BUILDING CULTURES OF PEACE
THAT PROTECT HUMAN RIGHTS[1]

The protection of vulnerable groups is a crucial aspect of the defense of the human rights so admirably described in the UN's Declaration of Human Rights and its subsequent conventions. Although governmental structures and policies are indispensable for the defense of these rights, we cannot rely on states to secure them. They ultimately depend on the solidarity of societies and how persons act and communities behave. Thus, the protection of human rights depends upon our building cultures of peace that resolve conflicts nonviolently and link governments with the affective ties and human relations that constitute civil society. To construct cultures of peace, the UN General Assembly advocated working on eight bases. This paper reviews these bases, their interdependency, and their reliance on both state systems and community solidarity. It suggests specific actions that may promote human rights.

We must protect vulnerable groups, both from a sense of compassion and in order to fulfill the human rights that are described in the UN's Declaration of Human Rights and its subsequent conventions. After affirming the basic dignity and equality of all persons, the articles of the Declaration list 14 of the so called »negative« rights – such as the right to life and liberty, to equal protection before the law, to free expression and peaceful assembly – , and 6 »positive« rights such as the right to employment, education, and an adequate standard of living. The Declaration is an attempt to establish a set of ideal global norms. It concludes with articles that state, »Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized,« and »Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.« I would like us to consider what this social order should be like, and what our duties to the community are. Let us begin with the role of governments.

---

1 This paper is based on a talk given at the Conference on Peace-psychology and the protection of vulnerable groups held at Copenhagen University, Jan 30, 2009.

Joseph de Rivera, Clark University.

The Role of Governments

We tend to associate rights with the obligations of states. It is states that sign the various conventions that support the human rights amplified in the Declaration, and we hold states accountable for defending these rights. Hence, I want to begin by noting the importance of laws that delineate rights and the establishment of a state bureaucracy that enforces these rights. There is little doubt that the laws we pass can help establish norms and that it is helpful for states to enforce these norms. Although laws in themselves do not achieve rights, they may establish a base for the personal actions that can achieve rights. Thus, in the U.S. the decision of the Supreme Court that called for the elimination of school segregation provided a moral base that encouraged the nonviolent sit-ins that actually ended segregation and furthered the struggle for racial equality. Likewise, the labor laws that were passed established norms for working hours and workplace safety; laws that are only functional when they are supported by an adequate staff of inspectors. Needless to say, the state support of rights requires a government that operates by the rule of law, as opposed to the rule by law that occurs when coups and dictators assume control. As Kritz (2007) observes, rule by law involves an executive that is accountable to an elected legislature or the electorate, an independent judiciary, a fair criminal justice system, means of redress against corrupt bureaucratic procedures, and so forth. Thus, at least in our current state of society, we need to support human rights by insuring strong viable states that are based more on consensus than force (Jackman, 1993).

Such support raises some obvious difficulties. Ayoob (2007) observes, »The major problem with the implementation of human rights in the Third world is that the concept of human rights owes its empirical validity to the existence and successful functioning of the industrialized, representative, and responsive states of Western Europe and North America« (p. 101). Aware of the difficulties in establishing strong democratic states, and the disastrous attempts at intervention by powerful states, he argues that democratization and the rule of law can only gradually occur and that we may want to accept the lack of human rights that occur as force is used to establish systems of strong governance. Rotberg (2007) agrees with the idea that strong states are necessary. However, he is more inclined to blame weak and failed states on disastrous leadership rather than factors such as the arbitrary boundaries of multiethnic states. Hence, he argues that the UN and those of us committed to human rights have a responsibility to protect the people in failed states. He mentions, for example, the case in Zimbabwe where Mugabe began as the leader of a viable nation. Although Mugabe initially allowed an independent judiciary, he never allowed a free press or a political opposition. When corruption intensified and the economy declined there was no open press to criticize what was happening and oppression and the violation of human rights has prevented a viable opposition.

I wondered to what extent we could attribute a lack of human rights to weak or failing states so I used Gibney's (1996) most recent ratings of Amnesty International reports as an indicator of negative rights and life expectancy as a crude indicator of positive rights, and examined the nations with the worst overall human rights. I found that 16 of the 18 nations with poor scores on both negative and positive rights were characterized by Rotberg (2007) as having failing, or collapsed states. Hence, one important approach to strengthening human rights is to find nonviolent ways to strengthen failing states. One way this could be done has been suggested by Krasner (2007). He suggests that the UN or other international agencies or companies could arrange for ways to have an external authority to share sovereignty with the government of a poorly governed state. As an example, he mentions that Chad's oil revenues are currently in a foreign escrow account that is managed by an external board that could encourage environmental protection and insure that a sizable portion of oil revenues are used for social services. Although, in this particular case, the board lacks the authority that is needed, it would be easy to establish boards with adequate control. Krasner details a number of incentives that might encourage arrangements that are mutually beneficial to the government of a weak state, international corporations, and those concerned with human rights. Thus, one way those of us living in relatively fortunate conditions can advance global human rights is by encouraging our own governments to accept responsibility for working to create arrangements of shared sovereignty that promote human rights in weak state systems.

However, the advancement of human rights and protection of vulnerable groups requires more than the strengthening of week state systems because there is not an invariant relationship between state strength and human rights. Some of the states Rotberg (2007) characterizes as »weak« score relatively well on both positive and negative rights, and some that are not characterized as week score poorly on either negative or positive rights. Thus we cannot simply attribute poor human rights to weak states. It seems clear that there are some relatively strong states with relatively weak records of human rights, states with governments that appear to be part of the problem rather than the solution and are governing more by law rather than under law. Hence, although those of us interested in promoting human rights may wish to encourage strong democratic states, we need to also continually monitor human rights in all states. We can help do this by supporting the publication and publicity of the reports issued by the UN's Commission on Human Rights.

The Role of Society

In spite of the fact that human rights are defended by states that operate under the rule of law, we cannot only rely on states and their laws. The term »rights« may mislead us because we tend to associate rights with states (as opposed to the economic freedom we associate with markets) and look towards governments to secure these rights. However, our governments involve our emotional relationships. The rule of law rests on respect for law, a sense of justice, political will, ownership, and the development of trust, confidence, and credibility. It depends on the control of fear, hate, resentment, and alienation, and the fostering of a sense of security. Rights do not only depend on the state and law, corporations, the World Bank and IMF, but on the will of the people, civil society, or community. States that promote human rights by following the rule of law are democracies that depend on open communication and tolerance and these characteristics are part of cultures. Rights involve values, norms about what ought to be, the will to insist on what ought to be and the emotion of anger when this is challenged. If rights are social and not egocentric they also involve duties and individual responsibility. Hence, the defense of rights ultimately depends on the solidarity of our societies (see Hearn, 1997). This is because the nature of the state relies on societal institutions and civil society; the observance of rights depends on community interdependency and tolerance; and at the most basic level, rights depend on how groups and individuals treat one another. Thus, in a concrete sense human rights depend on a society's culture, and the achievement of human rights depends upon our building cultures of peace that resolve conflicts nonviolently and link governments with the affective ties and human relations that constitute civil society.

A Culture of Peace

How can we best describe what we need to insure human welfare? There are a number of available concepts: We may emphasize *human rights* as a foundation for social justice (Wronka, 2008). We may advocate for *human security* in contrast to the concept of national security, so that our governments are reminding of our common human needs rather than narrowly focusing on what is good for the citizens of only one nation (UNDP, 1994). We may promote the adoption of the *Earth Charter* with its emphasis on the fact that we must share one earth and ensure its sustainability (Earth Charter Initiative, 2002). Each of these ideas has particular advantages and difficulties. However, I believe the most comprehensive concept involves the idea of a culture of peace, a culture where values, norms, and ways of behavior encourage the nonviolent resolution of conflict and tackle the root causes of these conflicts. While the concepts of both human rights and human security

tend to focus on what government can do, and the idea of an Earth Charter focuses us upon what ordinary citizens can do, the concept of a culture of peace stresses the involvement of both government and people.

The idea of developing a culture of peace originated in the 1980's with a Peruvian educator, Father Felipe MacGregor, who observed how Peruvians were living in the midst of a culture of war. That culture was characterized by male dominance hierarchies that used force and secrecy to exploit both the people and the environment. MacGregor developed an educational program that showed how both men and women could live democratically, using negotiation rather than force to openly meet needs in a non exploitative way. He brought the concept to UNESCO where people became excited by the idea of replacing a culture of war with a culture of peace. Work by Elise Boulding and David Adams developed the ideas. They described a culture of peace as values, attitudes, and ways of behaving based on nonviolence and respect for the human rights recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a caring society that protected the rights of the vulnerable. They wanted to develop a global movement and brought the concept to the UN. Although the major powers did not like the idea that the world was living in a culture of war, they could hardly be opposed to the idea of a culture of peace, and a resolution to begin a decade of building a culture of peace for the world's children passed the general assembly in 2000 (see Adams, 2003).

The Bases for a Culture of Peace

To construct cultures of peace, the UN General Assembly advocated working on eight cultural bases. These involve peace education, gender equality, tolerance, democracy, open communications, human rights, international security, and sustainable development. Each of these bases is described in separate chapters in a *Handbook on Building Cultures of Peace* (de Rivera, 2009). Here, I want to very briefly review these bases, consider how they may be built and how they are interdependent.

Peace education comes in many forms. It may emphasize the teaching of negotiation, of nonviolent protest, of peace through law, of peace through the personal transformations that enlarge our capacity for compassion and the acceptance of responsibility. It may be a process oriented peace education that emphasizes nonhierarchical structures, or an education that involves a community involvement that teaches about interdependence, or an education involving groups that are in conflict. Some evidence suggests that it is helpful if groups that are involved in intergroup conflict study the dynamics of other conflicts before they address conflicts in which people are personally involved, or the use of facilitated problem solving workshops.

Personally, I believe introductions to peace education should include at least some consideration of all these approaches.

Gender equality is important in its own right, as a matter of justice. However, it is also linked to all the other bases. For example, women's literacy is related to decreases in fertility rates and thus to environmental sustainability; democratic participation requires the right to vote and hold office and the amelioration of the conditions of poverty and sufferings that prevent participation. Gender equality is a factor in establishing families that cultivate the peaceful ways of behaving upon which a culture of peace must build. Female culture appears to emphasize empowerment more than dominance and women are less likely to support violence, and this relates to the base of international security.

Tolerance among different groups and the social cohesion it facilitates is a third base for a culture of peace. There are conditions where tolerance is commonplace. It is usually present when there is trade and a cosmopolitan environment. For example, it was present in Sarajevo, though less in the Bosnian countryside, before the breakup of Yugoslavia. However, when groups are in competition they usually discriminate in favor of their own group and resentments may easily develop. We have learned that these resentments and the related prejudices may be overcome when groups are thrown into a facilitated contact and cooperate for common goals. When this contact is successful the separate groups may maintain their identity but also develop a superordinate identity that helps mitigate subsequent conflict. Of course, in situations of protracted conflict many different actions must be encouraged to achieve social reconciliation (see the many possibilities suggested by Bar-Tal (2009)). The problem solving groups developed by Kelman (1996) may be used to handle the emotional difficulties and uncover the needs of each group prior to negotiation. One of the new techniques that is proving useful in unfreezing group prejudice are those involved in the practice of deliberate dialogue where safe spaces are created for people to share the experiences that underpin their prejudices. Within societies a special problem for cohesion is posed by those who have hurt others. When they are labeled »criminals,« jailed and subsequently rejected, the cohesion of a community is weakened. This danger is lessened when the criminal justice system is supplemented by the practice of restorative justice, which often is able to restore the social cohesion disrupted by the harmful act. When it can be developed tolerance encourages another base for the culture of peace, that of democratic participation.

Democratic participation, in contrast to hierarchical dictation provides a way for people to convey their needs and elect representatives who will work to meet these needs. We know that we can encourage participation by working for the adoption of certain methods of voting. For example, we can use preferential or instant runoff elections to encourage community participation. Of course those in power may prevent any voting or attempt to

restrict participation rather than encourage it. And in the U.S many elections are not contested because of the expense of campaigning. Such a situation can only be remedied by getting publicly financed elections. However, we have learned that nonviolent protest movements may be used to overthrow dictators and get procedures that promote participation. Further, nonviolent struggle can help establish a norm for nonviolence and the trust and the diffusion of power needed for democracy. Note, however, that if democracy simply means having elections that lead to majority rule it inevitably leads to the unfair treatment of minorities. This is what led to the disastrous civil war in Sri Lanka. And Amy Chua (2004) points out that advocating voting that gives power to majorities at the same time that a global economy is creating wealthy minorities is a recipe that is bound to eventually lead the resentful majority to repress the hated minority group. Thus, we must balance democratic rule with minority rights and a culture of peace must also require the base of human rights. And both of these bases require the base of open communication.

Open communication involves governmental transparency and a free media. Without transparency corruption is commonplace. Without a free press corruption is not publicized and meaningful elections cannot occur. Democratic participation depends on open communication both in the sense of transparency and a free media and this may be encouraged by the work of groups such as Freedom House and Transparency International. Further, to the extent that open communication occurs and nonviolent protest is utilized powerful central authorities may be encouraged to listen to the voices of those who know the facts of local conditions. Too often those making important economic decisions that affect the whole of a society appear to be out of contact with what is actually happening to people living in the communities of that society. To some extent, open communication is limited by a lack of tolerance. This tolerance may be advanced by promoting peace journalism (Lowenberg, 2008). In the absence of public tolerance some negotiations may need to be conducted in secrecy, and restrictions may be needed to prevent hate speech and sadistic portrayals in the entertainment media. In general, however, open communication is essential for the base of human rights because the worst abuses occur in conditions of secrecy.

Human rights require an independent judiciary and enough state power to enforce laws. Yet, this police power must always be under the control of locally elected officials and we are only gradually developing good adequate methods of police oversight. Human rights depend on community support. In fact, communities are quite capable of creating their own declarations of rights. Human rights are damaged by war and the defense of human rights may be a rallying point for creating spaces for peace. Anasarias and Berliner (2009) give an inspiring example of how a community in the Philippines, trapped between Moslem rebels and Christian government forces developed a narrative that united them, a mutually agreed upon declaration

that emphasized tolerance, participation, mutual responsibility, trust, the moral principles of caring and forgiveness, human rights, and common concerns. The Christians in the community went to the government forces and the Moslems talked to the rebels and secured an agreement that their community would be a zone of peace. But such arrangements only work as long as the government is willing to place the welfare of the people in the community ahead of worries about rebel infiltration. The sanctity of the space may be constantly challenged and relies on external public support. In Colombia communities of peace have led a tenuous existence dependent on the international accompaniment of members of external teams such as International Peace Brigades. Human rights workers in situations such as those in Colombia, Guatemala, and Sri Lanka only survive because of the efforts of observers from outside the country who can apply the pressure of publicity on foreign government who provide aid to governments who are not really committed to defending human rights. Nevertheless, the very existence of these communities shows that tolerance need not depend on state force.

Without international security it is difficult to sustain local cultures of peace. This is particularly true in the aftermath of war and in the presence of intractable conflict. Fortunately, we are beginning to develop culturally sensitive methods to integrate child soldiers back into their communities, to understand how truth and reconciliation commissions may better address the needs of those who testify, and to begin to organize the diverse things that must be done to achieve reconciliation. However, weapons of mass destruction threaten us all, and the transfer of small arms makes it difficult to end the wars that break out when states are weak and impinge on the basic human rights of life and all other rights. Although it would be helpful to enlarge the Security Council, it seems clear that the most needed change to the UN is the ending of the veto power enjoyed by China, England, France, Russia, and the U.S. Great powers to not give up power voluntarily and the people of the world may have to unite in the use of nonviolent protest. An alternative, suggested by Elise Boulding (2000) is to build an alternative UN alongside of the current UN.

In calling for the base of sustainable development, the UN has three interrelated goals: The elimination of poverty, the reduction of inequality, and the preservation of environments. Although the current market system and the policies of the World Bank and IMF have been successful in encouraging development, increasing life expectancy, and reducing poverty, they have not contributed to the reduction of inequality. Indeed the discrepancy between rich and poor appears to be increasing. And the current system has not contributed to sustainability. Sustainability and equality can be advanced by current participatory methods to community change, methods that promote democracy and open communication. It seems clear that we need to draw on the knowledge and practices of indigenous peoples who are

Joseph de Rivera

more closely related to their environments and to replace over-consumption with community. Ultimately a sustainable economy may require personal transformations and the first step may be an involvement in the Earth Charter.

Interdependence of the Bases

Since all eight bases involve the nonviolent solution to conflict are interdependent, it might be thought that they would cohere to yield a unified culture of peace. To see if this were so I used objective measures to measure the extent to which each of the eight bases existed in different nations. These measures are shown in Table I along with sample values and a number of other measures that could be obtained if funds were available.

Table 1. *Template for Assessing National Culture of Peace*

Aspect of Culture and UN Area of Action	*Objective Measures Low – High score (Mean)*	*Needed Measures*
SOCIETAL NORMS 1. Peace education: To what extent are people educated (or socialized) to see themselves as a peaceful people with norms that emphasize cooperation and the resolution of conflicts by dialogue, negotiation, and nonviolence?	Percent GDP devoted to education 1.4 – 8.30% (4.91)	Number of peace education programs per capita/ Percent agreeing with cooperative, nonviolent norms / Ratio of nonviolent to violent TV programs
2. Valuing of women and nurturance: To what extent are the voices of women as important as those of men, and to what extent are children and nurturance valued?	Percent of seats in legislature held by women 0.70 – 42.7% (14.6)	Availability of maternity/ paternity leave, daycare programs/ Ratio affectionate/ harsh socialization practices
3. Societal cohesion and tolerance: To what extent do understanding, tolerance, solidarity, and mutual obligation form the basis of a cohesive society (rather than the image of a common enemy or a rigid set of norms?)	Number of refugees admitted (minus refugees generated or displaced) relative to population – – – 1992 – 905.(.06)	Number of national celebrations in which different ethnic groups participate Patriotism/nationalism ratio

Aspect of Culture and UN Area of Action	Objective Measures Low – High score (Mean)	Needed Measures
STATE STRUCTURES ACHIEVE POLITICAL STABILITY BY 4. Democratic participation: To what extent is there democratic participation, with a civic society that enables freedom of advocacy so that personal needs can be met?	Vanhanen Index of Democratization (number contested elections X participation in elections) 0 – 42.8, (22.4)	Number of NGO's relative to population
5. Open communication: To what extent is there open communication with transparency and accountability, rather than press control and corruption?	Freedom House's Press Freedom Ratings 5 – 83, (37.2) (Transparency's corruption scores are also available)	Publicly debated issues (e.g. war in Iraq, gay marriage) minus un-debated issues (e.g. military budget, drug legalization). Nonviolent/ violent TV programs
6. Human rights and the inclusion of all groups: To what extent are human rights ensured by a government that includes all groups and has enough authority to insure these rights are maintained?	Inverse of Gibney's political terror ratings of Amnesty International data 10 – 49, (23.64)	Measure of group inclusion
ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS 7. International security: To what extent does the society encourage international security rather than compete for power and sell arms?	Military expenditure as a percent of GDP 0.2 – 9.6, (2.33) Use of military threats 0 – 81, (13.07) (Arms sales/ foreign aid also available)	Number of vetoes of Security Council Resolutions Percent of population imprisoned (available for only some nations)
8. Equitable and sustainable development: To what extent is there equitable and sustainable development so that needs are met in ways that are in harmony with the environment?	GDP per capita $ 1,022 – 50,061, ($12,781) life expectancy 43.5 – 80.00 years, (71.69) adult literacy 40.1 – 99.7% (89.5) Gini inequality index 21.7 – 60.7 (37.6) Homicide rate .70 – 78.6 (10.8) CO_2 emissions per capita .2 – 23.7 (6.0)	Much more comprehensive figures for environmental health and ecosystem vitality are now available at the Environmental Performance Index

The first column of the table I gives a brief description of the base. The second column gives an easily obtained objective measure along with the low, high, and average values from a sample of 74 countries. Some of these objective measure only approximately what we really would like to measure. For example, there is no currently available measure of peace education so I decided to simply use the percent of the nation's gross domestic spent on education. The third column lists a sample of measures that could be used if there were a little money to spend on peace research. As an approximation of gender equality I used the percentage of seats in legislatures held by women. For societal cohesion and tolerance I decided to take the number of refugees admitted relative to the nation's total population. Since the numbers of refuges and displaced persons are subtracted, a negative number indicating the lack of cohesion, the civil strive that generates refuges. As a measure of democracy, Vanhanen's (2000) index considers both the number of contested elections that are held and the percentage of the population that votes. Open communication may be estimated by Freedom House's ratings of press freedom, and as mentioned above, negative human rights may be indicated by Gibney's (1996) political terror ratings. As measures of a nation's impact on international security we may use the percentage of per capita gross domestic product (GDP) spent on the military and the raw number of military threats use in its disputes with other nations. These figures are all publicly available on the internet. For the aspects of sustainable development we may use per capita GDP, life expectancy, and adult literacy as measures of raw development; a Gini index for economic inequality and the homicide rate that parallels this inequality as measures of equality; and CO_2 emissions (or the currently available, and much more comprehensive, Environment Performance Index (2008) for sustainability. Note, however, that although the measurement of each aspect is possible we cannot easily combine these to get a measure of sustainable development as a whole.

It may be noted that these objective measures can be related to subjective questionnaire measures of a nation's emotional climate. Thus, when a country has good objective measures on the eight bases people report that others do not have much fear of speaking, have less anger at the governments and insecurity, and experience more social trust (de Rivera, 2007a).

Although data is not available from many nations, particularly from those that are the most economically underdeveloped, I was easily able to collect most of the measures from a sample of 74 nations. I then correlated all these measures and subjected them to a factor analysis to see if there was a single peace factor that could explain the correlations. What I discovered is no single factor accounted for the data. Rather there were four factors (de Rivera, 2004). That is we might say that there are four dimensions to a culture of peace. We may call then first factor »liberal development« because it involves GDP, literacy, life expectancy, democracy, press freedom, human rights, and gender equality. However, this factor is unrelated to an »equal-

ity« factor that involves a Gini measure of economic inequality, a nation's homicide rate, and to some extent with an absence of human rights. And neither of these dimensions are related to a factor involving the percentage of money spent on arms and military threats, a factor I call »state violence« because it correlates with the percentage of people imprisoned by the state. Finally, a fourth factor may be termed »nurturance« because it involves the acceptance of refugees, the percent spent on education, and to some extent human rights, and gender equality. In this regard, I should note that a comprehensive study of pre-industrial societies found that the total amount of violence in a society was best predicted by the lack of the nurturing and valuing of children (Ross, 1993).

Out of this sample of 74 countries we find eight nations (including Denmark) that score above average on all four dimensions. Thus, we might say these eight have achieved a relative culture of peace. However, many nations are peaceful on some dimensions but not on others. The United States, for example, is above average on liberal development, but only a bit above average on nurturance, a bit below on equality, and registers an extremely high score on state violence. Thus, it seems clear that democracy, literacy, a free press, human rights, and a high GDP are not in themselves sufficient to produce equality, and nurturance, or diminish the state use of violence. We may hope that a new administration in the U.S. will lead the nation to becoming more peaceful, but the scores in this study largely predate the Bush administration, and there seems little doubt that some cultural attitudes and the nation's military-industrial complex contribute to a problem that may take a while to solve. The nation does have a rule of law, but although the rule of law involves the bases of democracy, human rights, open communications, tolerance, and even gender equality, it is less likely to involve the bases of peace education, sustainable development, and international security.

Needed Actions

In the U.S., and I suspect in many other nations, I believe we are going to need to have a Secretary of Peace with a department that can establish the beaucracy needed to support those who want to transform the culture (de Rivera, 2007b). The department that is currently proposed in a congressional bill has offices for international and domestic activities, peace education and training, arms control and disarmament, human and economic rights, the impact of war and media, and technology of peace that encourages research and development for sustainability. Although his bill has the support of about 70 representatives it lacks support from the Democratic leadership. We need such departments in all countries, and they will only come into existence when enough people demand that they exist.

For those of us committed to human rights it seems clear that we must help construct adequate state systems; but this can only be done by fostering community solidarity and encouraging specific actions that promote human rights. The UN's office on human rights has mandated reporting requirements on how each nation is addressing the challenges to human rights within the nation. However, most people have no knowledge of these reports and how their governments respond to them. We may wish to be involved in these reports and to help their dissemination so that more citizens are aware of the issues within their own country and how their country might support human rights workers in other countries (see Wronka, 2008). We need to encourage the organization of the work done by different non-governmental organizations (NGO) and coordinate that work with the support of different governments.

Working with vulnerable groups is important in its own right and for its own sake. However, I believe it is useful to also see this human rights work as a part of building a culture of peace. The advantage of each of us thinking of our work as helping to build a culture of peace is that it links our separate endeavors together and reminds us of our interdependence. While some are working to improve democracy, others are working on human rights, or increasing tolerance or opening communications; while some are focusing on sustainable development or gender equality, others are focusing on international security or peace education. The successful building of each of these bases depends on work that our comrades have done on the others. Ultimately our success will depend on the interplay between governments and ordinary people and will require us to consider better ways to organize the work of different NGO's and integrate that work with sympathetic forces within governments. When our own individual endeavor seems too small in the face of all that is needed, we can sustain our morale by remembering that we are not alone, but working together on a common mission.

REFERENCES

ADAMS, D. (2003). Early history of the culture of peace: A personal memoir. Retrieved 2/28/2009, from http://www.culture-of-peace.info/history/introduction.html
ANASARIAS, E., & BERLINER, P. (2009). Human rights and peacebuilding. In J. de Rivera (Ed.), *Handbook on building cultures of peace* (pp. 181-196). New York: Springer.
AYOOB, M. (2007). State making, state breaking, and state failure. In C. A Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Leashing the dogs of war* (pp. 95-114). Washington, DC: U. S. Institute of Peace Press.
BAR-TAL, D. (2009). Reconciliation as a foundation for a culture of peace. In J. de Rivera (Ed.), *Handbook on building cultures of peace* (pp. 363-378). New York: Springer.
BOULDING, E. (2000). Cultures of peace: The hidden side of human history. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

CHUA, A. (2004). *World on fire.* New York: Random House.

DE RIVERA, J. H. (2004). Assessing the basis for a culture of peace in contemporary societies. *Journal of Peace Research, 41*, 531-548.

DE RIVERA, J. (2007a). Transforming the empire with a department of peace. *Peace and Change*, *32*, 4-19.

DE RIVERA, J. (2007b). Relating a nation's culture of peace to its emotional climate. Poster presented at the American Psychological Association's annual convention, San Francisco, CA, August 16.

DE RIVERA, J. (Ed.). (2009). *Handbook on building cultures of peace*. New York: Springer.

Earth Charter Initiative (2002). Earth Charter Initiative handbook. Retrieved February 16, 2008, from http://www.earthcharterinaction.org/content/

Environment Performance Index (2008). Environment Performance Index. Retrieved February 16, 2008, from http:epi.yale.edu

HEARN, F. (1997). *Moral order and social disorder*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

GIBNEY, M., & M. DALTON (1996). The political terror scale. *Policy Studies and Developing Nations, 4*, 73-84.

JACKMAN, R. W. (1993). *Power without force*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

KELMAN, H. C. (1996). The interactive problem-solving approach. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Managing global chaos* (pp. 501-520). Washington, DC: United Institute of Peace Press.

KRASNER, S. D. (2007). Sharing sovereignty: New institutions for collapsed and failing states. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Leashing the dogs of war* (pp. 653-678). Washington, DC: U. S. Institute of Peace Press.

KRITZ, N. J. (2007). The rule of law in conflict management. In C. A. Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Leashing the dogs of war* (pp. 401-424). Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press.

LOWENBERG, S. (2009). Open communication. In J. de Rivera (Ed.), *Handbook on building cultures of peace* (pp. 167-180). New York: Springer.

ROSS, M. H. (1993). *The culture of conflict.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

ROTBERG, R. I. (2007). The challenge of weak, failing, and collapsed states. In C. A Crocker, F. O. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Leashing the dogs of war* (pp. 83-94). Washington, DC: U. S. Institute of Peace Press.

UNDP (1994). New York: Oxford University Press, for United Nations Development Programme.

VANHANEN, T. (2000). A new dataset for measuring democracy, 1810-1998. *Journal of Peace Research, 37*(2), 251-265.

WRONKA, J. (2008). Human rights and social justice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.