1 2 9 0

UNIVERSIDADE Ð COIMBRA

Luis Octavio dos Santos Gouveia Junior

IT IS TIME FOR PEACE:
EXPLORATORY RESEARCH ON THE STUDY OF PEACE EMERGENCE.

VOLUME 1

Julho de 2022

FACULDADE DE ECONOMIA
UNIVERSIDADE Ð COIMBRA

1 2 9 0

IT IS TIME FOR PEACE:
EXPLORATORY RESEARCH ON THE STUDY OF PEACE EMERGENCE.

Luis Octavio dos Santos Gouveia Junior

VOLUME 1

Dissertação no âmbito do Mestrado em Relações Internacionais –
Estudos da Paz, Segurança e Desenvolvimento, orientada pelo
Professor Doutor Bernardo Teles Fazendeiro e apresentada à
Faculdade de Economia da Universidade de Coimbra para
obtenção do grau de Mestre.

Julho de 2022

Para Jorge Vittal de Resende "Kury" (in memorium), que para mim foi como um avô que sempre acreditou que eu apresentaria meu trabalho para a Universidade de Coimbra.

Acknowledgments

Epigraph

<div align="center">A Paz que eu não quero</div>

(...)
A minha alma está armada
E apontada para a cara do sossego.
Pois paz sem voz, não é paz,
É medo.

<div align="right">Marcelo Yuka ("O Rappa")</div>

Abstract

English: Recent research has identified that peace studies have focused extensively on violence and the causes of war. In a moment of crisis within the discipline, turning the focus to the causes of peace could arguably open space for innovative research. To that effect, this study consists of exploratory research. It interrogates how the study of the causes of peace can open space for new inquiries and hypotheses. Thus, I confronted mainstream international relations theories (neorealism, neoliberalism, and constructivism), peace studies, and two theories about the causes of peace. These two theories are the democratic peace theory and, what I labeled, civilizing processes theory. Among the theories and authors analyzed, I found that constructivism and civilizing process theory are the two most promising theories for innovation. Since the two theories look at how culture and identity forge peace, I coined three possibilities for innovation: 1- to study the formation of collective identity and a culture of peace; 2- the study of peaceful countries; 3- methodological approaches like historical or discourse analysis. To test empirically if these three hypotheses really offer space for innovation, I analyzed the publications of the Journal of Peace Research, the most important academic journal of the discipline. As result of the analysis, I found a substantial shortage of studies about the countries considered to be the most peaceful and about how culture influences peace. As expected, constructivist and civilizing process concepts have been underused among scholars. These findings can offer a valuable contribution to furthering research based on the causes of peace as opposed to the causes of war and violence.

 Keywords: Peace; Civilizing Process; Peaceful Countries.

Português: Pesquisas recentes têm identificado que os estudos para paz têm focado excessivamente na violência e nas causas da guerra. Num momento de crise dentro da disciplina, mudar o foco para as causas da paz poderia abrir espaço para novas e inovadoras pesquisas. Desta forma, esta pesquisa apresenta-se como um estudo exploratório. Seu objetivo é interrogar como estudar as causas da paz pode abrir espaço para novos questionamentos e hipóteses. Para isto, apresento neste trabalho uma confrontação entre as principais teorias das relações internacionais (neorealismo, neoliberalismo e construtivismo), os estudos para a paz e duas teorias propõem explicações para a emergência da paz. Estas são a teoria da paz democrática e a teoria do

processo civilizatório. Entre todas as teorias e autores analisados, encontrei que a teoria construtivista e a teoria do processo civilizatório são as duas mais promissoras a nível de inovação. Uma vez que as duas teorias olham para como questões culturais e identitárias forjam a paz, eu cunhei três possibilidades de inovação: 1- o estudo da formação de identidades coletivas e de uma cultura de paz; 2- o estudo dos países ditos "mais pacíficos"; 3- abordagens metodológicas como análise histórica e de discurso. Para testar empiricamente se estas três hipóteses realmente jogam luz em métodos e teorias sub-utilizadas nos estudos para a paz, analisei as publicações do Journal of Peace Research, o mais importante jornal acadêmico da disciplina. Como resultado desta análise, encontrei uma substancial ausência de estudos sobre os países considerados mais pacíficos e sobre como questões culturais influenciam a paz. Como esperado, conceitos construtivistas e do processo civilizatório são subutilizados por acadêmicos. Estas descobertas oferecem uma contribuição valiosa para pesquisas futuras que foquem nas causas da paz, ao invés do enfoque nas causas da guerra.

Palavras-chave: Paz; Processo Civilizatório; Países Pacíficos.

List of Abbreviations

EU – European Union

IR - International Relations

JRP - Journal of Peace Research

UNODC – United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime

US – United States.

List of Tables

Index

Chapter 1- Introduction

In the last hundred years, the search for peace has led to the emergence of the discipline of International Relations and of Peace Studies. This theme has preoccupied some of the most influential scholars of the last century. The aforementioned is evident by the fact that prominent scholars Albert Einstein and Sigmund Freud chose to discuss the theme of peace in their letters exchanged after the Second World War. If with the supposed "end of history" after the Cold War came great optimism about the proliferation of liberal peace, the persistence of conflicts in the global south and the recent Russian invasion of Ukraine would show the failure of the belief that peace was already a certainty. The resurgence of a discourse of nuclear confrontation and head-on collision between NATO and Russia has again brought, especially in Europe, the urgency of discussing peace. Germany announced a reinvestment in armaments, breaking its pacifist policy since the end of the Second World War. NATO is preparing for yet another expansion process. While I am writing this manuscript, Finland and Sweden have already announced their desire to join the organization, creating more tension between the allied countries of NATO and Russia, perhaps amounting to a life-threatening nuclear war. In this context of warmongering re-emergence, this thesis seeks to contribute to peace studies by finding spaces for academic innovation and investigative fragility.

In addition to the international reality, another factor which has contributed to the formulation of this thesis is a potential need to reformulate peace studies. Once the Cold War ended, Patomaki (2001:723) identified the need for a "partial redefinition of the task of peace research and, in particular, new theoretical ideas, ideas which take into account the methodological and ethical-political lessons learned in the past decades." In agreement with Patomaki, Jutila, Pehkonen and Vayrynen (2008) call for the need to "resurrect" the discipline of peace studies. According to the authors, the discipline has become too focused on the logics of power and traditional research models (Jutila, Pehkonen and Vayrynen, 2008). It is noteworthy to mention that even Johan Galtung, a pioneer in the discipline, recognized the excessive focus on power politics in peace organizations (Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand, 2014). Meanwhile, Mac Ginty (2006:32) criticizes the focus on low-quality peace, where researchers do not seem concerned with understanding how to create a solid and deep form of peace.

However, there is another proposal for the reorientation of peace studies, which this work will seek to deepen. This proposal, advanced by Jorgen Johansen (2006:37, brackets added), is that "to produce new knowledge about how to handle conflicts without the use of violent means, their [peace researcher's] focus must be to study cases where the stakeholders in the conflicts have not turned to armed struggle". In other words, Johansen defends the need to study the mechanisms of peace. Johansen assesses that peace research requires this reformulation. This proposal breaks with the current paradigm of peace studies. As Wallensteen (1988) argues, peace studies is the discipline that studies violence. Johansen (2006:31) agrees with this statement but believes that it does not need to remain true in the future of the discipline. For him, peace studies must turn their focus to the processes that make conflicts be resolved through peaceful means.

Indeed, many authors have attested Wallensteen's claim that peace studies focus excessively on the causes of violence and conflict to the detriment of the study of the causes of peace (Gleditsch, Nordkelle and Strand, 2014; Diehl, 2016). In the leading academic journal focusing on these issues (Journal of Peace Research, JPR), there are more articles that use the words conflict and war than the word peace (Gleditsch, Nordkelle and Strand, 2014; Diehl, 2016). Diehl (2016) reached the same conclusion whilst analyzing conferences and seminars on peace and violence. Furthermore, it is much easier to find academic books about the various forms of violence, rather than about pacifism or peace between states (Gittings, 2012). John Gittings (2012:8) even recognizes that part of the scholars "show a strangely emotive dislike of the arguments of peace". Douglas Fry (2004 apud Gittings 2012:8) goes even further affirming that "[a] substantial number of people do not like the idea that peaceful societies exist".

In fact, this view is not new. In 1981, Wiberg had already identified the lack of works focused on peaceful societies. In 1978, David Fabbro would conduct an isolated attempt to analyze such societies. At the time, Fabbro had already mentioned the refusal of some authors to admit that peace can exist. The focus on the sources of violence can be identified both in the work of traditional international relations and peace studies theorists. Kenneth Waltz (1959:2), one of the most important scholars of International Relations, would say that "to explain how peace can be more readily achieved requires an understanding of the causes of war". Similarly, Johan Galtung (1996:2), considered the main pioneer of peace studies, argues that: "creating peace obviously has to do with reducing violence (cure) and avoiding violence (prevention)".

From Galtung's work it is possible to retrieve a comparison between peace studies and medicine. In fact, the "medical analogy" of treating violence as a disease, under analysis and in the need of a cure, is basic to the work of many "peace science pioneers" (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall, 2005:41). Especially for Galtung, this analogy formed "his own social obligation" and his "role as a peace researcher" (Lawler, 1995: 32). According to Wallensteen (1988), the focus on curing diseases came from the values that compose peace research. Since such authors "hope to contribute to the improvement of the human condition", they position themselves close to studies with similar ideological claims, as education and especially health studies (Wallensteen, 1988:9). Hence, following this logic, to achieve health/peace, it becomes necessary to cure illness/violence (Galtung, 1996).

The medical analogy leads much of peace research, especially under Galtung's influence, to coin concepts mainly about violence. Even those concepts that apparently give primacy to peace properties are concerned with violence, war and their properties. For example, positive peace is defined as "the absence of structural violence" (Galtung, 1969:183). In the same way, the idea of negative peace refers to the absence of physical violence (Galtung, 1969:183). Other concepts central in Galtung's work maintain this focus on violence like "cultural violence" (Galtung, 1990). His ideas influenced many scholars to promote works about different forms of violence (Kohler and Alcock, 1976; Hoivik, 1977; Farmer, 1996, 2004; Diehl, 2016).

However, this work does not aim to affirm that studying violence or such concepts are not useful. Instead, I will try to delve into the opposite investigative path. As Emanuel Adler (1999) presents with distinction: peace exists and has to be studied. For Adler (1999), there are conditions and factors that directly influence the emergence of peace. Kenneth Boulding, another prominent peace researcher, presents the same logic. According to Boulding (1978B), peace and war interact, but do not have the same properties. Furthermore, he argues that it is possible to find practical cases of peace relations and, because of this, "peace is researchable" (Boulding, 1963). Decades later, Diehl (2016) would follow the same inclinations, calling for studies that could look at what conditions and factors contribute to the emergence of peace. The recently published *The Oxford Handbook for Peaceful Change* exemplifies an attempt in this direction (Paul, 2021).

The main contribution of this dissertation is precisely to deepen the theoretical discussion about the study of peace properties. Consequently, I will discuss methodologies, concepts and theories concerned only with peace. On this behalf, it is necessary to look at

peace as a phenomenon related with violence, but with its own positive definition, causes and dynamics. Thus, I will use the following definition: Peace is a state of tranquility from the belief that conflicts will be resolved in a conciliatory way. I prefer to coin my own definition, as I believe that peace is one of those definitions with little consensus among academics. Later in this study, I will discuss the meaning of peace at two different moments: at the beginning of the first chapter and at the beginning of the second chapter. In the former, I will discuss the literature review over this definition, while in the latter, I will explain the reasoning behind formulating the concept this way. Though, I can advance that my definition emerged under the influence of Baruch Spinoza (2009 [1677]), Johan Galtung (1996), Emanuel Adler (1999) and Johansen (2006).

As Johansen (2006:37) perfectly states, "in order to understand the mechanisms of peace it seems natural to study peace". Following this line of thought, I will aim to respond to the following research question: What are the underused theoretical and methodological approaches in the study of peace, its causes, conditions, or mechanisms? Additionally, my argument is based on three premises: 1- the study of peace can be conducted looking at the causes of violence or at the causes of peace (Galtung, 1996); 2- peace and violence are somehow connected phenomena but with different causes, conditions and mechanisms (Boulding, 1978B; Diehl, 2016); 3- the excessive focus on one of these two phenomena is unable to predict how the other phenomenon emerges and functions.

The first two premises laid on the work of several prominent peace scholars. For instance, Galtung (1996:30), in his *Peace by peaceful means*, had affirmed that a researcher can choose without prejudice to analyze the causes of peace and the causes of violence. Meanwhile, Boulding (1978B), Diehl (2016) and to some extent Johansen (2006) have argued that peace and violence have different properties. This can be regarded as the most controversial premise, due to the fact that some authors may argue that a factor that positively affects peace, will negatively affect war and vice versa. However, Diehl (2016) offers a substantial argument to support my second premise: some factors positively influence both war and peace. On one hand, some studies attested that a factor like geographic proximity increases the recurrence of war. On the other hand, others found substantive proof that it also increases the propensity for positive peace (Diehl, 2016:6). Therefore, it is necessary to specifically study the conditions in which peace emerges. The third premise stems from logic: if the second one is right, and peace and violence arise from

different sources, then, we must assume that only by studying both sides will we fully understand peace.

With these three premises in mind, I will formulate this research as an exploratory approach. Exploratory research is one that seeks to deepen the knowledge of a little explored topic in order to find spaces for new hypotheses and research (Neuman, 2007; Swedberg, 2020). My research question focuses on underused theories and methods exactly because of this exploratory characteristic. Answering my question aims to find, with theoretical basis, spaces for new hypotheses and questions. To find such spaces for innovation is fundamental for a reorientation of peace studies, as defended by Johansen (2006) and, to a certain extent, by Diehl (2016). Therefore, this work will not seek to test theories and confirm their proposals about the foundations of a solid peace. Rather, my aim is to see what paths can be followed by scholars who aim to study the causes of peace. Thus, I will look for spaces that have not yet been studied, theories that have not been applied and undervalued concepts.

In order to broaden the theoretical discussion, I did not limit my analysis to those traditions and theories that follow a definition like mine. The definition presented above serves simply to orient my research. While some theoretical currents focus on the negative definition of peace (the absence of physical violence), others have a more holistic approach, bringing to the concept notions of tranquility, equality and empathy. However, what really piqued my interest is how the authors study potential causes for peace. Little, if anything, matters, whether they focus on a more negative or positive concept of peace. Since they discuss how peace emerges and works, I shall look at their work. In a way, the same strategy used by the Journal of Peace Research (An Editorial, 1964) will be used here. If I predetermine that I will only look at a few concepts of peace, I would be automatically limiting the exploratory character of proposing useful new hypotheses and research.

As this work follows the line of exploratory research, I will delve deeply into the theoretical discussion. The objective of broadening the theoretical discussion is precisely to facilitate the identification of potential avenues for innovation. For this reason, I will have two chapters focused on this discussion. The first chapter will present a literature review of the origin of the discipline of peace studies and the three main theoretical currents of the discipline of International Relations. These are the realist, liberal and constructivist traditions (Walt, 1998; Snyder, 2009; Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012).

In the second chapter, I will present two theories that focus directly on peace, its causes and properties: the theory of democratic peace and the theory of the civilizing process.

Extracted from the discussion between all these theories, I will present my chapter on theoretical discussion, where I will seek to identify potential spaces for reorienting studies towards peace. I must emphasize that choosing which theories I will discuss in the first and second chapters evidently limits the possibilities of this study. Since I will search for underused methodological tools and theoretical approaches, from the starting point I am defining where I may find them. In fact, I did not include some influential and solid theories like the English School, Marxism, critical theories, feminist theories, etc.… The word limitation for this study had pushed me towards only choosing the most fundamental theories to analyze, selecting the ones that are, according to my opinion, the most fitting ones.

From this in-depth theoretical discussion, I will formulate hypotheses about where the underused theoretical and methodological approaches may be. In my third chapter, I will present my methodology and each one of the three hypotheses will be tested in three different sections. All of them, follow the idea that peace studies must understand how peace arises and works, as defended by Johansen (2006), but also by Diehl (2016). Thus, I will empirically test if those are, in fact, spaces for innovation. To test my hypotheses, I will analyze articles published by the Journal of Peace Research (JPR). I will explain the reason for this choice and the procedure carried out in my section "methodology". After my third chapter, I will present my conclusion, proposing spaces for new research, study limitations and the contribution to the existing literature.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review: Studying violence to achieve peace.

As advanced in the introduction, this pretends to be exploratory research. On this behalf, my goal is to open space to new and innovative research (Neuman, 2007; Swedberg, 2020). Therefore, I must start by presenting how scholars approach the topic in which I seek to contribute. Thus, this first chapter aims to present how the study of peace/violence has been carried out in the past years. In the last century, two disciplines emerged as an attempt to establish a long-standing international peace: International Relations and Peace Studies.

International Relations (IR) arose straight after the First World War, aiming to inhibit further widespread violence. The first department exploring International Relations was at Aberystwyth University, established in 1919, with a focus on this peaceful aspiration (Jacoby, 2007:13). Precisely four decades later, in 1959, the first institute dedicated solely to the study of peace, the International Peace Research Institute, was settled in Oslo (Galtung, 1984). Breaking with traditional IR, new institutes, academic journals and societies emerged, forging the subject known as "peace studies". Besides peace among states, peace studies would claim the necessity for an emancipatory area capable of achieving broader peace. For this reason, peace researchers used to discredit IR's contributions to the study of peace (Richmond, 2008:1).

Yet, the distinction between the two disciplines was not consensual. As Isard (2000), a precursor of peace research noted, some intellectuals were against a complete division between IR and Peace Studies. For them, IR could easily accommodate Peace Studies (Isard, 2000:27). Nowadays, the University of Notre Dame's "KROC Institute for International Peace Studies" (2021) defines peace studies as:

> An interdisciplinary academic field that draws on political science, sociology, history, anthropology, theology, psychology, philosophy, and other fields to: 1- understand the causes of armed conflict; 2- develop ways to prevent and resolve war, genocide, terrorism, gross violations of human rights; and 3- build peaceful and just systems and societies.

Although this definition applies to Peace Studies, it can also apply to traditional IR. The first proposition, "understanding the causes of armed conflict", roots many studies labelled under the term of international relations. IR scholars provide a plurality of tools to understand the causes of conflicts. Morgenthau (1948) would argue that armed conflicts emerge because international and national entities seek power. Meanwhile, Kenneth Waltz (1988) uses the concept of international anarchy to explain why conflicts persist in the

international system. Constructivists like Alexander Wendt (1992) would argue that states have identities and values, and those values are crucial to explain animosities and propensities to use the force.

International Relations theorists also presently discuss ways of preventing and resolving war, genocide, terrorism, and gross violations of human rights. Liberals like Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye (1973) argue that economic interdependence diminishes the propensity of one state to have military actions in order to achieve its goals. Another example is the theorization of the "responsibility to protect" (R2P). For its defenders, when a state loses its capacity to protect its citizens from crimes against humanity or genocides, the international community has a duty to protect such unprotected citizens (Bellamy, 2008).

Regarding the third topic that defines Peace Studies, some IR scholars also present propositions to build a peaceful and just system. In his classical *Politics among nations*, Hans Morgenthau (1948) gave primacy to the matter of peace. For some, his work is problem-oriented, and thus, his masterpiece represents an attempt to propose solutions to international problems (Behr and Heath, 2009). Considering the post-World War II reality, the realist scholar believed that two devices can take us to peace: 1- the balance of power in the international system; 2- through "normative limitations" as "international law, international morality, and world public opinion" (Morgenthau, 1948:9). Therefore, both International Relations and Peace Studies study peace. Throughout this thesis, I will discuss theories and authors from the two subjects/fields/areas.

To understand how peace and violence have previously been studied, I must begin with the discussion revolving around the definition of these two concepts. The only consensus about the definition of peace seems to be that it is not consensual (An editorial, 1964; Boulding, 1978B; Anderson, 2004; Gittings, 2012). The clearest example of it might be the avoidance of earlier peace researchers to use this word in the name of journals, courses or research centers. Kenneth Boulding (1978B), one of the pioneers in peace studies, opened his book "Stable Peace" by admitting that he avoided the term "peace" when he created the "Center for Research on Conflict Resolution" in the University of Michigan. Boulding and his colleagues feared that they would be misunderstood if they included the label peace in the center's name. Walter Isard (2000) and Johan Galtung (1984) admitted that some scholars and investors had this same concern when the first institutes were created.

Regarding the definition of peace, mainstream IR tends to follow a restricted conceptualization. Most of them will consider peace as the absence of war. However, such

a restriction becomes problematic since it hides other forms of violence. Furtado (2022), for example, accuses the liberal theory to propose a restricted definition of peace because liberalism can only address some forms of violence. Economic oppression, for instance, is not considered violent under a liberal conceptualization (Furtado, 2022). Furthermore, it seems inaccurate to call periods such as the Cold War "peaceful", as Gaddis (1986) recognizes. During the Cold War, major powers did not fight each other directly, but famine, genocide, or civil wars continue existing. Moreover, an atmosphere of complete fear and imminent nuclear catastrophe could not translate into an atmosphere of peace. As Mearsheimer (1994) points out, neorealists believe that peace in the sense of harmony and tranquility will never exist in the international arena.

The problem of seeing peace simply as the absence of war is identified by philosophers, tracing back to prominent figures such as Baruch Spinoza. In his *Tractatus Politicus*, Spinoza (2009:43:46) rejects the previous idea affirming that instead of the mere absence of war, peace is a virtue. This virtue "springs from a conscious willingness to carry out what the Commonwealth has decreed should be done" (Gittings, 2012:245). He even claims that a city where violence is not apparent but where its citizens live in fear, is not a city in peace. Instead, it is a city in "solitude". Centuries later, early peace researchers deepened the notion that peace should be more than just the absence of war. Boulding (1978B) affirms that war and peace are part of the same system. However, each has its "characteristic set of properties" (Boulding, 1978B:8).

Johan Galtung might be considered the author that delves further into widening the understanding of peace. He comprehends that a restricted definition of peace hides the existence of various forms of violence. Nevertheless, he does not propose a positive definition of peace apart from violence, as Spinoza did. Galtung attempts to fix the problem by widening the concept of violence considerably. Peace, in his view, is not only the opposite of war, but also the opposite on all forms of violence. For him, "violence is present when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations" (Galtung, 1969:168).

Nevertheless, Galtung's conceptualization creates one challenge for the study of peace. As the concept of violence becomes so broad, it becomes almost impossible to find consensus about it. Kenneth Boulding (1978A) acknowledges it and, then, rejects some of Galtung's premises. Furthermore, Boulding (1963, 1978A) could argue that an extremely broad conceptualization of peace would make it hardly researchable. Herman Schmidt

(1968) also criticizes Peace Studies detailing the difficulty of establishing what peace really is. For him, due to the wide conceptualization of positive peace, only the notion of negative peace is consensual among scholars (Schmidt, 1968). Recent research attests Schmidt's criticism. Gledistch, Nordkvelle and Strand (2013) and Diehl (2016) have found that the term positive peace has received considerably fewer mentions in academic journals.

Another consequence of a broad definition is that it hinders scholars to consider a society as peaceful. Following Galtung's wider conceptualization, Fabbro (1978) developed his study on "peaceful societies" limited to communities with small populations. This study of indigenous pre-modern communities is not new and from an anthropologic point of view, it is possible to find many examples. For instance, Margareth Mead (1940), while defending that warfare was an invention, also turned to small-scale communities to justify her argument that some of them were not aware of how to make war. In opposition to Mead, Azar Gat (2017) supported his own argument that violence is inherent to human beings analyzing isolated and small societies.

The focus on such indigenous communities, mostly with non-hierarchical structures, is because only those could have scarce recurrence of violence in its broader sense (Fabbro, 1978). Yet, considering peace studies' normative component, to study such small communities has one immediate problem. It does not replicate the interactions of modern state societies since their structures are quite different. Consequently, it is not applicable for almost the entire world. Indeed, if scholars studying peace aim to pave the way to achieve peace, to focus on this kind of communities has a small capacity to effectively impact the construction of peace. It then becomes problematic that under an enlarged definition of violence, peaceful countries, communities or societies barely exist. If by definition it does not exist, it cannot be studied and analyzed. Thus, as Boulding suggests, peace could not be empirically tested.

Therefore, there are two disciplines that study peace and within them, the definition of peace is not consensual. Inside these areas, there are different arguments in favor to focus on the causes of war or on the causes of peace. In this chapter, I will make a literature review on three International Relations approaches and Peace Studies. The three International Relations theories will be realism, liberalism and constructivism, which a few authors identified as the main competing theories within this field (Walt, 1998; Snyder, 2009; Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012). In the case of Peace Studies, I did not make a theoretical distinction within the discipline. I considered the authors whose work, in the

words of T. V. Paul (2021:14), leans mainly on the dynamics of peace, without subscribing "to a specific IR paradigm".

2.1 - Peace Studies

Peace Studies is the subject that studies violence. Such a statement sounds contradictory. Yet, authors like Wallensteen (1988:8) affirm that this "concentration" on violence is what "makes peace studies unique". To attest to this focus on studying violence, some research has quantitatively achieved this conclusion by analyzing the studies developed by the discipline. Wiberg (1981) identified that, during its first twenty years, only one article in the Journal of Peace Research (JPR) discussed peaceful societies, while all the others discussing forms of violence. More recently, Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand (2014) found that words regarding violence and war appear very more commonly in the titles and keywords of articles published by JPR and by the Journal of Conflict Resolution (JCR) than the word "peace". Diehl (2016) went beyond the academic journals and identified that the same happened regarding the papers presented at the International Studies Association annual meetings, where only one fifth of the papers have the word peace in the title. To understand why it happened, it is crucial to explain the foundations of Peace Research first.

What I am considering Peace Research, as a matter of fact, includes different traditions without a uniform and consensual understanding about peace and how to research it. Instead of a single theory, it calls itself a discipline what could be problematic to compare with other theories. In this thesis, I consider Peace Research to include all the studies and scholars that aim to study peace as a discipline apart from existing ones. It includes, for example, the European tradition, developed mainly around the work of Johan Galtung; the US tradition of "Conflict and Peace Studies" conceptualized by Kenneth Boulding; and even the work of John Burton, under the label of Conflict Resolution. I included all these traditions under a single label because, in all of them, the same issue emerges: the idea of understanding violence and conflict to achieve peace.

Thereby, the question arises of what the fundamental features that link all these traditions together are. In the first editorial of the Journal of Peace Research, the editors present the following definition of Peace Research: "One may now look upon peace research as research into the conditions, for moving closer to the state we have called GCP, or at least

not drifting closer towards GCW." (An Editorial, 1964:2). GCP is "general and complete peace", while GCW means "general and complete war". Such a definition seems to apply consistently well to the different Peace Studies traditions. Still, the JPR rejected an objective definition of "peace", leaving it for the subsequent scholars to define it (An Editorial, 1964; Galtung, 1984).

Although scholars have always been concerned about peace and war, it was in the late 1950s and the 1960s that the first peace societies, journals and institutes flourished. Walter Isard, published in 2000 an article in which he extensively described the creation of the first peace institutes, conferences and societies. In this article, he affirms that he and other scholars felt a huge necessity to establish formal connections for sharing and developing their research about peace (Isard, 2000). The context of the Cold War, with the eminence of nuclear conflict, fostered this necessity (Isard, 2000).

Albeit the fear of nuclear war seemed enough to justify the development of peace societies and institutes, early peace researchers paid special attention to distinguish Peace Studies from other disciplines and to legitimize this field of research. In the US, Kenneth Boulding (1963:71) dedicated an entire article to discuss if peace is researchable, affirming that peace "belongs to the empirical world and that in theory, therefore, it can be researched". His wife, Elise Boulding (1972) claimed, a decade later, that early peace researchers aimed to create "new understandings and new solutions" apart from the existing literature carried out by IR theorists. John Burton (1964) claimed that international relations became less worried about achieving peace, but were tasked with creating a necessity for a new discipline to fill the vacuum left by IR. Looking back to the early days of Peace Studies, Peter Lawler (1989) defended that peace studies arose as a response to realist pessimism in IR.

Meanwhile, in Europe, Johan Galtung, considered a founder of Peace Studies, proposed that what makes Peace Studies unique is its values. For him, "without values, peace studies become a social science in general and world studies in particular" (Galtung, 1996:13). Since some authors consider Johan Galtung the most pivotal figure in the development of Peace Studies, his legacy deserves a deeper description (Van Der Bergh, 1972; Wallersteen, 1998). In fact, articles like "Violence, Peace and Peace Research", published in 1969, shaped the concepts and epistemologies presently used by many peace researchers.

One of the most notable innovations proposed by Galtung is a broader definition of violence: "violence is present when human beings are being influenced so that their actual

somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations" (Galtung, 1969:168). By widening this concept, and peace being for him the opposite of violence, he also proposed a broader conception of peace, opening a space for a distinction between negative peace and positive peace (Galtung, 1969). Whereas negative peace represents the negative definition of peace as the absence of physical violence, positive peace would represent a more positive definition seeking to encompass "harmony, cooperation and integration" (Galtung, 1984:145). Allowed by this enlarged definition of peace, he also advanced the concept of structural violence. Structural violence represents forms of violence that occur without a direct action of an actor (Galtung, 1969:170). Thereby, structural violence occurs through structures of oppression and inequality. With an obvious influence of dependency theory, Galtung (1971) would even link what he considers an imperialistic international system to the maintenance of structural violence at the domestic and international levels.

Regarding method, Galtung's earlier works suffered a deep influence of US sociologists, who followed a positivist approach (Lawler, 1989). For Lawler (1989:30), Galtung's mixture of a positivist, empiricist approach, with a normative perspective, makes his work distinctive. Galtung's later work attest it, as he argued that peace studies must go beyond empiricism (although he does not deny the importance of empiric research) and include a critical and constructive component (Galtung, 1996:10). From Galtung's work, novel approaches and methods emerged. For example, the conceptual development of structural violence would influence many authors like Kohler and Alcock (1976) to attempt to measure structural violence through an analysis of life expectancy at birth. Farmer (2004) also used this concept to criticize the poor health conditions in Haiti.

The legacy of Galtung within peace research is unquestionable. However, his conceptualizations are not always in agreement amongst the different traditions. Kenneth Boulding (1978A:346) would heavily criticize the premises used by Galtung. For him, the ideological component of Galtung's work was "unfruitful" and the concepts of negative peace and positive peace are problematic because of its broad meaning (Boulding, 1978A:346). Constructivist Emanuel Adler (1999:166) also come up with a harsh criticism on these two concepts, affirming that "'Positive peace' (…) has no ontological existence at all". Nicholas Onuf (1975:74) asserted that peace researchers', especially Galtung' s belief on international feudalization, makes invisible "many examples of violence in the South that are unaffected by any North-entity to be ignored".

Considering this background and peace studies' *raison d'être*, we can now turn to why peace studies reproduce the focus on "studying violence to achieve peace". With "Conflict Resolution", the focus on violence and conflict seems logical, since this approach proposes to develop decision-making processes capable of resolving specific conflicts (Burton, 1997). John Burton (1997) claims the necessity of developing this problem-solving theory to overcome power politics' responses to disputes. Once conflicts are the "problems" to be solved, it is natural to study conflicts, and, therefore, to study violence to achieve peace. Meanwhile, Kenneth Boulding (1978) constructed his work under the label of "Conflict and Peace Studies". Although names can be misleading, they have a symbolical value and the usage of the two terms together means that peace is not the exclusive focus of his work.

Differing with Boulding, Galtung opted for the usage of the term "Peace Research", even though this term received criticism and opposition (Galtung, 1984). Thus, in symbolic terms, his work should be closer to the idea of studying peace to achieve peace. Although his later work put emphasis on the study of "peace by peaceful means", his earlier work nowadays supports the study of violence to achieve peace. For instance, he argues that "If the concern is with peace, and peace is absence of violence, then action should be directed against personal as well as structural violence" (Galtung, 1969:172). On this behalf, another important characteristic of Galtung's work is the recurrent comparison between Peace Studies and medical studies as mentioned in the introduction (Wallersteen, 1988). He claims that violence should be treated as a disease, and peace researchers should find the cure for that (Galtung, 1996). Such assumptions clearly emphasize the study of violence, since the cure can only be achieved after the study of the disease.

As mentioned previously, scholars would extensively use Galtung's work to make innovative studies. Nevertheless, many of these studies would focus on physical violence, and to a lesser extent, to structural violence. Authors who have analyzed publications in journals linked to peace research, have consistently found that positive peace barely appears in publications (Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand, 2014; Diehl, 2016). Therefore, even though Galtung's work lays at the core of peace studies, his proposals that go beyond physical violence stays at the discipline's corner.

Among all the articles and books read for this dissertation, only in one case did the author explicitly affirmed that studying peaceful societies could be methodologically wrong. Wiberg (1981:114), after identifying the lack of studies looking at peaceful societies, declared that:

> To claim that JPR has only published one article of peace might be somawhat (sic) facetious, but is still true, given the criteria. This proviso is important, since sticking to them would imply that we could only understand peace by studying peaceful societies. This, of course, is methodologically wrong (of which Fabbro is fully aware, pointing out the necessity of comparing his societies with more violent ones having similar social features, in order to find out what differences seem to be crucial).

It is not clear if Wiberg considers all studies about peaceful societies equivocal, or if he considers the study only of peaceful countries wrong. Even so, it explains peace scholars' view regarding the study of peaceful societies. Wiberg quoted David Fabbro (1978), who published in 1978 an article about five communities considered peaceful. He analyzed the social structures, economic activities and culture of these communities, concluding that social justice and low levels of physical violence can coexist (Fabbro, 1978:81). Fabbro's work also deserves to be highlighted here, since it was the only attempt to study peaceful societies during the first 20 years of the JPR (Wiberg, 1981).

As depicted above, quantitative analyses have found that much works under the label of peace studies focus on violence and war. It brings peace studies closer to mainstream international relations, when regarding their focus on studying violence. It is important to mention that peace researchers have proposed to study peaceful regions and societies. Boulding (1963:75) even used the fact that some "systems" have achieved a stable peace to argue that peace is methodologically researchable. Years later, Galtung (1996:30) would assert that peace studies can start either from the question "what is the cause of violence?" or from the question, "what is the cause of peace?"[1]. Still, such proposals do not appear to have affected contemporary scholars. For this reason, Johansen proposal for a re-orientation to the study of peace properties stands as particularly groundbreaking. This shift would represent a schism with the current peace research.

---

[1] Galtung's later work seems increasingly more concerned about studying peace to achieve peace. It is clearly stated in his book "Peace by Peaceful Means" (1996) and his work on Peace Education (1983). I will use some of his premises on chapter 3.

2.2 - International Relations – Realism

As one of the most disseminated theories in IR, realists propose a panoply of different perspectives on peace. I will concentrate on neorealism, more specifically on two neorealist authors: Kenneth Waltz and John Mearsheimer. I focused on Waltz and Mearsheimer due to the fact that, in 2012, they were considered by academics to be the two most influential exponents of such a theory (Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012:49). Furthermore, Waltz is considered a defensive realist, while Mearsheimer symbolizes offensive realism (Taliaferro, 2001). Authors usually apply these two categories to distinguish two perspectives of the neorealist thought. The main difference is that offensive realists believe that states seek to maximize power to guarantee their security (Jervis, 1999:48). Meanwhile, defensive realists believe that "states would be willing to settle for the status quo and are driven more by fear than by the desire to make gains" (Jervis, 1999:49).

Neorealists believe that the international system must be studied at a structural level of analysis (Waltz, 1988). This structural perspective leads neorealists to generalize international patterns, seeking universal answers capable of being replicated in the future (Keohane and Martin, 1995). Contrary to classical realists, power does not appear as an end, but as a tool to obtain security within the system of states (Waltz, 1988). Thus, conflicts between states exist not simply because of a human uncontrolled desire for power, but because of a system that pressures states to seek security (Waltz, 1988).

However, realists consider that there are moments of peace in the sense that there is an absence of war among states (Gaddis, 1986). However, such junctures, where inter-state war ceases, are periods of threats and preparation for war (Richmond, 2008:42). Therefore, neorealists are pessimists not only regarding the propensity of peace, but also regarding the quality of such peace. In the words of Mearsheimer (1994:12): "[p]eace, if one defines that concept as a state of tranquility or mutual concord, is not likely to break out in this world."

Mearsheimer (1994:10) presents five premises that explain why realists are pessimists regarding a long-standing peace in the international arena. Firstly, he identified the absence of a supranational authority, making the international system anarchic. The second assumption is that all states have some offensive capacity what turns them into security threats to other states. Furthermore, a state will always have doubts regarding other

states' intentions, generating a climate of fear. The fourth assumption is that states seek to survive in the international system. Finally, states carry out rational choices to survive.

Here, it is important to differentiate between offensive and defensive realists. While Mearsheimer and other offensive realists will argue that states always seek to maximize their power and gains, defensive realists will argue that fear moves states, causing them to avoid unnecessary conflicts (Jervis, 1999:48:49). For this reason, Waltz (1993) defends those two factors to explain peace between the two great powers during the Cold War: nuclear weapons and bipolarity. Whereas "a first-strike capability" exists, nuclear weapons discourage states to start a war with a capacity to create a mutual annihilation (Waltz, 1988:627). In countries without nuclear weapons, the war used to continue being held in conventional means (Waltz, 1993). As Gaddis (1986) points out, the Cold War period had a sharp increase in armament, a widespread usage of violence in the name of ideologies or ethnicities, and the persistence of famine and poverty. Mutual fear inhibited the war to arise between the two superpowers.

Realists' pessimism, albeit regarding the international system's propensity for peace, intrinsically defend some premises in their theory about how to achieve peace. First, in a realist perspective, we can only achieve peace under an order "ruled by a Leviathan" (Richmond, 2008:46). Peace is not achievable in the international arena because the system lacks the establishment of a supranational entity capable of imposing a long-standing peace (Waltz, 1959). If the international system was not anarchic, realists might have considered that peace is possible. They incline towards pessimism as they believe that anarchy will only continue.

Secondly, fear creates insecurity, which raises the propensity to use violence. Diminishing fear would permit peace, reinforcing the argument realists give that in the international arena, fear rules because of anarchy and suspicion (Mearsheimer, 1994). However, at the state level, the reduction of fear could lead to peace. Finally, neorealists believe structures shape peace and war, and changes in the structure may shape the propensity of war (Waltz, 1959, 1988). For instance, a variation in the number of Super-Powers in the World Order would lead to a variation in how countries are prone to enter into violent conflicts.

Therefore, using the health/peace illness/war metaphor to synthesize their thought, realists believe that the international system was born with a disease. One can partially control such a disease through medication: the balance of power and, nowadays, with nuclear

weapons. However, this disease can never be cured. From time to time, the therapy will stop working, which leads to conflict and wars arising again.

For the argument carried out in this study, the most important conclusion on neorealist thoughts about peace lays in its anachronic view of peace. They believe that peace and war emerge and disappear from a singular process. Whilst one is increasing, the other is decreasing. It is clear in Kenneth Waltz's introduction of "Man, the State and War", in which he opens his book arguing that understanding war is a precondition to achieve peace (Waltz, 1959). While Waltz (1959:71) discusses various streams of thought, at some point he criticizes how some of them focus only on the "knowing process" and forget to learn about the "doing". Yet, he does not propose a clear split between the study and the "doing" of peace and war. Both concepts continue being treated together throughout his book, in the sense that, for him, studying war means implicitly studying peace and vice versa. Meanwhile, Mearsheimer (1990) follows the same pattern, arguing that to predict the tendency of maintaining peace, an analyst must look also at the causes of war.

Regarding the turn to the study of peace properties, neorealists would probably reject this proposal. As evidenced by Mearsheimer's statement, these scholars do not believe that peace can be truly achieved in the international system. When Waltz portrays his "third image" of international relations, he advances the impacts anarchy has on peace and violence. The absence of an international state to act as an international Leviathan forbids any construction of an international stable peace. Therefore, to study peace properties seems senseless under this perspective.

2.3 - International Relations – Liberalism

Within the liberal tradition in IR, the prospects of peace are quite positive. Contrary to the realist tradition, liberals believe that peace either can be achieved or at least, that violence can be mitigated (Richmond, 2008). From a liberal point of view, people seek "self-preservation" and "material well-being", preferring peace instead of war (Owen, 1994:89). The liberal tradition has a variety of theories regarding peace, ranging from the Democratic Peace tradition to the defenders of liberalism as a guarantor of peace. Since they propose a study of peace properties, the Democratic Peace theory (and the Liberal Peace) will be discussed in chapter 3.

Similar to the realist tradition, I will only focus on one stream of thought in this section: the neoliberal institutionalist theory. This choice deals with the fact that the debate between neorealists and neoliberals permeated most of IR theory in the second half of the XXth century. Moreover, according to Robert Jervis (1999:47), the major difference between neorealists and neoliberals is exactly "the changes that they believe are feasible and required to reduce conflict." For Alexander Wendt (1992:392), this difference is so tenure that he calls neoliberals as "weak realists". Following this assessment, I will give primacy to the work of Robert O. Keohane and Joseph Nye. As with Mearsheimer and Waltz, Keohane and Nye are two of the most significant scholars of the institutionalist tradition (Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012).

Neoliberals, or institutionalists, consider cooperation and institutions as essential to diminish conflict in the international arena. Similar to structural realists, institutionalists see the international system as anarchic, which increases suspicion among states, and fosters the tendency of war (Keohane and Martin 1995). However, neoliberals believe that international institutions and economic interdependence can discourage the usage of violence. Once economic ties deepen, the costs of going to war will grow too, inhibiting states to do so (Nye, 1971; Keohane and Nye, 1973). Thus, neoliberals affirm that "in a world, politics constrained by state power and divergent interests, and unlikely to experience effective hierarchical governance, international institutions operating because of reciprocity will be components of any lasting peace." (Keohane and Martin, 1995:50). Such a statement can be considered crucial for the argument carried out in this study. For neoliberals, because they understand the causes of war ("state power", "divergent interests" and lack of "effective hierarchical governance"), they conclude that international institutions are "components of any lasting peace".

Nevertheless, I must note that neoliberals accept that cooperation and institutions do not always lead to the harmony of interests. As Keohane (1988:380) suggests, while rich countries can use cooperation to extract resources from poor countries and to dismantle local industries, institutions like military alliances can wage war. Thus, it is fundamental to understand how institutions work and in which conditions they can dissipate conflict (Keohane, 1988). Therefore, Keohane reinforces the necessity of understanding conflict to learn how to achieve peace.

Joseph Nye (1971) identified some hypotheses planned by proponents of regionalism. These five premises lay in "the capacity of micro-regional economic

organizations to foster integration that changes the character of relations between states and creates islands of peace in the international system." (Nye, 1971:11). First, regionalists believe that regional organizations lead to a multipolar system, which they believe to be more stable and peaceful (Nye, 1971:11). The regionalism tradition also thinks that the emergence of weak small states raises the occurrence of war (Nye, 1971:12). Then, if a small state is part of a larger organization, other states will have fewer incentives to attack the small one. Furthermore, international integration would go "beyond the nation-states", creating new relations among different communities (Nye, 1971:14). As regional organizations change the relations between states, it consequently boosts economic interdependence and a sense of friendship (Nye, 1971:16). Finally, regionalists believe regional organizations control and solve conflicts (Nye, 1971:17).

The first, the second and the third premises clearly encompass ideas developed by "the study of violence to achieve peace". The defense of multipolar systems raises from "history and theory" that support the view that systems with high inequality of power distribution were more prone to conflict (Nye, 1971:11-12). The second point follows the same pattern sustaining a positive aspect of regionalism because "the restricted size of many less developed countries poses a severe limit on their prospects for economic (particularly industrial) development, thereby leading to frustration and conflict." (Nye, 1971:13). Finally, the third premise, entitled "beyond the nation-state", expressed as: "Jean Monnet's view the ultimate causes of violent conflict lie in human nature, but it is possible, through creating new regional institutions, to limit the conflict-laden consequences of the division of mankind into sovereign national states" (Nye, 1971:14). Nye (1971) seems skeptical about this premise and pointed out to the problematic side of weakening sovereignty. Still, the proposal to go beyond the nation-state clearly arose from an understanding of conflict.

The fourth premise has a dual perspective. While economic integration emerges as a tool to create harmonious, and, therefore, peaceful relations among states, economic integration also increases the cost of conflict (Nye, 1971:16-17). If the idea of creating cooperation and harmony lays in the understanding of peace to achieve peace, the second idea reflects an understanding of war to achieve peace. Meanwhile, they argued that the last premise strengthens peace because dialogue solidifies peace and neighbors know their norms and cultures better, making the dialogue easier.

Although focused on regionalism, these five premises form an excellent overview of how an international organization arguably affects the occurrence of conflicts. Other

explanations given by neoliberals can also be added to that list. Exchange of information plays an important role in creating peace within an international institution since it diminishes suspicion among states (Keohane and Martin, 1995:46). Institutions diminish the costs of cooperation (Keohane, 1988). Organizations also put pressure on governments to respect human rights, since they are concerned about their image (Nye, 1971:181).

In an article regarding economic interdependence, Keohane and Nye (1973) pointed out how integration affects the states. They identified states are not always seeking relative gains, but also seeking absolute gains. Despite the desire to gain importance in the international system, a state will avoid taking actions that might negatively influence its domestic economy (Keohane and Nye, 1973). In their view, the domestic policy plays an important role in shaping international preferences and arrangements (Jervis, 1999:61). Seeking economic and political gains, states will cooperate since "genuine cooperation improves the rewards of both players" (Keohane, 1988:380). Thus, neoliberals move away from the view that international relations are a zero-sum game and propose that, under cooperation, it is possible to have win-win relations. Still, Nye (1968:856) also challenges the view that economic integration will always be positive concerning peace. He uses the example of early European integration to doubt if it would destabilize power distribution and European cooperation to other parts of the globe (Nye, 1968:856).

To prove their hypothesis, neoliberals look at institutions and how they have lessened conflicts. Duffield (1994) affirms that NATO played a pivotal role in avoiding conflicts among European countries during the Cold War. In 1971, Joseph Nye (1971:175) identified that "macro-regional political organizations have helped to isolate conflicts among their members in 74 percent of the relevant cases, helped contribute to the abatement of conflict in 58 percent of the cases, helped end fighting in 44 percent of the relevant cases, and helped to provide a lasting settlement in 32 percent of the cases." Nowadays, Nye has assertively affirmed that the European Union "has created a Kantian Island of peace in the international system" (Nye and Goldsmith, 2011:52).

Returning to the medical metaphor, neoliberals agree with neorealists: the patient (international system) was born sick (anarchy and self-interest). However, they disagree with neorealists' treatment. Instead, they see cooperation, economic interdependence, and institutionalism as better medicines for mitigating the disease.

Therefore, neoliberals do not break entirely with the thought of studying violence to achieve peace. They agree with neorealists arguments regarding the anarchic (consequently

problematic) organization of the international system. For this reason, neoliberals justify their propositions on views and studies about how violence emerges. A neoliberal would argue with statements like "since states do not trust each other, sharing information can prevent war" or "international anarchy creates insecurity and to achieve peace, we must understand how to mitigate anarchy (through international institutions)". The point of departure of neoliberals' arguments is mainly concerned with the reasons violence occurs, instead of the reasons behind peace occurrence. Although they have minor nuances, on overall, they also study violence to achieve peace.

2.4 - International Relations - Constructivism

Constructivism have been, in the last decades, one of the most influential theories in international relations (Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012). Similar to the other two theories advanced in the previous sections, the label "constructivism" encompasses a plurality of authors with different approaches and guidelines. In this section, I will give particular emphasis on the work of Alexander Wendt and Martha Finnemore since within the constructivist tradition, they are considered the two most influential authors (Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012). However, they did not discuss issues about peace in-depth. Wendt and Finnemore are more worried about security, militarization and norms. Thus, the work of Emanuel Adler will complement theirs since Adler constructs a bridge between constructivism and peace.

Constructivism's point of departure is that international relations are formed by people, who are "social beings", and then, social interactions impact international relations (Onuf, 1997:7). Contrary to neorealists and neoliberals, constructivists believe that reality is socially constructed and that ideas shape the international system (Wendt, 1992; Richmond, 2008). Under the influence of the structuration theory developed by Antony Giddens, constructivists believe that a structure has two components: material and rules (Kahl, 1998:102). Wendt would enrich Giddens assumption, arguing that the international structure has "three elements: material conditions, interests and ideas" (Wendt, 1999:139). From this ideational characteristic, Burai and Hofman (2021:169) defend that the constructivist view regarding "peaceful change" and "peaceful relations" put emphasis on three "theoretical

building blocks": "factors (such as culture or identity), actors (such as norm entrepreneurs), and mechanisms (such as persuasion and socialization)."

Identity, in fact, plays a pivotal role in constructivist thought (Kahl, 1998; Wendt, 1992, 1999). For Kahl (1998:104), the "social identity of states represent the names, ideal types, groups, statuses, and social categories that states are socially recognized, by themselves and others, to be members." As Wendt (1999:397) highlights, "identities are inherently relational". Therefore, it depends on how others perceive an agent in particular and how this agent perceives the others. Because of this focus on identity, Alexander Wendt (1992:392) would challenge even the rationalism, a premise crucial to realists and liberals. For him, presenting states and institutions as rational actors inhibits a comprehension of a state's identity formation (Wendt, 1992:392). However, Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) would criticize this view that rationality and social construction are antitheses. Instead, they would argue that social construction can occur through rational impulses, since norm entrepreneurs might act strategically to take forward their aims (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998).

Besides identity, norms, as "a standard of appropriate behavior for actors with a given identity", also composes an important part of constructivist thought (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998:891). Finnemore and Sikkink affirm that the constructions of norms at the domestic and international levels follow similar patterns. For them, understanding how norms are shaped and structured helps to understand how to formulate norms at the international system to inhibit conflicts (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998:893-894). With this in mind, constructivists have carried out research in order to understand "how to generate norms that make violence less permissible or reasonable" (Burai and Hofman, 2021:173).

Concerning the study of violence and peace, Burai and Hofman (2021) identified a lack of uniformity among constructivist scholars. For them, constructivism does not offer a concise set of premises and explanatory tools to understand peace (Burai and Hofman, 2021). It obviously reflects on how other scholars posits this theory in comparison to other theories. For instance, Jacoby (2008:92) stresses that constructivist will argue that violent behavior is not innate, but it is shaped and manipulated. From this perspective, discourses, symbols, and other social manifestations sustain and surge aggressive behavior (Jacoby, 2008:95). On this behalf, constructivists seem considerably different than neorealists. Wendt (1992:392) even fosters this premise criticizing not only neorealists, but also neoliberals,

arguing that they are "weak realists" that only "go beyond the limits of realism" in the case of international institutions.

Still, others will argue that in terms of peace, constructivism does not represent a complete break of traditional IR (Richmond, 2008). Although it brings identities and ideas to the debate, Richmond (2008:10) perceives that it does not reject "the core of realism which sees states as underpinning order and peace as limited to institutional cooperation and a limited recognition of individual agency." In fact, some authors like Alexander Wendt (1999) does not deny the existence of an international structure and the anarchic characteristic of it. Instead, he argues that besides the material component and interests (both accepted by neorealists) ideas are also part of the international structure (Wendt, 1999). For these theorists, ideas build and provoke change in the international system (Finnemore and Skkikink, 1998:894). However, for Richmond, constructivism seems to offer a dualistic approach to peace. Whilst it opens space for change, once interests and identities flow to be more peaceful, constructivism also rooted this change to the desire of the states in the system (Richmond, 2008:83).

Nevertheless, a few authors apply constructivist ideas to peace and violence, offering landmark propositions to explain these phenomena. When Finnemore (2003) analyzes the decrease of military interventions in the 1990s, she rejects a perspective that the development of weapons capable to create massive destruction explains why the use of force diminished in the international arena. For her, what changed was the ideas shared by states regarding when and how they can use the force (Finnemore, 2003). Concerning peacebuilding, constructivism fosters that it should reinforce local culture and identities (Conteh-Morgan, 2005). Other authors, like Colin Kahl (1998), even use constructivist though to explain and analyze the democratic peace theory, which will be depicted in deeper details in the second chapter. I must highlight that some constructivist studies that discuss peace and violence do it in an indirect way. Finnemore (1993) developed a study of how scientific bureaucracies emerge, rejecting quantitatively the perspective that security issues and military investment lead to the establishment of such scientific corpuses (Finnemore, 1993).

It was not easy to find constructivist authors extensively discussing about peace, its meaning and emergence. On this behalf, the work of Emanuel Adler, *Conditions for Peace,* deserves a more detailed description. Adler provides the clearest sample of the applicability of constructivist thought to explain peace. In an ingenious fashion, he propounds that peace is a social constructed practice (Adler, 1999:168). Based on Karl Deutsch, Adler will

highlight the idea of security community. This concept means that states can interact until the point of forming a sense of community, that mitigates the danger of war (Adler and Barnett, 1998:3). It implies that the formation of collective identity and the strengthening of mutual trust are fundamental conditions for peaceful change (Adler, 1999:177). Notwithstanding, when Adler talks in terms of security community, he does not refer to a military alliance, or any kind of formal organization (although he believes that a security community might establish a formal organization), what differs him from institutionalists and neoliberals. This security community refers to "transnational non-territorial 'cognitive regions' where peaceful change is practiced" (Adler, 1999:180).

Adler (1999) proposes a few factors capable to incentive the establishment of security communities and peace. He believes that through communication, changes in domestic structures and exchange of personal and elites, a sense of cultural proximity would emerge between different nations (Adler, 1999:179-180). Moreover, the existence of conditions like a "civic culture" or a "higher expectation of utility from peace than from war" would "play a facilitating role" (Adler, 1999:181). From this perspective, the view emerges that scholars should focus on "complex historical processes", instead of seeking "a primordial independent variable" (Adler and Barnett, 2000:323). In fact, Adler brings plenty of constructivist flags, ranging from shared identity or processes to the study of peace.

In this chapter, my aim is to offer an overview of the most important theories from IR and how they discuss the causes of peace and war. While neorealists and, to a lesser extent, neoliberals clearly stress the triggers of violence in their works, no clear pattern was found concerning constructivism. Anarchy, for instance, is always a source of conflict in a neorealist perspective. In the meantime, for constructivists, ideas and identities might interact with the causes of violence, but also with the causes of peace. Furthermore, under a constructivist perspective, I would say that this debate should be reframed. We need to go one step forward and interrogate what makes a community's identity to tilt towards peace or what lead peaceful ideas to flourish instead of violent ones.

Nevertheless, constructivism still seems to be reaching its full potential. As Burai and Hofman (2021) point out, this tradition needs to expand its conceptualizations in terms of peace. Despite being one of the three theories that most IR academics lean towards nowadays, it still receives merely secondary attention in works that create a dialogue between IR theory and peace. In Oliver Richmond's piece (2008), constructivism receives less attention than other theories like Marxism or the English School. The same happened

with Tim Jacoby (2008), where constructivist ideas filled a small 3-page section in his book about conflict and peace. This tradition is totally disregarded when Azar Gat (2017) discusses main approaches in the realm of IR on peace. I must highlight, however, that this shortage of attention might not be disproportionate in comparison with the number of studies carried out by constructivists about peace and violence.

While researching books, articles, and other forms of sources to construct my literary review, I found it considerably more difficult to find constructivist excerpts about peace. Emmanuel Adler can definitely be considered an exception, with a few works about this topic (Michael Barnett joined Adler in some of his work). Besides Adler, I only found one article written by Onuf (1975) and one by Kratochwil (1998) mentioning the word "peace" or "peaceful" in the title. Regarding Finnemore, she devoted an entire book to discuss military intervention and her work with Sikkink discusses how violent widespread norms eroded. I did not find a single article written by Alexander Wendt where peace lays in a central position.

The cause may be that this theory is considerably vast. All mentioned authors talk about issues connected to it, such as security, war and militarization. However, it is still intriguing how constructivists seem to forget to talk about peace per se. Such might happen because, as Richmond (2008) stresses, peace in their vision is submissive to states' interests and identities. Thus, what really matters would be to understand identity and interest formation. Also, it is possible that the less notable constructivist scholars pay more attention to these issues. For this review, I gave primacy for those whose work is considered vital within this tradition. Independently of the reason, the fact is that constructivism offers some tools to explain and to approach peace and these tools may be underused. For an exploratory study like this one, this information stands as a particularly important factor.

Therefore, as described in this chapter, mainstream IR theorists and Peace Researchers have mainly developed their studies seeking to understand violence to achieve peace. The liberal and constructivist traditions, only partially, aim to understand how peace can be created. Considering the crisis of peace research and the necessity stressed by some authors to "resuscitate" the interest of deepening peace studies as a subject, I will discuss if other theories support the idea of "studying peace to achieve peace" and if, in practice, this shift could open space for new research and new solutions.

Chapter 3- Theorical background for the "study of peace to achieve peace".

As described in the introduction, the question that guides this work relates to what kinds of new hypotheses and questions can emerge from the study of the causes of peace. I should therefore recall that this approach arises from the argument of some authors that peace studies should focus more on peace and its own properties (Johansen, 2006; Diehl, 2016). In this chapter I will delve deeper into the discussion of the meaning of terms like "cause of peace" and "conditions for peace". Furthermore, I will present two theories that primarily focus on explaining factors that lead to peace. At times, I will inevitably mention authors previously referred to in the bibliographical review chapter. As can be expected, even in the most influential theories of peace studies and international relations, some academics speak directly about peace emergence.

The first thing I must address in this chapter is, therefore, what it means to look at the causes and conditions of peace. In this sense, Fox (1970:4) offers an interesting distinction into four types of approach to research on war and peace: 1- the causes of war (what causes a war to start); 2- the causes of peace (what makes a war end); 3- the conditions of war (which prevents wars from ending); 4- the conditions of peace (which prevents a war from starting). Interestingly, all of Fox's descriptions are based on war. In this case, the causes of peace and conditions of peace are causes that prevent or end a war. It is interesting to establish a comparison between this view and Levi's (1964) view. For Levi (1964:23), this approach of focusing primarily on war comes both from the attention captured by such events and from the facility of finding conditions that supposedly lead to war.

However, in both Levi's and Fox's versions, there is a fundamental problem. They start from the premise that the properties of wars and peace are perfect antagonisms. That is, the absence of a factor that leads to peace will invariably lead to war. This view arises from the idea mentioned at the beginning of the second chapter that peace is the opposite of war. The best answer to this view comes from previously mentioned Emanuel Adler (1999). If peace is just the absence of something, then it doesn't really exist (Adler, 1999). Of course, Adler vehemently rejects this preposition, asserting that peace has to be something. Here we can draw a parallel with Elie Wiesel's striking phrase that "the opposite of love is not hate, it's indifference". In Adler's logic, the opposite of war is indifference. Therefore, peace must be seen as something beyond this.

This same logic can be found in the writings of Baruch Spinoza (2009:44-45, author's translation):

> Of the city whose subjects, overcome with fear, do not take up arms, it should rather be said that it is without war, than that it has peace. Because peace is not the absence of war, but a virtue born of strength of mind: obedience, in fact, is the constant will to carry out what, by the common decree of the city, must be done.

Therefore, in order to continue the discussion about the causes and conditions for peace, I will necessarily have to deepen the discussion about the concept of peace. If in chapter one I primarily presented the critique of the negative definition of peace as the absence of violence, now I will have to debate on how to define peace in a positive way. As advanced in the introduction, I defined peace as a state of tranquility from the belief that conflicts will be resolved in a conciliatory way.

This definition arises from the congruence of the works of Spinoza (2009 [1677]), Galtung (1996), Adler (1999), and Johansen (2006). Two parts in the concept can be included from this dialogue between authors. The first is that peace is a state of tranquility. The second is that peace is a state where there is an expectation that if a conflict pop up, it will be resolved through peaceful means. The first part comes from the traditional view of peace as a state of mind (Anderson, 2004). This perspective finds its basis in prophets and traditions of various religions. Buddhism holds that meditation as "looking within" is the path to inner peace. Likewise, when Christianity speaks of the "Peace of Christ," it refers to faith in salvation and eternal life. Some passages in the New Testament reinforce Jesus' denial of the use of violence in favor of maintaining a calm and peaceful state of mind (Gittings, 2012:75). On a religious level, peace is primarily related to tranquility of mind.

However, peace is not just any state of tranquility. It is closely linked to the absence of violence. It is not by coincidence that hundreds of academics have intertwined these two concepts for centuries. Linking them occurs through the ways in which a conflict can be resolved. "Conflict is a state of incompatible goals, within and between persons, societies, regions, the world" (Galtung, 2006:18). Thus, a world without conflicts is a utopia. Individuals, societies, states will always have incompatible goals. However, conflicts do not need necessarily to be resolved through violence (Galtung, 2006; Johansen, 2006). In this sense, a conflict can be resolved in a violent way (war, homicide, domination, threat, etc…) or in a conciliatory way (cooperation, diplomacy, agreements, etc…). The state of peace comes when conflicts are resolved by peaceful mechanisms (Galtung, 1996; Johansen,

2006). In a way, it is worth mentioning that in this case, the ideas of conflict and change may be very similar. Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett (1998) defined a security community as a relationship between states in which there are expectations of peaceful change. If for Adler (1999), the meaning of peace is very similar to that of a security community, then peace, in his view, presupposes an expectation of pacifism.

The inclusion of the term "belief" in my definition is indeed fundamental. The use of this word serves as a link between the first and second parts of my definition (Peace is a state of tranquility from the belief that conflicts will be resolved in a conciliatory way). Peace as a state of tranquility occurs when an actor (individual, community, society, international state) believes that future conflicts will not give rise to violence. This expectation may or may not come true. Consider a state that has prepared a surprise attack on another state. On the day before the attacks begin, the unsuspecting defending state may consider itself to be living in peace. However, those who know of the attack's existence will no longer be at peace.

In a way, this expectation in the present about the future dialogues again with Spinoza's philosophy. For the Dutch philosopher, fear is a negative perspective about the future. Fear arises along with the expectation that something bad may occur in the future (Safatle, 2019). Therefore, a social relationship based on fear, "will always see the other as an invader", as a potential threat (Safatle, 2019:n.p.). Peace, to a certain extent, converses antagonistically with the idea of fear since it is a non-negative perspective on the future (if we consider that the violent resolution of conflicts is something negative). However, peace is a perspective specifically on how a conflict will be resolved.

The question here arises, however, why the second part of the definition is not enough to say what peace is. Let us consider the definition advanced by Galtung (1996) and reproduced by Johansen (2006). "Peace […] is having the capacity and skills to act with creativity, empathy and nonviolence in conflict situations" (Johansen, 2006:37). Using only one definition in these terms has some problems. The first is that it collaborates with the idea that moments of fear can be moments of peace. From this angle, the Cold War was a moment of peace, as there were no violent resolutions of conflicts between the two superpowers. Likewise, contexts such as those in which Tatiana Moura (2004) calls the newest wars, where the conflict is located on a micro-territorial scale, would seem to be contexts of peace. For those who live in contexts of newest wars, perhaps they have never suffered from any kind of violence, but they will certainly not consider themselves living in peace.

Furthermore, having the capabilities and ability to act does not mean that such capabilities will be put into practice.

For these reasons I have coined the definition of peace in the terms presented. Like any definition, this one ought to be criticized. However, I needed a proposition that would allow me to clearly present what terms such as "conditions for peace", "causes of peace", "peaceful countries", mean for this study. Therefore, the causes for peace refer to the factors that inhibits conflicts to arise or make conflicts to be resolved peacefully. The conditions for peace are factors that allow conflicts to be resolved peacefully. Either way, an expectation of peaceful resolution will lead to a state of tranquility for one actor towards the other, bringing peace.

This point of view dialogues very well with the arguments developed by Johansen (2006) when he defends the reformulation of Peace Studies. For him, this reorientation should happen exactly as a way to deepen theoretical and practical knowledge of how to guarantee peace by peaceful means (Johansen, 2006). As evident in the work of Johan Galtung (1996:9): "peace work is work to reduce violence by peaceful means. Peace studies is the study of the conditions of peace work" or, more briefly, "peace studies explore handling conflict by peaceful means" (Galtung, 2006:15).

It is worthy to note that there are different conditions for peace, at different levels of influence. In this chapter, I will consider both constitutive and facilitative conditions (Adler, 1999:168). With this in mind, I will present two theories that offer substantive and elucidative conclusions from the study of the causes of peace: democratic peace theory and civilizing theory. As Gleditsch (2013) points out, both theories (in the case of civilizing theory, he refers to the work of Pinker, 2011) offer substantial data to attest claims that somehow the world is more peaceful today than it was a few centuries ago. Moreover, both agree that peace is not "natural to humankind" (Kant, 1795; Howard, 2000; Elias, 2008). However, democratic peace theory and civilizing process theory highlight different aspects of societal evolution.

In this chapter's third section, I will make a theoretical reflection about these two theories and how they interact with the mainstream traditions introduced in the last chapter. Due to its exploratory nature, my reflection will seek primarily to find spaces for innovative research rather than proving which theory is right.

3.1 - Democratic Peace Theory

The pillars of the democratic peace theory can be found in Immanuel Kant's *Perpetual Peace*. On this manuscript, the German philosopher proposes a few conditions for what he considers a durable and stable peace at the international level. Among other proposals, one stands out as a basis for defenders of democratic peace: the belief that Republicanism is the only form of government capable to create peace (Kant, 1795). The explanation for this choice appears quite simple. Since a republic gives citizens the right (and the duty) to choose between war and peace, its constituents will tend to opt for the latter. Ordinary citizens are the ones that carry the burden and the suffering of war, they are the ones sent to trenches and tanks. Thus, they inevitably reject war. In the meantime, despotic governments' decisions do not need to pass through the sieve of citizens. Only one, or a few persons, has the power to declare a war that he/she will not participate as a soldier. Writing during the Enlightenment period, Kant aimed to highlight the idea that "autocrats were responsible for war" (Gat, 2005:83). Still, for Michael Doyle (2005), Kant's writing provides substantive explanations for the reasons behind democracies avoidance to fight other democracies.

Under Kant's influence, scholars from the entitled "Democratic Peace Theory" defend that liberal democracy diminishes the propensity of a state to enter into war (Chan, 1997; MacMillan, 2004). Still, they disagree regarding the dimension of such impact. Reviewing the literature in this topic, Chan (1997:62) identified three "interpretations: (1) democracies are, in general, more peaceful than nondemocracies; (2) democracies are only more peaceful toward each other; and (3) democracies are no more peaceful than nondemocracies." According to this same study, published in 1997, the second interpretation was the more supported among scholars (Chan, 1997). A good example of this view is Russett, who admits that democracy might fight it other, but "wars between democracies are at most extremely rare events, and second, that even violent conflicts between democracies that fall short of war are also very rare" (Russett et al., 1995:169). In fact, this idea that democracies do not fight each other might be one of the few conclusions in IR that seems to be almost consensual (Maoz and Russett, 1993; Risse-Kappen, 1995).

Concerning the reasons of why democracies behave peacefully towards other democracies, authors also offer various propositions and contributions. Maoz and Russett (1993) quantitatively tested two models that seek to explain this phenomenon: the normative, focused on domestic political norms, and the structural, which stresses that democracy hinders the mobilization for war. For both models, they found a significant impact on war avoidance (Maoz and Russett, 1993). Doyle (2005:43) asserts that three factors combined accounted for this propensity for peace: "Republican representation, an ideological commitment to fundamental human rights, and transnational interdependence". Meanwhile, others believe that the impact of liberalism and economic interdependence is vast (Friedman, 1999; MacMillan, 2004).

Whilst liberals enforce that economic liberalism and interdependence are the source of peace among democracies, some authors propose a social constructivist explanation for it. Risse-Kappen (1995) suggests that democracies avoid fighting each other because of perceptions. For him, a democracy will inevitably view the other in a more friendly manner (Risse-Kappen, 1995). Furthermore, the policy-making process in democracies tends to be public, what fosters trust between democracies and mitigates the security dilemma (Risse-Kappen, 1995:508). Emanuel Adler (1997), following his ideas on security communities, argues that the democratic peace does not work because of liberalism per se, or the constraints faced by democratic leaders. He argues that democracy became a cross-national identity, and thus, "the democratic peace is about the social construction of a transnational 'civic culture' that engenders mutual trust and legitimacy" (Adler, 1997:347). In a more critical way, the constructivist Ido Oren (1995) also reinforces how democratic peace is value-oriented, arguing that instead of democracy, it reflects the US foreign policy. Furthermore, Oren would argue that democratic peace is ahistorical and acritical concerning US democratic system.

Notwithstanding, Oren is not alone, and democratic peace theory suffered severe criticism regarding their conclusions. For Azar Gat (2005), the industrial-technological revolution accounted for the peaceful turn of developed countries rather than the democratic transition alone. Another dimension important to this criticism is that democratic peace theorists emphasize peace between states, but they dismiss the internal violence of such states. Tavares Furtado (2022:8) uses the Brazilian example to show that a democratic state, which did not participate in any international conflict in the past decades, have a national

homicide rate higher than many inter-state wars. Therefore, democracies might not enter in wars, but can still be extremely violent internally.

Sebastian Rosato (2003) made one of the harshest criticisms upon democratic peace theory. He starts by showing how democracies can overcome liberal and democratic norms and values, as proven during the period of imperialism and colonialism. Another premise, defended by the normative model and rejected by Rosato, is that democracies trust and respect each other. On this behalf, he hits at the US Achilles' heel: the interventions carried out against other democracies during the Cold War. If democracies are peaceful because of mutual respect, why has one single democracy managed to impose other democratically elected governments, like in Guatemala, Chile or Brazil, to turn into autocracies? Beyond the normative perspective, Rosato criticizes the view that autocrats have no accountability regarding their choices. Rosato identified that autocrats are punished more and tend to fall from power if a military operation fails.

Independently of the validity of its conclusions and the criticism received, proponents of the democratic peace theory made one particularly important contribution for this study. The idea that only analyzing cases when conflict emerges misses all the situations in which crises did not turn into conflicts. In Russett's (Russett et al., 1995:167) words: "any research design focusing on crises misses all the dogs that did not bark - the crises that never erupted or never brought the participants to the brink of war". Scholars following the democratic peace theory aim to explain why peace prevailed in some cases where conflicts were imminent. In other words, they seek an explanation of what causes peace. This statement dialogues particularly well with Johansen's work. For him, it is crucial to understand what factors avoid conflicts to turn violent (Johansen, 2006).

I feel obliged to highlight, that Christopher Layne wrote a letter, in which he replies to Russett's affirmation on "non-barking" dogs (Russett et al., 1995:176). He affirms that "it is difficult (if not impossible) to prove why a non-event did not happen" (Russett et al., 1995:176). In fact, Layne's argument is quite persuasive. To some extent, the necessity of different authors to include additional criteria in the democratic peace theory attest such difficulty. The diversity of explanatory variables within this framework might occur exactly because it is difficult to prove which variations in fact influenced the non-events.

The debate concerning democratic peace theory is saturated, and not much of an innovative approach might emerge from this perspective. When Gledistch, Nordkvelle and Strand (2014:151) conducted his search on the Journal of Peace Research, they identified a

considerable number of articles discussing this topic. In a review developed by Chan (1997) more than 2 decades ago, it was already clear how this theory was put in the spotlight by a bunch of writers. Since this study aims to be exploratory research, such theory might not be the best opening for the innovation sought. Still, democratic peace theory advanced one proposition that will be important for my further analysis: it is possible to create a robust theory, with concrete hypothesis and questions, about the causes of peace. In other words, it is possible to test theories concerned with "the dogs that did not bark".

3.2 - The Civilizing Process

The term "Civilizing Process theory" used in this chapter does not represent a concise theory. Instead, I labelled this term to include scholars influenced by Nobert Elias' pivotal work *The Civilizing Process*. Besides Elias, I will give primacy in this chapter to the work of Steven Pinker. This choice is by the fact that Pinker applied Elias' theory into his own theory about peace. I will complement their work with the contribution of scholars such as Andrew Linklater, Azar Gat, John Gittings and Michael Howard. Some of them quote Elias (especially Linklater), while others do not base their work on his. Nevertheless, all these authors develop their work on an analysis of long-term changes of the civilizing process. To some extent, Johan Galtung (1996) in his later work also looks at what he calls "cultural violence" and civilization. The dialogue of these theorists with Galtung's later work can be extremely fruitful, since Galtung is an unavoidable researcher of peace. Due to the immense impact of his work in the IR field, I should highlight that I am not following the premises carried out by Samuel Huntington in his *Clash of Civilization*. Huntington (1993) believes that civilization will be a central cause of conflict, which is an argument that goes in a direction opposite to the one described in this section.

Similar to peace, civilization is a quite controversial concept. For Elias (1994:5), civilization embraces "the self-consciousness of the West", encompassing "everything in which Western society of the last two or three centuries believes itself superior to earlier societies". Albeit this terminology suggests an Eurocentric approach, Elias (1994:xiv) rejects the idea that the western civilization "is the most advanced of all human modes of behavior" vehemently. Going even further, he advanced the idea that a society (like the Nazi Germany)

might even step back in its civilization (Linklater, 2012:3). From this perspective, civilization is a process rather than a condition (Linklater, 2012). In his masterpiece, Elias portrays how this process flowed from the medieval ages until modernity. While medieval people were more benevolent toward cruelty and violence, restrictions over aggressive behaviors surge when monarchs started to centralize power in their hands (Elias, 1994:169-172).

> Outbursts of cruelty did not exclude one from society. They were not outlawed. The pleasure in killing and torturing others was great, and it was a socially permitted pleasure. To a certain extent, the social structure even pushed its members in this direction, making it necessary and practically advantageous to behave this way (Elias, 1994:163).

Notwithstanding, such relations began to change, opening space for a more peaceful society. For Elias (2008), this pacification process identified in contemporary societies occurred through two factors. The first one was the formation of the states, which force through the monopoly of violence the notion that individuals do not use violence (Elias, 2008). Thus, the danger of being assaulted by other individuals diminishes considerably (Elias, 1994:372). Andrew Linklater (2011:159) complements Elias' work, affirming that "all societies have such processes because all must address the question of how their members can go about satisfying their most basic needs". At the international sphere, Elias (2008) argues that only with an international supra-national power, wars might cease. From this perspective, Elias' standpoint comes closer to the realist thought. In fact, power plays a pivotal role in his work (Bour, 2017). However, power always interacts with knowledge and the combination of both impact social change.

Nevertheless, Elias goes beyond state-formation to explain peace. The second part of this pacification process lays in the "internalization of a conscience" (Elias, 2008:140). In "civilized" societies, some "psychological self-restraint" emerges that inhibits violent practices (Elias, 1994:369). Such psychological change overturns violent impulses, fostering self-control and creating a sense of empathy toward the others (Pinker, 2011:72-73). In *The Civilizing Process*, he analyzed how actions and beliefs, treated as normal in the Middle Ages, became abhor in the modern age. While medieval bards sang of the 'beauty' of wars, torture and genocides and warriors saw conflicts as their reason to live, after the formation of states, such views and creeds started to be excluded from social moral norms (Elias, 1994).

At this point, I must establish a bridge between the work of Elias and Galtung. When Galtung (1996) wrote about civilization, he followed a perspective similar to Elias', though

he did not cite the German sociologist. For Galtung, a form of violence exists titled cultural violence. This definition "means those aspects of culture, the symbolic sphere of our existence (…) that can be used to justify or legitimize direct or structural violence" (Galtung, 1990:291). Once, according to Galtung, peace and violence are antonymous, cultural peace will reflect exactly the opposite of cultural violence. When Elias affirms that the pacified Europe arose also because of "psychological self-restraints", he is affirming that an establishment of a peaceful culture minimizes physical violence.

However, there is one fundamental distinction between Galtung's and Elias' aims. Contrary to Galtung, Elias denies any kind of normative perspective in his work. In his words: "I am not concerned here with what ought to be, but only with analysing what is." (Elias, 2008:141). The German sociologist proposes a detachment from the position of power when an analysist is approaching his/her object of study (Bour, 2017). From this perspective, he concluded that the civilizing process carried out in the West was unplanned and even unintended (Elias, 1994:365). The self-control responsible for controlling violent instincts "had always been a part of human nature but which the medievals had underused" (Pinker, 2011:73). Thus, he distrusts that rationality impacted the construction of these more peaceful societies. From Elias' work, it becomes important to note that he did not defend that a particular form of civilization is better than others (Linklater, 2011:159). Although he focused on European civilizing process, he rejected an internationalist approach. Elias had never affirmed that others must follow the same European steps or patterns (Linklater, 2011).

The Civilizing Process became a highly influenced book among sociologists and even scholars from other disciplines, psychologist Steven Pinker coming up as one of these scholars. In his controversial *The Better Angels of our Nature*, Pinker presents the proposition that the 21st century might be the most peaceful period in human's history (Pinker, 2011). In his work, Pinker (2011:xxv) highlights what he considers to be the "four better angles", or "motives that can orient them [humans] away from violence and toward cooperation and altruism". These are: 1- empathy; 2- self-control; 3- moral sense; 4- reason (Pinker, 2011:xxv).

These four better angles of our nature would arguably be molded and fostered by five historical transformations. In this section, I will stress two of these processes: the civilizing process and the humanitarian revolution. Regarding the first historical process, Pinker (2011:85) uses data on homicide rates to attest how the emergence of the state reduced violence. To explain such a transformation, Pinker roots his argument in Elias' work. While

he aggregates his own data with previous research, he concluded that homicide rates in European countries have shrunken since the Middle Ages and, in the late 1800s, some of the northern countries had considerably low rates already (Pinker, 2011:87).

Notwithstanding, Pinker offers additional contributions to Elias' formulation. First, he emphasizes an explanatory variable considered by Elias but in a more implicit way: commerce (Pinker, 2011:77). Beyond the change in the political structural established by the formation of states, the gradual division of labor also would have played an important role in diminishing the propensity to violence (Pinker, 2011:77). To some extent, this perspective brings him closer to some proponents of liberal peace theory once the emergence of liberalism became an explanatory variable regarding this peaceful turn. Although Pinker agrees with some of Elias' propositions in terms of civilizing process, he advances that this theory would not be enough to explain another long-term process that accounts for contemporary peace, what he calls "The Humanitarian Revolution" (Pinker, 2011:170).

The humanitarian revolution refers to the gradual abolishment of different forms of brutal violence such as savage punishments, slavery, or torture. Pinker (2011) identified that after 1800s many of these actions considered ordinary became to be seen as unacceptable. Because of temporal incongruences, *The Civilizing Process* could hardly account for these changes. Thus, he sought other explanations for this upsurge of empathy during the XIXth century, proposing that the rise of literacy coupled with the boost in book production with the invention of the printing press appears as the best explanation for this humanitarian revolution (Pinker, 2011:174). On this behalf, Pinker supports his argument in Lynn Hunt's work on *Inventing Human Rights.* The main argument from this book explains that the spreading of novels increased the sense of empathy, what would later take to the creation of human rights (Walzer, 2009).

Pinker also highlights that the increase of reading occurred in a moment when Enlightenment ideas and philosophies were flourishing. Writers like Spinoza, Kant, Voltaire, Montesquieu, among others, proposed a profound break with the ancient regime and everything connected to it. When Spinoza affirms in his *Tractatus Politicus* that the main aim of the state shall be to guarantee peace, or when Kant proposes his treaty on perpetual peace, they were proposing a perspective antagonistic toward the warring nobility. The Age of Reason poured new perspectives in terms of humanity and empathy (Pinker, 2011). As Michael Howard (2000) also pointed out, the Enlightenment was a turning point

in terms of peace. The revolutionaries sought to break with anything that reminded the *ancient régime* (Howard, 2000).

Regarding the theoretical debate, Pinker's view puts his theory somewhere between constructivism, realism and even liberalism. According to him, ideas matter and "can lessen the possibility of war" (Pinker, 2013:405). Still, he does not reject the idea that the human nature is prone to war, but commerce and liberal values can lead to peace (Pinker, 2011, 2013). Unsurprisingly, scholars received Steven Pinker's thesis with skepticism. In a harsh criticism, Butler (2018) asserts that the data used by Pinker to present the Middle Ages as a period of widespread cruelty relies on unreliable data. Meanwhile, Thayer (2013) argues that Pinker misread the international conjuncture, missing an analysis of how US power suppressed violence. Another criticism advanced by Thayer is that Pinker's conclusion is limited to the West since the explanations for violence decline have led to more violence in other parts of the globe. In the meantime, Levy and Thompson (2013) doubt about the feasibility of an unified analysis on different forms of violence. Furthermore, they would argue that state-formation and commerce led to widespread violence in many parts of the globe (Levy and Thompson, 2013:415).

For this thesis, all this criticism only strengthens the idea that the reason behind the causes of peace must be studied. As Gleditsch (2013) points out and Thayer (2013) admits, it seems unquestionable that 400 years ago, some forms of violence were more accepted than in present times. Furthermore, the data displayed by Pinker to prove his thesis is vast and robust. However, as the critics show, the reason for this change can be challenged and must be tested. Thus, the crucial question for this dissertation is how such theories and methods applied to study peace can offer innovative backgrounds for future peace research. On this behalf, I must turn to the methodology used by Pinker and Elias.

Elias applied a long-term analysis of social processes (Linklater, 2012; Bour, 2017). He rejects the view that specific events led a society to become civilized (Linklater, 2012). For Bour (2017:46), Elias proposes a process-oriented methodology that requires "a causal processed-oriented micro-macro-analysis which enables social scientists to trace long-term social change". His *Civilizing Process* depicts the development of the French and German societies from the Medieval Age until the modern state. Similarly, Steven Pinker also roots his argument on long-term analysis of micro-macro processes. He begins his study with an analysis of classical books like Homer's *Illiad* and the Bible's Old Testament, passing

through the Medieval Age, the Humanitarian Revolution, reaching the Long Peace and the Civil Rights Movements (Pinker, 2011).

Influenced by Elias or Pinker, other authors also share this perspective. Azar Gat (2005:76) underlines that "historically, democratization and liberalization in general did not constitute a onetime transition from a nondemocratic regime but rather were processes that unfolded over time, often over decades and even centuries". Albeit he does not base his work on Elias', John Gittings (2012) also provides a historical standpoint to advance his arguments in favor of the study of peace. When Galtung (1990) coined the concept of "cultural violence", he brought to his work this long-term perspective once he affirms that this cultural perspective is more permanent than the physical and structural violence.

Besides the defense of a long-term analysis, Nobert Elias and Steven Pinker also shared the focus on countries with low violence rates. They picked up a few countries and looked at the historical change of social beliefs and perceptions. For this reason, their case studies were countries, regions or even cities that nowadays are considered peaceful. Both focused mainly on Western countries.

If the democratic peace theory could barely propose new frameworks for innovation, the opposite occurs with the Civilizing Process theories. Andrew Linklater (2012) already argued for the usefulness of building a dialogue between Elias' work and IR theory. Even though the work of Pinker sold an impressive number of copies, it does not seem that other scholars have extensively linked Elias' work with the study of peace.

Since this theory is far from being saturated, there are still some dialogues with other theories and problematics that could emerge from their propositions. First of all, a conversation between Elias and Pinker with Charles Tilly may bring some cards into the game. Levy and Thompson (2013) had already proposed this dialogue about how state formation only increased violence in other parts of the globe. However, I would like to establish this theoretical conversation from another perspective. In one of the most acclaimed works in sociology, Tilly (1990) affirmed that "wars make states and vice-versa". His argument is supported by the premise that states solidification in Europe (the consolidation of the monopoly of the force) occurred through an intensification of war, that needed vaster budgets and consequently more citizens to pay the efforts of war (as tax payers and soldiers). If wars made states and state formation led to peace, as Elias and Pinker argued, then, has war led to peace? If this logic is correct, how about the perspective that peace is the opposite of war? Can war be the opposite and a source of peace at the same

time? It seems to reinforce this study's basilar premises, but also the definition of peace proposed in this thesis. As Adler (1999) pointed out, peace must be something else than the opposite of violence.

Another reflection is that the civilizing process was also extremely violent towards others. Edward Said (2021:32), in his masterpiece *Orientalism,* discuss how the east, as an antagonistic image, shaped the construction of Western civilization. As Said reinforces, this relationship toward the exotic other has been mainly violent. Martha Finnemore (2003:1) opens her *The Purpose of Intervention*, with a statement that might be obvious, but frequently forgotten: "[m]any, probably most, societies throughout history that we have come to respect as exemplars of civilization engaged in exceptionally violent practices." Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2022) did not stay far behind, affirming that peace in Europe is rooted and financed by the exploration and oppression of under-developed countries.

A dialogue between civilizing process theory and Latin America history may makes Sousa Santos' argument clearer. When Pinker highlights how commerce impacted the creation of western civilization, he does not discuss how this commerce was based on the economic exploration of foreign territories. Since the XVth century, Portugal and Spain extensively explore their colonies in the Americas. Netherlands made a fortune with goods from Latin America, and it even owned a short-term colony in the Brazilian Northeast. The French extensively explored Haiti. The indigenous and African blood fueled the colonial expansion. Slavery was nuclear in this economy. Pinker correctly points out that this type of violence continued occurring until the emergence of what he calls "Humanitarian Revolution". Still, he does not go deeper in the relations created between violence in Latin America and the civilizing process in Europe.

Bringing wealth in from the "new world", the European crowns became much richer and, consequently, monarchs could reinforce their power more easily. The unification of Spain coincided with its occupation of territories owned by Mesoamerica's indigenous communities. Germany might be an exception during this period, since it was not yet unified. If the civilizing process occurred because of the formation and consolidation of state-power, and the newly-formed states consolidated their power through colonialism, can we say that colonialism created Western civilization?

Pinker also claims that the 1800s century saw the pinnacle of the humanitarian revolution in Europe. However, part of this period (after 1875) corresponds to what Eric Hobsbawn called the "Age of Empire". It is noteworthy that Hobsbawn (1990) links the

notion of civilization with imperialism. As he argued, the Western civilization began to need "exotic" goods to keep their technological development (Hobsbawn, 1990:85-86). For this reason, the economic and technological conjuncture propelled the Western powers to seek for certain raw materials abroad. From this perspective, can we consider that imperialism shaped the Humanitarian Revolution in Europe? Indeed, whether colonialism and imperialism permitted the European civilizing process and the Humanitarian Revolution to flourish, can we consider that violence abroad is a cause of internal peace?

These are rhetoric questions used to reinforce the possibilities of new inquiries from the premises advanced by civilizing process theory while analyzing the causes of peace. Although colonialism and imperialism might explain the decrease of violence inside European colonial powers, they seem meaningless when regarding the peaceful propensity of countries such as Iceland or Slovenia. Germany, again, is also an exception regarding the impact of colonialism into the civilizing process, since it was only unified centuries later.

In any case, such questions do matter and can only be answered through the analysis of long-term micro-macro processes, as defended by Elias (Bour, 2017). However, Elias' analysis was limited to national processes of customs, economic and social transformation. The analysis of such processes can only be carried out with a focus on the countries where they happened. Thus, using Russett's metaphor, we must analyze the processes that make some dogs stop barking. In the following chapter, I will develop my empirical analysis based on this theoretical discussion. *The Civilizing Process* theory arises as a promising framework for replying to my research question.

In the last chapter, I depicted two theories that offer solid support for studying the causes of peace. I must reinforce, though, that these are not competing theories and, in fact, some of their premises overlapped. However, to answer my research question (What are the underused theoretical and methodological approaches in the study of peace, its causes, conditions, or mechanisms?), I need first to identify where the underused theories and methos may be. Then, I must test if these already identified possibilities really open space for new inquiries and hypothesis. This test will be carried out in this chapter. Notwithstanding, this section will make a dialogue between democratic peace theory/civilizing process theories with the mainstream traditions advanced in the first chapter.

The first important reflection needed lays in an analysis of which theories still offer spaces for the desired innovation. Besides the excessive number of studies following these two views, neorealism and neoliberalism have one immediate problem concerning this question: they might not even believe that studying the causes of peace is desirable (or even possible) at the international level. As Waltz (1959) points out, a scholar should look at the causes of war to understand the feasibility of peace. In this case, anarchy is a persistent cause of conflict in the international arena. Due to its persistence, to talk about 'causes of peace' seems meaningless. A scholar must then analyze how to mitigate the causes of war. From this, Waltz proposes two mitigators: balance of power and nuclear arsenal. Meanwhile, neoliberals agree with neorealists' premises (for this reason Wendt called them "weak realists"), but they propose other mitigators: international organizations and economic interdependence. These factors may appear to be sources of peace. *The Oxford Handbook for Peaceful Change* exemplified that on a chapter dedicated to debate nuclear weapons as a transformational heel. However, I do not think that this conclusion is consensual. Only a hierarchical structure, an international Leviathan, can be considered a cause of peace under a realist perspective (Richmond, 2008:46). For them, balance of power or nuclear deterrence only diminishes the risk of war. If anarchy disentangles and an international state materializes, then these factors would become meaningless. Since the formation of an international state is utopic for them, to look at the causes of peace is senseless.

The second possibility is constructivism. In fact, some authors have argued for a constructivist turn in peace studies (Skelly, 2002). For Galtung (1996; 2006), peace research

should have an empiric, critical and constructivist component. Furthermore, Galtung's conceptualization of cultural violence was perceived as an attempt to include a constructivist (and critical) perspective in his theorization (Gledistch, Nordkevelle, and Strand, 2014). Nonetheless, constructivism is already an overused theory regarding the international system. Alexander Wendt is considered by some one of the most influential IR scholars of the last century (Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012). Together with neorealism and neoliberalism, constructivism is the tradition with more followers (Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012). Albeit the extensive research carried out under this label, I did not find an extensive work specifically talking about peace. As identified in the first chapter, I found it unexpectedly difficult to find constructivist writings about it. Interrelated topics, like security, militarization, and conflict, appeared in a few constructivists' pieces. However, the word "peace" scarcely arose in the articles and books cited in my research. Once again, Emanuel Adler and his work with Michael Barnett were the main exceptions, while other authors have applied constructivist premises into democratic peace theory (Risse-Kappen, 1995; Oren, 1997; Kahl, 1998). Therefore, constructivism emerges as a first candidate for innovation.

Concerning the democratic peace theory and the civilizing process theory, the opportunities for innovation tilt for the latter. As advanced in this chapter, democratic peace theory inspired a plurality of publications. Gletitsch, Nordkvelle and Strand (2014) identified how the number of articles issued by the JPR on democratic peace rose sharply in the 1990s and 2000s. In fact, the central proposition of this theory (democracies do not fight each other) was so overstudied that some authors consider it the closest sample in IR of a consensual phenomenon.

In relation to the civilizing process theory, it becomes more difficult to determine its possibilities. The analysis of underused approaches offered by these theorists ends up having to be done in an *ad hoc* manner. Norbert Elias is regarded as one of the most influential sociologists of the last century. However, his work is rarely used by International Relations scholars (Linklater, 2012). Meanwhile, Steven Pinker's *Better Angels of Our Nature* has achieved some success and impact. Pinker's central argument (we live in the most peaceful time in history) has generated some academic noise, as exemplified by the development of a forum in the International Studies Association on this topic (Gleditsch, 2013). However, there is nothing to indicate that this approach has reached a saturation point that inhibits innovations based on these theories.

Therefore, among the theories considered here, there are two that seem to offer more opportunities for innovation for the discipline of peace studies: constructivism and the civilizing process. It is therefore worth making a dialogue between the two theories. They share some similarities. The first of them is opening the eyes of researchers to long-term historical processes. Nobert Elias (1994), Alexander Wendt (1995), Adler (1999), Adler and Barnett (1998, 2000), Steven Pinker (2011), all of them reinforce the importance of long-term processes to the detriment of single case events. Peace, on this perspective, must be analyzed as a long-term construction.

Another similarity between these two theories deals with the importance given to cultural aspects. While Adler (1999) and Adler and Barnett (1998, 2000) talk in terms of security communities, Nobert Elias (1994, 2008) talks about civilization. To some extent, the two concepts have some points in common. They refer to how people perceive, understand, and make their reality. Using a constructivist terminology, security communities and civilizations are practices created, shaped, and reinforced daily. Such practices, however, are fluid. They can (and probably will) change over time.

At some point, constructivists and civilization processes theorists diverge. At the international level, Elias did not believe that identity formation could create peace between states. On the opposite, he believed that only a supranational state could create an international civilization, and thus, lead in the long term to an international pacification. I must highlight that this perspective is exclusive to Elias. Pinker (2011), for example, argues that what he calls an international "Long Peace" occurred because leaders and citizens began to see war as unacceptable. A perspective that dialogues extremely well with constructivism.

Still, Elias (2008) affirmed that only a supranational state could create a solid international peace. Although he did not use the word "anarchy", he was intrinsically talking in neorealist terms. Meanwhile, constructivists will argue that proximities among different domestic cultures could create a sense of collective identity besides the boundaries of nation-states (Adler, 1999). Furthermore, as Wendt (1992, 1999) affirms, anarchy does not function in a static way. States define how they will act and behave in an anarchy. They still can see other states as "friends", giving precedence to cooperation and peaceful change in this friendly relationship (Wendt, 1992). Therefore, constructivists would disagree with how Elias perceived the international propension to peace.

Therefore, from my theoretical discussion carried out in the previous two chapters, constructivism and civilizing process theory seem to be the theories that offer tools to look

at peace and its properties. Both have been underused, even though they propose substantive concepts, methods and explanations for peace. Three theoretical and methodological approaches emerged from these scholars. First, they gave priority to the argument that collective ideas, behaviors, and culture impact peace. Secondly, Elias (1994), Adler (1999), Adler and Barnett (1998, 2000) and Pinker (2011) look at peaceful countries, societies or communities to explain peace. Finally, they support a long-term analysis of social processes.

These three approaches emerged from my theoretical discussion as responses to my research question. They may open space for innovation and a re-orientation in Peace Studies away from the study of violence. I will, then, test it empirically. This chapter aims to find out if in fact these ideas have been as underused as they seem to be.

4.1 – Methodology

As recurrently mentioned throughout this thesis, this study composes what some authors consider "exploratory research" (Jaeger and Halliday, 1998; Stebbins, 2001; Neuman, 2007; Swedberg, 2020). As Swedberg (2020:24) points out, a reason to use exploratory research is "a general lack of knowledge about some topic". In my case, my point of departure is the fact that some authors identified a shortage of studies concerning the causes of peace (Fabbro, 1978; Wendt, 1999; Gittings, 2012; Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand, 2014; Diehl, 2016). As Gittings (2012) highlights, the number of publications about the causes of war and conflict stands out in comparison with books talking about peace. In academic journals, Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand (2014) and Diehl (2016) found out the same pattern, since the number of articles mentioning war and violence excel the ones mentioning peace. The recently published *The Oxford Handbook of Peaceful Change in International Relations* also claims for a deepening in our comprehension of peaceful change since IR "mainstream scholarly efforts still lag behind in unraveling the causes, sources, and mechanisms of peaceful change or their consequences." (Paul, 2021).

Because of the lack of knowledge about the topic analyzed, exploratory research aspires to open space and to give insights for new inquiries and hypothesis (Jaeger and Halliday, 1998; Neuman, 2007; Goeman and Solari, 2011; Swedberg, 2020). On this behalf, exploration is "primarily inductive" once researchers build their work on their own emerging theoretical framework (Stebbins, 2001:6). Thus, its objectives differ from "confirmatory

research" that aims to attest hypothesis proposed by existing theories (Jaeger and Halliday, 1998; Goeman and Solari, 2011). Although Neuman (2007) advances that this kind of research tends to "not be wedded to a specific theory or research question", I opted to develop a question to guide my research. However, because of the methodological characteristic of this type of research, I propose a question broader than expected in the cases of confirmatory studies. Thus, I could have a more flexible approach as needed for good exploratory research (Stebbins, 2001; Neuman, 2007). Therefore, the question guiding this research is:

What are the underused theoretical and methodological approaches in the study of peace, its causes, conditions, or mechanisms?

Based on this research question, I formulated three hypotheses. They reflect the possibilities of innovation that emerged from the theoretical discussion presented in the previous section. Now, I must test if they can create new inquiries and hypothesis to contribute to new research. Because this study composes "exploratory research", I followed Swedberg's (2020) proposal that a hypothesis in this kind of study should use "qualified formulations" and a non-incisive vocabulary (for example "may" rather than "is"). Such an approach opens space for two crucial elements of exploratory research, according to Stebbins (2001:5), "flexibility in looking for data and open-mindedness about where to find them".

Hypothesis 1- Theories and concepts connected to culture, identity or cognition may offer spaces for innovative studies on the causes of peace since they have been neglected by scholars.

I framed this hypothesis based mainly on the idea of self-conscious formation, developed by Elias (2008) and Pinker (2011), and of collective identity, stressed by constructivists (Adler, 1997, 1999; Poulit, 2007). It also dialogues well with the more recent work of Galtung (1990, 1996) on cultural peace. Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand (2014:150) suggested that Galtung's concept of cultural violence did not achieve the same prestige among authors than his concept of structural violence. However, the three authors did not evaluate quantitatively or qualitatively this assumption. It can be possible that scholars apply other terminologies like "civilization", "security communities" or even

"identity" to talk about the cultural aspects of peace. On this behalf, I will analyze in this section what are the concepts more used in the JPR. If I find that concepts and ideas connected to Galtung (culture of peace), Elias (civilization process), Pinker (humanitarian revolution) or Adler (collective identity/security community) are underused, then my hypothesis will be confirmed.

Hypothesis 2- Scholars do not study countries with better indicators of peace, what may open space for new case studies.

Johansen (2006) affirms that the re-orientation of peace studies should be based on a look at peace properties. Considering the methodology applied by civilizing process theorists (Elias, 1994; Pinker, 2011) and constructivists (Adler and Barnett, 1998), the analysis of peaceful societies, communities and countries may be a possibility for innovation. The possible shortage of studies concerned with the more peaceful countries seems plausible since Wiberg identified in 1981 a massive preponderancy of studies about violent societies and countries. Furthermore, more recent research identified that peace still appears less in articles' titles than war (Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand, 2014; Diehl, 2016). This hypothesis even becomes more relevant because of Russett's argument on "the dogs that did not bark" (Russett et al., 1993). Once it is important to study the cases when and where violence has not popped up, one should look at the more peaceful countries. Both Nobert Elias (1994) and Steven Pinker (2011) looked at these countries. Seeking to prove the decline in homicide rates, Pinker looked mainly to the data on England, while recurrently comparing it with other European countries. Elias (1994) focused mainly on France and Germany to support his civilization theory. Constructivists works, including Adler (1999) and Adler and Barnnett (1998, 2000) also offer support for the study of peaceful regions, or "security communities", as they call it. Moreover, case studies are a recurrent methodological approach in the social science (Silva and Menezes, 2005:21; Swedberg, 2020:26). In an interview with IR scholars from 20 countries from all around the globe, Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney (2012) found that "single case studies" and "comparative Case Study" were the two qualitative methods more applied. Case studies are a particularly useful tool "in studying complex phenomena" (Bennett and Elman, 2007:171). Therefore, finding underused case studies offers a far-reaching contribution to the study of peace.

Hypothesis 3- The methodology applied by scholars in the Journal of Peace Research is mainly empirical, qualitative and uses case studies.

This hypothesis was drawn from two perspectives, the first one is that the research carried out by mainstream Peace Researchers will be mainly focused on an empirical perspective. Patomaki (2001) and Jutila, Pehkonen and Vayrynen (2008) identified this tendency and claimed for a re-orientation towards a more critical and constructive analysis. Furthermore, Johan Galtung (1996) has constantly argued that peace studies without a critical and constructive character, become traditional international studies. The second perspective is that the current peace research has turn out to be very similar to the traditional research of International Relations (Patomaki, 2001; Diehl, 2016). For this reason, even Galtung has argued that the Journal of Peace Research became a tool of US foreign-policy (Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand, 2014). Then, I looked at studies which scan the methodological approaches in International Relations. From the work of Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney (2012:35-36), I found that the majority of IR scholars conduct qualitative studies and, among the different forms of qualitative methods, case studies are the most frequently used. I must highlight, however, that other studies have found a larger recurrence of quantitative methods (Sprinz and Wolinsky-Nahmias, 2004). For my research question and the contribution to this study, to understand the most used methods, it can be fruitful to open space for new approaches. Nobert Elias, for example, claims that social sciences must spend more time in historical analysis of micro-macro processes (Linklater, 2012; Bour, 2017). It is possible that historical analysis or discourse analysis may be underused by peace scholars. If this is the case, these methodologies might be important for a re-orientation in Peace Studies.

Albeit some authors use statistics to support the viability of their hypothesis, qualitative studies are more used for exploratory research (Neuman, 2007; Swedberg, 2020). However, I will apply a mixed method. Hence, I will follow mainly a convergent design, which occurs when "both types of data are gathered concurrently in a convergent core design and the results are merged together to examine a case" (Creswell and Creswell, 2018:311).

I gathered my data from the *Journal of Peace Research* (JPR). I preferred to analyze only one journal to be able to proceed with the mixed method described above. Otherwise, the number of articles considered would be so vast that I would barely be able to make a qualitative complementary analysis. The choice to look at the JRP came from the fact that it is the most important journal focused solely on issues of peace and violence (Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand, 2014). The emergence of the journal happened precisely to open space for the study of the conditions of peace, instead of the study of the logics of power (Jutila, Pehkonen and Vayrynen, 2008). Even though it focuses on Peace Studies, it is considered one of the most important journals of International Relations (Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012). Moreover, other authors have already used this journal to analyze how research in the field of Peace Studies has been conducted (Boulding, 1972; Jutila, Pehkonen and Vayrynen, 2008; Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand, 2014; Diehl, 2016). Since my hypotheses had not been tested by these previous studies on the JPR, I do not run the risk of repeating studies already carried out.

On this behalf, I entered on the SAGE (2022) archive online. There, I had access to all abstracts published by JPR. Thus, I carried out the same procedure that Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand (2014) used to analyze the recurrence of specific words, like violence and peace. I downloaded all the abstracts creating a single document where I could use a regular research engine to find the recurrence of a word. To limit my analysis to articles, I considered only those included in the sections "Research Article" and "Special Data Feature". Some JPR's issues had further sections like "Book Review" and about the prizes given to best articles. I did not consider such sections because it could create two entries about the same article into my data.

My dataset is composed by the abstracts of 995 articles published by JPR between 2002 and 2021. Similar to Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand (2014) and Diehl (2016) I opted to analyze abstracts since they include the most important information about an article. Authors tend to mention their case studies, temporal orientations, and methodological approaches in their abstracts. Thus, this method works particularly well for my purpose.

Regarding the temporal limitation imposed into my dataset, it happened for a few reasons. The first of them is because the Institute for Economics and Peace (2021) only came out with the Peace Index, which I used to test my second hypothesis, in 2008. I also needed to establish a limitation for my first hypothesis since constructivism as an IR theory, the democratic peace theory and Galtung's concept of cultural violence, only emerged in the

1990s[2]. For example, it did not make sense to test if scholars apply constructivist terminologies before their concepts were coined. Therefore, I decided to establish the same temporal limitation for all three hypotheses. Since my aim is to contribute to the current study of peace, it made sense to analyze what the academia has produced only in the last 20 years.

Once my dataset was considerably vast, I avoided to make the analysis without the support of a specialized engine. On this behalf, I utilized the "Sketch Engine", a software used mainly by scholars conducting discourse analysis (Allen and Blinder, 2018). This software allowed me to identify the recurrence of specific words, prefixes, suffixes and also the modifiers of a word. Besides the quantitative analysis of the data found in the Sketch Engine, I also proceeded with a qualitative analysis in all three hypotheses. This procedure sought to deepen my conclusions. Thereby, I will test my three hypotheses as follows:

Hypothesis 1: I will analyze the recurrence of words used by Galtung, Elias or constructivists to refer to cultural aspects of peace. Using the Sketch Engine, I will proceed with my analysis at three different levels. The first one encompasses the number of mentions each theory cited in this study received in my dataset. Besides the exact names of the theories, I will also search for the surnames of prominent scholars connected to the academic tradition. The second level of analysis refers to the recurrence in my dataset of specific theoretical concepts. On this behalf, I will search for conceptual phrases that characterize each theory (or discipline, in the case of Peace Studies). Finally, the third level of analysis is concerned with the words that somehow are connected to concepts or ideas that play a pivotal role for a specific theory. The Sketch Engine also allows me to search if the word is used in relation to peace or violence. For this study, finding mentions about the "clash of civilization" does not have the same meaning of references about the "civilizing process". My aim is to test if civilization, culture or identity, are terms used to study the sources of peace.

Once I have found articles that mention any of these conceptual frameworks (culture of peace, civilizing process and collective identity), I will analyze qualitatively how they approach the theme. This qualitative analysis seeks to confirm if authors discuss the

---

[2] All these theories and concepts had their basis before 1990s. Still, only after this decade, they achieved a wide influence on the academia.

formation of a peaceful culture/civilization/identity. Otherwise, I might find a confirmation of the first part of my hypothesis (authors do talk about culture), but a negation of the second (authors do not study how culture influences peace).

Hypothesis 2- This hypothesis centers on the case studies chosen by scholars. Thus, I will proceed this analysis mainly at the national level. Using the Sketch Engine, I will search for the number of mentions by country's names. To test if the more peaceful countries receive fewer mentions, I will use one measurement of peace: the Peace Index. The reason for this choice is that this indicator is the one that better interacts with the concept of peace used in this study. The peace index encompasses a panoply of indicators, like the perception of peacefulness or violent demonstrations, and more usual measurements of violence (Institute for Economics and Peace, 2022:84). Therefore, the index includes the state of tranquility (perceptions of peacefulness or not), but also if conflicts tend to be resolved with violence or by peaceful means.

Since the Peace Index was only established in 2008, I limited the abstracts used to test this hypothesis to the 768 published between 2008 and 2021. Moreover, the names of countries searched in the Sketch Regime were exactly with the same spell as presented by the Peace Index. It inevitably causes some discrepancies into the data. For example, the Peace Index includes the word "United States". Thus, I did not count the mentions of highly used terminologies as "US" or "USA". The same happened with other countries like the United Kingdom. Furthermore, only 3 Oceanian countries appeared in the index (Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea). It impacted especially when I compared the mentions by continents.

Hypothesis 3- The third hypothesis discusses the methodological approaches more commonly used in the Journal of Peace Research. On this behalf, I will make my analysis at two levels. The first one is similar to the previous two hypotheses. I will search through the Sketch Engine for words connected to quantitative and qualitative methods. I will start analyzing the most common modifiers applied to four nouns: "analysis"; "method"; "research" and "study". The reason for this approach is to identify without limitations which kinds of research have been conducted. Then, I will look at the names of specific methodologies referred by Sprinz and Wolinsky-Nahmias (2004) and Maliniak, Peterson

and Tierney (2012). Once again, I used the Sketch Engine to find how many times each one of these methods were mentioned.

This approach has a clear limitation regarding the possibility that authors mentions certain methods but they might not actually apply them. For this reason, I will have a second level of analysis primarily qualitative. I defined a set of articles which I will analyze how they approach their object of study. These articles will be the ones in which I have found a profound concern with peace and its properties. Thus, my goal is to identify in-depth the methods used by the authors discussing peace.

4.2 - The Culture of Peace.

In this section, I tested my first hypothesis: "Theories and concepts connected to culture, identity or cognition may offer spaces for innovative studies on the causes of peace since they have been neglected by scholars.". On this behalf, I analyzed the abstracts of the 995 articles published between 2002 and 2021 by the Journal of Peace Research. I conducted my research at 3 levels. The first level considered the name of the theory, or discipline, as used throughout the chapters of this thesis. The second presents some concepts central to such theories and described throughout the present study. Finally, the third level presents very common words in each theory.

In all three levels, I found an outstanding quantity of mentions of concepts and words connected to democratic peace theory. It was by far the most cited theory in abstracts. This finding supports the identification by Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand (2014) that this theory had a boost in mentions in the 2000s. Still, the discrepancy in relation to all other theories is notable and was unexpected. Scholars have used more the word "democracy" in JPR than the word "power". It also diverges from one of this study premises. Democratic peace theory undeniably discusses peace and its properties. Then, to some extent, it weakens the argument carried out by Johansen (2006) and Diehl (2016) regarding the necessity of peace studies to re-orient towards the study of peace. The most mentioned theory in the journal has already been oriented to study how some factors influence the emergence of peace.

As expected, concepts and words connected to realism and liberalism received more mentions than those connected to constructivism and civilizing process theory. Thus, my hypothesis was confirmed. Yet, I must highlight that civilizing process theory received an impressive low number of mentions. Even concepts and words presented by Steven Pinker did not appear substantially throughout the abstracts. Meanwhile, constructivists concepts and especially words like "identity" appeared in a proportion close to realists and liberals' concepts.

To complement this section, I proceeded with a qualitative analysis on the articles that mention at least one of the concepts linked to constructivism, civilizing process theory or Galtung's "culture of peace". The idea was to identify if these articles do, in fact, use cultural aspects to discuss peace properties. Ten abstracts mentioned such concepts. In four of them, I found an approach that sought to discuss how peace emerges and works.

Mentions by Theory and Authors

The recurrences of the names of the theories found are shown in Table 1. As demonstrated, the theory of "democratic peace" appears far ahead of the others, being cited fifty-six times. Among the theoretical traditions discussed in this chapter, the second most mentioned word was "liberalism" with only nine citations. However, it is important to emphasize that the word "liberalism" can refer to other theoretical forms, such as classical economic liberalism, than the IR neoliberalism described in this study. The two theories that discuss cultural and identity issues (constructivism and the civilizing process) were the two that received fewer citations. The term "Civilizing Process" was not used even once. As stated in the introduction, this work had to choose some theories over others. It is interesting to note, therefore, that the phrase "English School" and the word "Marxism", two theories that I have considered including in this analysis, have never been used in JPR abstracts in the last 20 years.

Table 1 – Mentions in the Journal of Peace Research abstracts (2002-2021) by theory or discipline.

NAME OF THE DISCIPLINE	NUMBER OF MENTIONS
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	39
PEACE STUDIES	2
REALISM	3
LIBERALISM	9
CONSTRUCTIVISM	2
DEMOCRATIC PEACE	56
CIVILIZING PROCESS	0

Such a discrepancy in citations in favor of democratic peace seems to support the perspective presented in the beginning of this chapter about the saturation of this theory. In a way, it also attests to the solidity of a perspective focused on the causes of peace. As stated earlier, the theory of democratic peace proves that it is possible to study peace from the point of view of its causes to the detriment of the causes of conflicts. However, regarding the hypothesis tested in this section, the results of this first level of analysis are not very representative. There is not, except for democratic peace, many citations in the abstracts that indicate whether the author will apply or criticize any of the theories. The fact that the word "realism" is mentioned three times in seven hundred and sixty-eight abstracts is not substantial to the point that we can say that this theory is more used than the constructivist theory. Even "liberalism" was not mentioned in any substantial way.

It is also curious to highlight the discrepancy in citations between the phrases "International Relations" (39) and "Peace Studies" (2). One possibility for such a discrepancy may come from the fact that the authors use other terminologies to refer to this discipline. The term "Peace Research", also commonly used, is mentioned twenty-nine times. Even if we add up the mentions of the terms "Peace Studies" (2) and "Peace Research" (29), it adds up to thirty-one. "International Relations" would still have been more cited (39). However, it is worth mentioning that seven of the mentions of the term "Peace Research"

refer to "democratic peace research" and four to the "Journal of Peace Research". Since the JPR had a structuring role in the discipline of peace studies, it seems that in the last twenty years, the newspaper has been captured by the discipline of international relations. In the early days of peace studies, the concern to differentiate itself from international relations permeated the work of several authors (Boulding, 1972; Isard, 2000). However, Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney (2012) had already identified that international relations scholars include the JPR among the most influential journals in the IR discipline. Future studies can analyze whether published scholars consider themselves to be in the discipline of international relations or peace studies.

To complement the first level of analysis, Table 2 demonstrates the disposition of mentions to the surnames of the authors of each theory analyzed in this study. As expected, the names of such authors are practically not mentioned. Once again, those linked to the idea of democratic peace received the vast majority of the reduced total number of citations. This may be due to the fact that the most important works of some authors (Waltz, Mearsheimer, Keohane, Nye, Boulding, Elias) have been written a long time before the period analyzed in this study. Interestingly, however, there are three works that mention "Galtung", another author whose most impactful research was published a few decades ago. On the other hand, I should point out that Steven Pinker wrote and published his books on peace during this period. As such, the complete lack of mention of his name suggests that his 2011 *Better Angels of Our Nature* did not achieve a major impact among academics concerned with these issues. It is also worth mentioning that his book was considered a *New York Times Bestseller*.

Table 2 – Mentions in the Journal of Peace Research's abstracts (2002-2021) by authors surnames.

THEORY	AUTHOR'S SURNAME	MENTIONS
NEOREALISM	Waltz	0
NEOREALISM	Mearsheimer	0
NEOLIBERALISM	Keohane	0
NEOLIBERALISM	Nye	0
CONSTRUCTIVISM	Wendt	0
CONSTRUCTIVISM	Finnemore	0
CONSTRUCTIVISM	Adler	1
PEACE STUDIES	Galtung	3
PEACE STUDIES	Boulding	0
DEMOCRATIC PEACE	Russett	6
DEMOCRATIC PEACE	Kant	5
CIVILIZING PROCESS	Elias	0
CIVILIZING PROCESS	Pinker	0

Mentions of theoretical concepts.

At this level of analysis, I considered two types of concepts about causes of peace: "phrases" (two or more words that together mean a concept) or "words" (a word that means or relates directly to a concept). The need for separation arose from the way I proceeded with the research. Comparing the recurrence of a single-word concept (norms, for example) to double-word concepts could be extremely misleading. In this way, Table 3 expresses the number of mentions by conceptual phrases. To guide the discussion, I indicated which theories tend to reinforce each of the concepts as causes of peace the most. I emphasize, however, that some of these concepts can be used and even studied by various theories. The

concept of "Democratic peace", for example, can be analyzed from a purely Kantian perspective, where the political system is what matters, or reinforcing economic liberalism, or even constructivist as described in the previous chapter.

Table 3 – Conceptual Phrases per number of mentions.

Theories (Specific author who uses the term)	Conceptual phrases	Number of Mentions	Number of abstracts
Neorealism (Waltz, 1988)	Nuclear Weapons[3]	22	7
	Balance of Power	11	11
Neoliberalism	International Organization	25	21
	Economic Interdependence	27	18
Peace Studies (Galtung, 1969) **Peace Studies (Galtung, 1990)**	Positive Peace	8	2
	Culture of Peace	5	1
Constructivism **Constructivism (Adler and Barnett, 1998)**	Collective Identity	6	5
	Security Community	9	3
Democratic Peace	Liberal Peace	25	13
	Democratic Peace	56	22
Civilizing Process **Civilizing Process (Pinker, 2011)**	Civilizing Process	0	0
	Humanitarian Revolution	0	0

---

[3] As presented in my "Theoretical Discussion", some will argue that balance of power and nuclear weapons are not triggers of peace in a neorealist perspective. Instead, they are inhibitors of violence. However, these are the conceptual phrases enforced by realists that come closer to "a cause of peace". Thus, I opted to include them in this table.

As identified in the analysis of the number of mentions by theory, the conceptual phrases highlighted by the democratic peace theory received a much higher number of citations. Concepts used by neorealists, and neoliberals received similar numbers of mentions. This time, the discrepancy between democratic peace and neorealism/neoliberalism is not so outstanding. In turn, the constructivist concepts considered are much less cited, although they appeared a few times. The two concepts developed by Johan Galtung (1969, 1990) were rarely mentioned. However, they were still ahead of the conceptual phrases developed by Nobert Elias (1994) and Steven Pinker (2011). Once again, the central concepts for the two authors of the theory of the civilizing process were not cited.

To complement this level of analysis on the total number of mentions, I have also counted the number of abstracts in which these concepts are mentioned at least once. Surprisingly, the number of articles talking about democratic peace is almost the same as those that mention the phrase "international organizations". It indicates that "democratic peace" is mentioned more times in the same abstract. In this analysis, there is a bigger discrepancy between the number of abstracts mentioning concepts connected to culture and identity and to concepts connected to material, economic and power relations. Only a reduced number of authors mentioned the concepts coined by Galtung or by the constructivists.

To further expand the analysis of the conceptual influences of each theoretical stream of thought, I developed Table 4. This time, I listed some words with conceptual meaning and that for the theories in question influence peacebuilding. Each word can be used in various contexts. "Nuclear", for example, can be used as a "nuclear weapon", "nuclear deterrence", "nuclear power" or even as a synonym for "pivotal". Obviously, this makes it even more problematic to determine that a word corresponds to a particular theory. Any theory can recurrently use words like "power", "democracy" or "liberal". However, all these words, at some point, began to be used and disseminated by a theoretical approach. Before the constructivist emergence, probably fewer authors used the word "identity". Likewise, during the Cold War it is possible that few linked democracies to peace or spoke of "anarchy" before Kenneth Waltz. Therefore, this analysis can still contribute to finding words that were highlighted by a given theory and then became widely disseminated among theorists. As expected, the number of mentions per word is considerably higher than the mentions of conceptual phrases.

Table 4 – Mentions in the Journal of Peace Research's abstracts (2002-2021) by theoretical keywords.

Theories (Author)	Keywords	Number of Mentions
Neorealism[4]	Power	290
Neorealism	Nuclear	67
Neorealism/neoliberalism	Anarchy	1
Neoliberalism	Cooperation	125
Neoliberalism	Integration	40
Peace Studies/Civilizing Process (Galtung)	Culture	29
Peace Studies	Structural	63
Constructivism	Identity	110
Constructivism	Norms	73
Democratic Peace/neoliberalism	Liberal	76
Democratic Peace	Democracy	331
Civilizing Process (Elias, 1994)	Civilization	15
Civilizing Process (Pinker, 2011)	Empathy	6
Civilizing Process (Pinker, 2011)	Self-control	0

Once again, the word democracy is the most used, even ahead of "power". It is noteworthy that the two constructivist concepts included in the list were also mentioned quite frequently. "Identity" is the fourth most mentioned word. Thus, this analysis suggests that some concepts developed and frequently used by constructivists also appear recurrently in works of peace research. The other theory that was supposed to be less studied, the theory of the civilizing process, again emerged as the one whose concepts are least cited. Likewise,

---

[4] Albeit classical realists put more emphasis on "power", neorealists also stressed this notion as a mean to obtain security.

the word "civilization" did not have a significant recurrence. It is important to note that of the fifteen quotes from "civilization", seven were within the conceptual phrase "Clash of Civilization". The other eight citations were also in this context.

It is noteworthy that the two reasons that Pinker identifies as fundamental to solidify peace, empathy and self-control, are hardly mentioned. It might be an interesting identification for further research. Empathy is a concept that may contribute to our understanding of how security communities emerge, or even why democracies do not fight each other. Collective identity and democracy may foster peace because of empathy and self-control. Citizens feel closer to those that they share similarities with. As Pinker argues based on Lyyn Hunt, the spreading of empathy during the XIX century may explain the decrease in homicide rates. It also may explain the pacifist movement or the European commotion regarding the Ukrainian war. Thus, empathy seems to be a promising concept for innovative research.

For comparative reasons, an important piece of information is that "conflict" was the most recurrent word with two thousand and seventy-six mentions in seven hundred and sixty-eight abstracts. The words "violence" (1151) and "war" (1064) complete the podium. "Peace" appeared seven hundred and forty-eight times, fewer times than "civil" (893) and "political" (847). This disproportion between the use of the word "peace" compared to "conflict" or "violence" reinforces the conclusions recently obtained by Gledistch, Nordkevelle and Strand (2014) and Diehl (2016).

Cultural aspects as causes of peace

As discussed in my methodological section, the first part of my hypothesis is based on the view that academics make the impact that cultural and identity issues have on the causes of peace invisible. Thus, the mere identification of the recurrence of certain terminologies is not enough to test the entirety of my hypothesis. It becomes necessary to analyze whether cultural aspects, when mentioned, are cited as causing peace. Bearing in mind that authors such as Galtung (1990, 1996), Elias (1994), Pinker (2011) or Adler (1999), reinforce the impact of such aspects. Therefore, I will now carry out a qualitative analysis of the articles that used some of the conceptual phrases described in the previous item.

In total, I found ten articles that mention at least one of the following conceptual phrases: "culture of peace" (Galtung, 1990), "collective identity" (Adler, 1999) or "security community" (Adler and Barnett, 1998; Adler, 1999). No author mentioned the phrases "civilizing process" (Elias, 1994; Pinker, 2011) or "humanitarian revolution" (Pinker, 2011).

In the article entitled *Assessing the Basis for a Culture of Peace in Contemporary Societies*, by Joseph de Rivera (2004), the term "culture of peace" appeared in his abstract. In this article, De Rivera analyzes how the implementation of the notion of a culture of peace by the United Nations can become problematic. For the author, there are some fundamental aspects for the emergence of a truly peaceful culture that are disregarded by the organization (De Rivera, 2004). Undoubtedly, this article aims to deepen the theoretical discussion about the causes of peace. In this case, the discussion of the sources of a cultural peace.

The term "collective identity" appeared in five abstracts. Two of them, *Israeli identity formation and the Arab—Israeli conflict in election platforms, 1969—2006* (Oren, 2010) and *Framing consensus: Evaluating the narrative specificity of territorial indivisibility* (Zellman, 2015), talk about the formation of Israeli identity. The first of these takes a dualistic approach in terms of focusing on causes of conflict or on causes of peace. This is due to the identification by Oren (2010) that the Israeli identity became more benevolent and friendly towards the Palestinian people at the end of the last century. However, this identity would return to a more conflictive position with the weakening of the peace processes between Israel and Palestine (Oren, 2010). Meanwhile, Zellman's (2015) article ends up focusing on how elites shape a nationalist and violent collective identity. Clearly, this article does not do much to understand the emergence of a peaceful collective identity.

In addition to these two cases discussing Israeli collective identity, the articles by Maney et al. (2006), Pouliot (2007) and Sen (2008) also use this concept. In *The Past's Promise: Lessons from Peace Processes in Northern Ireland and the Middle East*, Maney et al. (2006) basically analyze the difficulties faced by the peace processes in Northern Ireland and in the conflict between Israel and Palestine. There is no analysis here based purely on identity issues. Amartya Sen's (2008) article puts a little more emphasis on cultural issues. As might be expected from an article written by one of the most influential thinkers of the last century, Sen offers some innovative insights. He proposes that social inequalities and poverty influence the increase in violence together with cultural aspects. As interesting as

his conclusions are, Sen also puts a special focus on how violence arises. In this way, it does not fit into a study that seeks to present how a peaceful culture emerges.

Poulit's article deserves special attention. Published in 2007, a year before the beginning of the war between Georgia and Russia, Poulit presents an interesting position: the emergence of a security community does not require a collective identity. As an example, Poulit states that Russia and the West would be approaching the formation of a security community as defined by theorists such as Adler and Barnett. However, he did not perceive the formation of a collective identity between the two sides. For Poulit, the diplomatic rapprochement between the Russians and the Atlantic alliance already demonstrated a sharp reduction in the risk of conflict between them. Today, after the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022 under the justification of containing an expansion of NATO, Poulit's argument seems to have failed miserably. However, for what we seek to find, this article presents itself as an interesting example of the analysis of the causes for peace. For Poulit, trust and investment in diplomacy appear as causes for the emergence of a security community, which for Adler and Barnett represents a relationship of peace between states.

Finally, there are four articles that use the security community concept. One of them, as already described, is that of Poulit. Of the remaining 3, one of them *Accidental rivals? EU fiscal rules, NATO, and transatlantic burden-sharing* (Becker, 2019) does not reflect deeply on the concept of security community, it only mentions it. Meanwhile, the other two articles engage in a dialogue between the notion of security community and the theory of democratic peace (Wagner, 2003; Dorussen and Ward, 2010). This argument strengthens Emanuel Adler's view of how democracy ends up impacting peace. As I advanced in the section on constructivism, Adler (1997) suggests that democracy leads to peace by bringing collective identities closer to democratic states.

In *Trade networks and the Kantian peace*, Dorussen and Ward (2010) present the argument that trade influences the formation of bonds between states and, consequently, a security community. In turn, Wagner (2003) strengthens the view that democratic states end up cooperatively defining their security guidelines. However, the focus of his research is not peace. Instead, his analysis focuses on extradition processes and cooperation (Wagner, 2003). Therefore, the work of Dorussen and Ward (2010) defend that democracy, interdependence and security communities influence the emergence of peace. Still, Wagner does not contribute much to the literature on peace.

4.3 - The Study of Peaceful Countries

The hypothesis tested in this section is: Scholars do not study countries with better indicators of peace, what may open space for new case studies. It arose from the case studies used by Elias (1994) and Pinker (2011). In concordance with previous studies (Gleditsch, Nordkvelle, and Strand, 2014; Diehl, 2016), I found a positive correlation between the number of mentions received in the abstracts published by the Journal of Peace Research and the level of violence in the Peace Index. Thus, when I applied the Peace Index, the hypothesis planned is attested. Regarding the countries that did not receive at least one mention in JPR's abstracts, most of them are among the more peaceful countries. Among the more violent states, almost all of them were mentioned in at least one abstract.

At the regional level, the same happened. The more violent regions in the Peace Index are the ones more cited in JPR. Meanwhile, the more violent regions in terms of homicide rates are not the ones more cited. Considering homicide rates, I found that Latin American states are under-cited in JPR. Although they have extremely high homicide rates, they receive considerably fewer mentions than African and Asian countries. Therefore, this exploratory study shows that when scholars look at violence, they may have a more holistic approach to it. Only homicide rates might not be enough to measure if a country/region is violent.

Moreover, I found African countries are studied more at the regional level. The recurrence of the word "Africa" is considerably higher than any other continent. In the meantime, the number of citations referencing the name of each country is smaller for African countries than for Asian and American countries. These findings deserve further study to understand why African countries are more studied as part of a region.

Similar to my previous section, I also carried out a qualitative analysis of case states. My aim was to check if the studies concerned with the most peaceful countries discussed peace emergence. To my surprise, I found that no article extensively looks at peace and to if conflicts in these countries are solved by peaceful means. Only two articles, in a total of fifteen, discuss some aspects that may have some connection to peace. One of them studied anti-terrorism laws in Canada and the other discusses the real impact of nuclear non-proliferation agreements. Therefore, in a total of seven hundred and sixty-eight abstracts

published between 2008 and 2021, I found that no author who extensively looked at peace in the most peaceful countries.

Mentions of countries' names in the Journal of Peace Research (2008-2021).

I conducted the two-way Pearson correlation coefficient between my independent variable, the indicators of violence called Peace Index, and my dependent variable, the number of mentions in the Journal of Peace Research (JPR). Concerning the number of mentions, I made the analysis at three different levels: Level 1- the mentions in all JPR's articles published between 1964 and 2018 and available in JSTOR (Constellate, 2022); Level 2- the mentions in all JRP's articles published between 2008 and 2021 and available in Portico (Constellate, 2022); Level 3- the mentions in the seven hundred and sixty-eight abstracts published between 2008 and 2021 gathered in my dataset. As shown in Table 5, I found a positive correlation in the levels 2 and 3. Both are statistically significant at the 0,001 level. Meanwhile, on level 1, I found no correlation, but this result was not statistically significant. Thereby, I cannot consider it.

Table 5- Correlation between indicators of peace and mentions in the Journal of Peace Research by country.

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Peace Index	,068	,361*	,505*

*p < ,001

These results indicate that the more violent a country is, the more mentions it receives by scholars. Considering the number of countries' names cited through the full articles (Level 2), the correlation is positive, but weak. However, when we consider only the abstracts, the correlation between mentions and violence is stronger. When Gleditsch, Nordkvelle, and Strand (2014) or Diehl (2016) analyzed how scholars approach peace in JPR's abstracts, they presuppose that an abstract demonstrates the pivotal features of a particular study. Usually, scholars indicate in their abstracts which case study they will focus on. Therefore, this result suggests that the more violent countries in the Peace Index receive more attention than the more peaceful countries.

Notwithstanding, a few countries receive almost no attention, since they were not mentioned in any abstracts analyzed for this study. As table 6 shows, among the forty-one most peaceful states in the Peace Index, twenty-two countries did not receive a single mention in the abstracts analyzed. However, only three countries located among the forty-two most violent countries had zero mentions. Such discrepancy agrees with my hypothesis that as more peaceful a country is, the less attention it receives. Table 6 also shows that the mentions shrink between groups 3 and 4. Nearly all Group 4 countries were mentioned at least once. Whereas the variation between groups 1 and 2 remains almost constant in mentions, it falls slightly in group 3.

Table 6 – Percentage of countries with 0 mentions in JPR abstracts (2008-2021) per position in the Peace Index.

Ranking Peace Index 2008-2021*	Number of countries with no mention	Total number of countries	Per centage of countries with 0 mentions.
Group 1: 1-41	22	41	53,65%
Group 2: 42– 82	21	41	51,21%
Group 3: 83– 123	16	41	39,02%
Group 4: 123-165	3	42	7,14%

*Data extracted from the Peace Index. To establish a ranking for the entire period, I calculated the media of each country between 2008 and 2021.

Mentions by Continent

An analysis based only on terms of mentions per country might end up ignoring an important portion of studies where the case study is a region instead of a state. It can happen, for instance, if scholars are studying what Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett (1998) call "security communities". Although this dissertation focuses on the national level, the analysis of mentions per region can diminish the risk of misinterpretation where countries are studied under a regional umbrella. On this behalf, I developed Table 7, in which I included the mentions of the five inhabited continents. I opted to include continents instead of sub-regions

to diminish the subjectivity of the study. There are some divergences concerning which countries comprise some regions. The Middle East, for example, encompasses for some sources Egypt (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2022), while others do not include Egypt (Institut national de la Statistique et des études ecónomiques, 2022). Furthermore, the source used to determine the homicide rate, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) (2022), did not include in their data some regions like the Middle East. The regions presented by UNODC have their continent's name in their own name (ex: Northern Africa). Thus, when I searched in the "Sketch Engine" how many times the word "Africa" appears in my dataset, it also includes all the mentions referring to Africa's sub-regions.

Table 7 – Mentions in JPR Abstracts per Continent.

Region	Africa	Americas	Asia	Europe***	Oceania
Mentions of the continent's name.	129	15	17	11	0
Sum of mentions by countries' name.	200	104	256	109	1
Total of mentions per continent.	329	119	273	120	1
Number of countries per continent	50	25	43	42	3
Total of mentions per number of countries.	6,58	4,76	6,34	2,85	0,33
Homicide Rate**	12,06	15,73	2,03	2,56	3,06
Peace Index*	2,246	2,086	2,210	1,745	1,605

* I calculated the media of the Peace Index for each countries included in the lists between 2008 and 2021.

**Data extracted from the United Nations Office on Drug and Crime (2021). Homicide rate per 100.000 inhabitants.

***I considered Russia and Turkey as European countries.

In terms of the homicide rate, the regions with the lowest homicide rates are not the ones with fewer mentions in JPR. This is contrary to my hypothesis that the more peaceful countries, or regions, would receive fewer mentions. According to UNODC, Asia has the lowest rate of homicides per 100.000 inhabitants. Still, it is the second continent with more mentions in JPR abstracts and mentions per country. Meanwhile, the Americas have the worst indicator, which is considered the most violent region in terms of the homicide rate. Yet, in the total of mentions (name of the region + name of all countries), it is the second region with fewer mentions after Oceania. In terms of ratio per country, it has the third higher after Africa and Asia (4,76 mentions per country). I must highlight that the phrase "United States" is accountable for almost one-third of mentions. "United States" handles thirty-three citations in one hundred and four. Canada received one mention. Thus, the names of Latin American countries were mentioned seventy times, with a ratio of 3,05 mentions/country. Therefore, Latin America and the Caribbean have considerably fewer studies than Africa, Asia, and even Europe. Furthermore, the ratio of mentions per country is close to the European ratio. Latin America and the Caribbean is the region of the world with the highest homicide rate: 21,20 per 100.000 inhabitants (UNODC, 2022).

However, another interpretation emerges when one looks at the correlation between the number of citations and the Peace Index (Institute for Economics and Peace, 2022). Since the homicide rate is only one indicator that composes the index, the ranking among continents changes substantially. Africa becomes the most violent region, followed closely by Asia. The Americas are no longer the most violent region, having a slightly better result than Africa and Asia. Meanwhile, Oceania is the most peaceful, being followed by Europe. As discussed previously in this dissertation, this change in results attests to how difficult it might be to establish if a country, or a region, can be called "peaceful" (Fabbro, 1978; Anderson, 2004).

It is significant, however, that the regional results of the Peace Index match the results of mentions in the JPR. As my original hypothesis presupposes, based on this index, the more violent regions received more mentions in the JPR. Africa is the most violent region and the one that received more mentions. Asia is the second more violent and the second more mentioned, being the Americas the third in both. Europe is the fourth more violent and the fourth with more references. Oceania is, thus, the most peaceful and with fewer mentions.

Another noteworthy conclusion from this data is the discrepancy between the appearance of the word "Africa" (129) compared to the words "America" (15), "Europe"

(11), "Asia" (17), and "Oceania" (0). Only the phrase "sub-Saharan Africa" counted thirty-four citations in JPR. Thereby, African countries are studied at the regional level, while Asian or American countries are studied at the national level. Then, the words "Asia" and "America" have a lower usage than the name of each country. Such data offers an interesting suggestion regarding the approach used to study the different regions. Whilst African states are studied within a macro-region (Africa) or within a micro-region (Sub-Saharan Africa, for example), Asia and America are studied as an individual states. We need further study to understand why it happens, its benefits, and its prejudices.

This analysis also attests to how the measurement applied in a particular study can affect the conclusions in terms of peace. There are authors that use homicide rates as the indicator to study violence (Rivera, 2016). Meanwhile, other scholars attempt to establish more complex datasets, where a few indicators are considered (Anderson, 2004; Sarangi, 2018). In my case, the conclusion drawn based only on homicide rates differs from the one derived from the Peace Index. In the first case, I did not find any correlation between homicide rates and the number of mentions. Such variation might occur because scholars aiming to study violent states have a holistic approach to what violence is. Thus, the Peace Index might represent better what they consider to be violence.

How the most peaceful countries are studies.

In addition to the quantitative analysis already carried out, I also carried out a qualitative analysis of how the most peaceful countries were studied. This analysis becomes important as these countries may not be being studied in terms of its own domestic peace. In this way, I looked at the articles where authors mentioned the names of the forty-one most peaceful countries in the Peace Index. These mentions occurred thirty-one times, being distributed in a total of fifteen articles. In some cases, the same article mentions several countries. Table 8 presents the arrangement of citations:

Table 8 – Keywords of the articles that mention the most peaceful countries.

Article	Author (Year)	Countries Mentioned	Keywords
Who commits the most to NATO? It depends on how we measure commitment.	Cooper (2021)	Denmark, Slovenia, Portugal, Poland, Spain	NATO; military expenditure
Legislative response to international terrorism.	Epifanio (2011)	Canada, Switzerland	Terrorism; counter-terrorism legislation.
National and Regional Economic Consequences of Swiss Defense Spending.	Bernauer (2009)	Switzerland (2)	Military expenditure; economic performance.
Do nonproliferation agreements constrain?	Smith and Spaniel (2021)	Japan, Taiwan	Nuclear nonproliferation; nuclear agreement.
Adolescents' Explanations for Paramilitary Involvement.	Muldoon (2008)	Ireland	Youth Bulge; Youth paramilitary participation.
The diffusion of racist violence in the Netherlands: Discourse and distance.	Braun (2011)	Netherlands (2)	Racism; xenophobia.
The economic costs of the German participation in the Afghanistan war	Bruck (2011)	Germany	War costs; Afghanistan War.
A spatial analysis of the impact of West German television on protest mobilization during the East German revolution.	Crabtree (2015)	Germany	Revolution; information in dictatorships.

After ethnic civil war: Ethno-nationalism in the Western Balkans	Dyrstad (2012)	Croatia.	Ethnic war; nationalism.
Dynamics of internal resettlement during civil war: Evidence from Catalonia (1936–39)	Balcells (2018)	Spain	Civil war.
From ballot-boxes to barracks: Votes, institutions, and post-election coups.	Rozenas (2019)	Spain, Chile	Military coups.
Mobilizing memories: The social conditions of the long-term impact of victimization	Villamil (2021)	Spain	Civil war; victimization.
The origins of policing institutions: Legacies of colonial insurgency.	Eck (2018)	Malaysia	Police force; colonial rule.
Media power during humanitarian interventions: Is Eastern Europe any different from the West?	Balabanova (2010)	Bulgaria.	Media; Foreign Policy.
Why do the victors kill the vanquished? Explaining political violence in post-World War II Italy	Grandi (2013)	Italy (2)	Political violence.

I chose to present a column with the titles of the articles and another with their keywords to make clear the themes found. Even a brief look at these two columns is enough to see that even the most peaceful countries in the Peace Index are analyzed from a perspective of violence. Few works discuss themes that have any relation to the emergence and dynamics of peace. Perhaps the article written by Smith and Spaniel (2011) on nuclear

non-proliferation comes in handy here. To a certain extent, Epifanio's (2011) work on anti-terrorist legislation may also appear as a cause for peace. The remaining articles focus mainly on topics such as military spending, civil wars or misuse of police force.

Initially, the idea in this section would be to deepen an analysis of articles where I found a discussion about the causes of peace. However, there is no article that matches this approach. Thus, I will not conduct the analysis I expected. However, it is worth stressing that this lack of articles demonstrates that Johansen (2006) and Diehl (2016) were right. Between 2008 and 2021, I collected abstracts of seven hundred and sixty-eight articles. None of them address peace properties in more peaceful countries. Therefore, the study of how these countries became peaceful offers enormous possibilities for future research. It might be an important contribution to the Peace Studies re-orientation proposed by Johansen.

4.4 – Methodology applied in the Journal of Peace Research.

In this section, I proceeded with an analysis of my third hypothesis. On this behalf, I conjectured that the study carried out by peace researchers will be focused on an empirical and quantitative analysis. If this hypothesis is correct, then, Patomaki (2001) and Jutila, Pehkonen and Vayrynen (2008) proposal of a more critical turn in peace research may have a considerably impact in the discipline. From my own quantitative analysis, I found a robust disproportion of mentions in favor of empirical analyses. The idea of critical research was barely mentioned in my dataset of nine hundred and ninety-five abstracts published by the JPR between 2002 and 2021.

Concerning the usage of quantitative and qualitative methods, I found a less clear result. Although the word quantitative received considerably more citations than qualitative (93 vs. 55), the names of methods usually applied in qualitative studies also received a substantial number of mentions. However, some of the methods that were mentioned more could be used in any type of research. "Surveys", "case studies" and "comparative studies", three terms recurrently cited, can be used both in qualitative and in quantitative studies. On this behalf, I concluded that the method applied in this research was not appropriated for this specific purpose. In fact, it would be needed to identify in a qualitative approach how all the

articles approach their objects of study. However, due to study limitations, it would not be feasible to read all the nine hundred and ninety-five articles included in my dataset.

This hypothesis also sought to identify if authors use historical analysis to identify the variations in long-term processes, as proposed by Elias. In the quantitative analysis, I did not find a substantial number of articles mentioning this methodological approach. Then, like I did previously, I also proceeded with a qualitative analysis on a limited number of articles. This time, the articles chosen were the ones identified in the last two sections as studies in which the author discusses peace properties. Due to the limited number of articles matching this criterion, this analysis was not as vast as I originally desired. Still, I could find a panoply of approaches. Indeed, some authors even applied a long-term analysis of social processes, as defended by constructivists and civilizing processes theories (Adler, 1999; Bour, 2017).

Quantitative analysis of the most applied methodologies in the Journal of Peace Research (2002-2021).

In this section, I anchored my analysis to two types of words. The first was in the so-called "modifiers" and the second in the recurrence of the names themselves, or conceptual phrases referring to methodological tools. Table 9 indicates the most common modifiers on some terms referring to research and methodology. Modifiers are words used together with a noun, in order to modify its meaning. This same analysis using the Sketch Engine has been applied previously by other researchers. In my case, the objective is to identify, in a general way, how authors identify their own research. After this first level of analysis, the next two levels will be more focused and less general.

Table 9 – Most used modifiers to words related with methods.

"Method" (118*)		"Analysis" (595*)	
Estimation	**7**	**Empirical**	**61**
Quantitative	5	**Statistical**	27
Synthetic	5	**Quantitative**	22
Control	5	**Regression**	18
Binding	4	**Comparative**	16
Nonviolence	4	**Network**	14
Qualitative	4	**Cross-national**	10
		Qualitative	10

"Study" (590*)		"Research" (412*)	
Case	**43**	**Previous**	**36**
Previous	32	**Abstract**	28
Abstract	20	**Conflict**	20
Empirical	19	**Peace**	18
Conflict	12	**Future**	16
Quantitative	12	**Existing**	14
Recent	11	**Empirical**	13

*Total number of mentions of the word.

From table 9, we can identify two important factors for this research. The first is the relevant recurrence of the "empirical" modifier. The word "analysis" was used five hundred and ninety-five in the nine hundred and ninety-five abstracts collected in my database. Of these five hundred and ninety-five, sixty-one times the term was used as "empirical analysis". "Empirical" also appears in the list of most common modifiers, over the words

"study" (19 times) and "research" (13 times). As discussed earlier, in Galtung's view (1996; 2006), peace studies must have an empirical, a critical and a constructive component. Likewise, Potomaki (2001) and Jutila, Pehkonen and Vayrynen (2008) defend the need to increase research with the most critical component. As a comparison, I should mention that the term "critical analysis" was only used twice. The term "constructivist analysis" was not used. This discrepancy seems to support the arguments advanced by these authors.

The second important result is the presence of the term "Quantitative" in the most common modifier lists of the words "Method" (5 times), "Analysis" (22 times) and "Study" (12 times). In addition, it was used together with the word "Study", eight times. As expected, the term "Qualitative" only appeared in the list of the most used modifiers in the words "Method" (4) and "Analysis" (10). Regarding "Research", the word "Qualitative" was used four times and the word "Study" was used two times. In total, the word Quantitative appeared forty-seven times modifying one of the four words. Meanwhile, "Qualitative" appeared as a modifier only twenty times. Obviously, it is possible that researchers who use qualitative methods do not use this word in their abstracts. Due to the plurality of ways of doing qualitative research, it is very possible that the mentions are the way in which the data collection or analysis was carried out (case study, interview, ethnography, etc. …). Later in this section, I will analyze the recurrence of these terms. In any case, I should point out that there are indicators that peace studies have followed a more quantitative line in the last twenty years.

It is also interesting to mention other details in Table 9. First, the word "conflict" appears in two listings. The word "peace", on the other hand, only appears among the most common modifiers of the word "research", and even in this case, it is behind the word "conflict". I should also mention the considerable number of times that the "statistical" modifier came up together with the name "analysis". This finding supports the view that JPR has taken a more quantitative approach over the past twenty years.

Table 10 - Number of mentions of methodologies cited by Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney (2012)

Methodology	Mentions in JPR abstracts (2002-2021)
"Single Case Study"	1
"Comparative case study"	2
"Narrative analysis"	2
"Discourse analysis"	2
"ethnography"	1
"process tracing"	4
"Thick Description"	0
"Analytic Induction"	0
"Critical Theory"	0
"Dialectical Research"	0
"Hermeneutics"	0
"Ethical Inquiry"	0

Table 11 - Number of mentions of methodologies identified by Sprinz and Wolinsky-Nahmias (2004).

Methodology	Mentions in JPR abstracts (2002-2021)
"Descriptive"	19
"Case Studies"	21
"Quantitative"	93
"Formal Modeling"	1
"Cross-Methods"	0

Unfortunately, it was not possible to identify a substantial number of mentions of research methods as cited by Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney (2012). This probably occurs because the terms used by these authors are too complex. For example, the words "case study" appear a total of forty-seven times. However, they include the term "single". The composition "single case study" was used only once. Likewise, the terms used by Sprinz and Wolinsky-Nahmias (2004) also seem problematic in this analysis. The most used modifier on the word "Descriptive" was "statistic". When Sprinz and Wolinsky-Nahmias (2004) refer to "descriptive", they use it to refer to works using theoretical description. A work that follows this methodology will mainly look at historical processes and theoretical discussions. Clearly, in the JPR abstracts, the word appears in a generic way, without meaning the same as for the authors. Due to this difficulty in finding terms perfectly, I established in Table 12 some terms commonly used in qualitative research.

Table 12 – Number of mentions of methodologies in the Journal of Peace Research.

Methodology	Mentions in JPR abstracts (2002-2021)
Case Study	47
Comparative Analysis	15
Discourse Analysis	2
Ethnographic	17
Historical Analysis	2
Interview	26
Statistical Analysis	28
Survey	133
Theoretical Analysis	2

As expected, the usage of more flexible terms allowed me to gather a more robust number of mentions. Surprisingly, the number of mentions of the word "survey" is much higher than all the other forms included in Table 12. Case studies, which supposedly would be the most used method, is far behind it. Although surveys are commonly applied as a quantitative tool, they can also be applied to qualitative research (The University of Nottingham, 2022). In this analysis I could not delineate which type of questionnaires are most commonly used. A substantial number of abstracts also cite the use of interviews and ethnographic research. In a way, this type of method favors an approximation between the observer and the object studied. In the case of peace studies, these methodological tools can be important in bringing the researcher closer to local peace experiences, as some authors point out to be fundamental to understanding peace (MacGinty, 2013).

Qualitative analysis of methodological approaches in articles published by the Journal of Peace Research.

From the section on the most used theories and concepts, I found four articles that talk extensively about how cultural aspects influence the emergence of peace. The article by De Rivera (2004) discusses in depth the concept of Culture of Peace and some indicators. However, the indicators do not arise from a longitudinal analysis and the discussion is also not related to the historical process of the formation of a peaceful culture. Meanwhile, Dorussen and Ward (2010) also conduct a quantitative analysis regarding the impact trade has on pacification between two or more states. In this case, the authors considered the commercial variations between 1948 and 2000 (Dorussen and Ward, 2010:35). Therefore, this work arguably takes a long-term approach. However, the purely quantitative analysis applied by the authors does not observe the processes that caused trade between two states to change.

In turn, Oren follows a methodology that includes exactly the idea of analyzing the processes of identity formation. The author masterfully identifies how Israeli identity was shaped from 1969 to 2004. While analyzing the variations in the political discourses of the main Israeli parties, Oren observes how historical events influenced discourses about national identity. Because of this analysis, Oren was able to identify how national notions and identities became much friendlier towards Palestinians towards the end of the last century. This change, in the author's view, was due to a fear of Israeli society that the conflict would become too costly due to the country's difficulty in integrating internationally.

Vincent Poulit's work, once again, deserves a special look. In fact, he does not present a long-term view of the processes of identity formation and bilateral relations between NATO and Russia. His analysis is based mainly on political observations from the late 1990s to the early 2000s. From this brief observation, Poulit concludes that relations between Russia and NATO would be pacifying. As already argued, this conclusion would prove to be wrong shortly afterwards. In a way, this result raises the question if a longer-term study could not conclude that it was premature to talk about peace between Russia and NATO. In any case, Poulit does not promote a long-term study. Despite this, Poulit emphasizes the political processes of approximation between the two sides.

I expected to have a bigger number of articles to compose this qualitative analysis. However, I did not find in the previous two sections a substantial quantity of pieces talking about the causes of peace. Especially concerning the most peaceful countries, I found no article with this approach. Therefore, this analysis was shorter than originally predicted.

Now, more than ever, it is important to study peace. While I am concluding this dissertation, Russian troops are marching through Ukraine, Saudi Arabia and Iran are clashing in the Yemeni civil war, Rohingyas are being massacred in Myanmar, and the people from Tigray (Ethiopia) are suffering from a barbaric civil war. Meanwhile, homicides rates in Latin America remain extremely high and extremists' groups like the Islamic State (ISIS) spread terror throughout Africa.

If violence has always seeped through the history of humanity, as Pinker (2011) and Gat (2017) affirm, the current capacity of destruction by high-tech weapons brings humanity closer than ever to annihilation. In fact, we may live in the most peaceful period in human history, as argued by Pinker and other authors (Gleditsch, 2013). The problem is that any confrontation between super-powers will have an unpredictable outcome. Possibly, it will lead to the complete destruction of substantial parts of the globe. Although the Ukrainian War has not triggered a nuclear combat (yet), the threat of a nuclear confrontation came once again to the table of the Russian and the American presidents. Perhaps, the recent launching of the Zircon, a hypersonic missile by Russia that none anti-missiles systems seem capable to stop, is the best proof of the destructiveness capacity of nowadays' arsenals.

In the last one hundred years, International Relations and Peace Studies emerged to answer the question of how to achieve peace. Both have focused mainly on violence, its dynamics and how to stop it. From the study of violence, peace researchers have coined their concepts, methods and theories. It is difficult to attest if this approach has been successful or not. Nevertheless, the persistence of wars, widespread violence in the global South and the terror against minorities suggest that peace, as a universal aim, is far from being reached. On this behalf, this dissertation is particularly bold and audacious. Based mainly on Emanuel Adler (1999), Johansen (2006) and Diehl (2016), I have argued that to achieve peace, one must look to peace properties, dynamics and causes. I have also offered my own conceptualization of peace: peace is a state of tranquility from the belief that conflicts will be resolved in a conciliatory way.

From this definition, and as Adler (1999) had already advanced, peace is formed through practice. Conflicts need to be solved repeatedly by peaceful means. Then, when a conflict emerges, one side will believe that it will be resolved without resorting to violence.

Peace emerges from this belief. Probably the European Union arises as the best example of how peace is constructed through practice. Decades after its creation, the members of this organization believe that any conflict between them will be resolved in a conciliatory way. Besides the existence of institutions to prevent violent resolutions, like the Council of Europe or the Court of Justice of the European Union, citizens from these countries share a set of values that have led them to believe in each other. Thus, nowadays it seems extremely unlikely that EU countries will open fire against each other.

Still, institutions and diplomatic practice of resolving conflicts peacefully might not be enough to create peace. The failed argument advanced by Poulit (2007) proves that. In 2007, he identified that Russia and NATO countries have increased considerably their cooperation and diplomatic partnerships. However, it was not enough to create the belief that future conflicts will not turn to violence. As Poulit acknowledges, the two sides did not create a sense of collective community or empathy. It might partially explain the current clash between Russia and NATO. Besides diplomatic and institutional arrangements, it might be necessary to have a sense of collective identity, or a peaceful culture to create a solid peace.

To test all these assumptions, further research is needed. I do not aim to confirm such theoretical affirmations. I am merely mentioning theoretical debates that can emerge from my definition. This is exploratory research about an understudied topic. As some authors have identified, fewer articles, books and studies talk about peace than about violence and war (Gittings, 2012; Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand, 2014; Diehl, 2016). Thereby, my aim was to discuss if there are useful concepts and theories concerning peace and its properties. The contribution of this approach is evident: peace workers need to pave the way to resolve conflicts by peaceful means (Galtung, 2006; Johansen, 2006). Only understanding how peace emerges and persists, one can trace the strategies to create any over-lasting peace. Since Peace Studies is the discipline that studies violence, as Wallensteen (1988) identified, it becomes necessary to re-orient the discipline (Johansen, 2006). Such re-orientation will need to find spaces for innovation to propose new concepts and hypotheses about peace. Otherwise, it will continue applying the existing concepts oriented by violence and its properties. For this reason, the question I sought to answer addressed this search for innovation.

To answer my research question, I presented a deep theoretical discussion. I reviewed the literature of four traditions in depth: Peace Studies, a discipline that includes several

theorists; the neorealist, neoliberal and constructivist theory of international relations. All of them mainly present arguments in favor of looking at the causes and dynamics of violence. Only in a limited extent, they also look at the causes and dynamics of peace. To counteract these four traditions, I have presented two theories that, in my view, analyze the causes of peace in a deep and well-founded way. These were the theory of democratic peace and the theory of the civilizing process.

In Peace Studies, IR Neorealism and IR Neoliberalism, I found theoretical support for concepts and theories with an orientation towards violence. In the case of peace studies, Galtung, especially in his earlier work, encourages this perspective, since he considers violence the antagonism of peace. In his view, peace researchers should work as doctors seeking to understand the cure for the disease (violence). The main concepts developed by him were framed especially in terms of violence: direct/structural/cultural violence and negative peace/positive peace (defined as the absence of physical violence/absence of structural violence) (Galtung, 1969). I must highlight, however, that his later work ended up looking more at peace and how to achieve it by "peaceful means" (Galtung, 1996; 2006). Still, Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand (2014) have identified that Galtung's later concepts did not receive the same acclamation among scholars.

Regarding neorealism and neoliberalism in IR, the way these theories have drawn the idea of anarchy inhibits a consideration of the causes of peace. For them, anarchy inevitably leads states to seek security and a better position in the international system. In this view, fear and distrust permeate the relations between states. Whilst an international Leviathan did not arise, they see peace, as a state of tranquility, extremely unlikely (Mearsheimer, 2014). Although both traditions propose that some factors can diminish the danger of war. On this behalf, neorealists stress balance of power and nuclear weapons as war's inhibitors (Waltz, 1988). Meanwhile, neoliberals point out to international organizations and economic interdependence (Keohane and Nye, 1973; Keohane, 1988). Notwithstanding, these two theories also share the view that by understanding the source of war (anarchy), one can understand peace.

Constructivism has a more dualistic perspective. I did not find a robust literature applying constructivist thoughts on peace. This may happen because this is a considerably vast theory. Some authors even reinforce constructivism as a methodological approach, instead of a theory of international relations (Galtung, 1996; Onuf, 1997). Still, Michael Adler and Michael Barnett brought peace to the spotlight in their work. Their studies had a

profound influence in my own dissertation since they emphasize the focus on the dynamics of peace. Apart from their work, I did not find a concise position among constructivists. I did not get a definitive conclusion to know if most constructivists support the study on the causes of peace or not.

As expected, Democratic Peace Theory and Civilizing Process Theory gave priority to the study of peace, its causes, dynamics, and properties. Although each one highlights a different explanatory factor, both attested their propositions with robust data (Gleditsch, 2013). Whereas the first believe that democracy and liberal values increase the propensity for peace, the former believe that changes in social behaviors impact how people perceive violence. A dialogue between such conclusions and my definition of peace seems promising. Democratic Peace Theory believes that democracy and liberal values, like human rights, take states to address their conflicts by peaceful means, in a conciliatory way (diplomatic or judicial processes). Under a Kantian perspective, citizens in a "republic" will prefer to avoid wars as a form to resolve conflicts because they would pay a high price for it. Thus, they tend to believe that any conflict (especially with other democracies) will be solved without violence. From this belief, peace, as a state of tranquility, emerges. Citizens from a democracy tend to be more tranquil towards another democratic country.

Regarding the Civilizing Process Theory, the same parallel can be traced. State formation or the humanitarian revolution forced citizens to increase their self-control and empathy. On this way, those peoples experiencing these social transformations started to avoid to resolved conflicts by violent means. Because of the humanitarian revolution, Pinker (2011) affirms that people began to see themselves in the place of the other, who may suffer from violence. Then, psychological constrains forced people to resolve conflicts by peaceful means. A good example of this transformation is the end of duels as an accepted form of ending conflicts. When people have moral or legal problems with others, they now go to judicial courts rather than scheduling a duel. Once this peaceful resolution turned into a practice, people started to believe that conflicts should be resolved in this way. Then, peace arose.

Concerning my theoretical discussion, two possible limitations emerged. The first one is regarding the two theories chosen to discuss the causes of peace. In chapter one, I chose the three most influential theories among IR scholars (Walt, 1998; Snyder, 2009; Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012). In the second chapter, I followed a more inductive choice, as usual in exploratory research (Stebbins, 2001:6). I made this choice for a reason:

the two theories analyzed present a plausible explanation to the emergence of peace, however, the two reinforce different explanatory factors. The democratic peace theory is a widely debated theoretical current, with propositions even considered quasi-consensual. Furthermore, it is a theory that places enormous emphasis on material, economic, and political issues. What matters to theorists of this matter is the democratic system of government, and liberal principles. For the second theory, there are other factors at the heart of the emergence of peace. These are cultural, psychological and ideational issues. This does not mean, however, that these scholars disregard the importance of material entities. For Nobert Elias and Steven Pinker, changes in the material field played a fundamental role in altering collective conceptions.

The second possible limitation is that, in each theory, I chose only two authors whose work I paid special attention to. My choice to focus on a limited number of authors was because the theories analyzed are particularly vast and with a considerably high number of followers. To bring many and different authors to this debate could have weakened the conciseness of the study. Perhaps, these two choices are two of the main limitations of this study. I gave priority to the most influential authors of each theory. Nevertheless, it is possible that less well-known scholars have produced a work more worried about peace. However, these were choices I had to make due to study restrictions.

From my theoretical discussion between all these theories, I identified a trend that cultural and cognitive aspects could offer innovative and promising concepts and theories about studying the properties of peace. Constructivism and the theory of the civilizing process emerged as the two theoretical currents that would possibly offer little-used tools to understand peace. I must mention that Galtung's later work also dialogues well with these two perspectives. In this way, I formulated three hypotheses to answer my research question.

The first refers that theories, concepts and words that reinforce cultural, identity and cognitive aspects would be less used by peace studies. The second looks at the case studies, assuming that less peaceful countries would possibly be less studied. The third hypothesis comes from the methodological approach of peace studies. The question I sought to answer is which methodological tools and theoretical concepts are underused in the study of the causes, mechanisms and dynamics of peace. To this end, I analyzed the work published in the last twenty years in the main journal of the discipline: the Journal of Peace Research.

The answer to my starting question came in a few levels. In the theoretical field, it concludes that, as expected, the theory of the civilizing process is the least applied. In this

way, it offers more space for theoretical innovation. On the other hand, constructivist concepts were also not used on a recurring basis. However, words linked to constructivist thinking, such as "identity" and "norms" appeared recurrently in JPR. In turn, the theory of democratic peace is by far the one that receives the most citations. Its concepts are very widespread, and words like "democracy" and "liberal" permeated most of the newspaper's publications.

This conclusion has an important impact on the objectives of this study. There is no substantial analysis in peace studies that concludes whether the claims outlined by Nobert Elias and deepened by Steven Pinker are true or false. Elias, one of the most acclaimed sociologists of the last century, takes a deep look at how state formation transformed personal relationships toward peace. Andrew Linklater (2012) calls for the need to bring Elias' work to international relations. This dissertation appeals to the need to bring Elias' work into peace studies. This appeal becomes even more resonant if we consider the compelling work of Steven Pinker. Pinker uses Elias' thesis for part of his argument. However, Pinker considerably delves into the analysis of cognitive alterations in favor of peace.

As Gleditsch (2013) proposes, there is substantial literature that claims that violence is decreasing. For the conceptualization used in this study, there are indications that conflicts are increasingly being peacefully resolved. This practice takes people to create a peaceful expectation. From this expectation, a state of individual, collective, national, or even international tranquility, arises. This tranquility is what we call peace. What this study found is that in the largest academic journal in the discipline of peace studies, there was no in-depth discussion about the peaceful turn claimed by Pinker.

The second hypothesis debated the case studies used by peace studies. Given the recognized focus of the discipline, I expected to find a large disproportion in favor of case studies in countries where conflicts tend to be resolved violently. In fact, this expectation was confirmed. However, the complete lack of studies that analyze the causes of peace, was surprising. In this case, since the Institute for Economics and Peace only established the Peace Index in 2008, I limited the analyzed abstracts to those published between 2008 and 2021. To my surprise, of the 768 abstracts considered, only fifteen cite the name of a country among the 25% of the most peaceful countries in the world. Of these fifteen, only two present some analysis of factors related to the emergence of peace. One discusses nuclear non-proliferation treaties and the other presents anti-terrorism legislation.

This result is extremely expressive for what this study proposes. First, it finds an indisputably understudied factor. Looking at peace will consequently lead to looking at the places where that peace exists. This is a key argument for Johansen (2006) and Diehl (2016) and also for Kenneth Boulding (1978A). Similarly, Bruce Russett (1993) demonstrates this need to study cases where conflict did not lead to violence. In addition, case studies represent a methodological tool widely used in the social sciences (Sprinz and Wolinsky-Nahmias, 2004; Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney, 2012).

It is also worth mentioning that, by superimposing the results of the first two hypotheses, I concluded that the authors discussing the theory of democratic peace do not use case studies. In the first hypothesis, I found a very large number of articles mentioning concepts and even the name of this theory. However, in the second hypothesis, I could not find works with case studies in more peaceful countries. Since the analyzed abstracts were the same, the abstracts that talk about democratic peace do not mention peaceful case studies. This ends up having an important implication on Tavares Furtado's (2022) critique of democratic and liberal peace. As mentioned earlier, this author's criticism is that liberal peace seems to embody only what liberalism is able to "deliver". Would looking at the more peaceful countries invalidate the assumptions that liberalism or trade are the factors that lead to peace? Obviously, it is not the purpose of this work to answer this type of question. It is up to future studies to deepen or not these questions.

So, the study of peaceful societies offers a whole new possibility for peace-centered research. I will mention a few examples. There is no study that mentions, in the analyzed period, Iceland, considered the most peaceful country in the world. Nobody has ever studied why this country has such positive and continuous results in terms of peace. If we go beyond Europe, there are no studies that discuss why Chile has better results than its Latin American neighbors. Likewise, there are no studies that discuss Malaysia and its good results. Also, no one has researched what makes Sierra Leone, which having low levels of economic development, is considered more peaceful than the United States of America. At the international level, there are no studies that analyze the neutral stance of Switzerland, Sweden, or Finland[5].

Does peace in these countries come from empathy? Does the state reach more portions of the population? Do children have an education closer to the ideals of education

---

[5] As mentioned in the introduction, Sweden and Finland had applied for a NATO membership. Still, for a few decades they rejected to join the Western military pact and the Warsaw Pact.

for peace? Is there really a culture of peace that makes people resolve conflicts by peaceful means? Does economic development really have anything to do with peace? All these questions are fundamental for a re-orientation of Peace Research focused on the study of peace and its dynamics. All of them can be supported by theorists looking to peace properties. None has been solved by peace scholars. Considering the main journal of the discipline, I found no answer or even supposition to these inquiries.

Finally, the third analysis that I proposed in this study was at the level of the most applied methodologies. I identified a huge reoccurrence of studies that mention surveys. Case studies and comparative analysis also appeared as qualitative methodologies with some reoccurrence. There has also been a substantial amount of work on quantitative and statistical analysis. Although it was possible to identify a tendency towards works with an empirical aspect to the detriment of critical and constructive works, the results at this level of analysis are not very conclusive. The methodology applied to determine whether there are more quantitative or qualitative studies did not seem ideal. Perhaps future studies can make a deeper analysis of the methodologies most applied in peace studies. In these studies, it might be interesting to use a method more similar to that applied by Sprinz and Wolinsky-Nahmias (2004) or Maliniak, Peterson and Tierney (2012).

Therefore, the present work proposed, in an exploratory logic, to look for some spaces that are underused in research on the dynamics of peace. In a way, it was possible to identify potential methodological and theoretical spaces for future studies. The Civilizing Process theory can put some light into how social transformations impact peace. The most peaceful countries compose a large set of promising case studies to be analyzed individually or in comparative studies. Long-term historical analysis, as conducted by Elias, can provide solid methodological approaches to understand the construction of peace. It will be up to researchers who look at these issues to plan strategies, approaches and concepts about peace emergence, construction and maintenance.

Although my empirical findings can open space for further research, the most important contribution of this study is to help the re-orientation of a discipline. To limit the research to violent dynamics dismisses a lot of factors and components that influence peace. As Diehl (2016) has perfectly asserted, the same factor (like geographic proximity) may foster peace, but also war. Therefore, to study the conditions of peace requires a study of peace. An expressive majority of the existing literature has dismissed this idea. Thus, the main contribution of this study was to deepen this discussion. Seeking to understand what

creates peace remains fundamental in the 21st century. Unfortunately, it seems it will continue to be so for quite some time.

Bibliography

Adler, E. (1997). Seizing the middle ground: Constructivism in world politics. *European journal of international relations*, *3*(3), 319-363.

Adler, E. (1999). Condition(s) of Peace. *Review of International Studies*, 24, 165–191.

Adler, E., & Barnett, M. (1998). Security Communities in Theoretical Perspectives. In M. Adler and M. Barnett (Eds.), *Security Communities* (pp. 3-28). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Adler, E., & Barnett, M. (2000). Taking Identity and Our Critics Seriously. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 35(3), 321-329.

Allen, W. L., & Blinder, S. (2018). Media independence through routine press-state relations: Immigration and government statistics in the British press. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 23(2), 202-226.

Anderson, R. (2004). A Definition of Peace, Peace and Conflict. *Journal of Peace Psychology*, 10:2, 101-116.

An Editorial. (1964). *Journal of Peace Research*, 1(1), 1–4.

Becker, J. M. (2019). Accidental rivals? EU fiscal rules, NATO, and transatlantic burden-sharing. *Journal of peace research*, 56(5), 697-713.

Bellamy, A. J. (2008). The Responsibility to Protect and the Problem of Military Intervention. *International Affairs*, 84(4), 615–639.

Behr, H., & Heath, A. (2009). Misreading in IR Theory and Ideology Critique: Morgenthau, Waltz and Neo-Realism. *Review of International Studies*, 35(2), 327–349.

Bennett, A., & Elman, C. (2007). Case study methods in the international relations subfield. *Comparative Political Studies*, 40(2), 170-195.

Bour, N. (2017). Process-oriented micro-macro-analysis. Methodological reflections on Elias and Bourdieu. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 43-74.

Boulding, E. (1972). Peace Research: Dialectics and Development. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 16(4), 469–475.

Boulding, K. (1963). Is Peace Researchable? *Background*, 6(4), 70–77.

Boulding, K. (1978A). Future Directions in Conflict and Peace Studies. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 22(2), 342–354.

Boulding, K. (1978B). The Meaning of Peace. In *Stable Peace*. Chapter 1. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Burai, E. & Hofman, S. C. (2021) Constructivism and Peaceful Change. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Peaceful Change in International Relations.* Paul, T.V, Larsson, D., Trinkunas, H., Wivel, A., & Emmers, R. (eds.). New York: Oxford University Press. 169-189.

Burton, J. (1964). "Peace research" and" international relations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 8(3), 281-286.

Burton, J. (1986). The Theory of Conflict Resolution. *Current Research on Peace and Violence*, 9(3), 125–130.

Butler, S. M. (2018). Getting Medieval on Steven Pinker: Violence and Medieval England. *Historical Reflections/Réflexions Historiques*, *44*(1), 29-40.

Chan, S. (1997). In Search of Democratic Peace: Problems and Promise. *Mershon International Studies Review*, 41(1), 59–91.

Constellate (2022) *Text-mining support*. Accessed in 03 May, 2022 from at: https://constellate.org/

Conteh-Morgan, E. (2005). Peacebuilding and human security: a constructivist perspective. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 69-86.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Fifth Edition. Los Angeles: Sage publications.

De Rivera, J. (2004). Assessing the basis for a culture of peace in contemporary societies. *Journal of Peace Research*, *41*(5), 531-548.

De Sousa Santos, B. (2022) *2022 Aula Magistral #5 "Sofrimento e solidão num mundo multipandémico".* [document in vídeo]. Accessed on 25th July, 2022 from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hXN2At7v_wk&t=4s.

Diehl, P. F. (2016). Exploring Peace: Looking Beyond War and Negative Peace. *International Studies Quarterly*, 60(1), 1–10.

Dorussen, H., & Ward, H. (2010). Trade networks and the Kantian peace. *Journal of Peace Research*, 47(1), 29-42.

Doyle, M. W. (2005). Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace. *The American Political Science Review*, 99(3), 463–466.

Duffield, J. S. (1994). Explaining the Long Peace in Europe: The Contributions of Regional Security Regimes. *Review of International Studies*, 20(4), 369–388.

Elias, Norbert (1994) *The Civilizing Process*. New York: Urizen Books.

Elias, N. (2008) Power and Civilisation, *Journal of Power*, 1(2), 135-142.

Encyclopedia Britannica (2022) *Middle East*. Accessed in 03 May, 2022 from: https://www.britannica.com/place/Middle-East

Epifanio, M. (2011). Legislative response to international terrorism. *Journal of Peace Research*, *48*(3), 399-411.

Fabbro, D. (1978). Peaceful Societies: An Introduction. *Journal of Peace Research*, 15(1), 67–83.

Farmer, P. (1996). On Suffering and Structural Violence: A View from Below. *Daedalus*, 125(1), 261–283.

Farmer, P. (2004). An Anthropology of Structural Violence. *Current Anthropology*, 45(3), 305–325.

Finnemore, M. (1993). International Organizations as Teachers of Norms: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cutural Organization and Science Policy. *International Organization*, *47*(4), 565–597.

Finnemore, M. (2003) *The Purpose of Intervention*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International organization*, 52(4), 887-917.

Fox, W. (1970). The Causes of Peace and Conditions of War. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *392*, 1–13.

Friedman, T. (1999). The Golden Arches Theory of Conflict Prevention. In: T. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization* (pp. 239-264). New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.

Furtado, H. T. (2022). *Politics of Impunity: Torture, the Armed Forces and the Failure of Justice in Brazil*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gaddis, J. L. (1986). The Long Peace: Elements of Stability in the Postwar International System. *International Security*, 10(4), 99–142.

Galtung, Johan (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191.

Galtung, J. (1971). A Structural Theory of Imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research*, 8(2), 81–117.

Galtung, J. (1985). Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses. *Journal of Peace Research*, 22(2), 141–158.

Galtung, Johan (1990). Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research,* 27(3), 291–305.

Galtung, Johan (1996) *Peace by peaceful means: peace and conflict, development and civilization.* London: Sage.

Galtung, Johan (2006) Peace Studies: A Ten Point Primer. In: Alan Hunter (ed.) *Peace Studies in the Chinese Century* (pp. 15-20). Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

Gat, A. (2005). The Democratic Peace Theory Reframed: The Impact of Modernity. *World Politics*, 58(1), 73–100.

Gat, Azar (2017) *The Causes of War and the Spread of Peace: But Will War Rebound?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gleditsch, N. P. (2013). The Decline of War – The Main Issues. *International Studies Review*, 15(3), 396-399.

Gleditsch, N. P., Nordkvelle, J., & Strand, H. (2014). Peace research – Just the study of war? *Journal of Peace Research*, 51(2), 145–158.

Goeman, J. J., & Solari, A. (2011). Multiple testing for exploratory research. *Statistical Science*, 26(4), 584-597.

Gittings, J. (2012). *The Glorious Art of Peace: From the Iliad to Iraq.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Høivik, T. (1977). The Demography of Structural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, *14*(1), 59–73.

Hobsbawn, E. (1990) *A Era Dos Impérios*. In A Era dos Impérios. Chapter 3. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Huntington, S. P. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, *72*(3), 22–49.

Howard, Michael (2000). *The invention of peace: Reflections on war and international order*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Institut national de la Statistique et des études ecónomiques (2022) *Middle East countries.* Accessed in 03 May, 2022 from: https://www.insee.fr/en/metadonnees/definition/c1202

Institute for Economics and Peace (2021) *Global Peace Index 2021*. Accessed in 28 July, 2022 from: https://www.visionofhumanity.org/maps/#/

Isard, W. (2000). Formative and early years of the Peace Science Society (International). *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 18(1), 1-48.

Jacoby, Tim (2007). *Understanding conflict and violence: Theoretical and interdisciplinary approaches.* Oxon: Routledge.

Jaeger, R. G., & Halliday, T. R. (1998). On confirmatory versus exploratory research. *Herpetologica*, 64-66.

Jervis, R. (1999). Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation: Understanding the Debate. *International Security*, 24(1), 42–63.

Johansen, Jørgen (2006) Peace research needs to reorient. In Alan Hunter (ed.) *Peace Studies in the Chinese Century* (pp. 31-38). Aldershot: Ashgate, 31–38.

Jutila, M., Pehkonen, S., & Väyrynen, T. (2008). Resuscitating a discipline: an agenda for critical peace research. *Millennium*, 36(3), 623-640.

Kahl, C. H. (1998). Constructing a separate peace: Constructivism, collective liberal identity, and democratic peace. *Security Studies*, 8(2-3), 94-144.

Kant, I. (1795). *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*. Accessed on 25th July 25, 2022 from: http://www.dominiopublico.gov.br/download/texto/ll000011.pdf

Keohane, R. O. (1988). International Institutions: Two Approaches. *International Studies Quarterly*, 32(4), 379–396.

Keohane, R. O., & Martin, L. L. (1995). The Promise of Institutionalist Theory. *International Security*, 20(1), 39–51.

Keohane, R. O. & Nye, J. S. (1973) Power and interdependence. *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*, 15:4, 158-165

Kohler, G., & Alcock, N. (1976). An empirical table of structural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 13(4), 343-356.

Kratochwil, F. V. (1998). Politics, Norms and Peaceful Change. *Review of International Studies*, *24*, 193–218.

Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies (2021) *What is Peace Studies?* Accessed on 05 December, 2021 from: https://kroc.nd.edu/about-us/what-is-peace-studies/

Lawler, Peter (1989). A question of values: A critique of Galtung's peace research. *Global Change, Peace & Security*, 1(2), 27-55.

Levi, W. (1964). On the Causes of Peace. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *8*(1), 23–35.

Levy, J. S. & Thompson, W. R. (2013). The Decline of War? Multiple Trajectories and Diverging Trends. *International Studies Review*, 15(3), 411-416.

Linklater, A. (2011). *The problem of harm in world politics: theoretical investigations.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Linklater, A. (2012). Norbert Elias, process sociology and international relations. *E-International Relations*. Accessed on 25th July 2022 from: https://www.e-ir.info/2012/05/29/norbert-elias-process-sociology-and-international-relations/

Mac Ginty, R. (2006). Peace. In: *No War, No Peace. Rethinking Peace and Conflict Studies.* Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Macmillan, J. (2004). Liberalism and the Democratic Peace. *Review of International Studies*, 30(2), 179–200.

Maliniak, D., Peterson, S., & Tierney, M. J. (2012). *TRIP around the world: Teaching, research, and policy views of international relations faculty in 20 countries.* William & Marry College: Williamsburg.

Maney, G. M., Ibrahim, I., Higgins, G. I., & Herzog, H. (2006). The past's promise: Lessons from peace processes in Northern Ireland and the Middle East. *Journal of Peace Research*, *43*(2), 181-200.

Maoz, Z., & Russett, B. (1993). Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986. *The American Political Science Review*, *87*(3), 624–638.

Mead, M. (1940). Warfare is only an invention—not a biological necessity. *Asia*, 40(8), 402-405.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (1990). Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War. *International Security*, 15(1), 5–56.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (1994). The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security*, 19(3), 5–49.

Morgenthau, H. (1948) *Politics Among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Moura, T. (2005). Novíssimas guerras, novíssimas pazes. Desafios conceptuais e políticos. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, (71), 77-96.

Neuman, W. L. (2007) *Basics of Social Research. Qualitative and Quantitative Research.* Second Edition. Boston: Pearson Education.

Nye, J. S. (1968). Comparative regional integration: Concept and measurement. *International organization*, 22(4), 855-880.

Nye, J. S. (1971). *Peace in parts: Integration and conflict in regional organization.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Nye, J. S., & Goldsmith, J. L. (2011). The Future of Power. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 64(3), 45–52.

Onuf, N. G. (1975). Peace Research Parochialism. *Journal of Peace Research*, 12(1), 71–78.

Onuf, N. (1997). A constructivist manifesto. In Burch, K & Danemark, R. (Eds.) *Constituting international political economy* (pp.7-17). Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Oren, I. (1995). The Subjectivity of the "Democratic" Peace: Changing U.S. Perceptions of Imperial Germany. *International Security*, 20(2), 147–184.

Oren, N. (2010). Israeli identity formation and the Arab—Israeli conflict in election platforms, 1969—2006. *Journal of Peace Research*, 47(2), 193-204.

Owen, J. M. (1994). How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace. *International Security*, 19(2), 87–125.

Patomäki, H. (2001). The Challenge of Critical Theories: Peace Research at the Start of the New Century. *Journal of Peace Research*, 38(6), 723–737.

Paul, T. V. (2021) The Study of Peaceful Change in World Politics. In Paul, T.V, Larsson, D., Trinkunas, H., Wivel, A., & Emmers, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Peaceful Change in International Relations* (pp.3-27). New York: Oxford University Press.

Pinker, S. (2011). *The better angels of our nature: The decline of violence in history and its causes.* Penguin: London.

Pinker, S. (2013). The Decline of War and Conceptions of Human Nature. *International Studies Review*, 15(3), 400-405.

Pouliot, V. (2007). Pacification without collective identification: Russia and the transatlantic security community in the post-Cold War era. *Journal of Peace Research*, *44*(5), 605-622.

Reiter, B. (2017). Theory and methodology of exploratory social science research. *International Journal of Science & Research Methodology*, 5(4), 129-150.

Richmond, O. (2008). *Peace in International Relations*. Oxford: Routledge.

Risse-Kappen, T. (1995). Democratic peace—warlike democracies? A social constructivist interpretation of the liberal argument. *European journal of international relations*, 1(4), 491-517.

Rivera, M. (2016). The sources of social violence in Latin America: An empirical analysis of homicide rates, 1980-2010. *Journal of Peace Research*, 53(1), 84–99.

Rosato, S. (2003). The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory. *The American Political Science Review*, 97(4), 585–602.

Russett, B., Layne, C., Spiro, D. E., & Doyle, M. W. (1995). The Democratic Peace. *International Security*, 19(4), 164–184.

Safatle, W. (2019) A Linha Tênue Entre o Medo e a Esperança. [document in video] Accessed on 25th July 2022, from: https://tvcultura.com.br/videos/65891_a-linha-tenue-entre-o-medo-e-a-esperanca.html

Said, E. W. (2021). *Orientalismo. Representações Ocidentais do Oriente*. Lisboa: Edições 70.

SAGE (2022). *Journal of Peace Research*. SAGE journals [online]. Accessed on 28th July, 2022. Available at: https://journals.sagepub.com/home/jpr

Sarangi, U. (2018). GLOBAL PEACE INDEX OF ECONOMIES. *International Journal on World Peace*, 35(2), 7–25.

Schmid, H. (1968). Peace research and politics. *Journal of peace research*, 5(3), 217-232.

Sen, A. (2008). Violence, identity and poverty. *Journal of peace research*, *45*(1), 5-15.

Silva, E. L., & Menezes, E. M. (2005). *Metodologia da pesquisa e elaboração de dissertação* (4ª Edition). Florianópolis: UFSC.

Skelly, J. M. (2002) A Constructivist Approach to Peace Studies. *Peace Review*, 14:1, 57-60.

Smith, B. C., & Spaniel, W. (2021). Do nonproliferation agreements constrain?. *Journal of Peace Research*, *58*(6), 1163-1177.

Snyder, J. (2009) One World, Rival Theories. *Foreign Policy* [online]. Accessed on 25th July 2022 from: https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/10/26/one-world-rival-theories/

Spinoza B. (2009) *Tratado Político*. São Paulo: WMF Martins Fontes.

Sprinz, D. & Nahmias-Wolinsky, Y. (2004). Methodology in International Relations Research. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Stebbins, R. A. (2001). What is exploration. *Exploratory research in the social sciences*, 2-17.

Swedberg, R. (2020). Exploratory research. *The production of knowledge: Enhancing progress in social science*, 17-41.

Taliaferro, J. W. (2000). Security Seeking under Anarchy: Defensive Realism Revisited. *International Security*, 25(3), 128–161.

Thayer, B. A. (2013). Humans, Not Angels: Reasons to Doubt the Decline of War Thesis. *International Studies Review*, 15(3), 405-4011.

Tilly, C. (1993). How War Made States, and Vice Versa. In: C. Tilly, *Coercion, Capital and European States, A.D. 990 – 1992* (pp. 65-94). Cambridge: Blackwell.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2022). *Intentional Homicide*. dataUNODC [online]. Accessed on 26th July, 2022 from: https://dataunodc.un.org/dp-intentional-homicide-victims

Van Den Bergh, G.. (1972). Theory or Taxonomy? *Journal of Peace Research*, *9*(1), 77–85.

Van Dijk, T. (2010). Discourse, Knowledge, Power and Politics. Towards Critical Epistemic Discourse Analysis. *Revista De Investigacion Linguistica*, 13, 167-215.

Wagner, W. (2003). Building an Internal Security Community: The Democratic Peace and the Politics of Extradition in Western Europe. *Journal of Peace Research*, 40(6), 695-712.

Wallensteen, P. (1988) *Peace research: achievements and challenges*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Walt, S. M. (1998). International relations: one world, many theories. *Foreign policy*, 29-46.

Waltz, K. N. (1959) *Man, The State, And War*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Waltz, K. N. (1988). The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 18(4), 615–628.

Waltz, K. N. (1993). The Emerging Structure of International Politics. *International Security*, 18(2), 44–79.

Walzer, B. (2009). [Review of Inventing Human Rights, by L. Hunt]. *Comparative Literature Studies*, 46(1), 193–196.

Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*, 46(2), 391–425.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge University Press.

Wiberg, H. (1981). JPR 1964-1980. What Have We Learnt about Peace? *Journal of Peace Research*, 18(2), 111–148.

Woodhouse, T., Miall, H. and Ramsbotham, O. (2005). *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Zellman, A. (2015). Framing consensus: Evaluating the narrative specificity of territorial indivisibility. *Journal of Peace Research*, *52*(4), 492-507.