

The IPRA Path

Katsuya Kodama

Secretary General of International Peace Research Association

1. The Time Leading Up to IPRA's Birth

The birth of peace studies was the demand of a time which was in almost desperate need of a more peaceful world. The Second World War had given rise to the tragedy of the mass killing of Jews by Nazi Germany and to so many other horrors. In the majority of the countries that had a part in the war, innocent people lost their lives at gunpoint or in aerial bombardments by the newest weaponry. The cruel death and suffering of millions led to efforts to create a new science that could contribute to making impossible the repetition of the tragedies of the Second World War. Approaches were undertaken toward a science that could foster peace and would be a counterweight to the sort of "science" that had been used to develop weapons of killing and war. The unprecedented tragedies of the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were war crimes that cannot be forgotten. The history of humanity was now divided into two parts: "before Hiroshima" and "after Hiroshima." The advent of nuclear weapons, with their possibility of exterminating the human race, was a portentous event in human history.

Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein, fearing an exacerbation of the East-West "Cold War," called together scientists from East and West (including the Japanese Nobel Prize winner in physics Hideki Yukawa), who together set forth the Russell-Einstein Declaration. This further brought to the attention of the world's scientists the danger to the very survival of humanity being posed by the development of nuclear weapons. As a result of a proposal made by Russell that the various scientists who had signed the declaration meet personally together, in July 1957 the first international "Pugwash Conference" was held in the fishing village of Pugwash, on the coast of Nova Scotia, Canada. Its mission was to try to slow and eliminate the competition in the development of nuclear weapons that had resulted from the US-USSR "Cold War."

"Peace research" can be said to have grown out of hard reflection on the tragedies of the Second World War and out of worry about the nuclear weapons competition between the United States and the Soviet Union which so rapidly advanced during the following years.

2. IPRA's Founding

One after another, scholars and researchers expressed a desire to build peace with the help of scientific research, forming study groups and then beginning to establish larger and more structured organizations. In 1959 a Peace Research Institute was formed in Norway as a part of that country's Social Sciences Research Institute, and then seven years later became more independently established as the Peace Research Institute, Oslo. In 1961 the Polemology Institute was founded at Groningen University in the Netherlands. Together with the initiatives taken by these researchers, special mention should be given to the role played by Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF). In 1962 the WILPF set up an International Consultative Committee on Peace Research chaired by the Norwegian-born American sociologist Elise Boulding, and carried out important "networking" for peace research at the international level. Elise Boulding began publishing, from 1963, an "International Peace Research Newsletter", and steps toward internationalizing peace research proceeded apace.

In August 1963 there took place in Switzerland, a preparatory committee meeting to make arrangements for an International Peace Research Conference. Key individuals at this meeting were Kenneth Boulding and John Burton, both of whom had earlier participated in international conferences on peace and security studies. In December of 1964, Johan Galtung and Bert Röling were key figures in establishing the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) in London. The first IPRA General Meeting was held at Groningen University in 1965, at which time fifteen managing council members were chosen.

3. IPRA's Earliest Years

Prof. Bert Röling (head of Groningen University's Polemology Institute) was chosen to be IPRA's first Secretary-General. He served in this capacity for three terms, or a total of six years, and succeeded in keeping IPRA moving ahead during this formative period. In the peace studies of this period a variety of approaches and schools of thought emerged and sometimes could even seem to be in opposition to one another. There were differences, for example, between researchers who looked toward quite radical or revolutionary changes and those who placed emphasis on the practicality of avoiding conflicts by way of more gradual changes. There were likely to be ideological divides over the fundamental question of just what the term "resolution of conflicts" meant. However, Prof. Röling managed to inspire much confidence and the various approaches that emerged during IPRA's formative period did not result in an organizational split.

During this period the International Peace Research Association published several issues of *IPRA Proceedings*. These compilations of papers presented at the Association's general meetings and still are of great value for understanding the IPRA members' interests and concerns at the time.

Following the initial general meeting in Groningen, the 2nd general meeting was held in Tallberg, Sweden, in 1967; the 3rd general meeting took place in Karlovy Vary, Czechoslovakia, in 1969; and the 4th general meeting was held in Bled, Yugoslavia (present-day Slovenia) in 1971.

4. The Development of Peace Studies during their Formative Period

A. Mathematical Models and Game Theory

As “peace studies” got under way in the 1960s, many researchers’ focus of interest was the fearsome competition in nuclear weapons. Dismally enough, the Cuban Missile Crisis was symbolic of the era.

Confronted with these sorts of situations, peace studies attracted attention partly by their use of a variety of new methodologies. There were first of all new mathematical “models.” This was no doubt influenced by the fact that many of the researchers who had deep concerns over nuclear weapons were themselves specialists in physics and mathematics, and as these new mathematical approaches were developed a new style for building the science of peace studies was developed that differed from the previously dominant styles of social science research. Johan Galtung, who was himself a mathematician, brought to his research this background and kindred fields of knowledge. The approach of using mathematics to make thinking about social phenomena into a “science” helped to establish the peace studies’ image of a new branch of research.

“Game theory” was also often used as a peace research methodology. The so-called “game of chicken,” in which two automobiles would be driven directly toward each to see which driver would first swerve to avoid a collision, had long been engaged in by a few reckless young people as a so-called “test of courage.” The term came to be used in various ways, and in the case of peace studies it was used as a simile for the situation where the United States and the Soviet Union kept rushing recklessly ahead on a path of expanding nuclear armaments. In a situation like that of the Cuban Crisis, unless one or both sides gave way to some extent the outcome would be mutual death. It was obvious that for both sides this was an extremely perilous game.

One well-publicized type of discussion in “game theory” had to do with “the prisoners’ dilemma.” Here the attempt is made to analyze, in the form of a game, how two prisoners who lack communications with one another are likely to waver between the choice of mutual cooperation and the choice of betrayal. The relationship between Prisoner A and Prisoner B might, for example, be represented as follows:

	Prisoner A	
	Does not confess	Confess

Prisoner B	Does not confess	P.A: sentence 1 year P.B: sentence 1 year	P.A: sentence 3 months P.B: sentence 10 years
	Confess	P.A: sentence 10 years P.B: sentence 3 months	P.A: sentence 8 years P.B: sentence 8 years

If both prisoners should have effective communications, the optimum choice is for neither to “confess,” but if communications are severed, judgments will still be made about what sorts of behavior might be expected on the part of the “other party.” The worst case is that although one does not himself confess, the other party does confess. Conversely, one’s best situation is where one confesses while the other party does not.

In the case of the nuclear weapons race, proper communication between the United States and the Soviet Union was effectively severed and each side was put into the situation of not knowing what the other was thinking. As suggested by the “prisoners’ dilemma,” the so-called worse case would be where the other side launches a nuclear attack while one’s own side does not. If this is the case, we can better understand the psychological state of mind where one side could be tempted to launch a preemptive strike. So methodologies like these were developed, in which international military stances, etc., were thought of as a type of “game” and attempts were made to find clues that could lead to resolving tensions.

B. Negative Peace and Positive Peace

However, research that leaned too much on the nuclear armaments race easily came in for criticism by peace researchers in “developing countries.” This was because in many of these countries the more immediate reality was that a great many people were dying of hunger, poverty and preventable disease even in the absence of nuclear war. Researchers from the “South” took issue with those from the “North” who could be said to treating the “South-North problem” too lightly because of an unbalanced emphasis on the “crisis before humankind” brought by nuclear weapons. The compilation of reports presented at the second IPRA general meeting contains a paper by S. Dasgupta from India. He is a post Gandhian, Director of the Gandhian Institute of Studies at Varanasi and a close associate of Jayaprakash Narayan, arguably the most famous of the post Gandhians and Sarvodaya leaders. He used the term “peacelessness” as a concept counterpoised to “peace.” In other words, peace was not just the absence of war, and even in the absence of war there are situations where a lack of peace prevails. In developing countries like India, even without war many people are suffering from hunger and poverty. And in this view, so long as this sort of situation is not ended, peace will not be realized. Thus researchers from the “South” began making a strong case for bringing greater attention to “South-North” questions.

Johan Galtung proposed a new concept for discussing this question. Briefly put, he called the situation of a mere absence of war “negative (passive) peace,” while designating as “positive peace” a

situation where social justice was realized and where hunger and poverty were no longer endemic problems. He subdivided the concept of “violence” into “direct violence” and “structural violence,” designating war as an example of the former and hunger and poverty as examples of the latter.

This new concept had a very large influence on the trends that would be adopted in the field of peace studies. The understanding took root that peace studies did not stop with research on wars and the nuclear weapons race but should be approached from the wider perspectives of “structural violence,” including the inequalities associated with economic unfairness and social injustices. Gradually, from the viewpoint of looking toward “positive peace,” various disciplinary fields, including economics, sociology, environmental sciences and women’s studies, brought together a new style for addressing many of the problems we face in our earthly lives.

5. IPRA in the 1970s Period of Development

Following Bert Røling as IPRA secretary-general, Asbjørn Eide (head of the Peace Research Institute, Oslo) was twice elected to serve two-year terms as secretary-general, from 1971 to 1975. In contrast to the “period of IPRA’s establishment” in which greatest emphasis was placed on resolving the “nuclear question” under the influence of the US-USSR Cold War, in this subsequent “period of development” much greater attention was paid to “South-North problems.” Galtung had already offered the concepts of structural “violence” and “positive peace,” thus underlining the significance of studying the problem of poverty in the “South,” but in the “period of development” of the 1970s and the first half of the 1980s, research into these sorts of questions became more detailed and at the same time adopted further theoretical frameworks. It was during this period that the Vietnam War ended and the US-USSR Cold War underwent a greater “systematization.”

Special mention should be made of the fact that the 5th IPRA general meeting took place in India, in the city of Varanasi (Benares). With this IPRA conference in India, the peace studies which had earlier been disproportionately associated with Europe -- and especially Northern Europe -- had now definitely transcended the European frame. In 1975 the 6th IPRA general meeting was held in the old Finnish city of Turku, and two years later the 7th general meeting took place in Oaxtepec, Mexico. It can be said that with this second hosting of an IPRA general meeting in a “southern” country the position of “South-North issues” in peace research was further heightened.

Eide’s successor as secretary-general was Raimo Väyrynen (head of the Tampere Peace Research Institute, who served in that capacity during four years, after which the IPRA secretariat moved in 1979 to Tokyo, Japan, with Yoshikazu Sakamoto (professor at the University of Tokyo) as secretary-general. This was the first time for the secretariat to be located outside of Europe, and this well symbolized how peace studies were no longer “Euro-centered.” The Peace Studies Association of Japan had been established in 1974, and already by 1979 the accomplishments of peace studies in Japan had received

much positive recognition.

The 8th IPRA general meeting, in 1979, was held in Königstein, West Germany, and the 9th general meeting was held in Orillia, Ontario, Canada.

6. Developments in Peace Studies after 1970

A. The “Systems Approach”

Attempts to analyze structural violence from a global perspective in terms of relationships of dominance and subordination got well under way in the 1970s. Until then, the gap between the so-called “developed” and “developing” countries had been widely conceptualized as a “time gap” in “stages of development.” In other words, the developing countries were thought to be in a transitional period on the way to becoming developed countries, something that was seen as a “question of time.” However, it began to be argued that in reality a worldwide system had come about which gave special advantages to the developed countries, in ways whereby many developing countries had much of their wealth unfairly exploited and were unable, regardless of how much time might pass, to become “developed countries” or to extricate themselves from poverty.

“Assistance” from developed countries in the form of technology and values like “democracy” and “free competition” based on Western European modes of thought were more likely to be means for the “advanced” countries of the “North” to acquire still more prominent advantages than to be fundamentally linked to advantages for the less developed countries of the “South,” which in many cases were seen to be getting more impoverished. If a “North-reliant” type of industrialization” were carried forward, the “South” was hardly likely to become prosperous; rather one was likely to see a reinforced structure of exploitation by which the gap between dominance and subordination would tend to become all the more pronounced. In this conceptualization, the developing countries were not, in any simple way, on the path to development but were rather caught up in a system by which weaker countries were dominated by stronger countries.

If either the capitalist world or the socialist world were to be considered from this point of view, one could see not only a simple structure of confrontation between the two but also more complex structures of dominance and subordination. In other words, whether in the capitalist or the socialist worlds, “central” countries exercised political, economic and cultural dominance over “satellite” countries and tended to profit from them, while the satellite countries tended to become further caught up in mechanisms of exploitation. The analysis was often made that the confrontation between capitalism and socialism served to a considerable extent to permit the conservation of profits and advantages for the respective “central” countries.

The question of how one might overcome this sort of international structure of exploitation came to be seen as a new central task for peace studies.

B. The Development of Peace Education Research

During this period IPRA's Peace Education Commission (PEC) showed especially remarkable development. There is of course a tendency for peace studies to become more "specialized" as it strives to attain more scholarly recognition. Attention tends to be given to scholarly refinement through frequent recourse to sophisticated theoretical frameworks and the often hard-to-understand science of statistics. However emphasis must also be given to the question of how large numbers of ordinary people can together learn about the accomplishments of peace studies and to how this sort of peace education can be presented in an interesting, participatory, and easy-to-understand way. This will naturally mean new styles and novel methodologies.

The IPRA Peace Education Commission early on took up "development education," "gender education," and "multicultural education," and developed workshop-style teaching methods. But one might say that this often had more to do with developing its own methods, ideologies and ways of thinking than with explaining in a truly simple way the accomplishments of a "peace studies" that is in many ways akin to the study of international relations. It came to be said that in order to build peace and to oppose the thinking and culture of authoritarianism it was indispensable to create a more "human" type of culture. Among the Japanese peace researchers and educators who actively took part in the development of the PEC were Hisako Ukita and Mitsuo Okamoto.

7. IPRA's Period of Maturation

At the 10th IPRA general meeting held in Győr, Hungary, in 1983, the post of secretary-general passed from Yoshikazu Sakamoto to Chadwick Alger of Mershon Center of Ohio State University. Prof. Alger, a scholar in international relations, was also known for his role in pointing out the significance to peace studies of local governments, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and various citizens' movements. During the first half of the 1980s "new peace movements" were making their mark, especially in Europe, North America, and Japan. The Committee for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) in Britain and the Green Party in West Germany continued notable development, and international NGOs associated with peace and environmental protection came to have a much greater influence on society and on the United Nations.

Picking up on this worldwide wave of reinvigorated citizens' movements, peace studies advanced to a new stage. In other words, international NGOs (sometimes called "INGOs") came to front stage as actors in international relations, which meant that there was now a need to assign them a definite standing in peace studies. At the same time, international NGOs came to play definite roles as powers

in putting into practice many of the accomplishments of peace studies.

Within IPRA a Peace Movements Commission was born, at first chaired by Nigel Young, a professor at Colgate University in Hamilton, New York State. An important and newly highlighted topic was the tripartite balance and interrelationships among “peace studies,” “peace education,” and “peace movements.”

While there were on the one hand these and other positive effects, as peace studies became more diversified, there arose the criticism that it was losing its “core.” In addition to such traditional “core” elements as international relations theory and disarmament studies, other specialized branches of research, including “development theory,” environmental studies, gender studies, research into peace movements, and refugee studies had come to make their presence felt, even if their interrelationships were not always as clear as some might hope. Circumstances in this period were such that the question of just what “peace studies” ought to be were confusing and not always well understood. IPRA’s “commissions” had grown more numerous, and their mutual links and relationships often seemed to need greater clarity.

When Prof. Alger was Secretary General he made one of his prime goals to strengthen the global scope of participation in IPRA. IPRA was doing relatively well in Western Europe, United States, and Canada, and reasonably well in South Asia and Japan. He decided to focus his efforts to strengthen the weak participation from Africa and Latin America. His first effort was to plan to hold our conference in 1986 in Cairo. With the collaboration of a board member from Cairo he went to Cairo and was taken to see Boutros Boutros Ghali in the Foreign Office. He was very responsive and promised to help us with \$10,000 to be used to bring scholars from southern Africa to the conference in Cairo. Arrangements were made for the conference to be held at an Arab League conference site in Cairo, and he made arrangements for housing to be at a reasonably priced motel near the airport. But then, less than two months before the conference, Prof. Alger received a message from a contact in Cairo that Egyptian scholars had announced that they would not attend the conference because Israelis would be attending. After checking this out with the IPRA board member, core members agreed that a primary purpose of holding the conference in Cairo would be completely undermined if scholars from Egypt, and quite likely from other Arab countries, would not attend.

Therefore, IPRA was confronted with the challenge of quickly finding, and publicizing another site. Toward this end, a couple of IPRA members from the UK were very helpful in making arrangements with Sussex University.

In 1986, the 11th IPRA general meeting was held at Sussex University in England. It should be noted that, reflecting the trends of the times, the participants included a large number who represented various “peace movements.”

A challenge at Sussex was the fact that President Reagan directed the bombing of Libya at the time of our conference. A movement emerged for members of IPRA at the conference to go to London and demonstrate against the US bombing. This would, of course, have destroyed the conference. To help to undermine this effort Prof. Alger, secretary-general agreed to have a plenary on the Libyan situation and this overcame the move to travel to London.

The majority of members of IPRA strongly believed that members should not take positions on political issues in the name of IPRA. IPRA members are researchers and educators. IPRA is trying to contribute knowledge that is useful toward the end of building a more peaceful world. As we engage in this research we should have visions of more peaceful futures which we hope our knowledge will help policy makers to achieve. But it would be a great mistake for IPRA members to spend their time performing as a legislature, attempting to reach a common position on policy issues. This incident has become a good opportunity that members realize that the purpose of IPRA conference is to share the results of our research.

At the Sussex conference Clovis Brigagão from Brazil was elected secretary-general, and thus for the first time the IPRA secretariat was located in a “developing country.” This in itself was a very positive and notable development.

However, it appeared that to coordinate IPRA from a developing country was far from easy and the 12th IPRA general meeting in Rio de Janeiro had various difficulties from a “management” point of view. To some, it even seemed that IPRA, which had already in its “period of maturity,” had fallen into a crisis where its very continuation was being placed in question.

It was Elise Boulding who rescued IPRA from this situation and did much to strengthen it. Having played a central role in IPRA since its founding and called by some people the “mother of peace studies,” Elise Boulding, now taking up the challenge of this “IPRA crisis,” agreed to serve from 1989 to 1991 as the Association’s secretary-general. However, sufficiently positive support was not forthcoming from the university to which she belonged and her term of office began under very difficult conditions.

One of the first things that Elise Boulding did was to encourage the ongoing activities of IPRA’s many commissions and study groups. There were now 16 commissions and study groups, including a Human Rights Study Group, a Communications Group, and a Defense and Disarmament Study Group. At this time their members undertook important steps to invigorate their activities and to further develop peace studies.

In 1989, IPRA received the UNESCO Prize for Peace Education, as a result of the recognition given to the work of its Peace Education Commission (PEC).

The 1990 general meeting, which commemorated the quarter-century mark since IPRA's founding, was held at Groningen University in The Netherlands. There were about 350 participants and many lively discussions. Even if during this period IPRA's international standing and recognition was high, holding the general meeting was not easy given the lack of adequate operating funds. But even if there was not much money to use, the 1990 conference nevertheless scored many successes due to Elise Boulding's great competence as a facilitator and to the enthusiasm shown by the participants.

In order to assist IPRA' activities financially, IPRA foundation was established in 1990. It is a non-profit,tax-exempt organization to further the purposes and activities of IPRA. The Foundation began as a depository of funds brought in by people with specific projects, the main task was to invest those funds safely in socially acceptable enterprises for a modest charge and pay them out as needed. A short description of the five Foundation projects follows;

<p>*Dorothy Marcus Senesh Fellowship Endowment</p> <p>The Senesh Endowment provides a biennial fellowship for two years of graduate study to a Woman from the Third World.</p>
<p>*Kenneth Boulding Memorial Conference Funding Fund</p> <p>The Boulding Fund Supports research activities of IPRA Commissions and a limited number of travel grants.</p>
<p>*Paul Smoker Memorial Peace Fund</p> <p>The Smoker Fund provides small grants for research on holistic views of peace. Small Peace Research Grants Small research grants up to \$3000 to support systematic observation or study of conflict phenomena and peace strategies.</p>
<p>*IPRA Foundation Endowment Fund</p> <p>The Endowment Fund supports the work of the International Peace Research Association and its affiliates, including expenses and needs of the IPRA Foundation.</p>

8. The Development of Peace Studies during IPRA's "Period of Maturation"

A. Gulf War and IPRA

On August 2, 1990, Iraq's army invaded and occupied Kuwait. In response, the UN Security Council approved a series of resolutions which imposed economic sanctions and demanded the unconditional

withdrawal of the Iraqi army from Kuwait. At the same time there was put together a 500,000-strong multinational military force, known as “Operation Desert Shield,” with members not only from the United States but also from Saudi Arabia, the UK, Egypt, Syria, France, and other countries. In September, when the Iraqi government did not opt to withdraw from Kuwait, a new UN Security Council resolution authorized the use of military force, which led to the initiation of “Operation Desert Storm.”

In response to this strained situation, IPRA set up a “Working Committee to Research for the Peace Building in the Middle East.” This committee quickly put together an international network of researchers and set to work on producing scenarios for avoiding war.

In January 1991 war broke out when the multinational force commenced bombardment from airplanes and missiles against sites in Iraq. The above-mentioned IPRA committee was now busy working on scenarios for bringing peace at the earliest possible juncture. On February 26 Kuwait was liberated and two days later attacks against Iraq by the multinational force were ended.

The interval between the war’s beginning and end was short, and the IPRA committee’s “Scenario for Peace” presented to the UN was not completed prior to the ending of hostilities. However, in the process of producing this scenario a variety of papers and opinions were exchanged and some significant results were achieved. These can be said to have constituted a groundbreaking activity by which IPRA addressed a real, ongoing war from a standpoint informed by careful thinking and scholarship. The central roles in this committee were played by IPRA secretary-general Elise Boulding and by committee members Saul Mendlovitz and Håkan Wiberg.

B. Theories about New Social Movements

The wave of peace movements that came to the fore during the first half of the 1980s had a strong impact on peace researchers. Sociologists saw this wave within the framework of “new theories on social movements” and designated these new peace movements as being examples of global citizens’ initiatives aiming at autonomy and self-determination. Concepts of “citizens’ autonomy” and of “European independence from the United States” were put forward, and often heated discussions took place.

In the work of many sociologists, philosophers and political scientists, one can find a theoretical framework that is akin to this “new theories on social movements” approach. Among such researchers one could name, for example, Alain Touraine, Jürgen Habermas, Jean Cohen, and Klaus Offe. Northern Europe has also produced some unique researchers. Some of the work of Johan Galtung, Mats Friberg, and, Gunnar Olfsson are especially noteworthy for synthesizing currents of research into “new social movements” with the traditions of peace research in Northern Europe.

This “new social movements” type of approach, through a comparison with the older labor union movements, tries to make clear the peculiarities of movements for peace and for protecting the environment, but it cannot be said that sufficient consideration has yet been given to the positive and constructive mutual relationships *between* these two categories of new social movements. In studying movements aimed at peace and at environmental conservation, and in looking ahead to their further development in the arena of practical accomplishments, it is necessary to consider all their individual special characteristics – and also, for that matter, the special characteristics of the older labor union movements – and to look for the various mutually reinforcing interrelationships among them.

While incorporating considerations of diversity and definitional vagueness or versatility, Western European “new social movements” sociologists and peace researchers continued to build up a new paradigm for studying social movements. This can be said to be an extremely important “theoretical” development in the field of social movements research.

9. IPRA in a Period of Change after 1990

The Soviet Union’s secretary-general (later president) Mikhail Gorbachev, who stood for new ways of thinking, changed Soviet diplomatic policy from its roots. In 1989 the Malta Talks were opened and an end to the Cold War was declared. And the Berlin Wall, which had for twenty-eight years separated East and West Germany, was taken down in November 1989. The East-West Cold War was indeed coming to its end.

For peace studies, the resolution of the East-West Cold War was something of enormous importance. With the end of the US-USSR cold war structure, peace studies were obliged to develop important changes in style. On the one hand, as the optimistic view that peace had arrived was becoming widespread, there was in some quarters something of a mood that maybe the mission of peace studies had, like the Cold War, ended. However, many would now agree that subsequent world situations presented peace studies with still more complex and difficult tasks.

First of all, one was a surfacing of numerous racial and ethnic antagonisms, as if taking the place of earlier ideological antagonisms. Symbolic of these were the conflicts which erupted in Yugoslavia after 1991. In the course of these conflicts both “Serbian” and “Croatian” forces carried out systematic maltreatment and massacres of people from other ethnic groups, with the result that over 200,000 people died and over 2.5 million became refugees. Both economically and spiritually, great numbers of people suffered profound injuries. And a point that cannot be overlooked is that, in contradistinction to the East-West rapprochement, there was an enlargement of gaps between South and North. The phenomena “globalization,” involving a central trend in the world economy to evolve toward the standards of a capitalistic market economy, intensified. As a result, capitalistic-types of “gaps” in people’s welfare – including disparities within the countries of the North – tended to take on

more global proportions. However, at the same time the undeniably observed movements toward a “globalization” of democracy and human rights awareness also became more active, and international NGOs acquired a growing influence.

As international conditions continued to change greatly, peace studies, through a process of “trial and error,” looked for new roles and methodologies. After the beginning of the 1990s, there was almost no economic support from UNESCO to subsidize IPRA’s administrative costs, and so one of the tasks facing IPRA was that of becoming economically self-supporting.

Below I should like to review some of the issues which IPRA dealt with at each of its general meetings from 1992 onward.

10. The Kyoto General Meeting

From July 27 to 31, 1992, IPRA’s 14th general meeting was held at the Kyoto International Conference Hall and at Kyoto’s Ritsumeikan University, and had the joint sponsorship of the Peace Studies Association of Japan and the Science Council of Japan. It was the first IPRA general meeting held in East Asia and saw enthusiastic discussions among 450 participants from forty countries, 230 of them coming from outside Japan. In keeping with this conference’s main theme of “Challenges of a Changing Global Order,” presentations were given on research carried out in various related fields including environmental protection, human rights and development, and internal and international conflicts.

The following short description of the Kyoto conference is based upon an article which I submitted to the *Kyōto minpō* newspaper (published 23 August 1992):

A. Searching for Post-“Cold War” Peace

This event in Kyoto, Japan, drew special attention for being a peace studies conference held following the worldwide changes that occurred following the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War. Without doubt the main actors in international politics during the Cold War era were the American and Soviet superpowers. However in the post-Cold War present, together with the UN, a variety of citizens’ movements and especially international NGOs are strengthening their influence. This is not just in political and economic aspects but is also linked to the creation of a culture of peace along novel lines which go beyond the earlier emphasized paradigms.

On the evening of the second day of the Kyoto conference there was a plenary symposium under the name “Peacekeeping and Peace-building by the United Nations”, cosponsored by IPRA and the United Nations University (UNU) in Tokyo. It was an event open to the general public and attracted much

interest. Given the recent exacerbation of internal conflicts, especially in Yugoslavia and Cambodia, the UN's peacekeeping activities have been frequently discussed in the mass media. At the Kyoto conference's plenary symposium chaired by UNU rector DaSouza, emphasis was put on the need to utilize UN capabilities to the greatest extent possible as well as the need for changes in ways of thinking that would make this possible as an approach toward resolving the growing number of international and internal conflicts. It was proposed that we should get away from former ways of thinking grounded largely in the bipolar Cold War structure and aim at the building of a democratic international society in which the UN would play a major role.

B. The Ideal Image of NGO Participation

Nonetheless, it would be a mistake to burden the UN with *too many* expectations. The UN is, needless to say, an organization made up of nation-state units, and as such it must be said to have great limitations. In other words, because the UN is an agglomeration of nation-states and governments, bureaucratization continues to be a major problem and people's real-life sufferings and immediate concerns tend to get diluted and overlooked.

When we think carefully about the UN's inherent shortcomings, we see how very necessary are activities at the level of ordinary citizens. At this Kyoto conference there was much enthusiastic discussion of possibilities for international NGOs to participate in UN-centered peace activities. Today, when so much is being said about the need for "international contributions," what sorts of things do people have in mind when they talk about participation by NGOs in the real world? The Canadian peace researcher Hanna Newcombe has recently proposed UN citizens' bodies that would function with NGOs. Such citizens' groups would have the right to voice their opinions and ideas on world politics and governance, and ought, as an extension of this, play an important role in the search for a new global order. Possibilities are being suggested for a dynamic transition from an international politics "among nation-states" to an international politics "among citizens."

At this Kyoto conference one could in fact easily observe a very active participation by NGOs and other citizens' groups. I felt very grateful for how consumers' organizations and youth groups in the Kyoto-Osaka region, as well as women's groups, gave their support, in a variety of ways, to the conference's success. Since its founding in 1964, IPRA has worked toward a science of "putting peace into practice." It has advocated and promoted mutual contacts and cooperation with "peace movements" and other citizens' groups, believing that that one should break through any shell of "scholarship for the mere sake of scholarship," or, to put it another way, should get away from "ivory tower" scholarship that is isolated from the ordinary human community. I believe this sort of accumulated experience greatly contributed at the Kyoto conference to the success of constructive dialogue between researchers and citizens' organizations.

C. The Spiritual and Cultural Aspects of Peace-building

At the Kyoto conference the importance was repeatedly pointed out of not being limited by conventional and already existing ideas. It is noteworthy that Johan Galtung, Jan Øberg and other leading peace studies practitioners were among those who stressed this point. Something that NGOs will particularly require will be the ability to help create a “peace culture.” It will not be possible to move forward unless the individual citizens who make up international society make efforts, grounded in an enlightened awareness and maintaining their individual creativity, to build peace in its spiritual and cultural aspects. When we consider the proposition that the creation of peace culture must be the basis for world peace, we can only say that the mission to be carried out by citizens’ movements is very great indeed.

In connection with the task of creating a culture of peace, it is of course worth specially noting the long history and important cultural heritage of the conference’s host city Kyoto. The conference program included a reception at the Kiyomizudera Buddhist temple as well as visits to a traditional Nishijin textile workshop and to the pre-1868 Nijōjō imperial palace. These experiences should not be seen as mere pastimes or amusements. In thinking about questions of culture in our new era, great importance should be given to the inspiration which Kyoto’s rich traditional culture was able to impart.

Can we not say that a vital clue to resolving the confusions of a world still filled with conflict is to build, through what might be called a paradigm of “popularism” (defined largely by the growing prominence of NGOs and an international politics linked to the UN), an innovative and peace culture appropriate to our new post-Cold War era? The Kyoto conference made us feel this can be realized.

11. The IPRA 15th General Meeting in Malta

IPRA’s 15th general meeting was held from October 30 to November 4, 1994, in Valetta, Malta. Approximately 200 participants from some 40 countries carried out lively discussions on the theme “Intercultural Conflicts: The Roles of Peace Research and Education.” The following remarks on this conference are based on an article I contributed to the publication *Heiwa kenkyū* (Peace Research) (no. 20).

A. Peace Research and Means of Communication

The rapid strides being made by new means of communication are having a great influence on peace research and other peace-related activities. Through the spread of computers and the establishment of electronic mail systems, one gap between “South” and “North” has, to a large extent, been filled in. At one of the plenary meetings Elise Boulding, emphasizing the importance of the role of international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs) and in this regard, spoke of how the development of new means of communication is having a great impact on INGO activities. Also impressive how former IPRA secretary-general Paul Smoker several times emphasized, in commission meetings and before a

meeting of the IPRA Council, the need for an innovative relationship between peace research and the development of e-mail.

There were voices from some researchers from “southern” countries to the effect that “to stress the role of electronic mail and the like means that our environment, where we don’t even have fax machines, is not being understood.” However, it would seem that in fact the number of “southern” researchers already using e-mail (often having skipped entirely the use of faxes) is increasing, and e-mail, partly because of its low cost, seems likely to become an effective means of overcoming the communications gap between North and South. Japanese researchers who are still trying to make do with fax machines would seem, on the contrary, to be in danger of falling behind the times. At present a large part of the information sent out by the IPRA secretariat is done by e-mail. If we consider Japan’s particularly expensive postal and telephone rates, the Peace Studies Association of Japan would do well to study and to try to emulate the effective use of e-mail. IPRA has already experimented with international “e-mail conferences” and these will probably become more common in the future. The creative utilization of new means of communication in response to fluid world conditions has become an important task for peace researchers.

B. Peace Research and Creating a Peace Culture

UNESCO has launched its “Project for the Creation of Culture of Peace”, and at IPRA’s Malta general meeting there were also several discussions of “peace culture.” Most tried to squarely address the question of how a “culture of peace” can be created. The significance of peace research taking on the question of “peace culture” should by no means be underestimated. One problem that peace research must today cope with is the fact that with the subdivisions in areas of research and a trend toward greater specialization we are tending to lose a certain “comprehensiveness” that can tie all these various branches together. With IPRA there are today approximately 20 research “commissions” and it is not only very difficult to link them together but in some instances it might even seem that their large number could interfere with the various commissions’ overall effectiveness. Coming to grips with the very comprehensive issue of building “a culture of peace” can surely provide an opportunity for repositioning peace research from a more organic and inclusive point of view.

At this Malta conference an argument was made for the need to establish a “peace theories” research commission, and this in itself could be called one attempt at more holistically refashioning our overall field of peace research, which many feel is too subdivided into rather narrowly specialized sub-disciplines. It was in fact decided that following the Malta conference a new IPRA commission on peace theories would begin its activities. As to what results it will bring, we can only wait and see, but it is surely a development that merits our attention and interest

C. IPRA Organizational Reform

A distinctive feature of the Malta conference was the discussions that took place on reforming IPRA's organizational structure. Several informal "discussion meetings on reform" were held, at each of which there were a large number of participants and sometimes heated discussions. Even if these discussions did not necessarily go "smoothly" (partly because of some procedural problems), one could keenly feel the very great enthusiasm of the IPRA members for their activities and could be optimistic about the continued positive development of peace studies.

The most important focus of the reforms was the establishment of the new post of IPRA "president." Up until then, IPRA had directed a very great amount of its work to its secretary-general, and a succession of secretary-general had sensed a need for subdividing responsibilities. It was thus proposed that this difficulty could be relieved by establishing the additional post of "president." (Note: Adding the post of "president" turned out to be the increase of bureaucratic works for secretariat, and thus the post was abolished at Tampere conference in 2000.)

Various considerations were brought forward, including the "balance" between researchers from "South" and "North," the balance between men and women, and strategies for raising operational funds. A nomination committee had to come up with nomination proposals even while the new organizational pattern was still being left unclear, and the whole process took longer than expected. However it should be seen as quite significant that various problems which IPRA needed to deal with were frankly debated. At the time of the 12th general meeting in Brazil a good deal of alarm was expressed about IPRA "being in a crisis," but in Malta the atmosphere was different and the discussions were positive, grounded in the importance of the role of peace research in our changing international society.

It was finally decided that five persons would be elected: a secretary-general, a president, and three vice-presidents. Karlheinz Koppe (from Germany) was elected secretary-general; Kevin Clements (from the USA) was elected as president; and Sanaa Oseiran (France/Lebanon), Maria Elena Valenzuela (Chile) and Diyanana Ywassa-Varango (Togo) were elected as vice-presidents.

12. The 16th IPRA General Meeting in Brisbane

Between July 8 and 12, 1996, the 16th IPRA general meeting was held at the University of Queensland in Brisbane, Australia. Nearly 850 peace researchers and peace educators from around the world took part, making it the largest conference in IPRA's history. In spite of the view taken by some that after the end of the Cold War the peace studies movement was stagnating, judging from the great success of the of the Brisbane conference one had to feel that peace studies, grounded in a constant accumulation of efforts and accomplishments as well as in the enthusiasm of peace researchers, was steadily growing and developing. Brisbane's winter climate was sunny and pleasant, like early summer in Japan, and the city's splendid natural environment seemed to make it all the easier for the conference participants,

whose ethnic and national diversity suggested a sort of tour of the world, to get acquainted and enthusiastically address the topics at hand. The following summary of some of these topics is based on an article I contributed to *Heiwa kenkyū* (no. 21).

A. Transcending East and West

Even though Australia is culturally based in the geographical West, it is part of the geographical East, and the Brisbane general meeting was an occasion for finding points of contact between East and West. The very wording of the conference's main theme, "Creating a Nonviolent Future" can be said to reflect this. In the study of "nonviolence" important roles are played by research on Gandhi and by the study of Buddhism and other elements of "Eastern thought." For "peace research" of a type that had its origins in Western patterns of thinking to grow into a broader more truly "humanistic" discipline, it is indispensable to include these "eastern" elements. The Brisbane conference's organizing committee chairman Ralph Summy, the "Creating a Nonviolent Future" plenary session chairman Michael True, and many of the other presenters including Glenn Paige and Johan Galtung, are known as scholars with a deep grounding in Eastern cultures. We could even say that the early morning *t'ai-chi* exercises that many of the participants took part in during the conference period and the several demonstrations of *ikebana* flower arrangement helped symbolize the efforts which are being put into giving "peace research" a larger representation of Eastern patterns of thought.

However, this kind of trend is itself by no means new. Even twenty years ago this sort of approach was already getting a good deal of attention, and today it is necessary to give it still deeper content. At this conference there was in fact much discussion about not just finding points of convergence between East and West but how to go further to best utilize this approach for addressing real problems in our world. I felt that real effort was being given to going beyond frameworks of narrow academic theory and thought to discover in peace studies a "science of the practical" in ways that also transcend East and West. Today's world is of course full of all kinds of problems including armed conflicts, hunger, and poverty. And serious problems will no doubt still be part of our world in the future. How will peace studies respond to these very real matters that require our attention? At the Brisbane conference we felt that dialogue linking East and West was definitely aiming in the direction of new developments that would enhance peace studies' capacities for helping to put useful ideas into effective and practical action.

B. Regional Networks

One thing I feel each time I attend an IPRA general conference is how, as a sort of counterpart to the regionalization of international politics, peace research is continuing to develop along regional lines. IPRA encompasses 5 regional peace research organizations, which not only carry on their own research activities but also have an increasingly important significance for IPRA because of their help with various clerical matters, nominating members of the IPRA Council, etc. At the time of Brisbane conference, these 5 regional organizations are the Consortium for Peace Research, Education and Development (COPRED, based in North America), the European Peace Research Association (EuPRA), the Asia-Pacific Peace Research Association (APPRA), the African Peace Research Association (AfPRA), and the Latin American Council of Peace Research (Centro Latinoamericano para Investigar la Paz, or CLAIP). There also exists in North America the PSA (Peace Studies Association), more of whose core members play important roles in IPRA even if as an organization it is not officially one of IPRA's regional constituent bodies. (In 2003, COPRED and PSA has merged into one body, the Peace and Justice Studies Association.)

Since the Brisbane general meeting was held in the Asia-Pacific region, a plenary session under the name "Creating Peace in the Asia-Pacific Region" was held, on the morning of the third day. At this session, Yoko Ogashiwa from Japan drew attention with her presentation entitled "A South Pacific Forum in the Context of Asia-Pacific Macroregionalism: the Demand for Peace and Security." Rohan Gunaratna from Sri Lanka reported on the cruel realities of conflicts in South Asia, emphasizing the urgent need to bring together the wisdom of peace researchers to establish a more robust framework for resolving these regional disputes. Johan Saravanamuttu from Malaysia and Joseph Camilleri from Australia added their voices to the need for regional frameworks to promote confidence-building, and general approval was given to promoting "regional bases" for peace research. However, at the same time it is of course a reality that in our age of international awareness and better information flows (at least potentially), even so-called "regional problems" should be also considered from a world perspective. Thus we can say that a continuing task for peace research is how best to harmonize two important currents: "regionalization" and "globalization."

On the fourth day of the Brisbane conference (July 11) each of the five regional organizations separately held their own meetings. At the meeting of the Asia-Pacific Peace Research Association which I attended, Omar Farouk of Hiroshima City University gave a report titled "Peace Research in the Asia-Pacific Region." In response to this report, a lively discussion took place for about an hour, and a number of viewpoints were expressed. It was a very significant meeting which gave us a strong confidence in the potentialities for effective peace studies in the Asia-Pacific region.

C. Internet Availability and Peace Research

Electronic mail and the diffusion of the Internet are having a great influence on peace research. IPRA

now has an e-mail networking system called "List-Serve," developed at the initiative of George Kent at the University of Hawaii. I am a member of this network and feel that it will bring positive changes to peace research because of the way it facilitates substantive communications without losing time and also at a low cost. What is needed in response to the current problems of our age is the most effective possible means for discussing them together and to search for various ways to come to close grips with them and help devise workable solutions. The development of e-mail and the Internet can surely be a great help to this practical side of peace research. Already when worrisome problems have arisen in, for example, the "Middle East," information and opinions have been shared via IPRA's "List-Serve" network, and we have seen what might be called "e-mail conferences."

At the Brisbane IPRA general meeting, the relevance of electronic mail and the Internet to peace research was discussed on several occasions. Opinions were expressed to the effect that since, in an international organization like IPRA not all members have e-mail access, to rely too much on this medium could bring about a "North-South" problem in regard to transmitting information. However the general feelings seems to have been that the current rapid diffusion of computer technology is in fact contributing greatly to the elimination of North-South gaps of this sort. When one used to rely largely on postal services, researchers in developing countries were often disadvantaged by the time and cost involved in exchanging information, and with of course some exceptions it tended to be relatively difficult for them to make key contributions to international research networks. However due to the diffusion and falling costs of modems, the great majority of participants in the Brisbane conference from developing countries already had access to e-mail and many were in this way successfully overcoming earlier information handicaps. It was determined at the meeting of IPRA Council members that almost all of them also used e-mail to exchange information and carry out substantive discussions.

Peace research organizations as well as individual peace researchers and activists, have often encountered in the way of smooth communications due to limited financial resources. I feel that in our current "information age" new conditions are in place that will contribute in a dynamic way to help peace research develop as a "practical science" and to better help resolve some of the thorny problems of today's world. How shall we utilize and take the best advantage of these conditions? This is where the intelligence and wisdom of peace researchers must be called upon.

13. The 17th IPRA General Meeting in Durban, South Africa

The following sketch of this conference is an edited version (with the author's permission) of an article which Mayako Ishii contributed to *Heiwa kenkyū* (no. 23), and for which I heartily thank her for permitting me to include in this report.

A. Experiencing the Breath of a New South Africa

IPRA's 17th biannual general meeting was held June 23 to 26, 1998, on the campus of the Durban-Westville University in Durban, the Republic of South Africa. Particularly to be noted about this conference, which was attended by approximately 250 participants from 40 countries, is that in the thirty-four years since IPRA's founding in 1964, it was the first IPRA conference held in Africa.

The organization known as ACCORD (African Center for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes), with its headquarters on the Durban-Westville University campus, was the local sponsoring body that was key to the success of the 1998 conference. In response to former UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's proposal in 1992 of an "Agenda for Peace" which would include the establishment of training centers for the maintenance of peace at regional and sub-regional levels, ACCORD had developed since 1995, with funding assistance from the Norwegian government, as a security studies research institute and had also put much effort into developing, in cooperation with Norway's International Affairs Research Institute, a Training in Peace (TIP) program for Southern Africa. With the end of the Cold War, what the UN has called "peacekeeping activities" has come to emphasize, more than military matters, the growing importance of civilian activities like humanitarian assistance and the monitoring of human rights situations and elections. According to an ACCORD pamphlet, this organization's TIP project, designed to train persons who will undertake such activities and make policy proposals, is "one of the world's largest NGO-led training projects for peacekeeping." ACCORD's executive director, Vasu Gunden, ably looked after the entire IPRA conference program from beginning to end, and because of his leadership and unstinting attention to all the participants' needs, the conference could hardly have been better managed.

It is also of special note that this general meeting was held in Durban, capital of the state of Kwazulu-Natal. As Vasu Gunden reminded us during the opening ceremony, the port city of Durban was where Mahatma Gandhi first developed his principles of nonviolent opposition to the British colonial government, and was also the birthplace of the political leader and South Africa's first recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, Albert Luthuli, who was strongly influenced by Gandhi's principles of nonviolence. At an exhibit we visited on the third day of the conference titled "A Heritage for the Future" and sponsored by the on-campus Gandhi-Luthuli Documentation Center, we learned a great deal about the life, accomplishments and teachings of Gandhi, Luthuli, Martin Luther King, and Nelson Mandela, and had the good fortune to hear reminiscences by a granddaughter of Mahatma

Gandhi and by a daughter of Albert Luthuli. The opening ceremony held in the university's main auditorium on the evening of the first day of the IPRA conference began with a rhythmical drum performance and included ethnic Zulu and Indian dances as well as a performance by dancers of Zulu and Indian ethnic background joined by young "white Afrikaner" female dancers, symbolizing "unity within diversity," all of which captivated the onlookers. Also unforgettable were the smiling faces of the very approachable Durban-Westville University students and the national anthem, "God Bless Africa," which a student choir performed at the opening of a plenary session on the morning of the conference's third day.

B. Toward the Resolution of Internal Conflicts

The conference program in Durban had the main theme "Meeting Human Needs in a Cooperative World." At the opening ceremony, Dr. Francis Mading Deng, from Sudan, gave the keynote address "The Challenge from Conflicts at the end of the 20th Century." Dr. Deng first spoke of the process of his country's independence, which was achieved in 1956 while he was a student in Cairo, the problems of refugees from internal warfare which he dealt with as a UN special representative, and his work as deputy chairman of the Africa Leaders Forum. He then expressed his hope that Africans would seek a path of cooperation among diversity, according due recognition to plural identities and also giving importance to shared historical memories.

In addition to the opening ceremony there were seven other plenary sessions, all characterized by reference to African themes. It has been traditional at IPRA general meetings that about one third of the time spent in plenary sessions is allocated in some way to "local" themes especially relevant to the host country. Thus it was quite appropriate that Africa-related themes were given prominence at a conference held in Africa, a region that has experienced in a concentrated way many of the "unpeaceful conditions" that afflict today's world. The seven plenary sessions were designated thematically as follows:

(1) "Building Meaningful North-South Cooperation – Responsibility vs Specific Interests"; (2) "Globalization – Uniting or Dividing the World?"; (3) "Reforming International Institutions towards Meeting Human Needs"; (4) "Human Rights as an Instrument for the Eradication of Poverty – Women, Youth, and Rural Communities"; (5) "Military Security vs Human Security?"; (6) "Resolution of Internal Conflicts – Reconciliation and Reconstruction of War Torn Societies"; and (7) "IPRA: A Vision for Meeting Human Needs in a Cooperative World – Future Challenges to Peace Research." Interspersed between these plenary sessions were seven time-slots for simultaneously held "commission" meetings, and in addition to these there were also some "special sessions" and "workshops."

Every morning at 8 a.m. we left our ocean-front hotel in buses that took us directly to the university, situated on a hill, and we had meetings until at least 7 p.m., sometimes as late as 9 p.m. Although somewhat subjectively, I shall here briefly summarize three areas of discussion that received

considerable attention during the conference.

Firstly, emphasis was placed on the view that ongoing “globalization” is problematic in that it seems to entail a worldwide dominance of capitalistic economic principles and tends to be carried out in a “vertical” and “unified” fashion even if this may not be apparent at first sight. If we consider the reality in the “South” where often 20% of national budgets go to repaying monetary loans from abroad and such things as the Multilateral Accord on Investments (MAI) which is supported by multinational enterprises and the “structural adjustment” programs of the World Bank, an equitable cooperation between South and North is difficult, and what is now needed is a paradigm shift away from the “dehumanization” of technology and the idea that economies should strive for large-scale industrialization. It was emphasized at the same time that any such paradigm shift will be related to how international NGOs define their strategies for countering the very large and largely “invisible” powers that now dominate the world economy.

Secondly, much of our attention was focused on the many internal conflicts that have erupted in various parts of the world following the end of the Cold War. While in Rwanda a certain conciliation began only after a certain “justice” was imposed by an international court and its rulings, there are cases, like in Guatemala, where even though a judicial system already exists it can be corrupt and fail to function. In the case of South Africa, a Truth and Reconciliation Commission was set up to investigate and judge the true situation of crimes committed during the *apartheid* era, and to give compensation to the victims of human rights abuses, but at the same time provisions for absolution were set up whereby guilty parties who confess their own past criminal behavior and its organizational background will be spared punishment. All this leads us to think about the difficulties along the road to realizing truth and reconciliation. The limitations of intervention by the UN were also pointed out, and so long as the traditional concepts of “peacekeeping” activities are not radically changed, repetitions of the mistakes of the past are almost sure to occur. It was pointed out by a number of participants that, within one or another region, in order to get rid of ethnocentrism and “identity fetishism” it is important to create a sentiment of “unity within diversity” and, in the African context, to revive the wisdom of traditional types of mediation. It was interesting that these sorts of insights resonated with what Dr. Deng had said in his opening address. In another line of approach, for the peaceful resolution of conflicts it is undesirable for there to be outside economic influences which facilitate the supply of weapons to combatants. Voices were raised at the conference about the importance of stopping the cross-border sale of weapons as in the case of Sweden where NGOs joined forces to bring a stop to the export of weapons to Mexico and elsewhere. And certainly one of the biggest tasks for South-North cooperation will be to construct a world where “weapons” will not be seen as necessary.]

And thirdly, there was the theme of the significance of the communications revolution for peace studies. In the first plenary session, Katsuya Kodama emphasized the role of INGOs in the post-Cold War world in connection with reversing the present trend of widening South-North gaps. He said he considers that advances in communications technology are at least tending to overcome the

South-North communications gap and that IPRA's task should be to provide visions for the future, to carry out policy-oriented research, and to play a role as an information facilitator. As for the use of e-mail and the Internet, Ada Aharoni from Israel, who is the facilitator for the IPRA Peace Through Literature Commission, has already made some very active attempts, with considerable success, to effectively utilize these means of communication, and there is a plan for utilizing the Internet in the year 2000 to connect fifteen locations in different parts of the world to encourage their citizens to think together in a focused way about "agendas for promoting peace."

C. Rethinking IPRA Management

At the IPRA administrative meeting which was held the evening of the second day of the Durban conference, IPRA secretary-general Bjørn Møller frankly pointed out, in his keynote report, some of IPRA's organizational shortcomings and financial difficulties. The responsible conference organizer in the host country, Vasu Gunden, took issue, albeit in a subdued way, with some of the points made in the keynote report, expressing a certain amount of disappointment with how IPRA still seemed to be managed in a way that is centered around the countries of the North, and he made a plea for a greater South-North partnership in the future. It can probably be said that IPRA is just now undergoing some of the difficulties that are a part of the regeneration that must be undertaken if IPRA is to ably pursue its mission in the 21st century.

14. The 18th IPRA General Meeting in Tampere, Finland

Between August 5 and 9, 2000, IPRA held its 18th general meeting in Tampere, Finland. This conference, which revisited the part of the world (northern Europe) that had been closely associated with the development of contemporary peace research, saw lively discussions among some 350 researchers and peace activists from around the world. The following sketch of this conference is an edited version of my article which was contributed to *Heiwa kenkyū* (no. 25).

A. Dialogue

The overall theme of the 18th general meeting in Tampere was “Challenges for Peace Research in the 21st Century: A Dialogue of Civilizations.” At present there exist throughout the world many disputes resulting from “clashes” between differing cultures and civilizations. One purpose of this conference was to further develop peace studies in a way that aims at resolving such clashes, using “dialogue” as a key word and concept.

The dialogue that is today needed is not only among differing cultures. Within today’s field of peace studies, considerable gaps have come about in values and methodological approaches in respect to “research,” “education,” “peace movements,” and the like, and we need to have an open attitude of learning with one another through mutual dialogue. A plenary session held on August 7 under the title “The Interface between Peace Research, Peace Education and Activism” squarely addressed this matter. Betty Reardon of Columbia University in New York emphasized putting peace education into practice and the need to develop peace research in ways that will further put into practice the “peace education approach.” Suzuki Yūji of Hōsei University in Tokyo, speaking from his experience with UNESCO “culture of peace” activities, made a case for having a certain feeling of “positive tension” linking peace research, peace education and peace movements.

There took place during this Tampere conference a sort of “clash” between some of the core IPRA members. There was a substantial gap between, on the one hand, a group of researchers mainly from Northern Europe who wanted to regenerate IPRA as a more “academic” sort of research organization and, on the other, a group mainly from “developing” countries who favored strengthening “peace movement” orientations within IPRA and bringing them to bear in practical efforts to address or resolve specific real problems of our times. Håkan Wiberg, who is a director of the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute and one of IPRA’s founding members, has given this definition: “IPRA is a movement of peace researchers who are carrying out peace research which is oriented toward changing current realities.” Although this definition undeniably has its base in “research,” at the same time the hope is expressed that in such research there will be a strong element of practicality and “applied wisdom.” However, recently many peace movement members and NGO “activists” have joined IPRA and there are not a few members who feel that IPRA itself should issue political declarations. One senses that many feel impatient when IPRA does not more directly address -- and as an organization publicize opinions on -- current issues related to war and peace.

Former IPRA secretary-general Bjørn Møller had, in response to the circumstance that relatively few research papers were presented at the general meeting in Durban, had expressed a certain sense of crisis about IPRA as an “academic research body” and had said he looked forward to seeing the Tampere general meeting put more emphasis on “efficiency” and a high quality of the papers presented. This goal achieved to a large extent at the Tampere conference, which was highly evaluated from this point of view. Nonetheless there was a large proportion of the participants who placed more emphasis on

IPRA's practical abilities to contribute to "the construction of peace" than on its character as an "academic research body." Former IPRA president Ursula Oswald and others emphasize a direct approach to various peace-related issues, considering this to be more important than "efficiency" or the "high quality" of research papers.

These sorts of differences in approach reflect, of course, differences in the standpoints and specialties of peace researchers. In the field of peace studies, with its highly "interdisciplinary" character, it should not be surprising that there is a gap between persons who take a very "academic" approach and others whose approaches tend to focus on the process of "inter-human learning," with a special liking for such words as "equality," "participation" and "personal experience."

At the 2000 Tampere conference there was certainly a "clash" of styles and approaches, yet it should be said that efforts were made to understand these differences in approach, quite in keeping with the key word "dialogue," which was, after all, the main theme of the conference. This was no doubt one of the conference's successes.

B. The Core of Peace Studies

There are currently (in 2000) eighteen IPRA research "commissions." Their names, which include Peace Education, Religion and Peace, Security and Disarmament, Refugee Studies, and Nonviolence, mirror their diversity of themes. This very diversity may be called IPRA's special quality and point of strength. Nonetheless, when such a variety of themes are taken up, this entails certain difficulties in explaining "peace studies" as a unified whole, and it becomes hard to establish a commonly held interpretation of peace studies as a "discipline."

Holding this international conference in Northern Europe – sometimes called the "birthplace" of contemporary peace studies – helped provide a good opportunity for searching out and reconsidering peace studies' "essential core." IPRA's Peace Theories Commission, chaired by Bjørn Møller, is currently trying to better define this peace studies core, using conceptual constructs. This commission held sessions on the concepts of "peace" and "security." There is a trend to enlarge the definition of security to include "the security of human beings" and "environmental security." Will this result in giving further positive impetus to the development of peace studies? Or will it on the other hand be a factor that might tend to make it more difficult for peace studies to gain universal recognition as a proper research discipline? At the above-mentioned Peace Theories Commission session, various merits and demerits were discussed.

Discussions of how the concept of "peace" should be interpreted were also carried out in sessions of the Security and Disarmament Commission, the Environmental Security Commission, and the Women and Peace Commission. Because of the very diversity in concepts of peace, we no doubt need for certain commonality of approach that will promote fruitful debate and discussion.

C. The War-Experience Roots of Peace Studies

The days spent at the 2000 IPRA Tampere general meeting coincided with the anniversaries of the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima (August 6) and on Nagasaki (August 9). A message from the mayor of Hiroshima was read on August 6, at the beginning of the plenary session titled “Dialogue, Not Clash of Civilizations.”

In the establishment of IPRA a large role can be said to have been played by the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and by the cutting memories of other war atrocities including the massacres of Jews at Auschwitz (Oświęcim) and elsewhere in Europe. It is no mistake to say that such war-related horrors and the maniacal arms race between the USA and the USSR in the 1950s and 1960s were the main motive force in establishing peace research as a distinct and important discipline. In other words, ever since “peace studies” was established, great importance has been placed on sincere and informed introspection directed toward the many losses and horrors of war, as well as on a robust will to prevent the repetition of such evils.

Still today, thirty-six years after the founding of IPRA, the approach of molding our research in large part from an awareness of our fellow humans who have been war’s victims has not lost value or currency. The fact that the Tampere conference was planned to coincide with the anniversaries of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atrocities and had a message from Nagasaki’s mayor read before a plenary session surely testifies to how the spirit of the time of IPRA’s founding has not been forgotten and to how peace researchers strive to preserve the experiences of war’s victims.

In the Internal Conflicts Commission meetings during the Tampere conference, reports were given on the raw casualties of war in Kosovo (Yugoslavia) and parts of Africa. And it must be mentioned that, as an occasion to think more deeply about matters of armed conflict and peace in Southwest Asia, a special session was held, under the name “Globalization and the States in the Middle East”

Armed conflicts are not mere games. Even if some people call them games, they are games where people are injured and killed. Research that takes place only in libraries or offices tends to fall prisoner to the “game-like” aspects of conflicts and to overlook or forget the real suffering of human beings. But I came away from the IPRA Tampere conference with the feeling that at these meetings held in the North European “home region” of contemporary peace research a new recognition was accorded to the importance of practicing peace research in ways that continuously valorize the perspectives of the human victims of war and violence.

15. The 19th IPRA General Meeting in Suwon, Korea

The end of the long Cold War did not automatically mean the arrival of world peace. There have been a succession of armed conflicts and other violence that have shaken the world, including the Gulf War, the armed conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, the continuing “Palestine crisis,” the planned violence of hijacked airplane crashes in New York and Washington, and the fighting in Afghanistan. What should be done to cut the negative chain reactions of war and mutual distrust and to achieve instead a chain reaction of trust leading toward world peace? There is surely a large role which peace research should play in helping eliminate war and in creating a more peaceful and secure world.

At a time when many international situations seemed to be worsening and becoming less predictable, the 19th IPRA general meeting was held between July 1 and 5, 2002, on the campus of Kyunghee University in Suwon, Republic of Korea. Suwon, an industrial city only about an hour’s drive by car south from Seoul, had been in the news as one of the sites for the 2002 World Soccer Tournament. Just before the IPRA conference began, the Republic of Korea team had on June 29 gained “third place” in a semi-final competition held in Taegu, Republic of Korea, before the final competition was held the next day in Yokohama, Japan. Thus the IPRA conference shared something of the atmosphere of the recent World Cup events.

The 19th IPRA conference’s overarching theme was defined as “Globalization, Governance and Social Justice: New Challenges for Peace Research.” There were about 300 participants from some 50 countries. The following summary is based on an article I contributed to *Heiwa kenkyū* (no. 27):

A. The Practical Side of Peace Research

The “practical possibilities” of peace research were a major focus of discussion during the conference. With the ongoing war in Afghanistan and the Palestine crisis, today large numbers of people are being injured and killed because of warfare and other violent conflicts. Peace research might well be called an “applied science,” oriented toward changes and reforms in contemporary society that are grounded in the values and perspectives of “peace,” rather than a purely “academic-style” science kept largely within, so to speak, an ivory tower and considering itself obliged to proclaim, in all circumstances, “scholarly neutrality.” What sort of proposals is peace research to make in response to tense international situations, and what sorts of international order is it to design? These are big questions to which we peace researchers must answer.

In this context, an important point is how peace researchers are to evaluate today’s wave of “globalization.” There was present behind the main theme of this year’s conference the tendency to evaluate globalization from the viewpoint of social justice and human rights as well as a willingness to search for new types of globalization that could be of some overall benefit to the “weaker” members of international society. With the currents of “globalization” we see at present, however, how many children go hungry and how many of the weaker members of society live each day in grinding poverty? It is surely important that, growing from an awareness of these sorts of human predicaments, peace

research should with some urgency explore new modes and directions for its future development. Indeed urgently needed is a paradigm shift away from a globalization of “survival of the fittest” to a globalization of shared prosperity and shared responsibilities.

Former UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who delivered the keynote speech before the opening plenary session, pointed out the “inhumane” aspects of today’s dominant type of globalization and stressed the need for international society to find roads to achieve social justice of a kind where military power or force will one day be deemed by all parties wholly unnecessary. In this context, he spoke of the important contributions of international NGOs and he spoke of the large expectations he places on peace research, expressly referring to the “applied-science” roles that peace research ought properly to exercise.

There are some interesting examples of how IPRA is experimenting with hopefully practicable, policy-oriented responses to contemporary issues of our day. To better address the changing situation in Southwest Asia, it has been decided to establish a “Special Working Group for Middle Eastern Problems.” It is presently being organized under the leadership of Stephan Zunes of the University of San Francisco and George Kent of the University of Hawaii. This is not the first time, however, that IPRA has sponsored such a special commission. At the time of the Gulf War in 1990-91, Elise Boulding, who was at the time IPRA’s secretary-general, set up a special commission (with the same name) that worked on possible “scenarios” for ending the war. These were to be presented to the UN and they attracted a good deal of attention internationally. It is of course not an easy thing for researchers to prepare “policy proposals” in regard to actual, ongoing armed conflicts. But if we intend to bring to life, as it were, the accumulated results of peace research and apply them to society as it in fact exists, will it not be necessary, even if it involves certain risks, to accept in a dynamic way challenges to contribute to the resolution of real problems? In what way should a balance be struck? What sort of “style” should we adopt for contributing to problem resolution if we are to stick to our identity as a “research organization” rather than as a “peace movement organization”? How should funds for our research activities be raised? There are here not a few issues of style, approach, and financing that need to be resolved. But let us hope that we can succeed in opening new veins of development along which peace research can effectively catalyze positive transformations within our complex and multi-cultural world.

B. Meeting Together in a “Divided Land”

It was significant in several ways that the 2002 IPRA general meeting was held in Korea. Needless to say, the Korean peninsula is still divided between two mutually distrustful states amid great military tension, and the road to peaceful and mutually acceptable resolutions of the various problems caused thereby is not likely to be easy. I think the significance of holding an international conference on peace research in this divided land is more than just symbolic. First of all, it was an opportunity to be directly aware of how the issue of “peace” in this part of the world (and elsewhere) is not an abstract

problem but rather a problem of immediate realities. Violent conflicts are, after all, not ordinary “games” but games in which people are injured, tormented, murdered. At this conference held in a divided land that experienced horrible warfare in the middle of the last century, we were able to reaffirm the importance of nurturing the growth of “new peace thinking” in ways that do not neglect the viewpoints and standpoints of the victims of war and violence.

Unfortunately, there were no participants from North Korea (the DPRK) at IPRA’s Kyunghee University conference. (It should be mentioned, however, that two scholars from the DPRK attended the 1990 IPRA conference held at Groningen University in The Netherlands.) In June of 2000, ROK president Kim Dae Jung visited the DPRK and had top-level talks with that state’s leader Kim Jong Il, as a result of which the process of reducing tensions on the Korean peninsula took a large stride forward. I had strongly hoped that researchers from the DPRK would be able to take part in the Kyunghee University conference so that discussions on the peaceful resolution of problems in the divided land could be joined by researchers from both Korean states. However following the 2000 summit meeting, exchanges between citizens of the two states had not gone forward as well as once anticipated, and immediately prior to the 2002 conference, on June 29, cannonades were launched against one another by coastal patrol ships from North and South, resulting in sunken vessels and many deaths. Thus there are still some tall hurdles to be cleared before researchers from the two Korean states can discuss together the theme of peace at an international scholarly conference. Although such discussions did not materialize at the Kyunghee University conference, I hope to work on making this possible at the next IPRA conference.

In spite of our failure to arrange direct discussions in Suwon between scholars from the DPRK and the ROK, the conference nevertheless became an opportunity, I think, for applying some new thinking to the relationship between the northern and southern halves of the Korean peninsula. The members of IPRA’s Commission on Nonviolence carried out thoughtful discussions related to problem-resolution in the Korean peninsula by nonviolent means and through giving renewed prominence to the principles of nonviolence. The theme of the first plenary session was “Nonviolence as a Way to Social Justice in the Globalized World,” and here nonviolence as a philosophy of life was placed at the very core of peace studies. Ralph Summy of the University of Queensland emphasized this in the following words: “The philosophy of nonviolence is at the very basis of peace studies. IPRA must come to grips with the question of how the philosophy of nonviolence should be developed to address current circumstances.” Even if the concept of nonviolence is sometimes mistakenly seen as “powerless idealism,” researchers in this field are continuing take up the challenge of promoting workable ways to solve problems peacefully in divided Korea as elsewhere.

It is worth special mention that the 19th IPRA general meeting was realized through close cooperation between the IPRA secretariat in Japan and Kyunghee University in Korea. Japanese and Koreans worked together to cosponsor the 2002 World Cup soccer competition, and it could be said that this IPRA conference was “another example of Japanese-Korean cooperation.” During the conference’s

planning stage, historical memories of Japanese aggression in Korea and elsewhere in Asia often surfaced in one way or another, and it should be noted that Prime Minister Koizumi's visit last year to the Yasukuni Jinja – a Shintō shrine in Tokyo that is associated with former high-ranking military men, including some who were executed as “war criminals” – had a particularly negative influence and increased Koreans' feelings of distrust toward Japan. Nevertheless, the fact that it was possible for Japanese and Koreans to effectively work together in preparing the Kyunghee University IPRA conference reflects a shared awareness that these sorts of things must be overcome and that Japan and the Republic of Korea should both do their best to contribute to world peace. I greatly value the cooperative peace-oriented activities of Japanese and Korean researchers and want to see them developed further.

In the special meeting which the Peace Studies Association of Japan hosted with the theme “Building Peace in East Asia: Interactions of Perspectives,” there were two presentations by Korean scholars. Fortunately the time has come when researchers from Japan and the ROK can come together to discuss peace in East Asia and consider how they can best contribute to peace in the wider world. Until recently these sorts of joint endeavors, which should be considered natural and a “matter of course,” were not easy to arrange.

C. Promoting the Worldwide Development of Peace Education

Lastly I wish to say a few words about the importance of peace education, something to which this 2002 IPRA conference gave special attention. Peace studies have in many countries been systematized within school curricula and one has the feeling that, compared to some years ago, they have in various parts of the world attained, so to speak, “citizenship.” Nevertheless, when we look at many of the realities of a world so full of conflicts and distrust, giving much greater attention and substance to peace education lies before us as an essential task. It has been decided that IPRA will actively cooperate with the efforts and activities proposed by the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to realize “Hiroshima-Nagasaki Chairs for Peace Studies” in numerous universities throughout the world. UNESCO has decided to establish, as a joint project with IPRA, activities aimed at “the global development of peace education,” expected to get under way in 2003.

Worthy of special attention are the sorts of research on participatory peace education that utilize “workshop methods” and emphasize “personal experiences.” IPRA member Prof. Toh Swee-Hin, who teaches at the University of Alberta, Canada, was awarded the UNESCO Prize for Peace Education in 2000, and Prof. Betty Reardon, who teaches at Columbia University Teachers College, was given an Honorable Mention of UNESCO Prize for Peace Education the following year. Their work with “student-participation” peace education methods has been, needless to say, very highly evaluated. Peace education which is only a sort of “cram course” in abstract knowledge about war and peace is not enough, and what is most important is to help students use their powers of imagination to devise ways of realizing peace and to help them develop creative capacities to put these ideas into

effect. Research in this field is forging ahead at a rapid pitch. How should these insights be promoted and put into practice in those places where education is actually carried out? Peace education must choose which ways are best.

Beginning with the Kyunghee University IPRA general meeting, a new “Youth and Peace Commission” has been established, and certainly we must specially mention the fact that the participants in this IPRA conference included a substantial number of university students from countries around the world, including over twenty university students from Japan. Nothing could be more important than to educate a new generation of young students and researchers who will bring new vigor to peace studies and peace-related activities. I feel it will be very meaningful for more young researchers and peace activists to take part, from their student years, in international scholarly meetings such as ours and to nourish in this way a higher international awareness. In the 1970s IPRA sponsored a few “summer school” programs for university students. And there are today welcome discussions of the idea of again sponsoring programs of this sort. I would certainly like to see this happen.

16. IPRA Today

The International Peace Research Association has at present grown to have approximately 1,300 members from some 90 countries. It has strong links to UNESCO and other international organs, and during 2002-03 engaged with UNESCO in a worthwhile project under the name “Research on Participatory Methods of Peace Education for Hiroshima/Nagasaki Lectures.” In 2004-05 IPRA is cooperating with UNESCO in “Research on International NGOs and their Role in Conflict Resolution.” In 1989 IPRA received the UNESCO Prize for Peace Education.

IPRA is a regular constituent member of the International Social Science Council, which has its secretariat within UNESCO. It thus has strong links to the UN and it functions as an international NGO. Betty Reardon currently serves as IPRA’s main representative at UN-sponsored meetings. Former UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali took part in the opening ceremony of the 2002 IPRA conference in Suwon, Korea.

Katsuya Kodama was elected IPRA secretary-general for two two-year terms (2000-2004), and during this period the IPRA secretariat was located at Mie University in Tsu, Mie Prefecture, Japan. IPRA has its own journal, titled *International Journal of Peace Studies*, which is distributed to IPRA members, libraries, and other interested persons.

A. Organizational Data

Members of the “IPRA Council” are currently the following:

Africa

Gabona, Elizabeth (Uganda); Okwir, Betty (Uganda); Amoda, John (Nigeria); Mogekwu, Matt (Republic of South Africa)

Asia-Pacific

Parmar, Leena (India); Yamane, Kazuyo (Japan); Hart, Victor (Australia); Satha-Anand, Chaiwat (Thailand)

Europe

Patfoort, Pat (Belgium); Martinelli, Marta (UK/Denmark); Reychler, Luc (Belgium); Vesa, Unto (Finland)

Central and South America

Horowitz, Sara (Argentina); Villarreal, Maria (Guatemala); Bacal, Azril (Peru); Correa, Bradley (Brazil/USA)

North America

Groff, Linda (USA); Stephenson, Carolyn (USA); Kent, George (USA); Howard, Richard (USA)

Middle East

Aharoni, Ada (Israel); Tehranian, Majid (Iran/USA)

Russia and Eastern Europe

Balazs, Judit (Hungary); Levai, Imre (Hungary)

Newsletter Coeditors

Synott, John (Australia); Muthien, Bernedette (Republic of South Africa)

At present IPRA has 5 regional peace research organization, each of which carries on its own activities. There exists a proposal for establishing a Middle East Peace Research Association, but difficult political factors have unfortunately slowed its development.

Representatives of the Regional Peace Research Bodies

Asia-Pacific Peace Research Association

Perpinan, Mary Soledad

Africa Peace Research and Education Association

Nandutu, Susan

European Peace Research Association

Vesa, Unto

Latin American Peace Research Association

Oswald, Ursula

(Centro Latinoamericano para Investigar la Paz, or 'CLAIP');

Peace and Justice Research Association

Jennifer Turpin

(North America)

Matt Meyer

IPRA as a whole at present has the following “research commissions,” each of which carries out its own research activities:

Art and Peace; Conflict Resolution and Peace-building; Eastern Europe; Ecology and Peace; Gender and Peace; Global Political Economy; Indigenous Peoples' Rights; Internal Conflicts; International Human Rights; Nonviolence; Peace Culture and Communications; Peace Education (PEC); Peace History; Peace Movements; Peace Theories; Reconciliation; Forced Migration, Religion and Peace; Security and Disarmament; Youth

In addition, as a response to the violent conflicts and instability in the Middle East region, a “Working Group for Peacebuilding in the Middle East” has recently been established.

B. Current Tasks

As mentioned before, the end of the long “Cold War” did not mean that peace had arrived. Around the time of the Cold War's end some people tried to make the case that the “peace studies mission” had also been essentially completed. However, any such notion has been shown to be very wide of the mark. The Gulf War, the fighting in Yugoslavia, the terrorist attacks in the USA and elsewhere, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the continuing Palestinian crisis, etc., testify to peace studies' continuing relevance and importance. We still have the vital task of somehow cutting the negative “chain reactions” of war and distrust, while creating positive chain reactions of peace and trust. How should we proceed?

For one thing, we should do more to work with the UN and with international NGOs. In this way we can more effectively contribute to practical, peace-building activities. In every country much interest and hope is directed to peace studies and the ways that it can contribute to a better world. The International Peace Research Association hopes to address these expectations in part through activities which are undertaken jointly with NGOs and with UNESCO and other UN organizations. We wish to see these sorts of joint projects further develop and have an effective role in resolving real disputes and building the foundations of peace.

We must here again emphasize the importance of peace education. Peace studies are in many cases carried out in universities or other bodies which have dual functions of research and education. Special attention is now being given to “workshop”-type methods that emphasize student participation and personal experiences. IPRA members Swee-Hin and Betty Reardon were designated for UNESCO Prize for Peace Education in 2000 and 2001, largely on the basis of their highly evaluated participatory teaching methods. As mentioned earlier in this report, it is not enough for peace education to merely “instill knowledge” about peace. It is essential to inspire students to put their creativity and powers of imagination into thinking about the meaning and conditions of peace and then doing practical things that will contribute to a peaceful society and a peaceful world. Research and experiments in this area of education are making rapid progress. How should these insights be further applied and popularized? To answer this is part of the task facing peace education.

With good reason much is today being expected of IPRA and other peace research organizations. IPRA gets requests from UNESCO and other organizations to provide research and advice and must here, too, do its best to demonstrate its usefulness and capabilities. However, IPRA does not have adequate economic resources, and successive secretaries-general have had to pay many of the organization’s operating expenses out of their own pockets. Today’s IPRA “head office” at Mie University in Japan is not an exception and must economically confront a very stringent situation. It must be strongly hoped that IPRA can develop and improve its economic base so that IPRA can fulfill its intellectual and other capacities to contribute to realizing a peaceful world.

Published References in Japanese

Ishii, Mayako, “Afurika de hajimete hirakareta Kokusai Heiwa Kenkyū Gakkai sō kai” (The first IPRA general meeting held in Africa), *Heiwa kenkyū* (Peace Research), no. 23 (1998).

Okamoto, Mitsuo, “Heiwa kyōiku to wa nani ka – daihakkai Kokusai Heiwa Kenkyū Gakkai ni sankashite” (What is peace education? – participating in the 8th IPRA conference), *Heiwa kenkyū*, no. 5 (1980).

Okamoto, Mitsuo, “Saikin ni okeru heiwa kenkyū, heiwigaku no dōkō” (Recent trends in peace research and peace studies), *Heiwa kenkyū*, no. 14 (1989).

Okamoto, Mitsuo, “Kokusai Heiwa Kenkyū Gakkai (IPRA) Nihon yōchi no ikisatsu ni tsuite” (The

Data 1: A List of Conference Sites of International Peace Research Association

1. Groningen, Netherlands (1965);
2. Tallberg, Sweden (1967);
3. Karlovy Vary, Czechoslovakia (1969);
4. Bled, Yugoslavia (1971);
5. Varanasi, India (1974);
6. Turku, Finland (1975);
7. Oaxtepec, Mexico (1977);
8. Konigstein, FRG (1979);
9. Orillia, Canada (1981);
10. Gyor, Hungary (1983);
11. Sussex, England (1986);
12. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (1988);
13. Groningen, the Netherlands (1990);
14. Kyoto, Japan (1992);
15. Valetta, Malta (1994);
16. Brisbane, Australia (1996);
17. Durban, South Africa (1998) (details)
18. Tampere, Finland (2000) (details)
19. Suwon, Korea (2002)
20. Sopron, Hungary (to be held in 2004)

Data 2: A List of Secretary Generals

1964-1971	Bert V. A. Röling (The Netherlands)
1971-1975	Asbjørn Eide (Norway)
1975-1979	Raimo Väyrynen (Finland)
1979-1983	Yoshikazu Sakamoto (Japan)
1983-1987	Chadwick Alger (USA)
1987-1989	Clovis Brigagao (Brazil)
1989-1991	Elise Boulding (USA)
1991-1995	Paul Smoker (USA)
1995-1997	Karlheinz Koppe (Germany)
1997-2000	Bjørn Møller (Denmark)
2000-today	Katsuya Kodama (Japan)

Note: The author fully realizes that the description here is only a portion of the long history of IPRA and that some description may be to be corrected. The author appreciates to receive any comments, addition or correction on the description of IPRA's history. The most up-dated version shall be placed on the IPRA website.

History of International Peace Research Association

Written by Katsuya Kodama

Published on June 25, 2004

International Peace Research Association

1515 Kamihama, Tsu, Japan 514-8507

tel/fax: +81-59-231-9156

kkodama@human.mie-u.ac.jp

<http://www.human.mie-u.ac.jp/~peace/about-ipra.htm>