DISCUSSION

How Resistance Can Save Peace Studies

Richard Jackson

The National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Otago, New Zealand

Abstract

For the most part, peace studies has assumed that violent conflict and injustice require 'peace,' 'conflict management,' and forms of liberal interventionism from external actors. The consequence of this unquestioned assumption has been to prioritise external actors, top-down processes, governance and conflict mitigation – often at the expense of social justice and local actors. A shift in analytical focus, terminology and epistemology towards the theory and practice of 'resistance' has the potential to re-focus the field on local agency and priorities, local and everyday forms of peace, the role of power dynamics in conflict and peace, structural violence, solidarity, anti-violence and social justice. Generating such an epistemic and practice shift will be challenging, as it will entail de-privileging the field's position, empowering the other, abandoning Eurocentrism and putting immanent critique, radical activism and other-led research methodologies at the centre of its practices. A number of key dangers will have to be avoided along the way, including co-option into system-maintenance, the lure of violent resistance, pushback from liberal sensibility, the loss of access to powerful actors, the fragmentation of the peace studies field, and potential marginalisation in the neoliberal academy. However, on balance, I argue that the shift towards resistance has the potential to save peace studies by recovering its radical critique of violent global structures and practices, and its normative commitment to emancipation.

Introduction

Although this article is addressed largely to those critically-oriented peace researchers 'who have been searching for intellectual roots and whose work reflects a continuing struggle to develop a radical alternative in international relations and peace research' (Reid and Yanarella 1976: 317; see also Schmid 1968), I hope that it can also be of use in provoking deeper and more widespread debate about important issues relating to the underlying purpose and approach of the peace studies field as a whole. As such, it is designed to be deliberately provocative and somewhat polemical, and response and commentary is warmly welcomed. At the very least, the article is a reaction to Patomaki's (2001: 724) assertion more than a decade ago that 'there is a constant need to reflect upon the grounds, meaning and methodology' of peace research. Compared to other fields, broad, critical self-reflections on the state of the field are fairly few and far between within peace studies. Perhaps a little more harshly, Jutila, Pehkonen and Vayrynen have provocatively written about the 'corpse of Peace Research' which, they argue, requires 'a dose of critical theorising as a therapy for a body which, according to our diagnosis, has no pulse' (2008: 623). They are suggesting, I believe, that there is an urgent need for new kinds of critical theorising to revitalise a field which is arguably trapped, at least in many of its core activities and approaches,[1] in a stagnant, system-maintaining/status quo/pacification/stabilisation orientation. For example, while other fields have embraced the present historic moment of global and locally-based resistance, a great many

1 There are a growing number of openly critical peace scholars, and peace-oriented scholars on the edge of the orthodox peace studies field, who both identify as peace scholars and who also take an openly critical approach to common understandings of the subject. The criticisms of the field contained in this article are primarily directed at the orthodox peace studies field who dominate the textbook market, the primary peace studies journals, and who have the largest peace studies programmes at major universities. They are not aimed at individual scholars, in any case, but are intended to generate productive debate.

mainstream peace studies scholars are conspicuous by their absence[2] and appear content to continue quietly working away on helping conflicting parties to communicate better and learn to understand each other's point of view, or supporting peacebuilding activities which might be more accurately described as counterinsurgency (See Turner 2015) or stabilisation activities.

The main argument of this article is that, broadly speaking, it seems fair to characterise peace studies as resting on an underlying assumption that intense forms of violent and nonviolent conflict, cases of structural injustice and oppression, and social turmoil requires some kind of dialogue-based 'peace process' between the parties, a form of 'conflict management' by external parties, or forms of liberal interventionism by international actors in order to return these societies to a condition of order, stability and long-term 'peace' (most often defined in liberal terms)(see Richmond 2008). The direct consequences of this assumption have been, among others, to prioritise the role of external actors in top-down conflict intervention processes, good governance-based programmes, conflict mitigation, pacification/ stabilisation, dialogue and negotiation, liberal peacebuilding, and the like, in research and practice.

My argument, following those of earlier critical peace scholars (see Schmid 1968, eg), is that this broad orientation has de-valued and de-centred the crucial *positive* role of conflict, the need for a greater focus on structural and cultural violence over direct violence, the centrality and agency of local actors and values, social justice, revolution, self-determination, emancipation and other system-transforming values and vocabularies of knowledge and practice. As a result, in many respects, peace studies has functioned as a conflict-

[2] This criticism does not apply to the growing group of scholars dedicated to documenting and better understanding nonviolent movements, although there is an urgent need to critically assess whether this body of research is normatively motivated by social justice, or whether in its desire to maintain social scientific objectivity it continues to function in a system-maintenance, problem-solving way to, for example, furnish the authorities with greater knowledge for the purposes of deterring, preventing, suppressing or punishing nonviolent resistance movements which challenge the status quo.

suppressing, system-maintaining field which largely treats conflict as a 'problem' to be solved, and which is ultimately oriented towards maintaining the current global and domestic status quo – albeit with a limited number of relatively minor 'reforms' within a broader liberal system.

In response, my modest proposal is that the field needs to adopt the ontology, epistemology, pedagogy, terminology and values of 'resistance'[3] as a kind of theoretical shot in the arm to turn it away from its problem-solving, status quo, pacification/system maintenance orientation. I suggest that adopting 'resistance' will bring back into focus a number of important values and concepts, and provide the analytical tools necessary for kinds of conflict analysis which takes seriously the role of inequality, power, domination, oppression and historical-materialist conditions of economic and social organisation in generating intense class and sectional conflict and structural violence. It will also re-focus attention on power asymmetries, the much-greater lethality and destruction of structural and cultural violence, the key concept of justice, the necessity of abandoning the morally dubious but dominant approach to neutrality in conflict management, the importance and role of (nonviolent) resistance in achieving social justice and local peace, and the key issue of pacifism and anti-violence, among others.

This is not to say that embracing the theory and practice of 'resistance' is without risk or danger, or that it is the only solution to the problems of the field. A number of challenges will have to be carefully negotiated, including the twin temptations to either embrace violent revolutionary action or to reject the idea of 'resistance' outright because of its connotations with violent activities. However, at this juncture, turning to 'resistance' and accompanying conceptions of 'emancipation' could help to save the field from its current epistemic malaise and system-collaborator function. In the following section, I briefly discuss some of the main problems with the current state of peace studies in relation to the issues raised in this introduction. This is followed by an overview of my modest proposal to introduce the theory and practice

[3] See the Resistance Studies Mission Statement available online at: http://resistancestudies.org/?page_id=24

of resistance to peace studies. Following this, I have a short discussion of some of the key dangers and challenges to be avoided in this process of epistemic and praxiological transformation. The article concludes with some discussion of how we might practically take this proposal forward in the near future.

The Problem with Peace Studies

This broad assessment of some of the field's main problems as they relate to the question of resistance derives from my own research review in writing an introductory conflict resolution textbook (see Bercovitch and Jackson 2009), an initial although admittedly unsystematic survey of a number of popular peace studies handbooks and textbooks,[4] a similarly unsystematic survey of some of the core journals in the field, broad personal observations of many peace studies panels, seminars and lectures over the past few years, and a number of published papers which also attempt to make an assessment of the broader field and its current characteristics (see Schmid 1968; Krippendorff 1973; Reid and Yanarella 1976; Neufeld 1993; Patomaki 2001; Julita, Pehkonen and Vayrynen 2008). The assessment I make here summarises some of the more wide-ranging criticisms of the field I have provided elsewhere (see Jackson 2015a). Importantly, my characterisation of the field is not meant to imply that peace research is either monolithic or excessively dominated by a completely hegemonic, status quo-oriented, 'orthodox' approach. What has sometimes been called 'radical peace theory' (Neufeld 1993: 176) has been a small but notable part of the field since its very beginning. The field is also fairly diverse in other ways and has its share of critical voices, rebels, factions and internal disputes. Crucially, this assessment also does not imply a 'bad faith' model in which individual scholars are to blame for deliberately choosing a system maintenance orientation, or deliberately adopting a problem-solving, pacification, or stabilisation approach. Rather, I am simply attempting to paint in broad brush strokes some of the issues which beset the field when viewed from the perspective of

[4] The peace studies/conflict resolution textbooks I examined included: Barash and Webel 2009; Bercovitch, Kremenyuk and Zartman 2009; Deutsch, Coleman and Marcus 2006; Jeong 2006; Webel and Galtung 2007; Wallensteen 2012.

how academic fields function within society, and the ideological role they acquire in relation to power-knowledge structures.

Taking such a perspective, one of the most serious problems is that the field appears to have largely bought into a 'problem-solving' orientation[5] which broadly accepts the present international and domestic status quo (viewing it as the best of a set of other immanently possible but normatively inferior alternatives), and which therefore aims to 'solve' the problems of conflict, political violence and disorder because they appear to challenge the imperfect but nonetheless tolerable status quo.[6] In the context of peacebuilding efforts in Palestine, for example, Turner argues that 'there is a deep structural symbiosis in the philosophy and methods of counterinsurgency and peacebuilding that lie in securing the population against unrest through the implementation of governance, development and security strategies that instil acquiescence and ensure control' (Turner 2015: 97). Or, as Schmid puts it, '*Conflict in peace research is something to be "solved"*. No peace researcher has, as far as I know, studied how to sharpen conflict relations' (Schmid 1968: 228; original emphasis). Schmid goes further to suggest that such a stability and order-oriented approach 'is a biased view not scientifically warranted' (Ibid), because, he argues, conflict is a necessary pre-requisite for the kind of revolutionary systemic change required to end structural and cultural violence and move towards a condition of positive peace and social justice.

From this perspective, the antipathy of the field towards the expression of intense social conflict, and the constant efforts (including in its primary discourse and theoretical concepts) to manage or resolve conflict, is an ideologically tainted (if unconscious) orientation towards

---

[5] The notion of 'problem-solving' as employed in this paper should not be confused with the Problem-Solving Workshop approach of the field. It refers rather to Robert Cox's (1981) distinction between problem-solving and critical theory forms of social science.

[6] At the same time, forms of violence and militarism which do not challenge the status quo but rather restore or reinforce the status quo, such as humanitarian interventions, peace enforcement operations, Security Sector Reform activities, and the like, appear to have unquestioned support from large sections of the peace studies field.

the pacification and stabilisation of the current system. It could in fact, be argued (if we are to take Schmid's contention seriously), that peace studies has a mandate to try and sharpen and intensify conflict in many cases, in order to transform the unjust, violence-generating structures of the current system. Obviously, as I argue in this article, this would entail a re-focus and re-engagement with the theory and practice of resistance.

In other words, the problem-solving approach, far from being value-free social science, is (intentionally or unintentionally) value-laden in favour of the status quo with its inherent structures of power, domination, suppression and oppression. Moreover, it constructs a disciplinary discourse with narrow boundaries of appropriate debate, discussion and research, and an accompanying set of silences and subjugated knowledges. For example, in the conflict analysis section of the field, there is an excessive focus on endogenous conflict generating factors – including social-psychological factors at the group and individual levels, and domestic factors at the state level – rather than exogenous factors such as external interference by Western powers, the economic conditions imposed by the Western-imposed neoliberal global economy, imperialism, militarism, the arms trade, and the like. Whether this is the result of the methodological limitations of positivist, especially quantitative studies (see the discussion below), or simply bias against studies which would implicate Western foreign policies and consumption patterns, the effect is to narrow the parameters of research and practice.

Certainly, unlike resistance studies[7] and critical international political economy (CIPE), peace studies appears to have played, with only a few notable exceptions, little or no role in the recent Occupy Movement or the anti-globalisation movement before it – as a part of research and practice against the oppressive and conflict-generating effects of neoliberal capitalism. Instead, scholars in the field can most often be found working side-by-side with officials in development programmes based on neoliberal economic models, or in activities

[7] See the Resistance Studies Network organized out of the School of Global Studies at the University of Gothenburg (http://resistancestudies.org/?page_id=26).

which mostly ignore the roots of structural violence in peoples' lives and simply seek to alleviate some of the symptoms of historical-materialist oppression.

In part, this broader problem-solving orientation of the field is directly related to the dominance of the positivist social scientific paradigm. Assessing the state of research presented in the field's premier journals – the *Journal of Peace Research* and the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* – Julita, Pehkonen, and Vayrynen argue that:

A large part of the disciplinary body as presented in the major journals has remained in a state of stagnation where 'normal science' prevails without any willingness to analyse the foundational categories, the researcher's own positions in relation to these categories, and the social and political practices PR discourses produce and participate in. (2008: 639).

Within this paradigm, research questions and research design tend to proceed on the narrowly determined basis of positivist ontology and epistemology, and in a power-knowledge arrangement in which the positivist method appears to be the sole bearer of 'scientific' legitimacy. Understandable as an initial attempt to generate legitimacy in direct relation to the parent field of IR and to policy-makers, and considering the origins of the field in Europe and North America, this condition nonetheless has resulted in a general failure to reflect on foundational categories and the broader discursive practices that the field is caught up in – and indeed, any of the other meta-theoretical issues raised by the so-called 'critical turn' in the social sciences, including the relationship between knowledge and power and the normative ends of social science.

Moreover, part and parcel of problem-solving, and similar to other fields such as terrorism studies, peace studies is beset by the so-called 'fetishization of parts' problem (Wyn Jones, 1999; see also Toros and Gunning 2009). This concerns the tendency to study political conflict and violence separately from the social movements, state structures, political conflicts, culture, history, contexts, and international relations within which it occurs. This problem is, in turn, partly a consequence of other weaknesses, including the broader absence of engagement with social theory, fairly rigid disciplinary boundaries and the lack of theoretical cross-fertilisation, and the positivist

methodological orthodoxy noted above. At the very least, the requirement of defining, isolating and measuring precise 'variables' for statistical research into 'causal mechanisms' necessitates isolating research subjects from their broader context, culture, history and historical-materialist conditions.

This is perhaps part of the explanation, in my view, for why peace studies lacks a theoretically and empirically developed explanation of power, domination, oppression and mostly importantly for this article, resistance. Most glaringly, it lacks a critique of how capitalism as a system generates direct, cultural and structural violence,[8] and how the state is the principle institution of capitalist structural violence, and indeed, the principle cause of direct violence over the past few hundred years. As Rummel (1994) demonstrated some time ago, modern states have been responsible for the deaths of 170-200 million people over the past century, *not including* wars they have also engaged in which have killed a similar number. Meanwhile, the state-regulated and supported global capitalist system generates 30,000 – 40,000 preventable deaths from poverty-related causes every day, while cultural and structural violence causes hundreds of thousands of deaths per year from domestic violence, suicide, crime, work-related accidents and the like. In the 1970s, some peace researchers controversially estimated that structural violence resulted in 18 million annual deaths.[9]

Regardless of the veracity of this figure, there is little doubt that entire regions of the world, as well as geographical areas within developed states, experience long-standing generational poverty which is implicated in a plethora of social ills (Wilkinson and Pickett 2009), and at present, wealth inequality is at unprecedented levels and threatens to unleash deep economic crisis, mass instability and violent conflict. This simple empirical observation would suggest that a major critique of the neoliberal state, and a questioning of its ability to generate positive peace, would be in order for any scholars interested in making the world less violent and more peaceful.

---

[8] For such critiques within Security Studies and IR, see Roberts 2007, Leech 2012.

[9] This figure is discussed in Gleditsch, Nordkvelle, and Strand 2014: 149.

However, no reader will discern the role of the state, neoliberal capitalism or inequality in the production of mass violence and death from the popular peace studies textbooks or handbooks, or through reading its central journals. Instead, peace studies has a well-established set of micro- and meso-level explanations which appear to locate the primary causes of violent conflict within human individual or group behaviour (such as the widely employed social identity theory), or in domestic structures internal to specific states and groups (such as poverty, lack of democracy or ethnic divisions) (see Gleditsch, Nordkvelle, and Strand 2014). At the very least, the 'fetishization of parts' problem limits and distorts our understanding of conflict, violence and peace, and provides a poor basis for future research. At its worst, it provides legitimation for remedial policies which only deal with the symptoms of different forms of violence, and may, in fact, function to reinforce the systemic basis of the violence.

Similarly, the dominance of 'normal science' has resulted in a certain lack of direct engagement with the primary subjects of peace studies, namely, the people, usually oppressed subaltern human beings who are the victims of systemic structural, cultural and direct violence. This is not meant to discount the fieldwork or social psychological experiments which make up a great deal of peace studies research. Rather, it is to suggest that much more quantitative and experimental research occurs in peace studies, as judged by research published in the leading journals, than in-depth, contextualised, face-to-face ethnographic research in which the subjects are allowed to speak for themselves or participate directly in the construction of the research process itself. Importantly, the increasing emphasis of 'the local' – what some have referred to as 'the local turn' (Mac Ginty and Richmond 2013) – is starting to noticeably change this aspect of the field.

However, it nonetheless remains a problem that the field is largely characterised by Western or Western-educated scholars studying non-Western 'others' with social scientific methods (and subsequent policy recommendations) that often preclude the voice of the 'other'

being heard during the research process.[10] This missing 'subaltern view of peace' (Mac Ginty and Richmond 2013: 764), and the problem-solving and stability and control orientation of the field, probably helps to explain why there are so few peace studies centres located in the Global South (Schmid 1968: 221), despite the fact that this is where much of the conflict and peace activity being studied is located.

Another criticism of the peace studies field can be termed the 'embedded experts' or 'organic intellectuals' problem, whereby influential scholars have close ties to power holders, work directly on behalf of state or intergovernmental organisations and constitute a kind of epistemic community directly linked to state or intergovernmental power.[11] Such networks are arguably maintained through the operation of fairly closed, self-referential systems of knowledge production which frequently functions to exclude scholars with critical or counter-hegemonic views,[12] and subjugate alternative forms of knowledge. But it is also a function of the dominance of state-centric, problem-solving perspectives among many scholars in the field, particularly those with a background in governmental service[13] or from a positivist research tradition. It results in the kind of narrowing

---

[10] This problem has been thoroughly problematized by critically oriented scholars in relation to liberal peacebuilding, such as Roger Mac Ginty, Oliver Richmond, Michael Pugh, David Chandler, Jenny Peterson, Mandy Turner and others. These scholars are representative of the 'critical turn' which is gathering pace in peace studies, although it is largely confined to the United Kingdom and parts of North America.

[11] In relation to the same problem within terrorism studies, see Burnett and Whyte 2005.

[12] Reid (1993) has demonstrated how this functions within the terrorism studies field. More research is required to confirm and analyse it within the peace studies field.

[13] Some of the most influential peace studies scholars in the United States, for example, are former employees of the US government, and there are a number of well-known conflict resolution university programmes based in Washington that primarily serve the State Department and other government institutions.

of research and debate I have already noted, as well as providing a legitimation function for state policies directed at stabilisation, conflict mitigation, humanitarian intervention and liberal peacebuilding. In particular, a deleterious consequence of this kind of frequently unhealthy relationship is the prioritisation of research topics tailored to the demands of policy-makers for practically useful knowledge during stabilisation, counterinsurgency or post-conflict peacebuilding operations.

The reality is that a great many peace studies institutes, centres and scholars are closely linked to states and international organisations through peacebuilding programmes, policies and training programmes, or through consultancies, and they receive large amounts of funding from official sources. Arguably, they are part of a wider epistemic community which functions on the basis of a consensual definition of the 'problem' of conflict and violence, and a commonly agreed set of remedial policies. In other words, it can be reasonably argued that peace studies frequently functions as a form of ideology – in the way it works to maintain hegemonic stability, sustain dominant economic relationships, and promote certain kinds of material and class interests. Schmid's assessment remains pertinent today: 'peace research has adopted a system perspective and a value orientation which is identical with those of the existing international institutions and lies very close to those of the rich and powerful nations' (1968:221). Hansen concurs, suggesting that 'conflict resolution could potentially be seen as a tool of "the establishment" in attempting to pacify conflicting parties, potentially undermining the attempts of marginalized populations in attaining social justice' (2008:410).

As a consequence, a great deal of contemporary peace studies research is explicitly tailored to policy demands and interests, or at least, towards the provision of policy advice, either to Western states, international organisations or Western INGOs and their donors – such as, for example, the large literatures within peace studies on security sector reform (SSR), negotiations, third party intervention, peacebuilding, and dealing with spoilers, among others. On the other hand, very little research is oriented towards providing advice to local non-state actors, groups and movements seeking to resist state oppression or overcome the structural and cultural violence imposed by states and international institutions. In fact, there is research within the

field which is aimed at overcoming or subsuming local resistance to peacebuilding (see Galvanek 2013), and dealing with so-called 'spoilers' who refuse to participate in internationally-sanctioned peace processes. From this perspective, there is little doubt that peace studies is a largely state-centric field which performs a legitimising function to much Western and official conflict intervention.

This is not to suggest that policy relevance or official funding ought to be completely abandoned or eschewed in favour of solidarity with local resistance movements, or that peace studies ought never to legitimise official programmes and policies. Rather, it is to reflect on the dangers of being seduced by proximity and access to power, and the impact this can have on research and practice. It is also to highlight the deep structure of the field and its institutional bias towards official actors – arguably, its bourgeois character – and the simultaneous failure to orient its research and praxis towards the oppressed, the disenfranchised, and the downtrodden subaltern.

In sum, there are a number of important reasons for believing that as a field of research, teaching and practice, peace studies is in great need of some critical theorising in order to revitalise its original promise as a revolutionary vehicle of social progress. My simple suggestion is that by adopting the epistemology and values of 'resistance', we can inject some life-giving criticality into the mostly pulse-less body of peace studies.

The Promise of Resistance

Notwithstanding the burgeoning literature on nonviolent movements (see Chenoweth and Stephan 2011; Schock 2013; Chenoweth and Cunningham 2013; Nepstad 2011; Roberts and Ash 2009; Stephen 2009), which as I have noted may or may not be emancipatory in any case, it is safe to say that very few self-identified peace studies scholars have endeavoured to study peace and conflict through the theoretical and conceptual lens of resistance as it has been

studied in other related fields,[14] with its accompanying conceptual vocabulary of power, domination, oppression, subjection, class, direct action, counter-conduct, revolution, justice, emancipation, and the like. This is both cause and consequence of the problems noted in the broader field in the discussion above. Here, I want to suggest that an explicit commitment to adopting the language, ontology, epistemology and praxis of 'resistance'[15] could potentially reinvigorate the critical orientation of the field, enhance its analytical purchase and save it from some of its more debilitating features. Among other possible outcomes, some of the most obvious potential positive benefits would include the following.

First, a refocus on resistance would by necessity entail a serious engagement with the concept and analysis of 'power': its nature, types and forms, how it operates and its disciplinary and constitutive effects on agents. It would, in other words, force the field to develop a strong and explicit theory of power – a theory it arguably lacks at present in relation to both conflict analysis and conflict resolution. In turn, focusing on power would by necessity entail a stronger critical engagement with neoliberal capitalism and historical materialist theories of class and state power. To date, Galtung's (1971) seminal article on imperialism remains one of the few serious attempts by a self-proclaimed peace studies scholar to seriously engage with the broader historical material roots of oppression, structural violence and war.

Second, and directly related to this, a strong engagement with the theory of power (as a corollary to the concept of resistance) would force a more widespread and serious consideration of the central role

---

[14] There are important exceptions, such as Mac Ginty 2011, 2012a, 2012b, Richmond 2011, 2012, Turner 2011, and scholars associated with the Resistance Studies Network organized out of the School of Global Studies at the University of Gothenburg (http://resistancestudies.org/?page_id=26) – among others.

[15] For a useful overview of the academic literature on resistance – its definition, theories, types, and outcomes – see the Resistance Studies Mission Statement available online at: http://resistancestudies.org/?page_id=24. See also Amoore 2005.

of different forms of power in generating (or suppressing) conflict and violence. This would, in turn, bring much-needed clarity and theoretical sophistication to conflict analysis – a section of the peace studies field which is arguably locked into a limiting and theoretically underdeveloped focus on micro- and meso-level processes at the expense of macro-level factors, historical context and broader socio-economic processes. In part, this weakness is a consequence of the narrow positivist, and especially quantitative, focus of much research in this area. For example, while there is a large literature within conflict analysis on the correlates of levels of poverty as measured by GDP per capita, resource scarcity and other quantifiable meso-level variables, with violent conflict (see for example, Collier and Hoeffler 2002; Collier, Hoeffler and Soderbom 2004; Elbadawi and Sambanis 2000; Fearon 2004), there is rarely any accompanying explanation or analysis of the way in which Western dominated neoliberalism, Western-controlled markets and terms of trade, the disciplinary practices of the Western-dominated International Financial Institutions (IFIs), the practices of aid, development and debt, the influence of the cultural ideology of capitalism, class politics, or the nature of modern state-building, among others, constructs and reinforces the country-level poverty which is being correlated with war outbreak.

Directly related to this, the refocusing on resistance and power would bring back the importance of the concept of 'structural violence' to peace studies. As recently noted in a review of the field (Gleditsch, Nordkvelle, and Strand 2014:150), Galtung's original formulations of the linked concepts of structural and cultural violence (see Galtung 1969, 1990) have received little serious empirical or theoretical attention in the intervening years, and are rarely used as an explicit analytical framework within peace research. Instead, the field has almost solely focused on the problem of direct violence, and in most cases, following International Relations, the problem of war (terrorism is now also a growing focus of the field)(see Buhaug, Levy, and Urdal 2014).

It has been suggested that this failure to follow Galtung's theoretical lead is related to the inherent difficulties of studying structural violence in a meaningful manner using quantitative methods in order to uncover causally significant relationships. I would argue that there are other theoretical and conceptual tools for analysing structural and cultural violence, and that the privileging of positivist methods is

part of the ideology of peace studies and its status quo orientation. A refocus on resistance can furnish theoretical and empirical resources – through a focus on class analysis and revolution, for example – for excavating the bases and processes of structural violence and oppression, and the forms of resistance generated by it.

Third, a more theoretically and empirically sophisticated conflict analysis would then have a major impact on the subsequent practices of conflict resolution, particularly in relation to the established conflict resolution norm of third party neutrality. This is simply because 'a neutral stance, without an analysis of power between the parties in conflict, can obfuscate the power differential that exists between parties in conflict and actually undermine the efforts of oppressed people by tacitly or explicitly supporting the prevailing ideology and social order oppressing them' (Hansen 2008:412). The mainstay of third party neutrality, in many conflict contexts, actually functions to reinforce the status quo and unwittingly oppress the very people it purports to serve. This is certainly the case in terms of the Israel-Palestine conflict, a focus of a great many peace studies scholars who nonetheless continue to attempt forms of reconciliation and conflict resolution based on the implicit assumption that Palestinians and Israelis represent two equal parties in a conflict – rather than a situation of colonial dispossession and oppression by one powerful party against a much weaker party who employ a range of resistance strategies.

Related to this, it would also force the field to reconsider its dominant approach to, and treatment of, so-called 'spoilers' in peace processes. Instead, of reflexively viewing certain 'spoiler' groups as either irrational or illiberal actors violently opposed to peace, they would be investigated in order to determine whether they in fact, represent legitimate resistance to what are actually coercive processes driven by outside actors, or represent constituencies or issues which have been marginalised in the peace process. At the very least, the adoption of the theory and practice of resistance would force a reconsideration of the discourse surrounding 'spoilers', particularly to the extent that this discourse functions ideologically as a discursive tool of power and domination.

Fourth, in terms of conflict analysis and conflict intervention practice, a focus on resistance has the potential to re-focus attention

away from high-level elites, public officials and top-down macro-level processes, towards local actors, local agency and more bottom-up, societal processes. On one level, such a refocus has the potential to transform the peace studies 'self' by tempering or even deconstructing the unspoken assumption at the heart of a great deal of peace studies research and practice that 'we', the developed, civilised global north, have a responsibility to resolve the problems – including the destabilising violence – of the underdeveloped, global south. In other words, a focus on resistance, particularly the everyday, hidden resistance (Scott 1985) of ordinary people, has the possibility to temper the Eurocentrism and paternalism which is frequently part and parcel of peace studies by revealing the multiple and ingenious ways in which many ordinary people survive and thrive under immense pressures and constraints. At the same time, it also has the potential to analytically refocus attention on the ordinary, everyday actors who make up the majority of the world's population but whose lives and agency are largely ignored through an analytical focus on elites and armed actors, thereby revealing hidden processes and making research less one-dimensional. Additionally, a focus on local actors has the potential to actually empower them through greater recognition, partnership and collaboration in peace research and practice.

Fifth, the refocus on resistance would entail supplanting and transforming the current implicit (and explicit) values in the field of stability, order, neoliberalism and system maintenance, to a new set of normative values based on social justice, liberation from oppression, fairness, equality, consultation, empowerment and democratic participation – or, what the critical literature often refers to as 'emancipation'. Here, and following Ken Booth, I understand emancipation to mean a process (rather than a preconfigured endpoint) of trying to construct 'concrete utopias' by realising the unfulfilled potential of existing structures, freeing individuals from unnecessary structural constraints and forms of violence which would inhibit their ability to realise their potential for the full enjoyment of being human, and the deep democratisation of politics and the public sphere (see Jackson et al 2009; MacDonald 2009; Alker 2004). Such an emancipatory praxis would have clear and serious implications for the way in which peace studies engages with states, international organisations and other powerful actors, and the way it currently

participates in conflict intervention activities based on neoliberal economic theories, forms of militarism and liberal democratic governance.

Sixth, a focus on resistance (and emancipation) would force the field to confront the key question of physical/military violence – an issue that has not yet received the attention it deserves, with few exceptions (see Jabri 1996; Mantena 2012), if the widespread acceptance of humanitarian intervention, state building, stabilisation, peacekeeping, SSR and the like is anything to go by (see Jackson forthcoming). In fact, there appears to be an obvious ideological bias that operates in the field, whereby state violence is widely accepted as legitimate by definition, whereas all forms of non-state violence are condemned, even when employed in situations of intense political oppression and as a means to liberation, social justice or defence against genocide. This is an indication of the implicit state-centrism of the field and its acceptance of the state as a legitimate institution, despite the state's historical record of violence, death and destruction – and an indication of the unquestioned acceptance of the doctrine of legitimate violence.

For a number of reasons, a refocus on resistance would also necessitate a serious engagement with the nature of violence and what it does (see Arendt 1969) – its disciplinary and constitutive functions, its potential, its limitations as a political instrument, and so on. While the growing literature on nonviolent movements has started to touch on this question insomuch as debates over principled versus pragmatic nonviolence have started to take place, in-depth critical engagement with the ontology of political violence has been rare. This is part of the reason why so many peace studies scholars see no problem in supporting peacekeeping, humanitarian intervention, SSR, stabilisation programmes, and the like. The serious question of whether emancipation can ever be achieved by violent means – given that violence is constitutive of the actors who practice it, that it can never be emancipatory to its victims, and given the ethical incompatibility between violent means and peaceful ends – has not yet been adequately addressed in terms of the field's support for international conflict intervention efforts and processes such as the Responsibility to Protect.

Seventh, a refocusing on resistance, particularly in terms of peace practice, would help to put into effect Schmid's suggestion that the *promotion* of conflict is a necessary means of transforming unjust structures and ending forms of violence. In fact, a refocus on resistance would have the crucial effect of transforming or reinventing what we mean by 'peace' itself, the central concept of the field. In particular, it would entail a serious engagement with the notion of agonistic peace, which Shinko conceives of as 'a particular type of resistant response… characterised by the search for difficult truths'. She suggests that the main aim of the agonistic encounter lies in 'the unmasking of political violence… in order to alter power relations', and that it functions 'as a constant reminder of our own complicity in the perpetuation of structures of domination and moral hierarchy' (Shinko 2008:478-490). In other words, agonistic politics embraces conflict and resistance as a necessary part of dealing with all forms of violence, oppression and injustice, and it takes seriously the under-appreciated issue of power and its effects, as well as the persistence of difference and radical disagreement.

At the very least, a focus on resistance draws attention to the reality that 'peace' is a contested (Richmond 2008), ideologically loaded term, and that there are numerous forms it can take – such as 'hybrid peace', 'local peace', 'everyday peace', and 'post-liberal peace', among others (see Mac Ginty 2010, 2014; Mac Ginty and Richmond 2013; Richmond 2013). Focusing on resistance, including the resistance that local actors often mount to imposed forms of 'liberal peace' administered through international agencies, can help to rid the field of the implicit assumption that there is one kind of morally superior, liberal peace that all other societies ought to adopt and work towards.

Eighth, a refocus on resistance as theory and practice will draw important analytical and practical attention to the ways in which Western states and institutions, including corporations, resist popular pressures to demilitarise, regulate the arms trade, reduce inequality, transform carbon-based energy systems, promote gender equality, eradicate institutional racism, and deal with those systemic aspects which generate conflict and structural violence. It could thus help to refocus the activities of peace studies away from its relentless intervention into the problems and conflicts of the other overseas, and towards the transformation of the conflict and violence-generating

aspects of Western states themselves. That is, it could refocus peace practice from its ubiquitous involvement in the conflicts of global south, most often on the back of neoliberal exploitation and military penetration of those societies, towards the internal transformation of violently interventionist, militaristic, exploitative Western states – a case of dealing with the plank in the self's eye before attempting to take the splinter out of the other's eye.

For example, it is arguable that the most effective action which peace studies scholars from Western countries could take in relation to the oppression of the Palestinians is not to travel to Palestine and lead reconciliation or development activities, but to try and force Western governments through vigorous, direct, nonviolent action to end military and political support for the continued annexation of Palestinian land. Similarly, ending the weapons trade by Western countries would go a long way to preventing and ending violent conflicts in the global south – perhaps even further than the dialogue and development-based activities currently so popular in the field. Instead of field trips to post-conflict global south countries, peace scholars could take their students to an arms trade fair to protest, raise awareness and advocate for arms controls, or to parliament to protest unfair trade practices or military intervention.

A final important effect of re-focusing on the research and practice of resistance would be to transform peace studies pedagogy from its current problem-solving educational orientation towards a kind of 'problem-posing education' in which 'students learn to deconstruct the societal ideology affecting them in their everyday lives, see how it inhibits attainment of their interests, and visualize possible societal changes that could better serve their interests' (Hansen 2008:408). This would necessarily entail providing students with a language and set of conceptual tools for understanding the 'problematics of power, agency, and history' (Macedo 1993:17), and for developing appropriate modes of resistance and emancipatory action in their everyday lives and careers. Such forms of critical pedagogy are inherently praxiological because 'when individuals reach critical consciousness, it allows them to become subjects in their world, actively and consciously co-creating it, rather than passive "objects" who accept their social reality' (Ibid). Crucially, from this vantage point, it also means accepting that 'education is… a subversive force' (Shaull 1993:29), and the goal of

teaching is in part to radicalise the student because 'the more radical the person is, the more fully he or she enters into reality so that, knowing it better, he or she can better transform it' (Freire 1993:39).

Clearly, at the present juncture, such a critical pedagogy is far removed from the current mainstream teaching of peace studies, which is largely focused on abstract theorising, (largely positivist) methodological training, the accumulated empirical findings of the field, inter-personal conflict resolution skills training, professional certification, and the like. Moreover, it is frequently oriented towards skills-based preparation for a career in the official, state-linked aid and development or conflict resolution sectors (see Mac Ginty 2012c; Autesserre 2014), as opposed to the activist-based, social justice oriented arena which a critical pedagogy teaches.

Challenges and Dangers

Generating such an epistemic and practice shift towards resistance, particularly the resistance of the subaltern other, will be immensely challenging to the field, in part because such a move will entail de-privileging the field's position in relation to power, and its current hierarchical relation to the other. In effect, it will entail giving up some power, both material and epistemic, in order to support and empower the other. And it will involve abandoning Eurocentrism, and in a radical transformation of approach, putting immanent critique, radical activism and other-led research methodologies at the centre of its research practices. In this transformation, a number of key dangers will have to be avoided along the way.

In the first instance, the fear of using the terminology of 'resistance', 'revolution', 'revolt', 'class', 'capitalism', 'imperialism' and similar terms which imply conflict, disorder, challenge and explicit normative values will simply have to be overcome. In other words, we must expect that there will be resistance to 'resistance', emanating from a conscious or unconscious liberal sensibility and reinforced by the ideology of positivist social science which insists that it is the role of the scholar to simply study the world objectively, not improve it.

At the same time, it will be important to avoid the co-option of the language of resistance to a liberal agenda, or a tokenistic adoption of its theory and practice which does not touch the core theories and

practices of the field. Salutary lessons can be taken from the way in which 'peacebuilding' has been co-opted by various international actors as a cloak for neoliberal governance, or the way in which the 'sustainable development' and 'human security' agendas have been co-opted by the IFIs and other international agencies and actors since the 1980s. Indeed, Cynthia Weber (2014) has argued that critical IR theory itself has been 'gentrified' over the past few years, a process that peace studies clearly went through long ago. The danger here is that a new focus on resistance, if it fails to radically transform the field, and if scholars do not maintain high levels of critical reflexivity and commitment to the values of resistance, could also gentrify and then become system-validating rather than system transforming. Borrowing from Noam Chomsky, a tokenistic commitment to a kind of largely symbolic, nonthreatening 'resistance' could end up functioning as a way of manufacturing consent for the current system.

Closely related to this, there is a more obvious danger that research on 'resistance' will be monitored and exploited by the authorities to better understand and deal with – through more effective deterrence, diversion or suppression, for example – emerging forms of resistance. It will be necessary to develop a set of transparent research ethics for ensuring that we don't put into the public domain or allow our data to be vulnerable to surveillance when it could be exploited to counter resistance movements and harm activists.

A focus on resistance also risks the lure of employing violence as a resistance strategy, particularly if it is not accompanied by a rigorous critique of violence as a political instrument. The reality is that, accompanied by a sophisticated understanding of violence in all its forms, there is no reason at all why 'resistance' should necessarily entail the use of violence. In part, this fear – that 'resistance' can only really mean violent action, or that empowering resistance is little more than encouraging actors to be violent – is likely one of the reasons why the field has not yet fully embraced the concept. However, this is a narrow and inaccurate understanding of the diverse and broad notion of resistance and the forms it can take, and indeed the empirical record of successful nonviolent resistance, and such misconceptions must be vigorously challenged.

Another risk, as the field re-orients from stabilisation to conflict generation, and from seeking every opportunity to assist the powerful to seeking to assist the oppressed instead, is the certain pushback that will come from the authorities and the social and economic institutions which currently dominate society. As a field, peace studies will need to be ready to be re-labelled as radicals, rebels and dissidents, and viewed as a genuine threat to the current order. This inevitable collision will produce casualties, as the powerful seek to discipline and control radical peace researchers. One major consequence may be the loss of access to the powerful, and the loss of resources from research and practice programmes which the powerful are no longer willing to support.

There is also the risk, as has occurred to some degree in cognate fields such as terrorism studies and security studies, that the peace studies field will bifurcate into two or more divergent camps based on those who see the role of peace studies as to conduct 'value-free' social science directed towards controlling and resolving conflict, versus those who see the role of peace studies as a kind of 'outsider theorising' aimed at generating conflict and resistance as a pathway to transforming oppressive and violence-generating structures. This is the danger of splintering the field. Although there are genuine advantages to a heterogeneous field in which no single form of 'peace' dominates, but in which different conceptions of 'peace' are continually tested and debated, there is also the danger of dissipating energy in internal debates and competition. Efforts to bridge intellectual gaps, continue respectful dialogue, and build coalitions for the purposes of resistance campaigns, must continue to be made between peace scholars of all types.

Finally, there is a danger of marginalisation in the neoliberal academy. As universities are neoliberalised, and more deeply enmeshed in state programmes of homeland security, pacification and system stability, a field which has openly adopted a combative, critical, conflict-generating stance will no doubt find itself under pressure to conform. Unless peace studies scholars can make the case that siding with the oppressed and generating pressure for radically progressive social and political change will benefit all, and is part of the academic remit in any case (as critic and conscience of society, for example), then such a radical turn may have deleterious consequences for its programmes and scholars.

Concluding Remarks

In this article, I have attempted to make the argument that peace studies has a number of quite serious and debilitating problems, particularly in terms of its underlying conservatism and system maintenance orientation. Many of these problems, I have argued, could potentially be resolved if the field embraced the theory and practice of resistance. Specifically, I have tried to suggest that a shift towards resistance has the potential to help the field recover its original radical critique of violent global structures and practices, and its normative commitment to emancipation. However, I have also argued that the positive benefits of embracing resistance are also accompanied by some risks and dangers. Nevertheless, on balance, I believe that the opportunities far outweigh the potential dangers, and the most important question that remains is: how should we go about generating such a radical transformation in the field?

I do not have all the satisfactory answers to this question by any means, but my experience in generating a new kind of 'critical terrorism studies' in the broader field of terrorism studies offers some potential possibilities (see Jackson 2015b). In the first instance, taking this project forward entails provocations and polemical interventions in order to create a widespread debate. In other words, scholarly interventions by way of panels, seminars, conferences, workshops, articles, blogs and taught courses are required to uncover blind spots, open up new questions and make provocative suggestions. In addition, the institutionalisation of new academic structures, such as the launch of the peer-reviewed *Journal of Resistance Studies*, can add credibility and generate new relevant research. The establishment of a Resistance Studies section, working group or network within established peace studies organisations could also promote this function, and should be explored.

Second, critical peace scholars need to adopt the language and theory of resistance and embed it into their research, teaching and practice, and thus help to normalise the concepts as an accepted way of being a peace researcher. Adopting the language of resistance will, in time, be transformative and constitutive of a new subjectivity and kind of scholarship, which will in turn impact upon students and fellow scholars. In particular, the authors of peace studies textbooks and

handbooks need to be encouraged to include chapters or sections on resistance, and journal editors need to invite articles and special issues on the topic. Part of transforming the discourse will also initially entail abandoning those terms and forms of language which reinforce the dominant values and perspectives of the field, This includes popular terms like 'conflict management', 'conflict management', 'conflict settlement', 'spoilers', 'mediator neutrality', and the like. As I have argued, such language reinforces the epistemic orientation of the field towards problem-solving, conflict suppression, stabilisation and system maintenance.

From this perspective, it is also important to recognise that generating epistemic and cultural change within a field of study will not happen by itself; rather, it requires a group of dedicated individuals to actively play the role of 'change agents' or a kind of 'norm entrepreneur', in part by demonstrating new ways of speaking and acting. In part, this article is a call for both senior and emerging peace scholars to take the lead in making these kind of changes.

Third, it will be important for critical peace scholars to not only engage theoretically and academically with resistance, but to seek out opportunities to engage in the everyday *practice* of resistance and to assist actors who are engaged in resistance campaigns, both hidden and public. In other words, notwithstanding the risks involved and taking all due care to protect activists from official intimidation and interference, it will be important to forge connections with the resistance movements and activists and become involved in the ongoing struggles for social justice, arms control, environmental protection, anti-racism and the like, in addition to, or as an alternative to, all the work that peace studies scholars currently do with official actors and organisations.

Finally, it will be important to take the theories and arguments about resistance, structural violence and emancipation out of the academic enclave and into the public sphere. It will not be sufficient to limit efforts to reforming academic practices and altering the theories and research practices of the field; instead, broader social transformation needs to be engendered, which can only be achieved through some kind of 'public intellectual' engagement (see Oslender 2007). This necessarily entails engaging with the mainstream media, social media and other public platforms, and becoming involved in

public activities and debates. It may also entail writing in different ways for audiences outside of the academy, such as fiction writing (see Jackson 2014).

In the end, given the current historical juncture in which the theory and practice of resistance is spreading across the globe, and in which climate change, inequality and militarism are provoking more and more resistance from a plethora of local and international groups and movements, there is no better time than the present to seek to transform our field in the way suggested in this article. If we don't embrace the theory and practice of resistance, we not only risk perpetuating the field's unfortunate function as a gentrified, system-stabilising and maintaining force, but we risk being overtaken and left behind by historical movements and forces which are transforming the global academic and political landscape in any case. Importantly, the growing interest in nonviolent movements within peace studies and IR, albeit from a largely quantitative social scientific perspective, nonetheless provides an intellectual opening for exploring the theory and practice of 'resistance' within the academic context.

Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this article was presented as a paper at the International Studies Association (ISA) 56th Annual Convention, 18-21 February, 2015, New Orleans, United States. I am grateful to the panel discussant, Eric Selbin, my co-panellists, Jenny H. Peterson, Stellan Vinthagen, Jasmin Ramovic, and Anna Selmeczi, and members of the audience for comments and suggestions which have greatly improved the article. Any remaining errors are the sole responsibility of the author.

References

Alker, H., 2004. 'Emancipation in the Critical Security Studies Project', in Booth, K., ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Amoore, L., 2005. The Global Resistance Reader, London: Taylor & Francis.

Arendt, H., 1969. *On Violence*, Orlando: Harcourt Brace.

Autesserre, S., 2014. Peaceland: Conflict Resolution and the Everyday Politics of International Intervention, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barash, D., and Webel, C., 2009. *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 2nd edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bercovitch, J., and Jackson, R., 2009. Conflict Resolution in the Twenty-first Century: Principles, Methods and Approaches, Ann Arbor MI: Michigan University Press.

Bercovitch, J., Kremenyuk, V., and Zartman, I., eds., 2009. *The SAGE Handbook on Conflict Resolution*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Halvard Buhaug, H., Levy, J., and Urdal, H., 2014. '50 years of peace research: An introduction to the Journal of Peace Research anniversary special issue', *Journal of Peace Research*, 51(2): 139-144.

Chenoweth, E., and Cunningham, K., 2013. 'Understanding Nonviolent Resistance: An Introduction', *Journal of Peace Research*, 50(3): 271-76.

Chenoweth, E., and Stephan, M., 2011. Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict, New York: Columbia University Press.

Collier, P., and Hoeffler, A., 2002. 'On the incidence of civil war in Africa', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 46(1): 13-28.

Collier, P., Hoeffler, A., and Soderbom, M., 2004. 'On the duration of civil war', *Journal of Peace Research*, 41(3): 253-273

Cox, R., 1981. 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 10(2): 126-55.

Deutsch, M., Coleman, P., and Marcus, E., eds., 2006. The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice, 2nd edition, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elbadawi, I., and Sambanis, N., 2000. 'Why are there so many civil wars in Africa? Understanding and preventing violent conflict', *Journal of African Economies*, 9(3): 244-269.

Fearon, J., 2004. 'Why do some civil wars last so much longer than others?', *Journal of Peace Research*, 41(3): 275-301.

Freire, P., 1993. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 30th Anniversary Edition, New York: Continuum.

Galtung, J., 1969. 'Violence, Peace, and Peace Research', *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3): 167-191.

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

Galtung, J., 1990. 'Cultural Violence,' *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3): 291-305.

Galvanek, J., 2013. Translating Peacebuilding Rationalities into Practice: Local

Agency and Everyday Resistance, Berghof Foundation, available online at: http://image.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Papers/BF_CORE_Rep_Galvanek.pdf.

Gleditsch, N., Nordkvelle, J., and Strand, H., 2014. 'Peace research – Just the study of war?", *Journal of Peace Research*, 51(2): 145-158.

Hansen, T., 2008. 'Critical Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice', *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 25(4): 403-427.

Jabri, V., 1996. Discourses on Violence: Conflict Analysis Reconsidered, Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Jackson, R., 2014. Confessions of a Terrorist: A Novel, London: Zed Books.

Jackson, R., 2015a. 'Towards Critical Peace Research: Lessons from Critical Terrorism Studies', in H. Toros and Y. Tellidis, eds., *Researching Terrorism, Peace and Conflict Studies*, Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 19-37.

Jackson, R., 2015b. 'On how to be a Collective Intellectual – Critical Terrorism Studies (CTS) and the Countering of Hegemonic Discourse', in C. Bueger, ed., *Capturing Security Expertise: Concepts, Power, Practice*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Jackson, R., Forthcoming. 'Towards a Radical Post-Liberal Peace', in J. Ockey, ed., *Peacebuilding in the Asia-Pacific*.

Jackson, R., M. Breen Smyth and J. Gunning, 2009. 'Critical Terrorism Studies: Framing a New Research Agenda', in Jackson, R., M.

Breen Smyth and J. Gunning, eds., *Critical Terrorism Studies: A New Research Agenda*, London: Routledge.

Jeong, H., 2006. Understanding Conflict and Conflict Analysis, London: Sage.

Julita, M., Pehkonen, S., and Vayrynen, T., 2008. 'Resuscitating a Discipline: An Agenda for Critical Peace Research', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 36(3): 623-640.

Krippendorff, E., 1973. 'Peace Research and the Industrial Revolution', *Journal of Peace Research*, 10(3): 184-201.

Leech, G., 2012. Capitalism: A Structural Genocide, London: Zed.

McDonald, M., 2009. 'Emancipation and Critical Terrorism Studies', in Jackson, R., Breen Smyth, M., & Gunning, J., eds., *Critical Terrorism Studies: A New Research Agenda*, London: Routledge, pp. 109-123.

Mac Ginty, R., 2010. 'Hybrid Peace: The Interaction Between Top-Down and Bottom-Up Peace', *Security Dialogue*, 41(4): 391-412.

Mac Ginty, R., 2011. International Peacebuilding and Local Resistance, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Mac Ginty, R., 2012a. 'Against Stabilization', Stability: International Journal of Security and Development, 1(1): 20-30.

Mac Ginty, R., 2012b. 'Between Resistance and Compliance: Non-participation and the Liberal Peace', *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 6(4): 167-187.

Mac Ginty, R., 2012c. 'Routine Peace: Technocracy and Peacebuilding', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 47(3): 287-308.

Mac Ginty, R., 2014. '"We are just day friends": Micro-level civility and everyday peace in deeply divided societies,' *Security Dialogue*, 45(6): 548-564.

Mac Ginty, R., and Richmond, O., 2013. 'The Local Turn in Peace Building: A Critical Agenda for Peace', *Third World Quarterly*, 34(5): 763-783.

Macedo, D., 1993. 'Introduction', in Freire, P., *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 30th Anniversary Edition, New York: Continuum.

Mantena, K., 2012. 'Another Realism: The Politics of Gandhian Nonviolence', *American Political Science Review*, 106(2): 455-470.

Nepstad, S., 2011. Nonviolent Revolutions: Civil Resistance in the Late 20th Century, New York: Oxford University Press

Neufeld, B., 1993. 'The Marginalisation of Peace Research in International Relations', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 22(2): 165-184.

Oslender, U., 2007. 'The Resurfacing of the Public Intellectual: Towards the Proliferation of Public Spaces of Critical Intervention', *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 6(1): 98-123.

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

Reid, H., and Yanarella, E., 1976. 'Toward a Critical Theory of Peace Research in the United States: The Search for an "Intelligible Core"', *Journal of Peace Research*, 13(8): 315-341.

Richmond, O., 2011. 'Critical Agency, Resistance and a Post-Colonial Civil Society', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 46(4): 419-440.

Richmond, O., 2012. 'A Pedagogy of Peacebuilding: Infrapolitics, Resistance and Liberation', *International Political Sociology*, 6: 115-131.

Richmond, O., 2013. 'Failed Statebuilding Versus Peace Formation', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 48(3): 378-400.

Roberts, A., and Ash, T. G., eds., 2009. Civil Resistance and Power Politics: The Experience of Non-Violent Action from Gandhi to the Present, Oxford: OUP Oxford

Roberts, D., 2007. Human Insecurity: Global Structures of Violence, London: Zed.

Richmond, O., 2008. 'Reclaiming Peace in International Relations', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 36: 439-470.

Richmond, O., 2010. 'Resistance and the Post-liberal Peace,' *Millennium: Journal of* International Studies, 38 (3): 665-92.

Rummel, R. J., 1994. *Death by Government*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Schmid, H., 1968. 'Peace Research and Politics', *Journal of Peace Research*, 5(3): 217-232.

Schock, K., 2013. 'The Practice and Study of Civil Resistance', *Journal of Peace Research*, 50(3): 277-90.

Scott, J. 1985. Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance, Yale University Press.

Shaull, R., 1993. 'Foreword', in Freire, P., *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 30th Anniversary Edition, New York: Continuum.

Shinko, R., 2008. 'Agonistic Peace: A Postmodern Reading', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 36(3): 473-491.

Stephen, M., 2009. Civilian Jihad: Nonviolent Struggle, Democratization, and Governance in the Middle East, New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Toros, H., and Gunning, J., 2009. 'Exploring a Critical Theory Approach to Terrorism Studies', in Jackson, R., Gunning, J., and Breen Smyth, M., eds., *Critical Terrorism Studies: A New Research Agenda*, Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 89-108.

Turner, M., 2011. 'Security, Cooptation and Resistance: Peacebuilding-as-Fragmentation in the occupied Palestinian territory', in O. Richmond and A. Mitchell, eds., *Hybrid Forms of Peace: From the 'Everyday' to Post-Liberalism*, Basingstoke: PalgraveMacmillan, pp.188-207.

Turner, M., 2015. 'Peacebuilding as counterinsurgency in the occupied Palestinian territory, *Review of International Studies*, 41(1): 73-98.

Wallensteen, P., 2012. Understanding Conflict Resolution, 3rd edition, London: Sage.

Webel, C., and Galtung, J., eds., 2007. *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Weber, C., 2014. 'The Gentrification of International Theory', *ISQ Online*, available online at: http://www.isanet.org/Publications/ISQ/Posts/ID/313/The-Gentrification-of-International-Theory, accessed 10/3/15.

Wilkinson, R., and Pickett, K., 2009. The Spirit Level: Why More Equal Societies Almost Always Do Better, London: Bloomsbury.

Wyn Jones, R., 2004. 'On Emancipation: Necessity, Capacity, and Concrete Utopias', in Booth, K., ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner.