

Revisiting Peace: Compatibility in- Question

Syed Waqas Haider Bukhari

Abstract

Peace was the desire of humanity since beginning. Modern state system increased the hope of peace with the beginning of nation state system. In contemporary world the word 'peace' is being used in both positive and negative sense. Many scholars wrote on different dimensions of peace and practitioners did their best for the development of peace among nations. All divine religions imparted true education of peace to humanity. But unfortunately, religion is being taken as prime motivation factor of terrorism. This relentless terrorism is disturbing not only the peace of Pakistan but also of the rest of the world. Currently, Pakistan's security forces are exerting their utmost to eliminate terrorism and its causes by using force in the territory.

“We need an essentially new way of thinking if mankind is to survive. Men must radically change their attitudes toward each other and their views of the future. Force must no longer be an instrument of politics....Today, we do not have much time left; it is up to our generation to succeed in thinking differently. If we fail, the days of civilized humanity are numbered”.

Albert Einstein

The desire of peace or to create a society in which wars play limited role is now out of man's imaginations. In present world the states have big territory and have conflicts with its neighbors. Similarly, the interests of nation-states are also multi-dimensional and to achieve these interest nations do

not feel reluctant to disturb the peace of other states. In 21st century two world wars and one Cold War were seen on international arena. Along with these major wars many wars between some states and numerous conflicts were also seen. The huge number of conflicting nations' interests disrupted the peace of the world. But Peace can be achieved in all circumstances through different ways. The decision of war can be taken at the time of emergency when all efforts of avoiding conflict would be failed.

It is difficult to give exact definition of the word 'peace'. It is the combination of five English words and is proper noun. Like its definition it is difficult to achieve perpetual peace. To understand the concept of peace it is important to see how this word is used and abused. The use of the word peace was started in late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. This word is derived from Anglo-American *pas*, which means 'freedom from civil disorder'. Like all other abstract terms peace is intangible and its importance can be recognized in its absence.¹ The evolution peace seemed an ontologically unstable concept but with the passage of times and with different developments this became an ontologically stable concept.

The term peace is extremely motivating and frequently abused as tool for political purposes.² When there is no war there would be a peace. Peace is the establishment of society which has two characteristics; first when the society will have proper mechanism against any violence or aggression. Secondly, the society

¹ www.columbia.edu/fdc/pace/. Access on 18-05-2014

² David P. B. (1991). *Introduction to Peace Studies*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing. p.6.

will be just which means that it would protect against the exploitation by the more powerful.³

Following is the definition of peace in the view of different scholars:-

Howard: “Peace is more than the absence of war. It is also the maintenance of orderly and just society”.⁴

Norman Cousins: “Peace can be slavery or it can be freedom; subjugation or liberation”.⁵

Spinoza argued that “peace is not an absence of war; it is a virtue, a state of mind, a disposition for benevolence, confidence, and justice”.

According to Macmillan dictionary: “Peace is a situation in which there is no war between countries or groups”.⁶

Many scholars define peace simply as the absence of war but peace is more than this. Peace is also the absence of violence or war like situation. However, many people are not agreed upon this part of definition. They have view that peace includes justice and without justice there is no peace but attainment of justice is difficult and impractical. Along with justice in reality peace brings favorable environment for different opportunities. Peace is first and foremost thing; it can be achieved when it is desirable and all things come after the establishment of peace. A desire for peace can conquer the enemy without war and historically it has been proved that it is more powerful than any other form of violence.

Positive or Negative Peace

³ David C. (2008). *Peace: A History of Movements and Ideas*. New York, US.: Cambridge University Press. p.6.

⁴ Michael H. (Ed.). (1971). *Problems of a Disarmed World in Studies in War and Peace*. New York, US.: Twayne Publishers. p. 225

⁵ Norman C. (1946). *Modern Man in Obsolete*. New York, US.: Viking Press, p. 6

⁶ <http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/peace>. Access on 20-05-2014.

In peace study Johan Galtung gave two types of peace which are called positive peace and negative peace.

Positive Peace

Positive peace describes the continuous presence of many desirable factors like harmony, equity and justice. It refers to a situation in which there is minimum exploitation and no-overt or stable violence. It demands removal of structural and systematic violence and working for the development of true peace. In order to achieve equality, democracy and end the violence this type of peace is focuses on post war condition and physical force. Positive peace demands global justice “changes in global society and economic systems are seen as the necessary preconditions for authentic world peace”. There are three main areas of positive peace education

1. Address hurdles in economic deprivation and development
2. Resources and environment
3. Social justice and global human rights.⁷

Negative Peace

This type of peace refers to absence of violence, curative, pessimistic and achievement of peace through non-violent means. Negative peace is a condition in which no active military conflict is present.

Presence of peace means life and its absence is death. Peace encourages positivity and construction while in the absence of peace no society can be

⁷ Defining Peace-Defining Violence. Available on: <http://www.sunypress.edu/pdf/61489.pdf>
Access on 22-5-2014

flourished and there would be destruction everywhere. Peace brings progress and violence brings annihilation.⁸

Peace in Theories of International Relations

In international relations there are three orthodox theories which provided different narratives regarding peace. In this sense realism provides negative peace which is based on hierarchy, Idealism or liberalism provides positive peace while Marxism addresses the economy at root level through violent revolutions. There are many writers, thinkers, politicians and activists who are thinking on peace through different ways.

Peace in Realism

In realism peace is based on the hegemony of the victor. It sees international relations as a state of war in which states can ensure their survival through power. In realism peace is called negative peace because its sustainability is dependent on the will of victor. In the view of Wight in anarchic international system, state ensures their survival by putting the security of others' in threat.⁹ In realist representation of IR there is no general rule for security or welfare.¹⁰

Barry Buzan argued that “ever-changing discourse about the nature, application and effect of power in an ever-changing historical environment”. The basic assumption of the realism is power which is its core and cannot be

⁸ Maulana W. K. (2003). *The Ideology of Peace: Towards a Culture of Peace*. New Delhi, IN.: Goodword Books. pp. 69-70.

⁹ Martin W. (1994). *International Theory*. Leicester, US.: Leicester University Press. pp. 104–114.

¹⁰ Chris B. (2007). Tragedy, Tragic Choices' and Contemporary International Political Theory. *International Relations*. (21)5, p. 5.

changed.¹¹ In realist school of thought peace is a zero-sum game. The implications of major realist thinkers' work regarding peace undermine its universal ethics. They focus on limited understanding of peace which can be ensured within the boundaries of state and is anticipated by powerful state to secure its own interests. In realist thinking there exists only implicit version of peace which is only desirable but highly unobtainable. At the gross root level peace is only when there will be no violence between states. According to Hobbes:- "For every state war is incessant and lifelong against every other state ... For what most men call 'peace', this is really only a name in truth, all states by their very nature are always engaged in an informal war against all other states".¹²

In realism the main problem of IR is insecurity. Hobbes has given the idea of 'Civil Peace' which can work in its better form through monarchy in which no one can disagree with the orders. On international front there is anarchy, and war can lead to peaceful international environment if the winning power has the capacity to impose its will on others. This type of peace is called limited peace which is one limited to one state or alliance of state.¹³ On domestic front peace for limited time can be achieved but on international front this is not possible. This thing provides the basis of realist's assumption that domestic and international environment is formed according to the will and interests of the hegemon.

Hegel has different opinions or has criticism on peace. He said that war can prevent the nation from corruption and maintain the health and wealth of the nations which leads to perpetual peace. He has view point that war can provide the environment to the individual in which they can demonstrate their capabilities

¹¹ Marysia Z. *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge, UK.: Cambridge University Press. p. 51.

¹² Thomas H. (1998). *Leviathan*. Oxford, UK.: Oxford University Press. p.12

¹³ *Ibid.*, p.27

for an ethical life in the society. In Hegel opinion peace produces corruption of the nations.¹⁴ In 20th century the writing of E.H. Carr *Twenty years Crisis* and Hans Morganthau *Politics among Nations* respectively said that the idealists form of peace is difficult to achieve because nations are selffish in their economic, military and territorial terms. In realism there is no space for morality and in the view of Carr, peace which is defined on the basis of morality is only the projection of interest of dominant class.¹⁵

Idealism or Liberalism

In international relations, liberal school of thought represents larger part of the debate which includes Zimmern, Baily and Noel Baker as early idealist's thinkers, Mitranly and Burton as functionalists and pluralists and Woodrow Wilson during WW1.¹⁶ Idealism in international relations is based on different concepts of interdependence and internationalism, establishment of peace without war and de-weaponisation. It anticipates that war can be overthrown eventually;¹⁷ the right of self-determination for all citizens and the idea of world government can be fulfilled. The central point of idealist thinking is the establishment of international organizations like League of Nations and United Nations. Idealists are optimistic that human nature is not violent and international organizations, political norms and regimes can prevent the war. The idealists thinking presented early liberal agenda which has three main standards. John Locke focused on individualism, Bentham on utilitarianism Kant focused on republican

¹⁴ George W.F. H. (1996). *Philosophy of Right*. London, UK.: Prometheus. p. 10

¹⁵ Edward. H. C. (1939). *Twenty Years' Crisis*. London, UK.: Macmillan, p. 68

¹⁶ Martin W. (1966). (Ed.). *Why is There No International Theory?'*, in H. Butterfield and M. Wight *Diplomatic Investigations*. London, UK.: Allen and Unwin. pp. 12–33.

¹⁷ Norman A. (1921). *The Fruits of Victory*. London, UK. Collins. L. Woolf, (1916). *International Government*. London, UK.: Allen and Unwin. p. 8.

internationalism and Adam Smith focused on free trade and pacifism.¹⁸ In spite of different disagreement among these thinkers, these provided the basis of international law and human rights. Liberals have view that war is not in the interests of those states in which there is harmony, human rights and democracy which is very important for peace in international relations.¹⁹ In idealism individuals give preference peace, free trade, human rights and IR should be the zone of peace and positivity. According to Aristotle “we may have to make war that we may live in peace”.²⁰ John Locke as father of modern liberalism said that state of nature can be controlled by human reason. He gave importance to social contract through which subjects and rules developed combined constitutive role for the protection of private property, life and liberty.²¹ Combining this with Bentham view that the desire of liberal institutions opposed comparative tariff and imperialism which discuss the qualities of liberal states which is the base of international peace in the view of idealists.²² The concept of perpetual peace given by Kant has vital status in IR. Furthermore, it has same status in world politics thinking regarding peace. He further said that the reason behind war is the absence of rule of international law and democracy. According to him free trade can prevent wars and promotes peaceful relations. Similarly, a general will was adopted regarding the codes of conduct that reduced violence and established laws for people.²³ According to John Stuart Mill there was still need of Leviathan

¹⁸ Michael D. (1997). *Ways of War and Peace*. London, UK.: Norton Publisher. p. 206.

¹⁹ John S. M. (1998). *On Liberty*. Oxford, UK.: Oxford University Press. p.120

²⁰ Aristotle. (1998). *Nicomachean Ethics, Book X*. UK, New York: Dover Publications.

²¹ John L. (Ed.). (1988). *Two Treatises on Government*. Cambridge, UK.: Cambridge University Press. pp. 11-13.

²² Jeremy B. (Ed.). (1987). *Plan for a Universal and Perpetual Peace in H.P. Kainz Philosophical Perspectives on Peace*. London, UK.: Macmillan. p.11

²³ Lain A. (2005). *The Ethics of Peace and War*. Edinburgh, St.: Edinburgh University Press. p. 44.

through which freedom of individual should be protected. Jeremy Bentham also said in the same sense that peace would be constructed through the removal of arms and by enhancing the interests of the citizens.²⁴ This form of peace was crucially based on liberal ethic and set of norms of Christ and also presented liberal and idealists anticipation of sophisticated and sustainable form of peace

In liberal thinking there are four key standards of peace which are as following:-

Victor Peace

This concept of peace originated from old-age realist thinking that peace is based on military success. In this concept it is assumed that human being is a violent creature. Territorial states have nations which pursue their interests in the conflicting and anarchic world. In such world the nature of state system and balance of power allow for either minimal survival or a maximum of an imperial hegemony. The first and foremost task of individual is to ensure the security of the state and deploy different strategies to counter different external challenges. All these challenges forced state to enhance its power and work for maximizing own security. State's preparations for war reduce the possibilities of war. Peace and struggle for peace through international institutions and international law can be desirable but these can undermine the force of power and increase violence.

Institutional Peace

The concept of institutional peace is based on idealists, liberal institutionalist and liberal internationalist thinking. This concept of peace seeks to anchor states in legal and normative environment in which states are largely willing that how to behave, determine and enforce their behavior. This peace can

²⁴ Jeremy B. (Ed.). (1996). *A Plan for a Universal and Perpetual Peace*, in *The Principles of International Law*, *Essay IV, The Collected Works* Oxford, UK.: Clarendon

be track backed from the treaty of Westphalia through the emergence of United Nations and further.²⁵ Contemporary peace through international institutions is a major point of both realist and liberal thinkers. The focus is to develop liberal institutional peace because this type of peace is both universal and transferable. However in order to achieve this type of peace the institution must reflect the interests of values, identities and interests of all those individuals who affect directly or indirectly. The importance of International institutions in international relations is that peace holds a key position in liberal school of thought.

Constitutional Peace

This concept of peace is based on Kantian argument that peace is based on democracy, free trade and cosmopolitan values.

Civil Peace

In this concept of peace individuals are important rather than state or any other international or multilateral organizations. It is based on the direct action of the citizens for the defense of their rights or values. This concept is derived from liberal thought on individualism and rights. Furthermore, this approach has been adopted in contemporary constructivist critical and post-structural ideas on the issues of identity, pluralism, hegemony and pluralism. This also focuses on necessity of justice and security of human beyond state system.²⁶

Peace in Marxism

Marxism defines peace in term of international political economy, the economic problems of weaker and the subsequent need for fundamental reforms. In Marxist theory of international relations social and economic justice provides

²⁵ Michael W. D. (2005). *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 12(3), pp. 205-235.

²⁶ Fred H. (Ed.). (2001). *The Romance of Non-State Actors in Non-State Actors in World Politics*. London, UK.: Palgrave. p. 35.

the fundamental basis of peace. In classless society, Marx basically focuses on the context of capitalism and its effects on both national and international relations. He has view point that for mutual interests there is need to remove the capitalist property in order to abolish the exploitation between nations. This thing leads to social justice and is pre-requisite of peace.

In the view of Lenin, imperialism made the peace impossible and stopped from progress towards social democracy. Here is contradiction between Marx and Lenin is located that for the development of peace there is need of violent means. Though Marx has a view that the expansion of international capital was connected with inter-state conflict and thought that in spite of the conflicts those are produced by capitalist's class, capitalism is more durable than Marxism. Lenin also pointed out that imperialism is the highest point of capitalism and this imperialism would lead to the collapse of capitalism. Marx said that if reconfigured of materialism is possible according to the benefit of masses, so that they controlled the means of production and escaped from class conflict determined by private property, then a classless peace without structural violence and with inherent justice might emerge. He further said that this capitalist system was a hurdle in such type of peace and this should include social justice and equity and would not depend merely on peace agreement among states. In the view of Lenin this thing could be carried on international level where both capitalism fed imperialism stopped Marx-Lenin form of peace. This thing would emerge through revolutionary resistance from the proletariat,²⁷ facilitating the collapse of capitalism and imperialism. Furthermore, imperial powers could never be in anything more than a truce with each other.

²⁷ Vladimir L. (1997). *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. New York, UK.: International Publishers. p. 265

This depends on equity, social justice and equal system of international trade in which states and different actors are hierarchically organized according to the indicators of socioeconomic class. In these terms, peace can be achieved but after massive revolutionary struggle, violent disturbance in the international economy, economic hierarchies and traditional class and the system in which states work in the way which better secure and represent the interest of society and workers, rather than wealthy class.

Religion and Peace

Peace and religion both terms are defined by different scholars through different ways. Both terms are interoperated according to the religion and understanding of the people. Different scholars look on religion through different ways. Some defined it in a limited sense and some view it in broader. Contemporary conflicts are beyond the state boundaries but under the premises of religion, culture and ethnicity. Religion plays double role; on one way it can become the cause of conflict. Secondly it has the capacity to stop any type of conflict. Religion plays key role in preventing or perpetrating the conflict.²⁸

Peace is a very vital concern of human beings and all religions give importance to it. Peace is spirit of every religion and the objective or teaching of any religion cannot be fulfilled without peace. The objective of all religion is the spiritual development of individual and makes him a responsible citizen.

Peace in Islam

²⁸ Tools for Peace? *The Role of Religion in Conflicts, Report from an International Inter-Religious Peace Conference* 21–24 November 2004, Söderköping, Sweden. Available on http://www.life-peace.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Tools_for_Peace.pdf. p. 7. Access on 30 November 2014.

The word Islam originated from the word peace and Muslim is described as the one who believes in this religion. Islam is a divine religion which always teaches mercy and peace.

“It is the religion of your father Abraham. It is He (Allah) Who has named you Muslims both before and in this (the Qur’an), that the Messenger be a witness over you and you be a witness over mankind!” (Surat-al-Hajj (22), ayah 78).

The basic teaching of Islam is a peaceful submission to the lord of the world

“Yes, but whoever submits his face (himself) to Allah (i.e. follow Allah’s Religion of Islamic monotheism) and he is a good-doer, then his reward is with the Lord, on such shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve.” (Surat-al-Baqarah (2), ayah 112)

The Quran which is the basic or fundamental book of Islam always teaches the message of peace and the night in which it was revealed became the night of peace.

“Verily! We have sent it (this Qur’an) down in the night of Al-Qadr (Decree). And what will make you know what the night of decree is. The night of Al-Qadr (Decree) is better than a thousand months. Therein descend the angels and the Ruh (Jibreel) by Allah’s Permission with all Decree, Peace! until the appearance of dawn.” (Surat-al-Qadr (97), ayahs 1-5)

The holy prophet always preached the teaching of Islam and his whole life was the practical example of the Holy Quran. Holy Prophet (PBUH) said that the power of peace is stronger than the power of violence. The Holy Prophet promoted peace during his whole life and always forgave his opponents. When

Mecca was conquered and all the enemies who turned him out from Mecca, tortured him now brought before him. Now they were the criminals of war and were could be put to death by the victor. But Holy Prophet did not blame them and just said that “Go you all are free.”²⁹

There is no doubt that the Quran is the book of peace. There is no violence or war in the Quran. The whole Quranic teaching is directly or indirectly related to the preaching of peace. The starting invocation of the Quran is “In the Name of God, the Most Beneficent, the Most Merciful” has been repeated more than 114 times. From this it is clear that the greatest or the supreme who sent this book to mankind is merciful. The greater part of the Quran strongly supports peace. There are total 6666 verses of the Holy Quran and there are only forty verses which deal with the waging war.³⁰

In spite of clear instructions regarding the message of Islam there are many societal factors those are creating problems in implementation of true teaching. There are many hurdles like lack of cooperation and trust between religious scholars and government. Other than this there is corruption, gap between the rich and the power, discrimination and antagonism among political leadership all are harming the implementation of Islamic instruction of peace. Islam does not fully advocate peace. In some cases force can be used in accordance with the concept of Jihad which also prohibits the use of violent means except in some cases i.e.

1. When the practice of Islam is prohibited by the aggressor and the liberty of the religion is under threat.

²⁹ Maulana W. K. (2004). *Islam and Peace*. New Delhi, IN.: Good Work. P. 92.

³⁰ Maulana W. K. (2004). *The Ideology of Peace: Towards A Culture of Peace*. New Delhi, IN.: Good Words Book. p. 97.

2. When people are facing oppression and subjugation.
3. When the land is taken by the people with the use of force.³¹

In above circumstance Islam allows the use of force. So in contemporary circumstances a clash between West and Islam is emerging and a clash of civilization is observing. West especially United States is supporting authoritarian regimes and also intervenes in the Muslim World. In order to protect the liberty and land, Jihad is initiated against this foreign intervention. The peace of the region is disturbing and Muslims are thinking responsible for all kind of violence at present time. Pakistan is among one of those states which are facing internal as well as external disorder. The peace of the state is highly disturbed and on the side of state many efforts were made for the establishment of peace.

Pakistan and Peace Process

The geo-strategic location of Pakistan has very vital significance. It is the states which connect most of the regions of world with each others. Along with this there are many areas which are endowed with rich natural reserves. Baluchistan is one of them which have massive reserves of all natural resources. Pakistan shares its border with India, Iran, Afghanistan and sea. Among these Pakistan and Afghanistan have miles 2255 long border and such a huge border cannot be managed properly. The bordering area of Pakistan is facing disturbance which is now moving towards other stabilize areas. When the incident of 9/11 took place international forces led by the United States intervened in Afghanistan the heat of the attack was also faced by Pakistan.

The FATA region has international importance which faced terrorist incidents after the arrival of Al-Qaeda, Afghan Taliban and other militant groups.

³¹ Islamic Perspectives on Peace and Violence, (January 12, 2004). *Special Report, United States Institute of Peace*, Washington DC, UK.:

In order to counter the activities of the militants Pakistani forces under the pressure of United States launched an attack on these areas. In these circumstances, Pakistani government signed a series of agreements in South and North agencies to protect or disassociate local militants with foreign fighters.

In order to establish peace Pakistan's government signed three different agreements. These agreements were signed with the tribes of North and South Waziristan agencies namely Uthmanzai Tribe, Ahmadzai Tribe and Mahusad Tribe. Soon after this, these agreements became the subject of debate both in academic and policy making circle. These peace agreements were verbal agreement with Nek Mohammed and others and were concluded on 24 April 2004.³² The Sararogha agreement was concluded with Baitullah Mahsud and other tribes of Mahsud on 7 February 2005 in South Waziristan.³³

The enforcement method of these peace agreements was also very peaceful. A committee consisting of different elder leaders of tribes and religious scholars was formed. The responsibility of these members was to develop communication between tribes and respective tribes regarding the enforcement of the peace agreements.³⁴ Later on at different stages these agreements failed due to various reasons. After this failure, Pakistan's government decided to start operation in its tribal areas. Both air and land forces fought this war inside Pakistan territory. Later on Pakistani forces got success and increased its footprint in these areas. In spite of this strong presence the internal security situation of Pakistan was not good because different settled areas were facing different

³² Iqbal K. (April 25, 2004). Army Embraces Wanted Tribesmen. *Daily Times*.

³³ Dilawar K. W. (February 8, 2005). *Amnesty Granted to Militant Leaders Dawn*.

³⁴ Evagoras C. L. *Waziristan Accord*. Available on [http:// globalpolitician.com/articles.asp?print-true&id=3893](http://globalpolitician.com/articles.asp?print-true&id=3893). Access on 24-05-2014

terrorists' acts. Internal security situation was in turmoil and people were feared due to different brutal acts.

When the current government of Nawaz Sharif came into power it initiated peace talks with different groups of Taliban inside Pakistani territory. Government constituted a committee and gave the responsibility to start talk with Taliban. This committee held different talks with the Taliban leaders and tried to convince them for any possible agreement. On this serious initiative by the government, the leaders of Taliban decided for ceasefire for one month. According to this ceasefire any group of TTP will not attack inside Pakistan. The peace process was going on in spite of different hurdles. During this process inside confrontation emerged among different groups of TTP. Similarly government was reluctant to fulfill some demands of Taliban leaders which they put forth during the committee meetings. Initially the TTP increased the agreement for some days but later on they refused to increase it more. So different terrorist activities were started again inside Pakistan and Pakistan's army also attacked different places of Taliban's. The whole process failed but it can be hoped that in future peace can be established by using different tools of peace.

Conclusion

Peace is a difficult concept. Like the concept it is also difficult to achieve. In all ages of human life it was the desire that there should be peace which secured humanity. There are many obstacles in the development of peace. In the world peace was not achieved in spite of any particular period. On international level, peace cannot be achieved because international system is anarchic. In this international system powerful can secured its interest by all means and the interests of weaker are undermined. So in such type of situation peace cannot be achieved. The concept of peace is existing only in theory and its particle

implication does not seem in present world. There are many regional organizations are working for harmony and collaboration among nations and on international level there is United Nations which is working on developing peace in different regions of the world.

Although peace is difficult to achieve but efforts regarding the establishment of peace can prove useful. For the development of peace religion always played its role. All the divine religion of the world encouraged the development of peace. On positive side religion can play positive role for the establishment of peace but on negative side religion can disturb the peace of the world. In contemporary circumstances there is a wave of terrorism in the world which is directly associated to the religion. Religion is a sensitive issue and has capacity to mobilize people for any purpose.

The basic problem in the religion is that everyone perceives the religion according to his or her own desire and not focus on the true teaching. Similarly the self-perception of people on religion is harming peace of Pakistan. Along with terrorism, sectarianism is also a top in the state and people are not willing to bear other's thought. Currently, Pakistan is struggling for peace and for that purpose the government is putting all its effort for that purpose. In Pakistan, there are many foreign elements which are disturbing the peace of the nations. There are the interests of some powers behind this turbulence and no one is focusing on the misery of people.