BELLIGERENT PEACE

Chidiebere C. Ogbonna

**Department of Development Studies,
Kampala International University
Box 20000,
Ggaba Road, Kansanga
Kampala
UGANDA**

Chidiebere C. Ogbonna is lecturer in Development Studies at Kampala International University, Uganda. He specializes in ethnic and religious conflict management; social development, human rights, and well-being. He holds a B.Sc, in Business Management from Federal University of Calabar, (Nigeria), a BBA from Central Ostrobothnia University of Applied Sciences, (Finland), an M.Sc. in International Management from Gotland University, (Sweden), and a Doctorate in International Peace, Conflict and Development Studies from UNESCO Chair of Philosophy for Peace, Universitat Jaume I (Spain).

This article proposes the concept of *belligerent peace:* **the creation and maintenance of subjugation over a people or the environment using violence, such as oppressive police or the use of economic coercion to keep a population in check and unable to reach fulfillment. This oppression is justified to maintain the** *status quo.* **Peace lacks a generally accepted definition and it is often used, abused, and manipulated to achieve different ends.**

After the Cold War a new twist to the concept of peace developed: the expansion of peace NGOs and the advent of peace work as a career. This new labor sector changed the general perception of peace from an inherent responsibility of humanity to a job for monetary gain. Such peace "professionals" do their work for peace with conflicts of interest. Similarly, the quest by states and the international community to maintain peace and security has led to the adoption of violence and economic sanctions to maintain order. Real peace is thus a mirage under a belligerent peace.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of peace has been an issue of concern since the beginning of humanity. However, it became a real focus after WWII. Although WWI brought tremendous destruction and death, WWII was physically and emotionally devastating and the concept of peace became a mantra among world leaders. The need for peace and the determination to circumvent another world war gave rise to the establishment of the United Nations (UN) in 1945. The UN became a replacement for the ineffective League of Nations, which was founded at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 under the Treaty of Versailles.[1] The purpose of the UN, according to its Charter, is "to maintain international peace and security; to develop friendly relations among nations; to cooperate in solving

international economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems and in promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; and to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in attaining these ends."[2] Peacekeeping is the primary concern of the United Nations. The organization helps negotiate peace treaties and occasionally dispatches soldiers to help with peacekeeping missions across the world.

The post-Cold War era illuminated the professional aspect of *peace*, with numerous institutions of higher learning offering programs in peace and in conflict studies. Having a career in the field of peace became a trend, with a number of people identifying themselves as peace workers (peace-builders and peace facilitators), students of peace, and peace researchers.[3] By implication, *peace* became some sort of industry that absorbs employees and, as a result, the real meaning of peace is compromised. The advent of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) added to the incertitude surrounding the concept of *peace* and its de-facto meaning. In the 1990s, numerous NGOs—particularly from the Western countries of the United States, Canada, Australia and Europe—were established, with many of them focusing on peace-building in postcolonial and post-war African states. This development created employment opportunities for Western peace expatriates, volunteers, and locals who were gainfully employed under the auspices of peace-workers. The emergence of peace NGOs, changed many people's perception of peace from an inherent obligation of mankind[4] to a phenomenon of monetary gain to exploit.

> After WWII, having a career in the field of peace became a trend... By implication, peace became some sort of industry that absorbs employees and, as a result, the real meaning of peace is compromised.

Arguably, NGOs have proved to be an important development partner; nevertheless, the "pay-for-peace-concept" implies that peace workers will render their services in piecemeal—a case where services are rendered in consideration and in comparison with the value of paycheck. Another issue is the expatriate or academic value placed on peace-building. Well established NGOs often rely on the use of acclaimed peace-building experts and professionals, and in so doing, they undermine the capability of the ordinary people in making peace. The Gacaca court in post-genocide Rwanda, albeit

with reservations proved that peace-building is not a function of academic prowess. NGOs' immense reliance on academic professionals for peace-building does not provide the structures needed for peace to flourish. The ability and the potential of the locals and otherwise ordinary people to build peace in their own way and in line with their values and desires are oftentimes undermined. Instead of peace-building emanating from the people based on their needs and aspirations, it is imposed on them by expatriates who assume to understand what is best for the local people and, as a result, the locals are always faced with the challenges of adopting and adapting to a "foreign peace." This is not to deny the fact that NGOs have done a lot of good work in supporting the ordinary people in their desperate situations such as in time of war or deadly epidemic. Observably, NGOs now fill a gap where world-powers and the international community are unable to function in terms of mediating unconventional warfare such as terrorism. However, the adverse impact of the professional aspect of peace (monetizing peace-building) is that NGOs and peace-workers/researchers may promote violence in order to safeguard their paychecks. In essence, a paycheck becomes the ultimate motive, and talking about peace as means to that personal end, rather than the ultimate end being peace itself.

> **Instead of peace-building emanating from the people based on their needs and aspirations, it is imposed on them by peace workers who assume to understand what is best for them and, as a result, the locals are faced with the challenges of adopting and adapting to a "foreign peace."**

For example, NGOs access grants, mainly by proposing their research in a way that it appeals to the grant giver, whose motives might be personal or ideologically based. Thus, the NGO/peace researcher is forced to develop a "scientific" justification for grant, based on the ideology of the grant giver. Similarly, when states are the provider of grants, peace research often follows the interests of national elites who award such grants; accordingly the NGO/peace researcher becomes an instrument of the regime—championing the regime's agenda knowingly or unknowingly. Furthermore, the doctrine of state sovereignty and non-interference in the domestic affairs of other states seems to promote the role of NGOs. NGOs often provide states

with the opportunity to influence or interfere in the affairs of other states by proxy. NGOs supposedly mean not-for-profit non-governmental organizations. However, it is often difficult to separate NGOs from the government, considering the fact that most NGOs, particularly in impoverished countries, are funded by donor agencies directly connected to governments. In all, whether it is about safeguarding paychecks or playing a subtle accomplice to a grant giver/donor whose motives may not be constructive, this suggests that peace and its de-facto meaning has become a vehicle of force.

In order to engage in the peace discourse, it is crucial to examine the antipode of peace, which is violence. According to Galtung, peace research should not merely address the narrow narrative of ending or minimizing violence at a direct or structural level, rather it should seek to deepen understanding of conditions for averting violence. To understand violence, there is need to review how it comes about, and that brings us to the concept of *conflict*.

> **Whether it is about safeguarding paychecks or playing a subtle accomplice to a grant giver/donor whose motives may not be constructive, this suggests that peace and its de-facto meaning has become a vehicle of force.**

Conflict is defined as a struggle or contest between people with opposing needs, ideas, beliefs, values, or goals. In a broad perspective, it may be considered as the incompatibility of subject positions.[5] Incompatibilities may be between individuals or groups and the source could be differences in opinion, interest, beliefs and perhaps other factors.[6] Based on this definition, conflict is not always characterized by violence; nonetheless, conflict may escalate and create damaging outcomes in the form of physical violence that is increasingly seen as legitimate as conflict intensifies.

However, conflict can be positive; if the incompatibilities are well managed, it can forge a new social or political alliance and therefore become productive.[7] Peace practitioners, scholars, and researchers appear to be in disagreement between peace and violence, which is inherent in human nature. Macharia Munene, in his *Generic Peace and The Peace: A Discourse* argues that violence is a norm in human existence; while peace is the outcome of human effort, hence we often associate ourselves with

peace-building or peacemaking. The logic here is that one builds or makes something that is not in existence. Another scholar, Robin Fox, disagrees with this notion, and argues that human nature is innately peaceful, however, humans react violently due to the "frustration-aggression-hypothesis."[8] Fox's argument implies that peace is the original state of human nature, but derailed by frustration. Fox called this the "disease" approach to violence, whereas the normal human state is nonviolent. He added that people are concerned about violence and assign it to instinctual human nature because it is unusual; humans are mostly attracted to things that are unusual, hence we look for the causes of divorce, but never for the causes of marriage, for the causes of crime, but seldom for the causes of virtue, for the causes of violence and war, but rarely for the causes of peace.[9] This is because we seek to deepen our understanding of the unusual phenomenon. Be that as it may, our understanding of violence and its correlation with human nature influences our perception and comprehension of peace.

Given the manipulations, misconceptions, misinterpretations and con-fusion surrounding it, *peace* has lost its real meaning. Today, the use of force, aggression, and violence is considered as peace-building, as long as the proponents of such narrative are powerful enough to force it down the throat of others. Even though their approach to peace may be hostile, they say it will eventually result to peace. Hence, subjugation of the powerless is considered as attainment of peace. Besides, the mechanisms for realizing peace both at the domestic and international levels are marred with the use of force and coercion, thus resulting in *belligerent peace*.

UNDERSTANDING THE CONCEPT OF PEACE

As Johan Galtung noted, "An important task in peace research has always been and always will be the exploration of the concept of peace."[10] Despite a significant array of literature in the area of peace and peace studies, there is no consensus or generally accepted definition of *peace*. Consequently, there is no conceptually clear definition to guide researchers in developing measurement procedures and indicators for peace.[11] Thus, peace has become elusive in terms of definition and meaning. Baljit S. Grewal explains that *peace* conjures up images of harmony and bliss in a psychological, social, and political sense.[12] These images however, seem to conflict with the reality of

a chaotic and non-harmonious world. In 1969, Sugata Dasgupta proposed a noteworthy insight on the conceptualization of peace with the notion of "peacelessness," which refers to the situations especially in developing countries, where in spite of the absence of war, human beings are suffering just as much from poverty, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, discrimination, oppression, and so on, as from war.[13]

Dasgupta's notion countered the earlier understanding of peace as the absence of war. His proposal suggests that even in the absence of conventional warfare, people are subjected to other forms of war. According to Johang Galtung, "any concept of peace includes the absence of direct violence between states, engaged in by military and others in general, and of massive killing of categories of humans in particular. But peace would be a strange concept if it did not include relations between genders, races, classes and families, and did not also include absence of structural violence, the non-intended slow, massive suffering caused by economic and political structures in the form of massive exploitation and repression. And the absence of the cultural violence that legitimizes direct and-or structural violence."[14] Galtung's definition and understanding of peace covers a broad area and it highlights aspects of human relationships that could result in the breach of peace. However, it is worthwhile to note that Galtung's views on peace changed from causes and effects of direct, structural, and cultural violence to a broadened focus on contemporary issues in peace research, such as the environment.

> **Peace would be a strange concept if it did not include relations between genders, races, classes and families, and did not also include absence of structural violence, the non-intended slow, massive suffering caused by economic and political structures in the form of massive exploitation and repression.**

Another scholar, Vincent Guzman of the UNESCO Chair of Philosophy for Peace, Castellon-Spain, proposed that peace should not be perceived in a singular term, rather it should be considered in its plural form "peaces."[15] Guzman's argument is based on the fact that peace is relative and as such it should not be considered as a definite phenomenon. The argument

seems forthright. In January 2017, I gathered 150 students of Kampala International University, Uganda and inquired from them their understanding of peace or precisely what peace means to them. About 90 percent of the students had a different perception and meaning of peace. In line with Guzman, peace is relative and should be considered in its multi-faceted form. An often neglected issue when conceptualizing peace is its evolving nature. Scholars and researchers have always viewed peace to be static and unvarying. Contrarily, as a person's economic, social and political status evolves, so do his/her understanding and meaning of peace. During the colonial era, the meaning of peace to the colonial masters differs from that of their colonial subjects. To the former, peace means not challenging the order as designed while to the later peace signifies independence and an escape from colonial oppression. However, shortly after independence the economic, social and political class of the colonial subjects that took over the helm of affairs evolved and, as a result, their understanding and meaning of peace also changed to suit their newly acquired status. In colonial Africa, the colonial masters established the police to suppress and subdue the indigenous people and stop them from rising up against their peace. In postcolonial Africa, one will expect things to be different, but instead the same colonial subjects that abhor the *peace* of the colonial masters, who happened to assume control of government retained the same colonial peace maintenance mechanisms—in this case the colonial police. This happened because their understanding and meaning of peace evolved with their newly acquired status and realities. Having transformed from colonial subjects to a status of leadership, they needed to put the population under control and the answer to this need was to retain the colonial police against the wish of the people. This shows that peace is evolving as well as transformative.

CLASSIFICATIONS OF PEACE

Different authors and schools of thought have classified peace into different categories with the aim of deepening, as well as expatiating the conventional understanding of peace. Example is Johan Galtung, who classified peace into two categories, *Negative* and *Positive Peace*. In Galtung's view, *Negative Peace* refers to "the absence of violence. When, for example, a ceasefire is enacted, a negative peace will ensue. It is negative because something

undesirable stopped happening. For example, the violence stopped, the oppression ended, however, there is the presence of other forms of violence—structural and cultural violence."[16] It is a situation where there is no direct violence, yet people are constrained from achieving their full potentials either by government policies or other restraining structural factors. On the contrary, *Positive Peace* can be summed up as justice for all. It does not only mean the absence of violence, but it further emphasizes the presence of justice to everyone indiscriminately. Positive Peace therefore, is a situation where all forms of structural and direct violence are eradicated and social justice is delivered to each and every individual in the society in an equal and indiscriminate manner.[17] Furthermore, it refers to fair distribution of power and resources allocation and where people can literally attain their full potential without impediments resulting from direct and structural resistance. It imagines such a society where all forms of discriminations, inequalities and violence are absent and the society is built upon the foundations of cooperation, harmony, tolerance and respect. At the same time, it does not imply the elimination of conflict, rather the inevitability of conflict is always present. The main difference is that the conflicts arising from positive peace are managed on the basis

> **Positive Peace is a situation where all forms of structural and direct violence are eradicated and social justice is delivered to each and every individual in the society in an equal and indiscriminate manner.**

of cooperation and rational reasoning among the parties in a constructive way and considering the legitimate demands of each party mostly through structural reforms. Thus, positive peace may be considered as cooperating with one another to attain social prosperity through collective efforts.

In a further complication, it appears that different terms are sometimes used to describe the same concept. For example, Michael Lund while proposing what he referred to as the circle of conflict, came up with the terms "Unstable Peace, Stable Peace and Durable Peace."[18] These terms are used to describe the state of a relationship between nations or groups within nations. As a conflict evolves, these terms are used to describe the transformation stages in a changing relationship. For example, Lund defined "Unstable Peace" as a situation in which tension and suspicion

among parties run high, but violence is either absent or only sporadic. A *Negative Peace* prevails because although armed force is not deployed, the parties perceive one another as enemies and maintain deterrent military capabilities.[19] Thus, Galtung's Negative Peace and Lund's Unstable Peace seem to vary only in appellation and not in semantics. Furthermore, "Stable Peace" is a relationship of negative and/or suspicious communication and limited cooperation in areas, such as trade within an overall context of basic order or national stability. Under "Stable Peace," differences in value or goal exist, however, there is absence of military cooperation, whilst disputes are resolved through non-violent mechanisms, and the potential of war is minimal.[20] Lund perceives "Durable Peace" to be a situation of high level reciprocity and cooperation, and the virtual absence of self-defense measures among parties, although they may form a military alliance against a common threat. Albeit *Positive Peace* and *Durable Peace* share a lot in common, Lund explains that Positive Peace prevails based on shared values, goals, and institutions such as democratic political systems and rule of law, economic interdependence, and a sense of international community.[21] Lund supported his argument by referring to the relations among countries of the European Union as an example of Durable Peace. In comparison with Positive Peace, Durable Peace seem to focus on relationship between states, whereby there is non-existence of conflict and political tension among states, whereas Positive Peace emphasizes a broader perspective, incorporating the state of relationship among citizens and an inherent need for social justice.

Macharia Munene of the United States International University (USIU), Nairobi, classified peace into *Generic Peace* and *The Peace*, whereby *The Peace* means adherence and maintenance of the status quo as designed by the elite and the ruling class in the society. It means to accept order, stability and compliance with statutes that favors the interest of the political class.[22] As a result, popular agitation and social strife are considered to be anti-peace. And thus, to maintain *The Peace*, the political elites adopt brutal mechanisms as a way to keep the underclass and otherwise larger population in check. *The Peace* therefore, implies protecting the interest of the political elites at the expense of the subjects or marginalized population. On the other hand, *Generic Peace* suggests justice, fairness, and the absence of oppression and exploitation.[23] It seems to be in line with Galtung's *Positive Peace*, whereby peace is anchored on the presence

and preservation of social justice. However, as *Generic Peace* eludes the subjects, they tend to make good with *The Peace*. They endure oppression and social injustice with the hope to achieve *Generic Peace* at the end. In essence, the subjects accept *The Peace*, which emphasizes the welfare and interest of the political class as a situation they must endure in order to accomplish their ultimate goal, which is to have *Generic Peace*. Thus, *The Peace* means peace of the political class, while *Generic Peace* means peace of the subjects or the larger population.

BELLIGERENT PEACE

As noted earlier, peace is multi-faceted and its meaning is relative. Thusly, the classification of peace into Negative, Positive, Stable, Unstable, Durable, Generic and The Peace is an effort to capture and describe the complicated and ever-changing nature of peace. In this regard, *belligerent peace* is the creation and maintenance of subjugation over a people and perhaps the environment using the apparatus of violence, such as police brutality—arrest and unlawful detention, military assault, the use of machineries and forms of economic coercion to keep a population in check and out of reach of their self-actualization. It illustrates an oppressive social and structural mechanism that safeguards the narratives of the powerful elites against the interest and aspirations of the subdued and marginalized populations. It is the justification of violence, brutality, and domination incognito for peace. *Belligerent peace* undermines the happiness and fulfillment of the people and neglects the supporting structures of peace, considered here as the "pillars of peace."[24]

A range of issues from aggression, abuse of power, violation of human rights and the rule of law, nuclear proliferation, to support of terrorism threatens international peace and security. Consequently, the international community, regional organizations and individual states have employed different strategies in responding to these threats. One approach that has been highly favored in addressing threat to and/or breach of international peace and security is economic sanctions. The adoption of economic coercion as a tool of international relations started after World War I, with a proclamation by the then-U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, when he suggested to the League of Nations that the adoption of sanctions would help keep the

world free of war. In his words, sanctions are "peaceful, silent, deadly remedy that no modern nation could resist."[25] The question is: if sanctions can help keep the world free of war, what type of peace will it foster? Chapter VII of the UN Charter titled "action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression" gives the Security Council the power to determine an action deemed to be a threat to international peace and security. Under Articles 39 through 43, it further empowers the Security Council to take either military or non-military action, in order to restore international peace and security.[26] The above provisions of the Charter may have clandestinely empowered the Security Council to employ economic sanctions, under non-military measures to deal with threats to international peace and security. The United Nations on its part refers to sanctions as a "tool for all seasons." They are often seen as alternative to military action,[27] aimed to control the excesses of an offender, which is usually a State government, an individual or group. The rationale for adopting sanctions is the hope to resolve a conflict without mass suffering and other negative consequences inherent in warfare. However, reality shows that economic sanctions are not alternative to war judging by their humanitarian impact.

The adoption of economic coercion as a tool of international relations started after World War I, with a proclamation by the then U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, suggesting to the League of Nations that the adoption of sanctions would help keep the world free of war.

Instead, their impact on civilians is often similar to those produced by warfare. The United Nations, the United States, and regional organizations such as the EU, African Union, and others have explored sanctions as an option to address threats to international peace and security. In other cases, they have been used to express dissatisfaction or signal displeasure by one state to another.

The use of sanctions to address threat to international peace and security and gross violation of human rights by the international community dated back to 1966, when the UN imposed its first comprehensive economic sanctions against the white racist regime led by Ian Smith in Southern Rhodesia, followed by sanctions against the apartheid regime in South

Africa. UN sanctions against the aforementioned regimes in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa were perceived to be successful. The euphoria of using sanctions partially or wholly in achieving compliance in the behaviors of these regimes earned sanctions a monumental position in international relations. If I may say, it was overwhelming to use "ordinary" sanctions to remove the apartheid regime from power. Thus, it fueled the assumption that if it can succeed in South Africa, then it will succeed elsewhere. Apart from Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, sanctions are believed to be instrumental to forcing Tehran to the negotiation table over its nuclear program. Thus, sanctions have served as a useful instrument in coercing some of the world's most brutal regimes. Despite being instrumental to achieving set goals in the aforementioned and in other cases not mentioned, there are issues with using economic coercion for the purpose of peace. One of the issues is that they manifest negative outcomes on the welfare and well-being of the civilians or otherwise innocent population. The political theory of economic sanctions is to limit resources available to a regime on which sanctions are imposed; the expected result is to force the regime to accept the policies for which sanctions are imposed. To achieve this goal, the party imposing sanctions intentionally harms the civilian population of the sanctioned State by reducing their access to basic needs. The assumption is that imposing economic pressure and hardship on the civilian population will induce them to revolt against their regime and possibly force the regime to adhere to the demands of the party imposing sanctions. Thus, the implicit theory of sanctions is to use civilian pain/suffering to achieve political gain, by instigating economic stagnation or retrogression on the economy of a targeted state, economic sanctions inflict poverty and destitution on the population, limit their potentials for self actualization, breach their peace and happiness, and thus produce *belligerent peace*.

Even though they may coerce states to reform, economic sanctions have negative outcomes on the welfare and well-being of the civilians or otherwise innocent population. This is a *belligerent peace.*

Apparently, employing sanctions for the purpose of peace is often aimed at putting pressure on the target to influence a change in his/her behavior

over an issue believed to be contrary to acceptable standards such as support for terrorism, nuclear proliferation, rights violation, aggression/violation of state sovereignty and related issues, but at the same time, it inflicts pain and harm on the population who perhaps made no contribution to the issues that resulted in sanctions. When sanctions are adopted, the expression that is often used is "target State" or "offending nation."[28] The above expression imputes collective culpability on the entire population of a targeted state and provides indirect justification for imposing collective punishment or collateral damage. The expression "collateral damage" expresses the idea that civilian victims of military attacks are a regrettable but unavoidable by-product of legitimate warfare, as long as the attacks are justified by the principles of necessity and proportionality and do not specifically target civilians.[29] Unlike military warfare, the weapon of economic sanctions is incapable of discriminating between the individuals propagating obnoxious policies and civilians. It is leveled on the economy of the target State composed mainly by the civilian population. While the immediate purpose of armed warfare is to destroy military facilities and armed forces, the immediate purpose of economic sanctions is to cripple the economy, thereby inflicting

> **The criticism of comprehensive economic sanctions, led to the adoption of "targeted sanctions," those aimed at specific individuals, groups and entities responsible for the objectionable policies or behavior.**

suffering, hardship, discomfort, and disharmony on the civilian population. In this regard, even when sanctions achieve intended peace or facilitate change in the behavior of target, it does not take away the fact that they are always brutal on the wider population and as such they foster *belligerent peace*. Even in cases where mitigation measures are applied, they often fail to significantly reduce the negative impact of sanctions on the population simply because, if they do, then the whole essence of the sanctions will be defeated. Mitigation measures aim to sustain the hardship imposed on the population and not to get them out of it.

The criticism of comprehensive economic sanctions led to the adoption of "targeted sanctions." This brand of sanction is designed to target specific individuals, groups and entities responsible for the objectionable

policies or behavior. Theoretically, targeted sanctions make intuitive sense and seem to address the major criticisms against comprehensive sanctions. In this case, only the wrongdoers will face the consequences of sanctions whilst the civilian population will be spared. Unfortunately, targeted sanctions have been vaguely implemented and their impact always spill over to affect unintended targets. The U.S. and EU sanctions against former Zimbabwean President Robert Mugabe and his associates were said to be targeted sanctions, which means that their impact was supposed to be limited to Mugabe and his allies, yet they had regrettably negative impact on the rights, welfare, and well-being of the entire population. While targeted sanctions are less injurious to the population than comprehensive economic sanctions, they are not without negative effects. Most targets, be they individuals or groups, do not function in isolation, rather they are embedded in a system that involves other people. As such, the effects of a targeted sanctions cannot be entirely isolated to the target. Accordingly, sanctions as a whole be it comprehensive or targeted manifest humanitarian concerns. In Iraq, sanctions contributed to the death of thousands of Iraqi's including children, while in Zimbabwe, Iran, Cuba and other cases, they had

> **The U.S. and EU sanctions against former Zimbabwean President Robert Mugabe and his associates were said to be targeted sanctions, limited to Mugabe and his allies, yet they had a negative impact on the rights, welfare and well-being of the entire population.**

significant negative impact on the economy, leading to untold hardship on the population. As such, even when sanctions are successful in achieving their set goals, *vis-a-vis* restoring or maintaining international peace, they leave the target population in enmity—a clear evidence of *belligerent peace*.

CONCLUSIONS

The concept of *belligerent peace* focuses on the adoption and use of economic sanctions for the purpose of addressing threats to international peace and security. It examines the role of sanctions in addressing international incompatibilities and conflicts against its odious humanitarian outcomes.

This study was inspired by the notion that peace in its real sense can only be achieved by peaceful means and not the contrary. The narrative "peace is synonymous with war" is awkward. Contrary to the misconception that "if you want peace you get ready for war," empirical findings in peace research presents a more reliable notion that "peace is the only way to peace." Therefore, the use of a violent approach and mechanism such as economic sanctions for the purpose of peace or to deter violence/ aggression in our contemporary world is problematic, because they manifest negative humanitarian consequences and as such cannot promote peace in its real meaning but instead fosters *belligerent peace*. The study concludes that peace is multi-faceted as well as evolving; its propagation must be centered on peaceful means and approaches of which economic coercion is not considerable.

Notes

1.   Treaty of Versailles signed on 28 June 1919 in Paris, was the most important of the peace treaties that brought World War I to an end. The Treaty brought to an end the war between Germany and the Allied Powers.

2.   Charter of the United Nations, under Chapter I: Purposes and Principles: Article 1, states that the Purposes of the United Nations are: to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace; To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace, among other purposes.

3.   Macharia Munene, "Generic peace and the peace: a discourse," *Journal of Language, Technology and Entrepreneurship in Africa*, Volume 1, Number 2, 2009. pp. 218.

4.   Peace is an inherent obligation of mankind, in that it is something every human should ascribe to in order to achieve a happy and worthy life on earth.

5.   Diez et al., "The European Union and Border Conflicts: The Transformative Power of Integration," *International Organization*, Volume. 60, Number. 3, pp. 565.

6.   Emily Pia and Thomas Diez, "Conflict and Human Rights: A Theoretical Framework," *SHUR Working Paper Series, SHUR WP 1/07*, January 2007, pp. 2.

7.   Ibid, p. 6.

8.   The frustration-aggression hypothesis was proposed by Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mower, and Sears (1939). According to this view, frustration, which is defined as "the state that emerges when circumstances interfere with a goal response," often leads to aggression. Research indicates that frustration is more likely to lead to aggression if the aggressive behavior helps to eliminate the frustration. Arnold H. Buss in 1963 had college students experience one of three types of frustration—failure to win money, failure to earn a better grade, or failure on a task. All three groups showed more subsequent aggression than a control group that was not frustrated. An indication that frustration is a factor that leads to aggression.

9.   Robin Fox, *The Challenge of Anthropology: Old Encounters and New Excursions,* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1995, pp. 87 - 90. See also paper presented by Robin Fox at International Conference on Drinking and Public Disorder, organized by MCM Research, Available at. http://www.sirc.org/publik/foxviolence.html.

10. Johan Galtung, "Social Cosmology and the Concept of Peace," *Journal of Peace Research,* Volume 18, Number 2, 1981, pp. 183.

11. Anderson Royce, "A Definition of Peace," *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, Volume 10, Number 2, 2004, pp. 101.

12. Baljit S. Grewal, "Johan Galtung: Positive and Negative Peace," Auckland University of Technology, Available at. http://www.activeforpeace.org/no/fred/Positive_Negative_Peace.pdf.

13. Dasgupta Sugata, "Peacelesness and Maldevelopment: A New Theme for Peace Research in Developing Nations," *Proceedings of the International Peace Research Association Second Conference*, Assen, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Comp, Volume 2, 1968, pp. 19.

14. Johan Galtung and Dietrich Fischer, *Johan Galtung: Pioneer of Peace Research*, New York: Springer, 2013, pp. 173.

15. Vincent Martinez Guzman, "Knowledge for Making Peaces: Epistemologies for Peace Studies," *Filosofia Para Hacer Las Paces* (Barcelona: Icaria Editorial, S.A, 2001), pp.75, as presented in the course reader for the course: Introduction to Peace, taught by Dr. Fatuma Ahmed Ali, Spring 2011, Univeristat Jaume I, Castellon Spain.

16. Ayindo Babu and Jenner Janice, *Training of Trainers Manual: Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding in Rwanda*, USAID, Burlington: Center for Justice and Peacebuilding, 2008, pp. 2.

17. Johan Galtung, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research*, Volume 6, Number 3, 1969, pp. 169.

18. Mitchell O'Brien, Rick Stapenhurst and Niall Johnston, *Parliaments as Peacebuilders in Conflict-affected Countries*, Washington D.C: The World Bank, 2008, pp. 13, footnote 2.

19. United States Institute of peace. Available at. http://www.usip.org/training/online/analysis/2_3_1.php. See also, Thomas J. Ward, "The International Peace Highway: Reflections on its Role for World Peace," *Journal of Unification Studies*, Volume 11, 2010, pp. 199-210.

20. Ibid, pp. 10.

21. Ibid, pp. 9-10.

22. Macharia Munene, "Generic peace and the peace: a discourse," *Journal of Language, Technology and Entrepreneurship in Africa*, Volume 1, Number 2, 2009. pp. 221.

23. Ibid.

24. Pillars of peace are the institutional structures needed for peace to prevail and flourish in a given state; they include adoption of democracy, independence of the judiciary, well trained police and a civilized civilian population.

25. Carter Barry, "International Economic Sanctions: Improving the Haphazard U.S.," *California Law Review*, Volume 75, Number. 4, 1999, pp. 1169. See also, Gordon Joy, "Economic Sanctions, Just War Doctrine, and the 'Fearful Spectacle of the Civilian Dead,'" *Cross Currents*, Volume 49, Number 3, 1999, pp. 124.

26. Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice, 1985.

27. De-Goede Marieke, *Speculative Security: The Politics of Pursuing Terrorist Monies*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012, pp. 177.

28. Davidsson Elias, "The mechanism of economic sanctions: changing perceptions and euphemisms," 2002, pp.8. Available at: http://aldeilis.net/english/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2010/05/2877_econsanc-debate.pdf .

29. Ibid.

References

Ayindo Babu and Jenner Janice, *Training of Trainers Manual: Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding in Rwanda*, USAID–Rwanda, Burlington: Center for Justice and Peacebuilding, 2008.

Carter, E. Barry, "International Economic Sanctions: Improving the Haphazard U.S.," *California Law Review* 75, no. 4 (1999): pp. 1162-1278.

Dasgupta Sugata, "Peacelessness and Maldevelopment: A New Theme for Peace Research in Developing Nations," *Proceedings of the International Peace Research Association Second Conference*, Assen, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Comp 2, (1968): 19-42.

Davidsson Elias, "The Mechanism of Economic Sanctions: Changing Perceptions and euphemisms," 2002. Available at: http://aldeilis.net/english/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2010/05/2877_econsanc-debate.pdf (Accessed 16/03/2017).

De-Goede Marieke, *Speculative Security: The Politics of Pursuing Terrorist Monies*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, (2012).

Diez Thomas, Stetter Stephan and Albert Mathias, "The European Union and Border Conflicts: The Transformative Power of Integration," *International Organization* 60, no. 3 (2006): 563–593.

Fox Robin, *The Challenge of Anthropology: Old Encounters and New Excursions*, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1995.

Galtung Johan, "Social Cosmology and the Concept of Peace," *Journal of Peace Research* 18, no. 2 (1981): 183-199.

Galtung Johan, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research* 6, no. 3 (1969): 167-197.

Galtung Johan and Fischer Dietrich, *Johan Galtung: Pioneer of Peace Research*, New York: Springer, 2013.

Gordon Joy, "Economic Sanctions, Just War Doctrine, and the 'Fearful Spectacle of the Civilian Dead,'" *Cross Currents 49*, no. 3, (1999): pp. 387-400. www.crosscurrents.org/gordon.htm (July 7, 2017).

Grewal S. Baljit, "Johan Galtung: Positive and Negative Peace," Auckland University of Technology, 30 August 2003, Available at. http://www.activeforpeace.org/no/fred/Positive_Negative_Peace.pdf (Accessed 15/02/2017).

Guzman M. Vincent, "Knowledge for Making Peaces: Epistemologies for Peace Studies," *Filosofia Para Hacer Las Paces*, Barcelona: Icaria Editorial, S.A, 2001.

Munene Macharia, "Generic peace and the peace: a discourse," *Journal of Language, Technology and Entrepreneurship in Africa* 1, no. 2 (2009): 218-228.

O'Brien Mitchell, Stapenhurst Rick and Johnston Niall, *Parliaments as Peacebuilders in Conflict-affected Countries*, Washington D.C: The World Bank, 2008.

Pia Emily and Diez, Thomas "Conflict and Human Rights: A Theoretical Framework," *SHUR Working Paper Series*, SHUR WP 1/07, January

2007, Available at: http://shur.luiss.it/files/2008/10/shurwp01-07.pdf (Accessed: 04/06/2017).

Royce Anderson, "A Definition of Peace," *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 10, no. 2 (2004): 101 – 116.

United Nations, *Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice*, New York: United Nations, (1985).

Ward J. Thomas, "The International Peace Highway: Reflections on its Role for World Peace," *Journal of Unification Studies* 11, (2010): 199-210.