

# THE ESSENCE OF PHENOMENON OF PEACE AND THE NOTION OF PEACE BUILDING\*

*Ilija Kajtez\*\**

University "Union – Nikola Tesla",  
Faculty of International Politics and Security, Belgrade

*Srdjan Starčević*

University of Defence in Belgrade, Military Academy

*Bojana Ružičić*

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Political Sciences

Peace, as well as its inevitable companion and rival – war, are extremely complex notions and important socio-historical phenomena. This is why the study of peace, and its proper understanding, requires a wise philosophical view and a bold scientific and intellectual synthesis. Peace and war are complex notions and seductive phenomena, which can easily lead us to various dilemmas, blind alleys, simplifications, and also intellectual and ethical antinomies. What truly peace is represents a great question and it is unknown whether it is tranquility, respite, stagnation or absence of life, antithesis of war, oasis of human happiness or perhaps renouncement of any happiness. Dealing with peace shares a similar problem with artistic description of happiness, where we often lack the right words and appropriate sublime and dynamic action – on the other hand, an artist is eloquent, inspired, emotional and profound when describing misfortunes and suffering of nations and men. Peace has been mostly perceived as a necessary rest between wars and bloody battles throughout history. We think that it is necessary to abandon the often dominant Manichean image of the world, represented by dual dialectic and a black-and-white connection between peace and war, and that it is time for us to open ourselves to, among other things, wisdom from the East, which speaks about complementing, reciprocity and contrast between Yin and Yang, much like Galtung, the founder of the peace studies.

There is virtually no human activity that has not touched, in its own particular way – through commonsense, teleologically, mythically, epically, scientifically, intellectually, spiritually, with heart and soul, the questions and phenomena of war and peace because both peace and war are so crucially important for man, society and the overall humankind. Peace building is the necessity of the highest order because if the planet Earth

---

\* Translated by Dragan Stanar, PhD, Faculty of International Politics and Security, University "Union – Nikola Tesla", Belgrade.

\*\* Professor Ilija Kajtez, PhD, [ilijasbm@ptt.rs](mailto:ilijasbm@ptt.rs)

is not in the state of sustainable peace, we fear that there will be no man left on it. Hence, peace and peace-building are not merely ethical, scientific, esthetic, diplomatic or theological issues, even though they are all of these, but primarily the issues of destiny of humans and human society. Peace is an issue of the highest order, a requirement of all requirements, and hope before all other human hopes.

Key Words: *peace, war, man, society, peace studies, peace building, philosophy*

*“A tree as great as a man's embrace springs from a small shoot;  
A terrace nine stories high begins with a pile of earth;  
A journey of a thousand miles starts under one's feet.”*  
(Lao Tze)

*“There is no 'way to peace,' there is only 'peace'”*  
(Mahatma Gandhi)

Peace is one, singular and indivisible. The essence of peace and the notion of peace building are very complex and multilayered, and they comprise many layers of personal, human, social, historical and cosmic mystery<sup>1</sup>. Using the wisdom of intellectual cognition, Greek philosophers claim that “nature prefers to stay hidden”. Scientists<sup>2</sup>, philosophers and sages know that the essence, existence and being of the Mystery are in the fact that it likes to playfully conceal itself from explorers, travelers and the curious. This is precisely why the study and understanding of the essence of peace and the process of peace building requires a wise philosophical approach and a bold scientific and spiritual synthesis rather than a partial, isolated and one-sided approach<sup>3</sup>. This is the model of behavior for all leaders of non-violence and all fighters for peace and peace building in our restless world. One-sidedness (theoretical and practical) does not lead to profound wisdom. On the contrary, it blurs the essence and the valuable totality of the observed phenomenon of nature, society and man. If only one science or social theory<sup>4</sup> deals with the essence of the phe-

<sup>1</sup> See more about peace in: Ilija Kajtez, *Wisdom and Sword, Volume I, Ancient and Medieval Philosophers on the Secrets of War and Peace* (Lambert Academic Publishing, 2016) 32-45.

<sup>2</sup> “Most profound thinkers of scientific world... do not separate their work from their life... they take both their work and life too seriously to allow for such a division, and it is their desire to use their work in order to enrich their life, and life to enrich their work...” C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination*, quoted in Мирослав Печујлић, *Методологија друштвених наука* (Савремена администрација, 1982) 813.

<sup>3</sup> “...when... men... research without any philosophical thought... for whom talent would be just an obstacle... Men with such mediocre abilities dedicate all their abilities and all their skill to only one limited scientific field, in which they can accomplish complete knowledge under the condition that they remain perfect ignoramuses in all other fields. They resemble workers in watchmakers' workshops, in which the first one makes only wheels, the second one only springs, and the third one only chains”. (Schopenhauer) According to Лав Николајевић Толстој, *Пут у живот II*, (Златна књига, 2009) 45-46.

<sup>4</sup> “Our experience with those theories in which peace depends only on one factor is generally negative. Kant laid all his hopes on the republican solution and democracy, liberals on free market and democracy, Marxists on social manufacture and guided democracy, mondialists on the powerful United Nations. Peace never followed their hopes.” Johan Galtung, *Мирним средствима до мира, Мир и сукоб, развој и цивилизација*

nomenon of peace and long-term social process of peace building, it will most certainly not yield great results<sup>5</sup> in the research of these important and complex socio-historic processes. There are general notions, which stun every human thought, every power of reason, the ability of intellect and intellectual power of man – they are so ontologically, gnoseologically, historically, ethically, axiologically, socially, anthropologically and esthetically deep, complex and mysterious. Both peace and war are universal notions. Dragana Dulić writes: "...war and peace can (and ought to) be placed in the semantic field of philosophy<sup>6</sup>, and thus in the plain of ontology, axiology, praxeology, epistemology, existential analytics, even formal logic. They can also be studied from the perspective of military sciences, anthropology... sociology, culturology, mediology, psychology, pedagogy... irenology, polemology, criminology, international law and politics, as well as numerous theories which exist within these academic disciplines."<sup>7</sup> All the aforementioned clearly indicates and leads us to the conclusion that the notions of war and peace are complex, dynamic, contradictory and ontological problems of the Universe, World and Man, and that Man has coalesced with them more than with any other phenomenon – he is so interested in war and peace because they are a necessary presumption of his essence, persistence and life existence. Moreover, not just individuals, families, social groups and classes, but also different civilizations, cultures and nations understand general (universal) notions (good and evil, peace and war, necessity and coincidence, life and death, freedom and religion) identically, sometimes similarly, and they often have different and opposite interpretation and valuation of these notions. Peace and war<sup>8</sup> are complex, important and seductive notions that can lead us to numerous dilemmas, blind alleys, simplifications<sup>9</sup>, intellectual and ethical antinomies. Men have attempted to interpret war and peace in many ways and from the perspective of dif-

---

(Службени гласник, Београд, 2009) 16. (opг. Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*, International Peace Research Institute Oslo&SAGE Publications, 1996).

<sup>5</sup> "One who studies peace must seek for causes, conditions and contexts in different spheres – sphere of Nature, Man, Society, World, Time, Culture. This transdisciplinary specter makes peace studies simultaneously demanding, intellectually complex and problematic in practice. On the other hand, every narrower, limited approach is doomed to failure." Galtung, *Ibid.* 13.

<sup>6</sup> "Thinking about war and peace has always been in the focal point of philosophical discussions, since the very beginnings of philosophy, and Hobbes even considered it to be its integral element. From Heraclitus till today, peace and war have been discussed in a purely speculative way, without need to rely on empirical research. This is because war and peace possess certain characteristics like transcendence and noumenality, as well as because they can represent metaphors of earthly and cosmic order." Драгана Дулић, Бранко Ромчевић, *Етика рата, хрестоматија*, (Факултет безбедности, Београд, 2010) 15.

<sup>7</sup> Дулић, Ромчевић *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> War is a topic that has been studied the most: "Since the time of Thucydides, so much ink has been spent on this subject, so many library shelves have been filled with works about war! How many scientists, from how many specialized fields have applied their expertise on this unsolvable problem! Mathematicians, meteorologists, sociologists, anthropologists, geographers, physicists, politicologists, philosophers, theologians and legalists are just some of the most obvious categories that come to mind when we see rows of those seeking for a formula for permanent peace, or who at least hoped to reduce the complexity of international conflict to an organized structure, to develop a theory that would allow us to explain, understand and control a phenomenon that, if not eradicated, could eradicate us." Michael Howard, *The Causes of War and Other Essays* (Harvard University Press, 1983) 7-22.

<sup>9</sup> "... there is only one idea of peace in minds of ordinary people, which could lead to a singular understanding of peace; an example would be a classic child's drawing of a field, blue sky, sun and animals and children playing, with or without the lion and the lamb." Galtung, (n 6) 32.

ferent scientific disciplines. It is important to know that we, when speaking about war, necessarily speak from the position of tripartite dialectic (and-and) about peace (peace building), too and vice versa. On the battlefield shared by two armies that had been warring for years, there is only one thought in the heads of generals and regular soldiers – to end war and achieve peace as soon as possible – and as far as soldiers are concerned, permanent peace is preferred. It is impossible to talk about war without talking and thinking about peace, just like it is impossible to speak about darkness without thinking about light, or about a man without thinking about a woman. This is the general law of the cosmic and created world. Heraclitus<sup>10</sup> recognizes dialectics even in struggle and competition, not only in war, and he sees the general principle of human and world existence in it. Heraclitus (“the Obscure”), in his famous 53rd Fragment, writes about war: “some he has shown forth as gods and others as men, some he has made slaves and others free”. As we have seen, war and peace can be analyzed from the perspective of all social sciences and philosophical disciplines. In their pursuit to explain the ethical dimension of war, men have reached at least two opposite positions – one is the position of the absolute moral apologetics of war, and the other one is the position of absolute moral negation of war. Extremes are never good in explanation of any complex social phenomenon (finally, they boil down to the same thing), and they are not scientifically fruitful. However, we must keep in mind that the notions of war and peace have a very rich tradition, and that interpretation of these notions belongs to different scientific and ideological contexts<sup>11</sup>. Absolute moral negation of war rates every war as evil and unjust, without discussing reasons, causes and goals of war. Theoreticians of absolute moral negation of war (in the broadest sense we can refer to them as pacifists) consider war for justice and freedom, defensive war and war against slavery to be unjust wars. Pacifists see moral values only and exclusively in peace, and they only accept peaceful methods of conflict resolution. The basic problem of pacifism is that, despite its name, it lacks “interest in peace”<sup>12</sup> – in its achievement and defense, in the mode of organization and preservation of peace as a globally desired state. However, world, war and peace, and man living in them and with them, are not as simple and unquestionable as pacifists tend to see and interpret them – just like the extreme militarists. Still, the authors who claim that “Peace must be planned and worked on”<sup>13</sup> are right. Peace research<sup>14</sup> requires action, and it aims to put the gained knowledge into practice, to find optimal solutions for the existing problems using critical thinking, and to encourage change of consciousness both in individual communities and on a global scale. Some authors think

<sup>10</sup> See more about Greek philosophers views about war and peace in: Kajtez (n 3) 157-217.

<sup>11</sup> Дулић, Ромчевић, (n 8) 17-18.

<sup>12</sup> Јован Бабић, *Етика рата и „Теорија праведног рата“* (footnote 72), <http://www.rastko.rs/rastko/delo/15243,20/11/2017>.

<sup>13</sup> Pinchas, Lapide, *The Sermon on the Mount: Utopia od program for Action?* (Maryknoll, Orbis, 1986) 35.

<sup>14</sup> “In the beginning of the 1960s, peace research grew in popularity, and today it represents a full-fledged discipline. Peace studies formalized during the late 1950s, and in the beginning of 1960s, when special research institutes were formed, as parts of many universities or as independent institutions, first being: Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) founded by Johan Galtung in 1962; University of Michigan Center for Research of Conflict Resolution, USA; Stanford Center on International Conflict and Negotiation, Stanford University, USA; and the Canadian Peace Research Association. Relying on works of influential intellectuals between two world wars, such are Quincy Right, Lewis Richardson, Pitrim and Sorokin, researchers of peace in the 1950s and 1960s founded this discipline formally.” Дулић, Ромчевић (n 8) 66.

that reconciliation is about enabling local society to build common future, in which differences represent resources for peace building, not war. History of a society that has been in war cannot be altered, differences between enemies cannot disappear overnight, and the process of reconciliation can enable local society to live with its inherited history and actual differences in its effort to rebuild and heal itself from the consequences of war conflicts. Process of reconciliation has two basic elements: how to approach history, and how to turn from history to the peaceful and common future.

When we discuss peace, it is necessary to keep in mind that peace is differently, not necessarily oppositely, perceived by the western and eastern civilization. Ishida Takeshi<sup>15</sup>, whose perception of peace is similar to Galtung ones, proposes such a distinction. The core attributes of the western understanding of peace, or western "social cosmology"<sup>16</sup>, are that the western notion of peace derives from "ancient-Judeo notion *Shalom*, Greek notion *Eirene*, and Latin notion *pax*. Their semantic differences can be ignored due to all those elements they have in common: 1) peace is absence of war in the world; 2) peace is justice in the world; 3) peace is world order. Hence, peace is a global/social category of justice, prosperity, stability and order, with order meaning the rule of law... The western notion of peace is primarily understood as an attribute of a social system required for prosperity. Meanwhile, the eastern notion of peace accentuates order and *spiritual tranquility, internal balance*, in accordance with external order. Here, order is equally cosmic and political, and it is achieved by individual adherence to norms, customs... as outcomes of individual internal harmony."<sup>17</sup> Therefore, a possible conclusion is that the western perspective of peace (over)accentuates social and political aspect of peace, whilst the eastern insight in the phenomenon of peace places emphasis on internal harmony, spiritual and cosmic dimension of peace. Both perspectives have their own advantages and disadvantages, and only together they optimally describe peace. However, a justified issue is raised, whether notions such as war and peace possess something universal, undoubtable and ontological for all men and all nations in all times and epochs, or perhaps notions of peace and war greatly depend on social, historical, cultural and civilizational specificities. Dragana Dulić states, in her previously mentioned work: „Our understanding of peace is a product of our culture and upbringing. Notion of peace varies depending on cultures and civilizations, level of historical development, different ideologies, philosophies and religions, it is equally determined both by internal circumstances in a given state and by geopolitical circumstances. Besides the existing differences in understanding of peace, from an inter-cultural perspective, there is also a difference of opinions about peace between members of the same culture. Interpretation of this notion is also not immune to political implications...“. Understanding of relativity of peace is further explained by the author, when speaking about peace as a historical category<sup>18</sup>. Despite all abovementioned, it seems that there must be an understanding of peace that is anthropologically founded in the very ontological essence of man as a reasonable and rational being. Ivan Ilich points out an epochal and cultural diversity of the

---

<sup>15</sup> Ishida Takeshi, 'Beyond the Traditional Concepts of Peace in Different Cultures', *Journal of Peace Research*, (1969) 6 (2).

<sup>16</sup> See more in: Johan Galtung, 'Violence, Peace and Peace Research' (1969) *Journal of Peace Research*, 6 (3).

<sup>17</sup> Дулић, Ромчевић, (п 8) 22-23.

<sup>18</sup> Дулић, Ромчевић, Ibid. 23.

meaning and essence of peace. Foremost: "war tends to equalize cultures, whilst peace represents a state in which every culture blossoms in its own unique way. This means that peace cannot be exported"<sup>19</sup>. Galtung considers which types of peace there are, and rather successfully aims to determine a universal notion of peace: "*Peace in Nature* is cooperation, not battle of species. *Direct positive peace* would consist of verbal and physical goodness, good for the body, mind and spirit, for Ourselves and Others; it refers to all basic needs, survival, welfare, freedom and identity. Love is the embodiment of this: unity of body, mind and spirit. *Structural positive peace* would represent the substitution of repression with freedom and exploitation with equality... This also applies to *internal peace*- the goal is to achieve harmony of body, mind and spirit. The key: external and internal dialog. *Cultural positive peace* would represent substitution of legitimized violence with legitimized peace; in religion, law, and ideology; in language and science; in schools, universities and media; construction of a positive peace culture. In the internal sphere of I, this means openness for different human inclinations and abilities, not repression."<sup>20</sup> Relativity of the notion of peace is somewhat justified in the process of interpretation of peace from the standpoint of a civilization, era or an ideological paradigm, and it fails to answer the basic question of general understanding of the notion of peace as peace in general. The same goes for war. Relativity of understanding peace and war cannot fully satisfy human curiosity and their unquenchable desire for complete knowledge. Man always tends to grasp the world as a totality, both the world around him and the world inside him.

Is peace absence of full-blooded life, hibernation in which there is no true life? Could peace perhaps be a synonym for a life on a cemetery, and is peace actually giving up and reconciling with the disappearance of human freedom? Is peace a social state of numbness and somnolence in which man has no desire for hot dreams, in which a sailor no longer seeks Utopia, and in which a human being settles for mediocracy of non-eventfulness and motionlessness, is peace perhaps simply a contrast to terrors of war and fatal suffering, is peace truly a desired oasis of happiness<sup>21</sup> or total abandonment of the pursuit of happiness? There are many questions about peace, and only a few answers. The same goes for its eternal rival and the negative side of peace – war<sup>22</sup>. Our previous philosophical, scientific and life experience, along with human anthropology, clearly teaches us that neither scientists nor sages can fully determine and completely

<sup>19</sup> I. Illich, *Право на заједништво*, (Печат, Београд 1985). 166.

<sup>20</sup> Galtung, (n 6) 55.

<sup>21</sup> "Peace being a desired state does not necessarily mean that it is a moral state. Peace based on domination, strength of one and weakness of the other is a prison-type of peace, full of inhumane inhibitions and moral deviations; war and peace ought to be seen in their content, facticity and as processes, their basis must be understood before judging them." Илија Пријић, Славко Пријић, 'Етика и рат' (1992) Социолошки преглед, 26 (1-4) 27.

<sup>22</sup> Definition of war may include: "any active enmity or struggle between living beings, as well as a conflict between opposing powers or principles. (*The Oxford Dictionary*) ... There are many definitions of war, depending on their author's position; thus, we have rationalistic (Carl von Clausewitz and John Keegan), demographic (Thomas Malthus), sociological (Eckart Kehr and Hans-Urlich Wehler), Marxist (V.I. Lenin), behavioristic (E.F.M. Durban and John Bowlby), economic (Woodrow Wilson) and psychological (Konrad Lorenz) theories of war. Each of these shines light on a specific aspect of war, but not a single one is comprehensive enough". Дулић, Ромчевић, (n 8) 19.

define what peace and war are. However, this revelation is not a sufficient reason for us not to aim to reach this goal (complete knowledge), or at least to get as close to it as possible. Furthermore, magnificent human life is more than just what is real and certain, and it is also about dreams, hopes and desires.

Dealing with peace shares a similar problem with artistic description and expression of health and happiness, as well as creative depiction of a content man, because we always lack appropriately powerful words and appropriate sublime action. On the contrary, when speaking or writing about misfortune, illnesses and suffering of men and nations, an artist is so eloquent, creative, wise and intellectually deep. Peace, health, freedom and happiness of man, family, group and community are often, unfortunately, conceived only as a short and necessary pause, much-needed regrouping, calming and gathering of precious strength in the face of new challenges and life misfortunes, winds of history and future competitions of opposite human wills and quarrelling nations. Besides that, peace has been understood, throughout history, only as a pause and break between conflicts, wars and bloody battles. In this sense, every advocacy of peace is merely utopian as men of war propose that violence is determined by "human destiny". In the state of nature of Thomas Hobbes, all men have equal rights to all things, and thus the state of nature is the state of *bellum omnium contra omnes*, in which human life is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short"<sup>23</sup>. Glorious Hegel<sup>24</sup> states that the world history is not a stage of happiness, and that "periods of happiness are empty pages". Peace, as a prerequisite of happiness, is not as historically important for civilization as war, seen by Hegel almost as an instrument of progress<sup>25</sup>. Many interpret the great Hegel as an apologist for war. However, one must be aware of Hegel's profound intellectual depth before giving such arbitrary and categorical qualifications. Probably the most well-known definition of war is the one offered by the renowned Prussian theoretician of war, Clausewitz<sup>26</sup>, in his seminal work *On war*<sup>27</sup>. Niccolo Machiavelli is probably the most famous representative of those who thought that a ruler's prerogative is to wage war whenever he finds it appropriate and desirable<sup>28</sup>. From the dawn of civilization there has not been a single society that has not known war. Research, which claims that some early gathering societies have never waged wars have been proven wrong. Radomir Milašinović states that all assumptions regarding the existence of „non-conflict societies" were shown to be „ill-founded"<sup>29</sup>. War used to be a companion of man even before the first civilizations rose, and it still perseveres today, proving that nothing is quite as *constant* in history as human aggression.<sup>30</sup> Possibility of war and peace is a possibility of human freedom or human free choice.

---

<sup>23</sup> Thomas Hobbes, *Levijatan*, (Naklada Jesenjski i Turk, 2004) 92.

<sup>24</sup> See more about opinions of German Classical Idealism philosophers about war and peace in: Ilija Kajtez, *Wisdom and Sword, Volume II, Philosophers of the New Age on the Riddles of War and Peace* (Lambert Academic Publishing, 2017) 113-158.

<sup>25</sup> G.W.F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, (Batoche Books, 2001) 41.

<sup>26</sup> See more about Clausewitz understanding of war in: Kajtez (n 29) 158-202.

<sup>27</sup> "...war is not a mere act of policy, but a genuine political instrument, continuation of political activities using other means". Carl von Clausewitz, *On War* (Princeton University Press, 1976) 87.

<sup>28</sup> See more in: Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*, (Hackett Publishing Company, 2008).

<sup>29</sup> Радомир Милашиновић, Срђан Милашиновић, *Основи теорије конфликта* (Факултет безбедности Београд, 2007) 16.

<sup>30</sup> Lawrence H. Keeley "thinks that approximately 90-95% of societies known to history, at least occasionally, waged wars, while some were in constant war". According to: Дулић, Ромчевић (n 8) 16.

According to Christian teachings, God does not wish to force men into making peace or waging war because men would lose the most precious thing we have – freedom and free choice. Out of his love for men, God wishes not to take the possibility of free choice from us, regardless of all terrors and challenges of war. Professor Babić notices this in a particularly good and accurate manner: “Possibility of war, not its reality, is an implication of freedom and a part of its cost”<sup>31</sup>. Humans and human societies always have a choice. War is not human destiny. The only thing that is human destiny is our focus on free choice.

War and peace are *unique* phenomena. Men who wisely understand mysteries of man and world can easily recognize that human happiness can bear bitter fruits, if one takes it frivolously, irresponsibly and carelessly, because corruption and extremeness creep up on a happy man gradually and sometimes even subconsciously<sup>32</sup>. It is precisely happiness, along with leisurely and hedonistic life that usually accompanies it, that represents a tremendous life challenge, a challenge that hides perils of decay and potential downfall of moral, intellectual, and social aspect of men, families and nations, along with their health and values. Dragana Dulić writes that: “Not all men are thrilled with the idea of peace. For some, peace has more negative than affirmative meanings... for them, an individual's peace is related with conformism, spiritual numbness, triviality, boredom and passivity, opportunism... and, from a political perspective, peace relates with conservative regimes which are interested in keeping *status quo*, in safeguarding the existing models of international domination, in disinclination to structural reforms, and which are against determination of peace as a category of social justice. This is the angle often adopted by those who enjoy a privileged status and comfortable life, unlike those who suffer injustice or famine, and who prioritize change of life conditions over advocacy of peace.” By recognizing dangers, challenges and possible downfalls a responsible and loving man does not take a standpoint against peace and human happiness, his inner and outer community. His worry about the possibility of long-term peace and irresponsible happiness of an individual, family and community is rightfully present and justified, as they may be in a deceptive and perilous field of potential problems, blind alleys, and challenges for morally sound and healthy human life, and long existence of his community<sup>33</sup>. If human happiness is truly to be found in struggle, as Marx claimed, is this fighter a man who dislikes peace or he is a truly creative, historical being of gender fighting for just peace, equality, freedom<sup>34</sup> and human dignity. Here, struggle and happiness must

<sup>31</sup> Јован Бабић, *Морал и наше време* (Службени гласник, 2005) 148.

<sup>32</sup> Soldiers and their commanders are particularly aware that peace, not war, represents a state of emergency and danger for any army, as it bleeds and becomes undisciplined in peace, followed by physical and moral decadence. The same goes for a healthy, happy man who becomes too much accustomed to welfare of abundance and many life conveniences. This could be a deadly trap of decay, moral downfall and deviations, as well as inability to display all potentials residing in humans, beings of tremendous abilities.

<sup>33</sup> Livy often commented on dangers of peace and claimed that Tullus Hostilius: “in his belief that a state weakens in peace, sought for ways to encourage wars, everywhere”. This understanding was accepted even by the earliest Latin poet of love poetry, Catullus. “For you, Catullus, peace is suffering, you enjoy peace, and your desires grow too great; peace destroyed many kings and happy cities before you”. If we accept that Rome is a synonym for wars and combat, these objections to peace are not unfounded, especially if we know well human nature and its fallen, instinctive side.

<sup>34</sup> We must be shortly reminded that glorious Hegel thought that the purpose of man as a being is precisely freedom, and that we cannot truly speak about man without acknowledging his attribute of freedom, just like it

primarily be thought of in a Heraclitus-like, ontological sense, that is not limited only and exclusively to war and armed conflict. Struggle also implies an inner (psychological), personal and interpersonal, social, and also a cosmic competition and battle of oppositions. Ought we to advise a man, a friend, a nation to always be a calm citizen, loyal subject and obedient<sup>35</sup> to social order, or should we encourage and teach them to always and constantly search for deceptive and difficult paths of human freedom, justice, equality, personal self-affirmation, social change and reevaluation of everything in existence, like Prometheus? Can primal and original human intentions and eternal human desires be realized only in boundaries, ideas, rights, and given limits of social, agreed or imposed peace? Can we perceive social peace only as a pause, state of immobility of every motion, or should we perhaps speak of peace in a more humanistic way, as a process of accomplishing ever greater rights and freedoms of men and citizens<sup>36</sup>? A legitimate question comes to mind – does intellectual and spiritual peace necessarily require the absence of all internal struggles, personal battles and life pitfalls? If there is no inner intellectual and spiritual struggle, various life temptations, defeats and personal and collective victories, is there any real human maturing, life experience or individual wisdom? People tend to imagine peace as a description of heaven on the Earth, where there is neither conflict nor competition; if so, there is a big problem in such peace, because it lacks true, real life, meaning that there is no authentic man, and only a utopian image and the world deprived of men. This is not a good image of peace. Perhaps people, in their overwhelming desire and steaming imagination, in which they flee from the harsh world of suffering, cataclysm and horrors of war, picture peace as an overemphasized state of harmony, which is not a faithful image of human and social life. Peace (social and political) is neither the field of cemeteries nor a state of social relations in which some people are slaves, but rather an organism that is very much alive, an active social process, where naturally there is human ideological disagreement, conflict, different interests, and opposed opinions (this is a characteristic of free men). However, people should, being rational, humane and responsible beings, avoid dreadful armed conflicts, systemic inequalities and social injustices in peace, and particularly all forms of “structural violence”, as Galtung puts it, as much as possible.

We think that it is necessary to abandon the dominant Manichean world image, a two-partite dialectic and a black-and-white relations between peace and war, because in this case this eternal couple is observed in a mechanical<sup>37</sup>, i.e. exclusive way as opposi-

---

is impossible to discuss matter without acknowledging its extensiveness. According to Hegel, freedom is the essential characteristic of world spirit, which moves history.

<sup>35</sup> “You can remain invincible forever, if you do not enter any combat in which victory does not depend on you.” Епиктет, *Обрасци воље и среће, Стоички требник*, (Слободна књига, 2001).

<sup>36</sup> It seems that the Agenda for peace provides the determination of peace broad and dynamic enough to capture the essence of what peace ought to achieve in a political, social and historical sense: “Peace is more than just a non-violent conflict resolution, it is a balance of social structure, in which all members of society can live harmoniously”. See more in: *An Agenda for Peace, Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping*, Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January 1992; A/47/277-S/24111, 17 June 1992.

<sup>37</sup> Thomas Kuhn, in his classical work *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, showed that intellectual and scientific progress consists of removing the paradigm that has grown incompetent of explaining new or new-found facts and of replacing it with a paradigm which better explains those facts. He specifically and clearly

tion, exclusivity and an irreconcilable difference. Therefore, Galtung's approach seems wise, fruitful and worth mentioning. It is based on the philosophy of the Far East: "Yin/Yang opposition or contradiction is... more lifelike. Yin and Yang oppose each other, but in the sense of complementarity, existence of one in the other, not triumph of one over the other. By one balancing the other, rather than dominating over it, a state of balance is achieved. However, this balance is not stable. The aspect that is lagging will start to draw level with the other, until it surpasses it, leaving it behind, making it now the one that must catch up, take the lead again... An overall peace... will not be achieved... what can be achieved is a better relation between peace and violence, meaning more better peace... and... (less evil) violence – improvement of human position"<sup>38</sup>. This is an excellent cosmic and anthropological understanding of dichotomy of peace and war, or war and peace. Neither a final victory of peace, nor a final triumph of war is possible. Only their constant competition and eternal struggle is possible. As we have seen, Galtung substituted the historical, ancient and accepted dichotomy war-peace with the peace-violence pair<sup>39</sup>. Galtung is completely aware of the world we live in, and therefore claims: "We live in a militarized world in which our first option is direct violence, followed by structural and cultural violence... of institutionalized military-bureaucracy-corporation-intelligence complexes and firmly embedded militaristic ideologies... *direct violence* occurs in the realm of personality, society and consciousness, it is intentional, conducted by individuals... *structural violence or indirect violence* is... violence embedded into personality, society and consciousness, and it is not intentional; function of *Cultural violence* is to legitimize direct and structural violence, by motivating actors to perform direct violence or not to confront structural violence... Direct violence can be divided into verbal and physical violence, or violence conducted over the body, mind and soul... Structural violence can be political, i.e. repressive and economic, i.e. exploitative; cultural violence manifests itself through religion, law, ideology, language, art, empirical/formal sciences, cosmology/deep culture..."<sup>40</sup>. Moreover, Galtung thinks that Peace studies founded by him should aim not to accomplish unreal and complete peace on Earth, and an absolute triumph of good over evil, but rather to enable better interpersonal and international relations in our complex world, less suffering for all those who are at the receiving end of violence. We consider this to be a rational, reasonable, non-utopian and realistic under-

---

claims: 'In order to be accepted as a paradigm, a theory must appear better than its rivals, but it doesn't have to, actually it never does, explain all the facts it is facing' while another author, John Lewis Gaddis says that: 'Finding a path in uncharted territory usually requires some sort of a map...' Печулић, (n 4) 813.

<sup>38</sup> Johan Galtung, (n 6) 35.

<sup>39</sup> "Peace and violence must be seen in their totality, in all levels of life organization (not just human life). International violence is important, but violence between peoples and generations is even more important. Same goes for violence inside an individual, as well as inside a spirit... and inside a body... Conflict is much more than just direct violence, something that is determined as a problem at first glance. There is also violence petrified into structures, as well as a culture legitimizing it. In order to transform a conflict, much more is needed than just a new architecture of relations between conflicting sides. In order for the conflict to stop repeating itself indefinitely, participants themselves must transform... Human behavior is not directed by the ideas pulling us forward, but cosmology, a code, a collective program that pushes us. This does not mean that ideologies, individual or collective systems of belief, which we consciously follow, are irrelevant. But, far from it that only they manage human actions". Galtung, Ibid. 10.

<sup>40</sup> Galtung, Ibid. 51. and 54.

standing of peace, violence and war. It is fairly easy for peace and war to be in harsh opposition, and to completely exclude each other, but this will surely neither lead us to proper and deep understanding nor place us a step closer to the truth of these extremely complex, dynamic, layered, contradictory notions and socio-historic phenomena, of the utmost importance for humans. Therefore, a step further has to be made, and these notions must be analyzed in a creative, dialectical and reciprocal manner; naturally, in this process the differences and different content must not be denied, and also, we must not fall into the trap of complete exclusiveness, separateness, and hostility; what transcends both war and peace, with its power, logos and laws, is the very mystery of life and the mystery of their struggle. Unity and struggle of peace and war is permanent, undeniable and eternal in mankind history. Man is mistaken when and if he observes these two cosmic, ontological and eternal rivals (war and peace, and man caught between them) unilaterally, from only a single scientific position and from an exclusive point of view; in this situation he completely and utterly chooses one or the other dialectic couple, not realizing that this is essentially impossible and that they are one whole, an inseparable oneness, and that it is never possible to speak of war without peace, evil without good, or life without death. The greatest objection to all exclusive followers of only the rule of good or only of the empire of evil, of the overall triumph of war or absolute victory of peace is that their exclusiveness most certainly fails to reach the chambers of life's logos, meaning universe, social truth and mystery of human life. Human right, desire and advocacy of complete elimination of drastic and unacceptable forms and manifestations of the rule of evil and human violence, war destruction<sup>41</sup> and pillaging, are one thing, but the understanding that a complete triumph of good and peace in a created (real) world is simply incompatible with logic of universe, life and nature of Man. Human thoughts often impose the rule of man's desires and dreams. People have thought about war and fantasized about oases of happiness from the beginning of time, at least as breathers between battles<sup>42</sup>. However, we wonder who the sages that truly glorified peace and periods of peace are<sup>43</sup>, and where all those poems, odes and hymns dedicated to those who spent their lives peacefully, diligently, uneventfully, without turbulent changes and important historical events are<sup>44</sup>. Philosopher Immanuel Kant advocated

---

<sup>41</sup> "...What keeps war going? Many factors. Three of which being patriarchate (rule of male humans), state's system, with its monopoly of violence, and a system of super-states or superpowers with their supreme monopoly of hegemony". Galtung, *Ibid.* 19.

<sup>42</sup> Under the influence of Heraclitus Plato spoke about naturalty, universality and inevitability of war, saying that what we call 'peace' is nothing but a name. Plato, *Collected Dialogues* (Princeton University Press, 1961) 1227.

<sup>43</sup> Peace was never a focal point in ancient Greek philosophy, but it was present in their consciousness. Greek philosophers saw war as a part of divine order. What drives warriors into combat, in ancient Greece, was their desire for glory and immortality, making war a part of society, which gave birth to Homeric epic, in which the greatest prizes and honors are given to heroes, resulting in a state of constant war. However, war brings pain and suffering, and therefore the god of war was represented as a monster of slaughter on Achilles' shield, while Zeus considered Ares to be the "worst of all gods". It is known that in the time of the Olympics, the Olympic truce was proclaimed in Zeus' temple, but it did not stop war, it merely guaranteed protection for all competitors and observers traveling to the Olympics.

<sup>44</sup> "There are many encyclopedias about wars, revolutions, great victories and losses, and so little of those... in which thoughts about peace, tolerance, agreements and reconciliations are collected... Is this caused by human indifference towards... precious ideas and values of self-preservation like ideals of peace, or is man... an aggressive being of war, not a being of peace? This 'indifference' is probably explained by the fact that

peace in his famous and concise work *Perpetual peace*, in which he wrote that our “direct duty” is peace. This implies that education about peace is also our duty, even if perpetual peace is only a possibility, and even if it is unlikely to happen, we humans have a duty to work on the gradual establishment of genuine peace as our path to the ultimate goal, i.e. perpetual peace<sup>45</sup>. World humanists including Kant are dedicated individuals, who keep the fire of reason and steady hope burning in an, often unreasonable, world of humans and our arrogant leaders.

War and peace are important and eternal phenomena for humankind, dealt by many men throughout history, in all areas of thought and creativity, ensuring that war and peace are understood as anthropological, religious, mythical, philosophical and sociological phenomena, as political, historical and social notions; poets wrote about war and peace, writers, painters and musicians explained good and evil gifts of peace and war, they were studied both by natural and old sciences: astrology, cosmogony and theogony. There is virtually no human activity that has not touched, in its own particular way – through commonsense, teleologically, mythically, epically, scientifically, intellectually, spiritually, with heart and soul, the questions and phenomena of war and peace because both peace and war are so crucially important for man, society and the overall humankind. What human history has proved so far, when it comes to peace and war, is that wars and conflicts dominate<sup>46</sup>, war endeavors and heroes are glorified, while peace was discussed only by individuals, incidentally and shyly as of peace being only a rest and a desired state; peace has never had its own persistence without the shadow and overliness of war and military conflict. Human history, to date, shows that when we speak about peace the notion of war is always the “big brother” – something that is a necessary condition of talks about peace and conclusions about peace, much like when we speak about human health because the notion that stands ominously as a shadow and that is the unavoidable fate of understanding health and that seriously questions any human

---

humanity was never a whole, until the XX century, never a corpus with common destiny... Large world wars and emergence of nuclear weapons and... means of mass destruction of humans began to develop consciousness about common destiny, as well as the possibility of human disappearance... Global peace keeping institutions were created... League of Nations followed by the Organization of United Nations. International law and many global international institutions were primarily meant to protect peace as the most precious value, without which world risks its survival... Words of the Ephesian philosopher from VI century B.C, Heraclitus the Obscure, that war (polemos) is father of all things and king of all were laid into the foundation of an anthropology of human aggressiveness and combat as natural life principle... But, there were those in human history who did not accept such a view – from Aristophanes, Stoics, first Christians, Buddhists, to humanist Erasmus of Rotterdam, philosophers Kant and Russel, politician... Gandhi, writers... Leo Tolstoy and Bernard Shaw, scientist Albert Einstein, and many apostles and advocates of peace...” Драгољуб Мићуновић, Предговор, *Светска енциклопедија мира*, Том I, (Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, 1998) V-VI (org. World Encyclopedia of peace, Volume I, (Pergamon Press, 1986).

<sup>45</sup> Имануел Кант 'Вечни мир', Данило Баста(ед) *Ум и слобода, Списи из филозофије историје, права и државе* (Идеје, 1974) 161, 168-169.

<sup>46</sup> “Hegel rejected Christian and Enlightened ideas of war as absolute evil, and related war to freedom, inseparably connected with development of human history. He indicated that states need war – sacrificing of their own citizens – even when they are not directly threatened by other states. Reason being simple: nation, like an organism, only exists on the foundation of emotional unity of its citizens, and nothing fortifies this unity like war. Hegel thought that the force of negativity is a dialectical tension which resists peace and stagnation. Accordingly, he thought that Kant's perpetual peace, *foedus pacificum*, is a phantom construction...” Дулић, Ромчевић (n 8) 45.

health as transient and short-lived is human death; when it comes to social peace, then those notions are war and violence. We are aware that whenever we seriously discuss peace, happiness and health, chances are that we will be soon expected to introduce, perhaps in our next sentence, or in our next paragraph, those eternally present notions such as illness, misfortune, death, war and violence, notions that faithfully follow health, happiness and peace. Perhaps the reason for this is that health, happiness and peace are exceptions in human state and community life, or perhaps it is because they are so normal that all words would be superfluous, or maybe the point is that man does not glorify freedom as long as he enjoys it limitlessly, or health as long as he does not feel all the gruesome consequences of illness; likewise, people neither elevate nor specially accentuate all the blessings of peace until they feel the terrors of war, destruction, death, annihilation of people and loss of freedom. Hence it is either negative human anthropology at work or negative dialectic, or perhaps war and illness are simply a rule, or the ever-present domination of war and talk of war is a product of existing antagonistic and violent (aggressive) human history – the future will show the best. That negative anthropology and realistic pessimism, which are still at play is best shown by our modern world, and the position man holds in it. “The first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century commenced with terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, it continued with a preventive, second war in Iraq, in order for the end of this decade to be marked by the largest financial crisis in half a century... optimism from the beginning of the 90s dwindled, which predicted a certain bright future of humanity, to be marked by mutually beneficial cooperation of men and nations, and material welfare of a dominant majority of people...”<sup>47</sup> Unfortunately, there is almost nothing that modern man has not stultified, abased and discouraged; himself, scientific accomplishment and dedication of excellent individuals, which is why the world searches for new Christ-like love, that will provide hope for humankind and reassure it that it is not in certain decadence. It is wise to remember the words of Epicurus, who said that in order for men to live peacefully: “... man must do to relations what a musician does to his strings, i.e. to tune the untuned and to arrange everything in order and harmony.” Is modern man, steeped in egoism and hedonism, ready for such a step – it remains to be answered. Common life in peace requires the art of politics, economic and spiritual balance of power; diligent labor in the path of reconciliation and the path of stable and sustainable peace, if truly Kant’s perpetual peace is impossible.

To tell the truth, social peace<sup>48</sup> and spiritual peace of an individual are always a desired state men dream of because every war is waged with unquenchable hope of reaching peace as soon as possible, regardless of duration of a war, it is only natural that there will be human casualties, material destruction, political and military defeats and triumphs. Hence, albeit war has indisputably been dominant in human history, it still shel-

---

<sup>47</sup> Драган Р. Симић, 'Лабудови иза хоризонта', Магазин Одбрана (Београд, 15. фебруар. 2013) 13.

<sup>48</sup> In order to accomplish and secure social peace, men would like to build the culture and philosophy of peace. In the Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century there is a following sentence: “Culture of peace will be realized when citizens of the world begin to understand global problems, when they acquire skill needed for conflict resolution, when they fight for justice non-violently, when they live in accordance with international standards of human rights and equality, when they respect cultural diversity, the Earth and each other. Such knowledge is only achievable through systematic education for peace”. *Hague Agenda for Peace & Justice for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, <http://www.vmppeace.org./pages/hague-agenda-for-peace.htm>

ters an ontological defect and a fundamental flaw<sup>49</sup> in its basis, foundation and essence – it is not self-sufficient, it is not its own purpose or goal, and therefore it is transient, unwanted, offhand and instrumental because war only represents a possible path, journey and primal human aspiration for a new state of peace. When a notion or a social phenomenon lacks its ontological foundation, it is superficial and transient by its nature, and it is unworthy of the status of the basis of life and human existence. This is the case with war, but not peace as peace has its own ontological foundation because it is the purpose of every war and every life. Moreover, no one dreams more sublimely about peace and gifts of peace than great warriors; unfortunately, peace in its nature is something that asks for little words and celebration, since it always appears only as a short pause before a new bloody contest of enemies in conflict, battle and war. This is a paradox of human life. However, it is not the only one. The inevitable conclusion would be that neither of these states, historical processes and social occurrences (peace and war) can be observed in isolation, separated from the other, because in their deepest essence they are One, they are Dual-One, they are Whole-One. The similar case is with dialectic pairs of man and woman, light and dark, life and death. Of course, every rational, reasonable, good and biophilic human must favor peace because it represents our destiny and our only hope; this does not lessen the significance, place and meaning of war, struggle, evil and violence as important places in human life, in human community and in all mankind.

When we move from an ontological standpoint on war and peace to an ethical one, then we can surely claim that: "The most devastating invention for elimination of misunderstandings between men, nations and states is war, considered to be a total eclipse of the mind. Peace is the most authentic choice of human self-realization, self-determination and freedom. Paradox or the relationship between war and peace is that from the beginning of time everybody prepares for war, but everybody "wants" peace... History of peace is a true native history of humankind. Permanent peacebuilding and development of the idea and practice of peace as practices of constant liberation of man and world. A better and more righteous world ought to be created, a world of peace, a world of freedom and human rights, humanism and progress. World of peace should be a world full of human nativeness, freedom, personal dignity and self-determination"<sup>50</sup>. Peace and its essence, as well as the problem of peace, study of irenology<sup>51</sup> and peacebuilding, are in a way to a large extent and foremost a description of desired states in human relations and human communities<sup>52</sup>. Men and nations dreamt about peace, they

<sup>49</sup> "If we look carefully, we can see that there is a hidden assumption in celebrating war: war is always understood as something in the past... This clearly reflects the key characteristic of war, a defining characteristic – that war, by its nature, is something temporary, something that is supposed to end, as quickly as possible. War is not imagined as a permanent state..." Јован Бабић, "Теорија праведног рата и морални статус неизвесности његовог исхода" a part of the lecture that author delivered to professors of Portland State University, Portland, Oregon, USA, 25<sup>th</sup> July 2007

<sup>50</sup> Павле Б. Бубања, *Философија мира*, (25. мај, 1987) 6.

<sup>51</sup> Irene is a name derived from the Greek word εἰρήνη, meaning peace, and hence irenology is the science of peace.

<sup>52</sup> "Despite the overwhelming dominance of structural violence, many cultural traditions identified goals which are closer to positive peace than to its negative relative. Greek notion, *irene*, in a narrower sense, means harmony and justice, as well as peace. Similarly, Arabian word *salad'am* and Hebrew word *shalom* mean not just a negative peace, but also welfare, totality and harmony between individuals, within a community, and among

spoke and beautifully sang about peace, especially when there was no peace and when its older rival – war – spread its ominous wings bringing its evil gifts and taking a bloody toll. Such understanding of peace contributes to absolutizing it, just like any other exaggeration in human life is ill-advised. In order to optimally study peace and in order to fortify its strengths in its conflict with strengths of war some authors suggest implementing a philosophy of peace: “Introduction of the notion... of philosophy of peace is justified by the author’s conviction that a) peace, as a notion, an object, a value, and a theory and practice ‘belongs at the very pinnacle of magnificent human genius’ and that it is a term of magical power ‘without whose creative and universal existence the most enormous tragedies of senselessness... human civilization and culture were realized; b) ‘only in the world of peace, a suitable world of justice and freedom, always and for all, does the world stand a chance of being a world of genuine meaning, beauty, truth and good’ and c) authentic cultural history of mankind can be completely developed only under the assumption that ‘... rule or realm of peace is the fact of human history as human work’... therefore it is necessary to mobilize all wise and practical people in the quest to finally outbalance causes of war. It is... a necessary condition of humankind survival, because: ‘Architectonics of contemporary world, driven economically, politically, legally, ideologically, and in every other socio-cultural sense, postulates an idea of peace and peace as *conditio sine qua non*, not only in its own sense, but as its own perspective and in accordance with its cultural and historical powers”<sup>53</sup>. Nothing needs to be added here, except that this is a step towards the Utopia of peace, dreaming about places that do not exist, and in which it is possible to completely transcend all causes of war and warfare in human history, human nature and his community – this is truly only a human dream and social Utopia. To transcend drastic, extreme and unsustainable manifestations of human evil, inequality and mindlessness is quite a different goal, achievable for people. We can say about peace what Wolfgang Goethe said about people: “Treat people as they are what they are supposed to be, and you will help them become what they can be”. We shall add that also the culture of peace, along or besides philosophy and education about peace, essentially means an ethical approach to life<sup>54</sup>. We do not help peace by writing poems about it. We have to patiently and persistently work on strengthening those social powers and global peace organizations, mostly the United Nations, in order to achieve peace. An example of such peacebuilding: “is represented by a huge social experiment in which western models of social, economic and political organization are being applied on war-torn states, or those in which war just ended”<sup>55</sup>. However, Dragana Dulić highlights that: “state of peace must be differentiated from technics used to merely avoid conflicts or use non-violent ways to manage or shorten them.” Theoretical founda-

---

nations. Sanskrit word *shanty* signified not only peace, but also spiritual fulfillment, integration of internal and external human life, just like the Chinese word *ping*, which signifies harmony and adjustment, realization of unity of differences (this can be compared with the ancient understanding of integration of what seem to be opposed elements, represented by the classical principles of Yin and Yang). Russian word *mir* means both peace and world, accentuating the notion that only world peace would be a complete and fundamentally whole peace.” David P. Barash, *Introduction to Peace Studies* (Wadsworth, 1991) 5-28.

<sup>53</sup> Бубања, (62) 7.

<sup>54</sup> Дулић, Ромчевић, (п 8) 71.

<sup>55</sup> Paris Roland, ‘Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism’ (1997) *International Security*, (22) 54.

tion of peacebuilding is important too, but also practical actions and persistent endeavors of peace activists and peacemakers, as well as action of peace organizations, which build, fortify and nurture peace. Peace is the most precious gift to which people must pay the greatest attention and devote their best abilities.

Peace is so important for every political and human community that, accordingly, all social and political sciences have contributed to understanding peace: "Peace can be defined as a state of positive, cooperative, constructive and non-violent relations between people... nations and social groups, layers and classes and between individuals. Peace is more than just the absence of conflict or violence, it is a necessary condition and... prerequisite for preservation of... positive values, processes, relations, institutions such are: understanding, tolerance, cooperation, friendship, development, democracy, rule of law, social state. Peace has been for humans, from the dawn of men, one of the most precious values, because... war meant suffering, death, and sometimes, even disappearance of an entire society or nation"<sup>56</sup>. In another, a bit different, understanding of peace, peace is recognized primarily as a state of non-violence between various social actors: "A state in state-relations without coercion. Resolution of conflicts and quarrels... is achieved in a non-coercive manner. In a broader, metaphorical, meaning peace is the absence of severe conflicts and violent behavior in society... Peace has been negatively defined for a long time, as the absence of war... It wasn't before the mid XX century that peace, unlike conflict and war, became the object of a wider and deeper study, and a new separate scientific discipline was created... International and national research of peace brought together politicologists, legalists, sociologists, historians, psychologists, but also natural scientists. Besides attempting to shed some light on causes of war, to explore all the ways to resolve conflict, etc. study of peace also focused of searching for a positive content of the notion of peace"<sup>57</sup>. These peace definitions indicate that there is the firm cornerstone in understanding peace, but that every science and scientific discipline particularly emphasizes one of many veils of the mystery of peace; this is the level of complexity, dynamism, and mysteriousness of peace, as well as its pair war – they are as mysterious as life itself. It is also highlighted that study of peace is still in its infancy, just like all those young sciences and scientific disciplines that tend to study peace in a positive way, not only as the state without violence and war. What goes in favor of peace studying sciences is the understanding formulated by the excellent Quincy Wright, who said that: "the opinion that war is not good is more widespread in XX century than ever before in history. Far from it that war is generally accepted as an instrument of state's policy condemned only by the few; in modern period war is starting to be recognized as a problem." We sincerely hope that our XXI century will continue as Wright optimistically predicted, and that values and imperative global need for peace and peaceful coexistence among people and nations will be even more powerfully affirmed.

It must be known that peace, in itself, harbors perils and contradictions of life logic, primarily the lack of motion, constant competition, rise and redistribution of human strengths and social powers. To a great extent, peace reminds people of a state of ended struggle and improvement, dangerous statics resembling petrified life or a state of death vestibule,

<sup>56</sup> *Енциклопедија политичке културе* (Савремена администрација, 1993) 668.

<sup>57</sup> *Социолошки лексикон* (Савремена администрација, 1982) 368.

religious grasp of paradise as a state of absolute harmony and non-eventfulness. Dynamics of peace is rarely displayed because we do not recognize this dynamics in the architecture of peace, represented as an oasis of happiness and idyllic non-eventfulness. Harbor of peace is all too boring, monotonous, droning, stiff and tedious for those who can see it or who live in it, making it uninteresting for exploration, life and intellectual understanding. If the world was in the idyllic utopian peace, non-eventfulness and utter harmony, people would get bored<sup>58</sup>, which would make them settle for the existing, and to give up on courageous adventures and desired land of Utopia because satisfaction with peace and non-eventfulness leads to degradation and arrears due to the lack of the other side of life – pain, misfortunes, suffering, troubles and injustices, which strengthen and encourage men and human community to make new efforts, to accept important challenges and cosmic endeavors. Of course, we know that our world is miles away from the state of boring and stiff peace. However, it is necessary to have in mind the other side of social peace and human inaction, when considering peace. If we speak of peace as a social process in which drastic social and human inequalities and dangerous differences are broken, then we must completely agree with the desired and coveted state of peace.

Peace<sup>59</sup> has always been human aspiration, his dream and desire; particularly on a global scale, it gained importance and actuality after two global cataclysms in the form of world wars that claimed lives of tens of millions of people, and that questioned all optimistic images and visions of History. In the beginning, peace was possible only in territories of empires, and one of the most important empires the world has ever seen, the Roman Empire, even bore the name of peace (Pax Romana). Since it was the peace of slavery, no philanthropist can support such peace and such a social order. Since after two world wars the entire planet was strictly divided in order to protect peace, or at least in order to attempt to protect it, global organizations were formed, the most important one being the League of Nations and United Nations<sup>60</sup>; their principal task was to protect

---

<sup>58</sup> What all living beings are interested in: "... and what keeps them moving is their aspiration to exist. But, if their existence is secured, they are unable to start anything: therefore, the other thing moving them, aspiration to liberate themselves from the burden of existence, to make it insensible, to 'kill time', or to escape boredom." Теодор Адорно, *Minima moralia, Рефлексије из оштећеног живота*, (Веселин Маслеша, 1987)

<sup>59</sup> "Peace belongs to a Pleiad of great ideas such are justice, freedom, humanism, solidarity, progress. Its supremacy is reflected in the fact that it defends the mentioned values from disappearance and depreciation... Peace defends man from the apocalypse in a demonic, destructive sense. Today, when man can eliminate life from the planet, peace is an opportunity for the planet to keep people on it" Бубања (n 62) 5.

<sup>60</sup> "A complex, difficult and almost unsolvable world problems and terrible challenges of today can be overcome through unanimous action of nations, cooperation beyond national confines and century-old borders, because humanity now surely is on a new Noah's ark. Unfortunately, the United Nations are less and less in control of this biblical vessel of salvation. Contemporary world is left without much choice faced with horrible global concerns, and we can only hope that humanity, educated by our own costly mistakes, devastation and evil, wars, threat of nuclear cataclysm and power of globalization, is finally beginning to understand that it is one ship in the ocean of Existence, one destiny and one hope. Our era's challenges require a decisive, just and efficient global organization, wisdom of world leaders, good will of the powerful and negotiating talent of masters, implementation of fruitful solutions under the vaults of the global house of peace and hope for all nations of the world. Earth is too precious of a place for life of all of its inhabitants for individuals, powerful elite or great powers to toy with survival of the only world us humans have. People of Earth do not have another Planet to go to and rest from worries of this world, nor an organization that could successfully replace the UN, with all its infirmities, imperfections and weaknesses." Илија Кајтез, 'ОУН – огледало несавршеног света' (Магазин Одбрана, November, 1<sup>st</sup> 2005) 54.

peace. Still, Galtung's wise conclusions and recommendations must not be lost sight of, that if peace movements are to expand and to become at least as influential as the anti-colonial movement and abolitionism, because to be anti-war is a morally right position, but the issues of alternatives of war and conditions for abolishing war will not solve itself. Serious efforts must be invested in solving them. Hence, without man and his decisive strength, commitment and readiness to sacrifice himself for his ideals, goals and ideas it is impossible to do anything in social reality and human communities because peace, as Gandhi, global synonym of political non-violence, said – requires “action of the brave”. Peace seeks its fighters and people of the outmost commitment – they are apostles of peace because world of violence, war and inequality will not go down without a fight. Logic of the existing world is logic of struggle and competition, not Kant's perpetual peace. The future of the world is opened both to peace and war. Creative role of people is irreplaceable as world faces future days of fear and hope.

It has to be known and always kept in mind that there is no true reconstruction of human beings, no moral, spiritual, economic, or intellectual change without rethinking, redirecting of human beings, as a human effort, according to Solzhenitsyn, to self-limit, to self-restrain, to educate, internal, one's own will, one's own freedom. It is the basic question of life's philosophy essence: the question of reconstruction of human spirit, human body, human society and community. World peace is primarily a question of humanity's health, genuine human solidarity, true love and deepest philanthropy. Human peace in global community surely leads to restraint of all things instinctive, corporal and fallen in a man; it builds harmony and order in a man, his soul and human community.

### *Bibliography*

[1] Ilija Kajtez, *Wisdom and Sword, Volume I, Ancient and Medieval Philosophers on the Secrets of War and Peace*, Lambert Academic Publishing, Germany, 2016.

[2] Rajt Mils, *Socioloska imaginacija*, Vuk Karadzic, Beograd quoted in Мирослав Печулић, *Методологија друштвених наука*, Савремена администрација, Београд, 1982.

[3] Лав Николајевич Толстој, *Пут у живот, II*, Златна књига, Лесковац, 2009. (орг. Лев Николаевич Толстой, *Путь жизни*)

[4] Johan Galtung, *Peace by Peaceful and Civilization*, International Peace Research Institute Oslo&SAGE Publications, London 1996.

[5] Драгана Дулић, Бранко Ромчевић, *Етика рата, хрестоматија*, Факултет безбедности, Београд, 2010.

[6] Michael Howard, *The Causes of War and Other Essays* Cambridge, Mas.: Harvard University Press, 1983.

[7] Јован Бабић, *Етика рата и „Теорија праведног рата“* (footnote 72), <http://www.rastko.rs/rastko/delo/15243>, 20/11/2017.

[8] Pinchas, Lapide, *The Sermon on the Mount: Utopia, program for Action?* Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1986.

[9] Ishida Takeshi, 'Beyond the Traditional Concepts of Peace in Diferent Cultures', *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 6, No 2, 1969.

[10] Johan Galtung, 'Violence, Peace and Peace Research' (1969) *Journal of Peace Research*, vol 6, No 3, 1969.

- [11] I. Illich, *Право на заједништво*, Печат, Београд, 1985.
- [12] Илија Пријић, Славко Пријић, 'Етика и рат', Социолошки преглед, Београд, 1992.
- [13] Thomas Hobbes, *Levijatan*, Naklada Jesenski i Turk, Zagreb, 2004.
- [14] Ilija Kajtez, *Wisdom and Sword, Volume II, Philosophers of the New Age, the Riddles of War and Peace*, Lambert Academic Publishing, Germany, 2017.
- [15] G.W.F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, Batoche Books, Kitchener, 2001.
- [16] Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1976.
- [17] Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*, Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis/Cambridge, 2008.
- [18] Радомир Милашиновић, Срђан Милашиновић, *Основи теорије конфликта*, Факултет безбедности Београд, 2007.
- [19] Јован Бабић, *Морал и наше време*, Службени гласник, Београд, 2005.
- [20] Епиктет, *Обрасци воље и среће, Стоички требник*, Слободна књига, Београд, 2001.
- [21] *An Agenda for Peace, Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping*, Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January 1992; A/47/277-S/24111, 17 June 1992.
- [22] Plato, *Collected Dialogues*, Bollingen Series LXXI, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1961.
- [23] *Светска енциклопедија мира*, Том I, Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, Београд, 1998. (org. World Encyclopedia of peace, Volume I, Pergamon Press, Oxford – New York – Beijing – Frankfurt – Sao Paulo – Sydney – Tokyo – Toronto, 1986.)
- [24] Имануел Кант 'Вечни мир', Данило Баста(ed) *Ум и слобода, Списи из филозофије историје, права и државе*, Идеје, Београд, 1974.
- [25] Драган Р. Симић, 'Лабудови иза хоризонта', Магазин Одбрана Београд, 15. фебруар. 2013.
- [26] *Hague Agenda for Peace & Justice for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, <http://www.vmppeace.org./pages/hague-agenda-for-peace.htm>
- [27] Павле Б. Бубања, *Философија мира*, "25. Мај", Крушевац, 1987.
- [28] David P. Barash, *Introduction to Peace Studies*, Wadsworth, 1991.
- [29] Paris Roland, 'Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism' (1997) *International Security*, No, 22.
- [30] *Енциклопедија политичке културе* (Савремена администрација, Београд, 1993.
- [31] *Социолошки лексикон* (Савремена администрација, Београд, 1982.
- [32] Теодор Адорно, *Minima moralia, Рефлексије из оштећеног живота*, Веселин Маслеша, Сарајево, 1987.
- [33] Илија Кајтез, 'ОУН-огледало несавршеног света' Магазин Одбрана, 1. новембар, Београд, 2005.