International Journal of Peace Studies, Volume 18, Number 2, Winter 2013

Introduction: The Effect of Inclusion and Exclusion on Positive Peace

David E. Toohey

The articles in this special issue share a concern with how different voices are included or excluded from peace dialogues and discourses. This inclusion or exclusion can augment or diminish positive peace. These articles explore this by asking what types of relationships can be constructed and how these relationships may, or may not, create a genuine peace. These articles are written from a variety of theoretical perspectives, though they all converge in relation to the creation of genuine peace based on inclusion of different voices. This type of peace, which is "positive peace" is not simply an absence of physical violence, but true peace where the "distance between the potential and the actual" is not intentionally increased (Galtung 1969, 23). Thus, people are not intentionally kept developing their full "potential" (Galtung 1969, 23). This unfortunately contrasts with the current thrust of contemporary politics which, amidst a prevalence of what Ho-Won Jeong calls asymmetrical conflict (2001), represents peace as an absence of violent conflict but simultaneously obscures an excess of global poverty, environmental collapse, right-wing backlashes, and a rise in income gaps. In this context we hear concerns of peace studies such as environmental sustainability being used to justify the expansion of a poisonous nuclear industry or the use of conflict resolution practices to sustain war.

Yet, that this asymmetric conflict amidst a negative peace suggests that we are in need of ways to conceptualize how effectively peace is really created, rather than to simply register actions as peace. This unawareness is intensified because in "structural violence" there is no easily identifiable group committing violence (Galtung 1969, 29). One form of structural violence may be simply to exclude different voices from decision making or the construction of peace. Thus, people are denied their full potential by being kept out of problem definition and/or dialogues on peace These articles were chosen and are intentionally sequenced to show this process and then later to show how people and organizations have attempted to increase inclusion. Hawkim Williams analyzes how impoverished students are defined as a problem in part through accepted discourses that blame them rather than structures. Gregor Wolbring looks at how, in a way that appears natural, people with body related disabilities are left out of their own issue definition and mainstream peace studies. Alvany Maria dos Santos Santiago and Angaldo Garcia analyze how relationships that create positive peace can be built through the process of inclusion of people in dialogue who otherwise would not have been included because of their location in different countries. Christine A. Parker looks at how teachers use talk of conflict and identity, which can lead to exclusion, to create inclusive learning space for students from diverse ethnocultural backgrounds. Before I summarize these papers in detail, I will explain their greater significance to peace studies.

The Importance of Theories and Concepts to Practice

Peace studies, along with other forms of radical intellectualism, is often more immersed within the practice it describes than other academic disciplines. This creates some tensions and dilemmas for how scholars of peace studies should conduct research. To claim the mainstream social science distaste of "activism," would obviously alienate the peace studies scholars from those who we study and speaks of. Yet, the fact that we do not distance our discourse from activism does not automatically render us useful to peace activists. From a peace activist's perspective, what is the point of thinking rather than doing? Immanuel Wallerstein, discussing the post-War American Left, puts this paradox succinctly: "If one neglects to make sober calculations of one's real strength and moves too far in advance of it, repression and disaster are the result" (2000, 36). A similar problem applies to the study of peace. One way that "sober calculations" can be promoted in academia, in a way that helps practice is through analyses that both engage with the people we study as active participants and uses these encounters to enable thought that critically assesses how useful peace studies concepts are, both from an ontological and epistemological perspective.

These papers take a sober look at the consequences of inclusion and exclusion upon positive peace to theorize how peace can exist not just in conceptual/theoretical terms, but also in practical terms. Therefore, these papers operate on a dual conceptual-practical role. Their high quality academic theorizations are not simply showcases of academic skill, but also calls to rethink how well we practice peace. However, these are neither simple top-down directives nor simplified step by step plans created from the perspective of experts only. These papers are informed by those they study as active shapers of academic discourse, rather than passive subjects to be observed, recorded and commented on.

This process of conceptualizing the concept of peace within inclusion and exclusion is not limited to one topical dimension. Rather, these papers explore and conceptualize a variety of different topical areas: education of oppressed people in post-colonial settings, the exclusion of disabled people, international contact as a peace strategy, and education about conflict identity in elementary schools. It is safe to say that this multiplicity of topical areas means that these papers both speak to their topical areas as well as provide concepts that may be applicable elsewhere. These papers do, however, use different theories and methods. Next this will be illuminated through an overview of each individual article.

The Articles: From Negative Peace to Positive Peace

Hawkim Williams' article, "Postcolonial Structural Violence: A Study of School Violence in Trinidad & Tobago" analyzes inclusion and exclusion in schools serving impoverished students in Trinidad. This local-level study is contextualized within the international currents of structural violence, especially poverty in the wake of colonialism in what Williams mentions is an understudied region. The concept of post-colonial structural violence is introduced to analyze how discourse helps obscure structural violence in educational settings,

which in turn is one factor enabling the persistence of structural violence. This is not only a theoretical article. Rather, it combines postcolonial theory with an ethnographic study to explore how structural violence enables the continued direct violence within schools while blaming marginalized, impoverished students and their families rather than other processes such as political economy and educational bureaucracies. Williams uses ethnographic research to bring these voices into contact with academic conceptualization.

Gregory Wolbring's article "Body Related Ability Expectation and Peace," also explores the caustic marriage of discursive and structural violence by analyzing how disabled people are often left out of the constitution of their subjectivity and definition of problems and priorities. Wolbring explores this not as an inevitable, unavoidable, essential lack, but rather argues that disabled people have something to add to peace studies and subjective well-being. Wolbring further analyzes the absence of disabilities studies from peace studies in general and provides a beginning of a remedy to this through a conceptual overview of disabilities studies mixed with peace studies theories.

At this point, the focus of this special issue shifts slightly toward analyses of the practice of inclusion and building relationships. Of special interest in the next two articles is how negative peace is transformed into positive peace through specific peace practices.

Alvany Maria dos Santos Santiago and Agnaldo Garcia's article "Relationships and World Peace: a Peace Movement Survey" provides a theorized ethnographical analysis of the Servas International organization which uses travel and contact between people interested in peace to create positive peace as opposed to negative peace. As they mention, this is not simple tourism, but travel involving serious contact between people based on interpersonal relationships created by dialogue that brings a culture of peace to new groups of people and new parts of the world. They are especially concerned with the different levels and points that these relationships arise and their ability to form relationships which can foster peace. Thus we see a micro-politics of peace. This contrasts with peace looked at in the traditional mainstream way as an absence of war or a series of treaties between two warring parties. Instead Sanitago and Garcia look at the construction of peace as a practice which does not occur only during or after a serious conflict.

In "Peacebuilding education: Using conflict for democratic and inclusive learning opportunities for diverse students" Christine A. Parker analyzes teachers' strategies to use dialectical discussions of conflict to engage elementary school students in dialogues about their, and other students' identities. This occurs in elementary school classes, rather than university level conflict resolution and peace studies classes, thereby expanding the role of peace education outside the confines of academia. This article focuses specifically on schools in Ontario, Canada with many ehtnocultural minorities. Parker looks at controversial subjects about identity, often viewed in the mainstream as too conflictual, as productive sites of student learning and academic involvement. The ethnographic research in this article is combined with peace studies theories and education to explore how teachers engage with students using conflict as a tool for teaching about identity, rather than as something to be avoided. This

conflict is shown within these three settings to often engage students in the discussion of difficult subjects and increase their involvement in their own education.

Concepts and Practical Realities of Creating Positive Peace

These papers share an uncompromising look at how real and effective peace really is. This willingness to be uncompromising is not simply to create the preconditions for academic conceptualization only. Rather, these uncompromising conceptualizations help with a problem embedded within the very mention of peace itself. Immanuel Wallerstein's (2000) cautions of uncritical confidence are pertinent at a time when the discourse of peace, and perhaps academic practice, is too often misappropriated by those who do not wish to engage peace. Perhaps another way to put it is that dangers arise when we assume that peace cannot be used to different ends. Galtung has mentioned how peace can be used to justify almost any action or policy (1969). The probability that people will uncritically accept false versions of peace can be theorized as present, even amidst strong peace movements. For example, Ian Buchanan explains Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's concern with how people come to accept power when it is against their interests (2008, 14). Therefore, there is a need for theorizations and conceptualizations of peace processes that ask how inclusive they are and how much they actually promote positive peace.

The articles in this special issue provide examples of how to help clarify the elusive meaning of peace, and some conceptual problems of theory and practice, at a time when people in peace studies and activism need a conceptually sharp way to look not just at their own practice, but how it is being appropriated in ways that are not go against their interests. There is a corporatization of peace and a militarization of peace. Thus, there is a need for academics and practitioners alike to look at how well actual peace processes are going, to ask an ontology of practice—what can be known about practice—before assuming that their attempts are actually creating positive peace. The articles in this edited volume consider an ontology of what can be known through peace research, especially with a consideration of inclusion and exclusion within the design of peace research itself.

References

Buchanan, Ian. 2008. Power, theory and praxis. Chapter 1 in Ian Buchanan and Nicholas Thoburn (Eds.), *Deleuze and Politics*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Galtung, Johan. 1969. Violence, peace, and peace research. Chapter 1 in Matthew Evangelist ed., *Peace Studies: Critical Concepts in Political Science*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Jeong, Howon. 2001. "Politics for Global Environmental Governance." In Howon Jeong, ed., Global Environmental Policies: Institutions and Procedures. London: Palgrave.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2000. "Radical Intellectuals in a Liberal Society." Chapter 3 in *The Essential Wallerstein*. New York: The New Press