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The Peace and Global Studies (PAGS) Program at Earlham College is among the most well-established peace studies programs in the United States and is one of the majors for which the College is best known. Originally developed in 1974 under the name “Peace and Conflict Studies,” the program took its current name in 1981 to reflect a focus on international issues and an emphasis upon historical context in exploring aspects of conflict. From its inception to today, the PAGS program has always had a commitment to economic justice and an emphasis on non-violent social change to engender greater justice in peace building; but beyond these central unifying elements, PAGS strives to respect, embrace, and embody diversity.

Grounded on the premise that there can be no sustainable peace without justice—that is, a commitment to the Galtungian concept of “positive peace”—the PAGS Program primarily aims to develop students’ competencies in fields contributing to social transformation and greater justice. PAGS is thoroughly interdisciplinary, and that curricular embrace marks the program’s commitment to the best that a liberal arts education has to offer, with an emphasis on problematizing, questioning assumptions, and critical thinking, critical reading, and critical writing. At the upper-class level, courses focus on theory and methodology for thinking and transforming existing social, political, and symbolic structures. Throughout the curriculum, the PAGS Program tries to prepare students with an appreciation for, and understanding of, the relationship between the disciplines and interdisciplinarity. The core sequence of courses that all PAGS majors are required to take draws from the disciplines of economics, history, philosophy, politics, and sociology/anthropology. The reasoning behind each of these as primary contributing disciplines follows.

Economics is one of the most important discourses of the post-Enlightenment era, and being able to understand and engage the language specific to economics is important for any-
one who intends to be civically engaged. It is also extremely important for understanding international relations, as well as policy choices and structural constraints at all levels, whether these be local, national, regional, international, or transnational. It is central in many if not most social movements, especially those challenging colonialism or neocolonialism.\(^3\) Fundamentally, given the emphasis of PAGS upon the question of justice—and the pre-eminence of the phenomenon of economic poverty in questions of justice and injustice—economics is absolutely necessary for PAGS majors.

While all liberal arts students should have an appreciation for history, this discipline has a special contribution to make to the Peace and Global Studies curriculum, for to historicize is to de-naturalize. History destabilizes the status quo, opening up ways of thinking about the possibilities for change. It is also essential for PAGS majors, who might be thought of as preparing to make responsible interventions in the world, because we do not want our students going out into the world without an appreciation for, and sensitivity to, the differences of historical context and a knowledge of the current historical moment that is sound and well-founded. In what ways does this historical moment differ from previous ones, and what implications does this hold for the ways that action toward confronting injustice can be conceptualized?

Philosophy makes a critical contribution to these issues by raising questions of ethics (matters of the good and of how and on what grounds it is determined and actions are justified) and epistemology (ways of problematizing “justice” itself). In philosophy, students are introduced to methods of thinking (and re-thinking) about concepts and constructs they may take for granted, such as “law,” “democracy,” “freedom,” “power,” and “violence.” Philosophy also contributes “postcolonial theory,” which is one of the most important fields to encounter for idealistic students who have longings for “saving the world.” Postcolonial theory demands that students delve into a whole range of key questions relating to responsible engagement, especially to social location, in order that their efforts toward justice, whatever they may be, not exacerbate extant injustices.

The discipline of politics gets students to think about global issues, especially policy, at the level of the nation state, as well as the interface between the nation state and international and transnational institutions. In politics classes, PAGS students delve into the large question of governance—with its consideration of questions of major import for the cause of peace, including accountability, transparency, and consensus. They study the realm of international law, theories of international relations, questions of war and peace at those high levels, along with ways of confronting genocide, such as R2P ("Responsibility to Protect") and restorative justice.\(^4\) Students should also leave politics classes being well-informed about the most pressing issues facing the world today.

The disciplines of sociology and anthropology focus on theorizing “the social.” They bridge many of these other disciplines by dealing with many of the same questions raised in these other disciplines but with very different lenses, ones that keep students questioning and looking very critically at their interventions and their effects upon others. In sociology/anthropology classes, students encounter such important subjects for peace studies as the nuances of the workings of culture and power, how to theorize difference and constructions of subjectivities, how to theorize boundaries/borders and their interstices, and the intricacies of cultural change.

Building on the intellectual diversity of its faculty members as well as the diversity of the range of students who are passionate about social justice, the PAGS Program brings students to consider a plethora of approaches to peace building. Therefore, although students coming
into the program are often desirous of an absolute answer to the thorny questions surrounding the notion of peace and how it might be "achieved," the PAGS curriculum does not promote a single "correct" approach to peace building because of the belief, built into the curriculum, that approaches to peace must be highly context-dependent. The most important element in building this appreciation for context is for students to begin to understand and be able to articulate the connections between the micro and the macro—that is, the connections between and among the local, the national, the regional, the international, and the transnational (or global). Looking at the historical context for the PAGS Program itself will help to elucidate why these articulations are so critical to the PAGS curriculum.

The impetus for the Peace and Global Studies Program at Earlham College took shape in a location more than 5,000 miles from Earlham's home in Richmond, Indiana: Santiago, Chile, on September 11, 1973. For the three years preceding this date, Chileans were attempting something that had never been done. In 1970, they had elected Salvador Allende president of Chile. Allende was a long-time member of the Socialist Party who had campaigned on the promise to address the severe socio-economic inequalities in Chile that had left a relative few in prosperity, while most worked long hours, for years on end, and still sometimes faced quite severe poverty. The same phenomenon was being faced by many other nation states throughout Latin America, and not a few were moving or had moved in the direction of full-scale social revolution. Allende's ticket, Popular Unity (Unidad Popular), a coalition of the Socialist Party, the Communist Party, and the Radical Party, had a mandate from the popular classes to do what was necessary to address this massive gap between a wealthy minority and a struggling majority. But having watched the U.S. interventions in Guatemala and Cuba, the Allende administration was committed to change that was as transformative and far-reaching as possible, while utilizing the legal means available in a representative democracy. It was this combination, set within the context of the Cold War, with the U.S. eyeing every part of Latin America for signs of radicalism, that had never been tried before. This was the so-called "via chilena" (the "Chilean way"), also known as constructing the "peaceful road to socialism."17

In setting its sights firmly on remedying economic injustice, the Allende administration seemed to have taken to heart what the founder of the field of peace studies, Johan Galtung, had argued: that the opening toward any peace that was both meaningful and sustainable required addressing "structural violence." The word "peace" tends to bring to mind, for the vast majority, the circumstance that obtains when overt, direct violence is not a constant fear, when a nation state is not at war, not under military dictatorship, and when its residents are not fearing for their lives on a daily basis from non-state-directed violence, such as gang warfare or guerrilla warfare—in other words, when residents of a given region are not facing overt violence from another nation state, their own government, or their fellow residents. Indeed, this could have described Chile in 1969. Galtung, however, would look at the previously mentioned situation and argue that, while there might not be overt or direct violence involving bloodshed, that did not necessarily mean that the situation was such that it merited being called "peace."

Galtung first arrived at this insight when he was in Zimbabwe (then officially Rhodesia) in the mid-1960s. He later commented that while he was there, many spoke proudly of the fact that, from 1925 (the granting of "domestic autonomy" from the Crown) to 1965 (the unilateral declaration of independence), there had not been a single "racial murder" (i.e., a particular kind of direct violence). Meanwhile, though, as he observed, 4% of the population—all White—was calling the shots politically and had control of all matters "economic," with the re-
sult that the White minority had an average lifespan twice that of the average among the Black population. Galtung states: "And they called that 'peace.' So my thinking was very simple. If this is called peace, I'm against it. And I am supposed to dedicate my life to developing peace studies. Something is wrong here. Structural violence was the conceptual answer."  

Juxtaposing "structural violence" with the more obvious forms of "somatic incapacitation" that are brought to mind when most of us think of "violence," Galtung would later define the former as "the avoidable denial of what is necessary to meet the fundamental needs." Whereas direct (or personal) violence involves a subject intentionally acting, structural (or indirect) violence need not—and usually does not—involve intentionality. Structural violence includes such phenomena as the uneven distribution of resources and, above all, the uneven distribution of power to decide how resources will be distributed. It is a form of violence that is so ingrained in the quotidian that while some would recognize it as injustice, many would not see it as violence, and some—especially those who benefit from its effects—would not even see it at all. Galtung makes the distinction clear with this example: "[W]hen one husband beats his wife there is a clear case of personal [or "direct"] violence, but when one million husbands keep one million wives in ignorance there is structural violence."  

That this fundamental insight grounding the field of peace studies would arrive from a specifically colonial setting is worth emphasizing, for the colonial dynamic would have, and continues to have, profound implications for the way the relations between local, national, and international are experienced and conceptualized. A specifically "colonial" encounter never allows easy separations between "local," "national," and "global" ("transnational"), for a colonial space is one that is both divided against itself and also one that is forced to look beyond, to "answer" to the metropole. In the colonial setting, the "global" is thus always—already present, with implications for movements toward justice that are specifically locally defined and/or bounded.

Certainly Chileans, during the time of the Allende administration, still had to contend with dynamics first set in motion with the onset of colonialism. The non-egalitarian concentration of wealth and the race-class nexus that first took shape in the region after the Spanish invasion had persisted over the centuries, and the funneling of wealth out of the country had continued after independence, as British and then U.S. investment capital became major players. That there were factors originating outside the boundaries of the Chilean nation-state that had played a role in the socioeconomic injustice experienced by Chileans was undeniable. Still, the Allende administration's field for contesting such injustice was limited, bounded by the borders of the nation state and acceptance of the limitations imposed by liberal institutions. To try to encourage redistribution of income through legal means, one of the first moves of the Allende administration was to freeze prices and raise wages. This in itself was a move that foreign investors and their representatives would consistently characterize as undue interference with the workings of the free market, but there was more to come. Given the severe imbalances in the Chilean economy as a whole, and its heavy reliance upon the export of one commodity in particular (copper), the Allende administration followed through completely on a measure that previous administrations had tried on a more piecemeal basis and for which there had been growing popular support over the previous two decades: With a unanimous vote in Congress, the copper industry was nationalized. Once the industry was nationalized, so the reasoning went, the profits of these formerly U.S.-based corporations could be harnessed, via redistribution, for the cause of economic justice.
In spite of the position in the common discourse of the institutions of U.S. government of the tropes of “freedom,” “democracy,” and “rule of law” (all of which were tenets that the Allende administration would embrace), with this move of nationalization, which infringed upon the rights pertaining to ownership of private property, the United States deemed that the Chilean government had gone too far. President Richard Nixon issued the general directive to the Central Intelligence Agency to “[m]ake the [Chilean] economy scream,” and U.S. Ambassador Edward Korry promised: “Not a nut or bolt will be allowed to reach Chile under Allende. We shall do all within our power to condemn Chile and the Chileans to utmost deprivation and poverty....” And “scream” the economy did. For these few within the U.S. administration, intent to damage the Chilean economy was clear. On the whole, however, very little intent was necessary, for Chileans simply began responding as “economic rationality” would predict.

Keeping its pledge to make basic goods more widely accessible to the working class, the government continued to try to enforce price controls, which hit some of the smaller shopkeepers particularly hard. More and more products disappeared from store shelves and made their way into the underground economy—with much higher prices attached and consequent shortages experienced by many. By 1972, Western Europe and the Socialist Bloc were trying to come through with loans and other forms of financial assistance (to make up for the financial embargo placed on the Allende administration by the World Bank and related multinational lending institutions), but it would take a while for those infusions of money to make their effects felt in the wider economy. Opponents of Popular Unity began engaging in economic sabotage and/or withholding production, while others were forced to cut back production for lack of inputs. Workers who supported Popular Unity began organizing round-the-clock shifts to try to keep production going and to protect factories from sabotage. Increasingly, though, shortages of basic goods would force the government to withdraw price controls, and with that, inflation began to spin out of control. Chileans faced inflation rates of 150%, 200%, or higher, with prices of goods swinging wildly from month to month, even week to week, or sometimes daily. Furthermore, cutbacks in production brought rising unemployment.

The causes for this disastrous situation were not entirely within the control of those administering the nation state; nor, it bears repeating, were they mere matters of “intent,” as the embargo and acts of sabotage clearly were. Most of these acts were, simply, economically rational responses to price movements and supply and demand curves. Meanwhile, on the world markets, the price of copper—the main commodity the Chilean government was seeking to leverage—had also fallen precipitously in the early 1970s.

At the same time, the opposition-controlled Congress consistently tied the hands of the Allende administration at every turn, testing Allende’s commitment to the rule of law—a test he did not fail. Given its popular mandate, the Allende administration saw this moment as a chance to exercise Chilean sovereignty in order to bring to bear integrity and ethical judgment in the righting of the wrongs accumulated over the years. Its pledge to make “the peaceful road to socialism” within the context of a pluralist democracy was a demonstration of this commitment. Allende wanted to prove that democracy was so elastic that it could bear even a massive, popular upsurge toward greater social justice. Popular Unity was subjected, on the other side, to pressure from the working class (typically organized in associations of one kind or another at the local level) to move at a faster pace, to move on expropriations, or to take other actions without waiting for the slow channels of the judiciary and the legislative branch. The government counseled patience. This is where the situation stood in March 1973, when Chileans
went to the polls for a new round of congressional elections. This was a critical moment, because the opposition thought that surely all of this havoc would mean that their numbers in Congress would be increasing, and then they would use the opportunity to impeach Allende. Although the opposition still controlled Congress after these elections, (to its supporters' delight and its opponents' horror), Popular Unity had actually gained seats. Even as its mandate increased, opposition to Popular Unity intensified, impelled in the first place by the wealthy minority but also extending beyond the small numbers of this class, as the shortages persisted and the suffering of the economic devastation became more widespread. Large segments of the pro-Popular Unity working class took to the streets as well, chanting, "Allende, Allende, the people will defend you," and continued to try to produce, in spite of the shortages and continuing sabotage.14

On September 11, 1973, the "peaceful road to socialism" was cut short in a U.S.-backed coup d'état that ushered in the seventeen-year rightist dictatorship of General Augusto Pinochet, in which several thousand were killed and many more tortured, all in the name of returning Chile to the community of nations in which private property rights were sacrosanct and held to be inextricably linked to the sound functioning of liberal democracies. Granted, it is an understatement on the order of an obscenity to say that Chile under Pinochet was far from a "liberal democracy," but some nation states who purported to be such found it fine to do business with post-1973 Chile.15 Foreign investment poured back into the country, and Chile became one of the early testing grounds for the now-widespread economic policies of neoliberalism, with poverty rates soon outstripping pre-1970 levels and the massive disparities in wealth and income restored. The streets became very quiet; in the initial weeks of the dictatorship, it was illegal for more than three private citizens to be assembled publicly. Soldiers, military police, and surveillance were everywhere; crime rates were down; Gross Domestic Product was up. Anyone who had been directly involved in social justice projects (of which there were many) during the Popular Unity period—or even associated with anyone with direct involvement—was in mortal danger, and most who were in this position, if they had the chance, would try to go into exile.16 Among the many who were in this position were the founder and one of the future directors of Earlham's Peace and Global Studies Program, Howard Richards and Caroline Higgins, who had been in Santiago for several years working on popular education projects.17

The Allende administration had every reason to attempt what it had and in the way that it had. But it also, given the extent and severity of the challenges it faced, had the perfect conditions for demonstrating just what the cause of justice—especially economic justice—is up against, given the mandates of what is now termed "globalization." The moment of September 11, 1973, was thus the impetus for the Peace and Global Studies Program in that it gave rise to one of the central questions that undergirds the curriculum: How far, and under what conditions, can the quest for justice, on which sustainable peace is based, be pressed, without giving rise to increased violence, either direct or structural? Clearly this question has many answers, all highly context-dependent, and students in the Peace and Global Studies Program are encouraged to formulate many more questions of this kind in their thinking about the concept of "peace," but always to do so while taking issues of "scale," "place," and "social location" into full consideration.

Because of its emphasis upon praxis (i.e., an emphasis upon both "theory" and "action," but with an understanding that the distinction between these two is often a false distinction
and one that we should therefore seek to dissolve as much as possible), PAGS students combine their academic work with experiential opportunities outside of the classroom, in internships, paid work opportunities, and off-campus study programs (several of which are officially recognized as PAGS programs, including the Northern Ireland Program, the Jordan Program [which has currently replaced the Jerusalem Program that Earlham administered for many years under the leadership of Tony Bing], and the Border Studies Program, based in the Mexican–U.S. border region). These experiential opportunities are yet another instance in which students are invited to think about the relationship between the local and the global. "Scale," "place," and "social location" also come into consideration very deliberately in one of the upper-division PAGS courses, currently titled Methods of Peacemaking. In this course, students explore and analyze the one specific locality in which they are all immersed: Richmond, Indiana. We seek to contextualize Richmond in relation to the "global market" and to historicize current socio-economic trends in Richmond and the U.S. Midwest more broadly, and to discuss the ways that place, social location, and difference of all kinds complicate—and should complicate—approaches to justice and peace building.

As with all interdisciplinary programs of study at Earlham College, the Peace and Global Studies curriculum has two courses of study, one in the introductory sequence, and one as a senior capstone experience, that seek to tie the curriculum together. The first is PAGS 240, Global Dynamics and World Peace, which is designed specifically for sophomores who have taken at least two of the three introductory courses in the sequence. This course introduces students to some of the most important debates within the field of peace studies and ties together the themes present in the extant introductory-level PAGS courses: Macroeconomics: Globalization (PAGS 101), History of Nonviolent Social Movements (PAGS 130), and either Introduction to International Diplomacy or Introduction to International Relations (PAGS 170 or 107). It is positioned where it is in the sequence specifically to offer a more systematic articulation between the introductory-level PAGS courses and upper-division PAGS courses.

The course is grounded on the premise (one that should not be at all surprising but that, in fact, continues to surprise students as well as general audiences) that "peace" does not have a stable meaning. Therefore, after introducing questions about some standard definitions of the term, and then bringing students into debates within Peace Studies about that very question, the students are encouraged, throughout the semester, to elaborate their own understandings of "peace" and begin to sketch out what changes would engender a more peaceful world on the scale and along the contours they envision. Throughout Global Dynamics and World Peace, students are encouraged to engage in dominant, normative discourses with an analytical eye and in a self-reflexive manner, in order to see where, why, and how they are making use of such discourses in uncritical ways and to see all the forms that oppositional analytic and cultural spaces might take, and how these are to be recognized. This process helps contribute to strengthening the skills of critical reading, critical thinking, and critical writing that demonstrates fidelity to texts, intellectual creativity, and a degree of conceptual sophistication.

The history of Chile from 1970 to 1973 certainly looms in the background of the questions engaged in this particular course. The social democracies of the mid-20th century, in addition to being examples of the kinds of circumstances that come to mind for many when the word "peace" is uttered, were indeed a classic example of the attempt to pursue distributive justice at the nation state level as a path toward peace, and Chile was an example (again, one of many at the time) of a nation state pursuing that path in a specifically postcolonial
context.¹⁹ As such, studying this period in history allows students to grapple with all that is at stake in the field of peace studies in the debate between Johan Galtung, on the one hand, and Kenneth Boulding, on the other. Kenneth Boulding, another of the main scholars in the early field of peace studies, puts forth the proposition that the freedom granted by the institution of property rights is the ultimate guarantor of peace, because within the boundaries of property lies the otherwise elusive autonomy which many, Boulding included, consider the key to creating peace-engendering institutions. What if, however, the freedom granted by the institution of property rights carries direct implications for nation states pursuing forms of distributive justice premised on the acceptance of the cultural structure that places primacy on the profit motive? If a given location—whether small, such as a city, or larger, such as a nation state—operating within this structure and expressing its highest ethical and democratic ideals, chooses to lower prices or to raise wages or environmental standards beyond the level that "the market will allow," that location will most likely face a capital strike and/or capital flight. Those circumstances might well be followed by rising unemployment and rising rates of poverty, compromising the capacity for autonomy, integrity, and ethical judgment. When those kinds of questions arise, it is clear that all of the disciplines upon which PAGS draws—economics, history, philosophy, politics, and sociology/anthropology—have major contributions to make.

Furthermore, it is clear that giving due consideration to the spatial dimension—questions of "place" and "scale"—is critical. Many of the debates encountered within PAGS courses turn on discernment of the relationship between "the local" and "the global"—that is, whether and to what extent the flow of influence is effectively bidirectional or predominantly unidirectional; whether and to what extent the characteristics of each and the relationship between the two are overdetermined; whether the local and the global can even be counterposed axially; or whether "globalization" means the dissolution of boundaries both real and metaphorical so that the two are effectively collapsed together and lose the meaning they once had.²⁰ These are some of the questions engaged by the PAGS seniors in their 2012 senior capstone project, entitled, simply, "Sovereignty?" The subtitle is the two social movements they were exploring that were and are seeking greater socio-economic justice and positive peace: the Occupy Wall Street movement and the Boycott-Divest-Sanctions (BDS) movement to halt the Israeli military occupation of Palestine.²¹

The purpose of the senior capstone is to synthesize material from the entire PAGS curriculum and bring it to bear on an analysis of a topic of interest to students. In this particular project, the students engaged the broad question: "How do the changing contours of sovereignty, from the political to the economic, influence changes in, and respond to, challenges from forms of [popular] resistance/current social movements?" One need only look to the current situation in Greece, Spain, Ireland, or the United States to see the relevance of this question for the field of peace studies; for if, in the colonial setting, the "global" is always—already present, this is a lesson that even most former colonizers are learning now in the neoliberal era. The students drew upon the work of political theorist Wendy Brown in her Walled States, Waning Sovereignty, in which she presents the argument that capital is eroding nation state sovereignty as never before, in order to draw out the implications for Occupy Wall Street and BDS—and, by extension, the many activist movements similarly contoured. The public presentation by the senior class served as a welcome warning against simple solutions to the vexing problems of economic injustice, military occupation, and violence in its many forms—a call for us to think creatively about our organizing principles and to think "strategically and more self-consciously
about the philosophical and political implications and meanings of the programs...[we] endorse."

One of the most common misconceptions about the field of peace studies is that its curriculum simply encourages its students to be kind and decent. Most of the students who come to peace studies, though, are already among the most kind and decent people one would ever hope to meet. If achieving "peace" were just about acting in kind and decent ways, the world might already have seen instances of large-scale sustainable peace. Peace does not "arrive" simply through our trying, again and again, the same methods based on received wisdom and unchanged conceptualizations. The question of peace—and of justice, on which peace depends—requires analysis. We need to begin to question our own assumptions—even the ones that hold that there are neat and easy separations between "the local" and "the global"—and to think critically, in the best tradition of the liberal arts.

Notes
1. Since the 1660 Quaker Peace Testimony, the Society of Friends has consistently engaged the idea of peace and has collectively dedicated itself to a dialogue with the wider world concerning the best ways to live out this testimony and the best ways of bringing peace to fruition through action. Thus, it is Earlham College’s Quaker identity, and the Quaker commitment to social justice, that created the space for initial consideration of the major, and that have given the program the institutional commitment and resources to allow it to flourish.
2. The “Galtungian concept of ‘positive peace’” will be contextualized and explained later.
3. Matters “economic” were central in Gandhi’s thinking about non-violent resistance to British rule and to how Indian independence could be guaranteed after the achievement of formal political independence. See Mohandas K. Gandhi, Hind Swaraj, Anthony J. Parei ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
4. For more on the contributions of politics offerings, see the presentation by B. Welling Hall (a member of the current PAGS faculty at Earlham College), “Growing Global Citizens: Why Teach International Law to Undergraduates?” Roundtable presentation at the 49th Annual ISA Conference, San Francisco, California, March 28, 2008.
5. In this, the Peace and Global Studies Program explicitly works against a reductionist, technocratic approach to issues that bear upon justice and peace, emphasizing questions and critical thinking over formulating any kind of generalized “solution.” As Mikkeli Rasmussen states, peace is not a recipe; it is a practice. Mikkeli Vedby Rasmussen, “The Ideology of Peace: Peacebuilding and the War in Iraq,” in Oliver P. Richmond, ed., Palgrave Advances in Peacebuilding: Critical Developments and Approaches (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 187. In this article Rasmussen echoes, with a bit more precision, an earlier statement by Galtung that we should conceptualize peace “not as a point but as region—as the vast region of social orders from which violence is absent.” Johan Galtung, “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research,” Journal of Peace Research, V6,3 (1969), 168.
6. It will be noted that in the 1970 election, while Allende only got 36% of the popular vote, another 25% of the vote went to Radomiro Tomic (of the Christian Democratic Party), whose platform that year was virtually identical to that of Popular Unity. The Popular Unity coalition, in addition to the three prominent parties mentioned here, also included some of the smaller political parties.


10. Galtung, “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research,” 171. Galtung would cite Stokely Carmichael’s similar distinction in Black Power, in which Carmichael contrasts, on the one hand, institutionalized racism as a kind of violence not readily captured by cameras and projected onto television screens, with, on the other, the kind of violence (e.g., a “riot” or uprising) that can arise in response to racism. Carmichael notes that given the easy conveyance of the latter as a clear image of violence, it exacerbates the tendency to neglect to consider the former as violence as well. Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America (New York: Vintage Books, 1967). Galtung emphasizes that an expanded concept of violence leads to an expanded concept of peace, and that if peace is the absence of violence, it is the absence of both personal and structural violence. He goes on to distinguish between the absence of personal violence, which he terms “negative peace,” and the absence of structural violence, which he terms “positive peace.” Galtung, ibid., 183.


12. It should be noted as well that the tenets of “freedom,” “democracy,” and the “rule of law” are all mainstays in the “liberal peace project,” which is an approach to peacemaking that enjoys wide support across much of the political spectrum and is one of the approaches covered in the PAGS Program. On the “liberal peace project,” see Rasmussen, “The Ideology of Peace”; and Vivienne Jabri, “War, Government, Politics: A Critical Response to the Hegemony of the Liberal Peace,” in Oliver P. Richmond, ed., Peacebuilding: Critical Developments and Approaches (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 41–57. See also Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Righting Wrongs,” South Atlantic Quarterly, Vol. 103 (Spring/Summer 2004), 523–581.


15. In addition to the reign of terror it imposed, dissolving the Congress and suspending the Constitution were among the Pinochet dictatorship’s first acts, but policy-makers outside of Chile treated it, practically speaking, as if it were “on its way” to becoming a liberal democracy. George Will wrote an editorial (Baltimore Sun, December 10, 1998), in which he stated, “Pinochet was a nasty ruler who mandated torture, hostage-taking and murder…. But he was, on balance, good for Chile, which emerged from his despotism as a prosperous democracy.” Estimates of the number of those tortured and killed during the entire seventeen-year dictatorship agree that a minimum of 3,200 people were killed, with the number of arrests and torture much higher, upwards of 20,000. It has been established that more than 13,500 people were arrested in the first six weeks, with at least 1,500 civilians killed in this short period, and that 1,100 people were “disappeared” (and remain unaccounted for) over the entire 17–year period. Kornbluh, The Pinochet File, 153, 163.

16. Approximately 30,000 Chileans went into exile during the period 1973–1990.

17. Richards and Higgins have worked with a number of organizations in Chile, especially—on the matter of popular education—the Center for Research and Development in Education (Centro de Investigación y Desarrollo de la Educación, CIDIE) in Santiago. The work of Paulo Freire was a great influence on the work of CIDIE, and pedagogies of CIDIE and Freire clearly informed the design of the PAGS curriculum from the outset. Anthony G. Bing, “Peace Studies as Experiential Education,” Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science V. 504 (July 1989), 48–60.

18. On the experiential component of the PAGS curriculum, see the piece written by Professor Emeritus of Peace Studies and former director of the PAGS Program, Tony Bing, “Peace Studies as Experiential Education.”
19. For a wider discussion of the forms taken by these social democracies, and the implications for the field of peace studies, see Howard Richards and Joanna Swanger, The Dilemmas of Social Democracies: Overcoming Obstacles to a More Just World (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006).

20. For a thorough and excellent treatment that illustrates the complexity of these questions, see Appadurai on the global production of locality. Arjun Appadurai, Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization ( Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 178–99. For a treatment that speaks directly to the relationship of "globalization" to the economy and the environment, with direct implications for peace studies, see James G. Carrier, Confronting Environments: Local Understanding in a Globalizing World (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2004).

21. While there is no published work to cite for this senior project, I do want to credit the 2012 PAGS senior class, whose members are: Charlotte Bellm, Carolyn Brandt, Sophie Brinker, Sarah Chalton, Grant Collier, Erin Crooks, Rosalyn Endlich, Avery Hall, Joey Holloway, Grace Huang, Rachel Malmborg, Sarah Mink, Gwen Pastel, Tyler Pry, Alma Raymer, Yusra Saleh, Lisa Scarpelli, Tory Smith, and Catalina Tudor.
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