

BLESSED ARE THE PEACEMAKERS
AND
THOSE WHO COMPASSIONATELY DO JUSTICE

“Peace appeals to the heart, studies to the brain. Both are needed, indeed indispensable. But equally indispensable is a valid link between brain and heart. And that, in a nutshell, is what peace studies and peace practice are all about.” (Johan Galtung)

In the past quarter century or so the United States Catholic bishops have issued two major pastoral letters, *The Challenge of Peace* (1983) and *Economic Justice for All* (1986). Both of these documents addressed issues tied directly to United States’ policies and programs during the 1980’s. The bishops’ first effort, *The Challenge of Peace*, raised questions specifically about the U.S. nuclear policies, even the policy of nuclear deterrence itself. And this was at a time when there was general consensus that nuclear build-up was the only way to structure foreign policy in the cold-war era. The other contribution of the bishops, *Economic Justice for All*, raised serious questions about the nation’s economic system, just when there seemed to be general economic prosperity—at the height of the Reagan presidency.

It was not unrealistic to hope that, as a possible sequence in this series, the bishops would have further explored the relationship between peace *and* justice. Perhaps more particularly, that they would have tackled the question whether peace is even possible without justice. There was some speculation at the time that they were indeed contemplating such a project; what resulted, however, was a tenth anniversary reflection on *The Challenge of Peace*, entitled *The Harvest of Justice Sown in Peace* (1993). This document is an appropriate memorial to its predecessor, but it does not—nor was it intended to—draw in any systematic way the relationship between peace and justice, a relationship that has been discussed extensively in peace studies and peace literature over the last quarter century.¹

The purpose of this article is to note the direction this discussion on the relationship between peace and justice has in fact taken over the last three or so decades. In pursuit of this objective, we will explore four dimensions encompassing this topic: 1) recent literature on the meaning of peace and violence and the relationship between the two; 2) peace as the absence both of direct, personal violence and of indirect, structural violence; 3) the absence of structural violence further as the presence of justice; 4) peace lastly as the presence of harmony. Having explored these various dimensions of peace and violence, our conclusion should read something like this: peace is simultaneously both the absence of violence *and* the presence of justice, resulting in a sense of harmony. Describing peace as the absence of violence, we are to understand not only direct, personal violence (war, terrorism, abuse, street killings, rape, abuse, torture, etc.), but also indirect structural/systemic violence (hunger, homelessness, disease, repression, exploitation, discrimination, etc.). Finally, the absence of structural violence has as its corollary the presence of justice; thus the continual refrain, “there is no peace without justice.”

I. PEACE AND VIOLENCE.

Over the last several decades, dating especially from the publication of an article by Johan Galtung, one of the most influential thinkers in the field of peace research and conflict resolution, there has been a lively, ongoing discussion in peace literature on peace not only as the absence of war but more universally as the absence of *all* violence.² As Galtung wrote in that seminal piece,

...It will soon be clear why we are rejecting the narrow concept of violence—according to which violence is *somatic* incapacitation, or deprivation of health, alone (with killing as the extreme form), at the hands of an *actor* who *intends* this to be the consequence. If this were all violence is about, and peace is seen as its negation, then too little is rejected when peace is held up as an ideal. Highly unacceptable social orders would still be compatible with peace.”³

Given this hypothesis Galtung was led inevitably to add another element to the notion of peace, namely, peace also as the absence of structural violence (other “social orders”). He thus proceeds to posit as a second essential component the distinction between personal and structural violence:

...Violence becomes two-sided, and so does peace conceived as the absence of violence. *An extended concept of violence leads to an expanded concept of peace...*Peace also has two sides: *absence of personal violence, and absence of structural violence...*We shall refer to them as *negative peace* and *positive peace* respectively.”⁴

Although Galtung prefers the terms ‘personal violence’ and ‘structural violence’ when describing peace as the absence of violence, he also suggest a viable alternative using the terms *negative* and *positive*: “...the absence of personal violence does not lead to a positively defined condition, where as the absence of structural violence is what we have referred to as social justice, which is a positively defined condition (“egalitarian distribution of power and resources...”⁵) Galtung’s particular and special contribution to the discussion on peace and violence, therefore, is his *distinction between personal violence and structural violence*. In effect this distinction lays the groundwork for describing peace not only *negatively* (the absence of violence) but also *positively*—the presence of (social) justice. As one commentator puts it:

Negative peace signifies the absence of war, a desirable condition although it is frequently accompanied with a stalemate, where warring parties are at “peace” but hostilities and threats remain. Positive peace indicates the presence of justice and peace values, such as nonviolent conflict resolution skills and a genuine respect for human dignity...The distinction between negative and positive peace does not suggest a conflict between them; rather, they comprise a larger whole that combines absence of war with realization of justice. An effective philosophy of peace connects the two understandings by raising awareness about the causes of war and the barriers to non-violence, while building the skills needed to create a world defined by economic, gender and racial equality...”⁶

Some year later Birgit Brock-Utne, in her reflection on feminist perspectives on peace, makes her own Galtung’s distinction between negative peace and positive peace: “negative peace exists when there is absence of personal, physical and direct violence, while positive peace exists where there is the absence of indirect or structural violence.”⁷ At the same time, however, Brock-Utne pushes beyond Galtung in two areas. First of all, she suggests a further distinction within the category of ‘positive peace,’ namely, “...between indirect (structural) violence leading to a shortened life span and indirect violence which

reduces the quality of life.”⁸ Secondly, she offers a further differentiation within the categories of both positive peace and negative peace, depending upon whether the violence (personal/negative or structural/positive) is *organized* or *unorganized*. And so in her scheme *unorganized negative violence* would be exemplified through such harmful activities as domestic violence (child, spouse, elder abuse), rape, random street killings, etc., while war, terrorism, execution, torture, etc. would be examples of *organized negative violence*.⁹

On the other side, Brock-Utne describes *unorganized positive (structural) violence* as “inequalities in micro structures leading to unequal life chances,” or “repression in micro structures leading to less freedom of choice and fulfillment.”¹⁰ And so, for example, these microstructures produce the feminization and “childrenization” of poverty, as well as discrimination against women and minorities. *Organized positive violence*, finally, is the inevitable result at the macro-level of either “economic structures built up within a country or between countries so that life chances of some are reduced, or of political structures which result in repression in a country of free speech, the right to organize, etc.”¹¹ Brock-Utne’s distinction effectively may be viewed both at the *micro-level*, where structural violence is of a more unorganized kind and at the *macro-level*, where significant organized violence occurs.

Now, if we take Galtung’s earlier distinction between personal and structural violence, and add to that the refinements proposed by Brock-Utne, I think we have a quite penetrating and expansive description of traditional categories of peace and violence. This approach to defining peace and violence enables us to see clearly the systemic relationship between personal (direct, negative) and structural (indirect, positive) violence. Our next step is to explore more in depth these two dimensions of peace and its absence.

II. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONAL AND STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE

Our focus in this section will be the systematic analysis of the combined perspectives of Galtung and Brock-Utne. Violence is personal, direct and physical (negative), but violence is also structural, indirect and psychological (positive). Traditionally, however, we have been less inclined to take into account this second dimension (structural). As Galtung himself notes:

...It is not strange that attention has been focused more on personal than on structural violence. Personal violence *shows*. The object of personal violence perceives the violence, usually, and may complain—the object of structural violence may be persuaded not to perceive this at all. Personal violence represents change and dynamism—not only ripples on waves, but waves on otherwise tranquil waters. Structural violence is silent, it does not show—it is essentially static, it *is* the tranquil waters. In a *static* society, personal violence will be registered, whereas structural violence may be seen as about as natural as the air around us...”¹²

As is obvious from the traditional approach to peace studies, it has generally concentrated on peace as the absence of war, or on other factors—religious, political, economic—that cause war. But it is equally apparent that the definition of peace as the absence of war (and a priori, other direct forms of violence) is unacceptable. To be sure, war and the other direct forms of organized, personal, direct violence represent tragic examples of violence; but as our reflections make clear, there is untold violence that has no direct, easily identifiable agent. It is not necessary to probe very deeply before identifying large segments of society who are malnourished, or starving, or diseased—all forms of real violence which maim and

kill as surely as do wars. But this kind of violence (suffering) is less direct, since it results from those social structures which make food, education, health care and other basic needs unavailable to many worthy citizens. At the same time these very resources are readily available—and often in abundance—to the majority of society’s members. These forms of violence we know are the result of failed social structures, impersonal, indirect, but no less real.

The conclusion should be self-evident: studies in peace and peace-making need to focus attention not only on war, terrorism, street killings, execution, torture (all patent, concrete, direct acts of violence), but to turn the spotlight as well on that violence (hunger disease, manipulation, repression, discrimination) which is the (direct) result of generally accepted social structures (racist, sexist, xenophobic, homophobic). To repeat the theme, peace studies must engage one not only in studying war and its causes, but also in the study of development, social justice and their complex processes. To quote Galtung again,

...Peace conceived of in this way is not only a matter of control and reduction of the overt use of violence, but of what we have elsewhere referred to as ‘vertical development.’ And this means that peace theory is intimately connected not only with conflict theory, but equally with development theory. And peace research, defined as research into the conditions—past, present and future—of realizing peace, will be equally intimately connected with conflict research and development research; the former often more relevant for negative peace (absence of personal violence) and the latter more relevant for positive peace (absence of structural violence), but with highly important overlaps.¹³

To repeat the mantra of this essay, “there is no peace without justice.” And that is the particular focus of the following section of our study.

Before moving on to that discussion, however, I would like to conclude this section on personal and structural violence with some reflections on the relationship between what are now referred to as the masculine and feminine concepts of peace and security. Much has been written in the last few decades about feminism and peace studies:

Feminine perspectives on peace are of relatively recent origin, with most of them emerging in the 1980’s and later. The coalescence of the women’s movement and the peace movement as well as the feminist critique of the constructs and methods of individual social sciences played a key role in giving birth to them... It is facile to identify seven areas (of feminist influence), although they are not mutually exclusive. First, feminism has helped broaden the concept of peace and development by introducing the variable of gender... Second, feminism has contributed to the refashioning of the agenda of peace education by taking on sexually determined socialization... Third, feminists have put forward peace-intensive notions of politics, power, security and constructed peaceful social utopias... Fourth, they have also added another dimension to the critiques of militarism by crystallising the relationship between gender and militarism, or patriarchy and war... Fifth, they have provided a powerful critique of everyday language, particularly strategic discourse... Sixth, some feminists have come up with an alternative set of ethical ideas based on nurturing and a relational world-view. Finally, the differential effects of conflict on men and women, and the marginalization of women in conflict resolution and peace processes have also been brought to the centre of peace studies...¹⁴

Without pursuing each of these contributions in detail, although the author does so in the above article, I would like to summarize what I think are differentiating gender approaches to peace studies, namely, masculine and feminine approaches to *peace* and to *security*.¹⁵ From the *masculine* perspective, peace is seen as the absence of war *and* the *prevention* of armed

conflict. This is equivalent to our preceding description of *negative peace*. Following this understanding, *security* from the male perspective is seen as protection from the aggressor and defense against armed conflict. It seems clear from this notion of security that the *national defense* posture is only a short step away:

...(War) serves two security functions and may be pictured as an iceberg, one part of which is visible and the other hidden in deep waters. The first corresponds to the defense against external danger (that is, the real flesh and blood enemy), while the other, the hidden part, corresponds to an unconscious security maneuver against terrifying fantasy entities which are not flesh and blood but represent an absolute danger (as experienced, for example, in nightmares) which we could call the "Terrifier."¹⁶

The down-side of this method of pursuing national security is both too dangerous ("cold war," etc.) and too costly. And so we need to rethink approaches to achieving peace and maintaining security.

From the *feminine* perspective, *peace* and *security* are perceived in significantly different terms. The feminist approach more nearly parallels our earlier discussion about *positive peace*, that is, the presence of justice, economic equity and ecological balance. These conditions would be more truly peaceful because they would be more life-affirming and less likely to produce the types of conflict which lead to armed violence and war.

Women have been taking lead roles in defining social concepts and global issues in areas such as development, democracy, human rights, world security and the environment... Women have therefore contributed significant efforts in movements for peace in diverse cultural, social and geographical contexts. Women are highly visible in peace building groups and initiatives... Polls show that women oppose budget increases in military expenditures and deployment of new weapons more frequently than men... It is therefore common to think of women as being pro-peace. Women in general have sometimes been characterized as "natural pacifists" with a "proverbial" interest in peace...¹⁷

On the related issue of *security*, again the distinction between a *masculine* view of the world, where the values are more organizational, competitive and exclusive, and a *feminine* view, where the values tend to be familial, nurturant, and inclusive, becomes significant. In short, the gender difference on security is stark: masculine equals protection from attack; feminine equals fulfillment of fundamental human needs. The very emphasis on military security over other forms of security (world order values that meet basic human needs) marks the stark difference in perspectives. Betty Rearsen writes:

World order studies inquire into the possibilities for abolishing war and developing a peaceful and human global order. This inquiry offers the greatest potential for the integration of feminism and feminist perspectives into both peace research and the political struggle for peace... The concept of world order studies... provides a normative approach to global problems. It projects and evaluates alternatives to the present system that could achieve world order values and open possibilities for the evolution of a more peaceful and just social order... the five world order values (are) economic equity, social justice, ecological balance, political participation, and peace...¹⁸

This reflection on the relationship between masculine and feminine perspectives on peace and security is particularly engaging because, among other things, it emphasizes again from another vantage point the critical need to distinguish between peace in its negative dimension, the absence of personal violence, and peace in the positive perspective, the absence of structural violence. Finally, whether from the viewpoint of Galtung (personal and

structural violence), or Brock-Utne (negative and positive violence) or Reardon (masculine and feminine perspectives), we need to affirm as both complementary and mutually reinforcing this notion of peace as the absence of personal violence *and* the absence of structural violence. Our next objective is to demonstrate that the absence of structural violence is effectively the presence of justice: *there is no peace without justice*.

III. PEACE AS THE PRESENCE OF JUSTICE

From our analysis thus far, it becomes increasingly clear that the distinction between *personal* (direct, negative) violence and *structural* (indirect, positive) violence points up simultaneously the two sides of peace, namely, *negative peace* (absence of personal violence) and *positive peace* (absence of structural violence). To phrase it differently, as the notion of violence is expanded, so too is the notion of peace. Our objective in this section is to draw together more systematically these two sides both of violence and of peace. To introduce the topic, we can easily see that, on the one hand, in order to achieve peace as the absence of *personal* violence, it is necessary (sufficient) that enemies, combatants and antagonists abide by treaties, truces, laws, etc. Otherwise the perpetrators of personal violence will be dealt with violently themselves—execution representing the ultimate punishment. To achieve positive peace (absence of *structural* violence), on the other hand, is a quite different matter.

A simple exercise perhaps will help explain the reason for the stark inconsistency in addressing these two forms of violence. Let us change our description of positive peace from the “absence of structural violence” to the “presence of (social) justice.” With this change, however, we also face the formidable challenge raised by a corresponding question: What is social justice and how is it achieved? Clearly, there is no way that we can address this question adequately in this short essay. I raise it, however, because this question confronts those interested in peace studies with the magnitude of making peace and of doing justice (“Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God” (*Mt. 5,10*). Let me suggest that one approach to the question of justice is to talk about it as the fair distribution of the benefits and burdens of society among its members, as Galtung phrases it, “the egalitarian distribution of power and resources.”¹⁹ Using either of these descriptions of social justice, two key areas seem to open up, namely, *freedom/liberty* and *needs/justice*. Our shorthand for this complex set of ideas might well be a phrase from the “pledge of allegiance,” *with liberty and justice for all*.

Under the heading of *liberty* (freedoms), any general comment would need to include the notion of “fairness”: no discrimination, no repression, no exploitation. In our earlier discussion of Brock-Utne’s scheme, this facet would resonate with her phrase “reduced quality of life.”²⁰ Accordingly, repressive structures which curtailed the basic freedoms would be targeted, since they “do real violence” to worthy citizens. Likewise, under the category of *justice* (needs), an appropriate response would have to guarantee fundamental or basic needs: food, shelter, health-care, education—as a minimum. Again, to follow Brock-Utne’s scheme, this category would parallel structural violence which “shortens the life span.”²¹ Accordingly, social structures which create basic inequalities (lack of equal opportunities) would be the direct target of the peacemaker. A direct example of such injustice would be economic structures in society which systematically benefit the “haves,”

increasing both their numbers and their wealth, while at the same time further depriving the “have-nots,” leading inexorably to growing population of the poor and poorest.²²

To sum up, in both of these instances, whether of social structures which systematically repress, or of social structures which create glaring inequalities between member of society, the issue is truly one of violence, “...when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations.”²³ It is the case that through such structural inadequacies persons experience either a diminishment in the quality of their lives, or their life-spans are significantly shortened. Furthermore, there is no valid reason to affirm that *structural* violence amounts to less suffering than *personal* violence. In fact, in some ways it may be worse, since generally “good” people by simply doing nothing—through ignorance, indifference or unconcern—allow incredible violence/suffering to endure. Paradoxically, these conditions in a curious, almost retaliatory fashion goad such neglected citizens themselves into personal, direct, physical violence because of hopelessness and despair. And the cycle continues as the demands for law and order, incarceration and execution inexorably follow. Meanwhile structural violence continues virtually unabated.

To conclude this section, what becomes increasingly clear from these brief reflections on peace and justice is that the true pacifist, that is, peacemaker (*pacem facere*) not only may not *cause* (do) violence (direct, personal), but must also struggle mightily against those social structures which by their very nature exploit, repress and diminish worthy citizens. In all of this the traditional notion of pacifism/peacemaking is greatly enhanced and extended. Not only is peace-making effectively not acting violently (non-violent action), that is, the absence of personal violence; it is also concrete and positive action—always non-violent—designed specifically to both resist the agents and perpetrators of personal violence *and* at the same time to confront the social structures and systems which silently manipulate, incapacitate and otherwise diminish and marginalize worthy and decent citizens. Indeed, “whatever you do to the least of my brethren...” This is the challenge and weighty task of making peace and doing justice.

COROLLARY: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JUSTICE AND COMPASSION

It has been my intention throughout this essay to always connect the (mega) virtue of *justice* with the closely related theological virtue of love or *compassion*. One can imagine at least three different issues that need to be addressed when reflecting on the relationship between justice and compassion (*caritas*):

- 1) *Conflicting* human dispositions: suffice it to suggest reflecting on the theological issue of the relationship between God’s justice and God’s *mercy*. I do not intend in this short essay to engage this particular question.
- 2) *Complementary* human dispositions: justice in this sense represents the theory of rights and corresponding systemic inadequacies, whereas compassion points to, as it were, concrete *works of mercy* (e.g., working/volunteering in a soup kitchen, etc.)
- 3) *Compassion as the pathway/catalyst to Justice*: what I intend by this description is that effectively justice and compassion are two really different virtues, dispositions or

characteristics. To some extent they are complementary. Compassion (Latin = “to suffer/feel with) is generally characterized through action (alleviating the other’s pain/suffering. Justice on the other hand seems to deal with analysis of systems that create unfair gaps leading to suffering/violence. The word “pathway” was suggested by the following quote:

I think compassion is probably the doorway to justice. I think performing works of mercy helps people see the need for justice...For example, taking a small group...to serve dinner at a homeless shelter exposes people in that small group to the reality of injustice in the world of homeless men, women and children...When a person performs a work of mercy he/she is offered the chance to look more deeply into existing systems which may have brought the need for his compassionate action. If the person never had the chance to perform the work of mercy, perhaps the truth of injustice would never have made itself apparent to him/her.²⁴

In conclusion I would like to note that as critical as justice is for the well ordering of society, it is best analyzed and implemented through the disposition of caring or compassion. We need this attitude of “caring for all living things,” as Buddhism counsels, to really take justice seriously. It is truly in performing works of mercy (care, compassion) that we may be helped to see the need for justice. Herein lies the value of volunteerism and, in particular, the new pedagogy of service learning.

IV. PEACE AS THE PRESENCE OF HARMONY.

Our discussion so far has focused on peace as the absence of something: the absence of personal violence and the absence of structural violence. True, it was noted that the absence of structural violence can be otherwise described as the presence of justice. It is also central in concluding these reflection to affirm another positive, namely, that peace is also the *presence/experience of harmony*. Analyzing this dimension of peace leads us to the realization that there are at least two directions in which harmony points, *personal/internal* and *social/external harmony*. It is the development of each of these areas that will occupy us for the remainder of this essay.

1. *Internal Personal Harmony*. By definition this dimension of the general sense of harmony is concerned with personal, internal serenity and tranquility—being at *peace* with(in) oneself. Traditionally this is the state of mind or personal condition which seems to be the goal of every religion and most humanist philosophies, whatever their comprehensive myth or master narrative, In Hinduism the goal for the *raja* ascetic was *Samadhi*, a state of total and full consciousness where one completely transcends time and space (materiality) to become one with Brahman. In Buddhism the state of *nirvana* represented total self-transcendence, the end-term of dedication to the eightfold noble path. In Zen, *satori* was the anticipated state of the extended process of meditation, leading to total union or oneness—no dualities, not even life and death. In the West, though Christians were not generally invited to its heights, mystical union, through intense experiences of purification and enlightenment, was the end-term of the mystical journey. In both Judaism and Islam, such experiences as those described for other religions were also open to believer in these faith traditions, the *kabalah* for the Jew, and *Sufism* for the Muslim. All of these stories offered to their devotees a transcendent state of harmony, tranquility, serenity, contemplation, or union with the infinite.

Perhaps the contemporary expressions of humanistic philosophies, and their vocabulary of self-actualization, self-realization, transpersonal union, and similar descriptions are the modern parallels to (religious) mystical experience. Whatever the ideal of personal harmony, humans seem to experience that unique restlessness which no finite reality seems able to still. Perhaps St. Augustine's classic adage is uniquely appropriate, "the heart is restless (*cor inquietum*) until it rest in Thee. Contemporary humans may need to think deeply about "restlessness" and the void or vacuum that gnaws at us—even when we have *everything*. One cannot help but wonder about the long term effects of this spiritual void or vacuum. In the final analysis, if there is no peace within ourselves, can there be peace in the society which we are? A Chinese proverb says it well:

If there is righteousness in the heart, there is beauty in the character.

If there is beauty in the character, there will be harmony in the home.

If there is harmony in the home, there will be order in the nation.

If there is order in the nation, there will be peace in the world.

2. *External Social Harmony.* Each of us is not only an individual, autonomous person, but also a member of larger and larger social units (city, state, nation), and ultimately citizens of Earth. The resultant challenges for external harmony should not be difficult to assess. At the local and national levels we are talking about the just society, that is, the absence of personal and structural violence. The very description of such personal and social harmony raises questionable inklings of utopia when dystopia seems the reality. And yet for the Christian Jesus hope-filled plea rings out loudly, "Holy Father, protect them in your name... That they may be one, as We are one" (*Jn.* 17, 11).

The second dimension of external social harmony looks to world order. Paralleling individual autonomy and social harmony, national autonomy (nationalism) is always cast in the context of the larger union of nations. Perhaps for the first time in history contemporary humanity is beginning to see the reality of interdependence. Declarations of independence, from any reliable evolutionary perspective, are anachronistic. World order obviously will not happen tomorrow, since nationalistic tendencies are urges that need to play themselves out in various parts of the globe, but the final goal must truly be the union of nations within the human family. Hints of utopia? If social harmony seemed ultra-idealistic, what shall we say about world order? And yet, whether we want to or not, we are being forced by geopolitical forces to reinvent the structures of world government so as to provide for a viable United Nations (Union of Nations).

Finally, the question is about ecological balance and planetary harmony. Another challenge of the future is for humans to live responsibly in sustainable relationship with all over living beings on Earth. External, social harmony in the final analysis can be described as a series of concentric circles leading progressively to planetary harmony. Not only must we humans learn to live together, less disunited we perish, but we must live together here—on Earth. This is our true home (*exos*). We have entered what Thomas Berry has termed the *ecozoic era*, a radically novel moment in evolutionary history. We seek—indeed seek nothing less than *PEACE ON EARTH*.

ENDNOTES

1. See Bibliography, p. 11
2. “Johan Galtung, a Norwegian academic, is universally hailed as one of the most influential thinkers in the field of peace research and conflict resolution... In 1981 he advanced a new theory on violence and its various manifestation in modern society. This theory articulated the difference between direct and structural violence.” See Eamon Sweeney, “Ballot Paper and Elysium,” in *Journal of Protest and Dissent*, <http://www.phoblacht.net/ballotpaperses.html>, p.1
3. Galtung, Johan, “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research,” *Journal of Peace Research*, 6 (1969), p. 167-191.
4. *Ibid.*, 168.
5. *Ibid.*, 183. As one author remarks: “If we say that a child has been murdered, this is as a consequence of direct (personal) violence. However, if we say that children die as a result of poverty, then this is as a result of an inherent flaw in the societal structure. That is to say, children have died as a result of structural violence.” See Sweeney, Eamon, *op.cit.*, p. 1.
6. Mirra, John, “Peace and the Myth of Pax Americana,” *CPP Newsletter*, 24 (2004), pp. 1-2. See <http://benezet.org/phpnuke/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=11>.
7. Brock-Utne, Birgitt, “Peace Education in an Era of Globalization,” *Transcend*, Feb. 2004, p. 5. See www.transcend.org/t_database/articles.php/ida=290.
8. “Linking the Micro and Macro in Peace and Development Studies,” In *The Web of Violence* (eds. Jennifer Turpin & Lester Kurtz). Chicago: University of Illinois, 1997, p. 150.
9. *Ibid.*, 151-152.
10. *Ibid.*, 154. Note also the following quote: “...The new definition of peace then included not only the abolition of macro level organized violence, such as war, but also doing away with micro level unorganized violence, such as rape in time of war or in the home. In addition the concept of structural violence was similarly expanded to include personal, micro- and macro-level structures that harm or discriminate against particular individuals or groups. This feminist peace model came to include all types of violence, broadly defined, against people, from the individual to the global level, arguing that this is a necessary condition for a peaceful planet.” Linda Groff and Paul Smoker, “Creating Global-Local Cultures of Peace,” p. 4. See <http://www.gmu.edu/academics/pcs/smoker.htm>
11. *Ibid.*, 154 .
12. Galtung, Paul, *op.cit.*, p. 173
13. *Ibid.*, 183
14. Moolakkattu, Stephen John, “Feminism and Peace Studies: Taking Stock of a Quarter Century of Efforts,” *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, 13; 137 (2006), pp. 139-140. See: <http://ijg.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/13/2/137>.
15. See Reardon, Betty, *Sexism and the War System*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse U. Press, 1996. See especially pp. 26-36.
16. I have been unable to locate the source of this quote. It is either from Johan Galtung or a commentator on his work.
17. Yesufu, Adenike, “Women and a Culture of Peace,” p. 1

- <http://www.peace.ca/womenandaculture.htm>.
18. Reardon, Betty, *op.cit.*, p. 26.
 19. See above, n. 5
 20. See above, n. 8
 21. *Ibid.*
 22. It would be advantageous to explore the relationship between this discussion on the *presence of justice* and the study of human rights (cf. the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and its regular updates). The specific purpose would be to link the fact of human rights with the fundamental reality of human dignity. See David Hollenbach, *Claims in Conflict: Retrieving and Renewing the Catholic Human Rights Tradition*. New York: Paulist Press (1979), especially chapter 2 and the diagram on p. 98
 23. Galtung, *art. cit.*, p. 168.
 24. Paul Luikhart, "How I'm Going to Get my Master's Degree," p. 3. See <http://thejustlife.org/home/2008/01/31/compassion-vs-justice-how-im-going-to-get-my-mast>
-

SELECTED READING LIST

- Barash, David (ed.). *Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies*. New York: Oxford, 2000..
- Barash, David and Charles Weber. *Peace and Conflict Studies*. One Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2002.
- Brock-Utne, Britt. *Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Peace Education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1989.
- *Education for Peace: A Feminist Perspective*. New York: Pergamon, 1985.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Women and War*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.
- Galtung, John. *Transcend and Transform: An Introduction to Conflict Work*. London: Pluto Press, 2004.
- *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development & Civilization*. London: Sage Publications (PRIO), 1996
- *The True Worlds*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1980
- Groff, Linda. "A Holistic, Evolving View of Peace, with Implications for Development," *Journal of Globalization for the Common Good*. See <http://lass.calumet.purdue.edu/cca/jcgc/2007/fa/07/jcgc-fao7-groff.htm>
- Groff, Linda and Smoker, Paul, "Creating Global-Local Cultures of Peace" See: <http://www.gmu.edu/academic/pcs/smoker.htm>
- Reardon, Betty. *Sexism and the War System*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse U. Press, 1996.
- *Educating for Global Responsibility: Teacher Designed Curriculum for Peace Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.
- Smoker, Paul; Davies, Ruth; Munske, Barbara (eds). *Reader in Peace Studies*. New York: The Free Press, 1990.

-
- Tickner, J. Ann. *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era*. New York: Columbia U. Press, 2001.
- Turpin, Jennifer and Kurtz, Lester (eds). *The Web of Violence: From Interpersonal to Global*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997.
- Young, Iris Marion. "The Logic of Masculine Protests: Reflections on the Current Security State," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 29, 1 (2004), pp. 1-25

Hugh McElwain
Professor of Theology
Dominican University
River Forest, IL 60305
mcelwnhu@dom.edu

6/25/08