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ABSTRACT

Peace studies has produced an abundance of research and created numerous programs and courses. Despite these successes, the field is far from establishing itself as a valued part of the academic community. This project rests on the assertion that peace studies struggles for scholarly legitimacy and visibility within U.S. higher education. Based on this premise, it seeks to investigate the different kinds of beliefs about peace studies that have been produced, maintained, and reproduced. The aim is to understand the contemporary condition of peace studies and explore the possibilities and limitations of theorizing, researching, and teaching about peace in the U.S. academy.

A Foucauldian-informed poststructural analysis examines qualitative survey and interview data collected from 55 prominent U.S. scholars in the fields of international relations, peace studies, and peace science. First, a descriptive analysis of peace studies scholars’ perceptions identifies three precepts of the field along with a strategy, to “make the world a better, more humane, place.” Second, a comparative analysis of peace studies from scholars working within international relations and peace science shows that peace studies faces the predicament of being nearly invisible within international relations and on the other side of an epistemological and methodological divide from peace science.
Finally, a discourse analysis describes the discursive structures and rules of knowledge production that govern the way that scholars think, speak, and put into practice items associated with peace studies.

The study concludes that peace studies suffers from a problem of coherence that strikes at its core objects of knowledge, subject positions, and knowledge production. Furthermore, the field desires to transform, transgress, and transcend the traditional policies of the U.S. academy. Thus, it battles historical and contemporary perceptions of (1) what qualifies as legitimate “scholarship” in terms of traditional disciplinary specialty, substantive content, agenda, and method, (2) what it means to be a “scholar” in U.S. higher education, and (3) what the study of “peace” should include in its parameters. Recognizing these challenges, peace studies scholars are urged to reconsider their relationship to the broader academic community through an examination (and possible reframing) of their multiple subject positions.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my advisers, Drs. Patti Lather and Peter Demerath, for the intellectual encouragement and support that they provided during my time at The Ohio State University. Under their supervision, I have learned how to conduct a qualitative research project from start to finish and I am indebted to them for this. In addition, I am grateful for their counsel during the research design and data analysis stages of the project and their invaluable guidance (and patience) on the numerous drafts of the dissertation. In all, I thank them for educating me about the day-to-day workings of higher education and the complex meaning of membership in the academic community.

I extend gratitude also to my committee members, Drs. Alexander Wendt, Dan Christie, and Tatiana Suspitsyna, for their support of this project. I thank Professor Wendt for providing inspiration in the research design, a letter of support during data collection, and motivation for future research possibilities, Professor Christie for introducing me to professional opportunities within peace studies, and Professor Suspitsyna for offering her expertise in the field of higher education. Moreover, I am grateful to Dr. Antoinette Errante for serving on my general examination committee and contributing to the formation of this project and Drs. Tammy Birk and Annette Hemmings for advising me to join the educational policy and leadership program at The Ohio State University.
My friends and colleagues have been invaluable to me during completion of the graduate program and dissertation. I wish to thank Jessica Kohlschmidt, Tracey Keele, Cathy Chappell, Marie-José Tayah, Kate Carey, Lydia Brauer, Mike Hicks, Beth Miglin, Deb Zabloudil, Stephanie Daza, Nan Kurz, Robin Giampapa, Roland Coloma, Kristin Adams, Laurie Carney, and Ulrica Carlén for their inspiration, optimistic points of view, and loyal friendship during the years.

Finally, I thank my family. I am grateful to my parents, Frank Clemens and Carolyn Davidson, for giving me opportunities, in particular the chance to be an exchange student in Sweden. I thank my sister, Christine Holley, for believing in my choice to attend graduate school; I also thank my sister, Teresa Curfman, step-mother, Cindy Clemens, and grandmothers, Patricia Taylor and Josephine Clemens, for their cheerful words of support during this long process. I wish to thank David and Barbara Schweller for welcoming me into their family. Finally, I extend my love and admiration to my partner, Randall Schweller. His ideas and positive intellectual motivation have enhanced this project and his unconditional emotional support has inspired me to complete it. For these items, including all of the sacrifices during the process, I am forever grateful.
VITA

July 13, 1970…………………………Born – Columbus, Ohio

1997……………………………………A.S. Business Management, Franklin University

2000……………………………………B.S. International Business; Marketing, Franklin University

2002……………………………………M.Ed. Educational Foundations, University of Cincinnati

2005……………………………………M.A. Social and Cultural Foundations, The Ohio State University

1990-2001…………………………….Corporate Trainer; Series 7 Licensed Broker, Financial Services Industry, Columbus, Ohio, and Princeton, New Jersey

2001-2002…………………………….Graduate Research Associate, University of Cincinnati

2002-2008…………………………….Graduate Teaching and Research Associate, The Ohio State University

PUBLICATIONS


FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Education
Graduate Minor: Comparative Cultural Studies
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgments</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Tables</td>
<td>xii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THE STUDY OF PEACE IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Experience with Peace Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background to the Project</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth of the Field</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of the Field: Identity and Identifiers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Events in the History of the Field</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Construction and Production of Peace Research:</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945 to mid-1960s</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Re-production of Peace Research into Peace Studies:</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-1960s to 1980</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Maintenance of Peace Studies: 1980 to 1990</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Re-production or Transformation of Peace Studies:</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to the present</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration of the Problem, Questions, and Methodology</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trajectory of the Project</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline of the Study</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITS OF KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION IN PEACE STUDIES:</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A TENUOUS POSITION IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Inventory of Peace Studies Scholars’ Observations of the Field:</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thriving or Invisible?</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzzling Perceptions of Peace Studies</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations: A Complementary Tool</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: International Relations</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Peace Studies</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: Peace Science</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: Peace Studies Program Directors</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Data Analysis</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Analysis</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 1: Inclusion of Statements about Peace Studies and the Study of Peace</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 2: Inclusion of the Rules that Prescribe Certain Ways of Talking about Peace Studies and the Study of Peace</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 3: Inclusion of “Subjects”</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 4: Inclusion of How Knowledge about Peace Studies and the Study of Peace Acquires Authority</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 5: Inclusion of the Practices within Institutions</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 6: Inclusion of an Acknowledgment that a Different Discourse or Episteme will Arise at a Later Historical Moment</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Validity (Trustworthiness)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Reflexivity</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary and Conclusion</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. ASSEMBLING AN ARCHIVE: DESCRIPTIONS OF PEACE STUDIES FROM INSIDE THE FIELD ............................. 128

What is Peace Studies? Varied Perspectives ................................................................. 129

Toward a Consensus on Peace Studies: Peace Studies Scholars Define the Field .............................................................. 132

The Normative-Prescriptive Foundation of Peace Studies ........................................... 135

Structural Violence and Social Justice ................................................................. 136

Social Justice, Idealism, and Advocacy ............................................................... 137

Social Justice, Activism, and Nonviolence ......................................................... 141

Summary .................................................................................................................. 142

The Creative and Practical Foundation of Peace Studies ...................................... 142

ix
LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page
-----|------
3.1  Summary of Data Collection Phases .......................... 109
4.1  Peace Studies Scholars’ Definitions of Peace Studies ....................... 134
5.1  Disparity in Survey Responses between IR and Peace Studies Scholars .......... 170
5.2  Peace Science Scholars’ Definitions of Peace Studies .......................... 186
CHAPTER 1

THE STUDY OF PEACE IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION

No one has so far succeeded in singing an epic of peace. What is wrong with peace that its inspiration doesn’t endure and that it is almost untellable? (Wim Wenders, Der Himmel über Berlin, 1988)

Introduction

This quote from the German film, Der Himmel über Berlin, raises a poignant question about the notion of peace: Why is peace untellable? It is a timeless question that has been discussed throughout the ages. Indeed, academic fields of knowledge have been created to address similar questions. The field of international relations (IR), for instance, takes up questions about peace. Security studies, peace science, and conflict studies do as well. Another field, however, tackles the question more directly and has now done so for sixty years. The field of peace studies has been raising questions about many of the perceived “untellable” characteristics of peace since its fledgling beginnings as a loosely organized research endeavor in the 1950s. But, what do scholars in U.S. higher education know of it and its findings? What are the different “truths,” knowledge, and beliefs that circulate about peace studies, its scholarship, and its scholars in U.S. higher education?

Peace studies is an academic field that investigates the causes and consequences of violent conflict, the methods for reducing or eliminating it, and also the conditions necessary for creating a humane and peaceful world. During the course of its existence,
peace studies has sought the answers to many important questions about the nature of peace and its relationship to conflict, war, violence, and the stability of the global system. Curiously, many academics in related fields who ask similar questions do not know much about what has been said or found by peace studies scholars. Within the U.S. academy, peace studies has struggled for scholarly legitimacy and recognition. As one of its scholars recently observed, “visibility is a real problem” (Dunn, 2005, p. 6). To be sure, visibility is a challenge for peace studies, but perhaps the greater dilemma is its reputation. Peace studies is haunted by historical legacies that formed as it toiled to develop and achieve legitimacy as a field. Of particular significance is the historical issue that, “because of the dominance of the realist paradigm after 1945, peace research was marginalized” (Terriff, Croft, James, & Morgan, 1999, p. 65) within IR.

For many decades, the realist perspective dominated American IR theory. The lessons of WWII suggested that liberal idealism, as embodied in the League of Nations and a general belief in the efficacy of international law, was dangerously naïve and laid the groundwork for failed appeasement of dictators bent on taking over the world or large portions of it. The message was clear: the only way to deal with aggressors was by means of hard-line policies backed by superior power and resolve to contain and deter aggressors and, if that failed, to defeat them on the battlefield. In this climate, political realism emerged as the dominant paradigm for how the world works. International politics, in this view, resembles a Hobbesian state of nature, in which security is scarce and war constantly lurks in the background. The Cold War era was largely defined, rightly or wrongly, in these realist terms.
This primacy of realist thought within U.S.-based IR had important consequences for the field of peace studies.1 Realists accept the definition of peace offered by Ambrose Bierce in *The Devil's Dictionary*: “Peace: noun, in international affairs, a period of cheating between two periods of fighting” (quoted in Krauthammer, 2004, p. 10). While this statement may seem to be an attempt at humor, it is all the same a noteworthy characterization. As IR scholar, Oliver Richmond (2005), contends:

Debates about peace [in IR] tend to be unsophisticated, often revolving around a simplistic—realist–idealists axis —either there can be no peace, that peace is merely the absence of open violence but not of threat, or a utopian version of peace, perhaps to be arrived at by pacifism. (p. 7)

In this academic environment, peace is often viewed as a topic discussed by well-intentioned but wooly-headed utopians working on the fringes of higher education. In turn, this negative perception sets the tone for the reputation of peace studies in U.S. higher education.

In addition to the perception that the study of peace and, in particular, the field of peace studies are “idealistic” endeavors, peace studies battles another consequence of the legacy of political realism that stems in part from peace studies’ “radical” and sometimes revolutionary stance against all forms of violence—not just large-scale war but other types of human destruction, such as poverty, inequality, and injustice. Realism’s

---

1 The end of the Cold War witnessed the reemergence of liberalism as the dominant paradigm in IR theory. Moreover, social constructivism, a paradigm that centers on the power of ideas, identities, and social interactions, gained ascendancy in the 1990s, and arguably claims more adherence than realism. The peaceful end of the Cold War and the key role played by Gorbachev’s “new thinking” (ideas) largely explains the rise of these two perspectives and the decline of realism in the field. See Tierney, Peterson, and Maliniak, 2005.
dominant concern to safeguard security “leaves little room for envisioning different structural arrangements in the world and thus marginalize[s] broadly conceived ethical concerns” (Wapner & Ruiz, 2000, p. 2). Against this backdrop, peace studies, with its “moral passion and … commitment to improve the human prospect” (p. 3), is painted as “essentially an ‘intellectual protest movement’, often dismissed as the remit of bearded, sandal-wearing, bleeding-heart liberals rather than as a serious research area” (Terriff et al., 1999, p. 65). As will be discussed, this negative perception and the scholarly atmosphere in which it circulates contributes to a tumultuous climate for the study of peace within U.S. higher education, which limits peace studies’ possibilities for growth, recognition, and acceptance within the academy.

A central claim of this dissertation is that, aside from the commonly acknowledged societal view that peace is not newsworthy (which underpins the oft-stated view that peace is boring because it represents a normal state of affairs), there is something more complex at play in the construction of its “untellable” quality and, ultimately, its legitimacy as an academic object of study. Specifically, there is a system of discursive knowledge production about peace that produces and maintains the possibilities and limitations for its articulation, conceptualization, and dissemination within U.S. higher education and U.S. society at large. Although this system could be investigated in a variety of ways and from many vantage points, this study focuses on discourses of academic culture within three fields of U.S. higher education that examine the topic of peace: international relations (IR), peace studies, and peace science.
The principle contribution of this project is a critical examination of the current condition of the study of peace and, consequently, the field of peace studies in U.S. higher education. The project begins with the questions: What are the different “truths,” knowledge, and beliefs that circulate about peace studies, its scholarship, and its scholars in U.S. higher education? Why has the movement within the U.S. academy to research and advance a scholarly understanding of peace, principally the materialization of the field of “peace studies,” not been highly valued as a legitimate academic endeavor? These larger questions raise a series of smaller ones. Where is the study of peace, in particular “peace studies,” located within U.S. disciplinary hierarchies? How do peace studies scholars describe the field of peace studies and their work? How is peace studies viewed by scholars working within the closely related fields of IR and peace science? Overall, the project seeks to explore how and why it is that academic fields of study (and, consequently, their objects of knowledge, scholarship, and scholars) come to be more valued than others in the U.S. university system.

In order to pursue these questions, this project uses poststructuralist discourse analysis (blended with philosophical elements of grounded theory) to examine survey and interview data collected from 55 prominent U.S. scholars in the fields of IR, peace studies, and peace science. Although discourse analysis and grounded theory draw on different intellectual traditions, their “coevolution in the history of ideas means that boundaries between them are porous” (Starks & Brown Trinidad, 2007, p. 1373). The predominant methodological and theoretical framework of this project is discourse analysis. That said, the empirical nature of the research drives the incorporation of philosophical components from grounded theory. Specifically, the philosophy of
grounded theory is acknowledged in the project’s following two characteristics: (1) “simultaneous data collection and analysis, with each informing and focusing the other throughout the research process” (Charmaz, 2005, p. 508) and (2) theory development through “examining concepts grounded in the data” (Starks & Brown Trinidad, p. 1373).

While these philosophical notions from grounded theory play an indirect role in the project, poststructural discourse analysis sets the tone and direction, in particular, the study’s emphasis on power relationships and identity construction. Kathleen Hall (1999) argues that “postmodern, poststructural, postcolonial, and feminist analyses of knowledge have brought to the forefront a recognition of the play of power and identity in assigning social value and legitimacy to different forms of knowledge” (p. 124). The research design and analysis of this project highlights the “play of power” and “identity” in the assignment of “social value and legitimacy to different forms of knowledge” about peace, peace studies, and its scholars. Specifically, a Foucauldian frame of reference is used to scrutinize: (1) the way that competing academic discourses of peace are produced within a complicated conflation of power and knowledge relationships, and (2) the effects of that production on the institutional visibility and legitimacy of peace studies and, consequently, its scholars.

By assuming that meaning is constituted within language rather than in the intentionality of the subject who speaks it, poststructural theory posits a tenuous and contradictory subjectivity that constantly reconstitutes itself in discourse by means of speech, ideas, and actions. Reflecting on Foucault’s contribution to poststructuralist thought, Weedon (1997) avers:
It is in the work of Michel Foucault that the poststructuralist principles of plurality and constant deferral of meaning, and the precarious, discursive structure of subjectivity are integrated into a theory of language and social power which pays detailed attention to the institutional effects of discourse and its role in the constitution and government of individual subjects. (p. 104)

Indeed, the constitution and government of individual subjects was of great importance to Foucault. He contended that the main objective of his work was to analyze the ways in which individuals (traditionally understood to be “actors” with “agency”) are made subjects (subjects are constituted and governed within discourse; thus, the perceived “agency” of an individual is “decentered”) (see Foucault, 1982/1998d).

The analysis of how human beings are made subjects, specifically how peace studies scholars become subjects of different discourses within U.S. higher education, holds a primary place in this project. Broadly speaking, the foci of this project are: (1) the general academic context of the study of peace, by which I mean the visibility and scholarly legitimacy of the field of peace studies within U.S. higher education; (2) the conflict in interests among the objects of knowledge (peace, violence, war, conflict, justice, nonviolence, etc.) that exist within this context; (3) the subsequent unequal way that power is distributed among the subject positions (peace studies scholars vs. IR scholars, peace studies scholars vs. peace science scholars, etc.) embedded within this system; and, ultimately, (4) the methods by which systems of power constitute multiple subject positions of the peace studies scholars themselves (peace studies scholar as “activist,” “practitioner,” “teacher,” etc.).
Personal Experience with Peace Studies

Personal experience sparked my interest in this research question and then played an important role in shaping the dissertation. During the winter of 2004, I spent ten weeks observing an undergraduate introductory peace studies course offered at a Midwestern university. Although I was excited to discover how the topic of peace would be discussed within higher education, I was soon disappointed. The professor made it clear from the beginning of the ten-week period that the course would not address the “idealistic” notion of peace. “Forget about justice and beauty,” the professor declared during the first class session, “we are talking about the bad, ugly, and disgusting.” True to his word, the weekly classroom discussions examined the balance of power and deterrence literatures, topics prevalent within the field of IR. The course’s focus on war to the exclusion of any meaningful exploration of peace struck me as not only odd but also paradoxical. How is it that an introductory course on peace does not address the topic at its core and, instead, presents items more likely to be covered in a course addressing issues of international security, strategic studies, and the causes of war?

Thus began my first academic experience with peace studies and my initial motivation for conducting this project. Prior to attending the course, I had not grasped the complexities surrounding the perception of “peace,” “peace research,” “peace pedagogy,” and “peace studies” within the academy. Needless to say, this classroom encounter, in which peace and peace studies were indeed “unthinkable” and “unspeakable,” left me dizzy with questions. What are the practices within higher education that influence a situation such as this one? What are the overarching effects of these practices on the representation of peace within higher education?
To tackle these questions, I gathered research about the field of peace studies, starting with the core questions: What is the field of peace studies and what is its history in U.S. higher education? The following section introduces what I found in terms of the general scope of the field, the tensions represented in the mere “title” of the field, and the history of the field. Subsequent chapters deal further with these issues.

**Background to the Project**

*Breadth of the Field*

Peace studies first emerged as an organized research endeavor in the U.S. shortly after WWII, when a diverse group of scholars, seeking to avoid the carnage and atrocities of yet another war, began to explore how their individual disciplinary specialties and methodological preferences could contribute to the elimination or reduction of war. Though divided in their academic disciplines and methodologies, they shared the perception that contemporary war research being conducted in IR and security studies at the time did not serve their purposes, which were a commitment to “peace” and a deep concern about nuclear holocaust (see Kelman, 1981). The efforts of these scholars combined with a few others around the world eventually produced an academic field of knowledge that dramatically expanded the definition of peace and the methods by which it would be studied.

At its broadest conceptualization, peace studies is a “transdisciplinary” field of study dedicated to analysis of the causes of violence at all levels and the conditions for human well-being and global peace.² Along these lines, the field has an appreciation for

---

² I use “transdisciplinary” to express the most broad-minded view held by some peace studies scholars in the field. As an alternative to transdisciplinary, many peace studies scholars choose to use “interdisciplinary” or “multidisciplinary.”
topics such as nonviolence, conflict transformation, social justice, and future world order, and it is organized around three main objectives: to research and educate about peace and, in varying degrees, to advocate for peace. Furthermore, these objectives are to be accomplished in three areas: (1) at all levels of analysis (individual, interpersonal, group, inter-group, local, regional, international, transnational, global, etc.), (2) across nearly all academic disciplines (political science, history, psychology, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, religion, health, environmental studies, journalism, business, gender studies, etc.), and (3) in all forums (formal and informal education, communities, governmental and non-governmental organizations, global civil society, etc.).

To be sure, peace studies has set an enormously ambitious agenda, which a cursory glance at any comprehensive text will reveal. For instance, the table of contents for the recently published *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies* (2007) by Charles Webel and Johan Galtung features chapters about how to understand and transform conflict, conflict negotiation and mediation, nuclear disarmament, nonviolence, human rights, reconciliation, peace business, peace journalism, peace psychology, and peace and the arts. Similarly, a recent peace studies textbook, *Peace and Conflict Studies*, published in 2002 by David Barash and Charles Webel, demonstrates the wide range of pedagogical topics within the field: (1) the meanings of peace and war, including analyses of peace movements and the special significance of nuclear weapons, (2) the causes of war at all levels of analysis, including ideological, social, and economic levels, (3) building peace through more traditionally recognized routes such as diplomacy, peace through strength, disarmament and arms control, international organizations, international law, and world government, and (4) building peace through less familiar routes such as
guaranteeing human rights, ecological and economical well-being, nonviolent direct action, and personal transformation. Thus, “peace” means many things within peace studies, the scope of the field’s object of knowledge is broad, and the magnitude of the problems under study calls for in-depth analyses from multiple perspectives.

Turning to the programmatic efforts of peace studies, it is a field of study that has held a place in the U.S. academy since 1948, when the first peace studies program was established. Since that time, the number and structure of peace studies programs has grown and developed. Peace studies programs can be found in many types of institutions, not only religiously affiliated schools (such as, Quaker, Mennonite, Brethren, Roman Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and non-Abrahamic sponsored institutions) but also independent colleges, state universities, and community colleges.³ In some cases, peace studies programs have combined with other content areas to form programs, including but not limited to peace and justice studies, peace and global studies, peace and security studies, and peace and conflict studies. At the turn of the new millennium, 381 colleges, universities, and research centers in 42 countries offered courses, degrees, majors, minors, specializations, concentrations, and workshops in peace studies and conflict resolution (see O’Leary 2000). The most recent edition (7th) of the Global Directory of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Programs, published in 2006, reports a total of 450 undergraduate and graduate programs, specializations, research centers, etc., around the world.

³ For a discussion of peace studies’ programmatic efforts, see Smith, 2007a, 2007b.
Grasping the field of peace studies, both its wide-ranging terminology and areas of scholarship and pedagogy, can be quite challenging. One of the most confusing aspects of “getting to know” the field, however, is its use of interchangeable titles, e.g., sometimes the field is called “peace studies,” while at other times it is “peace research” and/or “peace education.” Stephenson (1999) confirms this discrepancy in the titles of the field, asserting that “the terms [peace research and peace studies] are sometimes used synonymously, sometimes differently” (p. 809). Based on my personal experience with “peace studies” in the United States, the following six items outline basic components for understanding how the “naming” of the field works and has come to be.

First, Johan Galtung (an influential and prolific peace studies scholar) delineated three essential dimensions of the study of peace: peace research, peace education, and peace action.4 Second, of these three dimensions, “peace research” is the overarching term that represents the scholarly production of knowledge about peace. Third, “peace education” is associated with any kind of teaching about peace but is mostly used to designate formal education about peace at the primary and secondary levels. Fourth, in the U.S., “peace education” at the tertiary level is called “peace studies.” Fifth, over time, “peace studies” has come to represent more than simply “university peace education.” It now represents (more often than not) the marriage of academic “peace research” and “university peace education.” Finally, and to make the picture all the

---

4 Galtung (1973/1975d) called for “a larger perspective in which peace research, peace action, and peace education would find each other and integrate into the natural unified whole” (p. 317). Furthermore, he asserted that, in actuality, peace research “has its origin in the movements of peace education and peace action” (1975a, p. 27).
murkier, many U.S. peace scholars add “peace action” to this equation. Hence, “peace studies” in the U.S. represents the linkage of peace research, university-level peace education, and often peace action.

Outside of the U.S., “peace research” remains for the most part the term used to represent the field. Perhaps one explanation for the geographic delineation of the name structure is that as peace research grew and developed, U.S. scholars driven by societal pressures (specifically those posed during the Vietnam War) and funding streams put their efforts into building undergraduate peace studies courses and programs. Thus, U.S. peace research followed a pedagogical trajectory, creating interdisciplinary “studies” programs that eventually led to the name of the field morphing from peace research into peace studies. Conversely, the focus of the field outside the U.S. remained on peace research because most of the impetus (once again, funding streams and societal interest) pushed for the creation of peace institutes that would provide scholarly research about the complex topic, rather than on university peace education programs and courses.

Another factor that affects how subfields came to be identified is a scholar’s entry point into the field. U.S. scholars who joined the field in its early years (post-WWII to mid-1970s) tend to make a clear distinction between terms such as “peace research” and

---

5 In practice, one sees examples of this occurrence. Journals, professional organizations, and scholarship from locations outside the United States are labeled “peace research,” but in the U.S. these items are called “peace studies.” An example of this is the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), the primary international organization for peace scholars. Four out of five of its regional associations use “peace research” in their titles: the European Peace Research Association (EUPRA), the African Peace Research and Education Association (AFPREA), the Latin American Council of Peace Research (CLAIP), and the Asia-Pacific Peace Research Association (APPRA). The only outlier in the group is the North American association, the Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA), which uses “peace studies” in its title. It should be noted, however, that some countries, such as the U.K., often use “peace studies.”
“peace studies.” Those who entered the field during and after its event of curricular and pedagogical expansion in the 1980s, which will be discussed in this chapter, tend to lump everything under “peace studies.”

Stephenson (1989) provides a useful explanation that might explain this discrepancy. She locates the difference in the naming of the field in disciplinary and methodological distinctions:

While both peace research and peace studies are interdisciplinary, peace research is concentrated largely within the social sciences, having begun with a positivistic, behavioral data-based approach to the study of conflict and having later expanded to embrace a wide variety of research methods. Peace studies (which is generally defined in the United States to include both research and education), on the other hand, has a broader disciplinary base, drawing on all of the social sciences, as well as, history, anthropology, psychology, philosophy, physics, biology, religion, art, linguistics, and other fields. (pp. 10-11)

Another explanation for the discrepancies in the name of the field might lie in an earlier observation made by Galtung that “the term ‘Peace Research’ or ‘Peace and Conflict Research’ should be replaced by ‘Peace Studies’ in order to avoid narrow connotations of ‘Peace Research’ in its conventional usage” (Harle, 1987, p. vii).

Drawing on Galtung, Harle contends that “peace studies” is preferable to “peace research” for two reasons: (1) “the history of peace studies goes back hundreds and even thousands of years and has no geographical limits” and (2) “one of the original mistakes of Peace Research was to place too much emphasis on the empiricist approach (Galtung

---

6 This is exemplified in the title of the U.S.-based peace studies organization. The original name of the organization was the Consortium on Peace Research, Education, and Development (COPRED). Today, the organization is called the Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA).
Thus, Galtung concluded that “peace research” represented a failed term because, although it had a history of scholarship, its research had not brought the world any closer to peace. He proposed to change the name of the field and implement the following:

What is needed (and where we have failed) is not so much the accumulation of more data on structural and manifest violence, on the arms race and on military coups, etc. What is in fact needed is theory, and the conceptual and scientific clarification of the framework within which we collect our data to make them speak (Krippendorff, 1981, p. 110). (Harle, 1987, p. vii)

It is possible that this call for a change from “peace research” to “peace studies”—what may be seen as a change in the field’s “brand name” or “brand image”—may have had some effect on the inconsistent naming of the field.

In summary, while in practice the six components presented at the beginning of this section might not always hold true, my experience shows them to be a fairly reliable guide to understanding the complexity of the field that the mere title, peace studies, obscures. Newcomers to the field are well served to recognize the need to conduct background research in at least three different areas: peace research, peace studies, and peace education.

**Critical Events in the History of the Field**

Aside from understanding the basic scope of peace studies and the complex historical understandings that are represented in its name, it is crucial to explore its scholarly and programmatic developments. During the sixty years since the formal introduction of peace studies into the U.S. academy, many peace scholars have
documented the growth of the field. Some scholars use chronological renderings of “waves” or “phases” to describe periods of development that are structured around societal happenings and concerns, while other scholars focus on criteria such as institutional milestones or geographic and regional developments. Carolyn Stephenson (1989), for instance, articulates three distinct waves of peace studies: (1) the 1950s and early 1960s, when peace research reflected ideas about the origins of WWII, as well as the alarm caused by the onset of the atomic age and the Cold War; (2) the late 1960s and early 1970s, when concerns over the Vietnam War dominated the agenda; and (3) the 1980s, when the field flourished due to an increase in graduate and undergraduate programming, content specialization, and a rise in private and state funding -- all linked to a societal concern over the nuclear arms race (pp. 12-18). Similarly, George Lopez (1989b) sees three distinct eras in peace studies: (1) the “formative years” (1948-1969), (2) the “energizing and institutionalizing [of] peace studies” (1970s), and (3) the “era of specialization” (1980s) (pp. 62-67).

In addition to Stephenson and Lopez, David Dunn has more recently examined “the first fifty years of peace research” through an analysis that documents and interprets the various points at which the field moved from a small, “invisible college”7 to a “significant intellectual presence fifty years later” (2005, p. 2). Dunn (2005) asserts that certain types of academic knowledge formations move from (1) individuals laboring on ideas by themselves (often viewing themselves as “misfits” within their disciplines), through (2) the realization of small private (invisible) networks of interest around the same or similar ideas, to finally (3) an enterprise that is formalized in the shape of highly

7 Dunn borrows this framework from Diane Crane, 1972.
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visible journals, conferences and organizations, where the ideas of the field are valued and picked up by others (see pp. 42-43). While I agree that “phases” and, especially, frameworks such as Dunn’s use of “invisible college” are important concepts for understanding the growth of peace studies, I have chosen to base this discussion on “critical events” in the field. The following commentary draws on the work of these scholars and others, but whittles down their inventory of all of the events to only those that are relevant to this project. The format of the information is presented as four phases of “critical events” that represent significant junctures or “disjunctures” in the construction and maintenance of knowledge about peace studies in U.S. higher education.

The Construction and Production of Peace Research: 1945 to mid-1960s

This section introduces the beginning of peace studies, which at the time was called “peace research.” This is the period in which scholars who were interested in researching peace attempted to build a scholarly presence and identity.

Critical event: Improving upon the study of war.

The scholarship of Quincy Wright and Lewis Richardson is considered a precursor to contemporary peace research. While each worked independently (Wright in the United States, Richardson in the United Kingdom), they both launched influential quantitative analyses of war. Wright, an expert on International Law, published *A Study of War* in 1942. This book was the culmination of a 15-year interdisciplinary research project (1400 pages), in which he statistically “studies (and not indifferently) the phenomenon of war from several aspects – anthropology, history, biology, demography, and so on” (Dunn, 2005, p. 44). Karl Deutsch would later write that, “in regard to the social sciences, the pursuit of knowledge about peace has gone unnoticed and
unhonoured at the highest level. On the day on which this changes…mankind may well remember the pioneering contribution of Quincy Wright (Deutsch, 1965, p. xix)” (p. 45).

Richardson, a Quaker, meteorologist, and mathematician, studied war as a hobby. The works for which he is most famous applied mathematical models to the analysis of international conflict and were published posthumously, *Arms and Insecurity* (1947/1960) and *Statistics of Deadly Quarrels* (1950/1960). Richardson viewed war as similar to weather patterns: “If we could see the phenomena with which war was associated, then we might be able to act accordingly, rather than be subject to its indiscriminate consequences. In other words, war was not to be treated as Providential” (Dunn, p. 46).

Positing that war was largely the result of leaders’ ignorance and misperceptions regarding the consequences of their policy decisions, Wright and Richardson “concluded that improving the knowledge base was a necessary part of dealing with the problem of war and that evaluation and application of that knowledge would be important” (Stephenson, 1989, p. 13). Their groundbreaking and innovative work located the origins of wars and the reasons for initiating them in the complex strategic interactions and dynamics of the international system and leaders’ inability to comprehend the unintended consequences of their actions within the system.

*Critical event: Mobilizing for a scientific and value-based exploration of peace.*

In 1945, Theodore Lentz founded the Lentz Peace Research Laboratory (St. Louis, Missouri) “to encourage the mobilization of social scientists for a science of peace that would bring about a scientific revolution involving both changes in fact and value” (Stephenson, 1999, p. 814). In addition to establishing the research center, which is the
“oldest continuously operating peace research center in the world” (p. 814), Lentz also wrote *Towards a Science of Peace* (1955), in which he called for “extensive research into human character and attitudes, to be carried out by multidisciplinary, multinational research teams, which … would be thoroughly professional and conducted within an institutional setting (Lawler, 1995, pp. 11-12).

Lentz’s major contribution was the call for an academic study of peace that would “be wide and draw upon the work of many researchers in disparate fields of endeavour, united in purpose but acting according to principles of division of labour” (Dunn, 2005, p. 48). As Dunn explains, this move by Lentz was an attempt to “bring about the circumstances in which a ‘critical mass’ of researchers could come together organizationally” and “go beyond it in order to have an effect upon attitudes” (p. 48).

*Critical event: First peace studies curriculum adopted in the United States.*

In 1948, the development of university undergraduate-level education marked the adoption of the first peace studies curriculum in the United States at Manchester College, a Brethren-affiliated liberal arts college in North Manchester, Indiana. According to Stephenson (1999), the program stressed the “interdisciplinary and cross-cultural emphasis that was to characterize later efforts” (p. 815).

*Critical event: A small network of scholars is formed.*

Through the efforts of Herbert Kelman and Arthur Gladstone, the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War was created in 1952, “to explore the possibilities of research on alternatives to war in resolving international conflicts” (Kelman, 1981, p. 96) and to provide a psychological perspective on the “assumptions about human behavior

---

8 Today, the program offers a major and minor in Peace Studies.
that underlie foreign policy” (p. 96). For several years, the group published the Bulletin of the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War and ran workshops at professional meetings; it was an interdisciplinary endeavor but its “strongest representation came from the field of psychology” (p. 96).

**Critical event: Creation of the first journal.**

After a few years of fostering interest in the topic through the activities of the Research Exchange, Kelman enlisted the support of a group of colleagues at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, namely Kenneth Boulding (from economics) and Anatol Rappoport (from mathematical biology). In 1957, they began the *Journal of Conflict Resolution: A Quarterly for Research Related to War and Peace* (JCR) at the University of Michigan (Boulding’s home institution) with the intent to use theoretical and empirical scholarship to “minimize the use of violence in resolving conflict” (Dunn, 2005, p. 68). Importantly, the term “conflict resolution” was chosen for the title instead of peace because, they reasoned, it “best reflected the interests of the editorial board in the analysis of conflict across different system levels” (Kelman, 1981, p. 98). Hence, as Lawler (1995) observes, “what … ensued was the rapid growth of conflict research,” largely in the United States, as an intellectual orientation” (p. 12). In time, the creation of the journal captured the attention of a few highly influential IR scholars, such as Richard Snyder, Karl Deutsch, and David Singer.

The Center for Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan was established in 1959, and it “became a major American center of activity in peace research during the early 1960s” (Kelman, 1981, p. 99). The founders of the Center shared “an enthusiasm for the application of new social scientific techniques … to the study of large-scale social
conflicts” (Lawler, 1995, p. 12) and produced research on topics such as “psychological studies of the origins, management, and resolution of conflict; game-theoretic analyses of the dynamics of conflict; [and], statistical analyses of arms races and the correlates of war” (p. 12).

**Critical event: The Peace Research Society (International) is formed.**

The Peace Research Society (International) or PRS(I) was established by the economist, Walter Isard, in 1963. The organization focused on studying the causes of war by generating theories through the use of quantitative-statistical techniques. Much of its research employed data sets from the Correlates of War (COW) project, which was headed by J. David Singer (from IR) and focused on “some of the state and systemic factors thought to be associated with the frequency, severity, magnitude, and intensity of war” (Stephenson, 1999, p. 814). Eventually the organization began “to prefer the term ‘peace science’” (Stephenson, 1999, p. 814), which is reflected in its current name, the Peace Science Society (International) or PSS(I).9

**Critical event: Creation of the first European journal.**

In 1964, Johan Galtung established the first “European journal in the field” (Dunn, 2005, p. 71), the *Journal of Peace Research* (JPR), which he edited for the next 10 years. The culture of JPR was to go beyond “research” to “encompass what might be called ‘peace search’” (p. 71). Galtung characterized this as “an audacious application of

---

9 Today, the PSS(I) sponsors *JCR* and *Conflict Management and Peace Science* (CMPS), both of which are “inter-disciplinary journals containing scientific papers on such topics as international conflict, arms races, the effect of international trade on political interactions, defense expenditures, foreign policy decision making, international mediation, and game theoretic approaches to conflict and cooperation” (Peace Science Society (International) [PSS(I)], 2008a).
science in order to generate visions of new worlds, … and to suggest policies” (Dunn, 2005, p. 71). In addition, Galtung stressed “the international and interdisciplinary character of the enterprise and argued strongly that it should be problem-centric” (p. 71).

Six years prior to launching JPR, Galtung was a visiting assistant professor at Columbia University’s department of sociology. It was during this time that he began researching and writing about “conflict theory” (see Lawler, 1995, pp. 27-29). Although Columbia offered him a faculty position, Galtung declined and returned to Oslo in 1960 “because it provided a location more conducive and sympathetic to the realization of a vision of a new, institutionalized scholarly enterprise” (p. 13). After returning to Norway, Galtung participated in the formation of the “section for research on conflict and peace of the Institute for Social Research” at the University of Oslo (p. 29). This work eventually led to the establishment (in 1966) of the International Peace Research Institute of Oslo (PRIO), a government-funded yet autonomous agency that remains in good standing to this day.10 It is important to note that, in both of these events (the creation of JPR and PRIO), the members of the Scandinavian peace research community, in contrast to their peers in the United States, chose to use “peace” in the titles.

**Critical event: The International Peace Research Association is created.**

The International Peace Research Association (IPRA) formed in 1964, as the result of a conference held a year earlier by the “Quaker International Conferences and Seminars” program. The principal aim of IPRA was to “increas[e] the quantity of

---

10 In addition to PRIO, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) was established the same year. SIPRI conducts applied research “on armaments, their limitation and reduction, and arms control” (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute [SIPRI], 2007) and is “probably the best known of all peace research institutes” (Lawler, 1995, p. 14).
research focused on world peace and ensure its scientific quality” (International Peace Research Association [IPRA], 2008). IPRA and the aforementioned PRS(I) would serve as the two primary peace research organizations for many years.\(^{11}\)

*Summary of first phase.*

Prior to World War II, institutionalized research of this sort had been an anomaly in higher education. The establishment of these organizations and journals provided arenas for responses, as scholars attempted to address the issues of the day. The core themes were the horrors of war and violence (reflected in sentiment lingering from WWII and concern about the Cold War and nuclear holocaust) and the choices scholars could make in light of them. The main institutional concerns were raising professional awareness of this burgeoning effort—especially attracting the attention of IR scholars, the ethics of combining normative values and science, and whether “conflict research” rather than “peace research” was a better means for achieving the goals of the endeavor.

*The Re-production of Peace Research into Peace Studies: Late-1960s to 1980*

The second wave of peace research emerged during the late 1960s on through the 1970s, when controversy over the Vietnam War dominated the agenda. Indeed, peace researchers were considering the impact that their work could make on scholarship and undergraduate curricula, especially in light of the many campus uprisings in protest over the Vietnam War. Stephenson (1999) indicates that the reaction to the Vietnam War led to two main happenings within the peace research community: (1) a radical critique of peace research and (2) the birth of peace education in the United States (p. 815). These events began to transform the identity of “peace research” into “peace studies.”

---

\(^{11}\) Today, IPRA is “regarded as the major international professional organization in the field of peace research” (Stephenson, 1999, p. 814).
Critical event: The radical critique of peace research.

The “radical critique of peace research” was a series of heated internal debates among peace research scholars during 1968-1969. The critique began when a group of young European peace researchers, during the 1969 annual meeting of the PRS(I), issued a declaration that was “directed against ‘traditional peace research’ and against the organizers of the conference” (Eide, 1972, p. 511). The impetus for the declaration was a set of published papers from a previous PRS(I) conference that examined the role of the United States in the Vietnam conflict. Young peace researchers (the so-called radicals) protested against the type of peace thinking in the conference papers and condemned “traditional” peace researchers for their lack of critical reflection regarding the American perspective. As Lawler (1995) explains:

The papers were seen effectively to constitute a set of policy options for the U.S. government that were ‘of doubtful scientific quality’ and, as such, unacceptable products of peace research. … In presenting only the American perspective, the participants in the Vietnam conference had reduced peace research to ‘an unwitting tool of American policy,’ symptomatic of a pernicious imperialism that mobilized ‘technicians, men of science and intellectuals’ in the service of ‘capitalist and neocolonial interests and purposes.’ (p. 71)

Comments such as these were not well-received by “traditional” peace researchers, who feared that “the radicals were undermining the hard-won status of peace research” (Lawler, p. 72). The debates during this critical event focused on describing and naming the field’s divisions and redefining the “limits or the boundaries of peace research” (Boulding, 1970, p. 79).
Critical event: Integration of peace research into the U.S. university classroom.

This event does not represent an “event” per se but rather a very important decade in the development of U.S. university peace education. Lopez (1989b) calls the 1970s the “institutionalization of peace” in academe (pp. 64-67). Indeed, as Elias and Turpin (1994) point out, it was during this time that “peace research was for the first time introduced extensively into the undergraduate classroom” (p. 6).

Although the first peace studies program in the United States emerged in 1948, it was not until the early 1970s that most of the programs were created, especially undergraduate programs at small liberal arts colleges with church affiliations. In addition to religious-based university initiatives, however, the Institute for World Order (now the World Policy Institute) and the Consortium on Peace Research, Education, and Development (COPRED) were instrumental in spurring the development of new programs. Colgate University provided the site of the first Peace Studies chair in 1971, and other programs were established at Earlham College, Manhattan College, Gustavus Adolphus College, Kent State University, and Syracuse University, Juniata, and the University of Akron (Stephenson, 1999, p. 815).

Critical event: The Consortium on Peace Research, Education, and Development is created.

A small group of teachers and scholars with a mission to “link peace research, peace education, and peace action, and to meet the needs of both policymakers and peace movements in the United States and Canada” (Stephenson, 1989, p. 15) created COPRED in 1970. A community of educators (K-16), activists, and researchers, COPRED, which was actually the North American Regional Association of IPRA, would produce six
directories of peace studies programs, with the first published in 1981, and the final edition published in 2000 (see O’Leary), when COPRED was dismantled and closed.12

Critical event: The Peace Education Commission of IPRA is formed.

Founded in 1973, the Peace Education Commission (PEC) was created for the purpose of “making peace research more accessible, combining the participation-action-research tradition with an emphasis on process, on experiential learning, and on democratic pedagogy” (Stephenson, 1999, p. 816). In 1974, the PEC would publish The Handbook on Peace Education. The editor’s preface to the book expresses excitement over the “considerable interest in education among peace researchers” (Wulf, p. ix). Emphasizing the importance of “non-violent, participatory learning and education processes,” it contends that the “ways of conveying contents and strategies of implementation is just as important as the question of content and goals” (p. x).13

Critical event: First peace studies curriculum guide is published.

The University Program of the Institute for World Order (now the World Policy Institute) published the first peace studies curriculum guide, Peace Studies: College Courses on Peace and World Order, in 1973, with the intent “to advance the teaching of peace and world order studies at colleges and universities in the United States and abroad, and, in this manner, to contribute to the global struggle to achieve lasting international peace and security” (Klare, 1994, p. ix). The Institute subsequently published three additional editions (1978, 1981, and 1984) under the title of Peace and World Order Studies: A Curriculum Guide. After the Institute cancelled its educational

---

12 Its replacement organization is named Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA).

13 Today, IPRA has 21 commissions, one of which is the PEC.
program, two more editions were published in 1989 and 1994, through the Five College Program in Peace and World Security Studies (PAWSS) based at Hampshire College in Amherst, Massachusetts. These guides provide syllabi and address issues of substantive content and pedagogical and curricular concerns about the field. ¹⁴

Critical event: The two cultures problem.

In 1971, UNESCO sponsored a global survey that investigated the substantive and methodological emphases of peace research institutes and university peace studies programs—specifically, “the extent to which the scientific method, particularly mathematics, and the more traditional (nonquantitative methods) were employed among peace research programs” (Vasquez, 1976, p. 709). The survey indicated that there was a “two cultures problem” or a division in the field between “humanists” and “scientists” that caused pedagogical questions and challenges. The survey itself spurred much literature and research on the issue of peace pedagogy and the two cultures problem (see Carey, 1980; Everts, 1972; Folk, 1978; Kemp, 1983; Lopez, 1985; Vasquez, 1976; Wehr & Washburn, 1976).

Summary of second phase.

This period of integration of peace research into peace education at the undergraduate level was marked by epistemological, methodological, pedagogical, and curricular debates over the field. By the conclusion of the 1970s, peace studies in U.S. higher education was defined and divided into several subfields: (1) a war/peace systems approach (resembling concerns in the field of IR), (2) a conflict regulation or

management approach, (3) a futurist or world-order approach, and (4) a nonviolent values and life-style approach. The clarification of substantive areas of focus and the growth in the number of programs offered more firmly established peace studies on university campuses (Lopez, 1989b). As Stephenson (1999) concludes, “While the quantitative and behavioral stream continued to be important in peace research, other research traditions took their places beside it, and peace education joined peace research as an important component of the field” (p. 816).

The Maintenance of Peace Studies: 1980 to 1990

During this phase of development, the identity of peace studies became widely recognized as the combination of peace research and peace education. Lopez (1989b) labels this the period of “specialization” (p. 67), when support from outside the university grew tremendously as widespread public concern over the dangerous nuclear arms race drove innovation and renewal within the peace studies community.

Critical event: The “Challenge of Peace” is published.

The U.S. Catholic Bishops’ letter on war and peace in 1983, catalyzed discussion and debate at over 135 Catholic colleges and universities (Johnson, 1986, p. vii). The Bishops asserted: “We call upon educational and research institutes to take a lead in conducting peace studies: ‘Scientific studies on war, its nature, causes, means, objectives and risks have much to teach us on the conditions for peace.’” (Fahey, 1986, p. 2).

Prior to the letter’s distribution, a “Call to Action” had been made (in 1976) by the U.S. Catholic Bishops for “Catholic educators to produce an education for justice” and “to develop new models of justice education at all levels” (Johnson, 1986, p. v). As a
result, the National Catholic Educational Association’s College and University
Department was given the duty to develop “justice and peace education at the 235
Catholic colleges and universities in the United States” (p. v).

*Critical event: The United States Institute of Peace is created.*

The United States Institute for Peace (USIP), an independent and nonpartisan
national institution, was signed into law by President Reagan in 1984.\(^{15}\) The goals of the
USIP are to help: (1) prevent and resolve violent international conflicts, (2) promote post-
conflict stability and development, and (3) increase conflict management capacity, tools,
and intellectual capital worldwide (United States Institute of Peace [USIP], 2008).

In 1986-1987, the USIP began structuring the Intellectual Map Project, which
grew out of the desire of the USIP’s Board members to determine the best way to proceed
with the forming of the Institute and its programs. Jensen and Thompson (1992) reflect
on the situation:

> The Institute’s early experience strongly suggested that, although an enormous
body of literature already sought to delineate the most useful ways to attain a
more peaceful world, considerable confusion and competition existed among
proponents of the various approaches. Furthermore—and precisely because of
this confusion and competition—vital lines of communication among various
schools of thought either had never existed or had broken down. (p. xii)

Thus, it was deemed necessary to investigate “the salient approaches to the study of
international conflict and peacemaking” (p. xi) through the views of scholars and to
develop a conceptual map of the field of “conflict and peace” (p. xiii).

---

\(^{15}\) For a detailed account of the founding of the USIP, see Miller, 1994.
Three activities resulted from this effort. First, the Map outlined four loosely organized approaches: (1) the “traditional approaches,” which consist of the subcategories of collective security and deterrence, diplomacy and negotiation, and strategic management and arms control; (2) the “newer approaches,” which address the subcategories of transnationalism, behavioral approaches, and conflict resolution; (3) “international law (IL) approaches,” which contain the subcategories of IL, interstate organizations, and third-party dispute settlement; and (4) “political systems approaches,” which subsume the subcategories of internal systems or domestic arrangements and systemic theories/world systems, i.e., international behavior and approaches that focus broadly on worldviews (see Jensen & Thompson, pp. xiii-xviii). Second, a series of seven colloquia took place, bringing together a total of 45 scholars and practitioners from fields such as international affairs, history, philosophy, behavioral theory, psychology, and peace activism. Third, at the Project’s conclusion in 1988, a ground-breaking conference was held that represented an “effort to bring together a variety of ‘cultures’ that, for intellectual, ideological, and institutional reasons, had not traditionally interacted with one another” (p. xxi). The conference was deemed an “important first step toward opening new lines of communication that had previously been considered closed or unproductive” (p. xxii). Since the Intellectual Map Project, the USIP has published many books, articles, and pedagogical tools related to the investigation of violent international conflict.16

---

16 For a recent USIP edited volume on the topic, see Crocker, Hampson, & Aall, 2007.
**Critical event: Hewlett Foundation supports conflict resolution programs.**

In 1984, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation began a $160 million funding program that would play a substantial role in the development and support of the field of conflict resolution for the next two decades. Kovick (2005) contends that “at the time Hewlett’s program began, the sense of a ‘field’ of conflict resolution was only beginning to emerge” (p. 1). Through almost 900 grants to over 320 organizations, the funding bolstered the field in ways that spanned from the:

- development of a theoretical foundation that seeks to understand the sources and dynamics of conflict,
- to the emergence of sustainable practitioner organizations that apply conflict resolution tools across society,
- to the infrastructure that supports the continuing vitality and advancement of the field. (p. 1)

According to Louis Kriesberg (2001), the field of conflict resolution (CR) is “not a narrowly defined discipline but is a general approach” that is “based on the work of academic analysts and nonofficial practitioners” (p. 407). CR uses “long-term strategies” and “short-term tactics” that are “oriented toward changing conflicts so that they can be conducted constructively, even creatively, in the sense that violence is minimized, antagonism between adversaries is overcome, outcomes are mutually acceptable to the opponents, and settlements are enduring” (p. 407).

**Critical event: Peace Studies Association is formed.**

The Peace Studies Association (PSA), an Organization of College and University Academic Programs for the Study of Peace, Conflict, Justice, and Global Security, was formed in 1987 to enhance and promote the academic field of peace studies in higher education. Prior to its formation, academics who were involved in the field of peace
studies had actively participated in COPRED. Over time, however, concerns were raised that the organization was not serving the various needs of its diverse membership. Academics had different needs and concerns than those of K-12 educators and peace activists. Thus, university-level scholars split from the group and formed the PSA.

*Summary of third phase.*

During this phase, outside institutions stepped up and supported the development of peace studies: (1) Catholic universities and colleges worked to integrate issues of justice into peace studies, (2) the USIP worked to locate and bridge scholarly and practitioner-based communities working on issues of international violent conflict, and (3) the Hewlett Foundation supported the growth and development of the field of conflict resolution. There is no doubt that conflict resolution and mediation gained tremendous popularity during this time. Heightened interest in these areas of specialization can also be attributed to several contemporary sources aside from the USIP and the Hewlett Foundation: the evolving “Civil Rights” literature on dispute resolution; work conducted on the topic of environmental mediation; the substantial literature and institutional development in public law; and the rising popularity of conflict negotiation in the business world (Lopez, 1989b, p. 69).

The Re-production or Transformation of Peace Studies: 1990 to the present

The end of the Cold War and the post-9/11 world gave peace studies great cause for deliberation and reflection about its established identity. The current period has provided an opportunity for peace studies to rethink its various areas of specialization and agenda for the future.
**Critical event: End of the Cold War.**

The period after the Cold War was a time during which peace studies worked to redefine itself. After gaining some legitimacy in higher education during the 1980s, the end of the Cold War gave cause for concern but peace researchers were prepared for the new challenge. Thus, the peace research community celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary not with euphoria over the end of the Cold War or by “pronouncing the end of history and a corollary end to the need for research on the causes of war and the conditions of peace” but rather “soberly assess[ing] new challenges: the changing nature of conflicts and increasing sources of insecurity” (Boulding, 1992, p. 1). The goal remained, however, “to render obsolete the field of security studies based on the military defense of nation-states” (p. 2).

**Critical event: Creation of the Peace and Justice Studies Association.**

In 2001, COPRED merged with the Peace Studies Association (PSA) to form the Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA). According to its mission statement, PJSA is a non-profit organization that seeks to: (1) promote peace studies within universities, colleges, and K-12 grade levels, (2) forge alliances among educators, students, activists, and other practitioners of peace, and (3) create and nurture by means of education, research, and action “alternatives to structures of inequality and injustice, war and violence” (Peace and Justice Studies Association [PJSA], 2008a). In 2006, PJSA published the 7th edition of the Global Directory of Peace and Conflict Resolution Programs (see Harris & Shuster, 2006).
Critical event: Joan B. Kroc’s generous contributions to peace studies.

Recent events of significance to the field have occurred at each of the Joan B. Kroc institutes. First, the Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame began a Ph.D. in Peace Studies during the 2008-09 academic year. The doctoral program is offered “in partnership with Notre Dame’s departments of history, political science, psychology, and sociology.” Hence, graduates of the peace studies program will be “fully credentialed in one of the four associated disciplines, plus be fully acquainted with the research questions and findings of interdisciplinary peace research.” The program intends to admit “approximately four students” per year (The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, 2008). Second, the Joan B. Kroc School of Peace Studies was recently established at the University of San Diego. This is the first school of peace studies to be developed in the United States. The founding Dean of the School, Father William Headley, Counselor to the President of the Catholic Relief Services, began his appointment in August 2007.

Summary of fourth phase.

Although peace studies scholars have not yet officially proclaimed and reflected on a “fourth phase,” though some have suggested what it might look like, a few of them have talked about the field’s situation in a post-Cold War political landscape, in which different issues such as religious and ethnic conflicts, nationalist passions and intra-national conflicts, ecological conflict, globalization, inner-city violence, violence against women, and terrorism have become central concerns of the field (Elias & Turpin, 1994;
Furthermore, some discussions in the post-9/11 environment have posited the need for peace studies to focus, once again, on the problem of war, suggesting a return to the field’s roots (see Lawler, 2002; Lopez, 2007).

**Conclusion**

Aside from understanding the basic scale of peace studies and the complex historical understandings represented by its name, it is essential for this project to explore “critical events” of the field’s scholarly and programmatic growth and development. Using multiple resources, the “events” were specially selected and expanded upon in an attempt to provide not just a chronological rendering of field’s progression but rather a compilation of the complexities that inform the contemporary state of the field. During the span of sixty years, of course, many other significant activities happened overseas and in the U.S. to fuel the development of the field. Yet, the particular events featured in this chapter are fundamental to understanding the field’s current standing in U.S. higher education and its continued struggle for scholarly legitimacy and visibility. The preceding “critical events” serve as significant events in the historical construction, maintenance, and production of knowledge about peace studies in U.S. higher education. The next section returns to the research problem and expands on the methodology used in this project.

**Elaboration of the Problem, Questions, and Methodology**

Rather than consisting of discrete knowledge formations, the study of peace and, consequently, peace studies is actually a tangled web of blurred boundaries, shared and shifting understandings, and contentious debates. This research project aims to examine critically these boundaries, understandings, and debates. In so doing, two core issues are
crucial to the analysis: (1) how the academic fields associated with peace (principally, peace studies, IR, and peace science) negotiate within and against the system of discursive rules and practices that circulate about the study of peace, and (2) how the conceptualization of peace within U.S. higher education is constructed against the backdrop of the hegemony of an assumedly value-free positivism that situates the study of peace as naïve, idealistic, and ideologically driven.

My inquiry into these questions is informed by a Foucauldian discourse analysis of 55 surveys and 36 interviews conducted with U.S. scholars in the fields of IR, peace studies, and peace science, and a review of several books and articles in the aforementioned fields, spanning from 1960-present.18 The Foucauldian notion of an unceasing reciprocal link between power relations and knowledge construction, sometimes referred to as the “power-knowledge nexus” (Han, 1998/2002, p. 77), provides the central methodological foundation for this study. Although the theoretical and methodological concerns of this project will be discussed in later chapters, a brief outline of this key concept must be introduced at this point.

Foucault’s “work is not a system of ideas nor a general theory” (Mills, 1997, p. 17) but rather an unremitting investigation into the complex relationship between power, the construction of knowledge, and the “will to truth.”19 Power is a prime element in Foucault’s discussions of discourse; and this is why his work has assisted many researchers in rethinking the power relations that exist in their analyses. Working from

18 This review also includes “naturally occurring” texts in the form of official written communication retrieved from academic professional associations’ web pages, printed material, and newsletters.

19 Foucault discusses the “will to truth” in The Order of Discourse (1971). For a discussion of Foucault’s use of “the will to truth,” see Han, 1998/2002, pp. 73-107.
Deleuze’s premise that “there exist multiple centers of power around which struggles develop” (Paras, 2006, p. 64), Foucault seeks to complicate the traditional idea of power as a singular and easily identifiable dominant force that works to repress in a top-down manner. Instead, he envisions the notion of power as “deeply enigmatic,” “at once visible and invisible, present and hidden, [and] invested everywhere” (p. 64). As Foucault (1980) explains:

Power in its exercise goes much further, passes through much finer channels, and is much more ambiguous, since each individual has at his disposal a certain power, and for that very reason can also act as the vehicle for transmitting a wider power. (p. 72)

Unlike other conceptions of power (e.g., as emanating from the State or a sovereign ruler), Foucault’s notion of power identifies three important dimensions: (1) the ubiquitous nature of power—that is, no single group “holds” power; rather, power radiates in a “centerless network of points” (Paras, 2006, p. 64), (2) the contingency of power relationships (they are never “carved in stone”), and (3) the elusive quality of power that allows it to function both in and out of sight (Foucault asks us to examine not only the “claims to power” but the “effects of power” as enacted in practices). Thus, Foucault urges researchers to view “power issues” as “distributed, dynamic, and nodal” (Paras, p. 64). In this way, power is understood to be “enacted within relationships and

---

20 Foucault (1980) clarifies his intent behind this unique conceptualization of power: “I do not mean in any way to minimize the importance and effectiveness of State power. I simply feel that excessive insistence on its playing an exclusive role leads to the risk of overlooking all the mechanisms and effects of power which don’t pass directly via the State apparatus, yet often sustain the State more effectively than its own institutions, enlarging and maximizing its effectiveness” (pp. 72-73).
Deeply intertwined with this understanding of power is Foucault’s consideration of the construction of knowledge and the “will to truth.”

Foucault challenges the popular notion that “power dominates people, but knowledge—that is, truth—sets people free” (Danaher, Schirato, & Webb, 2000, p. 63). Instead, he contends that knowledge and truth are not essential and ahistorical objects that can be obtained; rather, knowledge construction and the authentication of information as “true” or “false” have a history that is closely related to power relationships, both past and current. Foucault points out that “knowledge and truth are produced out of power struggles . . . and they are [also] used to authorize and legitimate the workings of power” (p. 64). In this way, “all of the knowledge we have is the result or the effect of power struggles” (Mills, 1997, p. 21).

Paramount to the function of the power-knowledge nexus is Foucault’s (1980) claim that “there can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth . . .” (p. 93). For Foucault (1980), truth must “be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation, and operation of statements” (p. 133). Furthermore, truth is “linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it” (p. 133).

The U.S. academic setting contains an array of discourses of “truth” that are produced within a system of ordered procedures of knowledge in relation to systems of power that sustain and extend them. In this atmosphere, peace (and, consequently, peace studies) is often viewed across the academy at large as a topic discussed by idealistic
utopians and/or ideologically-motivated activists, not professional scholars. While this dissertation examines such perceptions of peace and peace studies within various U.S.-based academic knowledge formations (IR, peace studies, and peace science), it should be pointed out that these academic perceptions reflect larger societal understandings of peace, which have been greatly influenced by representations in textbooks and the media that peace is the normal state of affairs and, therefore, uninteresting. In addition, peace has had to overcome the realist perceptions and mind-set of U.S. policymakers, who emphasize keeping the country “secure” in their crafting of U.S. foreign policy. These legacies of “peace” present a major hurdle to peace studies’ growth and legitimacy as a scholarly field. Accordingly, this study provides a critical analysis of the current conditions within and around the study of peace and the field of peace studies by examining how the discursive functioning of certain academic knowledge formations produce and maintain the perimeters of thought (or “truths”) about the study of peace within U.S. higher education. The general goal of this project is to investigate the possibilities and limitations of the study of peace and, accordingly, for the field of peace studies within the academic contexts of the contemporary U.S. university.

**Trajectory of the Project**

When I began investigating peace studies, I did not fully understand the magnitude and scope of the term. Thus, as I initially gathered information about the field, I focused on “peace studies” and “peace education,” all the time believing that “peace research” represented a different area of peace thinking—I thought it was an “outdated brand” of the study of peace that represented a predominately Scandinavian approach to the topic. This misconception caused me to overlook some of the substantive
and conceptual mappings and events from the early history of the field, which affected to some degree two areas of this project: (1) the construction of the project’s research design and (2) the data analyses in chapters 4 and 5.

The construction of the project’s research design was based on a conceptual mapping of the field of “peace studies.” That is, it was not informed by some of the critical moments in the early development of the field, e.g., the “radical critique of peace research.” The iterative unfolding of this project, which will be discussed more in chapter 3, nevertheless, proved quite beneficial because it allowed me to reflect on and subsequently alter items in the project’s design and methods as I encountered (through data collection) other scholars’ historical and contemporary mappings of the field. In particular, because of the iterative, grounded philosophy of the project, I was able to add the peace science sample. In the end, the information gathered from the peace scientists proved invaluable to the project’s goal of providing a reading of the contemporary condition of peace studies.

The data analyses in chapters 4 and 5 were also conducted before I was able to locate and string together the widely scattered articles and edited volumes documenting some of the early debates in the field. Thus, these analyses were deeply grounded in the empirical survey and interview data. This is not to suggest that I was entirely ignorant about the field prior to the analyses. My pre-data collection review of the literature had focused on what I believed to be the parameters of the field. In particular, I reviewed the literature on peace studies as a university-level pedagogical endeavor, e.g., I read the series of peace studies curriculum guides, articles about the substantive content of the field, the directories of peace programs, and course syllabi from around the country. I
also consulted the literature on the programmatic and pedagogical aspects of “peace education.” It was during the analysis of the empirical data from IR and peace science scholars that I finished gathering many of the articles from the formation and development of peace research, but I did not read them at this time. Having decided to follow a grounded philosophy of theory development through examining concepts in the empirical data, I deliberately chose to read the works after I finished analyzing the data and had written a draft of the chapter. The key point is that my insights, especially those found in chapters five, were deeply grounded in the process of analyzing the empirical survey and interview data and were not influenced by historical reflections on the differences among the fields, specifically between peace studies and peace science.

As is the case in many research endeavors, the trajectory of this project has shifted along the way. What began as an attempt to understand the perception of peace and the subfield of peace studies in IR transformed into a current rendering (with all of its complexities, junctures, and disjunctures) of the condition of peace studies in U.S. higher education, with a critical eye toward the internal and external perceptions of the field. While IR and its relationship with peace studies has remained an important aspect of the project (especially given the historical legacy of its connection to peace studies), it is no longer its sole focus and intent. Instead, I look at the broader relationship of peace studies within U.S. higher education writ large. Here again, this turned out for the best, since a very thorough analysis of the study of peace in IR has been recently explored in the articles and books of IR scholar, Oliver Richmond (see 2005, 2006, 2008a, 2008b).

21 In addition, Matthew Evangelista, a professor of international and comparative politics, edited a comprehensive 4-volume series on peace studies in political science in 2005, and
In summary, peace has not been perfected in peace studies. Not only are there contested meanings and struggles in the field over peace itself and tensions about how the primary object of knowledge should be constructed and defined within the field, there is also dissension vis-à-vis the scholarly production of knowledge within the field—a struggle among peace scholars over concepts, strategies, and much more. Reflecting on the critical events provided in this chapter, this is easy to understand given the key debates caused by the “radical critique” and the splintering of scholars into different groups based on epistemological and/or methodological concerns. If the mantras of the field are “peace is the way” and “peace by peaceful means,” then peace studies scholars in all their contestations seem not to be practicing what they preach. Nevertheless, peace studies still genuinely desires to creatively make peace in the likeness of attaining human fulfillment and ecological sustainability around the globe, and the field is to be lauded for this admirable characteristic.

Outline of the Study

This chapter has set the stage for the remainder of the study by presenting the breadth of the field, the confusion (and underlying tensions) about its name and purpose, and the critical events in the growth of the field; that is, significant events in the historical construction, maintenance, and production of knowledge about peace studies in U.S. higher education. The next chapter complicates this picture of the field, describing the highly contested debates and tensions that emerged with the “radical critique of peace.

*Millennium: Journal of International Studies* ran a special edition of its journal titled “Peace in International Relations” in 2008 (see Moore, Radice, & Sharma).
research,” which raised concerns about how to conceptualize peace and conflict, the relevance of evolutionary versus revolutionary processes in bringing about a more just and less violent world, and the “two cultures problem” of science versus values.

After having established a historical and contemporary understanding of peace studies in chapters 1 and 2, chapter 3 describes the project’s methods and methodology. Drawing on methodological perspectives from poststructuralist theory to investigate the contemporary perceptions of the study of peace and peace studies within U.S. higher education, the chapter outlines the research design, data collection procedures, and the six steps that were used as guidelines for a Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis.

Chapter 4 uses the data collected from peace studies scholars and program directors to present a descriptive analysis of the contemporary perceptions of peace studies. It focuses on the question: What are the different “truths,” knowledge, and beliefs that circulate about peace studies, its scholarship, and its scholars in U.S. higher education? Three precepts of contemporary peace studies are identified (normative-prescriptive, creative and practical, and interdisciplinary and multiple levels of analysis) along with a main strategy, to “make the world a better, more humane place.”

Chapter 5 provides a comparative analysis of the contemporary view of peace studies from scholars working within the closely related fields of IR and peace science. It documents various sites of contention and struggle between the fields and shows that peace studies faces the predicament of being nearly invisible within U.S.-based IR and on the other side of an epistemological and methodological divide from peace science.
The final chapter brings all of the information presented in previous chapters to bear on the discourse analysis. Chapters 1-5 establish an “archive of information” about the field of peace studies. Chapter 6 draws on this archive to suggest the structures and rules of peace studies’ discourses and ultimately the system of its discursive formation. This study concludes that peace studies suffers from a lack of scholarly legitimacy and visibility, which are primarily the result of the field’s desire to transform, transgress, and transcend the traditional (“normal”) policies of the U.S. academy. In addition, the field suffers from a lack of coherence that strikes at its core object of knowledge (peace), subject positions, and knowledge production.

While peace studies scholarship has established a research and programmatic presence within U.S. higher education, it confronts historical and contemporary perceptions of three items: (1) what qualifies as legitimate “scholarship” in terms of traditional disciplinary specialty, substantive content, agenda, and method, (2) what it means to be a “scholar” in U.S. higher education, and (3) what the study of “peace” should include in its parameters. Recognizing these challenges, this project urges peace studies scholars to reconsider their relationship to the broader academic community through an examination (and possible repositioning or reframing) of their multiple subject positions.
CHAPTER 2

POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITS OF KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION IN PEACE STUDIES: A TENUOUS POSITION IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION

In chapter 1, I set in motion the story of how peace studies and its primary object of knowledge, peace, have come to be represented. In particular, I provided basic information about peace studies and many critical events in the historical construction of the field in U.S. higher education. Pivotal points, such as these events, are important to recognize because, once the knowledge and practices produced by them enter into peace studies’ discourses, they guide the ways of talking, writing, and acting within the field—thus, allowing some items to be discussed, while at the same time ruling out others.

In this chapter, I bring together key information about the condition of the field, i.e., how scholars of the field have historically perceived and reflected on it. Accordingly, I address questions such as: What have peace studies scholars written about its contemporary state? Is peace studies perceived to hold a visible place in the U.S. academic culture (let alone one that is legitimate)? What are the general characteristics of the field that shape its reputation? In what ways have the internal tensions it has produced and the external critiques it has received constituted its current standing in U.S. higher education? In this way, the items presented do the traditional work of providing background knowledge to the problem addressed by the project and of justifying the theoretical input sought from Foucault to examine it. In addition to this, however, the
underlying dynamics introduced in this chapter serve another purpose. They frame the contemporary system of knowledge production about peace and peace studies that establishes and maintains not only what is possible for the field but also that which limits it (this topic is discussed in chapter 6).

The chapter is divided into three sections. First, I present the contradictions that exist within peace studies scholars’ contemporary perceptions of their field. Next, I outline historical constructions of peace studies, which consists of its distinguishing characteristics and the internal debates and external critiques that have shaped its current configuration. Finally, I discuss the main historical and contemporary reviews and surveys of the field.

**An Inventory of Peace Studies Scholars’ Observations of the Field: Thriving or Invisible?**

Several prominent peace studies scholars have recently reflected on the status of the field. According to them, peace studies is currently enjoying a period of success. For instance, in the Conclusion of the *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*, Johan Galtung and Charles Webel (2007) contend:

Looking back, say 50 years, the progress in peace and conflict studies is astounding, as evidenced by the chapters in this book. Perhaps one of the most important factors indicative of this progress, present in all chapters, is the use of the word “peace” itself. Peace is used unashamedly, no apology needed, as a subject to be explored in all possible directions, no holds barred. (p. 397)

Likewise, in the Introduction of the 7th edition of the *Global Directory of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Programs*, Ian Harris (2006) asserts:
At the beginning of the twenty-first century the study of peace appears as a serious academic discipline on over 300 colleges and universities in the world. College and university students can take individual courses, earn certificates, and complete bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees in peace studies. In addition on many college campuses student peace organizations and college peace societies offer public forums on the problems of violence that plague the postmodern world. This proliferation of peace studies programs emerges from diverse peace movements and interest in peace research. (p. xi)

Moreover, Chadwick Alger (2007), in his chapter for the *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*, shares a similar view of the success of the field:

> Of course, peace studies has made great progress in the 40 years since I became aware of its emergence. In 2006, … [there were] over 450 undergraduate, masters’ and doctoral programmes and concentrations in over 40 countries and 38 US states. …Whether or not peace studies is considered to be a discipline, there is no doubt that research in the past couple of decades has produced a great advance in understanding of the causes of war and other forms of seriously disruptive conflict. At the same time, there has been a remarkable development in knowledge about preventative measures, particularly with respect to long-term peace-building. (pp. 299-300)

Based on these observations of the field, peace studies seems to deserve the respect of its peers in the U.S. academy. These four prominent faculty members have nothing but praise for its accomplishments. From a programmatic and scholarly standpoint, the claims are that the field is well established, as exemplified by the
existence of peace studies courses and programs and an acceptable amount of peace studies scholarship. Although these perceptions present a cohesive view of peace studies as thriving, the scholars’ perceptions depicted in the next section elicit the complexity of the situation. The following is a synopsis of some of the puzzling descriptions, observations, and evaluations of the field spanning the last few decades.

**Puzzling Perceptions of Peace Studies**

Upon first glance, the state of peace studies, as described by peace studies scholars during the past few decades, seems to portray the same seemingly positive evaluations as those expressed by the four scholars in the prior section. Consider the observation of peace studies scholars, Maire Dugan and Dennis Carey, for instance, who commented in the mid-1990s that “the very proliferation of publications, associations, and programs is … indicative of the progression from being merely an ‘intellectual endeavour’ to being an ‘academic field’” (1996, p. 91). Furthermore, consider the commentary in the special edition of *THE ANNALS*, which commemorated peace studies’ fortieth anniversary. In the Preface, the editor of the edition, George Lopez (1989a), for example, lauds the performance of peace studies for having become “rather prevalent, if not somewhat standard, as one of the transdisciplinary areas of inquiry offered on U.S. college and university campuses” (p. 9).

While these comments suggest that by the mid-1990s peace studies had achieved a comfortable level of programmatic success as an academic field, a closer reading exposes cracks in this positive image. Returning to the special fortieth edition, one finds, alongside words of praise, less sanguine comments about perceptions of the field. Lopez (1989a), for instance, notes that peace studies was critiqued for an “‘implicit ideological
bias’ or … ‘activist orientation’ … in the development of a peace studies curriculum” (p. 9). He further points out that questions were raised about whether peace studies was a discernible field of study and if faculty, who had specialties in disciplinary areas, were sufficiently prepared to teach its interdisciplinary content. Within the special edition itself, an entire article critiques the field for having promoted a definition of peace as “a synonym for what is good” and for having advocated concepts such as “consciousness raising” in university education (see Quester, 1989). Consequently, Lopez (1989a) addresses this article with the following reflection:

The quest for legitimacy within the university on substantive grounds … clearly has not been the only perilous road that the development of peace studies has encountered over the past two decades. … Strong debate still exists regarding what ought to constitute the critical perspectives of peace studies among those who compose the field, while it also is true that many in international relations believe the notion of a peace studies field is problematic at best. (p. 11)

Jumping ahead another ten years and past other similar critiques, in 1999, an observation made by peace studies scholar Robin J. Crews provides a picture of the challenges faced by peace studies’ in the post-Cold War era. He comments:

What happened to peace studies at the end of the Cold War is the best indication yet that our own field had had insufficient impact on academia, let alone the world. From foundations to deans to chancellors, what we heard was that, with the end of the Cold War, we had finally arrived at “peace;” thus there was no longer a pressing need to support peace studies. (1999, pp. 24-25)
Crews surmises that this problem occurred because of peace studies’ inability to make clear that “peace” meant more than simply the absence of war. In short, he determines that this situation invited peace studies scholars “to engage in a serious assessment of [their] progress and future goals within academia and society at large” (p. 25).

Another special journal edition, which was dedicated to reflection on the state of peace studies after more than a half century of the field’s existence, provides several observations of the problematic status of the field at the beginning of the present decade. The journal edition points out, for instance, that while the number of peace studies programs created between the years 1980 and 2000, had doubled, the number represented only 4% of U.S. undergraduate institutions (Murray, 2002). In the same edition, Gregory Mason (2002) asks whether peace studies had “become a legitimate part of the academic landscape” (p. 17), inflecting our thoughts, with an encompassing and unique perspective. The answer, he claims, “would be in the negative” (p. 17).

Summary

The raw numbers of peace studies program development inspire optimism, but, like most purely statistical accounts, they do not tell the whole story. As one peace studies scholar whom I interviewed confided to me, “most people are unaware of [peace studies], still, despite there being scores of degree programs; it’s still not on a lot of people’s radar screens in the academic world” (PS47).22 This scholar’s representation of the field reflects not only the scholars’ comments provided in the previous section but also my own experience with the field during six years of graduate training.

22 These letters and numbers (e.g., “PS47”) represent the research participant numbering system used to maintain anonymity for the scholars who are quoted in this dissertation. The system is used extensively in chapters 4 and 5.
As explained in chapter 1, I attended an introductory peace studies course in which peace was summarily dismissed, but, aside from this experience, I also encountered other puzzling inconsistencies in the proclaimed success of the field. First, I struggled to locate professors on my campus that self-identified with peace studies. In the end, I found only two professors (an emeritus professor in IR and an emeritus psychology professor at a branch campus) who participate in the field. In addition to these items, I witnessed the elimination of a peace studies program (established in 1989) and its replacement with a new specialization called *International Relations and Diplomacy*. In response to my email inquiry that requested information about the change in the program, I received the following comment: “The peace studies courses attracted higher enrollment, but the peace studies major did not. We combined international relations and peace studies into the new [major]” (personal communication, June 15, 2004). Thus, although peace studies courses attracted a large number of students, high enrollment in the classes was not sufficient to keep the major specialization in place. A single introductory peace studies course was maintained while the major program was discarded.  

Furthermore, and adding insult to injury, the new program’s name, *International Relations and Diplomacy*, entirely obscures the combination of IR and peace studies into the new major.

This overview of the positive contemporary observations and reflections of peace studies from scholars in the field juxtaposed with the less optimistic comments about the field provided by other peace studies scholars, including my personal graduate training.

---

23 During a conversation concerning the removal of the program, a scholar involved in the program stated: “I argued against them doing it. But, there’s nobody on the faculty arguing for that, [and] it’s pick up to get somebody to teach [the courses]” (personal communication, August 30, 2004).
experiences, leaves many questions about the perception of peace studies unanswered. Why is peace studies, despite having made inroads with program development, for instance, barely visible within the academic culture of U.S. higher education? Furthermore, why does peace studies still struggle for scholarly legitimacy? The subsequent chapters will further examine these questions. The next section, however, provides a look at the general characteristics of the field that currently shape its reputation and the ways in which events in its history may have constituted its contemporary standing within U.S. higher education.

**Contemporary Characteristics and Historical Ways of Thinking about Peace Studies**

This section explores the distinguishing characteristics, debates, and critiques that have shaped the way in which peace studies is represented in U.S. higher education at this particular historical moment.

**Contemporary Characteristics of the Field**

In a 1971 Presidential address given to the PRS(I), Anatol Rapoport cited two fundamental and generally agreed upon assumptions of peace research:

1. “Peace research must include more than the conventional conceptions of international relations” (p. 43).
2. “Peace research should be conceived as an applied science with the goal of preventing wars (that is the preservation of ‘negative peace’) as a minimum and, more comprehensively, with the goal of promoting ‘positive peace,’ that is, the unification of mankind into a cooperative enterprise on a world scale” (p. 43).
Aside from agreement on these two basic assumptions, Rapoport contended that many peace researchers disagreed on the characteristics of the field, especially along methodological lines.

Like Rapoport, in his Presidential speech, several peace researchers throughout the course of the field’s existence have reflected on the characteristics and assumptions of the field. A contemporary reflection that is, perhaps, the most comprehensive in its breadth of characteristics identified was compiled in 1999, by Paul Rogers and Oliver Ramsbotham of the University of Bradford. In the article, the professors present a historical summary of the growth of peace research and suggest “seven features [that] are characteristic of its development and mark it out as a defined field of study” (pp. 740-741). These features, to which I now turn, provide a thorough overview of the different forms of knowledge within peace studies (e.g., the concepts, strategies, and objects of knowledge).

Rogers & Ramsbotham’s Seven Items

Not surprisingly, the first characteristic identified by Rogers and Ramsbotham (1999) is a concern for peace, which they describe as a desire “to address the root causes of direct violence and to explore ways of overcoming structural inequalities and of promoting equitable and cooperative relations between and within human collectivities” (p. 741). As was pointed out in the critical events, many of the early peace researchers, because of their personal Quaker or pacifistic beliefs, “valued peace” but focused all the same on understanding the reduction or elimination of war and large-scale, violent conflict. (Their research interest in reducing conflict, for instance, shows up in the way they named their journals and centers, e.g., the Journal of Conflict Resolution and the
It was mostly the work of Galtung, first prompted by his own convictions about peace and then further triggered by views presented in the “radical critique of peace research,” that expanded upon the common perception of “peace as the antithesis of war” and moved it into the realm of “social justice.”

In Galtung’s view, the study of peace requires not just the absence of war but the absence of violence. Through validation of this statement, Galtung finds room for greater theoretical maneuverability and nuance within the conceptualization of peace. More specifically, Galtung argues that the concept of violence should not be confused with the concept of conflict. After all, violence can occur in the absence of conflict (e.g., hunger and starvation), and conflict can and often is resolved through nonviolent means (Galtung, 1975c). In other words, violence manifests itself in various ways, and many of its forms do not require the existence of conflict. To understand peace, therefore, we must focus on a broader category of violence.

Galtung divides violence into two categories: direct and indirect. Direct violence is an intentional act meant to inflict personal harm on another. Indirect violence is described as “structural violence,” which refers to an often “hidden violence” that works slowly to harm members of society. Unlike direct violence, which is ascribed to personal behavior that is intended, structural violence is caused by impersonal societal structures that promote items such as racism, sexism, ethnocentrism, and poverty. Galtung defines structural violence “as unintended harm to human beings … as a process, working slowly as the way misery in general, and hunger in particular, erode and finally kill human beings” (Maas Weigert, 1989, p. 41).
By including structural factors within the purview of violence, Galtung expanded and complicated the definition of peace. The expansion resulted in a distinction between two types of peace often discussed within the field of peace studies: negative and positive peace. Negative peace is the absence of direct violence, whereas positive peace is the absence of direct and structural violence. Galtung (1990) writes:

The reason for the use of the terms ‘negative’ and ‘positive’ is easily seen: the absence of personal violence does not lead to a positively defined condition, whereas the absence of structural violence is what we have referred to as social justice, which is a positively defined condition (i.e., the egalitarian distribution of power and resources). (p. 13)

Galtung’s “positively defined condition” refers to the “establishment of positive, life-affirming, and life-enhancing values and social structures. …The achievement of positive peace demands a commitment to economic well being, social justice, democratic participation, ecological balance, global citizenship and the full protection of human rights” (Barash & Webel, 2002, pp. 3, 38).

The second characteristic of peace research given by Rogers and Ramsbotham is the common understanding among peace researchers that to investigate the complicated object of peace, an interdisciplinary lens is needed. Looking back at the field’s critical events, this characteristic is present from the beginning. The early U.S. peace researchers, who were not specialists in the field of IR, were concerned with the problem of international relations—specifically, the prevention of another world war and an avoidance of nuclear holocaust—and they believed that their disciplines and specialties (such as, psychology, social psychology, mathematics, anthropology, and game theory)
could shed new light on the topic. Hence, peace researchers reasoned that “given the multi-faceted nature of violent conflict, analysts would need to supplement an international relations approach with insights from the other political and social sciences, as well as from social psychology, anthropology and other disciplines” (Rogers & Ramsbotham, 1999, p. 741). Furthermore, they asserted that “if intellectual progress is to be made in this area, the study of international relations must be made an interdisciplinary enterprise, drawing its discourse from all the social sciences, and even further” (p. 743).

In his significant study of Galtung’s work, *A Question of Values: Johan Galtung’s Peace Research*, Lawler (1995) explains that Galtung, acting from a Scandinavian-influenced persuasion that focused more on the scientific study of “peace” rather than “conflict,” agreed with this perspective and contended that “peace research was not beholden to any specific discipline” (p. 52). Indeed, Galtung criticized what he called “disciplinary imperialism” and “though it was obliquely acknowledged that the research output of international relations scholars was already revealing symptoms of cross-disciplinary fertilization, peace research was explicitly to adopt an interdisciplinary approach from the outset” (p. 52). To Galtung, “certain forms of knowledge biases and methodological preferences could be corrected through cross-fertilization with other disciplines” (p. 52). In this way, the field of IR was to be just one resource used in the study of peace issues and problems.

Dunn (2005) asserts that “the fact that [peace researchers] sought … to be interdisciplinary is a de facto criticism of the assumptions, capabilities, and knowledge-base of International Relations” (p. 69). He continues to say that “of course they did not
ignore International Relations” (p. 69), but instead took a fairly “agnostic” approach, “in the sense that nothing was ruled out, a priori, as being more or less relevant to the problem at hand” (p. 69). Furthermore, there “was no implied hierarchy of inputs: a scholar from International Relations had no necessary prior claim to have a ‘better’ claim to authority than a scholar from, say, psychology or the emergent field of ethology” (p. 69). Peace researchers, recognizing that the problems of peace, violence, and conflict are ever-changing, believe that placing boundaries and limits on disciplines from which to draw is not conducive to addressing an increasingly complex problem that shifts regularly with societal concerns and needs.

A third characteristic pinpointed by Rogers and Ramsbotham is a dedication to the peaceful settlement or nonviolent transformation of disputes or violent conflict, regardless of whether they are actual or potential in nature. To explain, peace scholars reject the definition of peace as the mere absence or suppression of conflict (Stephenson, 1989, p. 11; Brunk, 2000, pp. 25-26). Rather, conflict, not to be confused with violence, is accepted as part of the human condition. The challenge for peace scholars, therefore, is to find ways to handle conflicts more constructively without resorting to indirect or direct violence. Rogers and Ramsbotham (1999) are quick to point out, however, that a desire for nonviolent or peaceful settlements does not imply “endorsing the status quo;” “unjust and oppressive systems [a]re seen as some of the chief sources of violence and war” (p. 741). Peace studies seeks to combat social justice issues through non-violent means.

The fourth characteristic is a concern with the analysis of conflict at all levels, such as individual, group, state, and interstate. Rogers and Ramsbotham (1999) explain that this characteristic represents “an attempt to overcome the institutionalized dichotomy
between studies of ‘internal’ and ‘external’ dimensions” (p. 741). “Internal” refers to analyses of within-state conflicts, such as civil wars, insurgencies, coups, which are typically found within sociology, anthropology, and psychology. “External” refers to studies of interstate wars, invasions, and border conflicts—research that is typically done in IR. Others have made similar observations about this characteristic of the field. Lopez (1989a), for instance, points out that the conceptual areas within peace studies are “open to scrutiny at the individual, national, and international level of analysis” (p. 10). Stephenson notes that a concern with multiple levels of analysis distinguishes peace studies from other closely related fields such as IR, which focuses on relations between states (see 1999).

Relatedly, the fifth characteristic is a commitment to a global or a multi-cultural approach to the analysis of violence, peace, non-violence, etc. Galtung, who viewed this characteristic as one that ran in complete opposition to IR’s state-centric outlook, conveyed strong opinions about this topic. He asserted that IR’s “whole perspective is frankly and openly asymmetrical; the whole world is seen from the vantage-point of the nation-state; and whether the research takes the form of apology or criticism, the perspective is limited to the author’s immediate surroundings” (Galtung, quoted in Lawler, 1995, p. 50). In contrast to this, Galtung believed that “the ‘field of identification’ of the peace researcher was ‘world problems in a world perspective’; its object domain was the global social system; and its research focus was to be ‘human survival’” (p. 52).
The sixth characteristic is that peace research is a normative and analytical endeavor. As was touched on in the critical events, peace research originated among scholars who were concerned with creating a “scientific” study of peace. They worked to establish peace studies as an “applied science.” Rogers and Ramsbotham (1999) draw our attention to the fact that the scholars greatly desired “to ground the subject in quantitative research and comparative empirical study, but, in anti-positivistic vein, most of the scholars attracted to the field were drawn by ethical concerns and commitments” (p. 742). In the end, “deterministic ideas were rejected, whether in realist or Marxist guises, with large-scale violence and war seen, not as inevitable features of the international system, but as the consequences of human actions and choices” (p. 742).

On the topic of normative values, Stephenson (1999) makes the important point that peace studies should not be described as “value based” because “all work is value based, whether consciously or not” (p. 810). She explains, “there is an explicit commitment in the field of peace research/peace studies to making the values and the assumptions of the researchers clear” (p. 810). Thus, peace studies does not claim to be a value-free field of study; rather, it is “value-explicit.” Barash (2000) writes:

Unlike the usual social science approach, which prides itself on being ‘value free,’ peace studies unblushingly acknowledges biases and preferences. It is scholarly, but not disinterested. It does not simply encourage the study of peace, but is in favor of peace. (p. 3)

The seventh and final characteristic is a concern for the necessary relationship between theory and practice in peace research. Rogers and Ramsbotham (1999) contend that “nearly all peace researchers insist that theoretical insight must be empirically tested,
and many have been more concerned with the policy implications of their research than with its reception among fellow academics” (p. 742). Prior to the “radical critique of peace research,” many peace researchers considered it a prime responsibility to communicate their findings to the policy-community. While this opinion still holds true, the radical critique brought to bear many questions on the topic of “for whom is the research being conducted.” Many debates over the notion of “selling out” to the “status quo” or the government transpired. There is currently a consensus to link peace research to the concerns of the general public and practitioners and policy-makers, but some scholars feel that not enough is being done about it.

In summary, these seven distinguishing characteristics of peace studies have been formed and shaped through many discussions and internal debates about the key concepts and strategies of the field during its growth and development. Over time, disputes have arisen, for instance, about items including the parameters of peace, the appropriate methodologies and theoretical frameworks of the field, and the legitimacy and efficacy of the use of force in certain circumstances. These discussions have affected the primary objects of investigation for the field and have also come to influence how peace studies scholars view themselves and their colleagues. The following section is a discussion of the major peace studies’ tensions that influenced the creation of some of these contemporary characteristics of the field.

*Debates and Tensions Internal to Peace Studies*

During the Presidential Address of the PRS(I) in 1971, Rapoport asserted that “the closer a field of research is to fundamental human concerns, the more surely are schisms to appear in it in the process of its growth. So it has been with peace research”
Peace studies, in its desire to improve the situation of humanity, has not been immune from its share of internal and external critiques. The following sections illuminate the different internal perspectives of the field and its scholars that grew out of historical junctures in the field.

**Kenneth Boulding’s Narrow, Broad, and Radical Schools**

In 1970, Kenneth Boulding, one of the founders of *JCR* and an exceptional scholar in the field, presented a paper at an IPRA conference that raised questions about the limits or boundaries of peace research. Although he recognized that drawing borders around peace research might be foolish because they would be somewhat arbitrary, he believed, all the same, that two dilemmas would plague the field if no attempt was made to address the field’s limits. First, he identified “a real problem with limited resources as to what are the limits of a field of discourse within which there is most likely to be fruitful interaction, for we obviously cannot interact with everybody.” Second, he recognized that there was “a problem in an applied field such as [peace research] as to where lie the priorities, that is, what problems should we concentrate on in the immediate future—what is urgent and what is not” (p. 80). He concluded that “there is a serious division among peace researchers…, which might even threaten the communication of the system of the entire peace research movement, and so the question of boundaries is by no means without practical importance” (p. 80). The “serious division” about which Boulding was speaking had formed as a result of the “radical critique of peace research.” He was writing in response to this event and the debates sparked by it. As a way to explain the situation, he grouped the field into three clusters: narrow, broad, and radical.
The “narrow” view, which Boulding conjectured was most characteristic of himself and scholars in the United States, held that:

The problem of peace and war can be separated to a considerable extent from the other problems of the social system simply because the international system within [which] the problems of peace and war mainly occur is itself a distinct system with properties of its own and a certain degree of independence of others, such as religious or economic systems. …In this narrow sense then the main object of the peace research movement is to understand the dynamics of the international system with a view to understanding what kinds of policies, decisions, and strategies, can move it in the direction of stable peace and away from the direction of war. (1970, p. 80)

Thus, Boulding characterized the “narrow cluster” as believing that war was the most pressing problem of the day and, unless this was solved, it would be impossible to solve any of the problems associated with structural violence. In this way, he credited the narrow view with focusing foremost on conflict resolution processes in the international system. But beyond this point, he emphasized that the narrow view was also concerned with conflict resolution processes at a general level, so that even “industrial conflict situations” were of interest to them. These “less destructive” conflicts were intriguing because they could “teach us about the appallingly destructive conflicts which occur within the international system” (1970, p. 81). For Boulding, the narrow group examined conflict at all levels of analysis as a way to learn more about how the international system functioned.
The second cluster of peace researchers, which Boulding labeled the “broad” view, is best represented by the work of Galtung. Boulding explained that this group rejected the notion that “peace research should be mainly confined to the study of the international system itself, spurning this as merely ‘negative peace’ and advocating the study of ‘positive peace’” (1970, pp. 81-82). Furthermore, he declared that positive peace “sometimes seems to be meant rectification of any condition anywhere which might be defined as injustice, oppression, discrimination, anything” (p. 82).

One of the disconnects between the “narrow” and “broad” clusters of scholars was that the broad group only occasionally dealt with conflicts at the international level, which meant that its work did not consistently fall under the purview of the narrow cluster’s concerns. Furthermore, the scholars of the narrow cluster believed that those of the broad view “seem[ed] to be taking too much under its hat and diluting peace research by an attempt to study virtually all social problems” (1970, p. 82). Boulding concluded:

It is understandable, therefore, that the narrow school gets impatient with the broad school for wanting to bring everything into peace research whether it is relevant or not, whereas the broad school gets impatient with the narrow school for being insensitive to social problems which it has felt are perhaps equally urgent as the problems of war and peace. (p. 82)

The third group identified by Boulding (1970) is the “radical” cluster, which was described as being young, mostly from England and Scandinavia, “bearded” (p. 82), “loutish” (p. 84), and possessing a “fancy for what might be called academic guerilla theatre” (p. 82). Boulding claimed that this group tended to view the other peace researchers as “having sold out to the enemy, which is American imperialism and
corporate capitalism” (p. 83). Furthermore, he asserted that these scholars viewed the older peace researchers as caring only about the Cold War, which was not a significant concern to them. Of interest to them, Boulding maintained, was a “revolutionary dialectic” (p. 83) and analyses that “tend[ed] to look for an economic or class basis for conflict”—indeed, he observed that the radical group was “disappointed when they could not find any” (p. 83).

In making a genuine effort to respect the concerns of the “radical” peace researchers and claiming he “would strongly be against any attempt to expel” them (1970, p. 83), Boulding proposed that the “narrow” group could learn from the opinions of the radicals, especially since the narrow group probably did “cooperate too enthusiastically with the powers that be in the hope of changing their decisions” and “occasionally a negative, obstreperous, and even discourteous denial of legitimacy may be what a situation need[ed]” (p. 84). Finally, Boulding concluded that, although he did not agree with the solutions proposed by the radical scholars, their questions could be noteworthy for the future of the field. In particular, he cited two questions that were of significance: (1) “the relation of research to ideology,” and (2) “the relation of research to power, especially political power” (p. 85). Of the first, Boulding wrote that communication could become impossible between communities of differing ideologies, such that even something as “benign as peace research” could “easily be perceived to be threatening, especially if it create[d] images of the world which [we]re at variance with the ideological identities of the people who practise[d] it” (p. 86). On the second matter, Boulding claimed that no researcher could “afford to be indifferent to the effects of his
research on the distribution of power” (p. 89) and, even if there were no immediate answers, questions about the relations of power and knowledge construction should be continually asked.

In summary, as a way to explore the internal challenges that resulted from the “radical critique of peace research,” Boulding grouped the field into three clusters. It is interesting to note that while Galtung’s work today is often viewed to be “radical,” Galtung’s views at this time were tame compared to those of Boulding’s radical cluster. Indeed, the radical critique eventually caused Galtung to reconsider his opinion about negative and positive peace, but he never condoned the use of force (violent revolution) to solve issues of positive peace. This synopsis of Boulding’s work demonstrates one opinion of the way in which the meanings of “peace,” “conflict,” and the purpose of research came to be re-examined within the field. The political scientist, J. David Singer, put forth another perspective.

*J. David Singer’s Pure Science, Applied Science, and Radical Critique Schools*

In a manner similar to Kenneth Boulding, J. David Singer identified three schools of thought that formed after the “radical critique of peace research” in his 1976 article, “An Assessment of Peace Research.” Referring to “the warring schools of peace research,” which he identified as the “pure science school,” the “applied science school,” and the “radical critique school,” Singer focused his analysis on the nature of research and methodology rather than “peace,” and, in this way, his categorizations and explanations provide a different outlook from that of Boulding.
Singer (1976) described the “pure science school” as the smallest group, whose members took “a dim view of the normative emphases conveyed by such labels as peace research, conflict resolution, or peace science” (p. 121). He explained: “these scholars generally hold to one version or another of the value-free position, justify their research on grounds of intellectual curiosity or basic science, and range from indifference to hostility on the question of whether or not their findings have an impact on the human condition” (p. 121). More importantly, Singer asserted that the pure science scholars questioned the view of the “applied science school” because they believed that “we not only know very little and can thus hardly offer much guidance to the policy community, but also that our early ‘findings’ could easily be wrong, to be overturned by later and more thorough investigations” (p. 121). Making it clear that he did not identify with this group, Singer observed that “these apolitical, pure science types overlook[ed] the fact that all information, when it becomes available, and seems to suit their purposes, will be utilized by elites and counter-elites” (p. 121).

The “applied science school” was characterized by Singer as those who saw themselves as the “true heirs” (1976, p. 122) of some of the early pioneers of the field, including Wright and Richardson. In his view, this group was not value-free but rather believed that:

a) one’s ethical values help determine the research questions that one addresses, but that b) strict adherence to scientific method keeps those values—and their research implications—quite visible and explicit, reducing the likelihood of their contaminating the results. (p. 122)
This group was “seen as representing the ‘law and order’ orientation, allegedly indifferent to matters of social justice and caring only about avoiding war” (p. 122).

Singer explained further that, unlike the pure science and radical critique schools, this school did not “shy away from collaboration or even serious communication with the establishments in their nations,” but instead “work[ed] on the assumption that their work, if it [were] to have any effect, must be utilized by the establishment” (p. 122).

Finally, the “radical critique school,” Singer interestingly noted, was “less cohesive now than eight or ten years ago,” and “still dominant in Europe, Japan, and India, but apparently on the decline in the United States” (1976, p. 122). Many members of this group began their careers in the “applied science school” but became disenchanted in the mid-1960s, because they did not see policymakers using the kind of peace research that was being generated. Singer explained, “not only was the research not moving as rapidly as hoped, but those few discoveries that were made were treated with disdain by the handful of policymakers that had even heard of that research” (p. 122). Thus, in their frustration, this group of scholars turned to the work of Karl Mannheim and Karl Marx. Singer opined that, “without recognizing the paradox that their own views must thus be regarded as skeptically as any others’, these revisionists began a vigorous assault on the mainstream applied science position” (p. 123). First, they worked to redefine “research” by making clear their position that attaining objective knowledge about social phenomena was not feasible and, furthermore, research was not to “discover the causes of war and violence,” because it was no longer necessary. Indeed, the “answers were more or less in, and the issue was one of acting on those answers” (p. 123).
In addition to redefining “research,” Singer contended that this school also redefined “peace” by (as Boulding also pointed out) lecturing to the field about the importance of “positive peace” and also about the distinction between “violence” and “structural violence.” On the former action, Singer (1976) facetiously observed that “now supplied with the useful distinction between ‘negative peace’ and ‘positive peace,’ we might go forth and slay virtually all of the dragons of human opposition” (p. 123). On the latter, he remarked that “structural violence” was “intended to emphasize the fact that fascist and imperialist regimes remain in power without having to resort to physical violence, because the threat of it sufficed to keep the masses in thralldom” (p. 124).

In summary, Singer concluded that three key items in the field—peace, research, and violence—meant something different after the “radical critique of peace research.” Peace was now concerned with reaching “positive peace”; research had shifted from understanding and discovering to “acting” (and this was a different kind of action from that practiced in the “applied science school”); and violence was more about structural inequities than large-scale direct attacks and war. In all, Singer (1976) delivered a stinging assessment of the “radical critique school” and how its views would affect the future of the field:

The radical wing has not only, by my criteria, given peace research a bad name, but it has corrupted the communication channels, sown conceptual confusion, and discredited the scientific mode. And since most of its adherents are university teachers or authors of books and articles used in universities, they—along with
their ideological friends—have made it highly unlikely that the next generation of university graduates will go on to make any important contributions to the understanding or the amelioration of the human condition. (p. 124)

Aside from Boulding and Singer, many other peace researchers wrote additional accounts of the “radical critique of peace research” and the controversies that resulted. Lars Dencik (1970), for instance, identified two groups of peace researchers that formed as a result of the radical critique: “the established conventional or conservative peace research (Pc) and the young, radical or revolutionary conflict research (Pr), also called ‘militant peace research’ by its adversaries” (p. 177). Dencik’s two groups of scholars will not be addressed in detail in this paper. Instead, another related issue, which represents one of the effects of the “radical critique of peace research” on peace studies’ pedagogy, is raised. Thus, how did the difference of opinions about “peace” and “research” affect the university classroom in the United States? John Vasquez addressed this issue in his 1976 article, “Toward a Unified Strategy for Peace Education: Resolving the Two Cultures Problem in the Classroom.” A brief discussion follows.

*John Vasquez and the Two Cultures Problem*

The “two cultures problem” emerged from the results of a UNESCO survey conducted in 1971, and a COPRED survey in 1973. As Vasquez (1976) explained, the “two surveys of peace programs provide evidence to show that scholars perceive themselves in a humanist/scientist dichotomy” (pp. 708-709). Indeed, peace research was divided between the concerns of normative, values analysis and quantitative, scientific analysis.
The UNESCO survey showed that, out of 140 programs, only 28% preferred to teach both statistical and qualitative analysis, while 54% preferred to teach only one of them. Furthermore, in the classrooms where only one version was taught, the qualitative approach won against the statistical, 42% to 12%. While the COPRED survey interviewed individual peace researchers instead of programs, it found that the scholars were divided into “two distinct groups on the question of ‘descriptive/analytical (approaches) vs. prescriptive/normative (approaches)’” (Vasquez, 1976, p. 709). Vasquez verified the findings of the surveys by examining publication trends in the major journals of peace research, which he identified as *JCR, Peace Research Society (International) Papers*, and *JPR*:

Each of these journals at its inception was committed to the publication of quantitative analysis of conditions of war and peace. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* has maintained that commitment. Despite some severe criticisms by other peace researchers (Olsen and Jarvad, 1970), the *Peace Research Society (International) Papers* has also maintained that commitment and emphasized its adherence to the scientific approach by changing its name to the Peace Science Society. However, the *Journal of Peace Research*, since the early 70s, has shifted to a more humanist approach by publishing radical and normative work. (p. 710)

The basic problem was that, over time, peace studies had “bifurcate[d] into two groups, the normative and the scientific” (Vasquez, 1976, p. 707). In the words of Lopez (1989c), it was “a situation in which university educators seemed caught in the tension between a behavioral science/international relations approach to peace studies problems” and “a more activist, experience-based, and often normative approach to the field” (p. 710).
To address the problem, Vasquez proposed that both cultures be represented within a peace studies program or course. His article explained in detail how to do this by first identifying educational objectives of the field and then providing a list and overview of the materials and exercises to reach these objectives in the classroom. To be sure, this work influenced the pedagogical discussion about peace studies for many years to come. In a 1985 article that provided several “visions” of university peace studies curriculum for the 1990s, for instance, one of the “visions” prescribed discussed the information presented by Vasquez. It stated: “Due to the bifurcation of the peace studies field between concerns of science and concerns of values, university-level peace studies must provide sound training in both quantitative skills and value analysis” (Lopez, p. 118).

Summary

This section has described some of the internal divisions of peace research that were sparked or amplified by the “radical critique of peace research.” In the Foreword of Juergen Dedring’s 1976 review of the state of the field of peace research, Elise Boulding points out that these debates centered on: (a) how to conceptualize peace, (b) how to conceptualize conflict, and (c) the relevance of evolutionary versus revolutionary processes in bringing about a more just and less violent world (p. 1). Elias and Turpin (1994) confirm and expand on this explanation, maintaining that, as a result of the radical critique, “some [scholars] felt that peace studies was underestimating the violence done by structures of power” and peace studies, therefore, broadened its lens “from the examination of war to the examination of other kinds of violence and injustice” (p. 7). In addition, the “critique” produced “a questioning of ‘objective’ science,” which “promoted a greater emphasis of values” (p. 7). In the end, this period witnessed peace researchers
describing and naming the divisions and debates in the field, redefining their objects of knowledge, the methodological strategies of the field, and, ultimately, the possibilities and/or limitations for the production of knowledge within the field.

Peace Studies’ Relationship to International Relations and Security Studies

Having discussed the contemporary characteristics of peace studies and several of the internal tensions and debates that contributed to the construction, production, and reproduction of the field, the conversation now turns to critiques of peace studies that have been raised by scholars outside of the field. Since many appraisals of peace studies have originated within the fields of IR and security studies, however, it is important to first elaborate on the complicated relationship between these fields.

Depending on the teller of the story, peace research either developed in opposition to work that was being produced in IR and security studies or as a supplement to this research. Stephenson (1999) describes the relationship between security studies and IR, along with “conflict resolution,” “as closely related” (p. 810), noting that “some would argue that these fields are totally different from peace studies, while others would argue that they are a part of it” (p. 810).24 To understand the relationship between the fields, Stephenson created a list of general features of peace studies that distinguish it from IR, security studies, and conflict resolution (see 1999). The following discussion presents the distinguishing factors.

First, the way that peace studies addresses violence, conflict, peace, and security from a global (holistic) perspective and at all levels of activity—from the individual, to group, to global and in between—distinguishes it from (1) conflict resolution, which

---

24 Indeed, in a 1989 article, Stephenson refers to IR, security studies, conflict resolution as “the ’sister’ fields” (p. 11).
works at the individual and groups levels in the domestic arena, (2) IR, which focuses on the international level, and (3) security studies, which primarily focuses on the “security of a single state or alliance” (Stephenson, 1999, p. 810).

Second, in contrast to IR and security studies, peace studies focuses on a longer time period—it goes farther back in history and projects a systematic look forward. IR generally brackets its field within the time period of the creation of the nation-state system (Treaty of Westphalia in 1648) to the current period. As Dunn (2005) explains, in IR and security studies, “there is a premium on dealing with the here and now, as opposed to futures. Both have conspicuously lacked, until relatively recently, a concern with long-term futures (and perhaps even short-term, too)” (p. 74). Stephenson (1989) explains that “IR accepts the nation-state and the existing international system as givens whose fundamentals are unalterable, while peace studies examines as well a wide variety of potential alternative world order systems, centralized and decentralized, hierarchical and nonhierarchical” (1989, p. 12). Along this line of thought, Elise Boulding (1976) calls “futurism” the “first cousin” of peace research (p. 2).

Third, in contrast to IR, peace studies incorporates tools from many disciplines. Early U.S. peace researchers believed that, with its focus on the nation-state system and its lack of interdisciplinarity, IR was not necessarily the best place to handle the threat of international relations and nuclear holocaust. The “non-specialists” (scholars who were not from the field of IR but, instead, from fields such as social psychology, economics, sociology, and mathematics) worked to present a global approach to peace using perspectives from multiple disciplines. This traditional foundation has continued

---

25 For an explanation of “specialists” and “non-specialists,” see Kelman, 1981.
throughout the history of the field. Peace studies “covers the social sciences, natural and physical sciences, and humanities, although with its focus within the social sciences” (Stephenson, 1999, p. 810). IR, on the other hand, “tends to be located within the social sciences, and especially political science” (p. 810).

Fourth, “while a substantial number of those in international relations see themselves as limited to description and explanation” (p. 810), peace studies has, since its inception, aimed to be policy-oriented, applied, and problem-centric. Thus, peace studies aims to “describe, explain, and recommend [italics added] policy relating to the conditions of peace” (p. 810). In addition, peace studies seeks to be problem-centric, rather than issue- or actor- centric, which means the field focuses on the “violent nature of the system and put[s] violence, war, and conflict at the agenda’s centre” (Dunn, 2005, p. 69), rather than issues of sovereign state entities, power, and order. Although some peace scholars admittedly do not aspire to work with the government, they do support providing research and tools to peace practitioners, activists, and the general public.

Finally, in contrast to IR, peace studies is explicitly value-based or, as Stephenson (1999) puts it, “value-explicit.” While many scholars within IR may not openly express their underlying values (they claim to be “value-free” or “value-neutral”), peace studies scholars begin by explicitly expressing their values—they are not only about peace, they are for peace. Many early peace researchers came to the field because they valued the cause of peace—either because of personal convictions like Quakerism or pacifism or in opposition to nuclear weaponry. Thus, they possessed “a positive valuation of peace itself and a commitment to examine trade-offs between values” (Stephenson, 1999, pp. 810-811). This sentiment remains strong in the contemporary setting.
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Summary

Many early U.S. peace researchers were disappointed with the work being done in IR. As Harle (1987) explains,

the first generation of peace researchers held that the traditional field of IR had appeared to legitimate the Cold War [and] … that the problem of war and peace as the problem of mankind’s existence had not been accorded its appropriate place in the study of IR, that essential issues had been neglected and that the research approach and attitude toward this problem had been inadequate. (p. 8)

Thus, these early peace researchers wanted to attract the attention of IR scholars to their field. Although they did not necessarily desire IR’s full cooperation or blessing, they did intend to supplement peace research by learning what they could about IR theory and bringing their own disciplines to bear on it.

While some early peace studies scholars wished to supplement IR research with peace research, others, on the other hand, opposed activities in IR and security studies. Galtung consistently critiqued IR for its promotion of a universal methodology and state centrism. As Lawler (1995) explains, two consequences resulted from this critique.

First, peace research subscribed to the view that “international relations as a discipline helped to perpetuate the existing international system, but peace research would seek to change it” (p. 50). Second, “peace research was to be global in focus, again in claimed contrast to the orthodox theory and practice of international relations” (p. 50). Rogers and Ramsbotham (1999) sum up the situation between the two fields as follows:

26 Lawler (1995) importantly points out that “noticeably absent [in Galtung’s critique of IR] was a consideration of the cogency of theoretical or ethical arguments for state centrism made by international relations scholars” (p. 51).
The peace researchers considered traditionalists within IR to be methodologically unsound and prone to unproven assumptions, whereas the latter regarded peace researchers with irritation, seeing them as one part of the behavioralist revolution which claimed ‘scientific’ understandings of international behavior which traditionalists considered to be simplistic if not naïve. (p. 744)

This brings the conversation to the topic of how IR (and other fields) views peace studies, which will be discussed in the next section.

*Critiques of Peace Studies*

Prior to “peace research,” IR was the field that gave “explicit attention to matters of war and peace” (Dunn, 2005, p. 66). The main view within IR is of a “state-centric system, where there [i]s no higher authority than the state and where the system of states [i]s essentially self-regulating” (p. 66). Furthermore, within security studies, “the elements of power, control, order and the military aspects of international relations [a]re predictably more pronounced” (p. 66). These academic cultures present primarily two approaches to peace: (1) the Realist approach, that seeks “to order and stabilize the system, through the exercise of power and influence” (p. 66), and (2) the Idealist approach that seeks “to improve the prospects of peace and order in the system through the exercise of reason, law, and the harmonization of interests” (p. 66).

Lawler (1995) contends that, “within the tradition of IR, peace research is usually relegated to the realm of so-called idealism, to be contrasted with that of realism” (p. 2); and “as an idealist discourse, peace research commits the sin, from the realist point of view, of being normatively motivated and overly optimistic about the possibility of change” (p. 3). As Thompson (1992) avers, “the normative perspective is central to the
philosophy of international relations. …In its simplest form, normative thinking entails an inquiry into the ‘is’ and the ‘ought’ of political relationships” (p. 48). The field of peace studies is undoubtedly driven by values rooted in the view that the continuation of systems that threaten human survival is morally wrong. In this way, the field desires to change the violent characteristics of the global system and possesses a “social change” agenda, which is a closely related item about which peace studies is often criticized.

Based on peace studies’ image as a social change field, challengers of peace studies have frequently charged that the field is dominated by “activists” and, therefore, is “too political.” Peace studies is “often critical of mainstream ways of thinking about government behaviour and policy” (Brunk, 2000, p. 15), but the field is sometimes viewed as “promoting pacifism, socialism, or other ‘left-wing’ political agendas and providing a platform for engaging students in anti-war protests and other forms of activism, rather than maintaining the appropriate level of scholarly ‘objectivity’” (p. 15).

Although critiques of the field’s idealism and its prescriptive and value-based ideological agenda are common, throughout the years, other critiques have been raised. To begin, many opponents have argued that peace studies is “unnecessary” because it “seek[s] to address issues already seriously and properly addressed in extant disciplines and fields of study” (Dunn, 2005, p. 2). This view was especially prominent in the early days of peace studies. With the success and prevalence of other interdisciplinary programs such as Women’ Studies, however, the “repetitive” or “it’s nothing new” image has been raised less frequently.
Finally, because of its empirical, behavioral, and scientific roots, peace studies is sometimes criticized for its methods, that is, for “trying too hard to look scientific.” The early scholars set out to build an applied science of peace, and the historical legacy of that remains today. Sometimes, because of this methodological reputation, peace studies is viewed as old-fashioned and out-of-touch in its research production. Furthermore, the field is often criticized for not producing a coherent theory on which to build a strong academic field.

Aside from these critiques, some contemporary scholars believe that the negative perception of peace studies is changing, especially in IR and security studies where it appears the agendas of the fields may be converging. As Terriff et al. (1999) explain:

The new contributions of critical theorists, postmodernists, and feminists have challenged the traditional ontological assumptions of IR. As a consequence, there is a much wider range of argument about what issues and questions should be included in the meaning of security, many of which have been advocated by peace studies. (p. 79)

In addition to this, Wapner and Ruiz contend that there is a renewed interest in “normative IR” (see Wapner and Ruiz, 2000). They explain that after roughly fifty years of “marginalization,” there is an effort “to fold ethical concerns into [IR] scholarship and use them to fashion intellectual support for achieving a more humane world” (2000, p. 1).

Review of Peace Studies Scholars’ Reflections on the State of the Art of the Field

In 1976, Elise Boulding made the following observation:

Some sense of the orchestration of the many tasks associated with the making of peace and justice is needed. No one book could or should try to do that. We
don’t want a ‘bible’ of peace research. That kind of orchestration has to go on in our own heads. But we can use help. (p. 3)

Over the years, many peace researchers have provided “help” through surveys of the field and critical reviews of the state of the field. To be sure, however, a “bible” of peace studies has not been created. Indeed, a project such as that might fill the span of an entire career. This section provides an overview of survey studies that have been completed in the field and discusses a few points from theoretical and substantive reviews of the field that have “helped” me in this project.

In reviewing the “state of the art” literature about the fields of peace studies, peace research, peace education, and peace science for this project, I came to understand just how much has been said about the fields since their inception. In the early years (1960s and 1970s), many scholars wrote about the state of the field, which amounted to many discussions about what the field should be, how the topic should be researched, how the field could distinguish itself from IR and security studies, and how the field could move forward after the “radical critique of peace research.” In the 1980s, at least in the U.S., the scholarly reflections on the field turned into questions about its programmatic and pedagogical implementation and upkeep. In the 1990s, the literature (which is smaller in amount) focused once again on substantive issues, i.e., what should be the field’s content after the end of the Cold War? Finally, at the new millennium, a few reviews discussed the state of the field on its fiftieth anniversary.
Aside from scholarly reflections on the state of the field, four large-scale, systematic surveys were conducted in the field during the 1970s and 1980s. In 1971, UNESCO sponsored a global survey of 140 peace and conflict research institutions and peace studies programs around the world that investigated the substantive and methodological emphases of the institutes and programs (see Everts, 1972). In 1973, COPRED conducted a survey of 300 individuals in peace education and peace research that investigated how teachers and researchers assessed the field, especially the central debates and tensions in the field (see Lopez, 1985; Vasquez, 1976). In 1977-78, COPRED sponsored a second study that consisted of a series of meetings with its University Education Network and a survey of 79 U.S. and Canadian peace studies programs; this study systematically investigated the “maturation process” of the peace education field (see Lopez, 1985). In 1982-1983, Anita Kemp conducted an international survey of individuals in the peace field to examine whether there was a similarity in the images belonging to the field (see Kemp, 1985). My research indicates that this was the last large-scale survey conducted of individual scholars in the field of peace studies.

In addition to the large-scale, systematic surveys of peace studies institutes, programs, and scholars, several theoretical and pedagogical reviews of the literature have been conducted. In 1973-74, UNITAR sponsored a presentation and systematic evaluation of mainly North American and West European theoretical literature in the field of peace and conflict research (see Dedring, 1976). In 1978, UNESCO sponsored a presentation of the dissemination of peace and conflict research in North America, Europe, and Japan through an examination of journal and periodical literature (see
Chatfield, 1979). In 1979, Paul Wehr conducted another systematic investigation of the theoretical literature of the field (see Lopez, 1985). In 1980, Dennis Carey investigated the progress of the field’s discipline development. In 1985, George Lopez provided a critical summary and review of most of these items. The information from Lopez informs this project.

**Recent Reviews of the Field: A Few Key Points**

In addition to these systematic reviews of the field, many scholars have reflected on the historical development and the status of the field during the years. In this dissertation, I draw from David Dunn’s recent book, *The First Fifty Years of Peace Research* (2005), that provides a historical overview of the field, addressing how and why “peace research developed as an intellectual endeavor in the course of five decades” (p. 2). Dunn also assesses the contribution of the field through themes represented in its key journals and conjectures about the future of the field. He contends that, aside from its many scholarly interests, the focus of peace research has always been research: “the discovery, articulation and practical implications of new knowledge was the point” (p. 2). To be sure, peace research “was not only about a personal stance, nor political protest” but the “guiding ethic was to be found in a search for knowledge, and then its practical relevance and implications” (p. 2). At the end of the book, Dunn presents nine issues of...

---

27 Although it is impossible to mention all of the reviews, it has been my intention to draw on many of them. In addition to what has been already cited, I will point out that Johan Galtung (1985; 2000) published an article that reflected on peace research after twenty-five years and one that reflected on peace at the turn of the millennium. Kenneth Boulding (1978) reflected on future directions for the field on the 21st birthday of *JCR*. Elise Boulding (2000a; 200b) reflected about “peace” and “cultures of peace” at the new millennium. Furthermore, Chadwick Alger (2000, 2007) has consistently provided articles that usefully outline many practical tools (and corresponding literature) that have been developed in the field.
significance, including the “survival of peace research.” On this topic, Dunn insists that “despite all the hazards and pitfalls along the way, not only has the enterprise survived, it has grown and flourished” (p. 99). I address aspects of Dunn’s book and, in particular, the topic of the “survival of peace research” in chapter 6.

In addition to Dunn’s book, a special edition of the journal Peace Review featured articles by various peace studies scholars who gathered at Juniata College in 2000, to reflect on the future of the field. In the editor’s Introduction, Andrew Murray notes that the group, after much discussion and debate, decided for all intents and purposes “to agree to disagree” about the state and future of the field. He ruminates:

The discussions centered on focus and methodology, and the conclusions reached were pretty much like conclusions reached at similar discussions through the preceding decades. That is there were no conclusions. Rather there was a reaffirmation, problematical for some and celebrative for others, that in the context of peace studies it is not possible to articulate a focus or to identify a methodology beyond the generic ‘to make a better world by whatever method or methodology is appropriate.’ This raised inevitable questions about what will or can, or should happen in the next 50 years to an academic venture that cannot say very clearly what it is about, or how it will go about doing whatever it is about. (2002, p. 6)

I draw on this point and several others from the special edition in chapter 6. The next section provides a preliminary look at how Foucault’s work helps me theorize about the production of knowledge within peace studies.
A Foucauldian Perspective on the Legitimation of Academic Fields of Study in U.S. Higher Education

Broadly speaking, this project offers a poststructural exploration, admittedly limited in scope to peace studies, into the ontological and epistemological boundaries of scholarly legitimacy and visibility within the U.S. university system—that is, the “problem” of how certain academic fields of study receive prominent positions within the U.S. university system, while others are pushed to the margins or, worse still, deemed nearly invisible. To accomplish these theoretical goals, the project draws on a Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis. A discussion of discourse analysis and its methodological significance to this project will follow in chapter 3. First, however, it is important to elaborate on two of Foucault’s concepts that have informed the theoretical direction of this project: (1) discursive formations and the role they serve in examining the “constitution of social practices and cultural patterns”\(^\text{28}\) and (2) dividing practices and the role they play in the exclusionary politics of normalization and truth.

This project contends that meaning is constituted within systems of discourse and is not “the sovereign creation of autonomous subjects” (Paras, 2006, p. 29).\(^\text{29}\) Hence, Foucault makes clear: “Before all human existence, all human thought, there must already be a knowledge, a system [italics added], that we are rediscovering” (quoted by Paras, p. 29). As the self-named chair of the “Professor of History of Systems of Thought” at the College de France, Foucault dedicated several years of academic

\(^{28}\) Søndergaard (2002) describes this as a theoretical premise that is often the focus of examination within poststructural approaches to empirical analysis (p. 188).

\(^{29}\) This is not to insinuate that nothing exists outside of discourse. As Hall (2001) explains, “the concept of discourse is not about whether things exist but about where meaning comes from” (p. 73).
research to an “interrogation of system” (Paras, p. 154). Hence, although Foucault’s objects of analyses (e.g., penology, sexuality, etc.) and frames of reference (discursive formations, technologies, etc.) changed during this period, his way of thinking about “systems” was consistent:

The phenomena under examination represented some portion of a great system.

… This system was self-governing in the sense that it transformed itself over time. It also produced a number of effects … that appeared to be the products of conscious and purposeful action, but were in the fact the result of the play of anonymous forces. These systemic ‘surface effects,’ whether viewed as discourse-objects or power-objects, succeeded in bearing meaning without meaning’s first being imparted to them by any subject. Subjects were not the makers of these objects, but were rather co-produced alongside the objects by the selfsame process. (Paras, pp. 154-155)

Of the analytical devices and concepts that Foucault created to describe the “interrogation of system,” one that is particularly relevant to this project is the “discursive formation.”

In The Archaeology of Knowledge, Foucault (1969/1972) asserts:

Whenever one can describe, between a number of statements, such a system of dispersion, whenever between objects, types of statements, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations), we will say, … that we are dealing with a discursive formation.” (p. 38)

A discursive formation is the “general enunciative system” (Foucault, p. 116) that regulates the domains of knowledge known as discourses—that is to say, discursive
formations comprise the system of rules for the constitution of the “social, including ‘objects’ and social subjects” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 55). According to Gutting (2005), Foucault’s “idea is that every mode of thinking involves implicit rules (maybe not even formulable by those following them) that materially restrict the range of thought” (p. 33). Thus, to describe a discursive formation is to seek out the laws or rules that dictate the scope of thought and practices within a discourse; that is, the intent is to weigh the actual capacity for the circulation, exchange, and transformation of information in the economy of a discourse (see Foucault, pp. 119-121).

Theoretically, the concept of discursive formation is central within this project because discursive formations “constitute a system of control within the production of discourse” (Foucault, 1972, p. 224). Hence, they provide information about what knowledge comprises thoughts and practices. In particular, discursive formations provide a window into “the conditions under which certain relations of subject to object are formed or modified, insofar as those relations constitute a possible knowledge” (Foucault, 1998a, p. 459). This project examines the historically and culturally specific conditions and assumptions that contribute to the “problem of legitimacy” for the study of peace and peace studies in U.S. higher education. The delineation of discursive formations (with special attention given to relations of subjects to objects) will enhance understanding about what is currently “thinkable” and “sayable” with respect to the topic.

In addition to the systems of formation that govern social practices and cultural patterns at this particular historical moment, Foucault’s complementary concern with the politics of normalization and “truth” is central to this project. Søndergaard (2002) contends that “truth claims become very interesting to study, not for their assumed
reflection of reality but … for their production of social and cultural effects and thereby for their inductions of regular effects of power” (p. 188). The politics of normalization and truth begins with an epistemological concern for the conditions of possibility for knowledge but incorporates into it “a historical questioning of the relations between truth and power, as well as of the real effects that it produces on those that say it or are forced to say it” (Han, 1998/2002, p. 75). Thus, the “neutral analysis of the ‘rules’ supposed to govern the discursive gives way to an interrogation of the forms of ‘control’ to which discourses are submitted” (p. 79). In particular, three forms of “control” are significant to this project: “being in the truth,” “speaking the truth,” (p. 79) and “dividing practices” (Foucault, 1982/1998d, p. 326).

With regard to “truth,” one of Foucault’s premises is that to “speak the truth” one must first “be in the truth” (see Han, 1998/2002, pp. 79-85). This means that within the rules and practices of discourses certain criteria dictate which propositions are “acceptable” enough in the first place to then be considered either “true” or “false.” For instance, in *The Order of Discourse*, Foucault (1971) contends, “a proposition must fulfil complex and heavy requirements to be able to belong to the grouping of a discipline; before it can be called true or false, it must be . . . ‘in the true’” (p. 60). As Han (1998/2002) explains, “for a statement to be ‘in the truth’ means that it is ‘acceptable,’ prior to its truth-value being established or negated (thus, a new scientific hypothesis can be *acceptable* [italics added] and yet *temporarily undecided* [italics added] for lack of proper experimentation)” (p. 81). In this way, statements can be given a “false” determination, but only if they are first accepted to “be in the true.” In other words, they
must be included in the discourse before they are evaluated. Thus, “in any given epoch and domain, acceptability partially conditions the predication of truth, in the sense that it predetermines … the objects and the form of the propositions considered” (p. 83).

In addition to “being in the truth” or “acceptability,” “speaking the truth” or the constitution of the “true” or the “false” is also important to this project. Here, “the rules according to which what a subject can say about certain things depends on the question of true and false” (Foucault, 1998a, p. 460). The relationship between subject and “truth” is important to Foucault.30 As Kamberelis and Dimitriadis (2005) contend: “More than anything, Foucault was interested in the ways discourses are produced and then produce subjects, allowing for certain meanings and practices to seem perfectly normal and others quite plainly abnormal” (p. 118). Once a topic is a part of what is “sayable” and “thinkable” (“being in the truth”) in a discourse, then discursive rules will ultimately govern what is considered “true” or “false,” and this includes the consideration of a “truth-value.” As Hall (2001) explains, Foucault is concerned with “how this knowledge about the topic acquires authority, a sense of embodying the ‘truth’ about it; constituting the ‘truth of the matter,’ at a historical moment” (p. 73).

It is in the “embodiment” of the “truth” that we locate the final theoretical concern of this project: the politics of normalization or exclusionary practices and, in particular, “dividing practices.” Foucault (1982/1998d) explains that dividing practices cause a

30 A constant in Foucault’s work is the critical questioning of modernity’s concepts of the “subject” and “reason.” As Scheurich and McKenzie (2005), quoting from page 12 of Foucault’s The Archaeology of Knowledge, explain: “Making historical analysis the discourse of the continuous [e.g., portraying formal knowledge … as emerging through a rational, logical, continuous trajectory] and making human consciousness [i.e., the human subject or subjectivity] the original subject of all historical development and all action are the two sides of the same system of thought [i.e., modernity]” (p. 848).
subject either to be “divided inside himself or divided from others,” and “this process objectivizes him” (p. 326). Some of Foucault’s examples of this are “the mad and the sane, the sick and the healthy, [and] the criminals and the ‘good boys’” (p. 326). Along these lines, Foucault’s work helps one to think about the effects of “truth” when subjects are produced as objects of knowledge “on the other side of a normative division” (Foucault, 1998a, p. 461). The question arises, what are the conditions and practices that produce and maintain “outsiders,” such as the “madman,” “pervert,” or “delinquent”? How does the “will to truth” function as a system of exclusion? Foucault (1980) asserts:

Each society has its regime of truth, its ‘general politics’ of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements … the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; [and] the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (p. 131)

This dissertation is not only concerned with the conditions of possibility of knowledge (or the possible range of thought and practices within discourses) but also the conditions of acceptability regarding truth (or the effects of normalization and other exclusionary practices within discourses).

When exploring the possibilities and limitations for peace studies and the study of peace within U.S. higher education, it is useful to investigate how present-day knowledge (what is considered “normal” and “true”) about the study of peace has been produced and maintained. Overall, a Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis helps us to understand how “particular relations, domains, games, forms, techniques and orders of a social context … shape the kind of power, knowledge, truth, subjectivity, self, and discourse
that apply within that context” (Danaher et al., 2000, p. 32). As discussed in chapter 1, Foucault’s work is essential to this project because my core research question hinges on the discursive nature of knowledge construction and its reciprocal link with power relations. In addition, Foucault’s concern with the systems of order within discourse and how objects and subjects become included in discourse and then judged as either normal or abnormal are central to the theoretical aims of this project.

**Summary and Conclusion**

This chapter presented a review and examination of the literature regarding the state of the field of peace studies. It is essentially an endeavor to gather pieces of the field’s historical development, especially internal debates that influenced the discontinuity that is identifiable within its contemporary landscape; that is, the support mechanisms that shaped the fields’ trajectory and its discursive limits and boundaries. Furthermore, I discussed the theoretical relevance of Foucault’s work to the research problem. The next chapter elaborates on how Foucault contributes to the methodological understanding of the project and provides the details of the research methods.
CHAPTER 3

FOUCAULDIAN-INFORMED DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: A QUALITATIVE VIEW OF KNOWLEDGE FORMATIONS IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION

Drawing on methodological perspectives from poststructuralist theory to investigate the contemporary perceptions of the study of peace and peace studies within U.S. higher education, this project is a qualitative survey-interview study that incorporates a Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis. This chapter is divided into two sections. First, I discuss the study’s methodology. Next, I outline the research process, which consists of three elements: (1) research pilot, site, sample, and methods, (2) data collection, analysis, and validity, and (3) researcher reflexivity.

Methodology

In terms of epistemology, this project is situated in the poststructuralist research paradigm. Poststructuralism focuses on the constitutive effects of language, and, as a consequence, the subject is “not immediately available to itself because it derives its identity only from its position in language or its involvement in various systems of signification” (Schwandt, 2001, p. 203). Hence, poststructuralism posits that “we can only know our world through textual representations of it” (Hatch, 2002, p. 18). Ontologically and epistemologically, poststructuralism posits that: (1) there are multiple realities, each with consistencies and implications that take shape in discourses that
construct “meaning”—how we make sense of our daily lives, and (2) there is no absolute “Truth” of knowledge—that is, there is no single “Truth,” which “remain[s] so, whatever the period, setting, [and] context” (Hall, 2001, p. 76).

This project rests on the theoretical assertion that peace studies and the study of peace struggle for scholarly legitimacy and visibility within U.S. higher education. Based on this premise, the project seeks to examine the different kinds of “truth,” knowledge, beliefs, and practices about peace studies and the study of peace that have been produced, maintained, and reproduced. Thus, while the project seeks to describe the current, but contingent, context of peace studies and the study of peace within the U.S. academy, at the same time, it aims to “deconstruct” it through an analysis of the systems that govern the social practices and cultural patterns—that is, the rules and effects of discourse and the nuanced power relations that constitute the social, including objects and subjects. A discourse analytical framework offers a powerful tool to examine the intricacy of the contemporary circumstance of the study of peace and peace studies within U.S. higher education.

The literature on discourse theory describes many different interpretations of discourse and discourse analysis. First, “discourse” can be understood simply as “actual practices of talking and writing” or, more broadly, as an “interrelated set of texts, and the practices of their production, dissemination, and reception that brings an object into being” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 3). Second, discourse analysis, as a method, can be an actual examination of the “structure of talk,” such as the “sequences of talk in

---

which particular events occur and the capacities in which people speak” (p. 19), or an investigation that focuses explicitly on “the dynamics of power, knowledge, and ideology that surround discursive processes” (p. 20). That said, the literature on discourse theory also identifies discourse analysis as a methodology in its own right.

Texts are not meaningful individually. Discourse analysis is, therefore, not just a method but a methodology. That is to say, discourse analysis represents an “epistemology that explains how we know the social world” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 3). Recognizing that it is “through the interconnection with other texts, the different discourses on which they draw, and the nature of their production, dissemination, and consumption that [texts] are made meaningful,” the methodology of discourse analysis enables the researcher to “explore how texts are made meaningful through these processes and also how they contribute to the constitution of social reality by making meaning” (p. 4).

Along these lines, Hall (2001) credits Foucault with the shift of attention from language to discourse: “[Foucault] studied not language, but discourse as a system of representation,” and “what interested him were the rules and practices that produced meaningful statements and regulated discourse in different historical periods” (p. 72). Lather (2004) credits Foucault with “chang[ing] the terms of debate across a wide range of ‘fields of knowledge’” (p. 279):

From emphasizing the insurrection of subjugated knowledges, through contesting taken-for-granted categories and concepts, to articulating post-humanist subjectivity, [Foucault’s] focus on denaturalizing the regularities that govern our thought has proven richly usable across the human sciences. (p. 279)
Although Foucault’s work “ranges over an extremely wide variety of subjects and it is very difficult to pin him down as a historian, a philosopher, a psychologist or a critical theorist” (Mills, 1997, p. 17), it is usually divided into three periods or approaches: (1) archaeology, (2) genealogy, and (3) “techniques of the self” (Han, 1998/2002, p. 1). This project incorporates tools from the approaches of archaeology and genealogy.

_Foucauldian-Informed Discourse Analysis_

To respond to the question of the conditions of possible knowledge will involve, not only an archaeology of knowledge, but also the genealogy of the ‘power-knowledge nexus.’ (Béatrice Han, 1998/2002, p. 55)

As the quote above points out, an examination of the possibilities and limitations for peace studies and the study of peace should combine perspectives from archaeology and genealogy; thus, these two concepts provide the primary lens through which I conduct a discourse analysis. *Archaeology*, which is described as the “study of the conditions of possibility of ideas” (Paras, 2006, p. 33), “attempt[s] to ascertain the rules governing the production of discourse for a given culture at a given time” (p. 33). *Genealogy*, as its complement, explores how discursive and non-discursive practices position individuals and their bodies/souls within a conflagration of truth, knowledge, and power. Overall, these concepts of archaeology and genealogy, as Foucault expressed them, strike at the very core of this project’s twofold theoretical and methodological aims: (1) to investigate the discursive system of academic knowledge formations regarding the study of peace within U.S. higher education—or “the site, the rules, and the relations that made meaningful speech [about the study of peace/peace studies] possible in the first place” (Paras, p. 40); and (2) to examine how the discursive rules and effects
of power have been put into practice through the politics of normalization and truth—or how the practices of scholarly legitimacy in reference to the study of peace/peace studies have been made real through discourses (Foucault, 1980, p. 97).

**Archaeology**

According to Scheurich and McKenzie (2005), Foucault’s archaeological work was intended as a critique of two items: modernity’s understandings of “reason” (or “a rationality that aspires to be universal” [Foucault, 1985/1998b, p. 469]) and the “agentic subject.” As they explain, Foucault believed that:

Modernist ideology and its resultant representation of ‘reality’ in works of history, philosophy, economy, psychiatry, language, and so on can be undermined by using his archaeological method to show that formal knowledges, [connaissance], emerge from [informal knowledges], savoir, which [are] not logical or rational, and that this process of emergence does not have a guiding or agentic subject at its center. (p. 848)

In this spirit, archaeology contributes to the recognition of the arbitrariness and discontinuity of discourse. In addition, it displaces the “traditionally recognized” autonomous subject from a privileged position of “knowing” to a place of knowing only through discourse.

Overall, Foucault (1969/1972) contends that archaeology “does not imply the search for a beginning; it does not relate analysis to geological excavation” (p. 131).

It is conducted:

---

32 For a thorough discussion of these items, see Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005.

Not to uncover the truth or the origin of a statement but rather to discover the support mechanisms that keep it in place. These support mechanisms are both intrinsic to discourse itself and also extra-discursive, in the sense that they are socio-cultural. (Mills, 1997, p. 49)

Thus, archaeology seeks to analyze the sites, rules, and relations of discourses by questioning “the already-said at the level of its existence” (Foucault, 1969/1972, p. 131). It poses the question: “Why did this and not another statement occur in this place?” (Åkerstrøm Anderson, 2003, p. 31)

**Genealogy**

Foucault’s genealogical approach incorporates a historical analysis of power into the discussion of discourse. Scheurich and McKenzie (2005) point out that, similar to the purpose of archaeology, the purpose of Foucault’s genealogical work is to critique some of the “foundational assumptions of modernity” (p. 14). They write:

The genealogist is [1] to critique the pursuit of origins by showing they are fabrications, [2] to show that the body “is imprinted by history” (Foucault, 1998, p. 376), [3] to describe “systems of subjection” (p. 376) and “the endlessly repeated play of dominations” (p. 377), and [4] to do what Foucault calls “effective history.” (p. 853)

In an effective history, “the traditional devices for constructing a comprehensive view of history and for retracing the past as a patient and continuous development must be systematically dismantled” (Foucault, 1971/1998c, p. 380). Therefore, an “effective history” is without constants. As Foucault emphasizes, “history becomes ‘effective’
to the degree that it introduces discontinuity into our very being—as it divides our emotions, dramatizes our instincts, multiplies our body and sets it against itself” (p. 380).

Perhaps one of the most important themes raised by Foucault is the “treatment of the social agent” (Paras, 2006, p. 11). As Foucault (1982/1998d) clarifies, the goal of his work was not “to analyze the phenomena of power” but, rather, “to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects” (p. 326). Thus, it is with genealogy that Foucault “offer[s] a vision of the individual as the by-product of the functioning of systems of power-knowledge” (Paras, p. 11). In particular, within genealogy, the theoretical premise is that the subject is objectified through the effects and practices of the power-knowledge nexus. As a synthesis of these items, then, genealogy is defined as a “history of the present designed to outline the historical conflicts and strategies of control by which knowledge and discourses are constituted and operate, and to use those descriptions as a counter-memory” (Åkerstrøm Andersen, 2003, p. 19). Overall, this approach poses the question: “How are different discursive formations and discursive strategies shaped and transformed?” (p. 31)

In summary, just as Han draws a connection between archaeology and genealogy in the quote that opens this section, Foucault firmly connects archaeology with genealogy, while providing an important methodological distinction between the two approaches. He (1980) points out:

If we were to characterize it in two terms, then ‘archaeology’ would be the appropriate methodology of the analysis of local discursivities, and ‘genealogy’

33 Foucault (1998a) describes objectified as occurring when “the subject himself is posited as an object of possible knowledge” (p. 460). For further information about “objectivizing of the subject” see Foucault, 1982/1998d.
would be the tactics whereby, on the basis of the descriptions of these local discursivities, the subjected knowledges which were thus released would be brought into play. (p. 85)

**Research Design**

The project’s methodological framework of discourse analysis, which rests on the assumption that texts (broadly defined) construct rather than reveal social “reality,” determines my research design. As an empirical tool to aid the Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis, a qualitative survey-interview strategy is used to examine how certain academic communities construct the scholarly legitimacy of peace studies and the study of peace within U.S. higher education. This section discusses the research pilot, site, sample, and methods.

**Research Pilot**

Glesne (1999) points out that a research pilot study is “not to gather data per se, but to learn about your research process, interview questions, observation techniques, and yourself” (p. 38). While this project did not have a traditional research pilot study, it did benefit from preliminary interviews conducted in August of 2004, and April of 2005, with two influential scholars in the fields of peace studies and IR. These interviews, which focused on the project’s topic and scope, informed three main areas of the project: (1) they verified my basic assumption that peace studies, as an academic field devoted to the study of peace, struggles for scholarly legitimacy within U.S. higher education; (2) they shaped the project’s research questions along with the research site, sample, and methods; (3) they allowed me to hone my interviewing style and techniques before I officially conducted the project’s interviews.
Research Site

The choice of a research site was based on theoretical and practical concerns. First, from a theoretical standpoint, this project prioritizes the perceptions, knowledge, and beliefs that contribute to the discursive struggle over the scholarly legitimacy of peace studies and the study of peace in U.S. higher education. In terms of choosing a research site, the location needed to include access to people and/or documents that were connected, in some way, to the generation of peace research and the creation of knowledge about the field of peace studies and the study of peace. The location also needed to facilitate a critical investigation into the “discursive struggle” over the scholarly legitimacy of peace studies and the study of peace.

The first requirement led me to focus, quite naturally, on the field of peace studies as a research site. In addition, I decided that I would investigate the scholars’ perceptions within the field, since they are often the primary participants in the generation and maintenance of knowledge on U.S. campuses. The second requirement of locating a “site” of “discursive struggle,” however, called for greater deliberation about the theoretical and methodological concerns of this project. I reflected on two key questions. First, how do scholars within the field of peace studies view their situation—are there any recognizable antagonisms between, for instance, the scholars who study peace? Second, what are the peace studies scholars’ “forms of resistance against the different forms of power” within the academic context of the study of peace?  

---

34 Foucault (1982/1998d) recommends that, when using archaeology and genealogy to analyze relations of power, one strategy for locating a “site” is to “tak[e] the forms of resistance against different forms of power as a starting point” and “us[e] this resistance as a chemical catalyst so as to bring to light power relations, locate their position, find out their point of application and the methods used” (p. 329).
Lengthy consideration of these questions brought me back, once again, to the astonishment that I felt during my first peace studies’ classroom experience—one in which the “idealistic” notion of peace was disparaged and discounted against the more “realistic” understanding of peace (viz., “balance of power,” “deterrence,” etc.) presented within IR theory. Based on this firsthand experience of the effects of power, in which certain interests were obviously being produced, reproduced, and maintained, I determined that the most fruitful location to investigate the “discursive struggle” of the project’s topic was within the field of IR. This decision was further supported by a historical review of the peace studies literature. In particular, Elise Boulding (a 1990 Nobel Peace Prize nominee, one of the founders of the International Peace Research Association (IRPA), and a pioneer in the field of peace research) made a comment that resonated with me as I made this decision—it was a comment that followed Foucault’s suggestion of locating “forms of resistance against different forms of power” (see footnote below). In the Preface to an edited volume about peace studies, Boulding (1999) writes:

Peace research and undergraduate peace studies programs grew out of frustrations [italics added] of social scientists with the intellectual freeze of the Cold War and the accompanying inability of international relations as a field [italics added] to focus on systems change and broader concepts of peace and security. (p. ix)

According to Boulding, then, peace studies began as a “form of resistance” to the topics being researched in IR. Thus, in the end, I decided that my research site would be
bounded by an investigation of influential scholars’ perceptions within the fields of peace studies and IR. Next, I needed to choose an acceptable location in which to accomplish this.

The practical concerns of this project determined the non-traditional construction of the research site. Two hallmark characteristics of qualitative research are “natural settings” and “extended engagement.” As Hatch (2002) explains: “For qualitative researchers, the lived experiences of real people in real settings are the objects of study” (p. 6). He continues: “If researchers are to understand participant perspectives in natural contexts, it makes immanent sense that they must spend enough time with those participants in those contexts to feel confident that they are capturing what they claim” (p. 8). Working under severe resource and time constraints, I was unable to have “extended firsthand engagement” within the “real settings” of IR and peace studies scholars, who happen to be scattered in universities around the United States. I chose, instead, to attend the annual conventions of the scholars in these fields, where I could observe and casually talk with them in a quasi-naturalistic setting. In addition, I decided that, in the event I was unable to speak with the participants at the conference venues, then off-site phone interviews would have to suffice.

Research Sample

Just as my selection of the research site was intended to provide rich examples of the phenomenon under study, my selection of research participants was designed to provide meaningful cases that explored the project’s topic in its entirety. In order to pinpoint the scholars to be interviewed for the research project, “purposeful” sampling was conducted. In the words of Patton (2002), “The logic and power of purposeful
sampling lie in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry” (p. 230). Thus, my priority was the quality, not quantity, of the participants. The questions of what and how much to sample were resolved by focusing on the most important themes/texts to the topic of analysis, the scholarly legitimacy of peace studies and the study of peace.

To obtain a quality sample of the academics within each field, then, a homogeneous sampling of the *top-ranked scholars* was conducted. A homogeneous sample is “made up of participants who share common characteristics” and is “useful for studying small subgroups in depth” (Hatch, 2002, p. 50). The participants share the common characteristic of being influential in their respective fields and, therefore, more likely to provide in-depth information about the project’s topic. The top-ranked scholars are of “central importance” to this study because they are, by definition, the most powerful actors in the creation and maintenance of academic knowledge—those with the most effective channels and the largest audiences (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, pp. 70-75).

Initially, the project incorporated a qualitative survey-interview strategy with prominent scholars in the fields of IR and peace studies. But, because qualitative inquiry allows for (and embraces) emergent design flexibility, I was able to integrate two additional groups of scholars into the project after data collection began.³⁵ Based on information gathered from IR and peace studies research participants, homogenous samples of top *peace science scholars* and *peace studies program directors* were added

³⁵ Lincoln and Guba (1985) state that “the design of a naturalistic inquiry (whether research, evaluation, or policy analysis) cannot be given in advance; it must emerge, develop, [and] unfold…” (p. 225).
to the research design. The reasons for these decisions are discussed later in the chapter.

The following information describes how the samples for each field were constructed.

Sample 1: International Relations

A recent survey of over 1000 U.S. IR faculty ranked the top scholars in U.S. international relations. I combined the responses from the questions on the survey to construct the sample of 32 participants.\(^\text{36}\)

Sample 2: Peace Studies

Since there is no ranking of U.S. peace studies scholars, I chose to use the following items to construct the sample of 50 participants: (1) randomly selected members of the editorial boards of the five most prevalent peace journals,\(^\text{37}\) (2) scholars serving in leadership positions within the academic peace organizations, and (3) authors of some of the highly-cited peace studies books.\(^\text{38}\)

Sample 3 (emergent): Peace Science

Like peace studies, the field of peace science does not have an official ranking of U.S. peace science scholars. I chose, therefore, to construct the sample of 24 participants by randomly selecting members of the editorial boards of the most reputable peace science journals and scholars serving in leadership positions of the main peace science organizations.\(^\text{39}\)

\(^{36}\) For discussion of the survey results, see Tierney et al., 2005.

\(^{37}\) By “most prevalent,” I mean that they had been mentioned to me by several scholars and/or they are journals sponsored by the main academic peace organizations.

\(^{38}\) It is in the interest of maintaining anonymity for the participants that I do not divulge the names of the journals, organizations, or books that were used to create the sample.

\(^{39}\) As indicated earlier, I do not divulge the items that were used to create the sample.
Sample 4 (emergent): Peace Studies Program Directors

This sample was compiled from the responses to my survey question given to peace studies scholars. I asked the participants: “In your view, what are the top three academic programs devoted to peace studies?” The program directors of the top-ten programs listed comprise the sample.

Research Methods

The methods employed in this study are a qualitative survey-interview strategy, which is used in conjunction with a Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis. Participant interviewing is the primary data collection strategy; the survey represents a secondary strategy. (Observations at academic conferences were also used, but they played only a minor role). In addition to survey and interview data, document analysis has been used as a tool to enhance the methodological perspective/method of Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis. The following section discusses each of the methods.

Grounded-Survey Instruments

The questionnaire was grounded in information collected during the research pilot and preliminary literature review. It was divided into four sections: (1) Location of Peace Studies, (2) Recognition of Peace Studies, (3) Contribution of Peace Studies, and (4) Academics and Peace Studies. The survey was standardized in content and contained a combination of open-ended and fixed-response questions. While a 30-question survey instrument was developed for the first phase of data collection, the survey had been

40 The italics indicate that the sample was created using the survey responses received from the “peace studies” scholars, not the IR or peace science scholars.

41 It is in the interest of maintaining anonymity for the participants that I do not divulge the “rankings” of the programs.
extended to 47 questions by the end of the project (an example of the longer survey is provided in Appendix A). An explanation for the changes to the survey is provided later in the chapter.

Aside from the purpose of gathering descriptive data to help in the construction of interview questions and during data analysis, the intent of the survey was also to pave the way, so to speak, to ask the participants for an extensive interview. Thus, it might be said that the survey was used as a tactic to “get a foot in the door.” Since the research was conducted with highly-respected, professional academics in fields outside of the researcher’s field of Educational Policy and Leadership, the questionnaire package was designed to “catch the eye” (and interest) of the scholar. That said, the survey was incorporated into the research design as a strategy to “negotiate access” to the scholars.  

Each survey was mailed to the participants in a package that contained a cover letter describing the intent of the project, an endorsement letter from a highly respected scholar in their field, a participant consent form, a pre-addressed, stamped envelope, and a business card from the researcher.

**Interviews**

Patton (2002) contends that “the purpose of qualitative interviewing is to capture how those being interviewed view their world, to learn their terminology and judgments, and to capture the complexities of their individual perceptions and experiences” (p. 348).

---

42 It is my belief that the survey packages facilitated the process of “negotiating access” to the influential scholars in each sample and increased the questionnaire return rate. In particular, the letter of endorsement, which was included in most of the survey packages, may have had a large impact.

43 The peace studies scholars and program directors did not receive a letter of endorsement, however, as I was unable to obtain one prior to the mailing.
While the surveys incorporated several open-ended questions to probe the project’s topic, they were not designed to reveal fully how the participants made sense of peace studies’ current situation. Specifically, they did not provide the “here and now constructions” of contemporary actions, feelings, and/or concerns, the “reconstructions” of past experiences, or the “projections” of future events (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 268). The scholars who completed the surveys were, therefore, thanked via an e-mail message and asked to participate in a follow-up interview.

Those who agreed participated in in-depth qualitative interviews.44 The interviews were semi-structured (using a general interview guide) and most of them lasted roughly ½ to 1 hour (the longest one stretched to two hours).45 The interview questions were open-ended and grounded in information received from the questionnaire (serving as a tool to check or expand on answers in the survey) and the research pilot (acting as a tool to check or explore information gathered by the researcher).46 In addition, at the end of each interview, participants were given the opportunity to share information that they felt had not been adequately addressed during the interview.

44 Originally, the participant interviews were to be conducted face-to-face at the annual meeting of the scholars, but, in the end, because of greater convenience for the majority of the participants, most of them were conducted over the telephone (the exception to this occurred with the peace science scholars, the majority of whom were able to meet with me during the PSS(I) convention).

45 Patton (2002) describes a general interview guide as an outline of a set of topics or subject areas that an interviewer wants to explore (see pp. 341-349). In the interviews, I came with a list of guiding themes and questions, but, at the same time, I was open to following the lead of the participants when unplanned topics or issues were raised.

46 Lincoln and Guba (1985) refer to these two uses of interviews as “triangulation,” which is “verification or extension of information from other sources,” and “member checking,” which is “verification or extension of information developed by the researcher” (p. 268).
While interviews are an important part of qualitative inquiry, research interviews as a source of data are a contested topic within discourse analysis. Many discourse analysts shun the use of interview data in discourse analytic studies because they believe that interviews are a form of “researcher-instigated texts.” In other words, “research interviews, of themselves, are not part of the discourse that constructs the organization” (Phillips & Hardy, 2000, p. 72) of study. While this is an important point to consider when designing discourse analysis projects, Phillips and Hardy argue that interviews can perform an important role: “At the very least, they are important for understanding the social context of the primary texts” (p. 72). In this project, interviews serve a vital function in understanding the complex academic knowledge formations in which peace studies circulate. Nonetheless, care has been taken to use the interview data in conjunction with “naturally occurring” forms of texts.47

Observations: A complementary tool

Since I had minimal financial support, it was unfeasible to visit the universities of the scholars who responded to the questionnaires. Consequently, I structured the research design around a few key academic conventions. In all, I attended a total of three conferences: (1) the International Studies Association (ISA) 2006 Annual Convention; (2) the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) 2006 Biannual Convention;48 (3) the Peace Science Society (International) 2006 Annual Convention.

47 “Naturally occurring” texts are discussed later in this chapter.

48 Although I knew that the annual convention of the Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA) would take place a few months later in September 2006, and would have probably been more aligned with my project’s research focus on peace studies in the United States, I decided that IPRA was better-suited to the schedule of the project’s research design—that is, I could not wait until September to begin phase 2 of the project.
My mission at the conferences was to observe and participate in the academic cultures of the conventions and to meet and interview the scholars who completed the survey. I attended many presentations and mingled with the scholars. At ISA, for example, I attended the presentations of most of the IR scholars who had responded to my questionnaire, and I observed many of the presentations and events sponsored by the ISA’s “peace studies section” (some of the members of the “peace studies section” would be sent surveys in the upcoming months). During ISA, I also asked many of the IR survey respondents for interviews; these efforts resulted in a few interviews during the conference and several telephone interviews afterward. In all, the observations were conducted as a complementary research tool rather than a method—they helped me to understand the academic cultures of the fields, but they primarily helped me to “negotiate access” with some of the scholars by placing a face (mine) with the name on the survey packet that they either had already received or would receive shortly after the conference.

**Document Analysis**

In conjunction with the traditional primary and secondary texts collected during discourse analysis, I also gathered many “naturally occurring” texts in the form of official written communication and unofficial, personal communication. Examples of these items include academic professional associations’ web pages, printed material, newsletters, and listserv postings.49

In addition, I could not afford to attend both of the conferences. Aside from the time and financial factors, I also decided to attend IPRA convention because it was the first time that it had been held in North America for more than a decade; hence, I viewed it as a fortuitous opportunity.

49 Phillips and Hardy (2002) define “naturally occurring” texts as “talk, written texts, nonverbal interactions, films, television programs, and other media, symbols, and
Data Collection

Data collection transpired as a four-stage, iterative process, in which I explored scholars’ perceptions of peace studies in the fields of IR, peace studies, peace science, and at “top-ranked” peace studies programs. An iterative process was chosen because of the empirical nature of the research. Thus, “simultaneous data collection and analysis, with each informing and focusing the other throughout the research process” (Charmaz, 2005, p. 508), which is a perspective borrowed from grounded theory, was the philosophy followed during this project. What follows is a table (Table 3.1) that summarizes the data collection process and a brief description of the findings from each sample.

artifacts” that “appear in the normal day-to-day activities of the research subjects” (pp. 70-71). Qualitative inquiry refers to this as “unobtrusive data,” which are represented by “artifacts, traces, documents, personal communications, records, photographs, and archives” that are “gathered without the direct involvement of research participants, … [and] does not interfere with the ongoing events of everyday life” (Hatch, 2002, p. 116).
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### Table 3.1: Summary of Data Collection Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase One</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th># Sent</th>
<th># Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Relations Scholars</strong></td>
<td>Mailed on March 4, 2006</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>March 2006 - May 2006</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Attended ISA convention: March 22-26, 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Two</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th># Sent</th>
<th># Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peace Studies Scholars</strong></td>
<td>Mailed on July 26, 2006</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>October 2006 - December 2006</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Attended IPRA Convention: June 29-July 2, 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Three</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th># Sent</th>
<th># Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peace Science Scholars</strong></td>
<td>Mailed on October 28, 2006</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>November 2006 - December 2006</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Attended PSS(I) Convention: November 10-11, 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Four</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th># Sent</th>
<th># Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peace Studies Program Directors</strong></td>
<td>Mailed on November 8, 2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>December 2006 - February 2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 1: International Relations (March-May 2006)

During this phase: (1) I mailed a 30-question, grounded-survey instrument to 32 of the top-ranked scholars in IR; 14 questionnaires were completed; (2) I attended the International Studies Association (ISA) 2006 Annual Convention; (3) I interviewed 6 of the 14 scholars who responded to the questionnaire.

Reflection on Phase 1

Four key findings arose from this phase of data collection. First, I learned that many of the IR scholars did not know exactly what peace studies entailed—one of the main suggestions and/or requests that I received from the survey respondents was to “define peace studies.” Second, I learned that many of the IR scholars were more familiar with a “different type of peace studies,” a field that they referred to as “peace science.” Third, I learned that only one of the IR scholars self-identified with or “claimed” peace studies as an area of academic interest. Fourth, I learned that the relationship between IR and peace studies may not have been as intimate as I had anticipated.

Based on these significant findings, I altered the project’s research design before beginning the next phase of data collection. The following changes were made:

(1) I added the following open-ended question to the survey: “Please define peace studies.”

a. I had intentionally omitted a definition of peace studies on the survey because I wanted the respondents to retain their own sense of the term when answering the questions. I subsequently decided, however, that the multiple interpretations of the field by the IR scholars warranted
the addition of the question. In an effort to avoid interference in the spontaneity of completing the questionnaire, I chose to place the question as the last one on the survey. One participant commented, “very clever of you to save this information for last.” Furthermore, because of my decision to add this question to the survey, I compiled over 30 definitions of the field. These definitions have enhanced the project’s data analysis.

(2) The “peace science sample” was added to the research design.

a. To understand the perception of peace studies within the field of IR, I had to investigate its relationship to peace science. This meant reaching out to another group of scholars through another round of surveys and interviews—a costly and time-consuming decision, but one I felt I had to make. In the end, the choice to add the sample paid off, for I received many rich and interesting responses from the peace science scholars, which added to the complexity presented in the data analysis.

(3) Three open-ended questions of a common theme were added to the survey: (a) Are there subdivisions within peace studies? If so, what are they? (b) What methods do you use in your work? (c) What area of international relations scholarship is most important to your work?

a. Although I was familiar with the field of peace science, I had not previously recognized its strong connection to IR. This knowledge compelled me to speculate about other epistemological and/or
methodological divisions that existed within and between fields devoted to the study of peace. Thus, I added these questions to probe deeper into potential schisms within the field of peace studies.

(4) Two open-ended questions were added to the survey: (a) If you could do it all over again, what would you do differently in your career? (b) What advice would you give to a graduate student who is intent on entering the field of peace studies?

a. The intent of these questions was to explore the concept of “self-identification.” Since only one IR scholar self-identified with peace studies, these questions were added to investigate why scholars may or may not choose to self-identify with the field of peace studies.

(5) Several questions were added to reflect the broader relationship of peace studies to higher education, not just to IR.

a. After this phase, I realized that I had structured the survey (and project) on the assumption that a close relationship existed between IR and peace studies, with peace studies being a “subfield” of IR. After learning that many of the IR scholars did not readily associate with peace studies, I added questions that would probe more deeply into peace studies relationship with higher education—possibly one in which it was its own field, as opposed to a “subfield” of various disciplines.
In summary, the purpose of phase 1 was to understand IR’s perception of peace studies. After this phase, my original conceptualization of peace studies changed dramatically: its relationship with IR became more complex and less intimate than I had previously perceived. My initial image of peace studies as a coherent whole connected to IR changed to one that was murky and undefined. The many divisions (epistemological, methodological, and substantive) within the various areas devoted to the study of peace, however, became clear to me. These changes in my understanding of peace studies, as demonstrated in the above modifications to the research design and survey protocol, informed the remaining three phases of the project.

Phase 2: Peace Studies (July-December 2006)

During this phase: (1) I attended the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) 2006 Biannual Convention; (2) I mailed a 47-question, grounded-survey instrument to 50 influential peace studies scholars; 24 questionnaires were completed; (3) I interviewed 14 of the 24 scholars who responded to the questionnaire.

Reflection on Phase 2

Two basic findings emerged during phase 2 of data collection. First, I learned that the changes made to the survey as a result of the findings from phase 1 were crucial to the success (and, probably, the return rate) of phase 2. For example, the first completed survey of this phase yielded the following response about its structure and content: “I’ve got to do justice to this because this is a good survey. It is a good form, by the way, and it is something that really prompts you to think about many of the questions.” Second, the important discovery of peace studies’ complex relationship to IR and higher education during phase 1 became even more significant during phase 2. For
this reason, I decided to add the “peace studies program directors” sample to the project design. The intent of this sample was to use the “peer-recommended experts”\textsuperscript{50} to double-check some of the inconsistencies within the other samples’ results.\textsuperscript{51} In so doing, I sought to learn more about how, if at all, the internal dialogues within peace studies integrated with the other disparate fields focused on the study of peace.

\textit{Phase 3: Peace Science (October-December 2006)}

During this phase: (1) I mailed a 47-question, grounded-survey instrument to 24 influential peace science scholars; 9 questionnaires were completed; (2) I attended the Peace Science Society (International) 2006 Annual Convention; (3) I interviewed 11 scholars.\textsuperscript{52}

\textit{Reflection on Phase 3}

The survey and interview data collected from the IR scholars pinpointed the significance of peace science in shaping the perception of peace studies within IR; therefore, I added this phase to the research design. The information gathered from peace scientists greatly informed my analysis of the data I collected for this project. For instance, I learned that an epistemological and methodological division exists between peace scientists and peace studies scholars. This division does not advance the fundamental concern of each group, which is to make the world more peaceful.

\textsuperscript{50} I call this group “peer-recommended experts” because they are the directors of the programs that the peace studies scholars listed as the “top three academic programs devoted to peace studies” on the survey administered during phase 2.

\textsuperscript{51} Inconsistencies included the following: Is peace studies a field? Is it multidisciplinary? What is the extent of its connection to conflict resolution, IR, justice, etc.?

\textsuperscript{52} Two peace science scholars asked to be interviewed in lieu of completing the survey; therefore, I actually interviewed more scholars (11) than I received survey responses (9).
Phase 4: Peace Studies Program Directors (November 2006-February 2007)

During this phase: (1) I mailed a 46-question, grounded-survey instrument to 10 peace studies program directors; 8 questionnaires were completed; (2) I interviewed 5 of the 8 scholars who responded to the questionnaire.

Reflection on Phase 4

This phase of data collection was used as a member check. Here, the study sought answers to the following questions that were grounded in preliminary analyses of the three prior stages: (1) Where do peace studies program directors think that peace studies belongs within U.S. higher education? (2) How can peace studies get to where it wants to go? (3) How can peace studies learn from the past? (4) How does building an awareness of the current conceptualization of peace studies within the field of IR inform the future growth of the field?

Procedurally, the survey was altered slightly for this phase to reflect the change in the sample’s demographic and purpose. I added an open-ended question to the survey: “What factors are relevant to the growth and success of peace studies?” In addition, I removed the following two questions from the survey: “Which methods do you use in your work?” “What area of IR scholarship is most important to your work?”

Since I did not have the opportunity to observe any of the participants during this phase, I turned, instead, to document analysis. In particular, I analyzed the print and video material of two recent conferences that sought to investigate the contemporary “state of the art of peace studies” in U.S. higher education. Furthermore, I analyzed the peace studies programs’ web pages as well as course and program printed material.
Data Analysis

Inductive qualitative data analysis traditionally involves “organizing what you have seen, heard, and read so that you can make sense of what you have learned” (Glesne, 1999, p. 130), and then “categoriz[ing], synthesiz[ing], search[ing] for patterns, and interpret[ing]” (p. 130) the data that has been collected. Although inductive analysis or “attention to emergent themes and patterns that occur in the data” is “one of the hallmarks of qualitative research” (Weems, 2000, p. 130), its emphasis on “using ‘standardized techniques’ and levels of coding make it a fairly modernist schema for generating meaning” (pp. 130-131). In contrast, this project uses a Foucauldian-informed discourse analytic approach to data analysis. Discourse analysis seeks to render problematic the generation of categories from empirical data. The following is an account of how I used a Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis to examine the data. First, however, I briefly address the contribution of the survey responses to the project.

Survey Data Analysis

I collected survey and interview data from the participants for 12 months. During this time, I analyzed the survey data, and this informed the construction of the research design that I described earlier in the chapter.53 To examine the survey responses, I compiled and totaled the information from each of the four samples and also from the total set of 55 questionnaires. Since the survey data was intended to complement the participant interviews and discourse analysis, they are used sporadically within the project either as descriptive statistics or as a point of comparison within the descriptive and comparative analyses provided in chapters 4 and 5. Thus, the study is primarily

53 Glesne (1999) points out that “data analysis done simultaneously with data collection enables you to focus and shape the study as it proceeds” (p. 130).
qualitative and incorporates a mixed-methods design only in the sense that it used “qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques in … sequential phases” (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, p. 11).

**Discourse Analysis**

Stuart Hall (2001) provides a summary of six elements that should be included in a Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis (see pp. 73-74). Having read a good deal of the literature describing Foucault’s intentions with discourse analysis, in particular Foucault’s pseudonymously written excerpt for the *Dictionnaire des philosophes* that was published in the early-1980’s, I chose to follow Hall’s recommendations, which struck me as the most precise, accurate, and usable.54 The following is an explanation of how I constructed the information provided in chapters 4, 5, and 6 using Hall’s six elements of discourse analysis.

*Element 1: Inclusion of Statements about Peace Studies and the Study of Peace (which give us a certain kind of knowledge about these things)*

In discourse analysis, “the need to link text, context, and discourse, and to incorporate a highly subjective and reflexive use of methods, poses a major challenge for researchers” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 10). At some point, researchers “inevitably have to select a subset of texts for the purpose of manageability” (p. 10). These cautionary statements from Phillips and Hardy apply to my project. After transcribing the interviews and organizing the data corpus over a period of seven months (in all, I transcribed 34 out of 36 interviews), I began to read the interview data (to get a sense of the whole), and,

---

after two times through the data corpus, I determined that I had too much data to analyze for this project. Thus, to maintain control over the sprawling amount of information, I decided to draw on a “subset of texts” that discussed how each group of scholars defined the contemporary situation of peace studies and the study of peace—that is, I used a subset of the data that addressed the scholars’ worldviews of peace studies and the study of peace and how they perceived themselves in relation to the topic. With this decision made, in January 2008, I began to construct Hall’s first element of discourse analysis, which is the inclusion of an item that Foucault called “statements.”

A “statement” is the smallest unit of discourse. Statements are not the same thing as sentences, for “one sentence can actually function as several different statements, depending upon which discursive context it appears in” (Mills, 1997, p. 60). Statements, instead, are “those utterances which can be seen to be grouped around one particular effect” (Mills, p. 13). Consequently, the aim during this phase of data analysis was to observe and weigh the participants’ sentences to see if there were similarities in the effects they produced. I was not looking to judge the significance or value of what they said; rather, I was looking for patterns in terms of the “objects they deployed, the concepts they utilized, the theoretical strategies in which they participated, and the subjective positions that they allowed” (Paras, 2006, pp. 48-49). In the end, the empirically grounded descriptive and comparative analyses presented in chapters 4 and 5 respectively are comprised of the “statements” that I found in the data. Thus, they represent “a set of sanctioned statements which have some institutionalized force, which

55 To assist in the management of this process, I used the qualitative data analysis software program, NVivo. For information about NVivo, see QSR International, 2007. For a discussion of various software options, see Ryan and Bernard, 2000.
means that they have a profound influence on the way that individuals act and think” (Mills, p. 62). In addition, they form a portion of the archive of information used for discourse analysis in chapter 6 (the information about peace studies presented in chapters 1 and 2 comprise the remainder of the archive). Ultimately, during this phase of analysis, I addressed the research question: “What are the different “truths,” knowledge, and beliefs that circulate about peace studies, its scholarship, and its scholars in U.S. higher education?”

Interlude between element 1 and element 2.

Upon completion of chapters 4 and 5, and as an interlude to data analysis, I interviewed an influential peace studies/IR scholar, who was not a participant in my project but wanted to talk with me about it, nonetheless. We agreed that our meeting would be a form of a “member check,” in that I would consult with an “expert” who was familiar with the academic fields and the situation addressed in the project. Although I did not have the “expert” read chapters 4 and 5 (because of time constraints), I prepared several questions that would assist me in “checking” the information in the chapters. I came away from the meeting with many new perspectives of the information presented in the chapters, and what I learned informed the writing of chapter 6—specifically, the discussion of peace studies scholars’ three primary concerns about the future of the field.

Element 2: Inclusion of the Rules that Prescribe Certain Ways of Talking about Peace Studies and the Study of Peace (and exclude other ways)

Hall’s second element of discourse analysis is the “inclusion of the rules that prescribe certain ways of talking.” Hence, this step of data analysis involved evaluating the information presented in chapters 4 and 5 to delimit what thoughts and speech are “unacceptable” and “acceptable” within the discursive formations. In particular, to
address the requirements of this Element, peace studies’ contemporary objects of
knowledge are investigated. It is determined that, if one desires to “speak the truth”
within peace studies discourses, only a certain kind of “peace” makes sense. In turn, this
explains why the type of “peace” discussed by peace studies scholars is of little interest to
peace science and IR scholars and vice versa. These items are discussed in detail in
chapter 6.

This phase of analysis examined the research questions: “Where is the study of
peace, particularly peace studies, located within disciplinary hierarchies?” “How do
peace studies scholars describe peace studies and their work?”56 “How is peace studies
viewed by scholars working within the closely related fields of IR and peace science?

Element 3: Inclusion of “Subjects” (who in some ways personify the discourse with the
attributes we would expect these subjects to have, given the way knowledge about peace
studies and the study of peace was constructed at the time)

During this phase of data analysis, I used the information presented in chapters 4
and 5 to identify and examine seven peace studies scholars’ subject positions. That said,
the boundaries of these identities are blurred and scholars reside in more than one role at
a time. This phase of data analysis, once again, engaged the research questions: “How do
peace studies scholars describe peace studies and their work?” “How is peace studies
viewed by scholars working within the closely related fields of IR and peace science?”57
The seven subject positions are presented in chapter 6.

56 For this portion of the project, I combined the peace studies scholar and peace studies
program director samples.

57 These research questions are also addressed in chapters 4 and 5.
Element 4: Inclusion of How Knowledge about Peace Studies and the Study of Peace Acquires Authority

The establishment of an archive of information about peace studies makes it possible to inquire about how knowledge about the field acquires authority. In addition to using the contemporary analyses put forward in chapters 4 and 5, I examined various books and articles from the fields of peace studies, IR, peace research, and peace science. These resources spanned from 1960-2008, and addressed issues of the “state of the art of the field” or its history, characteristics, and substantive content matter. Chapter 6 uses this “archive of information” (presented in chapters 1, 2, 4, and 5) to understand how peace studies’ three precepts (identified in chapter 4) emerged and why objections (presented in chapter 5) to them, including the field’s desire of “global human betterment,” were raised.

In all, the inclusion of chapters 1 and 2 in the archive of information made it possible to examine how knowledge about the topic acquires authority. This element addresses the research question: “Why has the movement within the U.S. academy to research and advance a scholarly understanding of peace, principally the materialization of the field of “peace studies,” not been highly valued as a legitimate academic endeavor?”

58 Prior to writing chapter 6, I re-read the 34 interview transcriptions to check for information that would “refine” or “alter” the data stories—I was looking for discontinuities within the data (see Hatch, 2002, p. 205).

59 Chapters 1, 2, and 6 discuss the information gathered from the texts.
Element 5: Inclusion of the Practices within Institutions (for dealing with the “subjects” whose conduct is being regulated and organized according to those ideas)

When designing this project, I faced “the choice of whether to conduct [a] more theoretically informed work or to let the data drive the research” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 64). It was a conscious choice on my part to “let the data drive the research.” In short, the empirical nature of the research influenced the incorporation of a philosophical component from grounded theory: theory development through “examining concepts grounded in the data” (Starks & Brown Trinidad, 2007, p. 1373). Therefore, it was only after completing the steps described above that I decided upon a theoretical direction for the dissertation—one that addressed the research question: “How and why is it that academic fields of study and its scholars come to be more valued than others in the U.S. university system?”

Chapter 6 accounts for the practices of institutions in peace studies’ discursive formations by identifying that peace studies suffers from a lack of scholarly legitimacy and visibility because of its desire to transform, transgress, and transcend the traditional policies of the U.S. academy. Thus, although peace studies scholarship has a research and programmatic presence, it battles historical and contemporary perceptions of three items: (1) what qualifies as legitimate “scholarship” in terms of traditional disciplinary specialty, substantive content, agenda, and method, (2) what it means to be a “scholar” in higher education, and (3) what the study of “peace” should include in its parameters.
Element 6: Inclusion of an Acknowledgement that a Different Discourse or Episteme will Arise at a Later Historical Moment (supplanting the existing one, opening up a new discursive formation and producing, in its turn, new conceptions of peace studies and the study of peace, new discourses with the power and authority, the “truth,” to regulate social practices in new ways)

I discuss this broad issue of transformation in my concluding remarks in chapter 6. To tip my hand a bit, the comments provided by peace studies scholars add up to the possibility of reframing or repositioning of the field. I am cautiously optimistic that an opportunity exists for peace studies scholars to reconsider their relationship to the broader academic community in U.S. higher education and, in chapter 6, I explain how this can be achieved.

In summary, Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis “consider[s] how historically and culturally located systems of power/knowledge construct subjects and their world” (Holstein & Gubrium, 2005, p 490). The six elements provided by Stuart Hall, in addition to the knowledge gathered from several articles and books written by Foucault and other scholars, informs the data analysis provided in the remaining chapters of this dissertation.

Research Validity (Trustworthiness)

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), four main criteria exist for establishing trustworthiness in qualitative research: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. This section will discuss these four items and their place within this project.

---

60 Trustworthiness is a parallel term for rigor; credibility is suggested as an analog to internal validity; transferability to external validity; dependability to reliability; confirmability to objectivity (Patton, 2002, p. 546).
In addition to conducting a multi-sited project, three items were used to account for the project’s credibility. First, the design was divided into four specific phases that centered on purposeful sampling of four distinct information-rich cases. As has been discussed in this chapter, the end of each phase served as an opportunity to evaluate the clarity and effectiveness of the research design and questions, and to make revisions accordingly. Second, the nature of the research design itself engendered triangulation\textsuperscript{61} of (1) sources (questionnaires and interviews with faculty from three fields within higher education: peace studies, IR, and peace science) and (2) methods (questionnaires, interviews, and discourse analysis). Third, two forms of “member checks” were conducted during the study. The first member check occurred during the collection of survey interview data from the peace studies program directors—prior to approaching this sample of participants, the survey and interview questions were adapted with the intent to “double-check” some of the data themes present during the prior three stages of research. The second “member check” was an interview conducted with an influential scholar after chapters 4 and 5 had been written. This scholar did not participate in any of the four phases of data collection and agreed to serve as an “expert” consultant for the project; consequently, the information shared by the “expert” was incorporated into the discourse analysis in chapter 6.

\textsuperscript{61} Lather (1991) contends that triangulation is: “critical in establishing data trustworthiness, a triangulation expanded beyond the psychometric definition of multiple measures to include multiple data sources, methods, and theoretical schemes” (pp. 66-67). She believes “the researcher must consciously utilize designs which seek counter patterns as well as convergence if data are to be credible” (pp. 66-67). Seeking “counter patterns” is the deliberate intent of the researcher in this research design. Thus, the design includes speaking with scholars and analyzing various documents from not only the field of peace studies (the primary “space” of peace in higher education), but also from the fields of IR and peace science (“spaces” that are often theoretically and epistemologically at odds with peace studies).
Another criterion for determining trustworthiness is transferability. The intent of this research project is to deeply engage a specific, complex problem and provide information rich in both theory and research narrative. Indeed, the research narrative has been detailed in such a way that the audience “can understand the phenomenon studied” and “draw [their] own interpretations about meanings and significance” (Patton, 2002, p.438). Hence, the researchers in other fields can decide whether the project is applicable to their particular interests.

The third criterion is dependability, which requires that the research process is “logical” and “traceable” (Schwandt, 2001, p. 258). First, the research questions and design of this project have been made clear; the questions have been addressed and the design has been evaluated and expanded throughout the course of the project to account for all items that should have been addressed that were not. In addition, the paradigmatic and analytic constructs used within the project have been clearly specified. As discussed earlier, the project was organized and maintained by means of a qualitative data analysis software program and the data collection and analysis process was thoroughly documented in logs and journals that have been stored in the software program.

The fourth criterion for trustworthiness is confirmability. One way to establish this criterion is to link assertions and findings to the data. For this, I used a Foucauldian-informed process of discourse analysis. Discourse analysts “are attuned to the co-construction of the theoretical categories at multiple levels, including researcher, research subject, academic community, and even society, and they attempt to design and present their research in ways that acknowledge these complex relationships” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 10). Thus, the use of discourse analysis in this project required a rigorous link
between data, assertion, context, and analytic narrative. In addition, it fostered a highly subjective and reflexive approach to the material. The researcher’s methods and procedures have been clearly stated; the next section will discuss the critical issue of researcher self-awareness.

**Research Reflexivity**

Although the research design of this project was an emergent one, it is important to point out that the term “emergent” does not imply that the “data speak for themselves, [and] that the researcher is neutral, unbiased, and ‘invisible’” (Fontana & Frey, 2000, p. 661) in the research process. My aim as a researcher has been to be reflexive about the process of collecting and analyzing data and to be “present” within the final written project. “Present” implies that the researcher’s biases and assumptions are visible within the writing, e.g., “the text created by the researcher’s rendition of events is ‘deconstructed;’ the author’s biases and taken-for-granted notions are exposed, and, at times, alternative ways to look at the data are introduced” (p. 661).62

One characteristic of discourse analytic methods is that they are “unavoidably reflexive because the strong social constructivist epistemology that forms its foundation applies equally to the work of academic researchers” (Phillips & Hardy, 2002, p. 10). As Phillips and Hardy explain: “Academic discourse also constitutes a particular reality, and we are continuously challenged to retain a sensitivity to our role in the constitution of categories and frames that produce a reality of a particular sort (see Marcus, 1994)” (p. 10). Thus, this research design acknowledges that no text is unmediated by the

---

62 As an exemplar, Lather and Smithies (1997) prioritize the task of bringing their influence as authors under scrutiny in *Troubling the Angels: Women Living with HIV/AIDS.*
researcher; and researcher intentionality within the project has been weighed with questions such as: “How do I know what I know?” “How have my perceptions and my background affected the data I have collected and my analysis of those data?” “How do I perceive those I have studied?” In addition, I have asked similar questions about my research participants and the project’s audience. For example, “How do those studied know what they know?” “How will those who receive my findings make sense of what I give them?”

63 Patton (2002) recommends using these questions to reflect on the roles of the researcher, participants, and audience in the project (p. 495).

Summary and Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the methodological perspective of Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis employed to examine critically the current condition of peace studies within U.S. higher education, with an eye toward the production of knowledge about the field and its visibility and legitimacy within U.S. higher education. In this chapter, I provided an overview of the research design, methods, collection and analysis. As part of the research process, I acknowledged the importance of trustworthiness and reflexivity. The methodological choices and procedures described in this chapter helped me to produce this study. In the upcoming chapters, I present descriptive and comparative analyses of the statements provided by peace studies, IR, and peace science scholars (chapters 4 and 5) and a Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis (chapter 6) of the archive of information (chapters 1, 2, 4, and 5) presented within the dissertation.
CHAPTER 4

ASSEMBLING AN ARCHIVE: DESCRIPTIONS OF PEACE STUDIES FROM INSIDE THE FIELD

[Foucault] ordered knowledge like no archivist before him. Neither formalization nor interpretation, but *description* was the essence of archaeology. (Eric Paras, 2006, p. 44)

What are the different “truths,” knowledge, and beliefs that circulate about peace studies, its scholarship, and its scholars in U.S. higher education? Foucault claims that the accumulation of knowledge is limited by contexts, which are made up of “statements” that regulate and normalize the way individuals comprehend what is “true.” In theory, there could be an infinite number of statements that constitute what we know and think. In practice, only a limited number of statements circulate once they have entered into a discourse within a given context, and these statements show up time and time again. This chapter describes the statements that constitute the current domain of objects, subject positions, concepts, and strategies within the academic field of peace studies.64

Chapters 1 and 2 began to contextualize the story of peace studies within the academic and historical understandings of four areas that study peace, viz., peace studies, international relations, peace research, and peace science. This chapter explores the contemporary “statements” that emerged from 32 surveys and 19 interviews that I conducted with influential scholars working in the field of peace studies. It puts forward

---

64 For information on the relationship between statements, objects, subject positions, concepts, and strategies see Foucault, 1969/1972, and Fairclough, 1992.
a descriptive analysis of the data. As Paras’ observation at the beginning of this section demonstrates, the goal is to understand how peace studies scholars perceive themselves through a rich description of patterns present in the “objects they deployed, the concepts they utilized, the theoretical strategies in which they participated, and the subjective positions that they allowed” (Paras, 2006, pp. 48-49). This information comprises the discourses, which are the “windows” that ultimately “allow us to make sense of and ‘see’ things” (Danaher et al., 2000, p. 31) within peace studies and the study of peace.

**What is Peace Studies? Varied Perspectives**

As indicated by the quote below from a peace science scholar, the study of peace goes mostly unnoticed by many people, and the “mysterious” quality (or conceptual murkiness) of the term “peace” tends to push it into the realm of indefinable obscurity.

[To] the general public, administrators in universities, [and] academics, more generally speaking, I think all of this is pretty much invisible to them. It all seems kind of mysterious to a lot of people. That’s part of the image. (SC18)

The field of peace studies as a whole has suffered an analogous fate, which partly explains why it remains at the periphery of U.S. higher education. For instance, an international relations professor summarized her understanding of the peace studies scene with the remark, “peace studies can be so many things” (IR181); while a renowned peace studies scholar said, “there’s this peculiar thing of the word having so many different meanings in higher education” (PS37). Likewise, a self-identified “peace and conflict analysis and resolution scholar,” who has worked in the field as an academic and practitioner for over two decades, declared: “I can’t even say I even fully know what peace studies entails” (PS46).
A Peace Studies Program Director, who witnessed the phenomenon firsthand during the creation of a program at her university, observes the adversity that peace studies has encountered as a result of its malleable character:

The word peace is its own problem in a certain way. …When [we were creating a program], there were actually faculty members, now granted we don’t have a peace studies program … so people were coming from very different disciplines, but to some people peace meant we were going to go out and deal with the social issues on a local level and maybe create a building that had showers for the homeless. For other people, it meant that, no, we were going to create a rigorous academic program. For still others, we were going to do something very interdisciplinary and come together and show how religious tolerance leads to peace or how business people can promote peace activities. So, there were a lot of different ideas around what we were supposed to be and I think that becomes a hindrance in a way to peace studies being taken seriously. (PP7)

Given these observations, one would expect that the situation would improve for the field if the ambiguity of the term “peace studies” and “peace” could be overcome. Unfortunately, this does not appear to be the case. When there was clarity on these issues (or the perception of clarity) among various interviewees, negative undertones frequently surfaced. This suggests that many scholars do have a precise understanding of how peace studies and peace are perceived, but the perception is not a positive one. One peace studies scholar explained: “Peace still has a negative connotation to too many people. It sounds weak. It sounds passive. It sounds all those things that we all know” (PS20). A peace science scholar affirmed this view with the remark, “the stereotype is that peace
scholarship is soft and mushy” (SC24). Beyond these sentiments, one peace studies scholar went so far as to suggest that the title “peace studies” has run its course. He laments:

I am afraid that peace studies maybe as a label, as a brand-name … has passed its peak of usefulness. Now, maybe, we ought to find a different way to package it; for example, in strategic planning or political design or some other term because I think by now, for many people, a certain disappointment has set in. … We see this bad stuff going on in the world and we’re not able to do much about it. We throw books at it and we throw articles at it and we begin to realize that that really doesn’t do a whole lot because the people in power are so capable of dismissing the academic work [of peace studies]. (PS36)

In addition to scholars who think that the name and subject matter of peace studies is inherently murky or associate peace with negative stereotypes or believe that the study of peace has run its course, some scholars believe that the disparaging labels attached to peace studies have loosened over the years. Indeed, one peace studies scholar thinks that "peace" is “pretty-well accepted these days.” He recounts that “peace used to be a dirty word in the 1950’s. If you advocated peace, you were thought to be a fellow traveler of the communist movement … because peace was a word that was used extensively by the Soviet Union” (PS45). Another interviewee concurs that “it was a tainted word” but concludes, “it certainly isn't now” (PS37). He further comments: “There is a kind of legitimacy to the word that has come about partly because of the involvement in peacekeeping, peacebuilding, and the post-war work, [and] the establishment of the United States Institute of Peace. It isn't a dirty word” (PS37).
Agreeing that the founding of the USIP is a mark of success, another peace studies participant points out:

Just the fact that there has been a USIP created at the governmental level in Washington is an indication of how far this field has come in terms of getting some kind of recognition, that there is something to be contributed to looking at how you actually achieve peace. (PS45)

This brief survey of the many varied sentiments evoked by the terms peace and peace studies illustrates the continued complexity faced by the field and its scholars. To be sure, there are still no easy answers to the question, “What is peace studies?”

**Toward a Consensus on Peace Studies: Peace Studies Scholars Define the Field**

As a point of departure into the world of peace studies as seen through the eyes of several prominent peace studies scholars and program directors, I analyzed an open-ended survey question that asked them to “define peace studies.” Definitions ranged from items such as “the study of violence and peace” and “analysis of conflict with the intention of developing strategies for its prevention, amelioration, and termination,” to notions such as “interdisciplinary research and teaching aimed at the creation of a more peaceful and just world” and:

The development of a vision of a world in which all people are able to fulfill their basic human needs while attentive to the fulfillment of these needs by others, and the development of knowledge needed for the development of strategies for achieving this vision.65

---

65 For a complete list of the definitions, see Appendix B.
From these examples, one can see that peace studies scholars have set a large agenda for themselves; they seek to make the world not only a more peaceful place through the study of peace, violence and conflict, but a more just, humane, and better one as well—“a world in which all people are able to fulfill their basic human needs.” Indeed, the interviews conducted with peace studies scholars expressed a similar intent. The scholars made comments such as: “I view myself as a … person committed to making the world a better place” (PS19); “peace studies is … looking at … how to prevent war and violence and how to create a more just world” (PS1); “[peace studies is] roughly … a field that cares about making the world a better place through the application of good scholarship and practice” (PP4).

In all, it seems a common and consistent desire expressed by peace studies scholars is “to make the world a better, more humane, place.” This begs the question: What does it take to make the world a better place? Table 4.1 (below) summarizes the definitions provided by peace studies scholars.66 Its purpose is to portray how they characterize what they study and how they plan to achieve their goals. The synopsis provided in the table should be viewed as a starting place for a conversation about how peace studies scholars intend to “promote well-being in individuals and the world” (PS2).

66 See Appendix C, for the key to this list.
Table 4.1: Peace Studies Scholars’ Definitions of Peace Studies

While an abundance of issues fall under the purview of peace studies, peace studies scholars consistently listed items such as “justice,” “peace,” “conflict,” “develop,” “promote,” “strategies,” and “interdisciplinary.” These terms are, of course, not new to peace studies. Concerns over indirect violence and the pursuit of positive peace have been previously and extensively addressed in the peace studies literature. Nonetheless, as the figure reflects, when peace studies scholars describe themselves and their work, they invariably include substantive items other than just the “study of war or massive violence.” For them, the job of making the world a better, more humane, place means that peace studies needs to be interpreted broadly, not merely as the study of war, violence, and conflict but also the study of justice and peace. Two other concerns emerge from the list. First, peace studies needs to be more than just a highly abstract
theoretically driven research program; it must create and promote the use of strategies and practices. Second, peace studies cannot be limited to analysis from one disciplinary perspective; it must be interdisciplinary and multi-level.

In summary, three precepts are vital to the self-perception of peace scholars with respect to their field: (1) Peace studies is a normative-prescriptive project that seeks to make the world more peaceful and just; (2) Peace studies is a creative enterprise that seeks to generate practical strategies; (3) Peace studies is an interdisciplinary endeavor that seeks to investigate peace at multiple levels of analysis. These principles, which shape the context in which “peace studies” knowledge and ideas circulate, are discussed in turn below.

*The Normative-Prescriptive Foundation of Peace Studies*

[Peace studies] is a field that … has had difficulty establishing itself because [the U.S. is] a major power, and ever since WWII, [it] has been intent on playing a major role in the world through the use of either active or passive military force—that creates a huge perception that this is the way to have peace. …The field of peace studies has emphasized a very different approach. To me, it’s the right approach because it looks at the whole broad idea of what causes peacelessness. It’s far beyond just making sure people know how strong you are. It has to do with people’s condition, their living standard, and the many, many other things that reflect on their welfare and well-being. (PS45)

At the core of peace studies resides an ethical commitment to the topics of “peace” and “social justice” and a prescription that these items ought to be preferred and valued by society. To the extent that peace studies promotes peace and social justice and puts forth a vision of the way the world “ought” to be, it is a normative project. A normative perspective is characterized by “a theoretical, prescriptive approach” (Kent, 2007a, p. 1) to research “that has the aim of appraising or establishing the values and norms that best fit the overall needs and expectations of society” (p. 1). That said, a
normative perspective represents a “value-based” approach to research as compared to a “value-free” or “value-neutral” approach.\(^{67}\) Peace studies, since it is strongly committed to the values and the cause of peace and social justice, is a normative endeavor (it is prescriptive and value-based). But, beyond this, peace studies is not just “value-based,” it is explicitly “value-based.” Indeed, it is what Stephenson calls “value-explicit” (see chapter 2). The following three sections describe the components that influence the field’s normative-prescriptive agenda.

*Structural Violence and Social Justice*

Peace studies is a field that developed mostly because of the urgent need to avoid war in the nuclear age. Today, after six decades within U.S. higher education, peace is no longer defined as the absence of war, and this is why war per se is not featured in peace studies scholars’ definitions of the field. As discussed in chapter 2, the concept of structural violence emerged within the field decades ago, and now many peace studies scholars believe that “in the aggregate, structural violence [or indirect violence] causes far more harm to human beings than direct violence” (PS36).

Structural violence acknowledges the numerous injustices of the world that often lead to conflict, violence, and strife. When peace studies scholars talk about how to build peace, many of them refer to “justice” or “injustice” in one form or another. Indeed, as the quote at the beginning of this section indicates, peace studies emphasizes “people’s condition, their living standard and the many other things that reflect on their welfare and well-being” (PS45). Thus, in their definitions of peace studies, scholars used words and

\(^{67}\) Many contemporary academic fields no longer claim to be “value-free” or “to make the observations and interpretations as unbiased as possible.” Instead, they claim “value-neutrality,” arguing that “the researchers should at least make clear what their values are and how they affect their work” (see Kent, 2007b).
phrases such as “gender inclusive,” “culturally sensitive,” “basic human needs,” “without oppressing others,” and “equitable.” Their overt commitment has broadened from an original concern about war and arms races to concerns about the elimination of structural violence, injustice, and oppression and the fulfillment of individual and global well-being. Being a peace studies scholar means being “a person who is professionally committed to imparting whatever knowledge … is relevant and useful to younger people who can carry on the work that is necessary to keep the planet from disintegrating—environmentally, politically, psychologically, and economically” (PS19).

Social Justice, Idealism, and Advocacy

How do peace studies scholars typically characterize justice in their discussions of structural violence? Some of the characterizations were present in their definitions of the field, but additional descriptions were given during the interviews. To begin with, peace studies scholars see justice as “a broad [term] that would include economic justice, social justice, environmental justice, [etc.]. So, it would be all of those interpersonal, inter-societal things” (PS20). As one self-identified “peace and justice studies scholar” explains, a focus on justice gives the field of peace studies a direction and strength that it might not otherwise possess. She firmly believes that

people have to see the importance of the link between [peace and justice], and it opens up the conversation to the more positive, … more positive kinds of peace and it highlights them. …So, to put the word justice with it is a direction, an action, and a strength that doesn’t come from the word peace itself. (PS20)

This professor’s definition of peace studies in the survey went so far as to include “justice” in the title of the field, i.e., “Justice & Peace Studies is the …” (PS20).
Peace studies’ predominant concern with indirect violence, including various forms of social injustice, positions the field to be an activist voice against what it perceives as the many social, political, and cultural ills of the world. Indeed, given its inherently normative nature, peace studies must advocate for its beliefs. It is not surprising that as it has grown and developed its objectives peace studies has acquired labels such as “goody-two shoes,” “unscientific,” “protest-oriented,” “idealistic,” and “political.” These externally held perceptions were often brought up during my conversations with peace studies scholars themselves, indicating that they understand their “deviant” status within certain mainstream cultures of U.S. higher education.

In particular, a few scholars spoke of their struggles against negative perceptions during the formation of the field. One professor commented, for instance, that words like peace, justice, and social change sounded “value-oriented” (PS17) to his colleagues. Another scholar recollected that because he “look[ed] at things differently,” he was “often called communist and things like that” (PS24). Moreover, he recalled that the field was characterized repeatedly as “soft” and not “academically rigorous” (PS24). These types of reflections carried into the present-day as well. One program director, for example, identified that peace studies risked “being perceived as mainly engaging in activism and not scholarship and academic pursuits” (PP4). He went on to make the observation that, “it’s a little bit of a catch-22, because people who write for *Foreign Affairs* and advocate bellicose policies from their university offices aren’t accused of activism. It’s only when you advocate for peaceful policies that you’re accused” (PP4). Finally, one scholar explained that peace studies is viewed “as an idealistic enterprise by members” (PS19) within IR and higher education.
The controversy surrounding structural violence and social justice not only engenders external criticism of the field but also strife and heated debates within the peace studies community. For example, one scholar expressed frustration that the field focused too much on negative peace, while merely paying lip service to positive peace and the elimination of structural violence. He asserted:

If you look at it in the aggregate, structural violence causes far more harm to human beings than direct violence. There’s a little bit of recognition of that in the field of peace studies, but not really. That is, they’re drawn always to the direct violence and they pick up on structural violence maybe to mention it as a cause of direct violence but the real interest is always in direct violence. I think the field is missing something by not giving more attention to structural violence. (PS37)

After this comment, I inquired about the perceived influence of Galtung’s scholarship, particularly the issue of structural violence, on the field. I was told that although Galtung had been working on the topic for a long time, it had not been “picked up.” He emphasized that “the importance of structural violence is so huge that a very large wing of the field of peace studies should be absorbed with it” (PS36).

Another debate turns on the issue of whether peace programs should be “activist-advocacy” or “studies” programs. Thus, while one scholar supports the field’s focus on “justice” because it conjures images of “action” and “strength” that give “peace” an added vigor, other peace studies scholars point out that there is no consensus about whether peace studies should be an activist-oriented enterprise. They view the issue of social justice, and its link to action and activism, as a source of division within the field. For instance, one peace studies scholar observed that, “some of the people in peace
studies feel that their constituency is the peace movement, the opposition to the government” (PS37), while, “for others, it is to try to influence the government, to work with the establishment to improve their behavior” (PS37). With a large part of its background firmly rooted in the peace movement (particularly the documented growth of peace studies programs on U.S. campuses during the Vietnam War), peace studies naturally struggles over its identity: whether to be an activist program that advocates for social justice and the elimination of structural violence or a strictly academic endeavor that researches and teaches about topics related to peace.

Adding to the confusion, one peace studies scholar claims that this matter has already been decided and put to bed. Categorizing this internal debate within peace studies as part of the “second wave of criticism,” he opines:

If [peace studies] expects kids to go to demonstrations and expects them to be socialists and expects them to do x, y, and z, then that’s where I part company. …I think we generally concluded that [peace studies] was a “studies” program and therefore the same standards of academic excellence apply to peace studies as any other discipline. …I think that the second wave of criticism did focus on… programs that were basically activist training programs, and I was one of those critics. …I don’t hear those criticisms at all [anymore]. (PS24)

Although this scholar thinks that there is no longer a general perception of peace studies as activist training programs, the data from this project indicates otherwise. As one IR scholar pointed out during an interview, peace studies is “about pre-activism—take it to
the streets” (IR181). In addition, a peace studies scholar commented that many of the activities of the field’s professional organizations would be perceived by a lot of people as “pretty flaky” or “just “taking a stand” (PS37).

Social Justice, Activism, and Nonviolence

Another internal struggle within peace studies, which is closely connected to the issues of social justice and activism, is the dilemma between the “nonviolentists” and the “Just Warists.” The idea of building peace through “nonviolent direct action” or, even more dramatically, through a holistic nonviolent philosophy toward all facets of everyday life is prevalent within the peace studies literature. Explanations of the connection between nonviolent philosophy and the struggle for justice, often referring to Mohandas Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr., typically show up in “peace studies readers” and introductory peace studies textbooks. Moreover, the word “nonviolence” turned up in several scholars’ definitions of peace studies, e.g., “nonviolent values,” “nonviolent alternatives,” and “nonviolent resistance.”

One way to think about the connection between nonviolence and justice is expressed within this definition of peace studies offered by one of the research participants: peace studies is “the study of justice by other means” (PP2). In other words, though nonviolentists champion the pursuit of justice, they are unwilling to sacrifice their philosophical belief in nonviolence for this pursuit. They must, therefore, find other means to use in the quest for social justice, e.g., “nonviolent alternatives,” which one scholar calls “conflict creation.” One professor explained his thoughts about the topic:

Peace studies as it is currently taught in universities comprises a lot of people who think that in order to be legitimate they have to work with the State department,
they have to buy in to the dominant paradigm that diplomacy with the threat of the sword is the most effective way to do business. …I think that’s simply an extension of war studies. …The best funded and the largest [programs] are those that are buying most into [this] paradigm. …I think that what peace studies ought to be … is the teaching of alternative means to conflict resolution—not until they don’t work, but period. (PS2)

Summary

One way that peace studies scholars “defined themselves” was through a conglomeration of statements that addressed the significance of structural violence within the academic pursuit of peace studies. These statements touched on many of the perceptions of the field circulating within peace studies. In particular, debates about structural violence led to numerous conceptualizations of social justice, which in turn led to statements about idealism, advocacy, nonviolence, and activism. These statements have been produced, reproduced, and sustained as they have become part of the many discourses circling in and around the perception of peace studies. In so doing, they set the tone for—and continue to create the image of—peace studies within the culture of U.S. higher education. The remaining two sections will explore the creative and practical focus of peace studies and the consequences of its interdisciplinary characteristics.

The Creative and Practical Foundation of Peace Studies

The second precept that arose from the definitions provided by the peace studies scholars is: “Peace studies is a creative enterprise that seeks to generate practical strategies.” According to the survey definitions, peace studies actively “envisions,” “develops,” “creates,” and “transforms” items such as “structures,” “systems,” and
“processes” through vehicles described as “strategies,” “methods,” “means,” “movements,” and “practices.” From these depictions, one can conclude that peace studies scholars plan to make the world a better place through the creation of solutions to imposing problems. Moreover, they plan to figure out how to implement the solutions in the form of practical skills and strategies.

*Creative and Visionary*

One timely example of this desire to bridge inspiring ideas and practical skills is the “Building Cultures of Peace” theme of the 2008 annual convention of the Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA). The Call for Proposals (CFP) for this conference encouraged applicants to submit “innovative papers and ideas for creating cultures of peace” (see PJSA, 2008b). Furthermore, the CFP suggested that papers could investigate questions such as: “What political, social and economic structures best assist human communities in prioritizing a culture of peace?” This example captures the lofty goals of peace studies, but one wonders whether it can bring the desire to “assist human communities” down to earth. Turning creative thinking into something tangible is a challenge for peace studies, as the following remark suggests:

> I think of this as a profession. We need a whole community of people devoted to this. We need to change our system of values in education so that we can promote not only peace studies but individuals developing the skills that allow them to communicate adequately so they can build the rest of the communities that have to be there, so you can build peaceful communities in the end. (PP7)

---

68 Many peace studies scholars, in particular Elise Boulding, have written and theorized about “cultures of peace.” In fact, we are currently living in the United Nations “International Decade for the Culture of Peace.”
Practical Skills

To be sure, peace studies faces an uphill battle of bridging creative and innovative theories, such as “peaceful communities” and “cultures of peace,” with practical skills, but there are some immediate opportunities. Indeed, several research participants talked about numerous prospects for marrying theory to practice. One scholar, in particular, positively reflected on the situation:

I have seen a lot of practical applications in peace studies and I think that is a healthy sign. …Where peace studies has flourished, is that it’s something that has gone just beyond theory and been able to actually get down to some really applied skills that people can use in their day-to-day work. …There will be a continual need of people who have the special types of skills …, whether in the ministry or community leadership or teaching professions or in police departments …, we will continue to need people who can handle this type of social problem. (PS45)

Another scholar talked about the possibility for peace studies to work within the field of education. She explains:

We have to be able to help [university departments of education] get more people to teach what peace studies is all about. It may mean that those of us who do it have to write modules, have to work with education schools, have to create a task force to be able to talk with education schools and say how can we do this. (PS20)

These quotes demonstrate that “creative ideas” can take shape in the form of many practical endeavors, such as providing training and resources to members of the ministry, police departments, community leadership, and K-12 educators. While these examples suggest useful ways to connect the long-run goal of making the world a better
place to the no-nonsense concern of addressing the needs of daily life in our communities, another example eerily captures the juxtaposition that can exist between the two—practical application and prophetic vision. Describing “what it means to be educated about peace,” this scholar opined:

It means knowing something about how to prevent violence at all levels and if not prevent it, then, [how to] respond immediately to put the fire out and then come in with less lethal interventions. It’s knowing something about where the darkness comes from and why it comes and then knowing something about how to transform the darkness into the light. (PS19)

Knowledge of how to “transform the darkness into the light” undeniably spins peace studies into the realm of visionary thinking. Let me now turn to the more practical concerns of the prevention and management of violence at all levels.

Conflict Studies

According to one interview participant, conflict studies started, to some extent, because a few of the founders of peace studies were frustrated with the lack of actual effect in the world that peace studies was having. As she points out:

When they started peace studies, people like Ken Boulding were really hoping that peace studies would have real effect. After several decades, they felt it really hadn’t had real effect and they began thinking in more practical and applied terms and so people moved toward conflict analysis and resolution. (PS46)

---

69 Conflict studies is also referred to as “conflict analysis and resolution,” “conflict management,” “conflict transformation,” and, sometimes, “peacebuilding.” For this project, I refer to the field as “conflict studies.”
Conflict studies shares a history and a blurred boundary with peace studies. It complements peace studies’ goal of “making the world a better place” by bringing theories of peace to bear on real world situations and problems. As one peace studies program director contended, conflict resolution is “what I think of as probably the most useful, concrete application of peace studies” (PP3). To be sure, many undergraduate programs devoted to peace studies frequently include conflict studies content in one form or another, and often the name of peace studies programs is “peace and conflict studies.”

As a tangible application of peace studies, conflict studies addresses “global problems that are interconnected” (PS19). One scholar explains the field thusly:

Applied problem solving at the global level, that’s how I see it. I think that is attainable. It is not visionary. It’s not pie in the sky. It is very practical. And that is where peace studies sometimes, alone, doesn’t seem to be practical. It’s visionary, it’s idealistic, it’s grand, but it’s not practical. To merely argue that we should eliminate structural violence may not be enough, but it is a beginning. On the conflict resolution side, we … bring people together. (PS19)

As the excerpt demonstrates, the fields can work together quite nicely and, in practice, they often do. One program director discussed how peace studies practitioners must have experience in conflict studies, especially in post-conflict situations:

The reality is [the two fields] are related. Looking through the glass, one side or the other, what are you working for? Are you working to build peace? But, have you resolved the conflict underlying it? …If you are in post-conflict situations and
you’re trying to teach peace, the reality is you have to deal with all the left over things from the conflict. … I don’t know if [conflict studies] has to be in the title, but it does have to be part of the definition of what you’re doing. (PP7)

Since the two fields complement each other well, they are often difficult to distinguish from one another. That is, it is often difficult to see the difference between the programmatic and/or academic peripheries of the fields. One peace studies scholar described the distinction as “very fluid and ill-defined” (PS47). He explained that there are programs and scholars “that straddle that so-called division,” [those] whose work would fall in both the conflict side and the peace studies side” (PS47). Another scholar went so far as to claim that he would not separate the two: “When I identify the field, it is ‘peace and conflict studies.’ … It is not ‘peace studies’ only. It is not ‘conflict resolution’ only. It is about ‘peace and conflict studies’” (PS19).

Though the boundaries of the fields may be indistinguishable, according to the scholars that I spoke with, if the contours had to be made more clear, they might be drawn between items such as: (1) a tactical, skills-based approach (or, as a scholar pointed out in an earlier excerpt, “applied problem solving”) for handling conflict versus a humanistic, interdisciplinary exploration of it, and (2) a concern with conflict at all levels of human interaction versus conflict at the international level. The following quotes are examples of the distinctions between the fields as described by two scholars:

1. Programs that are oriented to conflict resolution are … going to be more focused on teaching the concrete realities of negotiation and the different myriad approaches to mediation, and [they will] even include things such as strategic planning, meeting facilitation, arbitration, and truth and reconciliation
commissions. …The peace studies side is going to be more interdisciplinary and want to pursue such issues as: What’s the relationship between artistic expression and peace? Historically, how is peace conceived of in literature? They’re going to be more focused on nonviolence as a lifestyle or an ethical set of beliefs as opposed to nonviolent action as a conflict escalation strategy. (PS47)

2. [Conflict studies] leav[es] the realm of the international as a sole focus, which is where peace studies … tends to be usually, and look[s] at all levels of human relationships. …Peace studies people don’t necessarily get into mediation, facilitation, active third-party interventions, but they advocate structural change, elimination of structural and cultural violence. They argue for it, do research on it, but they don’t get in between the parties too much. We try to do that. (PS19)

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is clear that many feel that peace studies must be informed by conflict studies. The question of how much peace studies should inform conflict studies, however, remains to be answered. This topic was not discussed in the interviews except for a few comments by conflict studies scholars, who recognized peace studies for its concern with structural violence: “To merely argue that we should eliminate structural violence may not be enough, but it is a beginning” (PS19). One scholar made the interesting point that some of the conflict studies practitioners are beginning to realize they could benefit from knowledge of the larger structural violence and social change agendas addressed within peace studies:

I noticed at ACR [Association of Conflict Resolution] this year that more and more of the community mediators, family mediator people are saying: “You know
what? Somehow the world needs more than what I’m bringing [to it], and I need to know how what I’m doing actually attaches to a bigger structural, social change agenda.” (PS46)

A discussion of conflict studies would not be complete without pointing out two contentious issues between peace studies and conflict studies scholars. First, a few scholars pointed out that occasionally the fields are divided over the topic of “practice.” That is, some scholars believe that peace studies is more concerned with the theoretical generation of knowledge than its practical application. One scholar expressed:

It’s kind of like [peace studies scholars] seem to have this idea, “If we just got the knowledge, then everything would change,” and I don’t think so. You could be over here producing perfect knowledge about peace and how you get it, but if you don’t get that into peace and bureaucratic systems and show them what to do, it’s going nowhere. … We have to figure out what it is we do in the field that builds more peaceful communities and we have to find ways of measuring it. That freaks out the people who are … all about ‘peace and love’ and some [of the] people who [believe] …“If enough people just got individually converted to be peaceful, then the world would be peaceful.” (PS46)

Along these lines, another scholar asserted:

[The criterion] has to do with problem-solving, … not getting an article or a book published. My standard would be … the issues that the peace studies people have actually come to grips with and made a contribution to, and I have trouble making
that list. …Galtung can make a list of conflict situations that he has been actually, directly engaged in. …What I am pretty sure he doesn’t do is lay down his journal articles in front of them. He’s applying the ideas. (PS36)

In addition to this debate over the practical applications of peace studies, the second controversy highlights the antagonism between the *esprit de corps* of the principles of peace and social justice, which in some ways is about “conflict creation,” and efforts to “resolve” conflicts. Specifically, should a peace practitioner try to resolve a conflict if one of the parties involved is suffering from social injustice? On the other hand, should peace studies promote the creation of violent conflict if a society is being oppressed? As one scholar explained: “There are some people who have criticized conflict resolution as being … antagonistic to what they saw as the peace and justice principles” (PS17). Another scholar commented on this issue in greater detail:

I’m very angry [about conflict resolution], because for a while that’s how some people wanted to define the field, we resolved conflicts. Can you imagine saying that to Gandhi, Dr. King, Jesus Christ, Dorothy Day, and the rest of them? …I talk about conflict creation and this serves as a nice corrective to show … we’re not supposed to just put people to bed and kiss them goodnight. …I think the field sometimes has sold out to the conflict resolution side of it. We need to remember that the great practitioners … were basically all troublemakers. (PS24)

Some scholars believe that the time and energy used to debate these issues between the fields are precious commodities that should be conserved for other, more constructive and positive tasks. A scholar concerned with “keeping the peace” averred:
We could waste a lot of energy and time … pointing fingers at each other and saying you're not doing it right. We have to figure out which pieces of this major task of building a more peaceful world is everybody doing and how do we coordinate those pieces. (PS46)

*Increasing Relevance of Peace Studies*

In light of peace studies’ link to conflict studies, which provides it with an applied approach to solving conflict at all levels, and its view toward making the world a better place, many peace studies scholars define the field as a “hot topic” – one that is becoming increasingly necessary: “There’s a lot going on right now. This is a hot topic and a hot field that people are actually investing money in and certain countries are investing more money in it” (PP7). During my interviews, several scholars were optimistic about the marriage of peace and conflict studies. Global population growth, they believed, will create more conflict and violence, and so there will be a growing need for people with expertise in peace and conflict studies. Others suggested that the need for trained people who can do dispute resolution will become more pressing, as the complexity and intractable nature of global problems outpace the old solutions, which have become ineffective and passé. As one person put it, “You know the old saying that if the only tool in your toolbox is a hammer, then all your problems look like nails. I think … [more and more people] are recognizing that there’s got to be another way” (PP4).

*Summary*

Added to their foundation in normative-prescriptive theory, peace studies scholars have “defined themselves” in terms of the creative and visionary side of peace studies and also the practical side—the side that develops strategies and skills to implement the
creative ideas. Exploration into this applied side of peace studies led to a discussion of the importance of conflict studies and of the blurred boundary shared by the two fields. In addition, the relevance of conflict studies to contemporary issues and needs of local and global communities focused the conversation on statements that paint peace studies as an increasingly “hot topic” (at least, outside of academe).

The Interdisciplinary Foundation of Peace Studies

I don’t think that peace studies is delegitimized by arguing, as some might, that there’s no particular methodology that’s a part of peace studies or that it is interdisciplinary and hence really ought not to be a field unto itself. …I’m perfectly happy to work with historians and sociologists in pursuing truth. And perhaps, more importantly, in pursuing “the good.” (PS2)

The third statement that emerged from the definitions provided by the peace studies scholars is: “Peace studies is an interdisciplinary endeavor that seeks to investigate peace at multiple levels of analysis.” According to the survey definitions, peace studies is an “interdisciplinary” “field” of study that is concerned with “individual” and “group” relationships in the “world,” and at the “international,” “regional,” “national,” and “local” levels of human organization.70 From this, one may conclude that peace studies scholars plan to make the world a better place or, as the above quote proposes, pursue “the good” through analysis of peace, justice, and conflict at numerous levels and within many disciplinary frameworks and methodologies.

The Location of Peace Studies

When I began this project, I recognized peace studies as an interdisciplinary field of study but believed that it originated and predominately functioned within IR. Thus, although I was familiar with a variety of subfields devoted to the study of peace, namely

70 Aside from using “interdisciplinary,” some scholars used trans- or multi-disciplinary.
peace history, peace psychology, anthropology of peace, sociology of peace, and peace education, I envisioned peace studies as the “place” that brought these areas together, i.e., my perception was that peace studies was a canopy that lightly covered the other peace subfields but did not disturb the connections to their home disciplines. In addition, I viewed peace studies as maintaining its connection to its home discipline, which I perceived was IR (and, implicitly, political science). This perception was rooted in my personal and academic experiences, e.g., the “peace studies” courses that I had taken focused on IR literature; many of the peace studies journals and books that I encountered seemed to be edited or written by scholars associated with IR or political science; and the major portions of peace studies textbooks that I used were devoted to IR topics.

As I began to collect surveys and conduct interviews, however, I learned that many peace studies scholars did not perceive the field in this way. Indeed, the surveys contained comments such as “peace studies should be a subfield of EVERY discipline,” and “I don’t consider it a subfield of international relations.” During one of the interviews, a scholar expressed a strong opinion about the situation. She explained:

There was an underlying current in your entire survey that was thinking about peace studies as a part of international relations or in relation to international relations, and that’s something that … people in peace studies do not do very often. My experience is that we are not having a conversation about ourselves as a part of international relations or in relation to international relations. (PP9)

Pinpointing the location of peace studies in U.S. higher education is not a simple project. As should be clear at this point, peace studies has a complicated history that shares relationships, some now severed, with many other fields. Additionally, at a
programmatic level within U.S. higher education, peace studies takes many shapes and forms. That is, in one location, it might be a loosely structured interdisciplinary endeavor that is held together by a few professors and hosted within one department; while, in another location, it might be an institutionalized “studies” program, similar to programs such as Women’s Studies or African American Studies.

To open this conversation about the inherently interdisciplinary field of peace studies, I provide responses to two of the five survey questions that addressed the “location” of peace studies within U.S. higher education (I will present three more later in the discussion).71 The two questions focus on the relationship of peace studies to IR.

Peace studies and international relations.

1. Do you consider peace studies to be a subfield within the field of international relations?
   a. Yes: 8
   b. No: 19
   c. Maybe: 5

2. Is international relations the best location for peace studies within higher education?
   a. Yes: 1
   b. No: 22
   c. Maybe: 9

Three strong inferences emerge from these results. First, the responses to these two questions reflect a variety of conceptualizations of peace studies. Second, regarding my initial (mis)interpretation of the location of the field, only 8 out of 32 scholars (25%) believe that peace studies is a subfield of IR; whereas 19 out of 32 scholars (59%) agree

71 As in the preceding sections of this chapter, the survey responses are collected from two groups of scholars: (1) peace studies scholars and (2) peace studies program directors.
that peace studies is not a subfield of IR. Finally, 22 out of 32 scholars (69%) think that IR is not the best location for peace studies within United States higher education.

To find out more about this situation, I inquired about the link between peace studies and IR. One peace studies scholar with a degree in IR said that “clearly a lot of people think it’s a part of IR” and “a lot of folks” in peace studies “are trained in IR” (PS20). But, she continued, “I don’t want [peace studies] to think about how we relate to, improve our relationships with, [and] contribute to international relations … because I want to spend my time thinking about how we get peace studies further embedded in higher education” (PS20). A program director made this point about the subject:

There is a peace studies that exists within IR that’s institutionally recognized and it’s there, but … we don’t necessarily think that’s the best way to think of peace studies. … The way we do it at my university is a much more broad-based, humanistic, culturally aware set of interlocking emphases that’s interdisciplinary in the way that IR sometimes suggests it can be but really does not practice. (PP6)

After hearing this scholars’ view of “a peace studies within IR,” I asked him whether there is dialogue between “peace studies in IR” and “peace studies.” He responded: “Yes, I think so, sure. If you are going to do our kind of peace studies, you need to be aware of the other kind” (PP6).

One peace studies professor claimed that the “peace studies IR side of things is more applied and practical than peace studies” (PS1). A peace studies program director said that he tends to view the branches of peace studies in this way: (1) “peace science, which is based on economics,” (2) “peace and conflict resolution, with applicability from the home to the world,” and (3) “peace studies linked to IR.” He described the third
branch as “what’s left … essentially people, political scientists mainly, who study international relations and are unhappy with the conventional paradigms that assume conflict is inevitable” (PP3).

Based on these scholars’ comments and descriptions, there appears to be “a peace studies within IR.” One example of this crowd is the “peace studies section” of the International Studies Association (ISA). Indeed, one scholar alluded to this section and its interest in approaches other than those that are dominant in IR, which is similar to the “peace studies linked to IR” group cited above. He explained: “People who come out of the IR tradition, who are really active in the peace studies section of ISA, these are the people who have moved away from the dominant orienting frameworks of IR” (PS47).

*Peace studies and peace research.*

The comments from the survey questions at the beginning of this section also suggest the existence of a different type of peace studies within IR. One scholar made the following two observations: (1) “Peace research certainly is [a subfield within the field of IR], but peace studies is usually defined more broadly, to include humanities, history, etc.” and (2) “I believe peace research should be a part of IR, but I accept the fact that peace studies is a broader concept” (PS17). From these statements, it seems that the connection between IR and peace studies is through a field called “peace research.”

To clarify the association, I asked the scholar some additional questions during a telephone interview. He perceived the often confused conceptualization of peace studies as a subfield of IR to be based on “different and to some degree separate developments”

---

72 The aim of the Peace Studies Section of the ISA is “to seek a better understanding of the causes of war and violence and of the conditions of peace in the international system” (International Studies Association [ISA], 2008).
He characterized the separate developments as twofold: (1) peace research and conflict resolution and (2) peace studies programs. The following synopsis explains his perception of the situation. Though rather long, the excerpt has been included because it provides an important historical account of the fields associated with the study of peace.

There was the development of the peace research movement … in the 1950’s. …It was basically various social scientists, psychologists, economists, sociologists … and then gradually some anthropologists became involved … and increasingly over the years, occasional historians and not so many political scientists at first. …These are people whose training and experience was … not in IR … [but felt] that their own concepts and methods had some relevance to questions of war and peace. …And so … you had a … convergence of interests between the non-specialists who were interested in applying their approaches, methods, [and] concepts to issues of peace and war and the specialists who were working on issues of IR [and] were looking to other disciplines for new methods. [This] led to a kind of a blossoming of the field of peace research. Later, some people insisted on calling it peace science. There were some … who were very quantitatively oriented and others who were more flexible, etc. …[A] component of all of this is the interest in conflict resolution … which to a large extent has social, psychological, obviously IR components … all of this is what I am calling loosely peace research and conflict resolution. (PS17)

This was his explanation of the first part of the field. The following passage provides his commentary about the second part, which pertains to peace studies program development in U.S. higher education.
Independently of that … there was a development of peace studies programs in undergraduate locations in various, often liberal arts colleges. …[The programs] varied considerably depending on who were the people in them. But in some of these programs the emphasis was … not entirely on social science but on literature and history, more of the humanities kind of orientation. (PS17)

I then asked his opinion of the overlap between the two areas. He answered: “I think they tend to move in somewhat different circles, but there is definitely overlap” (PS17).

Essentially several cultures dedicated to the study of peace exist and, though related, remain somewhat separate from each other.

Aside from addressing peace studies’ connection to IR, I asked many of the peace studies scholars: How are peace studies and IR different in their investigation of peace? Responses included the following: “IR is too narrowly focused, still” (PP2); “Traditional IR does not look at positive peace, it looks at negative peace” (PS19). Other scholars discussed the primary differences between the views of security in IR and peace studies:

Peace studies asks questions that IR has neglected, including questions about gender and social hierarchies. …IR has … rewarded and reproduced an approach that is very male-centered … around weapons and power. IR has suffered from an alliance with the state, and that includes being supported by federal funds that are state allied and, in some cases, directly from the military. (PS21)

Leaving aside the relationship between peace studies and IR, I now return to the interdisciplinary configuration of peace studies within U.S. higher education and address the additional information given about the “location” of the field by the scholars.
The Politics of Interdisciplinarity

The peace studies scholars and program directors who responded to the survey overwhelmingly believe that peace studies is not a subfield of IR and that IR is not the best location for the field within U.S. higher education. But, what else do the scholars have to say about their perception of the location of the field? To begin with, their definitions of peace studies provided at the beginning of the chapter indicate that the field is interdisciplinary. As such, what shape does the field take? To answer this question, I provide the responses to the remaining three of the five survey questions.73

1. Which discipline is the best location for peace studies?
   a. Anthropology: 0
   b. Business: 0
   c. Economics: 0
   d. Education: 0
   e. History: 0
   f. Sociology: 0
   g. Philosophy: 0
   h. Political Science: 0
   i. A combination of these disciplines: 21
   j. None of the above: 4
   k. Other: 8
   l. No Answer: 0

2. Should peace studies be an academic field of study within U.S. higher education?
   a. Yes: 28
   b. No: 2
   c. Maybe: 2
   d. No Answer: 0

73 Due to an error in a batch of the surveys, the results to a question that asked whether “peace studies is an appropriate major for undergraduate students” have been excluded.
3. Should there be doctoral programs devoted specifically to peace studies?

   a. Yes: 27
   b. No: 2
   c. Maybe: 2
   d. No Answer: 1

   One consensus that emerges from these responses is that peace studies should be an academic field of study within U.S. higher education: 28 out of 32 (88%) of the respondents affirmatively answered this question. To be sure, a few of the participants wrote on the survey, “it already is!” Concerning the issue of interdisciplinarity, when asked which discipline is the best location for peace studies, 21 out of 32 (66%) answered that “a combination of these disciplines” was the best choice. The remaining twelve scholars chose either “none of the above” or “other;” they did not choose any of the listed disciplines as the single “best” choice. With regard to the programmatic concerns of peace studies, 27 out of 32 (84%) believe that there should be doctoral programs devoted to the field. These responses suggest that scholars agree peace studies is an interdisciplinary endeavor that is considered an academic field and is appropriate for doctoral programs. A review of some of the interview comments, however, depicts a range of perceptions and opinions about these topics.

   *Moving on up: From an interdisciplinary endeavor to a discipline.*

   As has been discussed, peace studies began as a secondary consideration among loosely scattered groups of scholars, whose primary interests/identities remained within their established field of study. This creates the kind of situation where anthropologists, economists, sociologists, and psychologists, etc., are “dabbling” in the topic, and, as a scholar described, “it’s hard to have a profile when that’s the reality of people’s research and teaching lives” (PS47). At some point, the framework shifted from a part-time effort
to an established interdisciplinary field of study or program. One professor wrote a brief comment on the survey about the struggle to build legitimacy as an interdisciplinary program: “In … the late 60s, the biggest battle we fought was about the legitimacy of peace studies as an interdisciplinary field of study. …[It was] an educational question[.] …[W]ere any interdisciplinary fields legitimate?” (PS24). When I followed up on this during a telephone conversation, he responded:

It could be that they really were opposed to peace studies but they were using that as an argument. So, I have to be careful … because as I look back sometimes I heard people saying, “Oh, this is a hodge-podge of courses. It doesn’t make any sense” and things like that. I don’t know if they were doing that to mask a hidden hostility to peace studies. I know one Dean who said he would never see a peace studies course taught in his school. He said that privately, but, then, publicly he said, “Well, these interdisciplinary programs can’t work.”

He continued,

there is legitimate academic concern that any “study” that uses multiple disciplines … runs the risk for the individual professor of incompetency. …I don’t sense that anybody is critical of that anymore. …We just had the Peace and Justice Studies Association annual meeting and a lot of people who are active in peace studies came, and … almost everybody says that it’s very much accepted on their campus, as the interdisciplinary stuff is not argued about anymore. (PS24)

Some of the scholars’ comments indicated that peace studies could be transitioning from an interdisciplinary “field” to a recognized “discipline” or a “school.” One scholar suggested that peace studies should be treated as a professional field, similar
to law. As discussed in chapter 1, a contemporary example of the formation of a school of peace studies is at the University of San Diego, where the Joan B. Kroc School of Peace Studies was established in 2007. This is an encouraging sign for the field of peace studies. Yet, the question of whether the field may be ready to achieve the status of a “discipline” is still under debate. Indeed, one scholar affirmed the possibility:

To constitute an academic discipline, you have to be able to first offer an introductory survey to the field and the field has to be defined enough … to establish what an introductory course would look like. Then there have to be established, required areas of knowledge, both breadth and depth, for students to pursue a degree in the field. And, I think those are established. (PS21)

But, another scholar disagreed with this opinion, claiming: “It takes a long time for fields of study to emerge and to begin to be considered a discipline, that’s another step and this field isn’t there yet” (PS47).

On another note, one scholar warned that peace studies should not be represented as a “subfield” within any discipline:

If it's a subfield of something, people can dismiss it way too readily and easily. I don't think it belongs in any discipline because … it crosses so many boundaries that it's not a discipline in that traditional sense of the term. I would argue there's got to be a disciplined approach. I mean this isn't “loosey-goosey,” this isn't “60's left-over rejects.” But, it isn't captured by one discipline and it cannot therefore be a subpart of one discipline. (PS20)
Thus, this scholar agrees that peace studies is currently recognized as an interdisciplinary approach, but she does not think it would be acceptable for the field to be readily identified as a “subfield”—as that would be a sign of weakness.

_The problems of ill-prepared students and scholars._

Although many of the scholars agree that peace studies is an established interdisciplinary field of study, some believe that it is inappropriate as a stand-alone or major program for students. One respondent argued that peace studies can be a very superficial major, especially if undergraduates do not have a background in history and contemporary knowledge of the world. Another professor said that she discourages undergraduates from pursuing a major in peace studies because it would not serve them well. She believes that it is more productive for them to major in a traditional discipline and focus on peace issues within that discipline. Some respondents said that a minor in peace studies is fine for undergraduates but, like law school, one does not major in peace studies before applying for graduate school. Overall, there are three reasons for these types of opinions. First, it is agreed that students need the breadth and depth of understanding in disciplines such as anthropology, psychology, and history. Second, some scholars think that students should participate in something like the Peace Corps to receive practical experience in the field after college and prior to going on for a Master’s degree. Finally, many scholars discourage undergraduate students from majoring in peace studies because: “What would you do? They’re not going to hire you to be a diplomat. You’re not going to be on the front lines anywhere” (PP7). Of course, not all
of the scholars feel this way. One scholar believes that “its strength has been as an undergraduate major” (PS24). In addition, he reflected: “Maybe the future of the field is that its large strength is going to be in the undergraduate level” (PS24).

The interdisciplinary nature of peace studies poses problems not only for students but also professors. On more than one occasion, participants claimed to have no formal training in the field. For example, one scholar remarked, “it’s not like a lot of us were trained in it” (PS20). Another peace studies program director repeatedly told me both on the survey and during the interview that he does not have a “background particularly in peace studies” (PP3). His reluctance to be identified with peace studies has nothing to do with the “status” of the field: “I don't mind that at all. My reluctance is not that it's a stigma. It's that maybe I am not qualified” (PP3). Another participant talked at length about this concern:

[We] have become more a part of the problem than of the solution [because] we are all schooled in terms of one discipline as a rule. …We [must] retool on our own and bring in other disciplines. Because to do justice to peace studies, … you’ve got to be a bit of an anthropologist, a political scientist, a historian, a psychologist, a sociologist, a communications person, an economist, etc. (PS19)

One wonders about the place of peace studies at the graduate level. Given that many peace studies scholars do not have any formal training in peace studies and most are trained in only one discipline, how can peace studies train future scholars? Aside from the three U.S.-based doctoral options listed in the Global Directory of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Programs (2006), which are (a) two Ph.D. programs in “Conflict
Analysis and Resolution” and (b) one Ph.D. program in “IR with an emphasis in peace studies,” a doctoral program in “peace studies” began in 2008 at the University of Notre Dame (see chapter 1). It remains to be seen how this program will fare.

Overall, it seems that the field is still charting its institutional course. One scholar believes that attracting younger people is key to the future success of the field. He notes, “fields always depend on the continual kind of infusion of new blood and new ideas, that is what keeps something dynamic. You can never stagnate as a field” (PS45). Another scholar agrees the field should strive to be dynamic: “For heaven’s sakes! For a field that’s just fifty years old or less than that, I don’t think we should define it yet … if we can’t experiment in the university, where the hell are you going to experiment” (PS24)?

Summary

One of the important challenges that has defined peace studies, charted its course, and weighs heavily on its future growth and direction is its interdisciplinary nature. Moreover, any exploration into the “location” of the field must traverse the complex relationship between peace studies, IR, and peace research. The contemporary challenge of the “place” of peace studies within the academy depends on the institutionalization of the field. During the years, debates have occurred about whether peace studies is a subfield, a major program, an academic field, a discipline, or a professional field/school. In addition, the conversations have pinpointed two hurdles faced by peace studies: (1) contestation over what type of configuration is best for students and (2) acknowledgment of the paucity of faculty trained in the field or as interdisciplinary specialists.
Summary and Conclusion

Current perceptions of the field through the eyes of peace studies scholars and program directors presents a complex, moving target. Peace studies, as a Janus-faced “normative-visionary” and “applied practical” interdisciplinary endeavor brings together many diverse understandings of the field. Given the ambiguous and “undefined” environment in which peace studies finds itself, it is useful to periodically review how scholars define themselves and their field. We must have a “serious examination of the state of the art of peace studies,” urges one peace studies program director:

There needs to be a lot of people working on this, if we want this to be serious and move forward at a pace that … creates a field of people that we can call upon to … set the standards of what we want to do and how we want to do it. (PP7)

In this chapter, many of the “statements” found within peace studies have been described; thus, the different kinds of “truth,” knowledge, and beliefs that have a strong influence on the way peace studies scholars act and think have been put forth for further examination in chapter 6. I have attempted to present the contemporary state of peace studies through the voices of some of the most influential scholars in the field. In all, I identified three precepts of the field and one common strategy, which is “to make the world a better place.” These statements, which “give us a certain kind of knowledge about” (Hall, 2001, p. 73) the field, however, represent only a fragment of the image at this point in time. The next chapter will add to (and complicate) the picture as it comparatively investigates the perceptions of peace studies and the study of peace within the fields of IR and peace science.
CHAPTER 5

TWO POINTS OF COMPARISON: DESCRIPTIONS OF PEACE STUDIES FROM INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND PEACE SCIENCE

Chapter 4 used the words of peace studies scholars to get a sense of the current knowledge, beliefs, and “truth” about peace studies and the study of peace that circulate; that is, it presented a descriptive analysis of the statements that have a strong effect on peace studies from within. The next step is to piece together a view of peace studies from the outside. This chapter presents a comparative analysis of how other related fields in terms of theme and content perceive and interpret peace studies and the study of peace. Thus, what are the different “truths,” knowledge, and beliefs that circulate about peace studies, its scholarship, and its scholars within these fields? In all, what are the “statements” that circulate about and have a profound influence on peace studies?

To answer these questions, I interviewed and collected survey data from top scholars in the fields of IR and peace science. When I began this project, I intended to investigate the “external view” of only IR. During my conversations with IR scholars, however, it became clear to me that another field, peace science, shaped the perception of peace studies within IR. Hence, I added peace science to the project’s research design. In all, the data presented in this chapter covers 23 surveys and 17 interviews. The chapter is divided into two sections (one for each of the fields’ perceptions of peace studies), which consist of descriptions of the most common “truth claims” that arose in the data.
The goal remains to examine the condition of peace studies in U.S. higher education and explore the possibilities and limitations of theorizing, researching, and teaching about peace.

**Top International Relations Scholars Discuss Peace Studies**

Peace studies implies that war is just a big mistake and if only people let the scales fall from their eyes, then there would be nothing but peace. So, people in political science tend to see it as a kind of goody-two shoes, ideological project. And we would distinguish that from studying war and peace as an academic topic where diverse hypotheses might be put forward to think about the conditions that might lead to war and peace, as opposed to an ideological agenda where you know the answer to the question before you do your research. (IR20)

The quote above by an IR scholar echoes the sentiments of many professors within that field and political science more broadly; they view peace studies as a “kind of goody-two shoes, ideological project” that is “agenda-driven.” It is a perception that springs from an age-old taproot of the U.S. academy: deep apprehension about value-based approaches and ideologically motivated research programs. This is the challenge faced by academic fields driven by normative (prescriptive and value-based) aims. One can reasonably argue, and many have, that virtually all scholarship is value-driven and has ideological underpinnings—whether deliberate or unintended, recognized or unnoticed. The predicament for peace studies, as well as other fields like it, is that the field does not pretend to be value-neutral. Likewise and because of this, research produced by peace studies’ scholars typically does not hide its ideological roots. This theme, along with others, is further explored below.
Is Peace Studies a Subfield of International Relations?

How is the relationship between peace studies and IR produced and maintained?

To begin this conversation, I discuss the results of two survey questions given to IR scholars that address whether peace studies is a subfield of IR.

1. Do you consider peace studies to be a subfield within the field of international relations?
   a. Yes: 13
   b. No: 1
   c. Maybe: 0

2. Is international relations the best location for peace studies within higher education?
   a. Yes: 11
   b. No: 2
   c. Maybe: 1

The results to these questions are surprising, to say the least. The responses to the first question indicate that 13 out of 14 (93%) IR scholars believe that peace studies is a subfield of IR. This overwhelming consensus among IR scholars is all the more remarkable given that only 25% of peace studies scholars viewed peace studies as a subfield of IR. Moreover, 59% of peace studies scholars asserted that peace studies is not a subfield of IR. Indeed, many peace studies scholars seemed offended by the question, emphatically declaring in written comments: “I don’t see peace studies as a subfield of IR so I can’t answer this question or others like it!” The second question yielded results as starkly divergent as the first question: 11 out of 14 (79%) IR scholars believe that IR is the best location for peace studies. In contrast, only 1 out of 32 (3%) peace studies scholars think that the best location for peace studies is IR (69% said that it is not).
These widely conflicting results from the two fields (shown below in Table 5.1) expose a vast and alarming disjunction between the perceptions of IR scholars and those of peace studies scholars regarding the relationship between the two fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International Relations</th>
<th>Peace Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Answering Yes to Q1</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Answering Yes to Q2</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Disparity in Survey Responses between IR and Peace Studies Scholars

One might conclude from these responses that peace studies has a fairly secure and certain home within IR (the only problem being that peace studies scholars do not want to reside in such a home). These data, however, are a bit misleading since the views in the field are not necessarily that clear-cut. For instance, one IR scholar said to me: “We do ‘war and peace studies,’ but we don’t do ‘peace studies’” (IR20). The same scholar had this to say about whether peace studies is a subfield of IR:

People in political science departments who study international relations sometimes include peace as one of their dependent variables. …If that’s what you mean by peace studies, then it’s part of IR. If, however, you mean a world systems theorist who is not at all engaged with political science literature or if you mean some practitioner of role-playing or emotional catharsis as a tactic of conflict resolution who doesn’t engage with political science literature on conflict, then that person wouldn’t be in what I think of as the field of IR. (IR20)
These quotes suggest that whether and how peace studies is or becomes a subfield of IR depends on the parameters used to define peace studies. A way to clarify the ambiguity in the survey data is to find out how IR scholars themselves define and explain the field. Since the IR survey did not ask for a definition of peace studies, I used telephone interviews to investigate this in greater detail, to which I now turn.

How Does International Relations Define Peace Studies?

Among IR scholars, peace studies is a complicated term that is often misunderstood or viewed differently because of a variety of historical and cultural meanings and understandings. The complex and ambiguous nature of the label “peace studies” became more and more clear to me as I worked through this project. The IR survey participants contacted me on several occasions to request a “definition of peace studies” for reasons such as “peace studies could be a lot of things” and “this is hard to answer without a definition of the field.” In addition to these requests, another scholar told me that, upon completing the survey, he “wondered what peace studies was” (IR26). Furthermore, he admitted, “I don’t know what’s going on. I don’t have a very good sense of the history of this field at all.” These queries suggest various meanings and a lack of knowledge of peace studies within the field of IR. To get a better grasp on these problems, I will share some IR scholars’ comments about how they perceive the field.

Several IR scholars said that peace studies is not a term with which they readily relate. For example, one scholar commented, “I don’t think there are many scholars who identify with peace studies—if there are, it is my ignorance not to know about them” (IR1). Another scholar explained that peace studies “has never been a big presence at any university I’ve been associated with” (IR20). When asked about the top-ranked U.S.
peace studies programs, this scholar was unfamiliar with the Joan B. Kroc Institute at the University of Notre Dame—one of the most admired peace studies programs in the U.S.\footnote{This status was verified by the results of a survey question for this project that asked scholars to list the “top three academic programs devoted to peace studies.” The Joan B. Kroc Institute at the University of Notre Dame was the top choice—listed 18 times.}

It appears that peace studies, though an academic endeavor primarily concerned with many of the topics prevalent within IR scholarship, has not forged a place for itself within IR’s everyday cultural schema of knowledge production. While IR scholars have heard of peace studies, they do not come across it in their daily, academic lives. This point is demonstrated by one scholar who declared that she would “need to know the purpose of using the term because … it’s not a term of meaning to me.” She continued:

I would never use the term. …Peace, war, wealth, poverty, all of those things go together, and to me they’re all linked. You can’t study peace without studying conflict and vice versa. You probably can’t study peace without studying equity issues and wealth and development. …I can only guess that you would break out something called peace studies and make it a topic of concern because you have some particular programmatic or policy goal, which is probably not my goal. …It’s not a term of meaning to me because all of these things are bound up together. I study international politics, that’s meaningful to me. (IR23)

Analysis of the interview data leads me to conclude that the challenge faced by peace studies is that mainstream IR scholars tend to perceive peace studies as either: (1) quantitative and behavioral scholarship or (2) humanistic and “touchy-feely” scholarship.
Unfortunately for peace studies, both areas suffer from questionable reputations within IR. Quantitative-behavioral scholarship is seen by many IR scholars as rigorous but atheoretical; whereas, humanistic scholarship is disparaged for its lack of rigor.\(^75\)

**Quantitative and Behavioral**

The “quantitative and behavioral” perception of peace studies within IR reflects the historical legacies of two fields associated with the study of peace: peace research and peace science. Among IR scholars, the image of peace studies is rooted in the memory of a type of “politically charged” Scandinavian scholarship that sprang from the 1960s “anti-Cold War” movement. For instance, one scholar remarked, “when I think of SIPRI [Stockholm International Peace Research Institute] and all of the big shops that turn out peace studies, the *Journal of Peace Research* and all that stuff, that goes way back. That’s a Sixties thing or earlier” (IR23). She continued, “in my intellectual universe, this whole peace research thing comes out of a, sort of a political left, it comes out of a time which is mostly Sixties-ish, Cold War stuff…the epicenter probably is Stockholm.” In these quotes, the first reference is to “peace studies” but, in the second quote, it changes to “peace research.” This shows that the two terms are sometimes used interchangeably within IR. Further, it suggests that the historical image of peace research as a 1960s, Swedish endeavor is a mainstream IR perception of the field of peace studies.

In addition to this image of “peace research” as retro and Scandinavian, IR scholars also add “peace science” to the mix. As one scholar states: “There is peace studies as it is understood within the discipline of political science and IR, which has

\(^75\) I borrow these terms from one IR scholar who adeptly surmised, “I think that peace and peace studies, if it’s not associated with the quantitative behavioral stuff, which is very rigorous but atheoretical, it’s associated with this kind of squishy, humanistic touchy-feely stuff, which isn’t viewed as rigorous” (IR26).
become identified with kind of quantitative, behavioral work, typically on war actually, that’s the peace science stuff” (IR26). In this statement, “peace studies” is equated with “peace science,” which, in turn, is equated with the study of war. Another scholar confirms this, describing peace science as: “The branch of IR that does quantitative war stuff, [and] routinely [uses] the SIPRI data sets as one of their…standard ‘let’s study all of the conflicts in the world and see what correlates with what projects’” (IR20). Here, peace science is viewed as a “branch of IR” and a connection is made between peace science and peace research through the work of SIPRI. As another IR scholar explained:

During the Reagan era, peace research was under some siege, but one of the ways the peace research guys have stayed in business is they’ve produced great data sets, and so the branch of IR that does quantitative war stuff, routinely would use the SIPRI data sets. (IR23)

As this statement makes clear, IR scholars view these data sets produced by scholars within peace research as products consumed by scholars in “peace science,” which is seen as “a branch of IR” that consists of “quantitative students of war” who do “method driven [positivistic] work ” (IR26).

In summary, the IR scholars tend to associate “peace studies” with peace research, which they see as a Scandinavian-based research endeavor that thrived during the Sixties and Seventies and produced large data sets, mainly about war. The association of peace studies with “peace research” sometimes becomes entangled with the work of the scholars in “peace science,” since it is the quantitative branch of IR that uses large data sets about war, e.g., the Correlates of War (COW) project (see chapter 1). During the
interviews, IR scholars often did not perceive a distinction between peace research and peace science. Moreover, it seemed that peace research and, consequently, peace science had appropriated the label of “peace studies.”

The equating of peace studies with peace science and peace research explains why, within the IR survey responses, the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* and the *Journal of Peace Research* were chosen (3 to 1) as the top “peace studies” journals—both of the journals represent the field of peace research, and the Peace Science Society (PSS[I]) sponsors *JCR*. It also explains why Bruce Russett (the editor of *JCR*), Nils Petter Gledtisch (the editor of *JPR*), and Johan Galtung (the former editor of *JPR*) were listed as the top three peace studies scholars. This characterization of the field might also explain why Penn State, the current home of the PSS(I), was listed as one of the top academic programs devoted to “peace studies.” Furthermore, because the quantitative, behavioral research on war and peace has a presence in IR and is associated with terms like peace research and peace science, it is not surprising that the majority of IR scholars’ survey responses indicated that peace studies is a subfield of IR.

*Humanistic*

The “humanistic” type of peace studies was only discussed by a few IR scholars. As one scholar explained, “[peace studies] is either the quantitative people in peace science or the humanistic people outside of IR” (IR26). He went on to say that “humanistic” peace studies is “not even on the radar screen within IR basically” (IR26). That said, a limited amount of discussion of this type of peace studies did emerge during the interviews. But this typically occurred either: (1) after the scholars had talked about the quantitative-behavioral type of peace research, which seemed to be the dominant and
most easily accessible understanding of peace studies to them or (2) after prompting from me. What emerged from the conversations about the “humanistic” type of peace research were two general concerns about peace studies: it is too ideological and lacks an intellectually robust research agenda.

*Peace studies is too ideological.*

The explicitly value-based agenda of peace studies was something discussed by several IR scholars. Even when the scholars claimed to be unfamiliar with peace studies, they would equate this agenda with the “politically charged” “Scandinavian” brand of scholarship. One scholar exclaimed: “My impression is that peace studies departments have become havens for ideologically rather uniform collections of people” (IR1). Within IR, peace studies is understood to be a field that stands for something—it is an “ideological project” or it is “ideologically uniform” in its approach. Thus, an IR professor posited: “It has a normative framework. People understand that what these guys are about is a normative endeavor to promote peace” (IR23). She clarifies, “the research academy understands that all research has to have normative underpinnings and that consciously or unconsciously you’re making normative choices about what you research and how you do it” (IR23). She went on to say, however, that “most of that research enterprise still understands itself to be part of the broader, academic, social science enterprise whose goal is not primarily prescriptive and normative” but rather to try to “understand how the world does work” (IR23). Once these explanations have been produced and validated, then people can write separate pieces about what normatively they think ought to be done.
Peace studies is not intellectually robust.

IR scholars also describe peace studies scholars as being “teaching-oriented” and, therefore, somewhat incapable of adhering to the standards of academic rigor. Thus, one IR professor wrote on the survey: “Separate peace studies majors, programs, etc. typically lack rigor. Such programs give peace studies a bad name” (IR8). Another scholar described the teaching side of peace studies as a field found in undergraduate curricula. He contends: “There are places where you can take peace studies courses. It’s typically the warm and fuzzy type stuff. …It’s not an academic field within Ph.D. programs as far as I can tell, at least in the United States” (IR26). Similarly an IR professor who initially associated peace studies with Scandinavian-style peace research, eventually characterized peace studies as a teaching effort that “you stumble across here and there.” She went on to say, “I can’t think of very many of them that are large in academic research. They tend to have a more curriculum, education-related focus” (IR23). She concluded, “we could quibble about the details but, in general, an intellectually compelling framework for understanding the world in new ways that are robust and distinct has not emerged from this group of people.”

Comments like these raise concerns that “peace studies hasn’t made a bigger splash in the research-oriented end of the academy” (IR23). Several IR scholars seemed to agree that peace studies “has not formulated an intellectual and theoretical framework that is robust and distinct from any other way we think about international politics, broadly” (IR23). This is not necessarily a bad thing, however, for there are plenty of opportunities for peace studies to interact with IR. Thus, one scholar wanted “to see engagement with the IR literature and not the IR literature on security or war but the IR
literature that speaks about causes of peace … or the constructivist literature” (IR26). In addition, this scholar believes that peace studies could engage with the literature on “global governance,” “alternative security systems,” or “post-conflict reconciliation.” He explained: “There’s a huge industry now on post-conflict reconciliation and that literature is much more interesting and often very qualitative. There’s a fair bit of theory in that literature … that could be called ‘peace studies’” (IR26).

The topic of “conflict studies” was raised by another IR scholar who wondered: “What’s the difference between [peace studies] and the conflict management and conflict resolution programs, which are really big?” (IR23). “The conflict resolution people have done a better job of attracting … high-powered faculty and … students,” she believes, “because they have, especially in the Nineties, been much more able to plug in to intellectual trends in the field” (IR23). Moreover, “if the peace studies people were robust,” she argued, “I would have expected them to be weighing in saying, ‘Okay, this is our time.’ But, in fact, I'm not aware that any [of the conflict resolution people] are self-identified peace studies scholars” (IR23).

According to IR scholars, one of the biggest challenges for peace studies is what they see as a vicious cycle. It looks something like this: peace studies fails to generate intellectually new, exciting, and compelling ideas → thus, it does not attract the best scholars → thus, as it develops, its scholarship remains unexciting and less than compelling → thus, the most exciting young scholars continue to avoid the field, and so

76 She elaborated on the point: “[The 1990s] should have been a boom time for all of these kinds of peace, conflict management, conflict resolution programs because the Cold War's over and you get all of this political activity around things like peacebuilding by the U.N. and nation-building and all this stuff. I'm not aware of peace studies people really glomming on to that in an intellectual way. If you go to conferences on peace building … they are conflict people, not peace studies people.”
on. After decades of this cycling process, peace studies has become an intellectual backwater of sorts. The IR perception of this negative cycle as well as other potential factors that have inhibited peace studies growth and development are demonstrated below in the survey responses to the following question:

1. What potential factors could influence peace studies growth and development?

   a. Answered: 10
   b. No Answer: 3
   c. No Opinion: 1

Here is a list of the “potential factors” provided by the scholars:

- Find a theory of peace
- Better theory
- Better Data—matched to theory
- Greater methodological rigor
- Injection of more empirical work
- Improved data sets
- Rigor
- Better training of researchers
- Pressure for academic rigor
- Attracting best minds in the field
- Focus on relevant topics
- Avoidance of jargon
- Funding
- Closer work with NGOs
- Sociological Turn
- More interdisciplinary
- Peace studies overlaps with democratic peace research in IR, through which it can join the mainstream and develop

The factors listed above are a mixture of the IR understanding of two types of peace studies. For instance, the mention of “improved data sets” refers to the “quantitative behavioral” type of peace studies, while “pressure for academic rigor” is more closely associated with the “humanistic” type. One of the items that stands apart from the others on the list is the “sociological turn.” Let me briefly discuss what this means before concluding this section.
A highly original and interesting perspective was presented by one of the IR scholars, who characterized peace studies as “postmodernism.” He explained that in Europe peace studies equates with the sociological turn. When the “sociological turn,” was imported to American IR scholarship in the form of social constructivism, Alexander Wendt’s work being the most influential of this new wave of IR scholarship, peace studies did not make the journey with it across the Atlantic. In his words, “the sociological turn—what you have in peace research, Galtung, the *Journal of Peace Research* … is basically the sociological approach to the study of international relations out of the European social theory tradition” (IR10). He went on to say that Thomas Schelling’s (1960) *Strategy of Conflict*, which put deterrence theory on the map, was “deeply consequential for U.S. foreign policy and strategy. But, it was deeply antithetical to the sociological tradition in Europe. So, you basically had a great divide” (IR10). The understandings of peace in U.S. and European IR scholarship were “two ships passing in the night.” The logic underpinning his argument is that peace studies is a field that must study the foundations of what is taken for granted because “you've got to understand what's taken for granted in order to understand how an imaginary world could be created” (IR10). He lamented that “a lot of social science doesn't take the concept of imagination very seriously and, therefore, isn't interested in unraveling what's taken for granted” (IR10). This is one of the reasons, he believes, peace studies is not well-institutionalized.

---

Summary

The data collected from top IR scholars highlighted several themes. First, IR scholars associate peace studies with two distinct cultures that study peace: (1) the “quantitative-behavioral” camp, which is equated with peace science and peace research, and (2) the “humanistic camp,” which is likened to a teaching endeavor and associated with characteristics such as “warm and fuzzy” and “touchy-feely.” The scholarship of the quantitative-behavioral group is perceived as rigorous but atheoretical, i.e., “they produce findings but no real theory” (IR26). The scholarship of the humanistic side of things is connected to ideological, normative-prescriptive scholarship that is perceived as lacking in rigor. This humanistic type of scholarship appears to have less legitimacy with IR scholars, even to the point where it is almost invisible from the conversation. Hence, the quantitative-behavioral grouping, which is associated with peace science, consists of the scholars “who kind of control the image or have structured the image of what peace studies is in the minds of IR scholars and security studies scholars” (IR26). In the end, however, it really does not matter which camp has control because, as one IR scholar proclaimed, “neither … is really going to sustain peace studies as an agenda within the discipline of IR as a whole” (IR26).

When discussing “peace studies,” the IR scholars raised two general concerns: (1) lack of intellectual rigor and engagement and (2) too much ideological and normative-prescriptive scholarship. These subjects raise several issues for the field of peace studies. First, the field of peace studies does not appear to be cohesive to IR scholars, and this is related to their concern over the intellectual rigor of the scholarship. As has been previously discussed, the formation of the two types of peace cultures within IR has been
fed by the existence of at least three scholarly communities: peace research, peace science, and peace studies. These communities are divided in terms of discipline, methodology, and epistemology. The inability to cohere around a common pursuit of peace presents a large challenge to peace studies because organizations are typically perceived as weaker when they are divided. Peace studies is perceived by IR as being intellectually weak—there is no grand theory of peace, etc. The three fields are producing research about the study of peace, and yet there is no organizing mechanism to demonstrate the progression, maintenance, and accumulation of knowledge production.

Another issue that has weakened peace studies is the problem of self-identification. There are several reasons for the reluctance among established scholars to identify themselves as peace scholars. To begin with, my interviews revealed skepticism and even distrust of people who would actually call themselves “peace studies” scholars. As already noted, one top scholar said: “First of all I would never use the term” (IR23). Another professor told me, “Peace studies implies that, you know, war is just a big mistake and if only people, you know, let the scales fall from their eyes, then there would be nothing but peace” (IR20). Given their negative feelings about ideological scholarship and their sense that peace studies lacks intellectual rigor, IR scholars do not identify with peace studies. It is not a term of meaning to them. The question is: How can you have a thriving, interdisciplinary field when scholars who study peace and related issues do not want to be associated with the brand name?
When you say peace studies scholar, to me, that conveys sort of a high degree of policy-interest and activism that doesn’t fit me. I think it’s great that people do that and I respect a lot of their work. I just … think of myself as a peace scientist in the sense that my primary interests are to generate and test theories about how the world works in terms of peace, war, and security issues. So, to me, peace science and peace studies are really different research communities. (SC22)

Peace science produces research about peace, war, conflict, and violence. As such, it shares common themes with peace studies but remains external to it. As the quote above from a peace science scholar indicates, peace studies and peace science are, for the most part, two “different research communities.” Moreover, as another professor acknowledged, “It’s a pretty weak relationship [between peace studies and peace science]. I don’t think there’s very much overlap” (SC13). Hence, peace studies and peace science are perceived as separate academic cultures. This central theme, along with the possible reasons for it, will be examined in this section.

Peace science is characterized as a field that focuses generally on the “causes of war, international conflict, and eliminating conflict and political violence” (SC18), and “tend[s] to do so using formal modeling or statistical analysis of lots of cases” (SC15). Furthermore, peace science “develop[s] generalizable theories to explain conflict and conflict management and to evaluate those ideas using empirical evidence” (SC15). One peace science scholar explained her perception of the field: “The majority of the work focuses on, … “conflict” rather than “peace” and that has been the dominant theme … over the years” (SC15). Here again, peace science and peace studies are described as two distinct entities. More important, peace science and peace studies diverge in their

---

78 She believes that, “as a community, people would probably identify with what we do more as ‘conflict studies.’ I don’t think they would call us … peace studies.”
central understandings of peace. In her eyes, peace science is more concerned with the study of conflict, while peace studies prioritizes the study of peace. Thus, peace science is more likely to be associated with “conflict studies” than “peace studies.”

In addition to the view that peace science is more akin to conflict studies, another scholar explained that peace science may be a better fit with the field of peace research. Peace science shares more commonalities with peace research than peace studies because the latter focuses on all topics that are related to direct and indirect violence. As he explained, “peace research and peace science are, I think, fairly closely allied in terms of meaning. Peace studies is a broader term. It tends to take on all the problems of the world basically” (SC18).

A few peace science scholars did not see a chasm separating peace science and peace studies. Peace science, in their view, is a “subset” of peace studies. One scholar declared, “Everything that applies to peace science also applies to peace studies” (SC16). Another professor explained the situation this way:

When I say that peace science is a subset of peace studies, I mean that substantively the questions that both disciplines ask are the same questions. I think that peace studies has a broader range of approaches or tools to studying these questions than peace science. Peace science has a more narrow or smaller array of methodologies or approaches, but substantively they ask the same questions about the same issues. (SC6)

Another peace science scholar claimed that the two fields “ask the same questions about the same issues;” there is “some overlap” between the two cultures (SC24).
How Does Peace Science Define Peace Studies?

These few examples illustrate the complex and murky relationship between peace studies and peace science. Some scholars describe peace science as a subset of peace studies because the substantive focus is essentially the same; the fields are distinguished primarily by their use of different research tools and methods. Other scholars disagree with this perception. They claim that the two fields do not share a substantive focus—peace science focuses on conflict, whereas peace studies emphasizes issues of structural violence and positive peace. The subsequent pages will investigate this complexity in greater detail. First, however, the following definitions of peace studies may shed light on the situation.

An open-ended survey question asked peace science scholars to “define peace studies.” Definitions ranged from items such as “the quantitative study of conflict (and so peace) using statistics and formal models,” to notions such as “the study of the processes by which actors resort to military force and violence as well as how those actors resolve their disputes,” to “area of studies that focus on the conditions that promote peace.”

From these examples, one can see that there is mainly a consensus on the topics of war and conflict, but one definition appears to be much broader in scope with its focus on the “conditions that promote peace.” Table 5.2 (below) summarizes the definitions provided by peace science scholars. Its purpose is to portray how they characterize what they study and how they plan to achieve their goals. The synopsis

---

79 For a complete list of the definitions, see Appendix B.

80 See Appendix D, for the key to this list.
provided in the table should be viewed as a starting place for a conversation about how peace science and peace studies scholars’ perceptions compare to each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content and Agenda</th>
<th># of Times</th>
<th>Means and Ends</th>
<th># of Times</th>
<th>Levels of Analysis</th>
<th># of Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Causes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Quantitative Methods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Peace Science Scholars’ Definitions of Peace Studies

Peace science scholars define “peace studies” mainly as the study of the causes and consequences of conflict and peace. This is in clear contrast to the definitions of “peace studies” given by the peace studies scholars (see chapter 4), which characterize the field as the interdisciplinary study and creation of practices and strategies for promoting peace and justice. Of the nine responses given by peace scientists, only a few resemble those provided by the peace studies scholars. For instance, one peace scientist defined peace studies as the “academic and practical investigation of human interactions.” The words “practical” and “human interactions” show that this definition of peace studies aligns with the traditional understanding of the field: practice-oriented and focused on all levels of analysis, not just state-centric ones. Moreover, a few individual terms listed within other definitions (e.g., “normative” and “prescribing”)
seem to match characteristics of peace studies. For most peace scientists, however, “peace studies” takes on a different set of characteristics. Their definitions use language such as “political conflict,” “military force,” “war and peace,” and “conflict resolution” and they also limit the idea of peace to the opposite of war or issues of direct violence and negative peace—positive peace is not, for the most part, included in the mix.

One reason for the difference in peace scientists’ view of peace studies may be that their answers conformed with their perceptions of their own field, i.e., they may have equated “peace science” with “peace studies.” If so, their definitions are consistent with the goals posted on the website of the Peace Science Society, which state that the organization “encourages the development of peace analysis and conflict management” and “avoids social, religious, or national bias,” which means “it does not promote political action or polemical discussion” (PSS[1], 2008b).

Another reason for the difference may be that peace scientists generalize the term “peace studies” to reflect the goals of the broader academic peace community, e.g., one of the definitions includes “broadly—the community of scholars. . . .” In addition, one peace science professor explained: “They all [peace studies, peace science, and peace research] initially have this focus on peace as the absence of war and eliminating war or making war less prevalent and solving the problem” (SC18). If this is, indeed, the broadly accepted interpretation of the three fields, it may have influenced the definitions. That noted, very few “definitions of peace studies” given by the peace scientists reflect peace studies’ endeavor to “make the world a better place.” Instead, most definitions reflect the contemporary goals of peace science or, perhaps, peace research.
In general, these definitions highlight discrepancies in the perceptions of peace studies among the academic communities devoted to studying peace. Peace scientists do not, for the most part, identify with the academic culture of “peace studies” and, as a result, most of their “definitions of peace studies” do not reflect the self-described main goals of peace studies scholars. The following sections use the information provided in my interviews with peace scientists to investigate the reasons for this breakdown between the two groups. I put forth three reasons for the disconnect: (1) contrasting intellectual goals, (2) different research traditions, and (3) little communication between the two fields, a matter to which the first two items greatly contribute.

Contrasting Intellectual Goals

Peace studies people are part of the discipline [international relations], but they’re people driven by a normative framework. You could be a realist and be normatively neutral in your work. You could be an IPE [international political economy] person and be normatively neutral in your work, but peace studies folks put their normative things out front. (SC19)

Peace scientists mainly described peace studies as a normative and, more specifically, explicitly value-based field. Hence, they believe that peace studies focuses on “this is the way the world should be and what we should be doing” (SC16) to change it. As one scholar explained, “I think the research agenda of peace studies is to demonstrate a normative perspective on peace and conflict in the world, to inform a public about what is wrong with violence” (SC19). Another professor expressed a similar view, stating that peace studies scholars believe “conflict is bad” and “they are interested in stopping it” (SC11). Overall, peace studies is perceived as a field that judges how the world should be and advocates for ways to make it so. To put it another
way, peace studies scholars “are more educators than scientists” (SC11), or as another peace scientist expressed “when I write in that area, I don’t think of it as research or scholarly, I just think of it as expressing my opinion” (SC24).

In contrast, peace scientists believe that they seek to understand how the world works; they are not trying to change it, at least openly and explicitly. One scholar explained that the defining goal of the peace science community is “let’s look at all of the pieces and let’s try to understand—let’s try to come up with generalizations about what works and what doesn’t” (SC15). Likewise, another professor maintained that “the agenda [of peace science] is first of all to understand [conflict and war]—what brings it about [and] what strategies can be used to eliminate it” (SC18). In other words, peace scientists “think conflict is bad too, but that is not what we’re focused on. We’re focused on why does conflict happen” (SC11). Simply put, peace studies seeks “to change” the world, peace science seeks “to understand” it.

As peace scientists addressed these subjects, related topics were thrown into the mix. For instance, peace studies is viewed as a field that has “a high degree of policy-interest” (SC22). It is also “driven to activism” (SC22). According to one peace science scholar, peace studies is not only dedicated to the motto of “war is bad, peace is good,” but [its research] has a particular political philosophy, often more toward the liberal end of the spectrum” (SC23). One professor confided,

The thing that is most troubling to me is that oftentimes people that are doing peace studies are unwilling to consider certain strategies or policies. They sort of have this de facto set that are automatically the right set, that are automatically… politically acceptable. For example, some of our quantitative research indicates
that peacekeeping actually worsens civil conflicts or makes them last longer.

Now, if you tell this to a peace studies person, they get really upset. (SC13)

Unlike peace studies scholars, who “get really upset” when research does not match the “de facto set” of characteristics necessary to change the world, peace scientists are quick to profess their objectivity toward the subject matter. They present themselves as “detached” and “dispassionate” scholars. According to one peace science professor,

[Peace scientists] try to take as less of an ideological approach as we can. I mean almost a dispassionate and removed approach, so that what we are really trying to do is study the subject as detached observers and trying to understand … the cause and effect relationships that determine how disputes are resolved. (SC16)

Another scholar agreed that the peace science community:

tends to be one that is still characterized by a normative element in the sense of finding a solution to the problem on war, but the difference between that and the peace studies community is that the normative aspects don’t necessarily affect the research design or research strategy that goes on as explicitly. One starts with a more agnostic view of the way the world is rather than a normative one. (SC23)

This perspective presents a point that other peace scientists had not explicitly addressed: both fields have a normative element; they each have a value-based interest in discovering solutions to alleviate the problem of war. Despite this shared normative goal, however, peace science does not let the framework of “finding a solution to war” affect its research designs and strategies.
Aside from issues related to policy-interest, activism, and political motivation, another related topic that peace scientists raised is that of structural violence. According to peace scientists, peace studies “focuses on broader conceptions of peace. It includes a broad range of things dealing with social justice issues, human rights, etc.” (SC23). One professor explained in detail his view of peace studies’ concern with structural violence:

There’s a very large slice of peace studies for whom structural violence is more important as a focus of research and activism than military violence, and, to be a little bit crude and simplistic, …whether they will admit it or not,… the concept of structural violence really points to the slogan or agenda or position that “capitalism is the problem and socialism is the solution.” (SC18)

He continued,

Somewhere along the line, peace studies became a lot more broad. …I guess maybe it has something to do with the feeling that starvation or poverty is a broader more serious problem than international war perhaps. I think that’s what inspired people of the peace studies persuasion. … Most peace scientist, peace research, systematic-empirical people are inclined to look at structural violence as such a vague concept that it really refers potentially to every single problem in the world—any cause of suffering, any cause of injustice is the focus of peace studies and they’re out to remove injustice wherever and whenever they can find it.

While this scholar takes issue with the vagueness of the concept of structural violence, another peace scientist thinks that structural violence is an issue that should be addressed:

Nobody here [at the annual convention of the PSS(I)] talks about poverty, that’s for the little people or something, …but poverty is a peace issue. We can’t have a
whole lot of poor people running around the world and have them not be at least a threat to the order they live in, but it would never come up in this group. (SC19)

From this brief discussion, a picture of the contrasting intellectual goals of the two fields becomes strikingly clear. One community seeks to understand how the world works; the other seeks to promote strategies to change it. While both fields examine peace and conflict, peace science stops short of advocating for peace from a politically-biased standpoint. Moreover, peace science ignores issues of structural violence in favor of military violence. Finally, peace scientists champion a removed and detached style of research that seeks to understand causal relationships of conflict. In contrast, they perceive peace studies research as openly parading its explicitly value-based framework. These paradigmatic differences are front and center in the next distinction between the two fields, different research traditions.

Different Research Traditions

Peace science is the study of the most common causes, consequences, and escalation of conflict, but the thing that I would stress is that it is done in a cumulative or scientific fashion. The thing that makes peace science generally, relatively coherent is that we use many of the same control variables, and the methods that we use are generally consistent—we form a coherent group. We don’t study exactly the same questions but the methods are certainly the same. Now, I think that is what distinguishes peace science from peace studies. (SC11)

The different research traditions of peace science and peace studies are informed by the contrasting intellectual goals of each community and vice versa. That is, the research tradition of peace studies has been driven by a prescriptive and explicitly value-based framework focused on positive peace; whereas the research tradition of peace science has been motivated by a scientific and “objective” framework focused on negative peace. One peace science scholar describes his perception of this situation:
Peace science uses the scientific method, it is empirical, and while the goal may be to bring about peace and it may look at peaceful periods, it doesn’t really advocate particular policies [or] spend a lot of time doing normative work … on specific issues of the present. For example, you won’t find any papers here [at the annual convention of the PSS(I)] condemning the war in Iraq or being concerned with human rights violations or concerned with what’s going on in Guantanamo, and I think that’s been true of the history of this organization. (SC24)

Peace scientists perceive “the” scientific method as the appropriate epistemology and methodology for the pursuit of their goal of understanding conflict and war. What does “science” mean to them? In practice, peace science is comprised of “systematic, mathematical” scholarship, which is “either empirical statistical-type analyses or formally derived mathematical theories” (SC16). One peace scholar described precisely what he means by scientific: “What I mean by scientific is ‘rigorous,’ in that the movement from a theoretical approach to the testing of a theoretical approach is explicit and that knowledge is explicitly cumulative” (SC11). This same scholar admonished the peace studies’ approach, which he perceived as falling below the bar of scientific standards:

Peace studies, I am sure most of us here would say, is nonscientific and, to a large extent, not cumulative. I am sure the peace studies people would say that also. …I truly believe that all social science, social investigation—anthropology, sociology, psychology, political science and economics—should be scientific, and peace studies, in my opinion, is not scientific.81 (SC11)

---

81 This person went on to say: “Peace studies could be scientific. It could be cumulative. I think there is a generational conflict that goes beyond what peace studies versus peace science is. I think the way the peace studies people think about the world is different
For peace science, “scientific” represents an explicit systematic, theoretical, and cumulative research endeavor, and peace studies, since it is viewed as primarily non-cumulative scholarship (or merely an expression of an opinion, like an “op-ed piece” [SC24]), does not qualify as “scientific.”

One factor underlying the peace science take on peace studies as non-cumulative is the multi-methods aspect of peace studies. As one peace scientist pointed out, peace studies “tends to be interdisciplinary” and since it is interdisciplinary, it “tends to be multi-methods” (SC15). Another professor explains that peace studies “involves humanities, which means that it involves history, it involves sociology, [and] it involves cultural issues” (SC6). He went on to say that peace studies, because of its interdisciplinary approach, “doesn’t really have an established set of methodologies. [Thus], it is sort of open-ended in terms of how people study these questions” (SC6). In the eyes of peace scientists, this is where peace studies runs into problems in terms of its research tradition. As the quote in the introduction to this section indicates: “The thing that makes peace science generally, relatively coherent is that we use many of the same control variables, and the methods that we use are generally consistent—we form a coherent group” (SC11). Thus, peace studies, with its interdisciplinary approach and multiple methods, does not form a “coherent group.”

from the way the peace science people think about the world, but it doesn’t have to be permanent. Some peace studies people that I know as individuals are anti-quantification and that isn’t inherent to the peace studies approach necessarily. It is now, given the people in peace studies and their attitudes, but it doesn’t have to be. [Peace science scholars] think of investigation of conflict as scientific. We don’t have to. We could be more normative. We could be more policy-oriented but it just happens that we … aren’t. I don’t think there is anything that causes the two disciplines to be separate, but from a Kuhnian perspective there’s a real paradigm difference that is hard to bridge.”
Surprisingly, the website of the Peace Science Society suggests that peace science is partly interdisciplinary: “PSS(I) does not confine itself to ideas specific to peace research, but welcomes and utilizes relevant work of the social and natural sciences” (PSS[I], 2008b). In practice, however, peace science does not meet this objective. Some peace scientists said that it could be interdisciplinary, but the reality is that “it’s mostly political scientists, in part because…most of the theoretical foundations that underlie all of this work is out of the political science tradition” (SC19).\textsuperscript{82}

\textit{Communication Breakdown}

Given the markedly contrasting intellectual goals and different research traditions of peace science and peace studies, there are few bridges and little dialogue across the two fields. This subject was raised numerous times during my conversations with peace scientists. For instance, one commented: “There is very little communication between the two groups, and so I [would not] go so far to say that peace studies has much of a reputation among peace scientists. We just don’t read it” (SC11). Another peace scientist also claimed that he does not know much about the peace studies crowd; he could not name their professional organizations and journals. Another professor could name the professional organizations and journals (he referred to the journal \textit{Peace and Change} and the now defunct organization called COPRED), but he confessed that he

\textsuperscript{82} This professor further observed: “I think in the ideal world we would love to have empirical sociologists here [at the annual convention of the PSS(I)] and more economists. There are some economists who are here, but it would be … on one hand that you could count them. Very few sociologists come. …Peace studies is a discipline full of sociologists, it’s full of department of education people, it’s full of political scientists, and, from my mind, that’s because the notion of peace is a human thing and you can study [things like] education and you can be driven by the normative quest for peace.”
does not pay much attention to it: “It’s mostly that I haven’t given it a lot of thought and my career hasn’t gone that way and when I do go that way … I’m surprised” (SC24).

The lack of communication exists, for the most part, because neither field reads the others’ journals or books. Part of the problem is that they do not speak the same language. One professor lamented this state of affairs, “there’s a limited amount of time and you … start focusing on your narrow community, and … we become so highly specialized that it is very difficult to read things that are done by people … using different methodologies” (SC16). Raising a similar point about usability, another scholar said that he reads peace studies articles “when they come to the forefront of the general journals” or “through books and textbooks … but rarely does it get into our [peace science] research” (SC19). On the flip side, peace studies scholars may not read peace science research either. The same scholar continued, “my guess is … they don’t care about some statistical regression, it doesn’t mean anything to them” (SC19).

The result is that both communities tend to view the others’ research as irrelevant to their work, primarily because they hold different epistemological perspectives. One peace scholar confirmed this matter: “when I would present … a paper that [the peace scientists] would like, [the peace studies scholars], you know, [to them] it was passé” (SC19). Although neither community is ready or willing to consume research produced by the other, one scholar saw peace scientists as more likely to use peace studies’ work:

More people who take the scientific approach will read peace studies or use it in the classroom than vice versa. My sense is … people who do the softer kinds of things don’t read a lot of statistics or they find it sterile or … they don’t understand it because they don’t have the training and that’s unfortunate. (SC24)
In summary, mutual disinterest, intolerance, and an inability to understand different research traditions has stifled cross-field dialogue. To illustrate how bad it has gotten, consider the two groups of peace scholars within the ISA: (1) the “peace studies” section (PSS) and (2) the “scientific study of international processes” (SSIP) section. Many peace scientists claimed to be members of SSIP but not PSS. At least one peace scientist was unfamiliar with PSS. When I brought up the section, he responded: “There is a peace studies section” (SC16)? Another scholar told me that “the overlap of membership between the peace studies section and the peace science society is damn close to zero” (SC11). In these examples, peace scholars inhabit two different sections within the same organization (ISA), and there is virtually no communication between them.83 Little wonder, then, when I asked a peace scientist about commonalities between peace science and peace studies, his answer was loud and clear: “You know what? Not a whole hell of a lot” (SC11).

Summary and Conclusion

This chapter examined the perception of peace studies using a comparative analysis of the statements about the field that have a profound effect on contemporary IR and peace science scholars. It showed that peace studies faces the predicament of being nearly invisible within IR and on the other side of an epistemological and methodological divide from peace science. IR scholars often did not perceive a distinction between peace

83 One scholar spoke of his experience as a peace scientist in a peace studies program: “I did spend time at ABC University, which was a fascinating time. [It was] much more in the peace studies version of stuff and to be truthful I was like the one [peace scientist] there. It wasn’t a good fit. Even though it was wonderful, the peace studies people were just much less interested in me I think than they were when they invited me. Whether they didn’t fully capture the difference between peace studies and peace science maybe or they maybe they just didn’t like me, I don’t know” (SC19).
research and peace science. Rather, it seemed that peace research and, consequently, peace science had appropriated the label of “peace studies.” This showed up consistently in conversations, as IR scholars used the terms interchangeably and failed to define “peace studies” in its traditional sense—unless they were prompted by me. In opposition to this ambiguous view of peace studies held by IR scholars, peace scientists were familiar with the field of peace studies but perceived a glaring contrast in intellectual goals between the two fields—thus, peace science seeks “to understand,” while peace studies seeks “to advocate.” Drawing on the information presented in chapters 1 and 2, it seems that IR and peace science scholars’ perceptions of peace studies are tied up in discursive possibilities and limitations that formed as a result of the “radical critique of peace research” and the “two cultures problem” (when peace research was divided between the concerns of normative, values analysis and quantitative, scientific analysis).

**International Relations’ Perceptions of Peace Research: More Ideological than Idealistic**

For IR scholars, peace research means the European-based side of the field (I use this term to distinguish it from the U.S-based side of peace research that created *JCR* and made the conscious decision to focus on “conflict” instead of “peace”). The scholars, for instance, mentioned “Swedish,” “Scandinavian,” and “SIPRI.” The SIPRI component is comparable to that of the “applied-science” school as defined by J. David Singer after the radical critique: it uses quantitative data to inform global policy. In the case of SIPRI, then and now, the main focus is nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. The connection IR scholars make between peace research and SIPRI, then, draws on the combination of a value-based and scientific agenda, which is similar to the original intent of the field of peace research in the United States. They also detect the ideological
agenda of the field that was (and still is) strong in Europe. Indeed, many IR scholars described the field as “politically charged,” “politically left,” and, correctly, as an “ideological project.” An important point here is that IR scholars did not explicitly characterize the field as “idealistic.” The only references to something that might be interpreted as “idealistic” were depictions of “warm and fuzzy” and a “goody-two shoes endeavor.”

*The Invisibility of U.S.-based Peace Research in International Relations*

During my interviews with IR scholars, I was struck by the total absence of any references to the U.S.-based side of peace research. Thus, one wonders whether this “side” of the study of peace has been rendered either nonexistent within IR or was folded into the discourse, wherein it has dissolved into IR’s academic investigation of “conflict.” Recall that U.S.-based peace research initially desired to *complement* the work of IR scholars. It seems that U.S.-based peace research is, for all intents and purposes, defunct.

*The Observations of Peace Scientists*

Aside from the concerns about methodology and methods, which resonates directly from the “two cultures problem” of the 1970s, peace scientists mainly expressed concerns about peace studies’ ideological agenda; that is, they commonly referred to the field’s “policy-interest,” “activism,” and “liberal” point of view. Like IR scholars, peace scientists rarely mentioned an idealistic agenda in connection to peace studies. One scholar equated peace studies’ concern with structural violence to socialism, which supports the view that it is the ideological component that is most associated with peace studies and its explicitly value-based and prescriptive approach to scholarship. The
contrasting goals between peace studies scholars and peace scientists—values vs. science—highlight the “radical critique of peace research” and the subsequent manifestation of the “two cultures problem.” The comments of peace scientists suggest that the two cultures problem is as firmly entrenched as ever.

In the next chapter, I use Foucauldian-informed discourse analysis to theorize the descriptive and comparative analyses presented in chapters 4 and 5. In so doing, I draw on the historical and empirically grounded “archive of information” compiled in chapters 1, 2, 4, and 5. The purpose of the chapter is to inquire into how knowledge acquires authority within the discourses. In addition, the final section of the chapter discusses the different ways in which new knowledge can enter the discourses of peace studies and, thereby, provide room for new conceptions of the field and its scholars—these remarks also represent the implications of the project. Moreover, suggestions for future research are presented.
CHAPTER 6

THE ORDER OF THINGS: THE DISCOURSES OF PEACE SCHOLARSHIP

What counts in the things said by men is not so much what they might have thought behind or beneath them, but that which systematizes them from the outset. (Foucault, quoted by Paras, p. 154)

Similar to the sentiment expressed by Foucault in the quote above, this chapter is concerned with that which “systematizes” the way that scholars think, speak, and put into practice items associated with peace studies and the study of peace in U.S. higher education. Chapters 4 and 5 used empirical data to present the perception of peace studies as it is currently articulated within the fields of peace studies, IR, and peace science. Chapter 4 offered a grounded, descriptive analysis of the contemporary statements of peace studies and, as such, identified three current precepts of the field.84 Chapter 5 put forward a grounded, comparative analysis of statements that circulate within IR and peace science about peace studies, documenting various sites of contention and struggle between the fields. These chapters, along with the historical information presented in chapters 1 and 2, establish an “archive of information” about the field of peace studies. This chapter draws on the archive to flesh out the structures and rules—the “order” or “system”—of the discourses used to construct peace studies.

---

84 As discussed in chapter 3, statements are not the same thing as sentences, for “one sentence can actually function as several different statements, depending upon which discursive context it appears in” (Mills, 1997, p. 60). Statements, instead, are “those utterances which can be seen to be grouped around one particular effect” (Mills, p. 13).
In so doing, the chapter is divided into two sections. The first section examines the rules and structures of peace studies’ discourses with the intent to investigate how the field’s objects of study, and the corresponding subject positions of its scholars, are produced by and acquire authority within these discourses; that is, how the inclusionary and exclusionary discursive practices govern what is “normal” or “acceptable” within the U.S. academic cultures of IR, peace science, and peace studies. The second section discusses the different ways in which new knowledge can enter the discourses of peace studies and, thereby, provide room for new conceptions of the field, its scholars, and its objects of study. This is important information for peace studies to grapple with because it helps the field to think about where it might want to go and how best to get there. For as Foucault (1969/1972) explains, knowledge of discourses outline the:

- systems of rules that must be put into operation if … an object is to be transformed, … a new enumeration appear, … a concept be developed, whether metamorphosed or imported, and … a strategy be modified—without ever ceasing to belong to th[e] same discourse. (p. 74)

**The Making of Contemporary Peace Studies: Objects of Knowledge and Subject Positions**

In recent publications, several peace studies scholars have lauded the success peace studies has achieved on university campuses around the world. In chapter 2, for instance, Ian Harris described peace studies as “a serious academic discipline,” and Johan Galtung and Charles Webel contended that “peace” is no longer a “dirty word” in society-at-large or in academic culture. Supporting these views, the *International Herald*
Tribune\textsuperscript{85} has just published an article, “Peace Studies Takes Off,” wherein Harris once again commends the field on its “sharp increase, particularly in the number of doctoral peace studies programs” (Micucci, 2008, p. 2) since the year 2000. Moreover, he remarks that “with escalating violence around the world, [peace studies] is becoming more acceptable as an area of scholarly research” (p. 2).

While pondering these sentiments, aside from speculating what Harris thinks is a sharp increase in doctoral programs, I wonder in which academic cultures and contexts peace studies is becoming “more acceptable” as an area of scholarly research. Although I understand that, given the number of programs and/or courses offered, peace studies is “undeniably on the academic map” (Mason, 2002, p. 16), my research indicates (especially the comparative analysis in chapter 5) that peace studies in the United States struggles for “acceptability”—it still strives for scholarly legitimacy and even visibility. Indeed, a peace studies program director interviewed for this project asserts that “there's a relatively small number of peace studies programs in the country” (PP9). She contends:

We're not a big presence in higher education. I think we could be a bigger presence. Most of the programs like mine are small. I have currently 22 students majoring in peace studies. So, I think we could have a bigger profile. (PP9)

In addition to these insights, my analysis suggests that “peace,” as represented by peace studies’ concept of positive peace, is still widely controversial as a valid object of study within U.S. higher education, though not necessarily within peace studies. All things considered, this section investigates the research question: Why has the movement within

\textsuperscript{85} The Global Edition of the New York Times
the U.S. academy to research and advance a scholarly understanding of peace, principally the materialization of the field of “peace studies,” not been highly valued as a legitimate academic endeavor?

An examination of this question begins with a critical assessment of the ideas and speech that are possible (and impossible) within peace studies; that is, how discourses construct and produce peace studies’ understanding of itself. To get an idea of how talk and thoughts are governed within peace studies, Foucault believes that one must analyze the field’s objects of knowledge,86 concepts, and strategies, as well as the corresponding subject positions (multiple identities) of the scholars in the field. That said, when these items form a distinct institutional, administrative or political style or pattern, then a “discursive formation” is present (see Hall, 2001).

According to Foucault (1969/1972), the items in a discursive formation are related in the following manner. Within a discourse, a range of strategic choices are made possible by “points of divergence” in groups of concepts, which are formed by the various types of articulations made by subjects (individuals) within the positions they occupy in relation to the domains of objects of knowledge about which they are thinking and/or speaking (see pp. 72-73). Discursive formations are important tools of analysis because, in weighing what can legitimately be said at a particular moment in history, they convey contemporary power struggles over the question: “Who are we?” (Foucault, 1982/1998d, p. 331). The following two segments provide an overview of the relations between a selection of objects of knowledge (e.g., “peace,” “war,” “justice,” etc.) and

---

86 Foucault views “objects of knowledge” as “the entities which particular disciplines or sciences recognize within their fields of interest, and which they take as targets for investigation” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 41).
subject positions (e.g., “scholar-activist,” “scholar-practitioner,” etc.) present within peace studies’ discursive formation. The aim is to examine how the exclusionary politics of normalization and truth, which govern contemporary peace studies scholars through “three forms of control,” influence the multiple (and often contradictory) identities of peace studies scholars, the objects they study, and, consequently, the scholarly legitimacy and visibility of peace studies.87

The Constitution of Peace Studies’ Four Primary Objects of Knowledge

In chapter 5, IR and peace science scholars voiced apprehensions about peace studies that can be divided into two main areas: (1) concerns about the types of scholarship produced in U.S. higher education and (2) concerns about the roles and practices of scholars in U.S. higher education. In short, they demonstrated these concerns through their identification of practices that could be included in and/or excluded from the categories of “acceptable U.S. scholarship” and “acceptable roles/practices of U.S. scholars” within the discourses of IR and peace science. These categories represent what Foucault calls “being in the truth.” Foucault (1971) contends, “a proposition must fulfil complex and heavy requirements to be able to belong to the grouping of a discipline; before it can be called true or false, it must be . . . ‘in the true’” (p. 60). As Han (1998/2002) explains, “for a statement to be ‘in the truth’ means that it is ‘acceptable,’ prior to its truth-value being established or negated” (p. 81). In other words, statements must be included in the discourse before they are evaluated. Thus, “in any given epoch and domain, acceptability partially conditions the predication of truth, in the sense that it predetermines . . . the objects and the form of the propositions considered” (p. 83).

87 The “three forms of control” are: “being in the truth,” “speaking the truth,” and “dividing practices.” For a discussion of these items, see chapter 2.
With regard to “acceptable U.S. scholarship” within the discourses of IR and peace science, for example, IR and peace science scholars identified items such as “science,” “rigorous scholarship,” and “understanding an object of knowledge.” On the other hand, these scholars judged “unacceptable,” and therefore excluded from practices of “acceptable scholarship,” notions such as “opinion,” “ideology,” “politicized,” “teaching-oriented,” “ideological bias,” “prescriptive and normative,” and “advocating for an object of knowledge.” Aside from the “acceptable” (and, therefore, correct) types of U.S. scholarship that are permissible within the discourses of IR and peace science, IR and peace science scholars also identified “acceptable” and “unacceptable” roles and practices of U.S. scholars. They employed, for instance, binaries such as “scientist vs. educator,” “scientific vs. activist,” “realistic vs. idealistic,” and “academically-oriented vs. activist-oriented,” with “scientist,” “scientific,” “realistic,” and “academically-oriented” representing the “acceptable” roles and practices of U.S. scholars.

At the core of these expressed concerns about acceptable and unacceptable scholarship and the roles/practices of scholars, is the common theme that peace studies relies on a normative-prescriptive agenda, which IR and peace science scholars believe extends beyond the traditional norms of “scholarship” and “scholar” in U.S. higher education. This perceived agenda of peace studies and the supposed lack of “normality” found within its scholarship and the roles/practices of its scholars set the divisive tenor for the relationship among peace studies, IR, and peace science, i.e., the discursively constructed perceptions of “acceptable” and “unacceptable” types of “scholarship” and “scholars” within the discourses of IR and peace science do not include normative-prescriptive notions and, consequently, divide these fields from peace studies.
Underlying the common theme of peace studies’ normative-prescriptive agenda is the inherently normative quality of its main object of knowledge, peace. Aside from perceptions of what constitutes traditional (acceptable) scholarship and the roles/practices of scholars in U.S. higher education, preconceived notions about the meaning of peace studies’ primary object of knowledge, “peace,” have played a large role in the “acceptability” (visibility and scholarly legitimacy) of peace studies in the U.S. academic context, specifically within the fields of IR and peace science. In fact, I believe it is the understanding of peace as it is constituted within peace studies—peace represented as a desire to achieve global transformation, human betterment, and the elimination of all injustice—that divides contemporary peace studies from IR and peace science. Here, I mean that peace studies scholars’ expansive definition of peace is the central motivating factor behind the discursive construction of what it means to be a peace studies scholar and what it means to conduct peace studies scholarship within peace studies’ discourses. This, in turn, affects the inclusionary and exclusionary politics of what is allowed to count as “normal” and “true” knowledge and/or practices within the discourses associated with the study of peace in U.S. higher education.

The normative aspect of peace studies clearly distinguishes it from the study of inter- and intra-state conflict and war. Many are tempted to conclude that this distinction is merely the result of self-selection: left-winged ideologues are attracted to peace studies; dispassionate social scientists are drawn to the study of war. At the core of this inference is the conventional wisdom that war and peace are opposite sides of the same coin. Thus, any differences in the type of scholarship produced must be the result of the scholar’s dispositions, not the subject matter they are working with. This standard view
is incorrect. It misses a crucial distinction between peace and conflict studies: the study of conflict (and war) is intrinsically more detached from value judgments than the study of peace. Conflict theories can simply acknowledge competing interests as a matter of fact: there is no theoretical need for the conflict theorist to characterize some interests as unrealistic, abnormal, obstructive, or even “evil.” They may still do so, but such judgments are not required for their work and, one might argue, are discouraged. In other words, the study of conflict and war not only allows for detached analysis, it promotes a dispassionate and, therefore, “scientific” approach to the field.

The study of peace, in contrast, is essentially a normative exercise: there is a need to posit and then build consensus around some vision of the future, some utopian (or more-utopian) possible world order. Conflict can be “value-free”; visions of possible world orders cannot be other than value-laden. This is not to suggest that those who study conflict do not bring their own values to their work or cannot or should not practice explicitly value-based research. Rather, I am merely suggesting that within the study of conflict and war there is no \textit{a priori} need to bring the researcher’s values to the work in an \textit{explicit} and \textit{prescriptive} way.

As stated earlier, U.S.-based peace research began with the intent to contribute to the conversation about large-scale conflict and war. U.S. peace researchers made an unequivocal decision to use “conflict” to identify their research Center and Journal (\textit{JCR}) because the term “was less controversial (less blatantly normative) than the term ‘peace’” (Kelman, 1981, p. 98). They worked tirelessly to present a “scientific” view of peace through analysis of the object of “conflict” (thus, trying to lessen the “blatantly” normative character of peace). In opposition to this example, Lawler (1995) points out
that the work of one of the pioneers of the field, Theodore Lentz, “most clearly foreshadowed the contemporary foundational model of a self-consciously labeled peace research” (p. 11). In his 1955 book, *Towards a Science of Peace*, Lentz held fast to the adage that “war begins in the minds of men” and believed that humanity could live in harmony. Thus, a value judgment was present—that peace was the preferred option for the world and that scientific research “would help to restore a balance between the development of physical power and the insufficient development of what he termed human ‘character’” (p. 11). That said, the questions remains: What events occurred along the way to affect a discursive change in how peace studies views its object of knowledge? Furthermore, why did peace studies scholars shift from scientifically studying large-scale conflict and war to embracing engaged scholarship about positive peace and an activist-oriented stance?

The web of complex events that provide answers to these questions can be discursively traced in many directions, but the scope of such an analysis is too large for this chapter. Thus, I will speak briefly about two transformations in peace studies’ discursive formation before I discuss peace studies’ contemporary configuration of objects of knowledge and the implications of it on its scholars and, as such, the field. The first discursive change occurred during the “radical critique of peace research.” The second change happened when U.S.-based peace research moved to a focus on university-level peace education (i.e., programmatic, pedagogical, and curricular development).
The Radical Critique and Its Backlash

The “radical critique of peace research” represents one of the events that transformed the rules and structures of peace studies’ discursive formation and caused the current configuration of “peace” (understood as positive peace) “to appear as a meaningful or intelligible construct” (Hall, 2001, p. 74) in the field. This change in the rules of peace studies’ discursive formation shapes the field today in its understanding of negative and positive peace and its use of multi-methods. When the “radical critique” occurred, it brought to the forefront the concept of structural injustice and questioned whether the promotion of peace was always in the best interest of all parties involved in conflict. The “radical critique” scholars even proposed that “revolution” as opposed to “evolution” was the best way to achieve peace. Thus, these scholars introduced the idea that the study of peace should have strong rejectionist and activist components: The field should take a stand (at the time it was a stand against the Vietnam War) in the name of peace (understood to mean a better quality of life) for all of humanity. In addition, the “radical critique” scholars questioned the degree to which the scientific, applied methods dominant in peace studies at the time obscured the value-orientation inherent in peace.

Of course, prior to this event, a more openly explicit, value-oriented notion of peace research was already circulating in European peace studies’ discourses. The “radical critique” reflected the European point of view on peace and clearly focused on peace rather than conflict, but, prior to the “critique,” the discourse of peace had been combined with the discourse of science both in Europe and the United States. Thus, Galtung and other European peace researchers held firm to the idea of producing a “scientific” field that studied peace. In Galtung’s early writings about peace research, for
instance, peace studies scholarship was understood to be scientific and professional and, therefore, not “a resurrection of what he described as traditional, idealist speculation as to the desirability or possibility of an ill-defined goal of global peace” (Lawler, 1995, p. 47). Indeed, Galtung was a critic of “classical philosophical reflections on the quest for global peace—such as Kant’s ‘Perpetual Peace’ and its twentieth-century successors” (p. 48).

Peace research was to be, instead, a critique of “traditional peace thinking” or “the modern Anglo-American discipline of international relations almost in its entirety” (p. 48). In his critique of IR scholarship about peace, Galtung was speaking mainly from a positivist perspective; he described the work in IR as “rarely original,” “vague, confused, and contradictory” (p. 49). He went on to assert that “peace [in IR] had become coterminous with nirvana—a concept that by virtue of its diffuseness, intangibility, and quasi-religious qualities could not be analyzed or researched” (p. 49).

Thus, prior to the “radical critique,” Galtung’s work centered on (1) defining the concept of peace and (2) applying “structural-functionalist sociology to the analysis of the international system” (Lawler, 1995, p. 47). Indeed, his initial contribution to defining the field’s main object of study was presented in the first volume of JPR, where “peace was defined as having two aspects, negative peace, being the absence of war and actual physical violence, and positive peace, initially described as the ‘integration of human society’” (p. 52). Although Galtung’s ideas were “radical” (compared to the scholars in U.S.-based peace research), in his articulation of a “positive peace” and his condemnation of IR scholarship, he consistently insisted on making “a contribution to the social scientific [italics added] study of international relations” (p. 60). As Lawler notes,
“there was a marked absence of normative-prescriptive content, and it was not surprising that in 1965 international relations scholar John Burton cast doubt on some of the claims to originality made by peace researchers such as Galtung” (p. 60). 88

After the “radical critique,” Galtung’s view of positive peace began to resemble more closely the one recognized within contemporary peace studies. With the views of the “radical critique” firmly enmeshed in the U.S. and European discursive formations of peace studies, the discourse of peace, and, consequently, positive peace began to change. In a 1969 article, “Violence, Peace and Peace Research,” Galtung (1975c) presented guidelines for a new understanding of positive peace, which he identified as the “absence of structural violence” and, consequently, the presence of “social justice”—though, in an effort to avoid an “overly economistic account of the human condition” (Lawler, 1995, p. 84), he would eventually change “social justice” to “human fulfillment” (p. 84). As Lawler most importantly points out, this paper placed an “emphasis on peace as a transideological value amalgam against which the extant and more importantly, preferred global social orders could be judged” (p. 85). Thus, as a result of the “radical critique” and Galtung’s re-evaluation of positive peace, the rules of peace studies’ discursive formation shifted to allow normative-prescriptive notions into the discourses of “peace” and “scientific inquiry.”

Move from Peace Research to University Peace Education

With the “radical critique” over and Galtung’s expansion of positive peace circulating in peace studies’ discursive formation, the normative-prescriptive emphasis of the field began to thrive. But not all peace studies scholars found the changes acceptable.

88 See Burton, 1964.
The field of peace research splintered along points such as method, peace, equity, and activism. The splintering that occurred within peace studies illustrates the “forms of control” (see chapter 2) that exist within discursive formations, specifically Foucault’s notion of “speaking the truth.” Prior to the “radical critique” peace studies scholars were “speaking the truth” concerning their method of choice and object of study, peace. Thus, U.S.-based peace studies scholars essentially spoke and practiced the “true” version of these items. It was “true” to use “scientific methods” to investigate a “less-value laden” notion of peace; it was “false” to use a “normative approach” to investigate a notion of peace that was “explicitly value-based.” After the “radical critique,” the coherence around these “true” discourses circulating in peace studies’ discursive formation changed. The “scientific approach” and a “less explicit value-based notion of peace” were now deemed “false” within the discourses. As a result, there were debates in peace studies over which version of “science” was “true” or “false” and over which version of “peace” was “true” or “false” (see chapter 2). Within peace studies, the object of knowledge, peace, and the field’s “scientific” strategy were constantly reconstituted in discourse, which eventually affected a change in the discursive formation of the field.

Although “the intellectual conflict was decisively recast as evidence of healthy diversity” (Lawler, 1995, p. 72), it caused U.S.-based peace studies to become more focused on the programmatic, pedagogical, and curricular development of the field. The focus on these items allowed peace studies, as an interdisciplinary field, to explore its tie to the humanities and liberal arts education. Furthermore, it allowed peace studies to explore the practices of “engaged” scholarship, which complemented the pedagogical approaches of critical education and democratic education that, at the time, were
increasing in popularity on U.S. university campuses. The move to a focus on university-level peace education represents another transformative discursive event in the field of peace studies—one that like the “radical critique of peace research” changed the object of knowledge, peace, and, ultimately, the identity of peace studies scholars. Specifically, peace would be expanded beyond its association with war through new understandings of violence and conflict. Moreover, through a more diverse understanding of research methods, the scientific method, positivism, and objectivity would no longer dominate the field or the practices of peace studies scholars.

Core Objects of Knowledge of Peace Studies

At the center of peace studies’ contemporary understanding of itself is the entity that it takes as its primary object of interest, peace. But peace, of course, can have many different meanings and is informed by a variety of strategies, concepts, and objects of knowledge that are specific to the purpose of the field. In peace studies, peace has been and continues to be constituted and transformed in discourse according to these multiple components.

Many of peace studies’ discursive components were presented in chapter 4. Foremost are three precepts that set the tone and strategy for the field and its scholars: (1) peace studies is a normative-prescriptive project that seeks to make the world more peaceful and just; (2) peace studies is a creative enterprise that seeks to generate practical strategies; (3) peace studies is an interdisciplinary endeavor that seeks to investigate peace at multiple levels of analysis. In addition to these components, the most common and consistent desire expressed by peace studies scholars is “to make the world a better, more humane, place.” Indeed, peace studies scholars made comments such as: “It has to
do with people’s condition, their living standard, and the other things that reflect on their welfare and well-being” (PS45); “[it] is professionally committed to imparting whatever knowledge … is necessary to keep the planet from disintegrating—environmentally, politically, psychologically, and economically” (PS19); “[it] is working … on some of the most important problems facing humanity” (PP4).

According to Foucault, there is a system or a discursive formation in place that allows these kinds of assertions a legitimate space within peace studies’ discourses; that is, the rules of the discursive formation permit the scholars to “value” their claims of “global human betterment.” While this is apparent from the declarations made in the paragraph above, statements such as these might not be valued in other fields that also include peace as an object of study. Thus, IR and peace science scholars may generally support the concept of “global human betterment,” but they find it inappropriate and unprofessional for scholars to pursue this goal if it advocates a specific perspective on how the world ought to be.

Historically, peace research has been “belittled and marginalized” in IR (Dunn, 2005, p. 27). With its view of an anarchic world populated by nation-states and its disdain for liberal idealism as prescribed during the interwar period, IR has consistently demonstrated that the “realistic” study of peace, which must include scholarly research on international politics, the nation-state system, and war, is more sufficient than the “idealistic” study of peace, which seeks to transform institutional structures and humankind’s thinking. In the early days of peace research, IR scholars opposed not only peace studies’ focus on peace but also the use of interdisciplinary and “scientific” methods to investigate the topic. That is, although IR gave lip service to
interdisciplinarity, it mainly focused on political science. In addition, the use of applied-behavioralist methods did not interest IR (some IR scholars, like J. David Singer, however, did join peace research because of an interest in scientific, applied methods).

Today, IR continues to eschew the normative-prescriptive, idealistic views of peace studies. As demonstrated in the statements presented in chapter 5, for the most part, IR’s discursive formation dictates—deems “acceptable” within IR’s discourses—a different understanding of “peace.” Peace, as an object of knowledge within IR, is divided up by a different set of objects of knowledge, concepts, strategies, and subject positions within the field. The object of “war,” for instance, must be connected to “peace,” and these objects are transformed through IR’s multiple discourses, such as the discourses of realism, nationalism, and objectivism. Forcey (1989) comments that the view of peace in IR is still the commonly preconceived societal understanding of peace: “Superpower summit talk aside, we have not been taught to think about peace. Although most of us seek some sort of meaningful peace in our personal lives, we see peace in the global sense as merely the absence of war, like the eye of some everlasting hurricane” (p. 4). This type of societal understanding of peace transfers into U.S. higher education. This raises the question, if the dominant view of peace in society and academic culture closely resembles that of IR, what is the contemporary configuration of peace in peace studies?

My research indicates that when peace studies scholars’ indicate that they want to “make the world a better, more humane, place,” they start with the value that they want the global system to be more peaceful for all human beings. This means that, in their eyes, “acceptable” peace studies scholarship investigates how to create conditions that are
conducive to global human betterment. From a review of peace studies scholars’ definitions of the field that were provided in the survey material in chapter 4, conditions for global human betterment must include justice for all individuals, which means that any type of injustice (viewed as a form of violence) must be eliminated. At the heart of these scholars’ desire for peace is the need to understand “justice” and all types of “violence.” While scholars outside of peace studies might take a sentiment like “more peaceful for all human beings” to mean the elimination of overt violence such as large scale wars, killing, etc. and stop there, peace studies scholars do not believe that this is enough. Indeed, they think it is “true” and “normal” for scholars to advocate for the global (not at the level of the nation-state) elimination of any type of violence, including subtle forms such as hunger or inadequate education. Consequently, peace studies scholars argue that it is “false” or even “naïve” to believe that the world can be made better through only the eradication of war or direct violence. Within this framework, discourses such as global citizenship, imperialism, and human rights widely circulate.

In addition to positing the need to explore “justice” and “violence,” by seeking to eliminate or reduce all types of violence and to create justice and human betterment for all individuals, peace studies scholars advocate that skills for dealing with “conflict,” which is viewed as unavoidable and occurring frequently in our daily lives, must be investigated, created, implemented, and practiced. Therefore, peace studies scholars aim to provide information and tools to prevent, mediate, resolve, and transform all types of conflict. From this standpoint, the object of “conflict” is a valued component for how to achieve peace. Therefore, peace studies discursive formation includes discourses from conflict studies, which are comprised of statements about applied, practical research.
In all, when peace studies scholars posit their intent to “make the world a better, more humane, place,” they draw on a complex configuration of, at least, four objects of knowledge: peace, justice, violence, and conflict. In addition, they draw on a variety of discourses such as idealism, global citizenship, and applied/practical scholarship. According to the rules of peace studies’ discursive formation, peace cannot be investigated on its own. More important, if one desires to “speak the truth” within peace studies discourses, only a certain kind of “peace” makes sense. Peace should be divided, described, explained, and transformed by the objects of “violence,” “ justice,” and “ conflict.”89 If this does not happen, then the object “peace” is deemed “false,” which means it does not contain the correct components to be the right kind of “peace” for the field. This explains why the type of “peace” discussed by peace science and international relations scholars is of little interest to peace studies scholars and vice versa. Unless the understanding of “peace” corresponds to the rules of the discursive formation, which is currently peace plus at least three additional primary objects (P + 3), it will not have much meaning to peace studies scholars.

Stephenson (1999) maintains that “probably the most serious division in the field of peace research” (p. 811) is grounded in the definition of its main object of knowledge, peace, but she also explains that most contemporary peace researchers do not necessarily consider the division to be negative:

Clearly there is some relationship between the absence of war and the presence of other social values such as justice and freedom, although we may not be able to

89 As Foucault (1969/1972) contends, objects of knowledge are “constituted by all that was said in all the statements that named it, divided it up, described it, explained it, traced its development, indicated its various correlations, judged it, and possibly gave it speech by articulating, in its name, discourses that were to be taken as its own” (p. 32).
specify yet exactly what those relationships are in a general theory acceptable to
the whole of the field. (p. 812)

While I agree that the meaning of peace, with its discursively constructed understanding,
continues to be defined and is the main culprit of dividing practices\(^90\) within the field
(and also outside of it), I do not believe that it remains the most serious division in peace
studies—at least, not within peace studies in U.S. higher education. Based on this
project’s grounded empirical and discursive analyses, P + 3 represents the current
consensus held by peace studies scholars on the primary components of “peace” in U.S.-
based peace studies. Having identified these objects of knowledge and some of the
contemporary discourses of peace studies, the next section discusses the constitution of a
continuum of subject positions for the field of peace studies.

_The Constitution of a Continuum of Subject Positions for Peace Studies Scholars_

According to my data, peace studies stands united in its present-day commitment
to the normative-prescriptive strategy of “making the world a better, more humane,
place.” That said, the presence of P + 3 produces, maintains, and reproduces various
subject positions for peace studies scholars. Compared to the amount of literature that
explores the characteristics and ever-changing goals of the field, including much
discussion about the concept of peace, the amount of information that examines the
contemporary “scholars” of the field is minimal. In Dunn’s recent (2005) examination of
peace research, for instance, he analyzes the substantive content of the field and discusses
its current significant issues but does not exclusively examine the role of peace studies

\(^90\) As discussed in chapter 2, “dividing practices” cause a subject either to be “divided
inside himself or divided from others,” and “this process objectivizes him” (Foucault,
scholars. Furthermore, in the 2002 special edition of *Peace Review*, Murray states that the roundtable discussions completed for the edition “centered on focus and methodology” (p. 6) and that contributors were asked “to consider focus, research, content, experiential learning, methodology, institutional context, vocational interface, undergraduate/graduate relationships, organization, fiscal vitality, and leadership development” (p. 6). Indeed, this project indicates that consideration of items such as leadership development is important for peace studies, but out of the 20 items published in the edition, only one author, Ute Buhler, specifically focuses on the subject positions of peace studies scholars. Buhler (2002) calls for a shift in direction of the field “away from [the question of], ‘What is the position of peace studies?’ and towards ‘How can and should those of us who are engaged in peace studies position ourselves?’” (p. 28).

The call for a shift in perspective from the field to the scholars, such as this one from Buhler, is important because, in contemporary peace studies, it seems the complex identity of the scholars has not been adequately examined. The epistemological and methodological debates of earlier years in the field, for example, sparked serious reflections on the multiple subject positions of peace researchers (e.g., radical scholars, applied scholars, humanistic scholars, etc.) and what these subject positions meant for the field. But these discussions have long been addressed and put to bed. Today, if you are a “peace studies” scholar, it is, for the most part, assumed that you use an interdisciplinary, holistic, humanities-based, theoretical and practical, and normative-prescriptive approach to research and pedagogy and that you most likely juggle the corresponding roles produced by these approaches, which are the roles of peace studies teacher, practitioner, activist, and researcher.
Surprisingly, Elise Boulding (1976) said as much about the subject positions of the field in a comment she made over thirty years ago:

Whether we choose to work in universities or in the streets; whether we opt for local, national, international, or transnational roles and institutional settings, we are all activists, we are all practitioners, we are all researchers, we are all teachers. (p. 3)

Although I agree with the general sentiment expressed in this statement, I think that it misses some relevant and consequential points about the current state of the field. First, many of these subject positions, such as “activist,” “practitioner,” etc., operate simultaneously—thus, complicating the situation for those involved in peace studies. Second, for those people who “choose to work in universities” (i.e., peace studies scholars), the discursive formations that constitute U.S. “scholarship” and “scholar” greatly affect what it means to be activists, practitioners, researchers, and teachers.

For these reasons, I find that peace studies scholars are “hyphenated” or “divided within themselves” because they are more than, for instance, just “activists”—they are “scholar-activists.” Moreover, they are more than just “practitioners”; they are “scholar-practitioners.” In addition, they are more than just “scholar-activists” or “scholar-practitioners;” in some settings, they might be “scholar-activists-practitioners.” But, perhaps more consequential for the field of peace studies, peace studies scholars have the added challenge of linking these subject positions to “peace.” Hence, one needs to evaluate what is meant by “peace scholar-activist.” This type of nuance within the hyphenated subject positions significantly influences the scholarly legitimacy (and visibility) of peace studies scholars and, accordingly, the field.
Regarding the concept of the “scholar-activist,” this particular subject position and its place within U.S. higher education has been explored in great depth. Although this subject position might not be commonly referred to as “scholar-activist,” it is a familiar identity of many scholars in fields that possess a social change agenda (e.g., Women’s Studies, African American Studies, Cultural Studies, Educational Foundations, Service-Learning, Environmental Studies, etc.), and it has been examined in literature that addresses openly ideological scholarship, such as morally-engaged research or “praxis” (theory informed by action and vice versa). What I believe is important about this topic to peace studies scholars and the scholarly legitimacy of the field is that the addition of “peace” to the mix of “scholar-activist” brings an inherently value-laden, deeply contested term (within not only U.S. academic culture but also society-at-large) to bear on a subject position that already goes against the rules of what a “traditional” scholar says and does. What does it mean for the legitimacy of peace studies when its primary subject position, “peace scholar-activist,” contains two concepts (peace and activist) that transform the notion of “traditional scholar?”

In addition to this point, it is important for peace studies scholars to recognize that, in the contemporary U.S. university setting, there are numerous subject positions constituted through the objects of knowledge, concepts, and strategies of peace studies’ discursive formation. This means, for instance, that not only is there a “peace scholar-activist” role but also a closely related yet distinct “peace scholar-advocate” role. There are a plethora of subject positions, such as these, that serve to divide peace studies
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91 Lather (1991) explains that “the requirements of praxis are theory both relevant to the world and nurtured by actions in it, and an action component in its own theorizing process that grows out of practical political grounding” (pp. 11-12). For additional information about “praxis,” see Lather, 1986.
sustained by the insights of other scholars within themselves and from other scholars. What follows is an account of some of the subject positions identified through this project. The boundaries of these identities are blurred and the scholars may reside in more than one role at a time. The intent of this conversation is not to force peace studies scholars into categories, but instead to present the range that emerged during data analysis, such that the field can contemplate whether its scholars are divided within these subject positions and how the various positions may be consequential to the visibility and scholarly legitimacy of the field. Moreover, these subject positions serve to either legitimize or delegitimize (and in many cases “objectify”) peace studies scholars’ speech, thoughts, and activities, which has a profound impact on the status of the field.

The Peace Scholar-Activist

The peace scholar-activist (S-Ac) personifies the field’s belief in the connection between peace and social justice. Peace studies’ predominant concern with indirect violence, including various forms of social injustice, positions this scholar to be an activist voice against what the field perceives as the many social, political, and cultural ills of the world. To be sure, this scholar holds “a lot of other activities outside of academia, [which are] activist-type activities” (PS2). The strategy taken by this scholar is the normative-prescriptive goal of “global human transformation.” For, the S-Ac, “justice” (including, to some extent, “equity” and “freedom”) is the vital object of knowledge.

Historically, this contemporary subject position is informed by the discursive remnants of the “radical critique of peace research.” Like some of the earlier “radical critique” scholars, the S-Ac desires to be an agitator; this scholar believes that, when
necessary, conflict relations should be sharpened not minimized (i.e., “conflict creation,” which does not necessarily have to be nonviolent, is key). Of course, scholars in this role view themselves as part of the peace movement—indeed, they “come to [peace studies] from the peace movement” (PS48). The S-Ac most likely stands against authority, including the types of views expressed within IR and security studies that have historically discounted the object of “justice,” and perceives herself as “more objective” for eschewing items such as government money to fund research. Often, the S-Ac does not get paid for teaching a peace studies course or running a peace studies program, and participates in these activities for motives such as “out of the goodness of my heart” (PS2) and “for personal reasons” (PP6). In all, the pedagogical intent of the S-Ac is to “prepare students to become social change agents” (Boulding, 1999, p. ix).

Methodologically, the S-Ac is also influenced by the “radical critique of peace research” and, subsequently, the division of the field into “two cultures” (humanistic and scientific). This scholar finds it acceptable to conduct morally-engaged research that promotes a certain position. The S-Ac views “praxis” as a vital component of scholarship, and does not agree that it is possible for scholarship to merely “understand” and “report” on the state of the world; all research has a position and it should be openly acknowledged and pursued.

The S-Ac is at the heart of many harsh academic critiques and controversies. Given the inherently normative nature of “peace” and the extent to which the field has been affected by the concept of positive peace, peace studies must be explicitly in favor of peace, justice, and equity. Inasmuch as peace studies scholars value the ideals of peace and justice as against the realities of things as they are, it is not surprising that
peace studies scholars have acquired labels such as “goody-two shoes,” or “idealistic.” Aside from these generic labels directed at scholars in the field, however, the practices of the S-Ac invoke the more-pointed labels of “protest-oriented” and “too political.” A few participants in IR and peace science even used the word “socialist” to describe this subject position. Along methodological lines, this scholar is criticized as being “too ideological,” “value-oriented,” and “unscientific.”

These externally held perceptions were often brought up during my conversations with peace scholar-activists, indicating that they understand (and, in some cases, value) their “deviant” status within certain academic cultures of U.S. higher education. Fahey (1994) expresses that “at heart a peacemaker is a troublemaker” and laments that “to a very large extent, I think, peace studies has not thus far fulfilled its promise of making trouble for our culture, our nation, and the academy” (p. 178). The S-Ac epitomizes this description of the field by attempting to “make trouble” in the name of “peace.”

In summary, this scholar pursues a social change strategy of global transformation. S/he values the object of “justice” and practices an activist, rejectionist position, which advocates against the objects of investigation and practices in the fields of IR and security studies. The S-Ac believes in morally-engaged scholarship where theory informs practice and vice-versa.

The Peace Scholar-Advocate

Like the peace scholar-activist (S-Ac), the peace scholar-advocate (S-Ad) is a highly valued subject position in contemporary peace studies. Although the S-Ad is similar to the peace scholar-activist in that s/he investigates the “most important problems facing humanity” (PS2), the S-Ad does not necessarily desire to work against the system
in the process; rather, s/he envisions “universities to be a vibrant part of rebuilding society” (PS2). Furthermore, this scholar uses education to help people re-conceive of themselves and the world, not necessarily to create “social change agents.” The scholarship, pedagogy, and scholars produced within this category, therefore, are often criticized as being “engaged,” but they do not receive the more biting critique of “protest-oriented.”

In the introduction to their peace studies reader, Smoker, Davies, and Munske (1990) comment that, in choosing articles for their book, they “invited contributions from authors of all political persuasions, and from many countries” (p. xi), and allowed them to “offer their knowledge and opinions as starting points for discussion rather than definitive statements” (p. xi). Furthermore, they assert that “it is up to the individual … to decide which, if any, of the approaches represented [in the book] are most likely to achieve a more peaceful and just world” (p. xii). This approach, which “offers” knowledge and opinions “as starting points” rather than as “definitive” statements and allows the individual to “decide,” illustrates the distinction that I draw between the S-Ac and S-Ad—one seeks to actively create agents of change, while the other seeks to assist people in the process of re-conceiving the world. Although these distinctions between the S-Ac and S-Ad subject positions are subtle and murky, they have been identified to express an observation that I made of the contingencies present not only in scholars’ comments during interviews but also in the vast quantity of peace studies literature.
The Peace Scholar-Studies Educator

The peace scholar-studies educator (S-SE) is perhaps the most benign subject position out of three that have been identified thus far. This scholar may be a proponent of peace and justice to the same extent as the S-Ac, but s/he seeks merely to expose students to the topics of the field, not to convert them. Thus, the S-SE will engage in critical and constructive conversations with the students but does not see the classroom as an “educational podium” (PS17), so to speak. In addition, while the S-Ac and S-Ad produce peace research, the S-SE focuses more heavily on teaching.

The S-SE takes seriously the notion of interdisciplinarity and its relevance to peace studies. At its core, peace studies is a “studies” program. This scholar makes a genuine attempt to investigate the problem of peace through the lenses of multiple disciplines at multiple levels. Along with scholars in other university “studies” programs (e.g., cultural studies, women’s studies, etc.), this subject position often receives criticisms such as “unfocused,” “lacking depth,” and “incoherent.”

Aside from these concerns, it is important to note that the S-SE has been discursively written by the “two cultures problem” of the 1970’s, which was a concern raised about the methodological divide in the field between scientific/quantitative and normative/qualitative approaches and its effect on peace pedagogy. Since most peace studies scholars interviewed for this project were unfamiliar with peace science, it is most likely the case that contemporary the S-SE uses a humanities-inspired classroom curriculum.
The Peace Scholar-Educator

The peace scholar-educator (S-E) is concerned with educating the general public about peace. Aside from any academic duties, this scholar may lead activities such as community and student workshops and forums on how to build skills related to the issues of “making the world a better place,” namely, teachable skills such as conflict mediation for building social movement organizations at the community or civil society levels. This subject position is different from the S-SE because it represents the concern for educating the general public as opposed to university-based peace education and it does not include the obligation to be taught from an interdisciplinary or a humanities-based perspective. Furthermore, this position is different from the S-Ac and S-Ad because it does not necessarily include the requirement of being an “activist” or even an “advocate.”

The Peace Scholar-Practitioner

The peace scholar-practitioner (S-P) works in some capacity with the field of conflict studies. The mantra of the S-P is “applied problem solving,” and “conflict” is the predominant object of knowledge. Thus, although this role might possess an ideological and transformational component, it redirects the “pie-in-the-sky” (SC17) intent of peace studies to the more practical goal of skills-based problem-solving. The S-P is prepared to roll-up her/his sleeves and get to work “put[ting] out fires” (SC17), which means mediating, negotiating, resolving, and/or transforming conflicts at all levels. While scholarship produced in this category avoids the criticism of being “idealistic” or “too political,” it is sometimes called “too practical” insinuating that it lacks theory. According to my discussions with the IR and peace science scholars, this is the most academically accepted peace scholar subject position.
The Peace Scholar-Researcher

The peace scholar-researcher (S-R) harkens back to the early days of the field, when, in the United States, peace studies was recognized as peace research. This scholar predominately engages with the field of conflict studies but is unlike the S-P in that s/he focuses on a type of research and practice that is concerned with issues of conflict at the international level. That said, the S-R is more likely to be informed about peace scholarship in IR and, consequently, more familiar with the field of peace science than the other peace studies scholars. In the same vein, the humanities-based side of peace studies may not be of interest to this scholar, who is mainly “social science” oriented. The primary objects of knowledge for this scholar are direct, large-scale “violence,” international and regional “conflict,” and “war.” The S-R publishes in peace journals such as *JCR* and *JPR* but does not necessarily receive academic recognition and reward for having published in them. It is important to note that the contemporary, U.S-based S-R may not necessarily identify with early peace researchers, who focused on behavioral and applied methodologies.

The Peace Scholar-Innovator

The peace scholar-innovator (S-I) is not a well-defined subject position of the field but it was often invoked when scholars talked about the level of creativity and vision needed to address the serious problem of “making the world a better place.” Thus, there is a “discourse of innovation” that circulates within the field. When scholars made comments such as “turning the darkness into light” (PS17) and “creat[ing] cultures, processes, [and] structures of peace that would in fact enable us as individuals, society and world to live more just, more humane lives” (PS20), the relationship between
scholar, scholarship, and innovation was brought into play. Thus, the S-I recognizes the normative agenda of peace studies and the creative vision that is required to accomplish the mission. The S-I may be tuned into the field that Elise Boulding identified as peace studies’ “cousin,” futurism. It seems that the field is headed more and more in this direction as it focuses on building cultures of peace. I think this subject position presents an area of opportunity for the peace scholar.

Summary

To understand how peace studies’ three precepts (identified in chapter 4) emerged and why objections to the field’s normative-prescriptive claims of “global human betterment” (presented in chapter 5) were raised, this section incorporated Foucauldian-informed tools of discourse analysis to investigate the objects of knowledge and subject positions within the discursive formation of peace studies. It is important to identify objects of knowledge because—aside from representing the primary topics of a field’s investigation and thus constituting its concepts and strategic choices—they produce a range of subject positions that individuals within the field must occupy. It was only after a certain definition of “peace” was put into practice that the appropriate subject, the “peace studies scholar” (defined by the knowledge formation of IR, peace studies, and peace research) could appear (Hall, 2001). In other words, to be accepted as a “legitimate” scholar within the field of peace studies, one must “value” the conditions of the object of knowledge (in this case, nothing less than P + 3) and, ultimately, “be” what they entail—since peace is an inherently normative (prescriptive and explicitly value-based) term, peace studies scholars have become normative-prescriptive in their practices
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92 For more information on the relationship between subject and object, see Foucault, 1969/1972, pp. 72-73.
of scholarship. Moreover, when peace studies scholars’ subject positions are analyzed in
terms of how they fit with the image of a traditional scholar in U.S. higher education,
invariably they reside on the other side of the normative divide. Thus, “scholar” is
deemed normal, while “scholar-activist” is abnormal. This section identified the
common subject positions within peace studies that emerged from my data analysis with
the aim of understanding to what degree peace studies scholars are either divided among
themselves or from other fields. The next section investigates what peace studies’ objects
of knowledge and subject positions mean for the perception and legitimacy of the field
through a presentation of the implications of this study.

Life on the Other Side of the Hyphen: Implications and Suggestions
for Contemporary Peace Studies

What does it mean to be a contemporary peace studies scholar in U.S. higher
education? Constituted within the rules and structures of the field’s current discursive
formation, peace studies scholars end up on the “other side of the hyphen.” Given the
rules of peace studies’ discursive formation, peace studies scholars are not just scholars
but scholar-activists; they are in a hyphenated relationship that places one of their
primary subject positions, activist, on the other side of the hyphen: scholar-activist. Life
on the other side of the hyphen presents a palpable challenge for peace studies scholars
because it is akin to being from the “other side of the tracks.” Like the discursive
practices that govern what life is like on the “other side of the tracks,” the contemporary

93 Michelle Fine raises the issue of “working the hyphen” in her scholarship about
U.S. academic standards and norms that are discursively constructed and regulated govern what life is like on the “other side of the hyphen,” and it is sometimes a difficult place for peace studies scholars to be.

Many peace studies scholars recognized this challenge and commented on the status of their legitimacy (and that of the field) in the data collected for this project: “I don’t think we’re paid much attention to … [and] I don’t think we are held in a particularly high regard” (PS2); “The academic culture does not really support peace studies” and “higher education doesn’t have an understanding of what this area can be, is, and should be” (PS20); and “I think for some people it is overly perceived as naïve, as protest-minded, as not tough minded” (PS37). Moreover, the data analysis indicates that, although the legitimacy issues of the field primarily stem from its normative-prescriptive reputation and higher education’s lack of interest in a transformational philosophy, the scholars raise three primary concerns about their lives on the other side of the hyphen: (1) the consequences of the current institutional reward system, (2) the need for increased coherence and visibility of peace studies scholarship, and (3) the challenges of generating and sustaining effective leadership in the field. In summary, several scholars called for what amounts to “a repositioning of the field.” These items will be addressed in turn.

---

For example, peace studies scholars made comments such as: “It’s viewed as an idealistic enterprise by members of both communities” (PS19); “Its reputation within higher education is marginal precisely because people see it as sort of idealistic and engaged scholarship” (PS1); “If we stopped using the word peace, overnight this field would be accepted” (PS24).
Peace studies transcends the disciplinary rules of the U.S. academic system. In past reviews of the field, the challenges of interdisciplinarity have been discussed and debated. As my research indicates, peace studies scholars view interdisciplinarity as a distinct feature of the field. In his recent survey of the field, Dunn (2005) proposes that “as a mature enterprise [peace studies] may even be a-disciplinary” (p. 69). As Dirks, Eley, and Ortner (1994) explain, being adisciplinary means “that the preserving of secure disciplinary foundations has receded further and further behind the exploring of common problems, and the ground of current innovation…lies across and beyond the established boundaries of disciplinary discussion.” (p. ix). That said, whether peace studies is multi-, inter-, trans-, or a-disciplinary, it is a “field of study” that draws on multiple disciplines.95

The academic culture of U.S. higher education has grown more acceptant of the institutional implications of interdisciplinary research programs; that is, the dominant perception that interdisciplinary programs fail to provide adequate depth on a topic has been and continues to be challenged. Thus, when a field of study is “problem-oriented” rather than discipline-oriented, it is acknowledged that the lenses of multiple disciplines are appropriate. The unfortunate consequence of interdisciplinarity from the peace studies scholars’ point of view revolves around the problem of attracting and keeping

95 In this regard, Galtung (1975b) identified four phases of “integrated effort” (p. 245). First, “a multi-disciplinary phase where a problem is attacked by researchers from different social science disciplines each preserving his identity, each contributing a chapter in a book, or one book in a series; second, a cross-disciplinary phase where these scientists start learning more from each other, borrowing and cross-fertilizing each other; third, an inter-disciplinary phase where they start working not merely parallel to each other, but as a team, each putting in his concepts, his perspectives, and his findings, producing a joint result. And finally: a fourth trans-disciplinary phase where the original identity as psychologist, sociologist, political scientist, anthropologist, jurist has disappeared” (pp. 245-246).
new scholars in the absence of meaningful institutional reward structures and cultural acknowledgements, such as scholarly recognition and legitimacy. The important overarching question for contemporary peace studies scholars is: “How can we make this appealing as a career choice so we know the field won’t die?” (PS20).

A core challenge for any field of study is to build the next generation of scholars. This is a particularly large obstacle for peace studies because it is often difficult for its new scholars to find a job in the field. As one scholar commented, “there’s a lot of lip service to being interdisciplinary these days but it doesn’t usually get you a job” (PS1). Because specialization in peace studies does not provide institutional rewards such as tenure, it is difficult for the field to attract new scholars, who often choose established disciplines where there is a guarantee of academic promotion and recognition. Furthermore, once in a discipline, they frequently do not elect to specialize in peace studies because it is difficult to receive credit for publishing in the field’s journals, and mainstream journals are often not interested in publishing peace studies scholarship. Alger (2007) discusses this topic in the *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*:

Most scholars who have a broad background in peace studies do not have the disciplinary qualifications, particularly publication in mainstream disciplinary journals, that is required for appointment to a position in political science, sociology, psychology, anthropology, history, etc. Thus, unless there is a department or programme of peace studies, or peace and conflict studies, scholars with degrees in one of the disciplines tend not to be appointed when the main focus of their teaching and research is peace studies. At the same time, they may receive little credit for their publication in peace research journals…. (p. 300)
The Struggle for Scholarly Coherence

On several occasions peace studies scholars raised the need for increased coherence and visibility of their scholarship. This topic derives from the fields’ interdisciplinary characteristic but also concerns the consequences of the historical debates and splintering of the field of peace research. To date, peace studies scholarship has created “little islands of theory” but not much that coheres (or, more importantly, gives the appearance of coherence) and, as a result, peace studies scholars struggle to achieve recognition from mainstream scholars. Several scholars pointed to this theme in the survey. Although many peace studies scholars commented that they did not care about their reputation in IR, they do desire a level of acknowledgement (if not, respect) from university administrators and faculty in other fields. The overarching observation is: “We fail to cohere in a way that we can collectively be effective. Because it does require building of some common language, approaches, etc., that are effective” (PS21).

In his 1971, UNESCO-sponsored global survey that investigated the substantive and methodological emphases of peace research institutes and programs, Everts (1972) concluded:

Peace research does not dispose yet (if it ever will) of one consistent overall theory in which the contributions from the various disciplines can easily be placed. What we have at most are little ‘islands of theory,’ lying in an uncharted ocean (Wright, 1942; Pruitt and Snyder, 1969; Newcombe and Newcombe, 1969). (p. 479)
Everts’ observation remains true to this day. Indeed, one peace studies program director, while she was not discussing peace theory directly, described peace studies’ contemporary situation in a similar way:

   Within peace studies, because it has been so small [for] so long … it is like a … string with little knots along it and they’re just in little clusters but they don’t necessarily see how to move down the string. They don’t get the vibrations. If you had it really straight and you stretched that string you’d get a lot more ripples, a lot more vibrations, a lot more sensitivity, a lot more feeling about the depth and value to the work. (PP7)

   There is no majestic work on the causes of peace, no commonly acknowledged grand theory of peace that would provide an accepted grammar about the topic and a conceptual foundation upon which to build a fruitful and progressive research program. In many ways, this is for the best, for the absence of a hegemonic knowledge allows many voices to be heard and this has been the intent of peace researchers since the field emerged. This strategy, however, has not succeeded for the field. The problem is no longer what Blainey observed during the 1970s: “For every thousand pages published on the causes of war, there is less than one page directly on the causes of peace” (1973, p. 3). Today, there is no shortage of monographs on peace.96 Rather, the problem is that it is unclear how the information produced coheres under the rubric of peace studies—that is, peace studies scholarship is scattered among the disciplines and scholars outside of the
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96 Richmond (2005) observes, however, that “to date, there have only been a few notable contemporary monographs published in IR [italics added], that have specifically focused on ‘peace’ rather than on the more common focus on war or order” (p. 7).
field are confused about what precisely is peace studies’ scholarship and what is the field’s overall research agenda (aside from the common critique of peace studies’ “ideological agenda”).

One peace studies scholar commented that other academics “are not quite sure what peace scholars do. Are peace scholars advocates? Are they researchers? Are they teachers? What do they do?” (PS19). This calls for cohesion in the name of greater visibility and acknowledgement—whether this means maintaining a common language or approaches. Peace studies program directors indicated on the survey that items such as “clearer scholarly contribution” and “increasing visibility of high quality scholarship” could lead to growth and development of the field within U.S. higher education. Moreover, peace studies scholars said that “publication of more scholarly” and “very high profile” books and “emergence of a seminal work” would benefit the field. In addition to these comments, one program director commented that the lack of a research agenda could lead to the field’s demise within higher education. Furthermore, peace studies scholars commented that “flaky research,” “marginal scholarship,” and a “lack of coherence in its own subfield structure” could be culprits in the field’s hypothetical downfall.

Although there is no grand theory of peace around which the field can cohere, there are substantive core themes that have been identified in reviews of peace studies throughout the years and currently a large-scale survey and study of the core content of peace and conflict studies undergraduate programs in Canada and the United States is being conducted by Patrick Coy at Kent State University and Timothy Hedeen at Kennesaw State University. Dunn contends that “arguably, the core around which much
of the work done in the United States coheres nowadays is a combination of world order studies, peace and justice studies, and conflict resolution” (2005, p. 75). Disagreeing with the remarks given above by the survey participants, he opines that, in U.S.-based peace studies, “it is now hard to sustain the view that [there] is a degree of lack of discipline. …Indeed, there is a clear network of interconnectedness, with scholars sharing similar aims and objectives, albeit with different strategies” (p. 75).

The cohesion of scholarship and semblance of a cumulative production of knowledge in peace studies remains a challenge—one that I experienced firsthand while conducting this project. It was especially difficult to piece together the divisions in the field in order to critically examine the characteristics and substantive foci of peace research, peace studies, peace science, and university-based peace education. One peace scientist presented the problem of visibility in this way, “there is almost a total lack of sensitivity and appreciation and knowledge about … peace studies, peace science, peace research. Very few people outside the academic communities and the activists involved know anything about those differences” (SC18). That said, this problem exists not just outside the field but within it. In other words, the question is: How well do the academic communities and activists involved in the fields of peace studies, peace science, and peace research understand and appreciate the differences among them? As Dunn (2005) points out:

Many who are interested in peace research currently have no direct experience of, or memory of, the circumstance in which it developed. Moreover, and as a corollary, it is perhaps necessary to observe that those who may know of events
and context may not be aware of, or misunderstand, the interplay of events, and the consequent effect upon the research agenda and research dynamic in peace research. (p. 9)

To be sure, this is a noteworthy challenge for peace studies as it thinks about how to shift from one generation to another and, also, about how to incorporate scholars who have recently come to the field from other areas, such as conflict studies. On several occasions, I had research participants tell me that they did not have a real perspective on peace studies or peace science. Furthermore, during our conversations only two peace studies participants brought up the field of peace research.

Conversations about the field need to continue, and they should ideally be gathered in an easily accessible publication. Scholars who are new to the field should not have to search databases of peace studies, peace science, and peace research (not to mention peace history, peace education, peace psychology, etc.) to understand what has transpired in the field. For new discourses of peace studies to emerge, along with new conceptions of the field, objects of knowledge, and identities of the scholars (which could, in fact, affect transformation in the field’s discursive formation) aspects of all of the related fields must continue to be described and put into circulation, with an eye toward gaining greater scholarly legitimacy.

The Challenge of Generating and Sustaining Leadership

Aside from working toward greater scholarly coherence in the pursuit of academic visibility and scholarly legitimacy, peace studies’ contemporary situation presents its scholars with an opportunity to reflect on their own roles and subject positions within the field. Several survey comments pointed to a need for effective
academic leadership. They claimed that to promote growth and development of peace studies in higher education, the field needed “greater assertiveness by peace studies scholars” and “articulate spokesperson[s].” On the flip side, they believed that problems of “absence of vision,” and “flaky spokespersons” would lead to the field’s demise. As one peace studies scholar put it, the problem is the “inability to articulate our work in a way that doesn’t marginalize us,” and, for this, peace studies needs “to identify good leadership and sustain it in a way that advances the field” (PS21).

One of the challenges of promoting effective leadership in peace studies involves, once again, a lack of coherence in the field—but this time it is among the scholars rather than the scholarship. In 1985, George Lopez warned that peace studies scholars, “must resist th[e] tendency towards narrow specialization, and must actively engage in a multimethod approach” (p. 127), or else risk returning to the bifurcation of quantitative and values schools that characterized the field in the 1970s. Unfortunately, the tendency towards narrow specialization that Lopez warned about over twenty years ago has materialized. Indeed, one scholar described contemporary peace studies scholars as “individual flowers blooming in a field” (PS38). While the division between the quantitative and values schools remains strong, as has been pointed out in this project, the primary divisions in the field today are theory vs. practice and rejectionist vs. conciliatory.

First, many scholars commented on the division between those who focus on applied problem solving (practice) and those who focus on theory building (scholarship). In one view, “peace studies is currently too academic and not applied enough” (PS46). Another scholar remarked that the field needs “less emphasis on theory and more on
skills and practice” (PS36). Furthermore, he asked, “the orientation leans toward academic, but what if we were to think more decisively about peace studies as a professional field—that is, a field of practice?” (PS36). Many scholars are calling for a tactical skills-based approach to the field, and it seems that they think peace studies scholars are not trained very well to tackle contemporary problems. They think it is imperative to provide real world alternatives, not just come up with knowledge about the topic (PS46). Thus, the subject position of “peace scholar-practitioner” that was discussed earlier in the chapter has become increasingly important. Moreover, scholars are looking to build a balance between the two: they want applied theory in practice or, as one scholar called it, “action knowledge” (PS46).

Second, a division was mentioned on several occasions between scholars “who want respectability and those who don’t care” (PS2). One scholar commented that “there is considerable overlap of people … and content but … a separation that has to do with methodology and the way in which people want to present themselves” (PS37). Another scholar added that “peace studies has not been that inclusive” (PS21). Indeed, “it’s been more in your face and dismissive of people’s concerns—people with oppositional voices—and unable to incorporate the opposition” (PS21). In this respect, the scholars are marginalized, but “they marginalize themselves,” which in this scholar’s view is “normal, when you’re trying to establish a terrain of expertise, to draw some boundaries and build your own lingo and … language” (PS46). These sentiments seem to draw on the “peace scholar-activist” subject position or, perhaps, more accurately, a “peace scholar-rejectionist” subject position.
From this conversation, it is clear that many tensions still exist in the field and “we have not figured out yet as a disciplinary community how to organize ourselves” (PS21). While this scholar agreed that “there is an academic culture created, however feeble” (PS21), it comes back to a problem of organization and leadership. She comments, “peace studies as a field has been difficult for the rest of the university establishment to take seriously, in part, because there are the nut cases. And, then, in addition, there is this extremely poor organization” (PS21). One scholar raised this question about the topic: “For whom are you trying to do the research? Who is your audience? (PS37). Another peace studies scholar had this to say:

We don’t know how to organize ourselves. I think that peace and conflict studies have a lot to say but they are not getting through to school teachers, to mothers and fathers, to policymakers, to media people. They are not getting through, which I think is part of our problem. We don’t know how to communicate with members of other organizational cultures. (PS19)

In the end, one scholar presented the idea that peace studies has not really earned a space at the academic table because “the stuff that we’ve been throwing out collectively has not been all that compelling” (PS36).

*The Time to Reposition Peace Studies?*

These comments add up to the possibility of reframing or repositioning the field. One scholar, who is disappointed with the amount of change the field has made in the world and believes “that peace studies … as a label, as a brand-name has passed its peak of usefulness,” called for a new way “to package” it (PS36). He imagined this to be a new way for the field to present itself, “for example, in strategic planning or political
design or some other term” (PS36). In addition, a peace studies program director discussed the problem peace studies has with gaining “academic buy-in,” which he described as “broad ownership of the program and … administrative commitment to its long-term success” (PP4). Perhaps a change in brand image could help the field move away from its connections to some of the disparate images of the field that were presented in chapters 4 and 5, such as “providing showers for the homeless.” Another scholar urged “an assertive revision that reaffirms the original values” (PS21) of the field. It is certainly a large challenge to think about repositioning peace studies, particularly when the field itself is difficult to define because of its object of knowledge and its ever-changing substantive content matter due to shifts in societal issues and concerns.

Another significant, but less drastic, recommendation for peace studies is for it to conduct “a serious examination of the state of the art of peace and conflict studies” (PP7). Indeed, at least two conferences have recently dealt with this topic: one held at the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace and Justice at the University of San Diego in 2004, the other at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies at The Ohio State University in 2007. This project adds to these discussions, but more dialogue, evaluation, and assessment within the field is needed. If nothing else, the data collected for this project indicates that peace studies scholars want to talk about the contemporary state of the field. The response rate for my survey and interviews was high, especially considering the pool of respondents was limited to the most influential scholars in the field.97

Why did a large number of scholars respond to the survey and agree to an interview? This remains an unanswered question that could be more closely examined in the literature that analyzes the consequences of studying “elites.” See Hertz & Imber, 1995; Marcus, 1983; Odendahl & Shaw, 2002; Stephens, 2007; Undheim, 2006; Wasserman, 2000, Zuckerman, 1996.
Regarding the question of repositioning the field, discourse analysis seems to add a great deal of value. The literature on discourse analysis is beneficial to reframing peace studies because it provides tools to explore the system of rules that should be put into operation: (1) if an object of knowledge is to be transformed, (2) if new concepts and strategies are to be developed, and, ultimately, (3) if different subject positions can be affected within the discursive formation of the field (see Foucault, 1969/1972, p. 74). Thus, discourse analysis brings into consideration the subject positions that are created and, more importantly, “objectified” within discursive formations. Through the constitution of discourses, peace studies scholars have been objectified by IR and peace science scholars and even by their own colleagues. Reflection on the various subject positions of the field is important to peace studies scholars because it provides a different way for them to evaluate, “who we are.” The literature on how to conduct discourse analysis is profuse and dense. As noted in chapter 3, the following tools proved invaluable to the project: Foucault, 1998a, Foucault, 1982/1998d, and Hall 2001.98

When thinking about discourse analysis and how it benefits the repositioning of peace studies, for example, I believe the constitution of subject positions is important to consider in future research about the field. Several contemporary subject positions were identified in this chapter. The question remains which ones strengthen the visibility and legitimacy of the field and which ones are less effective. In 1989, Rennie Forcey made an observation about the crucial role of peace studies scholars’ in the field:

---

98 The article, “Foucault,” presents a helpful summary of how subjects relate to objects of knowledge and, furthermore, the positions they must occupy in relation to the objects (see 1998a). The article, “Subject and Power,” provides a description of exclusionary and inclusionary practices, in particular “dividing practices” (see 1982/1998d). The contributions of Hall’s (2001) “six elements” were detailed in chapter 3.
Learning how we should change our thinking is peace studies. Peace studies students and educators are in the process of becoming thinkers in action. From a wide variety of perspectives, [this] forces us to question and examine our own values in preparation for becoming peace thinkers in action (pp. 4-5).

To become “peace thinkers in action,” peace studies scholars should closely examine their values as personified in their subject positions. Perhaps, the “peace thinker in action” of today is the “peace scholar-innovator” identified earlier in this chapter. What role does “innovation” have in the growth of the field and how could it be marketed to academics and society alike? Could this subject position be given a brand image that would represent peace studies? What would it look like? In brief, peace studies desires to transgress the traditional rules of being a scholar by advocating for social change.

Moreover, the field not only advocates for social change but desires to transform the world. This is a complicated social change agenda, which takes creativity, innovation, and, most likely, aspects of the “peace scholar-practitioner” discussed earlier.

People want the expertise of peace studies scholars. In chapter 4, some scholars made it clear that, with the increase of public and corporate interest in conflict mediation and negotiation skills, peace studies is a “hot topic.” That said, contemporary U.S. higher education is increasingly under pressure from state legislatures to produce socially-useful work—students with skills that can contribute to a better society.99 In addition to this government-driven agenda, universities around the country have also amped up the meaning of the terms “international,” “global,” and “multi-cultural” in the hope of exposing students to global opportunities for learning. Indeed, this year, Gordon Gee,

---

99 For instance, Ohio’s recent state budget cuts announced by Gov. Ted Strickland spared these types of higher education initiatives. See Elliott and Quaranta, 2008.
President of The Ohio State University, began a “strategic internationalization” initiative on campus that called for “steps to ensure the systemic internationalization of our institution” (Gee & Alutto, 2008, p. 1). With their connection to service-learning initiatives in higher education (see Maas Weigert & Crews, 1999) and other like-minded projects, peace studies scholars’ stand poised to contribute to this range of knowledge. Thus, not only is the public interested in the topic, but the climate in higher education is calling for it as well. As one peace studies program director affirmed, “there are bumps and valleys [in the future of peace studies] but the trajectory is clearly going up” (PP4).

**Future Research and Limitations of the Study**

The following discussion addresses several items that were not included in the project and raises possibilities for future research.

*Research Limitations*

One of the potential problems with the project is that the findings may have been influenced by the choices made to limit the research design and sample of the study. The project concludes that peace studies struggles with issues of visibility and scholarly legitimacy because of its transformative views of scholarship and of the role of scholars in the academic community and because of the normative-prescriptive aspect of its main object of knowledge, peace. This section acknowledges that these findings may have been different had the research design included a more diverse sample of scholars and a comparative perspective from a field similar in agenda and scope to peace studies.

First, this project limited the sample of scholars to those that are *influential* in the fields of IR, peace studies, and peace science in the *United States*. The decision to survey and interview “influential” scholars means that most of the research participants are
senior members of their respective fields. In this sense, one wonders how the data collected and the subsequent data analysis would have been different had the sample included junior scholars from each of the fields. This concern suggests that the opinions of junior scholars may be more attuned to the contemporary politics and future direction of the fields, while senior scholars’ opinions may be reminiscent of past events and struggles. This may be especially true for peace studies because its senior scholars may simply be tired and jaded by the sixty-year struggle to develop the field both organizationally and institutionally. The inclusion of scholars from outside of the United States or a “global perspective” might also have changed some of the findings of this project, in particular, by expanding the boundaries of the field’s contemporary agenda and the definition of its main object of study.

Second, the project did not include a comparative perspective to peace studies’ present-day predicament. Although the project included comparative perspectives of peace studies from IR and peace science scholars, it did not investigate the problems of visibility and scholarly legitimacy within another contemporary interdisciplinary field, e.g., women’s studies, curriculum studies, qualitative research, etc. A comparative perspective from one of these fields might have benefited the project in two ways. First, given that many interdisciplinary fields discuss the problem of incoherency, a comparative project might have provided another perspective or, at least, demonstrated that peace studies is not alone in this predicament.\textsuperscript{100} Second, given the contest in U.S. higher education over topics such as “narrow versus expanded” ideas of science,

\textsuperscript{100} See, for example, Denzin and Lincoln’s (2005) conversation about the multiple perspectives that comprise the interdisciplinary field of qualitative research in their introduction to the \textit{The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research}.
“objectivism vs. values” in scholarship, and advocacy-oriented research, a comparative perspective between peace studies and another interdisciplinary field might have shed light on the “two cultures problem” and other similar issues. In all, a comparative perspective might have helped the project to address the rather large research question presented in chapter 1: “How and why is it that academic fields of study and its scholars come to be more valued than others in the U.S. university system?”

Research Possibilities

The results of this project indicate three potential research opportunities. First, in light of the historical relationship between IR and peace studies, research about the contemporary connection between the two fields could be further pursued. For instance, the research produced in this study could launch an analysis into the link between the mission and substantive content of peace studies and the increasing popularity within IR of similar areas of study, namely global civil society, peacekeeping and post-conflict peacebuilding, alternative security communities, normative IR, and social constructivist theories of IR. Second, as was pointed out in the above discussion about research limitations, peace studies is not the only interdisciplinary field that possesses a social change agenda in U.S. higher education. Further research could be conducted about the academic status (visibility and scholarly legitimacy) of fields with similar characteristics. A study of this topic might increase understanding about whether peace studies’ problems with visibility and scholarly legitimacy are typical of interdisciplinary fields with social change agendas; and, if not, why not. Finally, most current research in the field of education regarding peace and conflict resolution is directed toward its advancement within the K-12 context. What if some of this energy were redirected toward research on
the organizational and institutional development of peace studies? My concern here is not pedagogical or curricular in nature. Rather, I would like to see more work at the university level on the academic health of peace studies within U.S. higher education.

**Conclusion**

The aim of this project has been not only to examine the current condition of peace studies in U.S. higher education but, drawing on the words of Foucault, to “increase the circumference of the visible” (Foucault quoted in Søndergaard, 2002, p. 202). Peace studies continues to suffer from the problems of visibility and scholarly legitimacy. The main reason for this is that peace studies is a maverick of sorts (and proud of it too). My research indicates that the field desires to transform, transgress, and transcend at least three of the traditional (normal) policies of the U.S. academy. First, it wants to transcend the rules of the academic system by removing disciplinary boundaries.101 Second, it intends to transform the rules of legitimate scholarship by conducting explicitly normative-prescriptive research and using it to inform real world practices. Third, it wishes to transgress the rules of being a scholar by condoning activist or advocacy-oriented agendas in the name of achieving a better world. For some in the field, peace studies’ main objective is nothing less than the “global transformation of the world.” This means that there are many unconventional and nonconformist agendas in peace studies, which decidedly defy the norms of U.S. academic culture. Most peace studies scholars accept the challenges that come from going against the grain of the academic discursive formation. But what does this mean for them and the field?

101 Dirks et al. (1994) contend that in the “transcending of the disciplines—a kind of creative disobedience—is taking place” (p. ix).
As demonstrated in chapters 1 and 2, peace studies is an expansive knowledge formation that shares and crosses borders with many different fields and areas of study. Peace studies, for instance, is a descendant of peace research. It is also a variation of peace education. Peace studies is related to peace science and easily transforms into items such as peace and justice studies, peace and conflict studies, peace and global studies, and peace and world order studies. Invariably, peace studies has produced an abundance of research in its sixty years in U.S. higher education. In addition to research, the field has been successful at establishing programs and courses in the United States. Despite growth in the number of programs and an abundance of published research, which seem to indicate success, peace studies is far from establishing itself as a valued part of the scholarly community within U.S. higher education.

Peace studies looks good on paper. But the field, all the same, suffers from a lack of scholarly legitimacy and visibility because of the three primary items described in the paragraph above—its desire to transform, transgress, and transcend the traditional (“normal”) policies of the U.S. academy. Although peace studies has a research and programmatic presence, it battles historical and contemporary perceptions of three items: (1) what qualifies as legitimate “scholarship” in terms of traditional disciplinary specialty, substantive content, agenda, and method, (2) what it means to be a “scholar” in U.S. higher education, and (3) what the study of “peace” should include in its parameters.

In 2002 (after fifty years in U.S. higher education), a meeting gathered to assess the state of the field, and concluded that “there were no conclusions” than beyond the generic “to make a better world by whatever method or methodology is appropriate” (p. 6). This project confirms this conclusion. The field suffers from a problem of coherence
that strikes at its core objects of knowledge, subject positions, and knowledge production. Yet, it also points to definitive commonalities in the shape of the three precepts of the field and the construction of \( P + 3 \). An opportunity exists for peace studies scholars to reconsider their relationship to the broader academic community through an examination (and possible repositioning or reframing) of their multiple subject positions. This will require an honest portrayal and reflective conversation about how scholars can go about “making the world a better place” within a university setting that imposes limitations on the range of scholarship and types of scholars it views as legitimate.
APPENDIX A

EXAMPLE OF GROUNDED-SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Questionnaire
Your answers to the following will help me in my dissertation study of the perception of peace scholarship within U.S. higher education. It will take roughly 15-25 minutes to complete this survey. All information will be kept confidential.

Part A: Location of Peace Studies
1. Do you consider peace studies to be a subfield within the field of international relations?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe:

2. Is international relations the best location for peace studies within higher education?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe:

3. Which discipline is the best location for peace studies?
   a. Anthropology
   b. Business
   c. Economics
   d. Education
   e. History
   f. Sociology
   g. Psychology
   h. Philosophy
   i. Political Science
   j. A combination of these disciplines
   k. None of the above
   l. Other:
4. Should peace studies be an *academic field of study* within U.S. higher education?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe:

   ______________________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________________

5. Should there be *doctoral programs* devoted specifically to peace studies?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe:

   ______________________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________________

6. What advice would you give a new graduate student who is intent on entering the subfield of peace studies?

   ______________________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________________

7. Is peace studies an appropriate major for *undergraduate students* within *higher education*?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe:

   ______________________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________________
Part B: Recognition of Peace Studies

8. What is your level of exposure to peace studies scholarship?
   a. High
   b. Medium
   c. Low
   d. None at all

9. What percentage of international relations scholarship does peace studies represent?
   a. 91-100%
   b. 81-90%
   c. 71-80%
   d. 61-70%
   e. 51-60%
   f. 41-50%
   g. 31-40%
   h. 21-30%
   i. 11-20%
   j. 0-10%

10. What percentage of your parent discipline does peace studies represent?
    a. 91-100%
    b. 81-90%
    c. 71-80%
    d. 61-70%
    e. 51-60%
    f. 41-50%
    g. 31-40%
    h. 21-30%
    i. 11-20%
    j. 0-10%

11. What percentage of peace studies scholarship is present within your work?
    a. 91-100%
    b. 81-90%
    c. 71-80%
    d. 61-70%
    e. 51-60%
    f. 41-50%
    g. 31-40%
    h. 21-30%
    i. 11-20%
    j. 0-10%
12. In your view, who are the top three peace studies scholars?
   a. _______________________________________
   b. _______________________________________
   c. _______________________________________

13. In your view, what are the top three academic programs devoted to peace studies?
   a. _______________________________________
   b. _______________________________________
   c. _______________________________________

14. Do you believe the programs listed in Question 13 are successful in their academic contribution to higher education?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Somewhat:
      _______________________________________

15. Please choose the top three journals from the list below.
   a. Peace & Change
   b. Peace Review
   c. Journal of Peace Education
   d. The International Journal of Peace Studies
   e. Journal of Peace Research
   f. Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology
   g. Peace and Conflict Studies
   h. The Journal of Conflict Resolution
   i. International Journal of Humanities and Peace
   j. Conflict Management and Peace Science
   k. Peace, Conflict, & Development
   l. Journal for Peace and Justice Studies
Part C: Contribution of Peace Studies

16. What is your opinion of the contribution of peace studies as a subfield within international relations?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low

17. What is your opinion of the contribution of peace studies within higher education?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low

18. Which of the following words in each group best describes the reputation of peace studies within international relations?

   **Group One:**
   a. Successful
   b. Satisfactory
   c. Unsuccessful

   **Group Two:**
   d. Failing
   e. Stagnant
   f. Developing

   **Group Three:**
   g. Dominant
   h. Somewhere in the Middle
   i. Marginal

   **Group Four:**
   j. Idealistic
   k. Practical

19. Which of the following words in each group best describes the reputation of peace studies within higher education?

   **Group One:**
   a. Successful
   b. Satisfactory
   c. Unsuccessful

   **Group Two:**
   d. Failing
   e. Stagnant
   f. Developing

   **Group Three:**
   g. Dominant
   h. Somewhere in the Middle
   i. Marginal

   **Group Four:**
   j. Idealistic
   k. Practical
20. Is future growth and development of peace studies within international relations feasible?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe:

21. What potential factors could influence its growth and development within international relations?
   a. ______________________________________
   b. ______________________________________
   c. ______________________________________
   d. No opinion

22. What potential factors could influence its demise within international relations?
   a. ______________________________________
   b. ______________________________________
   c. ______________________________________
   d. No opinion

23. Is future growth and development of peace studies within higher education feasible?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe:

24. What potential factors could influence its growth and development within higher education?
   a. ______________________________________
   b. ______________________________________
   c. ______________________________________
   d. No opinion
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25. What potential factors could influence its demise within higher education?
   a. ________________________________
   b. ________________________________
   c. ________________________________
   d. No opinion

26. What are the prospects of the future of peace studies within international relations?
   a. Very positive
   b. Positive
   c. Negative
   d. Very negative
   e. Not at all likely

27. What are the prospects of the future of peace studies within higher education?
   a. Very positive
   b. Positive
   c. Negative
   d. Very negative
   e. Not at all likely

28. Are there subdivisions within the subfield of peace studies? If so, what are they?
   a. Yes:
   b. No
   c. Maybe:
      ___________________________________________________________________

29. How do you rate the theoretical contribution of peace studies to international relations?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low
30. How do you rate the theoretical contribution of peace studies to higher education?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low

31. How do you rate the pedagogical contribution of peace studies to international relations?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low

32. How do you rate the pedagogical contribution of peace studies to higher education?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low

33. How do you rate the curricular contribution of peace studies to international relations?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low

34. How do you rate the curricular contribution of peace studies to higher education?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low
35. What is the level of need for peace studies in its current state within international relations?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low

36. What is the level of need for a revised version of peace studies within international relations?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low

37. What is the level of need for peace studies in its current state within higher education?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low

38. What is the level of need for a revised version of peace studies within higher education?
   a. Very High
   b. High
   c. Moderate
   d. Low
   e. Very Low

39. Which of the following groups is the most influential in determining the success of peace studies on university and college campuses?
   a. Students
   b. Faculty
   c. Administrators
   d. Other:

   ______________________________________________________________
Part D: Academics and Peace Studies

40. Are there courses offered in your program that focus specifically on issues of war?
   a. Yes
   b. No

41. Are there courses offered in your program that focus specifically on issues of peace?
   a. Yes
   b. No

42. Is an introductory peace studies course taught in your program?
   a. Yes
   b. No

43. What best defines your area of academic research (more than one item may be selected)?
   a. Anthropology
   b. Economics
   c. Education
   d. English/Literary Studies
   e. Ethnic Studies
   f. History
   g. Law
   h. Linguistics
   i. Peace Studies
   j. Philosophy
   k. Political Science
   l. Psychology
   m. Religion/Theology
   n. Sociology
   o. Technology
   p. Women’s Studies
   q. Other:

44. Which methods do you use in your work?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
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45. What area of IR scholarship is most important to your scholarship?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

46. If you could do it all over again, what would you do differently in your career?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

47. Please define peace studies.

____________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

DEFINITIONS OF PEACE STUDIES
(a) Peace Studies Scholars

- Interdisciplinary research and teaching aimed at the creation of a more peaceful and just world.
- The study of how to promote well-being in individuals and in the world, how to promote it without oppressing others.
- Peace studies encompasses an analysis of systems that perpetuate war, inequality and injustice and of the vision, theories, movements, and practices designed to transform them.
- As Paul Smoker defined in the mid-1990s
  - The study, practice, and advocacy of 'best practice' approaches to the development and perpetuation of systems of 'positive peace' at all levels, locally, domestically, and globally.
- Justice and Peace Studies is the transdisciplinary field that studies, researches and teaches about the structures and processes of building a more just and peaceful world.
- The study of the conditions that promote peace and diminish violence.
- Peace Studies is an interdisciplinary field of study that examines the problems of: (1) war and arms races, (2) social injustice at a local and global level. Peace Studies seeks to contribute to the solution of these problems through the study of: (1) conflict resolution, (2) conflict creation (nonviolent resistance), and (3) world community (global union).
- The study of organized violence, nonviolent alternatives, and conflict transformation.
- Promotion of human well-being, nonviolent values applied to not only human relations but also relations between humans and ecological systems.
- The development of a vision of a world in which all people are able to fulfill their basic human needs while attentive to the fulfillment of these needs by others, and the development of knowledge needed for the development of strategies for achieving this vision.
- The study of the possibilities, strategies for, conditions of, successful (and unsuccessful) conflict management and conflict resolution.
- Peace studies is inherently a normative project about the creation of a just, equitable, non-violent, and sustainable order.
- Analysis of conflict with the intention of developing strategies for its prevention, amelioration, and termination.
- That discipline which concerns itself with normative study of peace.
- A transdisciplinary theoretical, methodological and historical investigation of the preconditions for peace and the diminution of violent conflict.
- The study of the methods and means by which destructive structural conflicts, violence, and war can be avoided or controlled through peacekeeping and peacebuilding at the personal, group, regional, national, and international levels.
- The study of violence and peace.
(b) Peace Studies Program Directors

- Peace studies is the interdisciplinary examination of the conditions that make for peace and the obstacles to the realization of these conditions, drawing on theories and methods from diverse disciplines to focus on what makes for the development of a just and peaceful world order. Peace studies relates scholarship to practice.
- The study of justice by other means.
- As I indicated in my previous response, there are branches of peace studies that address issues of interpersonal and familial conflict, community relations, labor management conflict and the like. For our purposes, I would favor a definition that relates to world politics, something like: the study of war and other instances of collective violences and how to prevent them.
- An interdisciplinary field of study, grounded in a values orientation that promotes both positive and negative peace, and committed to the conviction that creative conflict transformation enhances the common good.
- An interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, STAND-alone study of social justice, and the processes by which it is achieved.
- The field of study for peace with justice (human rights) that provides skills in and devotes research to conflict resolution, human security, post-conflict reconstruction, reconciliation, rehabilitation and recovery, as well as culturally sensitive, gender-inclusive means to promote development and democratization that deals with the root causes of conflict.
- An interdisciplinary field focused on issues of conflict, war and peace and the pursuit of justice.

(c) Peace Science Scholars

- Area of studies that focus on the conditions that promote peace.
- The study of the causes, courses, and consequences of political conflict, and the conditions of peace.
- For the purposes of this survey, I consider it to be the quantitative study of conflict (and so peace) using statistics and formal models.
- Academic and practical investigation of the human interactions that reduce the risk of war.
- Study of causes and consequences of war vs. peace.
- Broadly--the community of scholars who study the causes, processes, consequences, and outcomes of conflict, typically with an ultimate goal of prescribing solutions for its alleviation.
- The search for a causal understanding of how conflicts are resolved--whether violently or not.
- The study of the processes by which actors resort to military force and violence as well as how those actors resolve their disputes.
- Study of peace (and war) with a normative focus.
APPENDIX C

KEY TO TABLE 4.1
To construct Table 4.1, I counted the number of times each word was used in the definitions. Peace studies scholars and program directors, for instance, included the word “teaching” two times in their responses. Needless to say, some of the words did not fit easily into the categories. Peace studies scholars and program directors, for example, did not use the word “war” seven times as the table indicates. Rather, “war” was only directly mentioned on five occasions, but two other terms, “arms races” and “negative peace,” were included in the total because I determined they were relevant to the category (see “War” below). Thus, instead of ignoring and discounting these less than obvious terms and phrases, I placed them into the categories that I deemed the most relevant and acceptable. The following is a list of the applicable categories from the table and the words/phrases that were placed into them—including the number of times each word or phrase was used.

- **Justice** (3): Just (4); positive peace (2); well-being (2); basic human needs (1); common good (1); culturally sensitive (1); democratization (1); equitable (1); gender-inclusive (1); inequality (1); injustice (1); peacebuilding (1); social injustice (1); social justice (1); without oppressing (1)

- **Peace** (7): Peaceful (3); human security (1); peacekeeping (1)

- **Conflict** (11): Post-conflict (1)

- **War** (5): Negative peace (1)

- **Violence** (5): Collective violence (1)

- **Nonviolence** (2): Conflict creation (1); nonviolent values (1)

- **Promote** (5) and **Transform** (3): Normative (2); advocate (1); movements (1); perpetuation (1); reconstruct (1); reconciliation; (1) rehabilitation (1); values-orientation (1)

- **Study** (12): Analysis (2); examine (2); investigation (1)
• **Strategies (3) and Practices (3):** Means (3); methods (2); approaches (1); perpetuation (1); processes (1); skills (1)

• **Develop (5) and Create (3):** Vision (3); building (1); possibilities for (1)

• **Research (3):** Theories/theoretical (3); knowledge (1); historical (1); methodological (1); scholarship (1)

• **Resolution (3):** Achieved (1); amelioration (1); realization (1); solution (1); termination (1)

• **Diminish (2) and Prevent (2):** Avoided (1); controlled (1); management (1); recovery (1)

• **Interdisciplinary (6):** Transdisciplinary (2); diverse disciplines (1); multidisciplinary (1)

• **World (7):** Global (2); international (1)

• **Individual (2) and Group (2):** Human (1); personal (1)

• **Systems (3):** Order (2); politics (1); structures and processes (1); structural (1)

• **Local (2):** Community (1)

• **Domestic (1) and Regional (1):** National (1)

• **Conditions (3):** Causes (1); preconditions (1)
APPENDIX D

KEY TO TABLE 5.2
To construct Table 5.2, I counted the number of times each word was used in the definitions. Peace science scholars, for instance, included the word “peace” five times in their responses. Needless to say, some of the words did not fit easily into the categories. Peace science scholars, for example, did not use the word “war” four times as the table indicates. Rather, “war” was only directly mentioned on three occasions, but another term, “military force,” was included in the total because I decided it was relevant to the category (see “War” below). Thus, instead of ignoring and discounting these less than obvious terms and phrases, I placed them into the categories that I deemed the most relevant and acceptable. The following is a list of the applicable categories from the table and the words/phrases that were placed into them—including the number of times each word or phrase was used.

- **Conflict** (2): Political conflict (1); how conflicts are resolved (1); resolve their disputes (1)
- **War** (3): Military force (1)
- **Research**: Investigation (1); search for understanding (1)
- **Quantitative Methods**: Statistics (1); formal models (1)
- **Practical** (1): Prescribing solutions (1)
- **Causes** (3): Causal (1)
- **Actors** (1): Human interaction (1)
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