



REVIEW OF RESEARCH

ISSN: 2249-894X

IMPACT FACTOR : 5.7631(UIF)

VOLUME - 14 | ISSUE - 5 | FEBRUARY - 2025



FROM CONFLICT TO HARMONY: THE EVOLUTION OF PEACE THEORIES

Dr. Binish Maryam

Assistant Professor

Nelson Mandela Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution
Jamia Millia Islamia , New Delhi.

Cibia Shehlin Hussain

Research Scholar

Nelson Mandela Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution
Jamia Millia Islamia , New Delhi.

ABSTRACT

The concept of peace has deep historical roots across various cultures, societies, states. It is a set of values whose concepts have predominantly existed over the course of time. The multidimensional and interdisciplinary approach of peace encompasses social, political, economic and cultural aspects. Peace becomes an important area of critical inquiry in international relations, as it is through the lens of peace that critical inquiry takes place providing the framework for exploring effective ways to resolve conflicts and create lasting peace. An effort will be made to explore the concept of peace as an academic discipline in peace and conflict studies.

Further, the theoretical understanding of peace's history, different types, key dimensions, and scholarly engagement for theorisation of peace will also be discussed.



KEYWORDS: *Evolution of Peace, Peace Theories, Global South and North Perspective, Feminist Peace Theories.*

INTRODUCTION :

The concept of peace was understood from the international relations theorist, Johan Galtung also regarded as the founder of peace school of thought. (Galtung, 1985) He discusses the study of the origins of peace research, expands the concept of peace by linking it to an expanded understanding of violence, thereby broadening the definition of peace. According to him peace is of two types: absence of personal violence, and absence of structural violence. Galtung referred to them as negative peace and positive peace respectively. Negative peace is the absence of violence, absence of war' and positive peace is the integration of human society. Negative peace is the absence of organized violence between such major human groups as nations, as well as between racial and ethnic groups and positive peace as a pattern of cooperation and integration between major human groups.

Quincy Wright marks the beginning of much that nowadays has become known as "peace research." (Wright, 1965) But the fundamental question remained about the fact that absence of war

(negative peace) is a precursor to peace. Initially peace was interpreted as an absence of war and the discipline of peace research left other social problems to different disciplines. Johan Galtung, outlined a broader notion of peace than the negative definitions previously favoured by the American school: (Galtung, 1985)

- *Peace research should liberate itself from a materialistic bias dealing with bodies, dead or alive, healthy or unhealthy—in other words with mortality and morbidity only, and not with the mental and spiritual dimensions of violence and human growth and development.* (Galtung, 1985)

Furthermore, discussions revolved around the ideas of positive and negative peace as they were put forward in Quincy Wright's book, 'A Study of War: Second Edition', articulating the different perspectives of the two camps which existed during this period, namely; the pacifists and the internationalists. They have a tendency to come together during times of peace, but at times of war or threats of war, the internationalists have called for collaboration against aggression, while the pacifists have advocated for non-intervention. The internationalist view, peace as absence of war whereas the pacifist viewed peace in exploring durable peace.

During this time, the Marxist idea of peace emerged as another aspect in the meaning of peace. Using dialectical materialism and historical materialism, Marx and Engels analysed war and peace. They scientifically discussed the nature of war and peace, revealed the rules of its development, and forwarded the proletariat's policy and strategy. According to Marxist historical materialism, the root of war is unitary; war is rooted in society and economy.

According to Meihong, after studying the works of Marx and Engels, it becomes clear that "peace" was addressed from various perspectives at different times and in different contexts. There are two aspects: one is the concept of war and peace; the other is the international principle of the new society (communism), focused on peace.

Nonetheless, Marxism rejects all theories that exaggerate the role of violence in history, that is war. Marxism does not view violence as a self-expedient tool but as a means for achieving an aim. The aim must not be conceived apart from man, for a human being and mankind is the substance of the aim. That is why Marxism makes it a rule that if one can reach the same goal in different ways then they must give preference to non-violent means to violent ones and to less violent means to those more violent. (Kara, 1968) Therefore the idea of peace from a Marxist lens is vague and is in a developing process, which finds its space in the idea of the pacifist school of thought of peace, with contradictions and vagueness.

ARTICULATING PACIFIST'S EXPLANATION OF PEACE:

Pacifism is believed to be morally desirable, and conducive to human welfare, as opposed to the use of violence which is neither. It is most widely known as an absolutist condemnation of any form of war or violence, but it is rather more complex and nuanced than this. (Richmond, 2020) Pacifism as a concept has long been associated with idealism and liberalism, and undermined by the discursive practices of realism. For instance, some argue that an unwillingness or refusal to countenance war means that the individual and the states are left at risk by the pacifist. Tolstoy, a Christian pacifist who was influenced by Thoreau's work on civil disobedience, argued that pacifism and anarchism were intimately connected because the state was often the source of violence. The most renowned advocate of non-violent resistance, Mahatma Gandhi, drew on this principled in his own campaign against British imperial rule in India in the 1930s.

Peter Lawler mentions Gandhian thought as being a background to Galtung's earlier writing, as Gandhi being his philosophical inspiration and a continuing background presence to his work; downplay the connection somewhat when he notes that 'traces of a Gandhian conception of pacifism' can be detected in Galtung's activist pacifism 'with the benefit of hindsight'. (Weber, 2004)

Galtung states, for Gandhi, the aim of conflict was not just to find a resolution but to achieve self-realization through the process itself, aiming for something deeper. Galtung's peace research is not

based on one monumentally significant paper or new paradigm. According to Anima Bose, although peace research is now a recognized discipline, the concept of 'structural violence' has become part of an almost universally accepted framework for the discipline.

Gandhi was concerned with exploitation and oppression as well as war and communal violence, he construed 'nonviolence' in such a way that its meaning was very wide. His definition included not treating another with less dignity than was warranted by a shared humanity. Not only does dehumanisation pave the way for violence, but dehumanisation is violence—closely echoed in Galtung's notion of structural violence. (Weber, 2004) While the central point of convergence for Galtung and Gandhi was the concept of structural violence, they also shared a peripheral area of intersection of ideas- Third Party intervention. Galtung postulated the theory of the 'Great Chain of Non-violence' to illustrate how third-party involvement can facilitate social change. Gandhi had his own imagination of Third-Party intervention as seen in his visualization of the idea of his '*Shanti Sena*' as a non-violent volunteer peace keeping force dedicated to minimize communal violence within the Indian populace. Through this idea, he wanted to demonstrate through it the viability and effectiveness of unarmed peace-keeping, drawing a parallel between the Shanti Sena and the challenges faced by the UN today.

Gandhi first derived the idea of a non-violent army of soldiers during the Second World War intending to use it to defend India non-violently in the eventuality of Japanese intrusion. However, from the testimony of Narayan Desai, Gandhi's Chief Secretary, it is known that the idea originated in 1922. Thereafter, in the wake of partition of India in 1947, he wanted to organize nationwide '*Shanti Sena*' or peace army in response to the communal holocaust which witnessed the slaughter of half a million people and 10 million people forced to leave their homes. The Conference scheduled in 1948, where this idea was to be given a concrete shape, never saw the light of the day as Gandhi himself followed by his assassination. (Mukherji, 2021)

ARTICULATING THE LIBERAL-INTERNATIONALIST MEANING OF PEACE:

In the early 20th century, an idealist or liberal-internationalist world peace looked unlikely as nationalism, authoritarian, and fascist dictatorships began to emerge. Certainly, the dream of a world federation and disarmament, which had been the focus of many early liberal-internationalists, was by 1914 little more than an aspiration. (Richmond, 2020) Though many states, such as Germany, Japan, and Italy, were to ignore the liberalisation of international relations for reasons of expediency vis-à-vis their leaders' definition of their national interests, there is little doubt that this modified the discourse of peace. It suggested that an ideal form of mutual international cooperation following liberal norms was a viable alternative to realpolitik. (Richmond, 2020) However, although discussions of international social, economic, and political systems had advocated the need for prosperity, political representation, and an embryonic form of human rights, they were not widely practised. Such ideals had first to encounter and overcome pre-existing political, economic, and social systems that favoured certain elites over the majority of the population, historical enmities between states and peoples, and the imperial competition for territory.

The end of WWI saw a general liberal agreement that democracy could be extended and a new international order created, though many states were reluctant to see this extended as fully as US President Wilson's Fourteen Points indicated. (Richmond, 2020) The new peace was idealistic in its aspirations – particularly for self-determination – yet it soon became clear that it was vague, untested, and lacked any guarantees, especially from the US. The importance of US President Wilson's Fourteen Points at Versailles in 1919 cannot be underestimated as idealist versions of peace facilitated the transition into liberal versions of peace.

Moreover, Woodrow Wilson believed that peace would be structured and enforced by a coalition or community of states. It would be a liberal peace in the image of the states that had imagined it, though he argued that this did not mean it was a victor's peace or indeed that it was idealistic. In this manner, utopian vision on an ideal form of peace was replaced by the liberal peace which would in theory and practice rested on a set of common pragmatic elements and institutions. It required a

hegemon who would construct the peace in its image: rights for all of its actors would be delineated, provided, enforced, and patrolled, according to a set of core values, based on just war thinking, self-determination and democracy, international law and an embryonic form of human rights, and the norms of cooperation and consent.

According to Immanuel Kant, 'No treaty of peace shall be regarded as valid, if made with the secret reservation of material for a future war.' For then it would be a mere truce, a mere suspension of hostilities, not peace. A peace signifies the end of all hostilities and to attach to it the epithet "eternal" is not only a verbal pleonasm, but a matter of suspicion. (Kant and Smith, 2016) According to Immanuel Kant, "standing armies shall be abolished in course of time." He also stated that, "no state shall violently interfere with the constitution and administration of another.

Kant's theory of perpetual peace finds contradiction to the policies adopted by Kautilya and Ashoka. While Kant advocated for abolishing standing armies in due course of time, Ashoka, although adopting a policy of non-violence, did not disband his standing army. Further, arms control and disarmament theories advance for limited nuclear weapons usage as well as control of arms. Kant mentions that a peace treaty is not valid, if it is made with the secret reservation of material for a future war. Thus, in the contemporary period, the global world is witnessing a greater number of countries coming in possession of nuclear weapons, while countries already possessing them are in the process of further developing their nuclear arsenal. Thus, Kant's views are further criticised in reference to being utopian, idealistic.

The notion of 'peace history' of historical method to the study and attainment of world peace predates World War I. However, it was mainly during the interwar period that a small number of historians in several countries started to open up a terrain of historical enquiry that had been almost entirely neglected. The horrors of the Great War, together with the promising new experiments in international organization that it had occasioned. (Dungen and Wittner, 2003) According to Peter van den Dungen and Lawrence S. Wittner, "in the early 1960s, a concerted effort on the part of US historians resulted in the establishment of an organization for peace historians. Increasing anxiety about, and opposition to, the war in Vietnam, as well as the pervasive atmosphere of peril brought about by the nuclear arms race, were important factors behind it." Thus, reflecting the growing concern over violent conflict, particularly the Vietnam War and the nuclear arms race.

Boutros-Boutros Ghali writes, the concept of peace is easy to grasp; that of international security is more complex, due to a pattern of contradictions. As major nuclear powers have begun to negotiate arms reduction agreements, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction threatens to increase and conventional arms continue to be amassed in many parts of the world. Ghali further states, technological advances are altering nature and the expectation of life all over the globe. The revolutions in communication technology have brought the world closer, fostering a shared awareness, common aspirations, and stronger collective action against injustice. But progress also puts forward new risks for stability: ecological damage, disruption of family and community life, increased intrusion into the lives and rights of individuals.

The Agenda for Peace report also addresses the critically related concept of post-conflict *peace-building-action* to identify and support efforts aimed at strengthening and solidifying peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict. Preventive diplomacy aims to resolve disputes before they escalate into violence; peace-making and peace-keeping are required to halt conflicts and preserve peace once it is attained.

The world has been torn by relentless conflict and widespread human suffering and deprivation on a vast scale. However, these challenges would have been even more severe without the ongoing efforts of the United Nations. This extensive experience should be considered when evaluating the UN's potential to maintain international security, not just in its traditional role but also in addressing the new challenges of the future.

The Linkages of Pacifist and Internationalist Idea of Peace from the Indian Strategic Theory

Mauryan Emperor Ashoka fought the Kalinga war (present day Orissa) with the goal of annexing its territory, something that Chandragupta Maurya (founder of Mauryan Empire) had also attempted. The conflict occurred around 261 BCE and it is regarded as one of the most brutal and bloodiest wars in world history. Ashoka's military strength was far beyond time. The disaster in Kalinga was supreme: with around 300,000 casualties the city devastated and thousands of surviving men, women and children deported and displaced.

According to Joseph Campbell and V.R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, Kautilya or Chanakya and his Arthashastra are placed in the court of Chandragupta Maurya. Although there have been debates generated on the placement of Kautilya, some earlier texts suggest that Kautilya was present in the court of Chandragupta and that he had undertaken policy guidance under Kautilya. Professor Sekhar Bandhopadhyay has stated that Kautilya represents much of the current thoughts of the fourth century B.C. Further Mauryan dynasty is also accorded for the illustrious and prominent ruler Ashoka who was the grandson of Chandragupta Maurya.

George Modelski has described Kautilya's *Arthashastra* as a remarkable treatise on government and foreign policy. The literal meaning of "*Arthashastra*" is "*Science of Polity*"; it has been rendered as the study of politics, wealth and practical expediency, of ways of acquiring and maintaining power. (George, 1964). It is a manual of statecraft, a handbook of rulers. Kautilya and his *Arthashastra* are often compared to Sun Tzu's '*The Art of War*' or Niccolo Macchiavelli's '*The Prince*'.

According to Upinder Singh, "Ashoka's connection with Buddhism is reflected in Buddhist texts and in his inscriptions." He ardently followed the Buddha's teaching, and had a position of authority through the *sangha*. Buddhist texts present Ashoka as a vile and evil man until he came under the influence of the Buddha's *dharmma* and present Ashoka's 'conversion' to Buddhism as a sudden, transformative event. (Upinder, 2016)

Ashokan *Dhamma* or the Prakrit form of *dharma* (Sanskrit) is based on *ahimsa* (non-injury). According to I.B. Horner, *dharmma* refers to the "natural state or condition of beings and things, the law of their being, what it is right for them to be, the very stuff their being. If they do what is right for them, they are true to themselves." So *dharmma* also means truth, with the derived meaning of 'religious' truth.

Thapar has propounded the political rationale behind the spreading of *dharmma*. She reduces the Buddhist element in Ashoka's *dharmma* and focuses on the fact that there doesn't have to be a connection between the personal beliefs of a statesman and his public proclamations. *Dharmma* was an ideological tool used by Ashoka to weld and consolidate his far-flung empire. Due to lack of support in the early years of his reign, he sought the support of non-orthodox elements and saw the practical advantages of adopting and propagating *dharmma*, which was basically an ethical concept that focused on the relationship between the individual and society.

According to Upinder Singh, Kautilya refers to envoys associated with different powers and activities. The Mauryas entertained diplomats from various Hellenistic kingdoms. While Deimachus was the ambassador of Antiochus (king of Syria), Megasthenes was the ambassador of Seleucus Nikator. The *dharmma* missions and Buddhist missions dispatched by Ashoka to other kingdoms reflect other kinds of interaction with neighbouring kingdoms. (Singh, 2016) Hence, it can be understood that *Dharmma* did increase the Ashokan empire's interactions with the neighbouring kingdoms.

Here, an observation can be made that both Ashoka's *Dharmma Mahamattas* and Gandhi's *Shanti Sena* exemplify a commitment to peace and moral governance. Ashoka's officials promoted ethical conduct and social harmony across his empire, while Gandhi's peace army sought to actively prevent violence and promote non-violence during times of conflict.

Further, Mughal Emperor Akbar founded his own Sufi order dedicated to "divine monotheism" and wanted to find a society based on "universal peace." This is attributed to Mughal's achievement during his rule which saw the empire extended to the entire of India. (Tien, 2018) His religious policy was based on the doctrine of '*Sulh-i Kul*' meaning 'universal peace' as well as tolerance for every individual. He saw himself as the ruler of all his subjects, including Muslims, Hindus, and followers of other faiths.

According to Tien, one may pass over the principal injunctions and petty ritual that Akbar provided for the accepted disciples. The content of his teaching is, however, summed up most intelligently by his son Jahangir, when soon after his own accession, he followed his father in enrolling his own murids: "Let the disciples never make their own time dark and disturbed by the hostility against any religion (*millat*) from amongst the religions; with men of all faiths, let them follow the path of *Sulh-i-Kul* (Absolute Peace). Let them not kill any living being with their own hands or carry arms, except in war and hunt". (Tien, 2018) According to Rizvi, *Sulh-i-Kul* is total peace. This too as a term and as a concept has its roots in the mystic philosophical traditions going back to the great Spanish thinker and ultimately West Asian thinker, by migration, Ibn al Arabi. (Chandra and Habib, 1992)

Sulh-i-Kul means steps should be carried out to impress upon everyone the main spiritual truth and to tell everyone that all quarrels should not be permitted. And this means that this work can only be carried out by a sovereign who is the representative of God. (Chandra and Habib, 1992) And therefore, Akbar and Abul Fazl built up a theory of sovereignty which had two pillars: one is that of 'Social Contract' which Abul Fazl puts forward as '*Rawa-i-Rozi*', similar to the European 'Social Contract Theory' in the seventeenth century, which derives from early Greek thought. Both the Muslim world and the Renaissance inherited the theory of Social Contract. (Chandra and Habib, 1992) So, there is a social contract between the king and the subject, so much so that like some of the ancient Indian thinkers, Abul Fazl calls taxes as the 'wages of sovereignty'.

The Feminist Idea of Peace:

The early twentieth-century historical references to pacifist movements and feminist claims on gender issues are largely connected to the two world wars. Nonetheless, feminists have previously questioned the gender dynamics of the French Revolution and the exclusion of women from the celebrated new status of citizenship. Pacifists like Bertha von Suttner and revolutionaries like Rosa Luxemburg and Emma Goldman made specific reference to the hardship of women in war and the persistence of private and public tyranny; men's dominance in the family and in the public realm. (Ishwar, 2023) The continuum of violence, spanning from domestic violence to war, is thus a fundamental paradigm for Feminist Peace and Conflict Theory (FPCT).

According to Kaushiki Ishwar, 'her-story,' a feminist term coined in the early 1970s, emphasized the exclusion of women from 'His-story' in conventional historiography. In one component of FPCT, the biological vs socially produced concept of gender is still relevant. For essentialist feminists who argue on the basis of women's intrinsic peacefulness as enacted by parenting and caring, war is not just disproportionately hurting women, but it is the ultimate assault on 'feminine' nonviolent principles.

The limiting of public space by conflict is a significant source of worry for both liberal and equality feminists. Betty Reardon (1985) and Carol Pateman (1988) define the patriarchal contract that legitimizes violence and conflict as teaching males to be aggressive and women to be submissive. Following the recognition of women's experiences in war, both as active fighters and as victims, the question of intrinsic peace and maternal mentality was shattered. Aggression and submission were re-examined as gendered adjectives conditioning men and women. Barbara Ehrenreich (1997) describes bloodthirsty deities, warrior queens, ancient goddesses, and female fighters.

Cynthia Enloe wrote extensively on western armies' *militarized masculinity* as a foundation for nation state construction and national identity reassurance. The interconnectedness of nation-state development, masculine initiation into the military body, the myth of the protector and the innocent, civilian victim of war was the general assumption on which feminist peace and conflict theories were built from the late 1980s onward. Jean Bethke-Elshtain (1987) presented the concepts of the 'Beautiful Soul' and the 'Just Warrior' as gendered conceptions mutually reinforcing the reassurance of a national security rhetoric as well as the mobilization of soldiers for protection.

With the conclusion of the Cold War, there has been a shift in warfare. The situation in which FPCT manoeuvres has changed due to 'New Wars' in failed or weak regimes, terrorist attacks, and an increase in operations by private military security corporations (PMC). Despite the existence of

empirical evidence of women's involvement in new wars and the activities of female suicide bombers, there has been little research in the field of FPCT on this topic. (Kaldor, 2013)

Kalevi Holsti examines the question of the frequency and ranking of conflict-producing issues over which individuals and nations fight wars. He found that, in descending order, the most important and frequent issues are territory, nation state creation, ideology, economic factors (i.e., access to natural resources, monopolies over trade routes, access to waterways and potable water, protection of the lives, property, and investment of nationals abroad), protection of ethnic and religious confreres, and predation (i.e., the attempt to destroy a regime or dismember, partition, or liquidate a sovereign state).

According to studies of International Relations, peace is the elimination of war in the state. Bushra states that, 'peace happens when people are anticipating and managing conflicts without violence, and are engaging in inclusive social change processes that improve the quality of life.

Not only the relationship between individual and state, but also the reasoning of International Relations, became fundamental for another discipline of feminist theorists. In the early 1990s, scholars in the field of International Relations theory examined the gendered assumptions and founding myths of IR theory and its relationship to war and peace. Christine Sylvester (1993) questioned the concept of security in IR theory. Tickner (1991) reconstructed Hans Morgenthau's ideas of political realism, questioning security as military strength, power as abstract and absolute rather than relational, and the political realm as objective, logical, and separate from the domestic sector.

This leads Tickner and other female IR theorists to believe that IR theory is founded on the ideal of the masculine state, which operates independently of human action. FPCT goes on to claim that the dichotomic constructions of masculinity and femininity, which are inextricably linked to the concept of citizen-warriors, are organically dependent on the devaluation of the feminine.

The Idea of Peace from the Global South Perspective:

According to Satish Chandra and Irfan Habib, one of the tragedies of civilisation, culture, is probably not that this immense effort failed but that in spite of its immense boldness, how many political leaders today can make the kind of political statements in favour of tolerance, national unity being supreme over religious laws. Chandra and Habib further argue that Akbar could say that Muslim daughters should inherit the same share as their brothers. However, they question how many ministers today would be able to make that statement. Akbar could say that in the Hindu attitude towards women there is male chauvinism. He says: 'What is the glory of the male if the male thinks that only by his wife undergoing suffering, he would get salvation?'

The North-South divide and the socio-economic inequalities that sustain discrimination and marginalization often lead to conflicts. The liberals and neoliberals, realists and neo-realists, Marxists and neo-Marxists interpret peace and security and try to arrive at a more humane model of peace and security.

Samuel S. Kim has argued, 'in fact, it served as a rendezvous point for various disciplines concerned with human conflict behaviour'. Peace research was also 'more value-oriented', questioning 'the feasibility as well as desirability of value-neutral' inquiry. It was 'broader in its scope' since it studied violence in all forms, domestic or transnational. It probed conflicts in a comparative framework. (Lahiry, 2019)

IR theorists in the initial period have emphasized 'negative peace' or war prevention. In doing so, they had emphasized on international law, nuclear disarmament and international organization in the context of prevention of war. However, soon they recognized the fallacies of such conceptualization of peace. They now conceptualized the social, economic, cultural and environmental dimensions of peace. However, very soon, they realized the fallacies of such conceptualization of peace. Expanding and exploring beyond the narrow notion of military security, they discussed the varied aspects of social security, economic security, cultural diversity and environmental stability. Richard Falk believed that the problems of poverty, underdevelopment, repression and the escalation of large-scale violence in many parts of the world were intrinsically related to militarism. (Lahiry, 2019) The same argument was echoed by Rajni Kothari, who also pointed to 'non-military threats to peace arising out of socio-

economic and political progress'. He believed that the concept of peace should be conceived as a new conception of life itself and not in a negative sense as negation of war.

Ali Mazrui added a cultural dimension to peace by pointing out that the problem of world peace is in the initial stages, a problem of domestic cultures and of relations between social groups in individual countries and of values governing those groups. It could be said that all international wars have been, so far, externalized civil deficiencies, both cultural and social. To solve the problem of international conflict therefore necessitates an attempt to tackle the causes of domestic tensions and domestic pathologies. (Lahiry, 2019)

CONCLUSION:

While exploring the concept about the meaning of peace it is understood that the idea of peace must not be looked at in isolation. This paper focused on documenting the academic works of the gamut of scholars postulating the idea of peace. There was an attempt to do a comparative analysis of their work thematically. Through this paper it was highlighted that there is a dichotomy between the Global North and Global South perspectives of peace in which it correlates with one another and also has certain contradictions.

An effort was made to document both the contradictions and correlations. Further, a brief overview of the research concepts has been provided. An attempt was made to explore how orientalism, post-coloniality scholars explain the relationship between Global South and the Global North, and how their ideas of peace did not emerge in isolation. Galtung's positive peace and negative peace (forceful peace) did not emerge in isolation. Through colonialism, ideas travelled. Hence, in that aspect, it is realised that attaining positive peace was hinted by the following theorist has its roots in history as well. The ideas on positive peace as a practice was practised by various rulers, whose rule was documented by various scholars, philosophers such as Kautilya and Abul Fazal from an Indian context. Thus, the concept of peace in international relations is divided into two distinct perspectives. From the viewpoint of certain political theorists, peace is closely connected to the socio-economic, cultural, and power dynamics within different societies.

REFERENCES

- ❖ Anima Bose (1981), 'A Gandhian Perspective on Peace', Journal of Peace Research
- ❖ Boesche. Roger (2002), 'The First Great Political Realist', Lexington Books
- ❖ Boutros Boutros-Ghali (1992), 'An Agenda for Peace', United Nations
- ❖ Dr Sumit Mukherji (2021), 'From Negative to Positive Peace: Meeting of Two Seminal Minds', Environment and Society
- ❖ Gu, Meihong (2020), 'Marx and Engels' Peace Thought and Its Contemporary Value', Scientific and Social Research
- ❖ Johan Galtung (1985), 'Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses', Journal of Peace Research, Sage Publications
- ❖ Kaldor, Mary (2013), 'In Defence of New Wars', The London School of Economics and Political Science
- ❖ Karel Kára(1968), 'On the Marxist Theory of War and Peace', Journal of Peace Research
- ❖ Kaushiki Ishwar(2023), 'Feminist Peace and Conflict Theory : An overview', Unseen Conflicts
- ❖ Lahiry, Sujit (2019), 'Conflict, Peace and Security: An International Relations Perspective with Special Reference to India', Sage Journals
- ❖ Peter Vanden Dungen and Lawrence S. Wittner (2003), 'Peace History: An Introduction', Journal of Peace Research, Sage Publications
- ❖ Quincy Wright (1965), 'A Study of War', Second Edition, The University of Chicago and London Press
- ❖ Richmond P, Richmond (2020), 'Peace in International Relations', Taylor and Francis Group
- ❖ Immanuel Kant and Mary Campbell Smith (1975), 'Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay', Project Gutenberg

-
- ❖ Satish Chandra, J. S. Grewal and Irfan Habib (1992), '*Akbar and His Age: A Symposium*', Social Scientist
 - ❖ Singh, Upinder (2016), '*A History of Ancient and Early Medieval India: From the Stone Age to the 12th Century*', Pearson
 - ❖ Tanham, George (1964), '*Indian Strategic Thought: An Interpretative Essay*', Rand Publications

 - ❖ Thomas Weber (2004), '*The Impact of Gandhi on the Development of Johan Galtung's Peace Research*', *Global Change, Peace & Security*, Taylor and Francis Group
 - ❖ Tien, Nguyen (2018), '*A Study on Universal Peace and Harmony in Akbar's Religious*', *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*