

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT: A HISTORICAL EXPLORATION

Anna-Karin Evaldsson¹

1. INTRODUCTION

Peace and development are concepts with deep historical roots and there are a large number of perspectives with regard to their definition, causes, desirability and attainability. In this article an attempt will be made to outline briefly the historical development of ideas about the nature of the relationship between peace and development. Four basic relationships can be distinguished, namely (a) peace promotes development, (b) peace harms development, (c) development promotes peace, and (d) development harms peace.

Furthermore, the emphasis will be placed on the relationship between peace and development in a post-settlement² or post-violence³ context. The length of what can be called a post-agreement period differs from case to case and it is neither meaningful nor advisable to set a time limit. A considerably long period can normally be seen as post-settlement, for example, in the sense that aspects of the conflict, which might turn violent in specific circumstances, are still present. It will often take a generation or more to move out of the post-agreement period.

Up until recently, neither peace nor development thinking focused much on the post-settlement period. Most peace research has in fact mainly been dealing with war and not with peace as such. War research will naturally form part of peace research since the absence of war can be seen as the most fundamental precondition for peace. However, war research should not be the only content of peace research, especially not if peace is seen as something more than the absence of war and if there is an aim to reach sustainable peace. The causes of peace are, for instance, not

¹ Department of History, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein. E-mail: akevaldsson@telkomsa.net.

² I.e. in conflicts where a peace agreement has been reached. This context will also be called 'post-agreement' in this article. Some authors call this context 'post-conflict', which is incorrect since the conflict is often still present and the main aim in the post-settlement period is to prevent the recurrence of violence.

³ I.e. in cases when no peace agreement has been signed, but where the violence has stopped.

Due to the existence of a great number of viewpoints on peace and development, this account is only a brief overview of some of the main positions. In order to demarcate the subject even further, the focus will be on peace and development thinking in the Western world. It should be noted that there is a great need for further research with regard to peace and development thinking from other parts of the world.

This article is divided into four chronological periods.⁴ The first one is made up of the classical era, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance; the second one consists of the period from the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, which is seen as the beginning of modern times for the purposes of this article, and ends with the conclusion of World War II; the third period spans from 1945 to the termination of the Cold War, and we are still living in the fourth one.

2. THE CLASSICAL ERA, THE MIDDLE AGES AND THE RENAISSANCE

As early as in classical Greece, a connection was made between war/peace and issues that would later become associated with development.⁵ The Greek philosopher Plato, for example, considered the basic cause of war to be the corruption of souls, a corruption that was due to the growth of luxury. In a state of scarcity, people were forced to cooperate, but with economic differentiation luxury became possible and valued because of the power it ensured. The Roman poet and philosopher, Lucretius, on the other hand, believed that war was caused by economic and technological backwardness. Technological growth stimulated a need for reciprocity and cooperation, and material progress therefore promoted the creation of peace. In addition, Lucretius held that economic equality was necessary in order to bring about a constructive rather than a destructive use of material progress.⁶ This difference of opinion between Plato and Lucretius, i.e. whether material and economic progress would have a positive or negative impact on peace, later reappeared many times. A third position can be illustrated by the Greek philosopher Heraclitus, who saw war as a natural condition, which was neither caused nor could be prevented by material or technological progress.⁷

⁴ This periodisation is partly based on B Hettne's chronological division in **Discourses on development** (unpublished paper, Göteborg, 2003). The division of the past into periods is always arbitrary to some extent, but for the purposes of this article the periodisation mentioned above is useful.

⁵ In classical Greece and Rome growth was mainly seen as a cyclical process, which is qualitatively different from the modern view of development. B Hettne, **Development theory and the three worlds: towards an international political economy of development** (Burnt Mill, 1995), p. 29.

⁶ IL Horowitz, **War and peace in contemporary social and philosophical theory** (London, 1973), pp. 4-6.

⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 6.

Both classical Greece and Rome were to a large extent geared towards war, and war was seen as a means to reach peace, which was considered to be the absence of war combined with a specific (Greek or Roman) societal order. This was a peace imposed by the victor and implied the imposition of a certain kind of (Greek or Roman) development. In Rome peace was also seen as a threat since it would make the men soft.⁸ We know very little about how the general public looked upon these issues, something that holds true for all the periods discussed in this article.

The opinion that war was the price that had to be paid for peace was also strong during the Middle Ages when the aim was to achieve a 'Christian peace'. In the Middle Ages, a number of peace plans were conceived calling for various forms of international governments, federations or world states, and reflecting the idea of the unity of Christianity.⁹ Also, during this era, growth was mainly seen in terms of degeneration and decay, with doom waiting at the end of the line.

During the Renaissance and the Reformation the views on peace and development changed to some extent. More thinkers than during the Middle Ages seem to have made a connection between peace and development. The German religious reformer Thomas Müntzer (c. 1490-1525), for example, argued that peace was impossible without a change in the social structure bringing perfect equality. He also emphasised that it was necessary for people themselves to try to change their lives.¹⁰ The most well-known peace thinker from this era was the Dutchman Desiderius Erasmus (1469-1536) who saw war as the enemy of all true progress, and peace as the source and defender of all good things, such as prosperity, security and happiness.¹¹

Erasmus and others saw peace as being more than the absence of war. They, for example, considered peace to be the improvement of life, and a way to "realize social justice, freedom and development".¹² Regarding the causes of peace some thinkers included issues such as the reform and universification of education and the construction of a network of roads and channels, which could bring people closer together, thereby improving their mutual understanding. One contribution

⁸ K Hopwood, "Peace in the ancient world" in **World encyclopedia of peace** (s.l., 1983), pp. 197-208; I Schalbroek, "Peace in the Middle Ages" in **World encyclopedia of peace**, p. 209; FS Northedge, "Peace, war and philosophy" in P Edwards (ed.), **The encyclopedia of philosophy** (New York, 1967), p. 63.

⁹ Northedge, p. 63; Schalbroek, p. 210; I Kende, "The history of peace: concepts and organizations from the late Middle Ages to the 1870s", **Journal of Peace Research** 26(3), 1989, pp. 233-5; G Darnton, "The concept of peace" in **Proceedings of the International Peace Research Association fourth general conference** (Oslo and Tokyo, 1973), p. 109.

¹⁰ Kende, pp. 234-5; S-E Liedman, **I skuggan av framtiden** (Stockholm, 1997), pp. 410-1.

¹¹ Kende, p. 235; D Erasmus, "The complaint of peace" in HP Kainz (ed.), **Philosophical perspectives on peace: an anthology of classical and modern sources** (Athens, 1987), pp. 148-77.

¹² Kende, p. 236.

was made by the French writer Emeric Crucé (c. 1590-1648) who deemed that an international organisation was a necessary, but not a sufficient, entity to maintain peace. It had to be complemented by the establishment of international relations, in particular through trade. In order to achieve this, the infrastructure connecting different parts of the world had to be improved. Crucé also recommended issues such as help to the poor, compulsory education up to the age of 18, and equal rights for aliens.¹³ His opinions were regarded as strange at the time, but would later become more prevalent. Kende argued:

"This is in fact where the ideas of peace and development not only compose a united system but practically become synonymous concepts; and where we meet the idea put more unambiguously than perhaps ever before that international peace cannot be realized without assuring the internal peace, justice and order of each country and its people."¹⁴

The realist view of peace as being the result of a balance of power also developed during the Renaissance; an idea that had no place in medieval thought, but would in the modern era become the predominant view of peace.¹⁵

During the eras that have been discussed in this section, there were several different ways of viewing the relationship between peace and development. It is interesting to note that many contemporary ideas can be traced this far back in time, even though the line of descent is neither straight nor uncomplicated.

3. THE MODERN ERA, 1648-1945

While peace thinking has a history reaching far back in time, development thinking basically emerged during the Enlightenment. Even if different pre-Enlightenment thinkers discussed issues that would later be associated with development, they did not necessarily make this connection. Changes regarding, for example, ways to look at space, time and human nature paved the way for the modern development idea,¹⁶ the main aspect of which was that human reason would bring about progress in all areas of life.¹⁷ The opinion that people could create and change society and were not just objects in the hands of God was in sharp contrast to the medieval view of people as helplessly rolling around in the wheel of fortune, defenceless against the accidents of life. In contrast, the modern human was seen to have the

¹³ **Ibid.**, pp. 236-7.

¹⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 237.

¹⁵ P Maurseth, "Balance-of-power thinking from the Renaissance to the French Revolution", **Journal of Peace Research** 2, 1964, pp. 120-1, 133.

¹⁶ See, for example, Liedman for further information regarding these changes.

¹⁷ Liedman, p. 518.

main responsibility for the future. This change of perception was a precondition for the modern idea of progress.¹⁸

Hettne states that the central element in the development thinking that evolved during the Enlightenment period was **growth**; a growth that had organic, cumulative, and irreversible characteristics. This association of growth with progress was new in the West.¹⁹ The Enlightenment view of development can be illustrated by the viewpoints of the French Enlightenment thinker Jean Antoine de Condorcet (1743-1794). He saw human reason as the means with which a better world would be built and he did not doubt that the world would enjoy progress, since perpetual progress, driven by reason, could not be stopped. He predicted the future to include complete equality between nations and people; no slavery or oppression; longer and healthier lives for everyone; knowledge everywhere; technology which would make life easier, and no conflicts since the knowledge of how to avoid them would be prevalent throughout society. Condorcet also believed that the amount of wealth in the world would increase immensely.²⁰

Liedman sees the Enlightenment project as consisting of two versions, which he calls the hard and the soft versions. The hard version concerns issues such as mathematics, natural science, economics and technology, while the soft one includes ethics, values (for instance, equality, freedom and democracy), world views, art, religion and attitudes. According to Condorcet, the hard and the soft features would automatically develop simultaneously. But, while his predictions with regard to natural science and technology have been surpassed by reality, the soft aspects have not developed as he expected. In fact, the soft features have frequently been the victims of progress with regard to the hard ones.²¹

It is important to note that the main difference in comparison to the previous eras was not the fact that change took place, even if society might have changed faster during the Enlightenment, but the **view** of change, which in itself probably contributed to an increased pace of change. A basic conviction was that humans with their own power, through their reason and knowledge, could change both nature and society. Even the critics of progress agreed with this conviction, but questioned whether the results of the modern development were desirable.²² They asked whether progress was worth its price, and if something important might not be sacrificed in the process. According to the Enlightenment tradition, progress would have emancipatory effects, but this belief has been continuously criticised,

¹⁸ Kende, p. 237; Liedman, pp. 411-4, 521; Hettne, **Development theory**, p. 29.

¹⁹ Hettne, **Development theory**, p. 29.

²⁰ **Ibid.**, pp. 15-6, 22.

²¹ **Ibid.**, pp. 22, 26-40, 46, 517-8.

²² Liedman, pp. 521-2.

for example by the well-known French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). The criticism often focused on how progress marginalised and bound people in an iron cage, to use the words of Max Weber. The world also lost its enchantment.²³

The industrial revolution contributed to significant changes in peace and development thinking, a fact that is even truer concerning the establishment of the nation state system. According to Kende, the views of the English Quaker leader William Penn (1644-1718) were well-suited to the industrial revolution and to the atmosphere of the Peace of Westphalia. Penn expressed the first bourgeois peace concept in that he considered the main **raison d'être** for peace to be the protection of private property and asserted that peace was more profitable, and therefore more useful, than war. Thus, for utilitarian thinkers development was a higher ideal than peace, and peace was mainly seen as a means to enhance development.²⁴

As seen above, the English often took an economic approach regarding peace; peace was seen as useful because it permitted trade and industry to develop. For the French, on the other hand, peace had to be based on justice and equality.²⁵ Freedom and human rights were seen as a more important rationale for peace than economic utility. One of the great number of people who philosophised about peace in France was Charles Irénée Castel de Saint-Pierre (1658-1743) who wrote a plan for everlasting peace. According to him, the European countries had to be bound by a permanent alliance in order to avoid war. A balance of power – which was the predominant view on how to avoid war at the time – was not enough as it could not be safeguarded. Rousseau later built on and criticised Saint-Pierre's work and stressed that such a union could only come into existence through violence exercised by the rulers, but that peace could not be built on the rulers since it had to be based in society.²⁶

As stated above, the nation state system had immense effects on peace and development thinking. The predominant way to view international relations after the Peace of Westphalia was to see the world as being in a state of anarchy. In this context, development mainly came to mean the strengthening of the state's material base, and was seen to take place chiefly through a process of industrialisation. Development was a means to gain power relative to other states and was therefore considered to be crucial for the survival of the state. If one nation would improve its power or prosperity, the other ones would automatically suffer as the

²³ **Ibid.**, pp. 34, 40-1, 45, 454-61, 464; M Power, "Enlightenment and the era of modernity" in V Desai and RB Potter (eds), **The companion to development studies** (London, 2002), p. 67.

²⁴ Kende, p. 237; Liedman, pp. 411-4, 521; Hettne, **Development theory**, p. 29; Power, p. 67.

²⁵ Liedman, p. 239.

²⁶ Kende, pp. 238-9.

international situation was seen as a zero-sum game. International relations and not the prosperity of the citizens was the driving force behind development strategies, and economics often became an instrument of war. This way of thinking came to be called **realism** and has been the dominant theory within international relations ever since, albeit in different forms. The realist way of thinking was probably also strengthened by the increased costs of war. The relationship between peace and development was seen as very tight; in fact, development was a crucial part of the peace strategy – which meant at this time to preserve the balance of power.²⁷

This realist view of the relationship between peace and development was predominant throughout the period discussed in this section, but there were also other approaches. One of these considered power to be an essential means to secure prosperity, which was seen as the main concern, while another saw power and prosperity as parallel goals, of more or less equal importance.²⁸ Furthermore, the British statesman and philosopher, Francis Bacon (1561-1626), was of the opinion that too much wealth would make people lazy, cowardly and afraid to lose their possessions. He also wanted to steer development away from certain occupations that he considered to contradict a military disposition.²⁹ Thus, it is possible to distinguish between seeing (i) prosperity as a means for power, (ii) power as a means for prosperity, (iii) the two as either indifferent to each other or as mutually supporting one another, and (iv) some degrees and kinds of prosperity as harmful with regard to power.

In opposition to the above-mentioned mercantilist-oriented views, ideas emphasising that the political power was the chief problem, and that its interests were conflicting with commercial interests, were developed. Increased commercialisation was seen as a possible counter-weight to the political power.³⁰ The philosopher and economist Adam Smith (1723-1790), for example, believed that free trade would create friendly inter-state relationships. But, in spite of his focus on a liberal economy, he stated that it might sometimes be necessary for the state to interfere in the economy for security reasons, and he emphasised that defence was more important than prosperity since a strong military power was a necessary guarantee for a liberal economy.³¹

²⁷ Hettne, **Development theory**, pp. 22-4; Hettne, **Discourses on development** (no pagination); L Eriksson, **Krigets och fredens politiska ekonomi: ett idéhistoriskt perspektiv** (Göteborg, 1993), pp. 75, 84-8, 90, 93; J Galtung, "Social cosmology and the concept of peace", **Journal of Peace Research** 26(2), 1981, p. 188.

²⁸ Eriksson, pp. 74, 99-100.

²⁹ **Ibid.**, pp. 77-9.

³⁰ **Ibid.**, pp. 105-18.

³¹ **Ibid.**, pp. 124-33; P Smekal, **Teorier om utveckling och underutveckling: en introduktion till u-landskunskapen** (Uppsala, 1991), pp. 23-5.

The classical political economy in its three forms - liberalism, protectionism and socialism – was in its essence part and parcel of the modern project. Classic liberalism was developed in England, and can be exemplified by the work of David Ricardo (1772-1823) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873). Ricardo considered wars to be fought only in the interest of certain elite groups, and war could never be advantageous to the general public since it had negative effects on a state's economy. Similar to other liberals, he considered free trade to contribute to harmony. But, on the other hand, he also emphasised that free trade could become a precondition for the continuation of a war as trade could provide the necessary means needed to proceed with a war. In contrast to Ricardo, Mill defended protectionism in two instances, namely with regard to national defence interests and in order to protect so-called infant industries. Mill was opposed to the socialistic idea that competition was a major cause of war; according to him commercialism made humans more peaceful. Apart from a strong defence force and peace-creating connections brought about by international trade, Mill also considered the creation of some kind of supranational body to be necessary in order to secure peace. Liberals, in general, placed the responsibility for wars amid the irrational wishes of the rulers, and were convinced that a liberal economy had peace-creating characteristics. Most of them also considered peace and economic development to reinforce one another.³²

The protectionists generally had a realist perspective. They focused on the need to protect national industries, especially those connected to military strength. Most of them did not agree with the hypothesis that trade contributed to friendly relations, but believed that competition and commercialisation were often causes of war. One of the most well-known protectionists was the German-American (U.S.A.) economist Friedrich List (1789-1846). He emphasised that war usually led to poverty and suffering, while prosperity would increase to the same degree that peaceful relationships between people increased. National wealth increased the state's power and the latter was seen as more important than the former. List opposed the liberal view of the peace-creating tendencies of free trade and stated that political unification always came before economic unification. To try to unify the world through trade would only lead to unequal development where the stronger states would dominate the weaker ones. Universal peace could take place only through the development of strong and independent states. List defended protectionism in the name of free trade, since he considered a period of protectionism to be necessary before free trade could have positive effects and before peace could be sustained.³³

³² Eriksson., pp. 139-73; Smekal, p. 25.

³³ Eriksson, pp. 173-94; Hettne, **Development theory**, p. 33.

The socialist school is very diverse, but will be exemplified here by its most well-known thinkers, namely Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820-1895). According to them, there was no definite boundary between war and peace, since the economy was seen as the continuation of war by other means. The liberal peace was superficial and the war went on unhindered underneath the surface. In capitalistic societies a constant social war between capital and work took place, and international conflicts were just a projection of the antagonism inherent in capitalism. Development was mainly seen as the development of capitalism, and the less developed countries would, in line with evolutionary thinking, develop along the same lines as the industrialised ones. This inevitable development would ultimately end up in communism and when the vertical conflicts between classes disappeared, the same would happen with the horizontal conflicts between nations. Communism would, therefore, basically eliminate the causes of war. However, Marx and Engels emphasised that violence was often a necessary means in the transformation process.³⁴

These three perspectives, i.e. liberalism, protectionism and socialism, were modified and generally became more diversified during the 20th century. However, the main emphasis regarding the relationship between peace and development remained the same; liberalism stressed the peace-promoting effects of free trade; protectionism took a more or less realist position regarding both economy and politics and, in particular, stressed the need to protect economic spheres of importance for the national security; while socialism emphasised the economic causes of war and saw a development towards a socialist society as the only way to reach peace.³⁵

In conclusion, one could state that the modern period (1648-1945) was characterised by a strong focus on the state and by the domination of the realist perspective. Various approaches can be distinguished with regard to the relationship between peace and development, for example, those emphasising their mutual contribution to one another, and those stressing their negative effects on one another. The dominating view saw development as crucial to the security of the state. The peace and security strategies differed. Whereas liberalism was promoted by the strong states, protectionism was often chosen by the weaker ones. During this phase, the focus regarding both peace and development was on the West, something that would change after World War II.

³⁴ Eriksson, pp. 224-46; Hettne, **Development theory**, p. 30; J Øberg, **Utveckla säkerhet - säkra utveckling: om militarism och fred** (Göteborg, 1983), pp. 161-2; P Månsson, "Karl Marx" in H Andersen and LB Kaspersen (eds), **Klassisk och modern samhällsteori** (Lund, 1999), pp. 27-46.

³⁵ Hettne, **Development theory**, p. 26.

The thinking during this period has several implications with regard to a post-agreement context. In line with Enlightenment thinking, peace and development would develop simultaneously since they were both driven by human reason. According to realist thinking, the main goal in a post-agreement period would be to maintain the balance of power. Liberalism could envisage a number of activities that would be necessary to secure peace in a post-settlement situation, with the main focus being on increasing free trade. Following socialist thinking, the post-agreement context would not be seen as peaceful since the social war would still go on and the only way to reach peace would be to develop communism.

4. PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT DURING THE COLD WAR

World War II (1939-1945) and the subsequent Cold War had an enormous impact on peace and development thinking. The realist position within peace thinking had already been seriously questioned after World War I (1914-1918) and this tendency increased after World War II.³⁶ Furthermore, the Marshall Plan and the reconstruction of Europe came to have a large impact on the development strategies vis-à-vis the developing countries.³⁷

Decolonisation also had extensive effects on peace and development thinking. Apart from the rapid dissolution of the colonial system, other issues that played a major role were the desire for development in the underdeveloped countries as well as the fact that the Cold War made the fate of these countries a policy concern in the rich states. Two competing development ideologies emerged, namely capitalism and socialism. Poverty in the developing countries was seen as a security threat, which was the main rationale behind the rich countries' wish to develop the poor ones along the same lines as they themselves had developed.³⁸

After World War II, development thinking was, in contrast to peace thinking, very optimistic. There was a strong belief that the developing world would, by imitating the West, also develop, i.e. become modernised. The Keynesian school was at this stage and up until the end of the 1970s dominant and, subsequently, development was seen as a kind of large-scale social engineering project needing strong governments for its implementation. It seems as if development thinking was not really related to peace at this stage, except to a Cold War balance of power/terror kind of peace. Development was mainly seen in terms of the economy and its

³⁶ P Wallensteen, "The origins of peace research" in P Wallensteen (ed.), **Peace research: achievements and challenges** (Boulder, 1988), pp. 12, 14-5.

³⁷ Hettne, **Development theory**, p. 35-6; T Binns, "Dualistic and unilinear concepts of development" in Desai and Potter (eds), p. 75.

³⁸ Hettne, **Development theory**, p. 35; B Hettne, "Current trends and future options in development studies" in Desai and Potter (eds), p. 8.

obstacles were often located in the so-called traditional sector. According to the **modernisation paradigm**, development, which included structural differentiation and functional specialisation, was an evolutionary process that could be divided into various stages. It was also seen as a spontaneous, irreversible process inherent in all societies.³⁹

The **dependency theory** grew out of a criticism of the modernisation theory and was the first development tradition to originate in the developing world. According to dependency theories, a country's position in the international structure determined its level of development or underdevelopment. The latter was almost completely ascribed to external sources, especially capitalist penetration.⁴⁰ It does not seem as if this school, just as the modernisation paradigm, dealt much, if at all, with the question of peace.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, changes took place regarding both peace and development thinking.⁴¹ The Vietnam War influenced peace thinking by provoking questions with regard to asymmetrical conflicts and the value of sovereignty in a world of asymmetric economic dependency. It was also less self-evident than previously that economic integration would advance peace.⁴² The agenda for peace research widened in the 1970s and an increasing amount of perspectives transcended the conceptualisation of peace as the absence of war. The content of peace was discussed more often than previously, which brought peace thinking closer in contact with development thinking. The issue of basic needs was, for example, extensively discussed within both areas.⁴³ Central to the widened agenda of peace research was the distinction between a positive and a negative peace. 'Negative peace' depicts peace as being the absence of war, while the concept of 'positive peace' is broader. In 1969, it was by peace researcher Johan Galtung defined as the absence of both direct **and** structural violence,⁴⁴ a definition that brought peace and development very close together. An absence of structural violence implies that people can develop their physical and mental potential maximally. This is basically the same thing as Nobel-prize winner Amartya Sen's

³⁹ Hettne, **Development theory**, chapter 1; Binns, pp. 76-8; R Batley, "The changing role of the state in development" in Desai and Potter (eds), p. 135.

⁴⁰ Hettne, **Development theory**, pp. 87-104; D Conway and N Heynen, "Classical dependency theories: from ECLA to André Gunder Frank" in Desai and Potter (eds), pp. 97-101.

⁴¹ This development coincided with, and was to some extent probably also caused by, a period of major growth for both disciplines.

⁴² Wallensteen, pp. 17-8; H Wiberg, "The peace research movement" in Wallensteen (ed.), pp. 44-5.

⁴³ For further information about the basic needs approach see, for example, J Burton, **Conflict: resolution and prevention** (Houndmills, 1990), passim; and L Kriesberg, **Constructive conflicts: from escalation to resolution** (Lanham, 2003), pp. 41-4.

⁴⁴ H Wiberg, "JPR 1964-1980. What have we learnt about peace?", **Journal of Peace Research** 18(2), 1981, p. 112-3; Øberg, p. 151; J Galtung, "Violence, peace and peace research", **Journal of Peace Research** 6(3), 1969, pp. 183-4.

view of development as the removal of different kinds of unfreedoms that leave people with little opportunity to exercise their reasoned agency.⁴⁵ Today, even if it is still contested, the concept of positive peace is more or less accepted within peace research - although the conceptualisation of peace as the absence of war is still predominant among political leaders and the general population.

During the 1970s, the so-called counterpoint in development thinking gained momentum in the West, partly because there were few visible results from mainstream practices. It did, however, not gain much support in the developing countries. The counterpoint came to be called 'Another Development' by many researchers. A wide range of issues is included in its brand of development theory, such as small-scale solutions, ecological sustainability and popular participation. Furthermore, it is needs oriented, focuses on self-reliance and emphasises the need for structural transformations. The gender issue also became increasingly incorporated. Within 'Another Development' the lack of any universal path to development is stressed; instead every society has to find its own path.⁴⁶

According to Hettne, 'Another Development' strategies are more peace intensive than mainstream ones. "Basic needs strategies would reduce the need for internal repression, self-reliance strategies [would reduce] the need for international competition, endogenous development would create conditions for the cultural survival of aboriginal peoples, and sustainable development would eliminate tensions generated by resource scarcity."⁴⁷ The effects of environmental degradation and diminishing natural resources with regard to conflicts have also been debated. Another issue of importance for peace research was the question of the relationship between ethnicity and development.⁴⁸

There was an impasse in development thinking during the 1980s, when neo-liberalism was the dominant trend in development economics. At the same time, peace research came under attack, for example, due to the resurgence of international tensions.

During the period discussed in this section, development increasingly became an issue in and for the developing world, and was often used as a security policy by both sides in the Cold War. In particular in the 1970s, changes took place regarding peace and development thinking. The counterpoint in development thinking became stronger and the agenda for peace research was widened considerably. This

⁴⁵ A Sen, **Development as freedom** (Oxford, 1999), passim.

⁴⁶ Hettne, **Development theory**, pp. 160-1; Binns, pp. 79-80; MJG Parnwell, "Agropolitan and bottom-up development" in Desai and Potter (eds), pp. 113-5.

⁴⁷ Hettne, **Development theory**, p. 173.

⁴⁸ **Ibid.**, pp. 173, 186-98.

resulted in a deeper realisation of the interconnections between peace and development; although considerable changes in this regard did not take place within the dominant approach or among policy-makers.

5. PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

The end of the Cold War had substantial effects with regard to peace thinking, especially due to the emergence of a large number of internal conflicts. It became evident that the old ways of thinking needed revision in order to be applicable to internal conflicts, and even more so to internal conflicts in a continuously globalising world. The prevalence of internal conflicts contributed to a greater emphasis on the interconnections between peace and development. Another important change that had effects on peace as well as development thinking was the new role that the United Nations (UN) took on after the Cold War, and the relatively large number of peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations that have been carried out since 1989. In an explicit way, the UN links peace and development. Some key elements in peacebuilding are, for example, demilitarisation, institutional reform, improved police and judicial systems, the promotion of human rights, electoral reform and socio-economic development.⁴⁹

The predominant development paradigm today is what Hettne calls (neo-liberal economic) globalism or global adjustment. Its ideological base is the growth of the world market, which increasingly penetrates and dominates national economies. According to this paradigm, the less government involvement, the better. Free markets and liberal economic policies are, however, no longer always seen as sufficient on their own. There is therefore also a focus on institutional conditions and issues such as the rule of law, an active civil society, good governance and effective public administration. Another important issue is that the globalisation process has resulted in an increased tendency for states to become alienated from their population, for example, since the state no longer has the function of protecting society against external economic forces.⁵⁰ This erosion of the role of the state poses an important problem for both peace and development thinking, since both of them have and are, to a great extent, still focused at the state level.

Development policies in the developing countries have increasingly become crisis management strategies and are often not geared towards long-term socio-economic

⁴⁹ H Miall et al., **Contemporary conflict resolution: the prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflicts** (Cambridge, 1999), p. 195. This is not the place for an evaluation of the UN's peacebuilding projects; the purpose was simply to illustrate how peace and development are, at least at a discursive level, seen as intertwined by the organisation.

⁵⁰ Hettne, **Discourses on development**; FJ Schuurman, "The impasse in development studies" in Desai and Potter (eds), p. 14; Batley, pp. 137-8.

transformation.⁵¹ The same applies to development assistance, which is increasingly directed towards humanitarian interventions. The rising number of humanitarian emergencies related to conflicts has diverted resources from long-term development assistance. At the same time, there is an increased awareness of the relationship between peace and development among aid organisations. There is, according to Leonhardt, an increasing consensus that development should foster not only economically but also socially sustainable structures, including an increased ability to transform conflicts non-violently. A development approach directed towards this objective has to have a long-term perspective and deep knowledge about the conflict in question. The possible negative effects of development assistance have also been highlighted, for example, the manner in which assistance can increase tensions and prolong violent conflicts. Another theme that has been discussed in both peace and development research is the need to prevent conflicts from turning violent; an area in which peace and development are highly interrelated.⁵²

An additional area of debate is how development and development assistance can help to build sustainable peace. The focus is thus on the post-settlement phase, a period that previously received little attention in both peace and development thinking. The post-settlement period is full of risks, is frequently disappointing and can form a 'bad peace', which might ultimately worsen the original conflict. There is a great need for making sure that the post-settlement period does not become a post-war period.⁵³ Development, or rather certain kinds of development, is necessary in order to address many root causes of conflicts.

According to Leonhardt, the social groundwork for peace is based on three factors, namely participation, material benefit and security.⁵⁴ The need for participation has been discussed for some time in development thinking, and can also contribute to a sense of ownership of a peace process. Material benefits are important, especially if there is extensive inequality between the different parties in a conflict. Such benefits can function as a proof of the peace process, and might make people more inclined to support it, while the lack of material benefits may have the opposite

⁵¹ Hettne, *Development theory*, p. 131.

⁵² M Leonhardt, "The challenge of linking aid and peacebuilding" in L Rechler and T Paffenholz (eds), *Peace-building: a field guide* (Boulder, 2001), pp. 238-45; V Erasmus, "Community mobilization as a tool for peacebuilding" in Rechler and Paffenholz (eds), pp. 246-50; MB Anderson, "Enhancing local capacity for peace: do no harm" in Rechler and Paffenholz (eds), pp. 258-64; B Munslow, "Complex emergencies and development" in Desai and Potter (eds), pp. 447-8; JP Lederach, *Building peace: sustainable reconciliation in divided societies* (Washington, 1997), pp. 90-2; EM Cousens and C Kumar (eds), *Peacebuilding as politics: cultivating peace in fragile societies* (Boulder, 2001), pp. 15, 184.

⁵³ Miall et al., pp. 188-90, 202; Kriesberg, pp. 235-6, 351; RL Rothstein, "In fear of peace: getting past maybe" in RL Rothstein (ed.), *After the peace: resistance and reconciliation* (Boulder, 1999), passim.

⁵⁴ Leonhardt, p. 241.

effect. Development assistance must take into account both the short-term needs of the people and the long-term needs of sustainable development.⁵⁵ Security is necessary to build sustainable peace and ultimately depends on the creation of mutual trust. Moreover, peace processes are often driven by the élite and it is of utmost importance to create a sustainable peace also on the grass-roots level, an area in which development can play a crucial role.⁵⁶

Miall et al. state that the creation of sustainable peace can be seen as an attempt to make up for four interlinked deficits that often afflict countries after wars, and especially after internal wars, namely in the military/security sphere, political/constitutional incapacity, economic/social debilitation, and psycho/social trauma.⁵⁷ This is a clear example of the crucial relationship between peace and development in a post-settlement context.

The belief in the idea of perpetual progress and in the modern project decreased from the 1970s, even though it had a recurrence in the 1980s. Postmodernism in its essence attacks the modern project and its views on development and progress.⁵⁸ Development thinking during the 1990s increasingly came to be conceived in terms of human rights and freedoms, issues that are also closely related to peace.⁵⁹

It is interesting that both the war in Afghanistan (since 2002) and the war in Iraq (since 2003) have, to a large extent, been justified with statements about post-war development. The wars have even been presented as a means to bring this development about. However, one must question whether this is a true motive or whether it is not mainly used in order to justify the war. Another issue that is highlighted by the above-mentioned wars is the view of war as a means to peace, a conviction that usually goes together with a very specific conceptualisation of peace, in this case a democratic and market-oriented peace that is benevolent towards the West. The old view of war as the path to peace is thus still viable. The peace in question is seemingly envisaged to take place through some kind of massive development campaign, from which democracy appears to be expected to flow naturally. This is an example of the old Enlightenment view of the simultaneous development of the hard and soft enlightenments.

⁵⁵ Leonhardt, *passim*; Miall et al., p. 214; Kriesberg, pp. 352, 360; Lederach, pp. 74-5, 93; RL Rothstein, "Fragile peace and its aftermath" in Rothstein (ed.), pp. 235-7; Cousens and Kumar, pp. 1-2, 14-5, 211.

⁵⁶ Leonhardt, *passim*; Rothstein, "In fear of peace", pp. 4-5, 7-8.

⁵⁷ Miall et al., p. 191.

⁵⁸ Liedman, pp. 474, 523-8; Schuurman, pp. 13-5; JD Sidaway, "Post-development" in Desai and Potter (eds), pp. 16-20.

⁵⁹ JA Elliott, "Development as improving human welfare and human rights" in Desai and Potter (eds), p. 47.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Every age - at least from the Enlightenment onwards - tends to think that its ways of thinking are new, or at least qualitatively different from previous ones. However, even a very brief overview as this one clearly shows that few ideas and theories can be seen as entirely or even predominantly new. Many ideas appear over and over again, albeit in different forms. Processes of both continuity and change are at work when it comes to the formation of ideas, and the difference is often chiefly one of emphasis. It is possible to learn from the way in which others, both in the present and in the past, have looked at issues such as peace and development.

A great number of ways to view the relationship between peace and development is visible throughout the period discussed in this article. In the introduction, four basic relationships were spelled out. A return will now be made to these, with a particular emphasis on the post-agreement context.

6.1 Peace promotes development

The majority of the thinkers discussed in this article consider peace to have positive effects on development; many even see peace as a precondition for development. One of the main examples comes from the liberal school, as well as from the utilitarians who are of the conviction that the main rationale for peace is its economic utility.

The main relevance of the opinion stressing the positive effects that peace can have on development for the post-agreement period is to see a peaceful context as a crucial condition in order for development to take place. Thus, without peace the possibilities for development are small or basically non-existing.

6.2 Peace harms development

The opinion that peace harms development is nowadays relatively rare. It is usually based on the belief that war is a driving force for development, or that war enhances certain human qualities,⁶⁰ or on dissatisfaction with a particular peaceful situation. In classical Greece, war was seen as the factor that made society evolve, and without it nothing would exist.⁶¹ The Romans saw peace as negative since it made men soft, an idea that has reappeared several times throughout history (for example in Nazi-Germany).⁶² The development of nationalism also led some

⁶⁰ See, for example, W James, "The moral equivalent of war" in Kainz (ed.), pp. 213-25.

⁶¹ Northedge, p. 63.

⁶² Hopwood, p. 206.

people to believe that war was desirable since it was seen to contribute to national regeneration.⁶³ Marx and Engels considered it necessary to use violence in order to bring about the desired development and ultimately bring about true peace. Liberal peace could therefore be seen as harmful to development.

The line of reasoning that results in the conclusion that peace has negative effects on development usually rests on a static concept of peace as a state of total harmony and no conflicts, where human, material and economic development would stagnate. The German philosopher Hegel, for example, believed that "war was the catalyst through which history unfolded its purpose. Man must accept war or stagnate".⁶⁴

Thus, according to the viewpoint that peace harms development, it is not desirable - in all or in some circumstances - to create sustainable peace in the post-agreement period. According to this line of thinking, a war should preferably break out from time to time, although several of the thinkers believe that war could promote development only under certain conditions.

6.3 Development promotes peace

The viewpoint that development promotes peace is supported by the majority of peace and development thinkers today. Peace and development are often seen as two sides of the same coin and therefore mutually supporting. Thus, most thinkers who believe that peace promotes development also believe that development promotes peace.

In the realist perspective, development is mainly seen as a means to increase or secure the relative power of the state. It therefore forms a crucial part in the peace (in the sense of an absence of war) strategy of a state. Without development the state would be weak and vulnerable, which would lead to a change in the balance of power, thereby increasing the risks for war.

Most liberals consider peace and development to be mutually reinforcing. The liberal school has placed much emphasis on commercialism, free trade and interdependence, which are seen to promote peace strongly.⁶⁵

⁶³ Northedge, p. 64.

⁶⁴ **Ibid.**

⁶⁵ Eriksson, p. 332; Kriesberg, pp. 45, 384-5.

There are also many theories that set up conditions for when development can have a positive impact on peace, stating, for example, that development will promote peace only if it is equal and/or environmentally sustainable. Lucretius, for instance, believed that material and technological progress would contribute to peace, provided that it took place in an equal society. List, for example, considered protectionism to be necessary for weak states since a liberal economy could have peace sustaining effects only if all the states were of equal strength.

To view development as promoting or as being a crucial condition for sustainable peace is common today, and it is the main point of debate with regard to the post-agreement context.

6.4 Development harms peace

The opinion that development harms peace is often connected to different kinds of development, where a certain development course is seen as detrimental to peace. Plato, for example, considered material progress to be the main cause of war, since it corrupted people's souls and made them cooperate less with each other. Another example is that in opposition to the liberal argument that free trade promotes peace, many thinkers state that free trade does just the opposite, and is often a cause of war.⁶⁶ This is, for example, a common view among protectionists and realists. Another example is that capitalism was seen by Marx and Engels as an inherently conflictual system and the root of war was considered to be the economic structure.

One important aspect of the viewpoint that certain kinds of development have a detrimental effect on peace is the focus on asymmetrical development. Asymmetry is seen as a root cause of many violent conflicts.⁶⁷ A major argument in both the counterpoint in development theory as well as in much peace research is that there is a need for structural transformations in order to achieve sustainable peace.⁶⁸

Thus, development is seen as necessary for peace, but a development that is different from the one currently being pursued. This is an important line of thinking with regard to the post-agreement situation, especially since most violent conflicts today are asymmetrical. If the asymmetry is not changed, which will usually not take place unless another development strategy to the one prior to the war is pursued, the possibilities for sustainable peace are minute.

⁶⁶ See, for example, Eriksson, *passim*; Kriesberg, p. 385.

⁶⁷ Kriesberg, p. 315.

⁶⁸ See, for example, J Galtung, **Peace by peaceful means** (Oslo and London, 1996); B Russell, "On world government" in Kainz (ed.).

Peace and development can fruitfully be seen as two highly interrelated processes that can, depending on the particular circumstances, either support or harm each other. The main issue regarding their relationship concerns sustainability, since none of them can be sustainable without the other one. The connection between peace and development is particularly important after the conclusion of a violent asymmetrical conflict. After a symmetrical conflict, reconstruction of the societies is usually needed, while after an asymmetrical conflict, both reconstruction (of what was destroyed) and development (making the situation less asymmetrical) are needed, otherwise the possibilities for sustainable peace are small.