plays only a supportive and prescriptive role in generating and sustaining culture of peace. The principal role is that of the individual members of society. If even a few of them commit themselves to peace, society can eventually become peaceful. It is in this context that Mahatma Gandhi's observation assumes

significance. He is very optimistic about the prevalence of peace in the world. He says: “my optimism rests on my belief in the infinite possibilities of the individual to develop nonviolence. The more you develop it in your own being, the more infectious it becomes till it overwhelms your surrounding and by and by might over sweep the world.”² Thus the foundation of culture of peace in a society is the peace in the minds of its members.

4.6 TERMINAL QUESTIONS

1. What does the term “Culture of peace” mean? Should it disallow change?
2. What control mechanisms should societies develop to control aggression and violence?
3. Describe the different ways a society uses to regulate conflict and prevent violence.
4. Do you think that external measures of controlling aggression and preventing violence are sufficient in themselves? Discuss.
5. Write short notes on enculturation and education as important means of sustaining culture of peace. Which of the two is more effective in your opinion?

Endnotes:

1. Johann Galtung., “Peace”, in *Sciences*, Macmillan and Free Press, New York, 1968, p.489
2. Quoted in Janet Patti and Linda Lantiere., “Peace Education: Youth”, in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1992, Vol. 1, p.709

SUGGESTED READINGS

Adams, David., (ed), *Saville Statement on Violence*, UNESCO, Paris, 1991.

Boulding, Elise., “Peace Culture”, in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1999, Vol.2, pp.653 – 67

Gandhi, M.K., *Hind Swaraj*, Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad, 1938

Macy, J., *Dharma and Development*, C.T. Kumarian Press, Hartford, 1981

Robarchek, C.A, and C.J. Robarchek., “Waging Peace- The Psychological and Socio-cultural dynamics of positive peace”, in A.W. Wolfe and H. Yang., (eds), *Anthropological Contributions to Conflict Resolution*, G.A University of Georgia Press, Athens, 1996, pp.64-80.

UNESCO, *From a Culture of Violence to a Culture of Peace*, UNESCO, Paris, 1996.