

CREATING A CULTURE OF NONVIOLENCE:

Peace Studies in Higher Education

Jerald H. Richards, PhD

These writings were selected from numerous articles and addresses by the author while he was professor of philosophy at Western Kentucky University (1969-1972) and Northern Kentucky University (1972-2004) where he initially developed and chaired the philosophy program and later chaired the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Philosophy. His areas of specialty were ethics, value theory, social and political philosophy, and peace studies. His undergraduate education was at the University of Texas at Arlington and the University of Kentucky; his graduate education was at Harvard University and Boston University. A year of post-graduate studies in world religions was also spent at Harvard.

Editing Notes

Dr. Richard's writings and the peace studies he developed reflect a pragmatic and principled commitment to non-violence that is grounded in his Christian world view. The speeches, letters and acts of civil disobedience of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. informed and shaped his conclusions that non-violent policies must be recognized and pursued as meaningful options to conflict resolution so as to diminish the persistent use of military aggression and mitigate the destructive and inhumane consequences.

The articles here reflect a range of approaches to the issues of peace and war. A special concern is the ideological sources of violence with a focus on religious intolerance. Other writing advocates for and defines a path towards reconciliation and resolution between nations where past wars inflicted gross violations of human rights. Articles that address the pre-emptive invasion of Iraq and the bombing of Hiroshima, that may appear out dated, shine an important light on national policies that led to morally questionable military actions with consequences that continue to impact the security of our world. Cross-cultural efforts to promote a more global understanding of the moral dimension of human relations are seen in "Morality: Primary Institutions and Fundamental Principles."

The addendum provides a list of writings and addresses on other subjects that reflect the wide range of the author's philosophical concerns.

Ann Richards, May 2017

CONTENTS: SELECTED WRITINGS

"Power Imbalance and Human Worth", in Kaplan, Laura, and Lawrence Bove, eds. *Philosophical Perspectives on Power and Domination: Theory and Practice* (Amsterdam/Atlanta Rodopi Press, 1997), pp. 93-104.

"Ideological Intolerance: Causes, Consequences and Alternatives", in Cur tin, Deane, and Robert Litke, eds., *Institutional Violence* (Amsterdam/Atlanta Rodopi Press. 1999), pp. 113-126.

"Common Morality and Peacemaking" in Presler, Judith and Sally J. Scholtz, eds. *Peacemaking: Lessons from the Past, Visions for the Future* (Amsterdam/Atlanta Rodopi Press, 2000), pp. 19-30.

"Creating a Culture of Nonviolence", *Out of Line*, Spring/Summer 2001 (This was the winning essay in *Out of Line's* essay contest on the topic: "Responding to violence in a democratic society."), pp. 6-32.

"A Moral Assessment of the War with Iraq", *Concerned Philosophers for Peace Newsletter*, Vol.22, Spring & Fall 2002, pp. 7-16.

"Against the Grain: Peace Studies in Higher Education," essay presented at Educating for Peace and Social Justice: Friends Association for Higher Education Annual Conference, June 20-23, 2002. conference "Proceedings", p. 33.

"Keys to Political Forgiveness in International Relations", *Putting Peace into Practice, Value Inquiry Book Series*, ed. Nancy Nyquist Potter, Rodopi Press, New York 2004, pp. 165-176.

"Hiroshima, Morality and Democracy", in Kultgen, John and Mary Lenzi, eds., *Problems in Democracy* (Amsterdam/New York, NY Rodopi Press 2006), pp. 83-99.

"Morality: Primary Institutions and Fundamental Principles" written in response to an invitation from Concerned Philosophers for Peace from the Institute of Philosophy at the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow, Russia, to participate in a cross-national project to publish a book that would compare diverse definitions of morality and promote mutual understanding within a context of plurality. The article was selected to represent an American perspective and was published in *Morality: Diversity of Concepts and Meanings*. Alfa-M, 2014, pp. 409-414. Published in English and Russian.

ADDENDUM

A list of the author's writings and addresses in applied philosophy.

A Moral Assessment of War with Iraq

Jerald Richards

Northern Kentucky University

Sadly lacking in most public discussions for or against the United States going to war against Iraq is a moral assessment of initiating a military attack against that country. One main means for carrying out this assessment is by way of applying the criteria of just war morality. This morality has a long history, having evolved over the centuries out of both religious and secular sources to provide the accepted moral standards by which war should be evaluated in the modern world. This morality has influenced the formulation of many of the conditions placed upon both the initiation and the conduct of war found in international and national laws, treaties, and conventions. If we are going to be true to the values and principles we claim to hold dear—the preciousness of human life, the worth of the individual, human well-being and happiness, the rule of law, honoring our moral and legal commitments, etc.—it is incumbent upon us, it is the least we can do, to openly, honestly, and thoroughly assess the proposed war against Iraq by just war criteria.

Unfortunately, when the threatened U.S. war against Iraq is evaluated by the criteria of just war morality, it comes up wanting. Particularly troubling is the absence of anything even remotely resembling a **just cause** grounded in **right intentions** that will be acted upon only as a **last resort**. Although specific definitions of these criteria vary somewhat from source to source, there is considerable agreement that a just cause for the use of military force would be a response to military aggression that forebodes imminent harm and destruction to human beings. A right intention would be to resort to the use of military force only for the purpose of implementing a just cause. But acting on this intention to implement a just cause can only be justified if all other nonviolent, peaceful alternatives to resolve the conflict have been tried and found wanting. In addition, no more military force must be used than is absolutely necessary to thwart

imminent harm to human beings who are being attacked, civilians must not be attacked, and care must be given to avoid and to minimize indirect harm to them.

There is little if any evidence that Iraq poses a real and certain danger to the lives of innocent human beings or to their basic rights either in the United States or other countries, the preservation and securing of which requires the use of military action. It is possible that Iraq does possess some biological and chemical weapons and that it continues to want to acquire nuclear weapons, as Israel and Pakistan, some of its neighbor nations, have acquired them. But possession and desire do not constitute, in and of themselves, a credible threat to human life and well being, at least apart from any stated threat by Iraqi officials to use these weapons against other peoples and nations. If Iraqi possession of biological and chemical weapons and the desire to acquire nuclear weapons constitute such a threat, then most of the nations of the western world, including the United States as well as several nations in other regions of the world, stand guilty and are, themselves, legitimate candidates of preemptive military strikes by those nations who feel threatened by them.

Even if, contrary to fact, we could conclude that the threat to other peoples and nations is credible, alternative means to the destructive, brutal acts of modern warfare are available to respond to this threat. Given the recent acceptance by Iraq of the latest U.N. resolution calling for the virtually unfettered inspection of potential sites housing "weapons of mass destruction," there is no justification for the continuing rhetoric of war coming out of Washington and London.

That the rhetoric continues almost unabated suggests that there may be motives or intentions behind the drive for war against Iraq other than the justified intention to protect human beings from serious harm and to establish genuine peace. There is a considerable amount of speculation about other possible motives, with some of the suggestions no doubt being more credible than others. Troubling possibilities are the desire of President Bush and his administration to secure and to extend the power of the Republican Party; the desire of President Bush for revenge against Saddam Hussein for allegedly attempting to assassinate his father, the former President Bush, during a trip the latter took to Kuwait after the Gulf War of 1991; the desire of the U.S. government and U.S. energy companies to guarantee a supply of Iraqi oil for the United States and other western countries; and the desire to implement what appears to be an "imperial ideology" espoused by President Bush and other top members of his administration including, among others, Vice-President Richard Cheney, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, and Richard Pearle, Chair of the Defense Policy Board.

This apparent desire to implement an "imperial ideology" over the other nations of the world is the most frightening and dangerous of these other possible motives for aggressively pursuing war against Iraq. This ideology became clear when President Bush issued a report on September 20, 2002, called "The National Security Strategy of the United States." This report, among other things, asserts the right of the United States to engage in preemptive military strikes against other nations in order to exercise its right of self-defense, protect its interests, destroy threats before they get to its borders, and also make sure that no other nation threatens its status as the lone remaining

superpower in the world. On this latter "right," the report says: "The President has no intention of allowing any foreign power to catch up with the huge leads the United States has opened."

If the motive to implement an imperial ideology is prominent in the minds and hearts of many members of the current Bush administration, as it appears to be, then the push to go to war against Iraq is a push to test out this ideology and to let the rest of the world know that the United States will not tolerate any challenge to its "imperial" status and that it will dominate the nations of the world militarily in order to secure this status.

It seems clear that the threatened war against Iraq does not satisfy the criteria of just war morality. But for some just war moralists this should not be surprising since even the Gulf War of 1991, that did involve at least a response to the unprovoked Iraqi attack upon Kuwait, did not satisfy many of these criteria, especially the criterion of last resort and the criteria of proportionality and noncombatant immunity.

Still other moralists have concluded that, although wars before the 20th century could be, although most were not, conducted in ways consistent with the criteria of just war morality, modern wars cannot be so conducted. And they cannot because of the horrendously lethal, indiscriminate, and disproportionate nature of modern military weaponry culminating in the creation, production, deployment, and use of "weapons of mass destruction." This lesson, it has been argued, could have been learned from any of the major 20th century wars, but certainly from WWII and subsequent wars, and most recently from the Gulf War of 1991.

Wendell Berry, writing shortly after the Gulf War of 1991, articulated the nature of the logic of war in terms of the end results of the continuing spiral of war making in our time. He wrote,

the logic of war can produce only the idea of a "preemptive strike"—a madman's idea—which would destroy the world or a considerable part of it in order to prevent the other madman from doing the same thing. Military logic is thus driving us along an ever-narrowing gamut of possibilities toward absurdity, hopelessness, and ruin.¹

For Barry, to restore sense and hope, we must replace the logic of war with the logic of peaceableness. In his reflections on what the Gulf War taught us about war, he offered suggestions on what the "agenda of peaceableness" would include. Among them are:²

- the recognition that war technology has advanced to the point where "we have destroyed the capacity of war to improve anything"
- the recognition that peaceableness is a "proven possibility" in resolving human conflicts, as so convincingly documented, for example, in the television series, *A Force More Powerful*, as well as in the book of the same title that accompanied the series³

¹ Wendell Berry, "What the Gulf War Taught Us," *The Progressive*, November 1991, p. 29.

² On the following and additional suggestions see *ibid.*

³ Peter Ackerman and Jack Duvall, series editor and principal content advisor, and executive producer, respectively, of the television series, *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict*, and authors of the book of the same title published by Palgrave in 2000.

- giving the virtues of peaceableness and the means of nonviolent conflict resolution the same status and value that the virtues and means of war making have been given
- the recognition that our industrial economy with its current ideological bent leads "inevitably" to violent conflict against other peoples and nations
- learning to value quality, service, neighborliness, persons and other living beings, health, democratic prosperity, and economic health **over** quantity, profit, competition, machines, wealth, centralized power, and unfettered economic growth.

Unfortunately, for Berry, we have not taken seriously the lessons that the Gulf War of 1991 taught us. And thus we have not taken to heart the need and the call to replace the logic of war with the logic of peaceableness. Assuming Berry and other like-minded moralists are correct in their assessment of the logic of war in the modern world, let us hope and pray that "the penny will drop" and "the light will flash" in the minds and hearts of enough of our fellow Americans and fellow human beings so that they will be stirred to actions that will bring a halt to the rush to initiate war against Iraq and that an "agenda of peaceableness" will be placed first on the lists of national and global priorities. Short of this, and at the very least, let us hope and pray that the criteria of just war morality will be honestly considered in our government's deliberations about war-making and honestly applied to the proposal that the United States attack Iraq.

Prevention of Terrorism*

Matthew Cannon

Irish Peace Institute/Centre for European Studies
University of Limerick

Terrorism has significant global implications. The September 11, 2001 attack on the United States highlights how terrorist organizations operating within one state can have an impact that impacts the economies of nation-states throughout the world. Thus, considering terrorism as an internal problem of the nation-state is no longer possible. Terrorism, like environmental problems, does not stop at the borders of a nation-state, but instead depends on a network that crosses borders and defies national jurisdictions. Thus responding to terrorism requires an international effort. However, cross-border responses to terrorism need not be dominated by a co-coordinated military response. The experiences of other countries, such as the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland, have demonstrated the usefulness of multi-track diplomacy as a long-term strategy in responding to terrorism.

In many senses terrorism is a war in slow motion. Terrorism cannot be distilled from civilized society as war once was. The very nature of war has changed so that civilian, non-combatant victims are the inevitable conclusion of the evolution of war. War was once characterized as a state of armed conflict between nation-states. In this type of

* Editorial Note. An almost identical version of this article will appear in the *International Global Studies Encyclopedia*, eds. Ivan Mazour, Alexander Chumakov, and William Gay (Moscow: Raduga: 2003). See Announcement #5 (p. 3) in this issue for details on this Russian-American encyclopedia that addresses global problems from a philosophical perspective.

conflict battles were fought and soldiers lost lives, however the civilian remained removed from conflict. The twentieth century witnessed an escalation of conflict and the change in the nature of war. War evolved into an increasingly brutal struggle where civilians were no longer considered separate from the conflict, but instead were deemed cogs in the war machine. This was validated by Hiroshima and Nagasaki where the distinction between combatant and non-combatant disappeared.

Terrorism has taken conflict to the next level. Traditional ethical arguments over a just war become clouded by the need to respond to acts that threaten civilians going about their daily business. Attempts to defeat terrorism through military operations in rogue states may eventually defeat one foe, however the pictures of bombed hospitals and injured civilians will only create more enemies. Admittedly, military efforts have not been the only instrument in the *War on Terrorism*, but they have been the most prominent one. To many the bombing of Afghanistan demonstrates the futility of using military means to defeat a threat that transgresses all aspects of civilized society. The belief that terrorism can be defeated by a military campaign carried out by a coalition of nation-states against rogue states demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of terrorism. Terrorism is transnational and feeds off the inability of sovereign nation-states to monitor their cross-border networks. The nation-state is a blunt tool, poorly equipped to respond to a long-term war against terrorism. Those who have been victimized by terrorism have a natural initial reaction to suppress the supporters of terrorism. By criminalizing terrorism you strike out at potential threats to peace and security. However, the history of terrorism demonstrates that simply defining terrorism as a criminal act does little to prevent it. Northern Ireland witnessed horrific acts of inhumanity, acts that acted as a barrier, dividing communities and preventing understanding. Yet in the midst of this division and terror, some brave proponents of peace have found a way to construct a framework for reconciliation.

This framework was not constructed by top down elimination of the proponents of terror, but instead was forged through a gradual process of building trust from the bottom-up. Instead of continually fighting the symptoms of terror, the process of building relationships that cross borders and communities is essential to addressing misconceptions that feed terror. It is only through contact that you can change the minds of those who feel they are locked in a zero-sum game where the fear and alienation they feel result in support for terrorism to preserve a way of life.

Peaceful settlement of disputes in Northern Ireland provides support for the belief that the people must construct peace and not have it imposed upon them. Imposing peace may work in the short-term; however, the long-term consequences can be worse than the initial conflict. We need only look as far as the Balkans for an example of this. Is this a call to end military and legal enforcement against terrorism? No, short-term prevention of terrorism requires a degree of enforcement and deterrence of extremist groups that are willing to perpetuate violence for the sake of violence. However, those groups gain strength from populations that feel wronged or a desire to be heard. The only way to defeat terrorism in the long term and ensure a lasting peace is to address misconceptions of the populations that have genuine grievances. The best way to approach this is through authentic attempts at promoting contact and exchange across borders.

The events of September 11th brought a new focus to the need to respond to terrorism as part of national security. Efforts at using methods such as coalition building and international law enforcement networks are laudable; however, they still fall short of the goal of providing long-term security. Peace requires a bottom-up effort. In addition to enforcement strategies a new priority should be placed on promoting understanding through bottom-up programs conducted by NGOs so that fundamentalist terrorists no longer find support from the moderate members of society.

Theories of Conflict Transformation

Peacebuilding through programs of people to people contact has become more commonly known as *Multi-track Diplomacy*, which emerged from the study of conflict transformation. The study of conflict transformation has grown in importance in recent decades, as policymakers have realized that internal conflicts can result in a threat to international security, and thereby leading to increased efforts to address these conflicts. Addressing conflicts between adversaries within state boundaries have highlighted the role played by peace building. Joseph Monteville first coined the term *track-two* diplomacy. *Track-two diplomacy* is based on informal interaction between representatives of groups or nations in conflict with one another, the aim of which is to develop strategies and create an environment that could contribute to the resolution of their conflict. From this earlier definition the study of conflict transformation has grown and a number of theorists have added to the field. Rupesinghe argues for a comprehensive, eclectic approach to conflict transformation that embraces multi-track interventions. He proposes building peace constituencies at the grass-roots level and across the parties at the civil society level (where it exists) and also creating peace alliances with any groups able to bring about change, such as business groups, the media, and the military. He sees conflict transformation as a broad approach incorporating conflict resolution training and Track I interventions including diplomatic interventions and peacekeeping. Although many theorists have approached similar definitions, few theorists, with the exception of Diamond and McDonald, have clearly specified what carefully designed processes entailed. Diamond and McDonald attempted to clarify the confusion surrounding the definition of multi-track diplomacy by identifying separate areas of activity in their "systems approach to peace." Thus, according to their analysis multi-track diplomacy can be divided into nine peace-building tracks.

Nine Peace-Building Tracks (Diamond and McDonald, 1996)

Track I	Government to Government
Track II	Conflict Resolution Professionals
Track III	The Business Community
Track IV	Private Citizens
Track V	The Education Community
Track VI	Activism
Track VII	The Religious Community
Track VIII	Philanthropy/Funding Community
Track IX	The Media

Peace building through the grassroots is an essential element in multi-track diplomacy. Traditionally the understanding of ethnic and political conflicts has tended to focus on political dimension. Focus has been primarily placed on negotiation of a political settlement and top-down enforcement of that settlement. However political settlement, particularly in democratic states, requires support from the public as well as support from politicians. As those who studies the role played by personality politics would point out, effective politicians can lead, thereby bringing people to a settlement. This is not always the case; in fact it is more likely that politicians will respond to the will and resolve of the people. Thus to ensure peaceful settlement of disputes and the evolution of a society that accepts differences it is necessary to build peace from the bottom-up.

Peacebuilding Mechanisms

Multi-track Diplomacy entails the use of certain mechanisms or tools. These tools have developed out of the work and experience of practitioners involved in peacebuilding in various conflicts throughout the world. Stephen Ryan identified seven peacebuilding mechanisms: contact, reconciliation, subordinate goals, confidence building, generational change, prejudice. In the case of Northern Ireland four mechanisms have been particularly useful in achieving and promoting conflict resolution. The primary tools for conflict resolution have been: contact theory, subordinate goals, single-identity work, and cross border co-operation.

According to contact theory people to people contact or by simply meeting one another members of adversarial groups will gain a better understanding of one another, thereby reducing stereotypes and prejudice. Common cause theory, also known as subordinate goals theory, states that contact and co-operation around an area of common interest or threat is inclined to promote beneficial results. Single identity work was created from the notion that communities need to be secure with themselves and their own identity before they can begin cross-community work. The ultimate objective of *single identity work* is to facilitate cross-community contact; however, it has been criticized for reinforcing prejudices and stereotyping of adversarial groups. A large segment of the groups engaged in peace and reconciliation carry out some form of cross-border co-operation. Cross-border co-operation is considered to be important because of the role it plays in promoting understanding between communities and demystifying the myths and prejudices held. In addition cross-border co-operation can be important in changing the attitudes of those who could eventually support or join paramilitary groups. These four theories form the basis of peace and reconciliation work on the island of Ireland.

Peace and Reconciliation in Ireland

Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland provide a clear example of an advanced peace and reconciliation sector. The success of efforts to quell an ongoing conflict is embodied in the Good Friday/Belfast Agreement endorsed by a referendum on both sides of the border. The peace and reconciliation sector in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland have been extremely active and effective in promoting mutual respect and understanding.

John Darby's control model examined the reasons why Northern Ireland remained a low-intensity affair. Darby believed that the long familiarity with conflict in Ireland has led to the emergence of effective mechanisms designed to control these outbreaks. The mechanisms evolved from mundane and local accommodations that had been reached in the localities. The key to explaining why a conflict that has existed for quite some time has not produced more serious levels of violence lay in the efficiency and variety of the mechanisms. These mundane local mechanisms have amounted to an effective control against the expansion of the conflict into a genocidal war.

The success of the non-profit peacebuilding sector in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland is highly reliant on external sources of funding. Previously organizations sought funding through foundations, government funding, and various forms of private philanthropy. Recently a new *professionalism* has been brought into the realm of peacebuilding with the introduction of European Union structural funds under the Program for Peace and Reconciliation. These funds provide a solid foundation for the growth of peacebuilding organizations, providing them with an opportunity to move beyond a constant struggle for funding and expand the number of programs that they operate.

There are currently approximately 150 peace and reconciliation groups in Northern Ireland. It is difficult to measure the role played by peace and reconciliation groups through what Darby refers to as *local accommodations*. The published hearings of the Opsahl Commission point to the depth of vision that exists at a grassroots level in Northern Ireland. Some of the organizations that stand out when examining peacebuilding on the island of Ireland include the Community Relations Council (CRC), Co-operation Ireland (formerly Co-operation North) and the Irish Peace Institute. An examination of some of the programs in the Institute can provide insight into the operation of a peace and reconciliation organization.

Experience of the Irish Peace Institute

To get a better empirical understanding of the benefits and pitfalls associated with peacebuilding it is important to look more specifically at one organization. A brief examination of one organization, the Irish Peace Institute (IPI), can provide some insight into the operation of peacebuilding in Ireland/Northern Ireland. The Irish Peace Institute is a well established non-profit based in the Republic of Ireland whose aim is to promote peaceful reconciliation through a series of programs aimed at increasing understanding between the people. The programs conducted by the IPI cover a wide range of individuals in society and draw upon the peacebuilding mechanisms, particularly those highlighted in this article; contact, common cause, single identity, and cross-border. For the sake of brevity I shall highlight three programs that target various sections of society. The IPI conducts many other programs; however, these three highlight the variety of work undertaken by a peace and reconciliation NGO. The Youthcruise program targets youths from disadvantaged areas in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. These youths are drawn from both Nationalist and Unionist communities. Many of the participants would be, due to their economic circumstances, likely candidates for paramilitary organizations. Youthcruise attempts to confront prejudices before they have a chance to form or ingrain themselves in the minds of the

participants. The Victims of Conflict program conducted by the IPI attempts to ease the tensions that develop from the victimization of someone touched directly by a conflict. It began with a program to take some of the families of the victims of the Omagh bombing and has grown to involve groups from other areas in Northern Ireland.

Finally the Local-Links program involves politicians from the North and South. In the Local-Links program the IPI acts as a facilitator between politicians from the North and South in meeting for ideas of best practice. This is an excellent example of common cause peacebuilding as networks have developed between Unionist politicians and their counterparts in the Republic of Ireland through considering common strategies in regard to tourism, employment, and local development issues.

The difficulty faced by the Irish Peace Institute and other groups that promote cross-border programs can be found in the perception of cross-border work in the Unionist community. Some Unionist communities could perceive cross-border work as part of a hidden agenda for a United Ireland. Thus encouraging Unionists to participate in cross-border work requires a lengthy process of building trust among members of the Unionist population. In addition to operational difficulties the IPI has also had to deal with financial problems. Although the peace and reconciliation sector in Ireland is quite advanced, it is still difficult for peacebuilding NGOs to find support for their programs. Great amounts of effort and resources are put into acquiring new sources of funding to support programs.

Grassroots and Politicians

Grassroots peace building has been identified as important, but does it have an impact on the political sphere? In order to prevent ongoing conflict grassroots peace building should result in a change in the manner in which conflict is governed. John Burton, a leading conflict resolution theorist, believes that another practical step is to identify how bottom-up decision-making can be incorporated into existing political systems. Bloomfield believes that track-one (politicians) and track-two (people to people contact) should not be seen as mutually exclusive, but instead emphasizes that both complement one another and calls for co-operation and collaboration between the cultural (bottom-up) and the structural (top-down) peace strategies.

In Ireland the relationship between track-one and track-two diplomacy still has a way to go. The relationship between peace and reconciliation groups, politicians, and the political processes remains largely uncultivated. Thus, issues of practical advice and financial support dominate the relationship between peace and reconciliation groups and statutory agencies. A working example of the synthesis of track-one and track-two can be found in the form of the IPI's Local-Links programs. By drawing on the resources of earlier track-two programs and incorporating politicians from Northern Ireland, the IPI is able to use peacebuilding mechanisms to encourage support of reconciliation both from the top-down and the bottom-up. In addition to the advent of programs that involve politicians, peace and reconciliation groups in the Republic of Ireland have begun to lobby politicians. The formation of *Platform for Peace and Reconciliation*, an umbrella organization for peace and reconciliation groups in the Republic of Ireland, has the potential to influence politicians in their thinking and their policy-making.

Peacebuilding

Ethical arguments on the topic of terrorism tend to center on questions related to the right to terrorists to take action versus the moral right of the state and its citizens. As is often quoted in relation to morality and terrorism, "one person's freedom fighter is another person's terrorist". Responding to terrorism creates a whole new debate and one that has received little attention in the American literature until the events of September 11th. From a cross-cultural perspective Ireland has demonstrated the success of a two-tiered approach to responding to terrorism. The emphasis here is placed on the role of non-governmental actors and the peacebuilding sector in ensuring that mutual understanding and respect is gradually built up between adversarial communities. Peacebuilding is a long-term response to terrorism that seeks to attack the causes of terrorism at its roots. In addition, proper funding and impartial distributors of funding must be available to ensure the success of grassroots peacebuilding.

By eroding the public support for terrorism through programs of peacebuilding a long-term response to ending terrorism is more likely and possible. Ireland and Northern Ireland emerged out of a history littered with poverty and terrorism to become an important member of the European Union with a strong economy and an added significance as a region that has been able to avoid all out warfare stemming from terrorism. The lessons learned in Northern Ireland have significant implications for the rest of the world that is beginning to struggle with the impacts of terrorism. The events of September 11th have brought to bear the need to address conflicts globally. Perhaps the lessons learned from Northern Ireland can be brought to bear on other parts of the world to prevent the further growth of terrorism.

References

- Bloomfield, D., 1995, "Towards Complementarity in Conflict Management: Resolution and Settlement in Northern Ireland," *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 32, no. 2.
- Curle, 1990, *Tools for Transformation*, Hawthorne Press, London.
- Burton, John, 1996, "Civilisation in Crisis: From Adversarial to Problem Solving Process," *International Journal of Peace Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1.
- Darby, John, 1986, *Intimidation and the Control of Conflict in Northern Ireland*, Gill and McMillan, Dublin.
- Diamond, Louise and McDonald, John, 1996, *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace*, West Hartford, Kumarian Press.
- Lederach, John Paul, 1995, *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*, United Nations University, Tokyo.
- Monteville, 1982, *Track Two Diplomacy: The Development of Non-Governmental Promoting Relationships*, paper presented to the Irish Peace Institute Research Centre.
- Nordstrom, C., 1995, *Fieldwork Under Fire: Contemporary Studies of Violence and Survival*, University of California Press, Berkley, London.
- Rupensinghe, Kumar, *Conflict Transformation*, Macmillan Press, London.

Dr. Jerald H. "Jerry" Richards, Ph.D.

January 22, 1933 - April 26, 2018

Dr. Jerald H. "Jerry" Richards, Ph.D., born January 22, 1933 in Ellwood City,

Pennsylvania to the late Jessie and Clifford Richards, passed away at age 85, April



26, 2018 in Edgewood, Kentucky. Jerald was the beloved husband of Ann Richards, and devoted father and grandfather. He is survived by his daughters, Paula Westwood (Greg) and Robin Richards (Andrew Reed); sons, Alan Richards and Stephen Richards; brothers, Vic Richards (Sylvia) and Barry Richards (Margaret); granddaughters, Rachel Renner (Darren), Abigail Haidle (Luke), Mary Cook (Alex), and Georgia Rounder; and great-grandson, Sylvester Haidle. Jerald grew up in western Pennsylvania, and married Ann on May 7, 1955. In 1961 he graduated from the University of Kentucky with a B.A. in Philosophy. He pursued graduate work at Harvard University and Boston

University as a Danforth Graduate Fellow, receiving the M.A. and Ph.D. from Boston University in 1963 and 1966 respectively. Jerald was a postdoctoral scholar at Harvard from 1967 to 1968. He taught at Western Kentucky University from 1965 to 1972. He joined the Northern Kentucky University faculty in 1972, founding the Philosophy and Religion Department, serving as chair, then as coordinator of Philosophy, Religion, Anthropology and Sociology Programs in 1999 before retiring in 2004. Jerald published articles and chapters in a variety of journals and books, with a focus on peace studies, with his hope for a more peaceful and compassionate world. He also planned and participated in related conferences. He served on the NKU Wesley Foundation Board and Executive Committee of the national Committee of Concerned Philosophers for Peace. He was a Sunday school teacher and small group leader at Highland United Methodist Church in Ft. Thomas, where he and Ann attended together and actively participated for over 40 years. Friends and family are welcome to attend the memorial service, officiated by Rev. John Bowling, on Sunday, May 6, 2018 at 11 a.m., followed by visitation, noon to 1:30 p.m. at Highland United Methodist Church, 406 N. Ft. Thomas Ave. Ft. Thomas, Kentucky, 41075.