

# Development Studies and Peace Studies –The Links

■ *Diane Hendrick*

*When “peace studies” emerged as a field of academic enquiry thirty years ago it was concerned with the causes and prevention of war, conflict and violence. By the late 1960s the central concerns had broadened to issues of justice. Violence is no longer associated solely with war but with poverty. Structural violence is identified in political and social institutions and processes. Security refers not just to security from attack, but to “livelihood security” against sickness, early death and deprivation. The overlap with development studies is clear. There is however no direct link between disarmament and development. Scaling down military expenditure will not in itself advance development but will increase the potential for development. Peace and development are best conceived as processes rather than states. Degrees of peacelessness and development co-exist and interact and the two processes cannot be separated.*

**T**hroughout history there have been those who have argued the superior morality, or even efficacy, of non-violence. A smaller number have put forward proposals or plans for peace. However, moves to set the study of war, its causes, effects and how to prevent it, on a more rigorous academic footing really began in the mid-nineteenth century with the rise of social science and with the desire among pacifists and anti-war

propagandists to move away from arguments against war which were based on religious-moral-emotional appeals and to provide a "scientific" basis for the pacifist case. War was to be viewed as a sociological phenomenon — a quite different approach from that favoured in military academies.

The emergence of peace studies as a field of academic study in its own right came in the late 1950's and early 1960's with the establishment of a number of peace research institutes and the publication of several journals in the field.<sup>1</sup> Peace studies were defined with regard to their explicit value content, i.e. value-oriented towards peace and its promotion, but also, crucially, in terms of their interdisciplinarity. So many aspects of life are touched by the problem of war and conflict that it was believed that many disciplines would have insights to contribute to the study of peace. Initially this meant political science, diplomacy, international relations and history but extended to sociology, psychology and even the physical sciences. Peace studies sought to bring together apparently disparate disciplines and focus them on the problem of peace with the aim that each would illuminate a part of the whole.

Johan Galtung, a prominent peace researcher, speculated that eventually there would emerge a new type of researcher who would be able to incorporate and integrate relevant aspects of various academic disciplines into her/his outlook and research into peace. This remains a desirable goal. The benefits to be gained by specialisation are great in terms of detailed, in depth research and analysis but over-specialisation, particularly where coupled with a lack of appreciation of contextual factors, may result in the perception of a partial picture leading to distorted conclusions. In the same way simplification is often necessary in order to operate efficiently in our world (for example, we operate using a model of Newton's rather than Einstein's universe for most purposes) but there is always the danger that we will confound the simplification with reality. The complexity of the real world requires an holistic approach to its study and a bringing together of the various fields of specialisation, as in peace studies, goes some way towards this. A further concern of peace studies has been to maintain a global perspective in order to avoid the nationalism which had often prevailed in traditional approaches to international politics and diplomacy founded on the furtherance of the interests of one particular country.

In the early years much peace research centred around the causes of war and conflict, the genesis of arms races and how to control and reverse them. However, by the late 1960's the focus

was beginning to broaden to include consideration of issues of justice — economic exploitation nationally and internationally, poverty, human rights, oppression and liberation. These new concerns complemented rather than replaced the old agenda of peace research. They coupled the negative aspects of peace — the avoidance or prevention of war, conflict and violence — with the positive aspects of justice and looked to discover the processes and create the structures for the development of just social, economic and political relations. Violence was no longer identified solely with the cruelty of war or torture but also with the poverty of millions in the face of the plenty reserved for the few, the violence that hurts people day after day, physically and psychologically, by keeping them hungry, in ill health, deprived of their rights, excluded from participation in social, economic and political processes.

It is at this juncture that development studies enters into the arena of peace studies. The remainder of this paper will briefly survey some of the areas where the relationship between development and peace is clearly illustrated and where development related research contributes to the field of peace studies.

## **The effect of war on development**

There are few today who will argue that war has overall positive effects on development. However, there are those like Gavin Kennedy<sup>2</sup> who point to some advantages such as the acquisition of territory and resources through military means and he cites the example of the oil gained by Nigeria through capture of territory during the civil war. Kennedy also presents the aid received by Vietnam's neighbours from the United States during the Vietnam War as a sort of development windfall. He further claims that a war climate can provide the best environment for economic discipline and can give impetus to the process of "economic nation-building" (again citing the example of Nigeria). Indeed the economic development of first Spain and Portugal and later Britain, France and other European countries depended to an extent on the spoils of war in the shape of colonial acquisitions. And Andre Gunder Frank<sup>3</sup> has pointed to the beneficial side-effects of war for some countries in the periphery who were not directly involved in the conflict but whose pattern of trade and

other links with the centre countries were disrupted as a result. Certain periods of war, he claims, so successfully isolated areas of Latin America as to force a self-reliance which proved an impetus to indigenous development and a break in the cycle of dependency.

While it may be argued that there are spin-offs from other people's wars whether in terms of increased aid to secure allegiance or a possible boost in exports these gains must be offset against the increase in regional destabilisation, the danger of the spillover of any war and the possible disruption of trade. And it is also generally true that the increase in social cohesion that the invocation of an external enemy provides, depends for its sustainability on the war being far from the home territory, relatively cheap and winnable without the loss of too many of "our boys".

It may be that war, often of the low intensity variety, is employed precisely to prevent development as in the case of South Africa's destabilisation of Mozambique or the US-backed Contra war against Nicaragua. Reginald Green<sup>4</sup> and Joseph Hanlon<sup>5</sup> have both investigated the costs of war in Africa. Although there is very often an economic element in the motivation for fighting a war, including independence struggles and civil wars as well as international armed conflict, it is hard to find an example among LDCs (less developed countries) in modern times where the costs of war have not had a detrimental effect on development. The loss of life (which is also the loss of labour, skills and expertise), the loss of productive capacity through war damage and diversion from civilian to military production, the disruption of markets, communications, transport and international trade, the distortion of the economy, and often the move towards more authoritarian forms of government with suspension of civil and political rights — all this and more serves to hinder development.

Peace research has focused on the effects of arms races and military expenditure on development rather than the effects of war on development and I will deal with this perspective in a later section. Perhaps the more perceptive insight has come with the recognition of situations of injustice within and between societies, resulting from exploitative structures or repressive institutions, as constituting a form of violence despite the absence of war or violent conflict.

# The peacelessness of underdevelopment

The term “development”, as difficult to define as the term “peace”, has always been subject to a myriad of interpretations. They range from the restrictive identification of development with economic growth evidenced by high GNP per capita growth rates to the comprehensive notion of development as the achievement of human potential — economic, social, political and spiritual — in harmony with the environment. Those who espouse the more inclusive definition of development will find themselves in accord with the aims and methods of peace studies. In fact, development studies has been concerned to understand the complexity of development processes through an interdisciplinary approach relying not merely on economics but also drawing on politics, ecology, sociology, anthropology, etc.

In a peace studies framework what may be termed “impeded development”, and situations in which countries may even be said to be underdeveloping as in the case of Sub-Saharan Africa, represents an imbalance in access to resources and power such that the majority of people live in a situation of chronic and dire poverty and powerlessness. This is viewed as structural violence, a violence which is as crippling and deadly as bombs and bullets for millions of people. Johan Galtung<sup>6</sup> in particular has discussed and developed this concept (see also the work of Adam Curle.<sup>7</sup>) This sort of social injustice is common enough and can be found from Indonesia to Ireland only varying in its intensity. It is argued that one must view critically situations which appear outwardly peaceful in order to discern the elements of violence in the political and social institutions and processes. One may then recognise the state of “peacelessness” that prevails in unjust societies.

However, the perception of structural violence is inevitably conditioned by one’s values and beliefs making the definition problematical in all but the grossest instances of injustice. The introduction of the concept itself resulted in heated debates within the peace studies community in the early 1970’s and a parting of the ways for a number of peace researchers. It must, however, be recognised that the value base of peace studies refers to the common aim of achieving peace and justice but does not preclude a plurality of visions of the “just society” and how to achieve it.

# Security

Security is often seen as central to the issue of peace as widely understood. However it is a limited concept when used to denote security from attack; a preoccupation with protection from an external aggressor and the safeguard of information deemed vital to the defence of the state. In reality security is a multifaceted concept and the threats to our well-being, and even our survival, derive more commonly from non-military rather than military sources. Of particular relevance are economic and ecological security.

For poor people a defining characteristic of their lives is the lack of security. What poor people seek, therefore, first and foremost, is what Robert Chambers calls "livelihood security".<sup>8</sup> This includes, among other things, security against sickness, against early death, and against becoming poorer. What the poor need in addition to incomes at subsistence level is some sort of reserve to meet the sort of contingencies which may propel them into an even deeper state of poverty e.g. sickness, accidents, losses, etc. One can gain an appreciation of the consequences of such vulnerability to shocks or sudden increases in expenditure through the sort of micro-study carried out by Leela Gulati on poor women in Kerala in India.<sup>9</sup> By building up a picture of an individual's day to day existence Gulati reveals the significance of reserves to meet contingencies and how these can make the difference between bearable survival and complete immiserisation for the poorest of the poor.

In order to be truly secure livelihoods must also be sustainable. The Brundtland Commission's Advisory Panel on Food, Agriculture, Forestry and Environment defined the concept of "sustainable livelihood security" thus: "Livelihood is defined as adequate stocks and flows of food and cash to meet basic needs. Security refers to secure ownership of, or access to, resources and income-earning activities, including reserves and assets to offset risks, ease shocks and meet contingencies. Sustainable refers to the maintenance or enhancement of resource productivity on a long-term basis."<sup>10</sup>

While the issue of sustainable livelihood security is particularly acute for the very poorest it is not without relevance in a global context. Since development is not a state to be reached but rather a process (and not a process possessing an inevitably evolutionary impetus) all countries can be said to be engaged in development. However, some forms of development in individual countries can

so disrupt the biosphere as to endanger the global as well as the local environment, and consequently ourselves and our fellow creatures.

An example in the Third World, on a spectacular scale, would be desertification, a problem which has arisen due to increased pressure on land from rapidly growing populations and the adoption of inappropriate methods of agriculture. The fulfilment of immediate, essential needs can have disastrous long-term effects as can ill thought out development plans. The problem is by no means confined to the Third World. Development processes in the industrialised countries have contributed significantly to ecological destabilisation through depletion of the ozone layer, the formation of acid rain, the generation of nuclear waste, and so on. The demands of Third World governments for foreign exchange and personal profit, of the industrialised countries for timber plus the increasing demands of local people for firewood and land for agriculture as population pressure increases, are all serving to rapidly deforest tropical zones. This is creating problems not only in the local ecosystem and livelihood systems by disrupting agriculture, drainage patterns, tribal lifestyles, etc. but also has globally harmful effects — loss of genetic material, loss of sources of chemicals and medicines, disruptions in the patterns of climate regulation and so on.

The long-term threats to the sustainable security of North and South flowing from the pursuit of short-term interests are daunting in their complexity. There is much scope for the peace researcher to develop the concept of security and explore in greater depth the idea of common security and its practical implications for relations between states. Some work on environmental aspects of security is already being carried out.<sup>11</sup> The mechanisms for obtaining sustainable livelihood security for the poorest and how these can be developed by the poor themselves remains a crucial area of research for those concerned with development. Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) pioneered at Khon Kaen University in Thailand<sup>12</sup> utilising interdisciplinary teams and innovative forms of communication for the gathering of information on rural areas, together with participative research, as promoted under the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development Programme on Participation, should provide methodologies in keeping with the aims of peace studies.

# Development and inner peace

In a full definition of development I would favour not only the inclusion of the meeting of basic needs, material and social, nor merely the addition of the intellectual quest for knowledge but also, fundamentally, spiritual development and growth. The perception of spiritual poverty or aridity is often crowded out by the grosser claims of the physical body for sheer survival but following the satisfaction of basic needs the perception of a lack of some deeper element to human existence emerges. There have been few attempts to explicitly link the spiritual with economic, social and political development. However, examples do exist. Some varieties of liberation theology try harder than others to maintain the spiritual, as opposed to the merely religious, element in their programmes of social liberation and development. Gandhi and his successors in India evolved an holistic approach to development which included the spiritual dimension and in Sri Lanka a mass movement has emerged inspired by Gandhi's concept of "Sarvodaya" or "the welfare of all".

The members of this movement are convinced of the saliency of inner peace to development. A. T. Ariyaratne established the Sri Lankan Sarvodaya movement in 1958. Since that time the Sarvodaya movement has grown to encompass over 3000 villages. The philosophy of Sarvodaya is shaped by the Theravadan Buddhism of Sri Lanka and therefore views true development as the progression of all beings towards enlightenment. The need to satisfy the basic needs for survival as a precondition for spiritual pursuits was recognised by the Buddha himself who counselled a "Middle Path" between sensual indulgence and asceticism. Such ideas have flowered in the renaissance of Buddhism in the twentieth century which has oriented itself towards social and political engagement as exemplified among the Buddhists of Vietnam during the war, in Burma under U Nu and by some Buddhist groups in Thailand today.

Development, as defined by the villagers involved in the Sarvodaya movement, comprises six elements (here I use the summary recorded in Denis Goulet's study of the movement<sup>13</sup>): "a moral element (right action and righteous livelihood), a cultural one (accumulated beneficial experiences along with customs, beliefs, art, music, song, dance and drama, which helps to keep a community of people together as a cohesive whole), a spiritual one (awakening of one's mind, through concentration,

to wisdom and unconditioned happiness), a social one (access of all to physical and mental health, knowledge, culture, etc.), a political one (the enjoyment of fundamental rights by all and freedom to shape one's political environment) and an economic one (meeting human needs)."

Far from being other-worldly Sarvodaya is involved in thousands of practical small-scale appropriate development projects at village level which, as a matter of course, allow for grassroots participation in all stages of planning and implementation of projects. Indigenous technical knowledge (ITK) is utilised as a base to which are added increments of appropriate technology as and when required. Self-reliance is a guiding principle with use of local labour and materials. The range of projects is broad — income-generating activities, education, social and community service, credit provision, skills and leadership training, among many others.

For both development and peace researchers the study of this sort of holistic development theory and practice, in Sri Lanka and elsewhere, where it fails and where it succeeds, where it can be generalised and where it is culturally specific, would add a valuable perspective and depth to the study of development. In the past research has often focussed on the extent to which a particular set of religious beliefs and practices has hindered or engendered economic development.<sup>14</sup> This presupposes a narrow economic definition of development and usually excludes the study of religiously or spiritually appropriate development or indeed the satisfaction of spiritual needs as a goal of development.

## Disarmament and development

In recent years attempts to link disarmament with development have increased especially at the international level. United Nations studies exposing the social and economic consequences of the colossal level of expenditure on arms have been produced, acknowledged and shelved. The facts are depressing. World military expenditure expanded fivefold after World War II to reach \$850-\$870 billions by 1985 (larger than the combined GNP of Africa and Latin America).<sup>15</sup> In 1986 world military expenditure was running at \$1.7 million per minute.<sup>16</sup>

The major force behind the global arms race is the qualitative arms race between the super-powers in which advantage is gained through technological improvement rather than an increase in

the number of weapons. In fact, six of the main military powers account for around three-quarters of world military expenditure, virtually all military research and development and the bulk of exports of weapons and military equipment. Research and development plays an important role in the whole process of development and this is skewed not only internationally (the vast majority of R and D work is done in the North) but is also heavily weighted in favour of military R and D.

Military expenditure in the Third World had vastly increased in the first flush of independence in the mid-1960's and for some countries again in the mid-1970's with the increase in oil revenues. In 1960 LDC's accounted for 8% of global military expenditure; in 1985 it was 20% of the total.<sup>17</sup> What this represents is a gigantic waste of resources for any country (the US's poor performance recently in international markets is put down to lack of investment in civilian as opposed to military R & D) but in the Third World the diversion of resources — skilled workforce, foreign exchange, etc. — to the military is particularly damaging. Much work has been done on the social and economic costs of the arms trade and arms races including Marek Thee's analysis of the role played by military R & D.<sup>18</sup>

It would take less than the cost of one nuclear-powered aircraft carrier to finance a programme of reforestation that would reverse the destruction of the world's forests.<sup>19</sup> It actually cost less than thirty minutes of the world's military expenditure for the FAO to destroy a plague of locusts in Africa and in the process save enough grain to feed 1.2 million people for a year.<sup>20</sup> These are the sorts of comparisons that are made use of by the UN and numerous development agencies. They bring home the terrible waste involved in arms production and exchange.

However, there is no direct link between disarmament and development. A decrease in fighter jets and an increase in, say, Rolls Royces or palaces would not necessarily constitute an increase in development. Unless the money is productively invested in human resources as well as industry and agriculture, then the direct contribution of disarmament to development will be severely limited. In this view proposals such as that for a UN Disarmament Fund for Development are of little use as more than a gesture to the notion of a relationship between disarmament and development. In fact, disarmament measures in the nuclear field may initially entail a rise in military expenditure as the removal of these relatively cost-efficient weapons is offset by increased expenditure on conventional weapons to maintain what is perceived as a "credible deterrent capacity".

What is true is that the lessening of tension engendered by any disarmament measures will provide a more conducive environment for any development efforts. In addition, the intensity and scale of violent conflict in the Third World would be reduced as a result of any decrease in the flow of sophisticated weaponry and military systems to conflict areas. However, it would be a mistake to forget that the conflicts and their causes would remain to be resolved. As Eboe Hutchful<sup>21</sup> points out, in terms of military expenditure and number of soldiers in relation to population, Africa rates as one of the less militarised continents. However, this has not prevented Africa reaching a high ranking in terms of frequency of war, coups and foreign incursions and also in levels of domestic repression and abuse of human rights.

Therefore, the scaling down of military expenditure will not in itself improve development but will increase the potential for development. The political problem of who receives benefits and who is disadvantaged by any development policy will remain, as will the unjust international system in which LDCs have to operate. Apart then from some international regulation and restriction on the arms trade, two priorities for international research and action present themselves.

Firstly, research into methods of conflict management and resolution, the establishment of machinery for negotiation and arbitration on a regional basis, and the provision of mediation services — each with the aim of providing alternatives to armed conflict. The UN could play a role in providing advisory services or expertise in this area much as it does in the area of human rights.

The second priority is undoubtedly research into the conversion of military industries to civilian purposes. Some measures of this kind have already been taken on a small-scale in, for instance, Vietnam and China. The detailed planning for conversion with all the re-tooling and retraining required (and this would include retraining of the highly specialised scientists involved in military R and D), is a prerequisite of large-scale disarmament. Although the problem is far more acute in the industrialised countries there are around fifty LDCs who have taken up military production as part of their development strategy and would benefit from industry conversion studies.

# The military, militarism and development

An area where the development aspect of peace studies is clearly to the fore is the study of the effect of the military and processes of militarisation on the prospects for development. However, following the proliferation of literature on the role of the military in politics in the 1950's and 1960's there has been a dearth of theoretical work in the field although there have been some useful detailed case studies.

The early liberal view of the military was of an organisation given temporary prominence during time of war or, in the case of some Third World countries, a political aberration. However, by the late 1950's a more positive view of the military and its role in political and economic development of LDCs began to emerge. Not only was the military viewed as an agent of political stability but also as being oriented towards modernisation and social and political change. Analysts such as *Finer*,<sup>22</sup> *Huntington*<sup>23</sup> and *Janowitz*<sup>24</sup> stressed the modern training of the military, their access to technology and their efficiency and organisation as factors which provided them with the best background and outlook to further development in LDCs.

However, the following years proved the analysts over-optimistic in their appraisal of the potential of the military in social and economic development. The professed link between military government and economic growth in LDCs was not conclusively proved and critical studies such as *Stepan's*<sup>25</sup> of the military regime in Brazil, (heavily backed and financed by the US and their allies), sounded a cautionary note. Since that time studies of the role of the military in development and the extent to which societies under military rule become militarised have only served to emphasise the variety of experiences. For every positive example one can point to a negative counter-example. A brief discussion of a few examples will illustrate the point.

Until July 1988 Thailand had been ruled by a military government so closely interlinked with a pervasive bureaucracy that it was difficult to determine the precise locus of power. The military came to power in 1932 by deposing the absolute monarchy and ruled the country with brief interruptions of civilian rule in 1945-48 and 1973-76. Manoeuvrings for power in the higher echelons of the military, with the attendant coups and countercoups, to a great extent left the rest of the country

unaffected. With a western-oriented military elite more interested in personal power than possessed by any vision of a particular path of development for their country, military rule resulted in a relatively low level of militarisation in society.

A contrasting case is that of Indonesia. Here the military is deeply involved in very many aspects of the economic and political life of the country. It is estimated that around 40% of the military budget comes from outside the state central budget.<sup>26</sup> Army divisions own hotels or mining companies or make lucrative business deals with local millionaires and a highly placed military clique has been siphoning off billions from the state oil company, Pertamina, for years. The military's complete control of the state allows them to manipulate economic actors through, for example, the allocation of licences, monopolies, foreign investment approval, and so on. The Indonesian military have been referred to as a class of military businessmen but that is not their only role in society. A small fraction of the massive military force is engaged in military operations to suppress revolt in Timor and West Irian while the majority of the troops are stationed in virtually every village of the country closely directing the social and political life of the masses.

In Vietnam following the end of the Vietnam War the government created a Department of Economic Construction within the military. This was shortlived as soldiers were called back to active service in 1978 to invade Kampuchea and drive out the Khmer Rouge. However, in 1986 the idea was taken up again and today sixteen divisions of 3,000 men each, together with a number of engineering regiments, are assigned to solely economic work.<sup>27</sup> They are involved in road and housing construction, flood control and land reclamation, work in plantations, etc. Nevertheless it remains true that the majority of soldiers are still engaged in economically unproductive activity.

In Eritrea the EPLF (the Eritrean People's Liberation Front) is a military force engaged in a war of independence against Ethiopia. However, the guerillas are simultaneously undertaking a project of radical social transformation. They carry out programmes of health care by training barefoot doctors, providing clinics and setting up the production of basic drugs. In the field of education they provide schools, teachers, textbooks as well as adult literacy training. They seek to improve the position of women in society by allowing them title to land, access to education and participation in social and political decision-making. Development of small-scale industries, crafts, agricultural improvement programmes, land reform — are all recognisable as

projects for development. This is the positive picture painted by the propaganda of the EPLF but there are enough independent reports to indicate that the EPLF are at least making moves in this direction.

What is not clear is how much access to these development programmes depends on political allegiance to the EPLF and “ideological soundness” and to what extent political “re-education” is an instrument of oppression. What is clear is that the people are desperately poor and the war is making them poorer—workers become fighters, resources are destroyed (human and material), markets, communications and transport systems are disrupted. Not the most propitious circumstances for development to flourish and yet it cannot be denied that projects such as those mentioned above are elements in a process of development.

What should by now be clear is that there are as many varieties of military rule as there are military forces and consequently as many different experiences of development under military domination. What this seems to indicate for research in this area is chiefly two things. Firstly, that attempts to achieve a general theory of the role of the military in development will most likely be fruitless and that case studies on a country by country basis will provide much more useful information for development purposes. Secondly, that in general the central question of the unequal distribution of power and access to resources in society and how this determines poverty for the masses and plenty for the few is not significantly aided by viewing a military ruling elite as unique and distinct from other civilian ruling elites. The elite, or elites, of a country represent a constellation of forces, varying in composition from situation to situation but never deriving solely from one group. As Valenzuela rightly observes, the military and the civilian are highly interpenetrated: “to the point where it is more accurate to conceive of the military as one of many actors within the same political system. . .”<sup>28</sup> Researchers in the peace field then would be better advised to study the military in its relationships with other social and political forces rather than to attempt to oppose it to the mass of other actors in the political arena in a crude military vs civilian framework.

## Conclusion

Before concluding this survey of some of the interrelationships between peace and development I would like to briefly discuss a

danger that arises for analysts and advocates in the field of peace and development. There is a tendency in some quarters for claims of the priority of peace over development to be made or vice versa. They are usually formulated as “peace is a precondition of development” or “development is a precondition of peace”. While it is true that peace without development denies the positive aspect of peace that is the flourishing of social justice, it is equally true that development without peace is at best a stunted growth, hampered and distorted by the conflict and violence in which it seeks to emerge. However, what does not follow is that peace must necessarily precede development or vice versa. This type of linear thinking is an abstraction which fails to appreciate the organic form of social relations and human relations with the environment.

Part of the difficulty lies in seeing peace and development as states to be achieved rather than as processes. In reality peace and development are processes which are conterminous and must feed off each other. Progress in one or the other may be at differing rates, there may be hiccoughs and reverses, and their relative relationship may change over time. This view is more in keeping with the holistic approach advocated by peace studies as more accurately reflecting the real world and providing a more comprehensive set of tools for its analysis. Rather than this notion of “preconditionality” I find the concept of “simultaneity” — the simultaneous unfolding of processes of peace and development — to be a more useful framework theoretically and practically. In Eritrea there is social and economic development in the midst of an armed liberation struggle; in Mozambique there is development under destabilisation from South Africa (e.g. the women’s market gardens surrounding Maputo producing food for the capital and increasing the status and skills of local women), in Sri Lanka there is the attempt to combine spiritual and material development in the midst of violent civil strife. Such examples do not show peace or development in fullness or maturity but indicate that degrees of peaceness and degrees of development co-exist and interact and while priorities must be assigned the two processes cannot be separated.

In some sense the conduct of research into development contributes to the field of peace research by definition but development-related research has a particular relevance to peace studies where it is concerned with security in the broader economic and environmental sense, the effects of arms, militarisation and war on development, and where justice is recognised as an essential ingredient of development.

## Footnotes

1. For example publication of *Journal of Conflict Resolution* in 1957 and establishment in 1959 of Center for Research on Conflict Resolution at University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. The International Peace Research Institute was set up in Oslo in 1959 and in 1965 published the *Journal of Peace Research* and in 1970 *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*.
2. Kennedy, G., *The Military in the Third World*, Gerald Duckworth, 1974
3. Frank, A. G., "The Development of Underdevelopment" in C. K. Wilber, (ed), *The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment*, Random House, 1979
4. Green, R., "Killing the Dream, The Political and Human Economy of War in Sub-Saharan Africa", IDS Discussion Paper 238, Nov. 1987. See also R. Green and P. Manning, "Namibia: Preparations for Destablization", and R. Green and C. Thompson, "Political Economies in Conflict: SADCC, South Africa and Sanctions", in *Frontline Southern Africa: Destructive Engagement*, P. Johnson & D. Martin, (eds) Four Walls Eight Windows, 1988
5. Hanlon, J., *Beggar Your Neighbour*, CIIR, 1985
6. Johan Galtung has written on the concept of structural violence in many articles contained in the *Journal of Peace Research*.
7. Curle, A., *True Justice*, Quaker Home Service, 1981
8. Chambers, R. "Sustainable Livelihoods, Environment and Development, Putting Poor Rural People First", IDS Discussion Paper 240, 1987
9. Gulati, L., *Profiles in Female Poverty, A Study of Five Poor Working Women in Kerala*, Hindustan Publishing Corporation, 1981
10. *Food 2000, Global Policies for Sustainable Agriculture*, A Report of the Advisory Panel on Food Security, Agriculture, Forestry and Environment to World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987
11. See Worldwatch Paper 89, "National Security: The Economic and Environmental Dimensions", May 1989, and special section on Environmental Security in *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, Vol. 20, No. 2, June 1989
12. See S. W. Grandstaff, T. B. Grandstaff, and G. W. Lovelace, Proceedings of the 1985 International Conference on Rapid Rural Appraisal, Khon Kaen University, 1987
13. Goulet, D., "Participation in Development: New Avenues", *World Development*, Vol. 17, No. 2, 1989. See also "Survival with Integrity: Sarvodaya at the Crossroads", Marga Institute, 1981
14. See for example T. Ling, "Buddhist values and Development problems: A Case Study of Sri Lanka", *World Development*, Vol. 8, 1980. Examples quoted by Ling include B. Parkinson, "Economic

- Retardation of the Malays”, *Modern Asian Studies*, Cambridge University Press, Vol. 1, Part 1, 1967 and M. Spiro, “Buddhism and Economic Activity in Burma”, *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 68, No. 5, 1966
15. Tullberg, R., “World Military Expenditure”, *SIPRI Yearbook 1986*, Oxford University Press 1986
  16. Leger Sivard, Ruth, *World Military and Social Expenditure 1986*, World Priorities, Washington, 1986, p.5
  17. *Ibid.*, p.12
  18. See for example “Military Technology, Arms Control and Human Development”, IPRI, 1986, and “Science and Technology for War and Peace”, *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, Vol. 19, No. 3/4, 1988
  19. UNDP estimate quoted in R. Luckham, “Development and Disarmament, Analysing the present and a better way ahead”, in “Disarming Poverty, Disarmament for Development in Asia-Pacific”, *Development Dossier No. 21*, Australian Council for Overseas Aid, August 1987
  20. Leger Sivard, Ruth, *op.cit.*, p.5
  21. Hutchful, Eboe, “Disarmament and Development: An African View”, *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 16, No. 4, 1985
  22. Finer, S., *The Man on Horseback, The Role of the Military in Politics*, Pall Mall Press, 1962
  23. Huntington, S., *The Soldier and the State*, Vintage Books, 1957
  24. Janowitz, M. (ed), *The Military in the Political Development of New States*, University of Chicago, 1964
  25. Stepan, A. C., *The Military in Politics: Changing Patterns in Brazil*, Rand Corp, Princeton University Press 1971
  26. Quoted in R. Tanter, “Indonesia — Political Control by Generals”, in *Development Dossier No. 21*, Australian Council for Overseas Aid, August 1987
  27. Ungar, Esta, “Vietnam — Economic as well as military role for armed forces” in *Development Dossier No. 21*, Australian Council for Overseas Aid, August 1987
  28. Valenzuela, A., “A Note on the Military and Social Science Theory”, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 1, Jan. 1985, p.140

