

# The Value of Peace

## Pacea ca valoare

Ph.D Associate professor **Dejan MATIĆ\***  
Faculty of Law, University of Kragujevac

Ph.D Assistant Professor **Dragana ĆORIĆ\***  
Faculty of Law, University of Novi Sad

### Abstract

*One of the moral standings says, that we cannot trully aknowledge something good and appreciate it, if we didn't go through something bad. From this standpoint of view, peace is often defined as something that goes after period of war, riot, turnmoil, or uncertainty of any kind. War, in a way, seems to be a very efficient mechanism for establishing peace, Aristothel said. Even today, stating the absence of war is the most common way of defining it, although it is possible to define peace without mentioning war or unrest in any form.*

*The existence of the world depends on peace and on the speed of calming social riots as well as the removal of rates of terror and extremism of any kind. Modern legal and political systems have a lot of new mechanisms to achieve peace, and a lot of international agreements and national measures as well. Some of these mechanisms, in the long term, can unfortunately bring more harm than benefit. It seems that peace, taken as the aspiration and the need of human kind, could be the biggest loser, while trying to achieve itself fully.*

*People want peace. Augustine of Hippo said that there is no word that is more spoken, more wanted as a state of mind than the state of peace. We can examine peace as a temporary station of future winers, in some new future wars, and that seems quite exceptable on many levels. Kant believed that it is possible to make a perpetual peace and save a human kind, although it is possible that there must precede some very unjust war.*

*In this short overview, the authors will tend to research some theories and circumstances in which achieveing peace is possible, and also to explore defining peace, without connecting with unrest and uneasiness in any sense.*

**Keywords:** definition; peace; war; value.

---

\* dmatic@jura.kg.ac.rs.

\* d.coric@pf.uns.ac.rs.

## Rezumat

*Una dintre aserțiunile morale spune că nu putem să recunoaștem cu adevărat ceva bun și să-l apreciem, dacă nu am trecut prin ceva rău. Din acest punct de vedere, pacea este adesea definită ca ceva care se întâmplă după o perioadă de război, revoltă, tulburare sau incertitudine de orice fel. Războiul, într-un fel, pare a fi un mecanism foarte eficient pentru stabilirea păcii, a spus Aristotel. Chiar și astăzi, afirmarea absenței războiului este cel mai comun mod de a defini pacea, deși acest lucru este posibil fără a menționa războiul sau tulburările sub orice formă.*

*Existența lumii depinde de pace și de viteza de calmare a revoltelor sociale, precum și de eliminarea ratelor de teroare și extremism de orice fel. Sistemele juridice și politice moderne au o mulțime de mecanisme noi pentru a obține pacea, precum și o mulțime de acorduri internaționale și măsuri naționale, de asemenea. Unele dintre aceste mecanisme, pe termen lung, pot aduce, din păcate, mai mult rău decât beneficii. Se pare că pacea, luată ca aspirație și nevoie a omenirii, ar putea fi cel mai mare învins, în timp ce încearcă să se realizeze pe deplin.*

*Oamenii vor pace. Augustin spunea că nu există cuvânt care să fie mai rostit, mai dorit ca stare de spirit, decât starea de pace. Putem examina pacea ca o staționare temporară a viitorilor învingători, în unele noi războaie viitoare, și asta pare excepțional la multe niveluri. Kant credea că este posibil să se încheie o pace perpetuă și să salveze astfel omenirea, deși este posibil ca acest lucru să fie precedat de un război nedrept.*

*În această scurtă prezentare generală, autorii vor cerceta unele teorii și circumstanțe în care este posibilă atingerea păcii și, de asemenea, să exploreze definiția păcii, fără a epuiza tema în vreun sens.*

**Cuvinte-cheie:** definiție, pace, război, valoare.

### Introductory remarks

People want peace. In order to achieve it, they usually must, paradoxically, fight for it. Violence is often used to defeat or destroy other violence (violent acts or people), so that peace may reign. The absence of war, used as definiens of peace, is not that easy to achieve, and once achieved, seems it is more difficult to maintain. Especially in the last century and a half, humanity had a lot of challenges for peace, which appeared in the form of such wars and conflicts, such destruction and loss of so many human lives, that the achievement of Kant's eternal peace seemed impossible. After their active duration, the wars that hit the world continued to produce consequences for the societies in which they took place- economic, social, psychological. The last great war, the Second World War, ended almost 80 years ago, and not all the human victims who disappeared in the whirlwinds of war and mass destruction are still known. This makes these periods of peace incomplete, because although there is no war formally or other conflict events, transgenerational sadness, fear and suffering make it impossible to achieve full peace, especially the peace of

mind for all those who survived those horrors or remember them from the stories of survivors.

That's why talking about peace today is more necessary than ever. That is why discovering the value of peace is important, because as humanity, we no longer have the time to lose peace in order to appreciate how important and necessary it was to us.

Longing for peace, both in ourselves and in the world society is constant. Hope that there will be no more war and conflicts, is still present, from ancient times till now. It is the assignment given by not only religion, or state's law, but by natural obligation to every human being, whether believing or not, to build peace as a permanent state and to maintain it as such. Peace then becomes not only a state of consciousness of people as individuals and as part of society, but also fills every physical space between all people in the world, creating balance, calmness and a state of progress for everyone.

Some authors think that reconciliation is something that precedes the peace:

„Let's always start with ourselves. Aren't we in constant conflict with ourselves, both visible and invisible. Once we really loved someone, and then we don't love them anymore. Consciousness wants one thing, the unconscious something completely different, and the forgotten superconscious? It would reconcile the „quarrels” in us, yet help us and bring what is impossible – the reconciliation of opposites and thus establish peace, at least temporarily, let it be short-lived, or a real peace that prepares for new creative unrest”<sup>1</sup>.

Peace cannot and must not occur only when the conflicting parties are exhausted by the conflict itself. Peace must come from *the joint decision of the parties to end the conflict*, that they truly want peace, and not surrender to peace just because they don't have the strength to continue the conflict. That is why peace remains as not so lasting truce, which will last only until the parties in the conflict gather enough strength and start a new round of war and other violent events. „Thus, every peace is just a respite between two wars, and so again, ad infinitum”<sup>2</sup>.

In this sense, *the International day of Peace*, which was established by the United Nations and which is celebrated every year on September 21st, in the form of a 24-hour cease-fire, war and other actions, should also be observed. Regardless of the humane mission and meaning of this day, peace here also looks like forced option, because numerous conflicts continue also on that day, while all the other conflicts continue the next day, after the internationally recognized and requested ceasefire expires<sup>3</sup>. As long as peace

---

<sup>1</sup> Јеротић, Владета, „Мир и помирење” (Peace and reconciliation), at: *MIR i pomirenje: zbornik radova (PEACE and reconciliation, Collected papers)*/ editors: Zorica Kuburić, Ljiljana Čumura, Ana Zotova. – Novi Sad: CEIR [i. e.] Centar za empirijska istraživanja religije (Center for empirical research of religion), 2018, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Šušnjić, Đuro, „Religija i religijska ideologija (religion and religious ideology)”, *MIR i pomirenje: zbornik radova (PEACE and Reconciliation: collected papers)*/ editors: Zorica Kuburić, Ljiljana Čumura, Ana Zotova. Novi Sad: CEIR [i. e.] Centar za empirijska istraživanja religije, (Center for empirical research of religion), 2018, 12.

<sup>3</sup> The 2022 theme for the International Day of Peace is „End racism. Build peace.” UN is calling all people to be involved in activities in making a world free of racism and racial discrimination-which were which have been identified as the most common causes of violence and conflict around the world. More about this campaign on: <https://www.un.org/en/observances/international-day-peace>, link retrieved on July 13<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

here is recognized as sort of „punishment”, the peace itself wouldn’t evolve into greater and bigger ideal which must be.

The long lasting *war-peace debates* – whether war must come first in order to feel what peace is and how significant is; is it possible to achieve peace as a permanent state without being associated with war; or whether peace should be treated as half time between two active devastating war periods, should end with achieving of *perfect peace*, while we are still alive. As Seneca said in a letter to his brother Novat, rage is the scourge that has caused the most damage to humanity. Rage stands behind every massacre, Seneca continues, behind the destruction of cities, behind tarnishing of people and destroying their reputation in courtrooms, behind selling people into slavery, even the most noble cities of his time were razed to the ground just because of anger that could not be controlled.

Seneca claims that there are two ways *to control anger*, one is not to let it dominate us, and the other is that if our will is already overpowered by anger, we should never do harm to ourselves or others in that state. Otherwise, *we will lose peace within ourselves and further destroy peace among other people*<sup>4</sup>. Our paper should be understood as a reminder of how important and valuable peace is to us, and that a life without wars and other violent incidents is possible and needed by this humanity, more than ever.

### Definition(s) of peace

*„Peace is notoriously difficult to define”<sup>5</sup>.*

Peace (as a word) has interesting etymology. Online Etymology Dictionary says that term „peace” comes from:

mid-12century., *pes*, which meant *„freedom from civil disorder, internal peace of a nation,”*, Anglo-French *pes*;

Old French *pais*, meaning *„peace, reconciliation, silence, permission”* (from 11century., Modern French word now is *paix*),

from Latin *pacem* (nominative *pax*, gen, *pacis*), which means *„compact, agreement, treaty of peace, tranquility, absence of war”* (source of Provençal *patz*, Spanish *paz*, Italian *pace*).

Also of Latin *pacisci*, meaning *„to covenant or agree;”*, also as the notion of *„a binding together” by treaty or agreement*<sup>6</sup>.

Within this etymological definition, the peace pipe is also mentioned, a symbolic act that Native Americans resorted to when concluding a truce with other tribes or with settlers, which again hints at the need for mutual consent to end the conflict and to continue

---

<sup>4</sup> Seneca (Seneca), *Kako ostati pribran i hladan, drevni vodič za kontrolu besa (How to keep your cool, ancient guide for anger management)*, odabrao, preveo sa latinskog i napisao uvod Džejms Rom (edited, translated from Latin and Introduction by James Rom), Miba Boks, 2021, 43-49.

<sup>5</sup> Page, James, *Philosophy of Peace*, <https://iep.utm.edu/peace/>.

<sup>6</sup> Online Etymology Dictionary, <https://www.etymonline.com/word/peace>, link retrieved on July 13th, 2022.

coexistence in a different, more peaceful way. It was supposedly smoked as the accompaniment of a treaty, and mentioned first in 1760. Peace is also used as an adjective, not only as a noun in the following words, which are the names of some professions, or symbolic events:

*Peace-officer*, „civil officer whose duty it is to preserve public peace” (recorded for the first time in 1714)<sup>7</sup>;

*Peace offering*, „offering that procures peace or reconciliation, satisfaction offered to an offended person” (in use from 1530s)<sup>8</sup>;

*Peace with honor* dates to 1607 (in „Coriolanus”)<sup>9</sup> etc.

Peace is often connected with some goals important to humankind to achieve, while thriving to a vision of a good society. Especially in 20th and in 21st centuries, peace is used when describing some other social phenomena, that are caused by peace or are causing the peace. So, we have a notion of democratic peace, liberal peace, institutional peace, constitutional peace, capitalist peace etc.<sup>10</sup>. Although the peace is more desirable, much attention is devoted to conflicts, wars, and violent acts, as if the authors want to prove again that peace is only possible if it is preceded by something from the above. That is why it is hard to find narrowminded, clear definition of peace, which doesn't include anything violent before it. Of course, there are some attempts to define peace as a state where people are free to make their own choices and able to settle their differences in a non-violent manner. But, those attempts are rather rare. That is why we cannot say that there is a „the notion of peace commonly adopted”, because this definition is one of the most affected by historical, social, religious, economic and other circumstances and activities.

„The word „peace” is used in a wide variety of ways that are connected with diverse assumptions and practices”, says G.Cox<sup>11</sup>.

*„Sometimes it is used as a moral category to characterize a virtue that people or societies may have. Just as they may be just and wise, they may also be law-abiding or peaceful. Sometimes it is used as a religious category to describe the profound state of peace that God can provide-- or to name an aspect of the divine, as in „the Prince of Peace”. Sometimes it is used as a scientific category in social research. There it is often thought of as*

---

<sup>7</sup> Online Etymology Dictionary, <https://www.etymonline.com/word/peace>, link retrieved on July 13th, 2022.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* Although this phrase became popular when president of US Nixon used it, it has a longer history of use, dating from Cicero, more about it on: [https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Peace\\_with\\_Honor](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Peace_with_Honor), link retrieved on July 13th, 2022. We find it important to say that every time when this phrase was used, it was in the context of war, which further reinforced the idea that peace and its importance cannot be talked about without the prior existence of war and destruction.

<sup>10</sup> Jarstad, Anna, „Three Approaches to peace, A framework for describing and exploring varieties of peace”, *Umeå Working Papers in Peace and Conflict Studies*, no 12 Publication date 2019-12-06.

<sup>11</sup> Cox, Gray, *A Philosophy of Peace as Action*, originally published by Paulist Press. 1986, available on: <https://www.coa.edu/faculty/webpages/gcox/thewaysofpeace/waysofpeace1.pdf>, link retrieved on July 13th, 2022.

*a state or condition of a social system, a bit like the states of equilibrium that chemists and ecologists study*<sup>12</sup>.

Usually defined as absence of all kinds of conflicts (as we will show in our work), peace can fall into the chasm that arises between peace and the war. Namely, if we look at peace and war as the endpoints of a long line, they are the farthest from each other. Achieving a balance here does not constitute either complete peace, nor does it solve war and violence-the middle point in this case simply cannot exist because it makes no logical sense. Because of all this, peace became the concept that wanders from one (scientific, social etc.) area to another, and is used as an auxiliary explanation of other phenomena, rarely gaining its full significance-it is safer to do that, than to define it straight.

Cox hints at defining peace as an *activity*:

„The activity of cultivating agreements<sup>13</sup>. Peace, in this view, is the *struggle to solve concrete problems* in ways that enable us to agree to work together in the future. It is not a quiet agreeable feeling that descends upon us from beyond”<sup>14</sup>.

This notion of peace leads us to *concoring activity*, or role that peace has (or should have). Peace might be more than absence of war and hostility, it could be the *development of a group sense of solidarity* (although this feeling can be further developed during wartime events), *creating harmony* (resembling melodic harmony) *and unity*(extremely important in a deeply divided society) and even *coming to terms with one's finitude*. Peace, says Cox, could be all that, and much more.

We also find the notions of *world peace*, which

„means the absence of world war, that is, the great war in the world framework. In a narrower sense, world peace is the name for occasional periods of calm, time intervals when there was no war in the world, when there was no war on the planet. In the narrowest sense, world peace means stable a state characterized by the complete absence of war, a reality in which war has definitely become a historical category. So, something that doesn't really exist for now, something that is aspired to and hoped for”<sup>15</sup>.

In this passage we find another definition of peace that avoids directly defining peace as such, but is contextually connected to the absence of war.

*Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace*, adopted on 12th November 1984, by General Assembly is establishing peace as the highest good of the mankind and the right of people all over the world to have that(peace) without interference or restriction. It also establishes the obligation for all countries in the world to assist in implementing the right of

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> Which also refers to the etymological meaning of peace, as stated earlier in the text, especially in Latin.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> Krivokapić, Boris, *Mir i međunarodno pravo, Zbornik radova „Vladavina prava i pravna država u regionu”*, Istočno Sarajevo, 2014, str. 928.

peoples to peace through the adoption of appropriate measures at both the national and the international level<sup>16</sup>.

But it doesn't define it.

According to Merriam-Webster's Dictionary<sup>17</sup>, peace can be defined as:

*„1: a state of tranquility or quiet: such as*

*a: freedom from civil disturbance.*

*b: a state of security or order within a community provided for by law or custom a breach of the peace*

*2: freedom from disquieting or oppressive thoughts or emotions*

*3: harmony in personal relations*

*4a: a state or period of mutual concord between governments*

*b: a pact or agreement to end hostilities between those who have been at war or in a state of enmity offered the possibility of a negotiated peace*

*5 – used interjectionally to ask for silence or calm or as a greeting or farewell at peace :in a state of concord or tranquility”.*

Certainly there are rare definitions of peace that doesn't directly connect it with war, but rather positively define it<sup>18</sup>. Peace, presumed to be as the state of inner state of mind and the state of the society at the same time, could be one of most desired conditions of living in the world. And probably, the most hard to achieve it.

According to Johan Galtung<sup>19</sup>, the terms „peace” and „violence” are strongly connected. Peace should be a great social goal, the reason why it is worth losing even a life, so that generations after ours would enjoy the same peace. To discuss the idea of peace Galtung presumed that one should follow next three simple principles:

*„1. The term 'peace' shall be used for social goals at least verbally agreed to by many, if not necessarily by most.*

*2. These social goals may be complex and difficult, but not impossible, to attain.*

*3. The statement peace is absence of violence shall be retained as valid<sup>20</sup>*

---

<sup>16</sup> Available on: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/declaration-right-peoples-peace>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>17</sup> *Word entry: peace*, available on: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/peace>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>18</sup> Also Einstein's definition of peace could be treated also as positive one, because it claims what conditions must be fulfilled in order to have peace: „Peace is not merely the absence of war but the presence of justice, of law, of order-in short, of government”. The most of other definition include linkage with violence, war etc. See more: Sandy, Leo R. and Perkins, Ray, Jr., *The Nature of Peace and its Implications for Peace Education*, text available on: <http://jupiter.plymouth.edu/~lsandy/peacedef.html>, retrieved on 10th June 2022. Further in this paper will be explained positive and negative definition of peace.

<sup>19</sup> Galtung, Johan, *Violence, Peace, and Peace Research, Essays on Peace: Paradigms for Global Order*, ed. Michael Salla, Walter Tonetto & Enrique and Martinez, (Central Queensland University press, 1995), p. 1.

<sup>20</sup> Galtung, Johan, „Violence, Peace, and Peace Research”, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (1969), p. 167-191.

Galtung further states that like a coin, peace has two sides: *negative peace* and *positive peace*. Those two definitions of peace come from three types of relations<sup>21</sup>: negative, disharmonious (what is bad for one can be good for others); indifferent (not caring for others); and positive, harmonious (people tend to do everything thinking about the others, what is good for them, is good for others, and vice versa). Those types of relations are mixing in the real world, all the time. No relation is always indifferent, or negative; they have their phases of development and changing.

From this, two definitions arise:

„*Negative peace: the absence of violence, like a cease-fire, like keeping them apart, not negative but indifferent relations.*

*Positive peace: the presence of harmony, intended or not. They are as different as negative health, the absence of (symptoms of) illness and positive health, the feeling of wellness and the capacity to handle some illness.*

*Negative peace is also the absence of personal violence; positive peace is an absence of structural violence or social justice*”<sup>22</sup>.

Galtung collected and classified 35 theories of peace<sup>23</sup>, each defining peace differently, but much more on the positive defining side<sup>24</sup>.

Division into *inner* and *outer* peace, or else *internal* and *external* peace is a common place in process of defining the peace. Inner peace is associated with peace of mind and body, state of full calmness, serenity and tranquility, without any external disturbances or negative emotions. On the other side, external peace, can be described as negative and as positive. In the first sense, peace is the absence of all negative and violent actions or thoughts, refers to the freedom from violence by individuals and groups alike and to the absence of conflict and it equates to Galtung's negative definition of peace. Positive peace requires presence social harmony, social justice, social equality, friendship or friendly relation respect for human rights and ecological balance etc. so it is similar to external definition mentioned here above.

We found interesting classification (and also definitions) of peace in the *World Council of curriculum and instruction* and think that it needs to be shared and discussed here:

---

<sup>21</sup> Galtung, Johan, *A Mini Theory of Peace*, <https://www.galtung-institut.de/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Mini-Theory-of-Peace.pdf>. Retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>22</sup> Or else we can say that positive peace could be that tranquility and the negative, absence of violence.

<sup>23</sup> Galtung divided all theories into three big groups: The Basic types of subnational peace thinking, The basic types of international peace thinking and The Basic types of supranational peace thinking. More about this: Galtung, Johan, „*Theories of Peace – A Synthetic Approach to Peace Thinking*”, *International Peace Research Institute*, Oslo, September, 1967, 70-117, available on: [https://www.transcend.org/files/Galtung\\_Book\\_unpub\\_Theories\\_of\\_Peace\\_-\\_A\\_Synthetic\\_Approach\\_to\\_Peace\\_Thinking\\_1967.pdf](https://www.transcend.org/files/Galtung_Book_unpub_Theories_of_Peace_-_A_Synthetic_Approach_to_Peace_Thinking_1967.pdf), retrieved on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2022.

<sup>24</sup> The positive definition of peace is sometimes criticized. „This is not a satisfying solution. If the two things are identical, why do we need different terms to describe them? Obviously, the fact that these different terms exist and are widely used in everyday's language and in academic parlance suggests that they refer to distinct scopes of practice in the real world”. Müller, Harald, „*Theories of Peace (leicht überarbeitete Version von 2003)*”, in: Evangelista, Matthew (ed.), *Peace Studies. Critical Concepts in Political Science*, London, 1-2.



„1. *Intrapersonal peace*: the state of peace within man himself that means there is no conflict inside one's mind.

2. *Interpersonal peace*: the state of peace between a man and men; there are no conflicts between a man and men or one another.

3. *Intragroup peace*: the state of peace within groups; the state of having no conflicts in groups.

4. *Intergroup peace*: the state of peace between group and group; the state of having no conflicts among groups.

5. *Intraracial peace*: the state of peace within race; the state of having no conflicts in each race.

6. *Interracial peace*: the state of peace between race and races; the state of having no conflicts among races.

7. *Intranational peace*: the state of peace within nations or countries; the state of having no conflicts in each nation or country.

8. *International peace*: the state of peace between a nation and the nations; the state of having no conflicts among nations.

9. *World peace*: peace of the world. It means that the countries throughout the world are said to be in the state of normalcy, absence of wars and conflicts, presence of justice and balance of control”<sup>25</sup>.

The significance of this classification of peace is that every form of peace has *its own positive and negative definition*, and it seems that the reader is left to choose his/her own personal interpretation of peace, according to his/her inner feeling and other values he/she accepts. Also, it should be noted here that definition of peace *comes gradually*, from the lowest level of organization, such as individual himself/herself, to the encompassing the entire world population. It is a logical order, because everything starts with the individual and his/her attitude towards himself/herself and his/her environment. If an individual feels lack of compassion or support of any kind, injustice or deorganizations around, or gets the impression that the world is a neverending *war of all against all*<sup>26</sup>, his /her mindset and also behavior will turn to surviving mode, where stronger wins- with use of violence.

There is also a distinction made between *cold peace*, situation when there is little mutual hostility but there is also a lack of mutually beneficial interactions aimed at developing trust, interdependence, and collaboration, and *hot peace*<sup>27</sup> which involves active collaborative efforts designed to build bridges between and among past and present adversaries.

---

<sup>25</sup> Achava-Amrung, Prachoomsuk, „Peace Research”, *International Association of Educators for World Peace, Bangkok, 1983, 4-5.*

<sup>26</sup> Referring to the famous Thomas Hobbs' thought, that people in so called natural state are in the state of war of all against all others (*bellum omnia contra omnem*), in Thomas Hobbes, *Elementorum Philosophiae, sectio secunda, De Homine (Opera philosophica quae latine scripsit omnia,; in unum corpus nunc primum collecta studio et labore Gulielmi Molesworth)*, Londini, 1839, 166.

<sup>27</sup> Sandy, Leo R. and Perkins, Ray Jr., *The Nature of Peace and its Implications for Peace Education.*

A group of theorists<sup>28</sup> created a concept called *The Pillars of Peace* which have been developed from the following elements:

- *Well-functioning government*, meaning how governments are elected and the political culture they establish. The more democratic government, the more satisfied citizens.

- *Sound business environment*. The strength of economic conditions in a country is important, as well as the support of state's institutions in creating safe business environment.

- *Equitable distribution of resources*. Although it is firstly considered as the distribution of money, it also refers to the distribution of all kinds of powers to specific groups of people.

- *Acceptance of the rights of others* – importance of the formal laws that guarantee basic human rights and freedoms as well as the informal social and cultural norms that relate to behaviors of citizens.

- *Good relations with neighbors*, whether they are neighbors next door, or – next state.

- *Free flow of information*, emphasized importance of free media and well informed citizens, who are ready to be involved in social changes.

- *High levels of education*. When people think about more educating themselves, it means according to A. Maslow, that they achieved the fifth level of their needs-the need for self-realization. That also means that they have stable jobs and families, so they have enough time to invest in themselves only.

- *Low levels of corruption*. Raising confidence and trust in institutions, which in turn helps to create informal institutions which enhance peace is rather useful.

When analyzing those pillars of peace, we find it *similar to pillars of democracy*<sup>29</sup> as a political regime, and also to *the rule of law practices*. We must keep in mind that *peace goes together with order and certainty*<sup>30</sup>, which are crucial social and legal values for establishing a lasting community with harmonious relationships.

Some authors think that peace is achievable when goes through next stages:

*0. Surface*. We are not even conscious that there are violence, nor peace.

*1. Acquiescence* – an individual sees that there is something wrong, but is without any initiative to change that, because what is wrong, doesn't affect him/her. Usually in this

---

<sup>28</sup> The Institute for Economics and Peace, *The Pillars of Peace*, available on: <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/165173/Pillars-of-Peace.pdf>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>29</sup> In different combination, whether there are 7 or 11 pillars of democracy mentioned, democracy implies always sovereignty, predictability (or legal certainty), human rights, transparency of work of state bodies, civic engagement, rule of law etc. More about it: Bassiouni, Cherif et alia, *Democracy: Its principles and Achievement*, Inter – Parliamentary Union, Geneva, 1998.

<sup>30</sup> In a lot of laws in Republic of Serbia, for example, peace and (law) order, go together:

„1) *public order and peace* – is a harmonized state of mutual relations between citizens resulting from their behavior in public places and the actions of organs and organizations in public life in order to ensure equal conditions for the realization of human and minority rights and freedoms of citizens guaranteed by the Constitution; Article 1 paragraph 1 point 1 of Law on Public Order and Peace. („Official Gazette of RS”, no. 6/2016 and 24/2018).

phase an individual comforts himself/herself that there is nothing he/she can do, and that things have always been the same.

2. *Pacifism* – the individual is awoken, because what was working is now affecting on his/her life. There is a slight thought that something should be done, in order to stop that violence, but there is no significant action in reality.

3. *Passive Nonviolent Resistance* – individual's decisions are more affected by violent acts, but there is still any specific action against it. Maybe in this phase the individual starts to be afraid to share his/her concerns with others, because it seems dangerous to share their own thoughts about it.

4. *Active Nonviolent Resistance* – here the individual starts publicly to talk about violence, oppression, and subjugation, organizes some kinds of riots etc.

After these four phases, comes conflict, that can be stopped with *making an active peace*, that encompasses three more subphases:

*Peacemaking* – stopping the conflicts and making truce stable in order to start the process of:

*Peacekeeping* – motivating people to stay in this state of peace and making them believe that it is better now than earlier was. At the very end, we have:

*Peacebuilding* – making people use to this state and involving them into vision of free society<sup>31</sup>.

According to this concept, peace is not easy to be achieved, nor else to be defined simply.

At the end, we share a specific *typology of negative peace*, developed by Raymond Aron<sup>32</sup>:

*a peace of equilibrium* where the various nations counterbalance each other;

*a peace of hegemony*, where one nation dominates the others;

*a peace of empire* where an imperial state confiscates the autonomy of subjugated nations;

*a peace of powerlessness*, which flows from terror and reciprocal intimidation;

*a peace of satisfaction* where peace reigns because of a lack of demands.

All those definitions of peace are unique, and new to the field of defining peace in general. Aron, a French sociologist, when defining peace, took into account other elements than all previous authors didn't use. Even the qualifiers he used (equilibrium, hegemony, empire, powerlessness, and satisfaction) have not yet been brought into line with peace, because they were considered contrasts to peace. By uniting them, he created a fresh view on defining peace.

This long chapter was necessary because of the indication that the impossibility of unambiguously defining peace is connected with a similar degree of misunderstanding of

---

<sup>31</sup> Phases listed in order as in: John Wilmerding, *The Theory of Active Peace*, internet discussion, <https://web.archive.org/web/20150725235108/http://www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org/forum/topics/the-theory-of-active-peace#.VbQg-ajP3IV>. Retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>32</sup> Aron, Raymond, *Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations*, 1<sup>st</sup> Kindle Edition, Routledge, 2017.

the importance of peace for everyday life and for the life of civilization in general. Discussions about whether it is necessary to define peace negatively or positively, whether it goes through certain phases of its development or not, are useful, because they give us an insight into the state of consciousness in society, in the sense of whether and how much peace is thought about at all, at least at this abstract level.

On the other hand, an ordinary person is often at the 3rd level of achieving active peace – passive non-violent resistance, either out of fear that the fragile peace they know will disappear or because they do not know that there is a higher state of peace and the possibility of achieving complete peace, tranquility and balance.

If a person is not aware that there is peace, because he/she has never experienced it, or he/she has not experienced it at a higher level than he/she has so far, how can he/she know / demand something more? Related to that, how can he/she then be aware of the importance / need for such peace?

That is why we need to determine the value of peace. Or at least, we will try to do that.

### **Determining the Value of Peace (abstract and economical)**

Values are the highest principles upon we are living. They are sort of rules by which we act in certain situations, and the result of which must have an outcome that corresponds to the content of that value<sup>33</sup>. For example, if the justice is our value, it must be fulfilled in certain ways: those who are good and achieve great results should be rewarded; those who break the rules, hurt others or take away their belongings should be punished. Set up this way, it seems simple – both sides of this equation should be equated and there are clear rules for that. But what if those rules aren't that clear, or there aren't any?

In moral theory, definition of the *intrinsic value* has traditionally been thought to lie at the heart of ethics. Intrinsic value is that value, that something (or somebody) has „in itself,” or „for its own sake,” or „as such,” or „in its own right”<sup>34</sup>. On the other side, there is *extrinsic value*, which is usually defined as value that is not intrinsic, that something is valuable for the sake of something else to which it is related in some way. Plants are intrinsically valuable just for existing. But their extrinsic value comes due to the process of photosynthesis and air purification.

From this point of view, *peace could have intrinsic value, but also extrinsic value*. Peace has its intrinsic dimension when it just exists, when there is tranquility, calmness, balance and order. But extrinsically, peace is valuable because when we have peace, it means that we don't have wars, violence etc. Peace is also result of process of resolving disputes and

---

<sup>33</sup> Schroeder, Mark, „Value Theory”, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2021 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2021/entries/value-theory/>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>34</sup> Zimmerman, Michael J. and Ben Bradley, „Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic Value”, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2019/entries/value-intrinsic-extrinsic/>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

conflicts<sup>35</sup> that may arise due to disagreements or social tensions between people. So, intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of peace reminds us on positive and negative definitions of peace, as we noted earlier.

Peace is considered as one of the *incommensurable values*. Its greatness and the everyone's need for its existence cannot be compared to any other value. Peace is often connected with other values, and norms of social conduct. Peace consists and merges from all other socially known values, such as justice, liberty, freedom, certainty etc. So we find it difficult to compare peace to anything that is or should be its part<sup>36</sup>. All those mentioned values are different by their origins, according to their content and the consequences that have on human behavior and human thinking, so they cannot be compared with each other. Peace, as it unites them all in its own content, wouldn't be good material for comparing (as we here are comparing something that is whole with something that is a part of it). In this sense, neither one of values, which includes also peace, cannot be reduced to a common measure and *should be stated as „incomparable“*. How could we measure, or compare peace as quality to anything else peaceful living ?Or compare it, using *argumentum a contrario* peace with non-violence?

*From economical side, it might be possible to determine the cost of peace.* Building and maintaining peace, especially in these challenging times, needs a lot of time, patience, and money. But not that much money as the wars and other violent acts cost- *peace is much cheaper*. Economists say that it is possible to measure how much, indirectly, *costs peace*, by calculating *how much does cost- wars and violence*.

Institute for Economics & Peace (IEP) estimates the economic impact of violence and conflict on the global economy. Their methodology includes 18 indicators covering the direct and indirect costs of violence, and the expenditures to contain and prevent violence. The costs of violence are defined as „the expenditure and economic effect related to containing, preventing and dealing with the consequences of violence.“<sup>37</sup> Those indicators are: terrorism impact, internal conflicts fought, deaths from internal conflict, external conflicts fought, incarceration rate, homicide rate, intensity of internal conflict, perceptions of criminality, deaths from external conflict, weapons exports, violent crime, access to small arms, political terror scale, nuclear and heavy weapons, police rate, armed services personnel rate, neighbouring countries relations, political instability, UN Peacekeeping Funding, refugees and IDPs, military expenditure (% GDP), violent demonstrations, weapons imports. All indicators are directly or indirectly connected to violence, violent acts or groups of people who are doing those violent acts (whetehr they are members of the military or perpetrators of criminal acts.

---

<sup>35</sup> Conflict could be verbal, not always physically violent. When conflict is resolved without „help“ of violence, this is regarded as peace. So extrinsic definitions of peace have a lot of faces.

<sup>36</sup> Hsieh, Nien-hê and Andersson, Henrik „Incommensurable Values“, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2021 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2021/entries/value-incommensurable/>. retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>37</sup> *Economic Value of Peace 2021*, Institute for Economics & Peace, 2, available on: <https://www.visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/EVP-2021-web-1.pdf>, retrieved on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2022.

When act of violence occurs, its consequences go way beyond the relationship established between the victim and perpetrator, says the authors of this report. According to this report,

*„From 2007 to 2019, 85 countries decreased their economic cost of violence, whereas 78 increased. In 2019, loss that suffered every man on earth because of violence was worth 5 dollars a day. To achieve positive peace, as all of the attitude and state’s and social’s structures that are devoted to creating peaceful societies, there must be strong opposition to violence as a way of resolving conflicts and conflicts in general, together with all peacekeeping mechanisms (which paradoxically includes „violent measures” of punishment as a form of disciplining all those who do not respect the rules).And it would cost a lot less than almost 15 trillion dollars in 2019 (how much it costs all the nations in the world just a small part of all the violent acts done in that year)”<sup>38</sup>.*

On the other hand, pandemic circumstances made peace more valuable than ever. According to the Global Peace Index 2021, also done by Institute for Economics & Peace(IEP):

*„There were over 5,000 pandemic-related incidents during this period that involved some form of violence, ranging from violent demonstrations and riots in response to lockdown measures, to physical assaults targeted at people of Asian descent. There were at least 158 countries that recorded one or more violent incidents directly related to the pandemic during this time. Although there was an initial fall in civil unrest and demonstrations at the start of the pandemic, the number of demonstrations worldwide surged after this initial lull. The total number of protest events worldwide increased in 2020, and although not every demonstration was directly related to the pandemic, it was a key driver of civil unrest across many countries, most notably in Europe”<sup>39</sup>.*

Pandemic circumstances increased the percent of cases of domestic violence<sup>40</sup>, crimes done from poverty and also hate crimes and discrimination<sup>41</sup>. Without freedom of movement and all other freedoms, when the importance of those freedoms was not understood until they were lost in the fight against an unknown enemy (a virus that behaves unpredictably), people became different, more focused on themselves and their own survival. *Empathy* has become the most necessary currency in interpersonal relations in the last almost three years of the pandemic. It is the only „remedy” that could truly contribute to the creation of inner peace in people. All other measures, taken by the states, in order to prevent the spread of the COVID- 19 virus, were generally perceived as an attack on the

---

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid*, 14.

<sup>39</sup> Global Peace Index 2021, Institute for Economics & Peace, 27. Available on: <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/global-peace-index-2021>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid*, 28. In some countries domestic violence in these conditions has increased for 20-50 %.The authors of this report stated that „this pattern of increasing domestic violence mirrors the trend often seen in the wake of large scale catastrophes such as bushfires, earthquakes, or hurricanes”. *Ibid*, 26.

<sup>41</sup> Discrimination was mostly discrimination targeted at Asians, but most of the international reports are emerging that other minority groups are becoming the victims of hate at almost same rate. Global Peace Index 2021, 29, 30.

same people whose protection was attempted in this way. Increase of violent acts caused increasing the costs of establishing peace- We will a complete picture of costs only when the pandemic is officially over.

IEP has empirically derived also *the Positive Peace Index (PPI)* through the analysis of almost 25,000 economic and social progress indicators to determine which ones have statistically significant relationships with peace as measured by the Global Peace Index. They also take into account definition of positive (the attitudes, institutions & structures that create and sustain peaceful societies) and negative peace (the absence of violence or fear of violence) and compare them.

When addressing to the positive peace, IEP thinks of Pillars of Positive Peace, which are (earlier mentioned): well-functioning government, sound business environment, equitable distribution of resources, acceptance of the rights of others, good relations with neighbours, free flow of information, and high levels of education and low levels of corruption.

Almost 69% of the countries in the world there have been noticed the deficit of Positive Peace<sup>42</sup>, from various causes, motivated by pandemics or that deficit started decreasing even earlier. Violence and Positive Peace co-evolve and as such operate as a system<sup>43</sup>. So cost of peace, ie cost of wars and other violent acts depends on their relationship and who is more powerful at the appointed moment

Building peace seems to be rather fragile and longlasting process, especially when there is constant conflicts, where the nature and levels of violence continuously changes. Determining the value of peace isn't that easy. *Although it could be expressed in money, the true value of peace derives from its intrinsic value of its mere and independent existence. So even the costs of peace could be indirectly proven, we think that this doesn't outline the true value of peace.*

## **Culture of peace**

If we leave aside the abstract building of peace in each individual and society as an internal activity of each and every actor, it remains for us to determine *how the culture of peace is built externally*. Peace is built and maintained externally through legal frameworks, primarily through international conventions. It seems that there is not enough social agreement about what can and cannot be done, so we often need a punitive policy, preferably as strict as possible, which would bring individuals and groups into a state of obedience to the system they live in.

*Universal Declaration of Human Rights*<sup>44</sup> states in its preamble that peace is, besides freedom and justice, one of the most important foundation of the civilized world. Although there is no direct mentioning of peace further in this declaration, everything appoint at

---

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid*, 64.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid*, 67.

<sup>44</sup> *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Paris on 10 December 1948 (General Assembly resolution 217 A) <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

peace: when granted all rights and freedoms, without any discrimination (Art. 1, Art. 2), when granted all equal right before the court to anyone, especially the presumption of innocence (Art. 11), or when granted peaceful assembly (Art. 20).

Significant international act is also *the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace*<sup>45</sup>, adopted on 15 December 1978. UN declared here *the right to live in peace* as the utmost human right, that is „is in the common interest of all mankind and an indispensable condition of advancement of all nations, large and small, in all fields” (Part 1, Art. 1). Planning of any aggression is presumably an act against peace and is prohibited by international law (Part 1, Art. 2); that is why every state in the world got the obligation to „refrain from propaganda for wars of aggression” (Part 1, Art. 3). Colonialism was mentioned as one of practices that could disturb the peace (Part 1 Art. 7), as well as racism, racial discrimination and apartheid. A lot of people has suffered from these forms of violence. That is why they, as well as their advocacy, are considered unacceptable in this era and are strictly prohibited by international law. Devotion to principles of peaceful coexistence and friendly co-operation is crucial (Part 1 Art. 8). Strongly is encouraged cooperation between states, in order to fulfill their duty as peace guardians.

*The Declaration of the Right of the Peoples of the World to Peace*, adopted on 12 November 1984<sup>46</sup> proclaimed the right to *live in peace as sacred right* (Art. 1) and confirmed the obligation of the signatory states to make all possible efforts to preserve peace (Art. 2).

Although none of mentioned international document didn't define directly peace, it is noticeable the understanding of peace is the widest possible of all previous theoretical positions. Namely, the peace in these international documents is the peace that represents the absence of war, and the obligation of states to maintain it, and the prohibition of discrimination on any basis, and the prohibition of inhumane behavior towards prisoners, the presumption of innocence for every accused, the prohibition of advocating any violent acts whatsoever by the state or other social groups... *The definition of peace here is much wider, its value is greater and the impact of peace on life is more powerful.*

It also implies the right to development in any area of life without any obstacles, the enjoyment of individual or collective human rights at any time and any place. „Peace can be seen as an overarching human right”<sup>47</sup>, and its true value is really hard to determine. Peace has always corresponded with basic human needs, because the right to life<sup>48</sup>, the freedom

---

<sup>45</sup> *Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace*, <http://www.un-documents.net/a33r73.htm>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>46</sup> *The Declaration of the Right of the Peoples of the World to Peace*, adopted on 12 November 1984, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/declaration-right-peoples-peace>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>47</sup> Page, James, „Philosophy of Peace”, *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://iep.utm.edu/peace/>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>48</sup> Finnis thought that „A first basic value, corresponding to the drive for self-preservation, is the value of life”, but in accordance to everything before mentioned, it is obvious that peace is the beginning and the end of realization of every human right, even for the right to life. Finnis, John, *Natural Law and Natural Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1980, 97.



of thought, the freedom of choice, right to active participation in the election of state bodies, all these rights are only fully possible in a state of peace.

*That is why the Culture of Peace is important.*

As defined by the United Nations, the Culture of Peace is

*„a set of values, attitudes, modes of behavior and ways of life that reject violence and prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups and nations“<sup>49</sup>.*

This culture should be promoted through 8 different activities<sup>50</sup>:

– *fostering a culture of peace through education*- from the earliest years, children must be informed about peace, valuability of peace and mechanisms for achieving it;

– *promoting sustainable economic and social development*- as we are more equal in this, we have less reasons to start conflicts;

– *ensuring equality between women and men*, as we are all equally born in rights, freedoms and also obligations;

– *fostering democratic participation*, because peace encompasses the right to choose the best people to lead all others, and to have an equal opportunity to engage in all decision making processes they want to;

– *advance understanding, tolerance and solidarity* between people and countries, in order to support further

– *participatory communication and the free flow of information and knowledge*.

Knowledge is the most valuable asset one can have, especially in 21<sup>st</sup> century.

– in the end, *promoting international peace and security* is overall obligation of all of us.

In order to promote a Culture of Peace, in 2000, a campaign of online signatures of the *Manifesto 2000* was started, which set the following principles as goals that will lead to the establishment of a culture of peace:

*„Respect all life“.*

*„Reject violence“*

*„Share with others“.*

*„Listen to understand.“*

*„Preserve the planet.“*

*„Rediscover solidarity“.*

Those principles were then and now great reminders of the skills that each of us needs to develop again in order to reach inner peace and continue to spread the same around, as a common heritage<sup>51</sup>.

---

<sup>49</sup> *Buliding a culture of Peace*, <https://internationaldayofpeace.org/culture-of-peace/>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>50</sup> *Toward Building A Culture of Peace: 8 Action Areas*, <http://www.peacedayphilly.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Culture-of-Peace-Action-Areas.pdf>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>51</sup> Full text of Manifesto 2000: [www3.unesco.org/manifesto2000](http://www3.unesco.org/manifesto2000), retrieved on 10th June 2022.

## Is non-violence the same as the peace?

Ghandian way of achieving peace thru *non-violence* and *by fighting for peace* was one of a kind. It encompasses paradoxes- fighting and using sort of violence to achieve state of peacefulness and serenity. Sustainable peace, Ghandi thought, can occur only in an environment based upon *truth and non-violence*, where feelings of fear, anger, hatred, cowardice and retaliation don't exist.

Why was the truth so important to Ghandi? He thought that, when one is true to himself, he/she cannot be violent in thoughts. Violence at first is born in people's minds. If we clear our mind of thoughts that lead us to do something violent, or encourage others to do something violent, there will be no violence outside our mind either. The only way to efficiently clear our minds from violent thoughts is the truth. The truth deliberates us all, from our sins, bad behaviors or spoken words. Ghandi knew that neither human-beings nor human institutions could follow absolute/pure non-violence because the very process of living is impossible without a certain amount of violence and untruthfulness. But, there is always a will to try different, non-violent way.

„Gandhi did not believe in the primitive idea of „*an eye for an eye*” because he knew that it would leave the entire world blind”<sup>52</sup>. He strongly distinguish non-violence, as the decision to fight violence in different ways, not only by violence, from *pacifism*, which he considered as a non-recognition of the existence of violence. Pacifism is a renunciation of the truth that there is violence and that it should be fought against it, in order to establish peace. *Nonviolence, on the other hand, is a way of thinking, an inner mindset that a person needs to develop*. The more non-violent mindsets are developed, the greater the chance for the world to eradicate non-violence by accepting that violence exists and deciding not to participate in it.

When establishing peace we must do it without any secret agenda- secret plan about preparing a new war. Any doubt in the the truthfulness of the expressed will to establish peace, Kant believed, makes that will false, and peace non-existent<sup>53</sup>. *Perpetual peace* exists, only if people are devoted to truth- and ready thru *satyagraha*<sup>54</sup> (asserting for truth) to achieve *ahimsa* (the state of non-violent, not yet fully peaceful society). Here the peace comes from truth and its pure practice; which is different from most of other definitions of

---

<sup>52</sup> Asha Gupta, *Fighting for Peace: The Gandhian Way*, Gandhi Marg, Vol. 38, Number 1, April-June 2016. Also available on: <https://www.mk Gandhi.org/articles/fighting-for-peace-the-Gandhian-way.html>, retrieved on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2022.

<sup>53</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Perpetual Peace- A Philosophical Essay*, translated and with notes of Mary Campbell Smith, available on: [https://www.gutenberg.org/files/50922/50922-h/50922-h.htm#Page\\_106](https://www.gutenberg.org/files/50922/50922-h/50922-h.htm#Page_106), Release Date: January 14, 2016 [EBook #50922], retrieved on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2022.

<sup>54</sup> The word *satyagraha* itself was formed through a public contest sponsored by Gandhi through his South African newspaper, *Indian Opinion*, when he came to the conclusion that neither the common, modern Hindi language nor the English language contained a word that fully expressed its own meanings. Etymologically, this new coined Hindu word means „firmness of truth” or „force of truth”. This movement inspired especially Martin Luther King.

peace. Namely, peace mostly unites many other values; however, *here, peace is a lower generic concept*, that is, a phenomenon of truth<sup>55</sup>. If there is no truth, there is no peace<sup>56</sup>. Peace is the only path that should the civilization be on.

Non violence has its own forms, such as methods of non violent protests and persuasion, methods of social noncooperation (for example, ostracism and withdrawal from the social system are noted here), methods of economic non cooperation (strikes), methods of political non cooperation and other interventions (for example psychological etc.)<sup>57</sup>. Those methods seem non violent- they do not directly contain an act of violence in themselves. But the refusal to do something or the stopping of any process is an indirect act of violence towards the other party. We believe that these methods are worth using in situations where a peaceful solution or mediation did not resolve the conflict, but one should not be deceived that all these methods are not violent at all. Exercising psychological pressure, especially in the case of ostracism or isolation of a certain person from the rest of the group in any way, is an act of violence that leaves more serious consequences for the person than if he/she were physically punished.

So, is the non-violence equal to peace? No, it is not, as non violence contains indirect violence in forms of economical psychological or other pressure. As long as there is even the slightest trace of violence, even if it is not directly expressed, peace as such cannot exist. Non-violence gives the impression of peace, but it is not peace. So, the value of non-violence cannot be equal to value of peace, although it is acceptable and has some public support.

### Concluding remarks

From Seneca<sup>58</sup> in ancient times, to Hobbes and even Freud, the opinion has been established that man is a wolf to another man (*Homo homini lupus est*), meaning that man in relations with other people necessarily behaves like a wolf. Human mind is violent one, always looking for combat, challenge or way to survive thru violence and more frequently, with physical overpowering of others.

---

<sup>55</sup> In any nonviolent campaign there are four basic steps: collection of the facts to determine whether injustices exist; negotiation; self purification; and direct action. Letter from a Birmingham Jail [King, Jr., AFRICAN STUDIES CENTER – UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, [https://www.africa.upenn.edu/Articles\\_Gen/Letter\\_Birmingham.html](https://www.africa.upenn.edu/Articles_Gen/Letter_Birmingham.html), retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>56</sup> More about this concept in: Mahatma Gandhi, Put nenasilja, Službeni glasnik, 2008. Connection of peace and truth revealed also Wolfgang Dietrich, when grouping the different meanings of peace into five peace families: Energetic family/Harmony, Moral family/Justice, Modern family/Security, Postmodern family/Truth, and Transrational, which is a synthesis of the positive sides of the four previous families and the society. Dietrich, W., Interpretations of Peace in History and Culture, Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2012, 12.

<sup>57</sup> More about these methods in: Sharp, Gene, The dynamics of nonviolent action, P. Sargent Publisher, Boston, 1968.

<sup>58</sup> Lucius Annaeus Seneca. „Epistulae morales ad Lucilium”. The Latin Library. retrieved on 10th June 2022.

Freud said that people “are, on the contrary, creatures among whose instinctual endowments is to be reckoned a powerful share of aggressiveness”<sup>59</sup>. Our aggressiveness help us survive and thrive. It is unlikely that a person will give up his good strategy for survival and give up violence as a way of life, Freud claimed. Simply, a person does not feel good by suppressing his natural urge. Why would any man want a peace at all, if the violence got him/her to this day? Why should any man cherish peace inside himself/herself and promote it around, when violence violence provided food, shelter, life?

Because, after centuries of violence, and violent responses to even minor conflicts, the civilization must hold on to peace as the only recipe for its own survival. Effects of wars and violent acts of any kind are far reaching. Peace is not an end in itself, but a way of improving ourselves and the societies we are living in. It is a way to achieve a better, happier and safer life for human beings. „Peace is universally desired. It is not a matter of personal attitude alone, it is a question of establishing a new society founded on values, culture and a way of life integral to peace at local, regional or global levels”<sup>60</sup>.

So we can conclude, that value of peace must stand immesurable. It has no value, but it is a value by itself (intrinsic), recognized as the only possible way of living. Peace goes way beyond security, certainty, and all other social or legal values that it encompasses.

Peace cannot exist, without having the education about the meaning of it and without feeling the need for peace in human society. Education for peace remains the main mission that contributes in the improvement of relations in human society. It enables us to manage the conflicts in a natural and constructive manner, because *only the peacefull mind and heart can win in every battle*<sup>61</sup>.

---

<sup>59</sup> Freud, Civilization and its Discontents, 1930 (excerpt), available on: [http://historyguide.org/europe/freud\\_discontents.html](http://historyguide.org/europe/freud_discontents.html), retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>60</sup> Importance of Peace for Human Survival and Development, text from unknown author, available on: <https://egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/63198/1/Unit-2.pdf>, retrieved on 10th June 2022.

<sup>61</sup> Sun Cu(Sun Tzu), Umeće ratovanja8The Art of War), Indmedia, 2015, 112.

