

A PHILOSOPHY OF PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT:

AMARTYA SEN'S CAPABILITY APPROACH

ALTHON DAVE NAQUILA OMICTIN, MA-Philosophy

Abstract

The research clarifies the concepts of peace and development as part of the re-evaluation of the capability approach as a social philosophical framework for peace and development. The research re-examines the idea of Amartya Sen's capability approach to peace and development as a viable framework to social development. This paper talks about the criticisms of the approaches currently in use today for the well-being of the individual. Further, it follows the line of development of social philosophical frameworks related to the approaches of peace and development currently in use and uses these philosophical frameworks as stepping stones to build up a new understanding of the capability approach with the modifications from the recent developments and studies. In conclusion, the research provides a philosophical framework in understanding peace and development that would help in the reevaluation of the approaches being used today for the well-being of the individual and the society at the same time introducing the adaptations of the capability approach by Amartya Sen as well as the recent developments of the approach as a probable solution towards this problem.

Keywords: *Peace and Development, Amartya Sen's Capability, Social Development, Philosophical Framework*

INTRODUCTION

According to Sen (1976), the understanding of peace and development is necessary to avoid the shortcomings of the measures in the approaches for the wellbeing of the individual and society. Peace and development were understood separately from each other. Thus, it requires separate frameworks and approaches to be able to address issues in the wellbeing of the individual and society. The problem is that, throughout generations, the understanding of peace and development varies from different perspectives and frameworks promulgated by social philosophers. Social Philosophers had developed frameworks that provide different approaches for peace and development in society despite differences in the understanding of what they mean as peace and as development. Also, the frameworks of different philosophers follow different timelines of understanding of what society considers as peace and development in different social contexts.

The common understanding of peace, as separate from development, by people who experience war and violence in the early timeline is the achievement of the general tranquility and the provision of communal claims (Green, 1999 & Rood, 2005). This implies the cessation of quarrels and fighting among opposing parties. On the one hand, peace must be achieved first. On the other hand, development is considered as a product of the achievement of peace. When one says peace, there must be a development that comes after. Otherwise, peace will not be considered as progressive (Welch, 1997).

Another is the difference in perspectives. The understanding of peace and development varies from different perspectives of the person and the social background of their understanding. Peace is different from the perspective of the rich or those in the upper class of the society than in those of the lower class or the poor and the oppressed. At the same time, development is seen differently from the level of the individual to the level of society. The understanding of peace and development can be seen as widely separate from each other to be able to produce a framework that could address both. According to Pope Paul VI in the book *Populorum Progressio*, peace and development must be understood in a holistic sense of development with noticeable progress in the life of the individuals.

The frameworks for the approaches to address problems and issues in the society do not see peace and development in the individual and the society as both as similar and an analogous concept thus creates misunderstanding. Social philosophical frameworks for peace create cognitional distance for social philosophical frameworks for development and vice versa. For Sen (1999) the concept of peace and development focuses on human freedom in contrast with narrower views of peace and development. Some understand otherwise and cause misunderstanding and

conflict to rise among the individuals where peace and development frameworks and the approach are used in the promulgation of the wellbeing of the masses. Some understand peace as freedom from any form of disturbance and a sense of tranquility, while for others it means the absence of war and violence (Galtung, 1989).

The philosophy of Amartya Sen about freedom, peace, and development would play an important role in creating a new understanding of peace and development. It would be necessary to be able to find a common ground where both ideas are catered and at the same time addressed to their perspectives and timeline relating to the approaches in social philosophy. There is a need to define peace and development from the common understanding of an individual and the understanding of some of the social philosophers for one to be able to see the disparity and similarity between the two perspectives. The idea of Sen, coming from an oriental perspective and economic mindset, would act as an intermediary to understand the new definition of peace and development in the modern perspective with the application of the capability approach.

Apart from the common understanding of peace and development that leads to the cessation of action and normalization of perilous undertakings, Sen challenges everyone to look farther. Peace leads to movement and action or more about freedom of the individual himself or being able to access the tools he needs for development as the real meaning for the application of peace and development in the light of Sen's social philosophy.

Creating a common ground of understanding peace and development that would be beneficial to all and especially as a considerable avenue towards progress in the field of social philosophies. The idea of Sen would be a part of the trend of economic and philosophical addition to the social philosophies present today that provide support and evaluation to the social problems that everyone faces. A collaborative work of philosophical ideas that had different views before and seeing it in the new but connected perspective will shed new light on social philosophy. The application, as well as the progress that would bring more freedom to a person, should be the peace and development Amartya Sen is referring to. Peace is achieved through the cessation of fighting over certain goals and motivations (Sen, 2008). This would result in the proposition of Amartya Sen about freedom, peace, and development that leads to movement and progress.

METHODS

This chapter discusses the methods and nature of the research. The research was a pure philosophical study, particularly under analytic and comparative research design. This research analyzed the different streams of social philosophies that deal with the understanding of peace and development. It then compared the philosophies and looked for the uniqueness of the ideas to support the philosophy of Amartya Sen. Particularly, it analyzed the social philosophical ideas about enhancing the life of the human person to the building of their capacity and empowering their ability to access programs and institutions that would make their life better.

The research examined the humanistic and social philosophical perspective of Amartya Sen which is present in his economic views characterized by the movement of the political system in a certain society or community. The research had looked into the perspective of different philosophers in the field of social philosophy to this movement, their actions to the idea of peace and development.

The research was focused on understanding Amartya Sen's philosophical point of view on peace and development concerning other peace and development of philosophical frameworks. It is only focused on the major philosophical frameworks that influence the approaches currently in use in society. The social philosophies that follow the stream of thinking for the poor and oppressed individuals were only the line of thought for this research to the philosophy of Amartya Sen. The research only covered the social philosophies related to the main study like that of Hobbes, Marx, Rawls and recent developments in the capability approach.

DISCUSSIONS

This shows the important ideas that build up the approach of Amartya Sen. As mentioned in the introduction and related literature, philosophers and other writers have differing points of view of the definition of peace and development. To understand more of the idea of peace and development, one needs to understand also the disparities caused by the different interpretations of the concept and how they help to build up our understanding of peace and development today. This would also become an avenue for a new understanding of a framework that may provide a more adapted concept of wellbeing for the individual founded on this idea of peace and development.

One theory about development that was widely used before is the trickle-down theory. This theory is thought to be one of the most effective in terms of understanding development. Its main point is the understanding that people might benefit from the general perspective of putting more funds to the higher institutions and let it trickle down to the lower masses. This theory of development is ideal only to the effect that it is executed properly. Still, due to the differences in the understanding of development, people in the higher ladder of the institutions tend to corrupt the funds; thus, lesser or nothing trickles down to the masses. The achievement of peace and development is the main agenda. It is an ideal state where one can live fully and be able to exercise all the basic rights or freedom intrinsic upon the individual. This had been tried over time in many places bearing the same generalization of peace and development the people hoped to be led to their freedom (Kenton, 2019).

To arrive at this state, the idea of peace and development must be grounded on a uniform understanding and interpretation; clarifying these facts would give chance for adaptations of addressing some issues as the progress of human thinking capacity also improve. It is but timely to re-evaluate the researcher's idea of the approach and incorporate the idea of Amartya Sen. The peace and development issues have been the concern of many especially in the locality, but one has to approach the idea of incorporating the issues of peace and development to individual and social applications of the incapability in assessing how to achieve such.

Peace and Development According to Social Philosophers

The idea of synthesizing the concept of peace and development came later on as the definition of peace and development became almost synonymous as the needs of the time also change. The research gathers how social philosophers describe and contrast peace and development and how it affects the approaches that are used in society. The research comprehends that these definitions of the philosophers cause the misunderstanding not just of the approaches but also of the application of the frameworks. This will also be necessary to emphasize the capability approach of Amartya Sen as an approach to both peace and development.

Peace had a different connotation during the time of Thomas Hobbes. In his book, *Leviathan*, Hobbes speaks about civil law and law of nature that affirms human self-preservation and condemns acts destructive to human life. Hobbes concludes that natural man, to preserve life, must seek peace. Natural law demands that we seek peace because to seek peace is to fulfill our natural right to defend ourselves. Peace is giving up some of my rights and argues that civil peace and social unity are best achieved by the establishment of a commonwealth through a social contract. The book was written during the civil war around the 16th century. This explains why peace is defined as such for Hobbes and why it requires a sovereign power or entity not only a consensual understanding of peace. This definition had a huge influence on how we understand peace and the establishments of societies today. The idea of development is not yet so evident in Hobbes' work, what he considers as development is the attainment of the commonwealth ruled by a sovereign power responsible for protecting the security of the commonwealth and granted absolute authority to ensure the common defense for peace.

Another social philosopher that had a great contribution to the development of the idea of peace and development is that of Karl Marx. Unlike Hobbes, Marx is an economist that focuses on socioeconomic analysis that views class relations and social conflict as a measure of peace and development. Marx uses a materialist interpretation of historical development and takes a dialectical view of social transformation in contrast to a consensual understanding. From the Marxist viewpoint, war and peace are understood exclusively as social phenomena, not manifestations of any super-natural power outside human society, this means that peace and development can be achieved within the members of the society. The Marxist conception of peaceful and non-violent forms of revolution is believed to result in the developments within the society. Marx also believes in the avoidability and unavoidable of wars in our times and the problems relating to peaceful coexistence. He concludes that peace and peaceful co-existence among states is not only possible but a historical necessity (Kara, 1968).

The most notable idea of peace in modern times is that of Johan Galtung. In his book, *Violence, Peace and Peace Research*, Galtung started by defining the term peace as used for social goals that may be complex and difficult, but not impossible, to attain. He also maintained the idea that peace is the absence of violence though he focused on distinguishing different types of violence as personal violence and structural violence as his answer to what should be the real idea of peace. For Galtung, if peace is the absence of violence, then it must refer to all kinds of violence, which means that peace becomes a state of human fulfillment. The absence of direct, personal violence can be defined as negative peace and the other type as positive peace (Galtung, 1969). Here, Galtung concluded that peace is not only a matter of control and reduction of violence but

also vertical development. This means that peace is not only connected with conflict but equally with development.

The idea of Galtung is widely used and influences a lot of social philosophers including that of Sen. Though not directly similar, Galtung's claim at the end that peace is not just about the reduction of conflict but equally vertical to development means that he also acknowledges the relationship between peace and development. Sen adheres to this similarity starting with his definition of development as freedom. Later, both the idea of Galtung about peace and the development Sen was referring to influence the synthesis of Jon Barnett.

Jon Barnett examined and synthesized Johan Galtung's theory of peace as the absence of violence and Amartya Sen's theory of development as freedom. Galtung's theory of peace is clear on the meaning and causes of direct violence, but unclear on the details of structural violence. Sen's theory helps overcome many of the problems associated with structural violence. In the theory of peace as freedom, peace is defined as the equitable distribution of economic opportunities, political freedoms, social opportunities, transparency guarantees, protective security and freedom from direct violence (Barnett, 2008). Barnett, as highly influenced by Sen, somehow also promulgated the development of the idea of peace and development. From Sen's earlier work, development as freedom, and from the synthesis of Barnett, peace as freedom, the research has a common ground of peace and development as freedom.

Peace and Development for Amartya Sen

Peace and development are understood independently and separately with each other as mentioned earlier. Peace is the absence of violence and war (Galtung, 1969). This is the long-standing notion of peace and is still widely adapted to this date in many countries especially those who are in constant struggle and conflicting ideas and interests as influenced also by Sen. Moreover, Sen, actually gave a deeper and more timely understanding of peace which also entails democratic society. Civil Paths to peace include the removal, to the extent possible, of gross economic inequalities, social humiliations and political disenfranchisement, which can contribute to generating confrontation and hostility (Sen, 2007).

Development is more widely accepted after Sen defines it as the freedom that people enjoy. After the end of the war, a definition of peace and development gradually begins to emerge as scholars try to relate each other as part of the progress and a shift in the paradigm of a new era of understanding peace and development. The people wanted to ask, what the kind of development would facilitate the emergence of a more peaceful economic, social and political structures (Hettne, 1983). At the heart of *Development as Freedom* laid Sen's claim that development is not so much something that can be done to others, but is instead something that people do for themselves. This claim is based on his studies of famine (Sen, 1981), his observations about the preconditions of the success of the East Asian economies, and his observations about the enhanced freedoms and opportunities afforded to most people in liberal democratic societies. So, for Sen, people will develop as they see it if given sufficient economic opportunities, political liberties, social powers, and the enabling conditions of good health, basic education, and the encouragement and cultivation of initiatives (Sen, 1999). These opportunities are, in Sen's words, freedoms, and it is freedom, he argued, that should be, the means how to attain as well as the ends or the goal of development.

As influenced by Sen, John Barrett (2008) came up with a new synthesis that would explain this proposition: Peace as Freedom. Peace is synonymous with freedom. To bring about peace in society, people must enjoy more independence and autonomy. Peace as freedom suggests that the means and ends of peace and development practices should be to ensure the equitable distribution of economic opportunities, political freedoms, social opportunities, transparency guaranty, protective security and freedom from direct violence. It is a view that merges peace and development into a single framework (Barrett, 2008). Barnett's idea was important in the development of the framework by being able to comprehend the foundation of peace and development.

Understanding peace as freedom offers a framework for assessments and reassessments of peace and development at any scale and in any place. It also offers a basis upon which the causes of armed conflicts may be systematically identified and then examined. Indeed, if such linkages between the denial of freedoms and opportunities and violent conflict can be determined more systematically and robustly, then a theory of peace as freedom may have the potential to become a theory that unifies many areas of peace studies. (Barnett, 2008)

This definition of Peace utilizes the limited set of criteria added by Sen. Peace and development is not anymore so much of something that can be done to others but instead something that people do for themselves. This is where the idea of freedom comes in. Freedom is both a means and an end to peace and development. For Sorensen (1985) both are structurally interlocked. Peace and development are equal to freedom. The new definition of peace and development adapted by Sen is the goal and the process of expanding people's freedom. Expanding freedom is possible through the Capability Approach.

Development of the Approaches

The goal is to find the relationship between Amartya Sen's capability approach to human well-being and social philosophy referring to peace and development (Saito, 2003). According to Sen, the notion of Capability relates centrally to freedom – the range of options a person has in deciding what kind of life to lead (Dreze and Sen, 1995). The capability approach to human well-being is a concentration on the freedom to achieve in general and the capabilities to function in particular, and the core concepts of this approach are functionings and capabilities (Sen, 1995). Functioning is an achievement, whereas a capability is the ability to achieve (Sen, 1987).

This part discusses the adaptation of what is lacking in the previous approaches needed to understand the capability approach. One is a Commodity approach or an income-based approach. Although income and commodity can be crucially important, Sen criticized the way of measuring a person's well-being in terms of the amount of income or commodities the person owns for the following reasons (Clark, 1999). First, Sen argued that 'a person's well-being is not a matter of how rich he or she is. Commodity command is a means to the end of well-being, but can scarcely be the end itself' (Sen, 1985). Commodities are merely objects which a person might use. Second, individuals have different commodity requirements (Sen, 1992). Third, differing commodity requirements can also be found in different cultures and societies (Clark, 1999). Lastly, as Nussbaum argued, more is not, in fact, always better, where wealth and income are concerned. Too many goods can encourage excessive competitiveness and make people insolent and arrogant, causing them to have a mercenary attitude towards other things (Nussbaum, 1990).

The Welfare or Utility approach is another prominent approach. Sen has criticized both types of utilitarianism by arguing that neither pleasure nor happiness in the classical form, nor the fulfillment of desire in the modern form, is appropriate as a representation of one's well-being. First, Sen argued that utilitarianism has no interest in the distribution of utilities since the concentration is entirely on the total utility of everyone taken together (Sen, 1999). Second, about desires, Sen thought that some functionings are intrinsically valuable, on the desire-based utilitarianism account a functioning has value only to the extent that it is desired by the person concerned. This claim can be critically important because the process of constructing desire is complex: A poor, undernourished person, brought up in penury, may have learned to come to terms with a half-empty stomach, seizing joy in small comforts and desiring no more than what seems *realistic* (Sen, 1987).

The deprivations are suppressed and muted in the scale of utilities reflected by the fulfillment of desires and happiness in enduring for survival. What Sen emphasized here is that since a person learns not to desire what he knows to be unattainable, he may suffer extreme deprivation without having a strong desire for change (Sen, 1992, & Sugden, 1993). Therefore, it seems problematic to conceive one's well-being in terms of the utility approach.

Another is Rawls' approach to justice as fairness. Sen indicated the incompleteness of Rawls' theory of justice as fairness as an approach to well-being. Sen recognized and welcomed the fact that Rawls, 'by basing his theory of justice on resources rather than on utility, had shifted the focus of attention in the direction of freedom (Sugden, 1993). Sen seemed to see Rawls' theory, based on the concept of primary goods, as the most credible alternative to his capability approach, since primary goods include rights, liberties, and opportunities, income and wealth, and the social bases of self-respect (Sen, 1999). However, Sen argued that his capability approach to justice is to be preferred to Rawls' in terms of discussing a person's wellbeing.

Sen took this view because he saw Rawls' theory as incomplete in its claim that individuals have equal opportunities if they have equal command over resources and in its concentration on means to freedom, rather than on the extent of the freedom that a person has (Sen, 1992). Sen argues that because individuals differ in their ability to convert resources into functionings, providing an equal command over resources does not always mean giving equal opportunities. Since resources do not have intrinsic value, and people value resources for the opportunities that the resources create, Sen argued that it is more appropriate to value opportunities in the way that his capability approach does. It should be noted, however, that this whole argument does not imply a neglect of the concept of 'opportunities' in the Rawlsian sense. Both theories share a commitment to equality in opportunities. The difference between Rawls and Sen on this matter is that Rawls focused on resources to achieve equal opportunities, an indirect strategy, whereas Sen tried to

achieve opportunities directly (Sugden, 1993). Therefore, it seems inappropriate simply to argue that Rawls' theory conflicts with the capability approach.

Amartya Sen's Capability Approach

The capability approach of Amartya Sen is the core concept of his philosophy about peace and development. It is the instrument to achieve Sen's goal of freedom as the real representation of peace and development of the individual and the society.

A capability approach is a well-known tool for evaluating the wellbeing of the individual and society as a whole. It is a broad normative framework for the evaluation and assessment of individual well-being and social arrangements, the design of policies, and proposals about social change in society. The field of applications involves a wide range of fields, most prominently in development studies, welfare economics, social policy, and political philosophy. Evaluation of the wellbeing of the individual includes inequality, poverty, the well-being of an individual or the average well-being of the members of a group. The capability approach was used as an alternative evaluative tool for social cost-benefit analysis, or as a framework within which to design and evaluate policies, ranging from welfare state design in affluent societies to development policies by governments and non-governmental organizations in developing countries (Robeyns, 2005).

Hartley (2009) defined capability as a neo-Aristotelian concept. For him, it is an idea that potentially captures the notion of eudaimonic wellbeing and the good life that is to be found in Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics and the Eudemian Ethics. It is also considered as a post-Enlightenment liberal concept. It is an idea within the tradition of Roosevelt's four freedoms speech in which - amongst other things - he asserted that a necessitous man is not a free man.

Hence the capability approach is a framework offering a way to think about normative issues and make evaluations. It provides a framework to analyze a variety of social issues, such as well-being and poverty, liberty and freedom, development, gender bias and inequalities, justice and social ethics (Sen, 1993 & Dang, 2014).

The concept also includes criticisms and was not addressed specifically by Sen especially the list or to prioritize what might constitute *capabilities* (Beck, 2005). It is a concept whose influence has many different interpretations. The general idea of the capability approach is a framework of thought or a mode of thinking for the evaluation and assessment of the individual and society. Moreover, Sen has stressed that this diverse idea and interpretation of the capability approach provides the plurality of purposes for which the capability approach can have relevance (Sen, 1993).




Figure 2: A schematic representation of the capability approach

The capability approach involves concentration on freedoms to achieve in general and the capabilities to function in particular (Sen, 1995). The major constituents of the capability approach are functionings and capabilities. Functionings are the beings and doings of a person, whereas a person's capability is the various combinations of functionings that a person can achieve. Thus, a capability is a set of vectors of functionings, reflecting the person's freedom to lead one type of life or another (Sen, 1992). A person's functioning and his/her capabilities are closely related but distinct. Functioning is an achievement, whereas a capability is the ability to achieve. Functionings are, in a sense, more directly related to living conditions, since these are different aspects of living conditions. Capabilities, in contrast, are notions of freedom, in the positive sense: what real opportunities one has regarding the life he may lead (Sen, 1987).

The idea of the capability approach is that the person will be able to gain the ability to access the opportunities that are available for the utilization of resources for the promotion of one's well-being. Following as a response to the famine in India, Sen's idea of capability approach was able to determine that the problem was not on the lack of resources for the masses. Rather, it was on the lack of opportunities that the people can have despite the availability of the resources. From the lack of understanding of people's capacity to achieve, they also lost their opportunities; thus they were not able to achieve functionings as members of the society.

The capability approach has individual self-entitlement and individual capability set that is intrinsically available for the person as a means to achieve and the freedom to achieve in the society. This approach proposes the recognition of these abilities and capabilities from society. The idea of what Sen called functionings are the actions that the person must exhibit in society as part of his freedom and wellbeing. This includes the person's freedom to access resources needed for one's development. Capabilities are a set of functionings that the person can lead. Through the vectors of commodities that the individual functionings can act upon, the capabilities are sets of actions where the person acted and achieved. This means that the individual freedom to achieve from a set of particular functioning is what achievement is for capability approach.

The event in India was an eye-opener that the approaches currently in use were not sufficient enough for the consideration of the well-being of the people. The people were not able to access opportunities and exercise their freedom. The people were not able to convert their functionings to access resources from their actions and, thus, their set of capabilities to function was limited.

Criticisms of the Capability Approach

Sen's capability approach was widely accepted and influenced a great number of studies and developments. The idea of bringing about wellbeing to the individual and the society through the freedoms that the person can access his capability will result in what Sen considers as real peace and development. However, his idea cannot come without criticisms.

One of the most common criticisms of the Capability approach is its incompleteness in terms of application. According to Dean (2009) in his book *Critiquing Capabilities: The Distractions of a Beguiling Concept*, he pointed out three key realities that the concept obscures or neglects: (a) the constitutive nature of human interdependency; (b) the problematic nature of public realm; and (c) the exploitative nature of capitalism. Human society is an association of interdependent beings (Rodger, 2004), not only on how it organizes its means of production but also on how its members care for each other.

Dean pointed out the importance of social intersubjectivity in the process of attaining the development of society. He emphasized that the interdependency of humans is an important element to create solidarity. Social Solidarity, in this term, is not opposed to freedom, but because of other freedoms, it will matter as much. Nussbaum (2000) also emphasized that being able to live with and towards others, a person should be able to imagine the situation of another and have compassion for that situation. Clement (1998) focused on Care frameworks that support the notion of the interdependent relationship between individuals.

Another important point of view is proposed by Turner (2006). Turner's idea proposed another reason for the need for humankind to interact and relate with others socially for peace and development as well as for personal growth. Humankind is a struggle for recognition as much as for freedom (Honneth, 1995). Human beings must contend with their shared vulnerabilities as much as their quest for personal autonomy. These points out the interdependency of the humankind in terms of building and organizing capabilities before actualizing the freedom to access the different resources for individual enhancement.

These criticisms are worth considering. Though Sen argued that inequalities of income and outcome are less important than the equality of fundamental freedoms one cannot neglect the fact that one person needs the others to recognize this idea of gradation of which is more important than the other and which is not.

The capability approach also sees poverty as an objective curtailment of a person's capabilities to choose and act. However, a capability is not the same as ability – it is not simply what people can do, but to their freedom to lead the kind of lives they value, and have reason to value. Poverty, on that note, whether seen objectively or subjectively does not change the fact about the idea of a capability.

Capabilities become an essential fulcrum between material resources and human achievements because; equal inputs do not necessarily give rise to equal outputs. After all, human capabilities may be objectively constrained by poverty. Another is that the concept is not able to accommodate the diversity of human beings and the complexity of their circumstances due to its absolute notion of needs contrary to the relative notion of needs. Due to the capability being a neo-Aristotelian concept with post-enlightenment liberal concept of individuality. According to Burchardt (2006), the priority is individual liberty not social solidarity, the freedom to choose not the need to belong.

Lastly, for Hartley (2009), Capabilities reflect an abstraction of philosophical judgments about the nature of human virtues: virtues exist to be discovered as opposed to concrete human needs that occur only as when they are experienced. The capability approach is well suited to a consensual approach, but a politics of needs should be about struggle, not consensus. It is the struggle for the recognition of unspoken needs.

ANALYSIS

The philosophical analysis and the point of view of the researcher about the concept of the study. It shows how it came to be and how the development of the study evolved. The research begins in the presentation of the philosophies concerning peace and development. By coming up with connections to the general perspective of peace and development, the research is able to supply information to satisfy major criticisms of the capability approach. Utilizing as much as possible the writings of Amartya Sen, the research contends that both have an underlying relationship to the concept of freedom of the person. The center of the applicability of the approach is freedom. One of the sources highlighted a new understanding of peace as freedom as influenced also by Sen. Freedom also is the center of the capability approach. The capability approach is projected towards development. This entails understanding the significance of freedom and its relation to the approach to work in the field of social development.

Capability Approach is Freedom

To address the problem, can a new understanding of Amartya Sen's capability approach to peace and development be a viable framework to social development, the research establishes first that the capability approach is about freedom. The philosophies of Sen about peace and development are always centered around individual freedom and his capacity to achieve this, the approach of Sen will always be anchored to freedom. It is also supported by the recent developments of the approach. As the core concept of Sen's philosophy, the capability approach still revolves around the idea of freedom as the real representation of peace and development.

The approach that Sen developed is focused on acquiring capabilities of equal access and opportunities to the individual because of the situation that they were in. Throughout the works of Amartya Sen, his notion of development as freedom goes hand-and-hand with the approach (Evans, 2002). To comprehend this further, one should take into account that freedom as discussed by other philosophers for peace and development. The researcher highlights this notion of freedom as he finds out its relationship to social development. For the approach to work as a framework of peace and development the researcher used the criticisms of the approach to comprehend the incompleteness of the study and finds out that the answer is found in the field of social development. The capability approach is a broad idea and unspecified in its application. For this, the researcher follows the recent developments of the approach to better support the claim that it works.

Because Sen is not able to give a definitive list of prioritized capabilities, Nussbaum (2000), Alkire (2002) Burchardt and Vizard (2007) made improvements and a possible list of central human capabilities. According to Malcolm Bull (2007), the capability approach is equivalent to the projected human development envisioned by the communism of Marx. Nussbaum (2000) frames these basic principles in terms of 10 capabilities, real opportunities based on personal and social circumstances. She claimed that a political order can only be considered as being decent if this order secures at least a threshold level of these 10 capabilities to all inhabitants. Nussbaum's capability approach is centered on the notion of individual human dignity. Given Nussbaum's contention that the goal of the capabilities approach is to produce capabilities for every person, the capabilities below belong to individual persons, rather than to groups. More recently, the approach has been criticized for being grounded in the liberal notion of freedom:

This is a fundamentally reductive view of the human condition. Moreover, the emphasis on freedom betrays a profoundly modern orientation. The compound problem is that freedom in Nussbaum's hands is both given an intrinsic and primary value (a reductive claim), and, at the same time, the list is treated as a contingent negotiated relation in tension with other virtues such as justice, equality, and rights. Both propositions cannot hold. (James, 2018)

Added to the development of the capability approach is the list of capabilities as prioritized by Nussbaum. This list also contributed further to the notion of the approach as a social framework that promotes freedoms and more opportunities to the individual. The core capabilities Nussbaum argued which should be supported by all democracies are: (1) Life, being able to live to the end of

human life of normal length; not dying prematurely, or before one's life is so reduced as to be not worth living. (2) Bodily Health, being able to have good health, including reproductive health; to be adequately nourished; to have adequate shelter. (3) Bodily Integrity, being able to move freely from place to place; to be secure against violent assault, including sexual assault and domestic violence; having opportunities for sexual satisfaction and choice in matters of reproduction. (4) Senses, Imagination, and Thought, being able to use the senses, to imagine, think, and reason. (5) Emotions, being able to have attachments to things and people outside ourselves. (6) Practical Reason, being able to form a conception of the good and to engage in critical reflection about the planning of one's life. (7) Affiliation, being able to live with and toward others, to recognize and show concern for other humans, to engage in various forms of social interaction. (8) Other Species, being able to live with concern for and about animals, plants, and the world of nature. (9) Play, being able to laugh, to play, to enjoy recreational activities. (10) Control over one's environment, political, being able to participate effectively in political choices that govern one's life. (11) Material, being able to hold property and having property rights on an equal basis with others (Nussbaum, 2011). This list of priorities about the capabilities that the individual can achieve provides the adequate supplement for the approach to be following the goal which is the wellbeing of the person while maintaining the importance of individual freedom and opportunity available for the people.

Nussbaum's contribution to the development of the capability approach was significant as she was able to address one of the most common criticisms of Sen, being reluctant to add the list of priorities that the individual must be able to access.

Capability Approach is Social

One of the main criticisms of the capability approach is that it is focused on individuality. This is also one of the main propositions why it is contended not to work as a framework for social development. However, during the research process, the researcher stumbles upon recent developments of the concept as well as the help of the criterion of social choice, and the list of prioritized human capabilities, adaptations of the approach can be made. The researcher discovers an approach that is presently developed as a framework for social development that was evaluated to fit the standards of social choice and argues to find its applicability completeness in the field of the socials as well the inclusions of the list of capabilities that are necessary for it to work.

As a support that the capability approach will work in social development, the researcher looks into the social responsibilities of institutions. By definition, social responsibility is an ethical framework that suggests that any entity, whether individual or organizational, must manage its essential resources so that they may benefit the welfare and interest of the society in which it operates (Business Dictionary, 2018). Another point is that part of the social responsibility of institutions and organizations in the society is to promote capacity building which enables people to do something significant for themselves that the rest of the community can sustain (The Borgen Project, 2018).

For the philosophical criteria of how the approach fits in the social development, Sen developed a re-examination of the Social Choice theory by Fishburn. According to Fishburn (1973), Social Choice theory is concerned with the relationship between individuals' preferences and social choice. Sen's re-examination of Social Choice theory stipulated point of views that indicate the social choices that are acceptable to the masses that would coincide with the capability approach (Sen, 1977).

Also, he pointed out that it starts with aggregation types like the committee decision (based on the committee), Social welfare judgment (based on social welfare judgment), and Normative indication (based on indicated norms). There are forms of criteria to judge the applicability of a concept or an approach to society. The adapted capability approach is social because it fits these forms of criteria. More so, it adapts further to what should be done rather than aggregating the personal welfare levels of members. It adopts the concepts of The Optimality – binary concepts like "better". The poor will gain more from this policy – wider scope but less firm. Compromise of interest rather than views – focuses on making systematic judgments rather than reaching actual decisions. It is the aggregation of that individual interest or individual judgments that matters.

A Philosophy of Peace and Development

The new understanding of Sen's capability approach can be used as a philosophy of peace and development in the area of social development. The capability approach is well suited to a consensual approach (Hartley, 2009). Social development speaks about an idea about the overall

well-being of an individual. The capability approach empowers the idea of an individual that is capable of thinking for itself and by itself but is always directed towards the other. It is a kind of framework in the philosophy that recognizes the individual freedom and the opportunity available for the person and directs this freedom to other individuals who are also free and capable, thereby creating a network of socially empowered individuals working together for peace and development. By giving the capability to access resources as well as understanding the inhabiting responsibilities, accountabilities, and limitations, social development is possible.

From the stream of philosophies of peace and development, the research shows the different understandings of peace and development and the approaches that were developed. From Hobbes, the idea shows the importance of social solidarity in achieving a certain goal in society. A person needs to give up some of their freedoms to be able to acquire communal freedom that would apply and accessible to everyone. This idea is one of the core concepts of the new capability approach where communal consideration is needed for one to achieve his well-being. The recognition of the freedom of others also allows the applicability of the capability approach to the social realm. The criticism about the capability approach being focused only on independent freedom is answered by the notion that the capability approach is, in fact, social in its applicability by considering the need of others and their rights to access their capabilities.

The idea of Marx about a class struggle that would lead to progress and development in the society also contributes to the overall understanding of the capability approach. The new capability approach is a product of the struggle of ideas from the previous approaches that were applied in society. The exchange of ideas and contradictions throughout the approaches and the criticisms that sprung from it created the avenue for the reevaluation of Sen's capability approach. Thus, the conflicts of the approaches contributed to the development of the approach. At the same time, the idea of Marx about class struggle and alienated labor also furnished the new understanding of the capability approach that is not only for the individual wellbeing. It paved the way to the understanding that the capability approach is not only about empowering the individual freedom and their right to access resources. It also provides the idea that the capability approach involves struggle or conflict, in a sense, between individuals both from the implementers and the achievers. The idea is that those who are exercising the capability approach will not be passive as to accept everything that was given to them without questioning and evaluating. A great part of the new idea that capability approach is the empowerment of the individual which means that a person comes into an argument with the contradicting perceptions that are opposed to the idea of what his/her capability can achieve.

The most common similarity from the development of the philosophies of the frameworks and shares the same ideas of approach for the wellbeing of the individual is John Rawls's theory of justice and fairness. The idea is that giving more opportunities to those with lesser capabilities is more or like the same with the understanding of the new capability approach. The only difference is that the theory of Rawls was focused on the distribution of these opportunities to the masses while the capability approach does not only deal with expanding people's freedom but also in accepting the importance and significance of the others or other freedoms and other persons with capabilities to access. The theory of justice and fairness is the closest stepping stone to the understanding of the capability approach. It would seem as if they are just the same with just different focuses. The idea, however, is to highlight what justice and fairness try to do away with the collective capability approach. The new understanding entails a collective approach that would result in a reevaluation of the previous theory of justice and fairness. As discussed, justice and fairness mean giving more opportunities to the less fortunate. The collective capability approach disequilibrates the opportunities available for the masses and the distribution of these opportunities.

An Approach of Peace and Development

The capability approach is the most suitable in modern times. The approach is highly applicable to the current generation that requires a complex yet holistic and all-encompassing framework for the well-being of the masses. From the previous approaches like the commodity and the utilitarian approach, the capability approach adapted the positive attributes and reconfigured or reevaluated some aspects that needed further development as the needs and satisfaction of the people also improved. To understand further, the development of the approaches is a gradual process of development to be able to meet the demands and needs of the subjects. Moreover, the reevaluation of the capability approach was a necessary action to complete this progress.

The commodity approach initiated the idea of bringing about the overall well-being of the person and to achieve such, the community or society needs to work together. The society begins to recognize that peace and development is a communal effort and achievement. Every person's

involvement is important for the goal to be achieved. This idea is also the foundation of the capability approach and it also recognizes the significance of the role that each individual plays. The new understanding of the capability approach would not be possible if the idea of a commodity approach was not laid down. The commodity approach recognizes the need of every individual in society and that is the start of the process in achieving peace and development of the individual and the society.

The welfare or utility approach is the other side of the progress that was also necessary to the development of an approach that is both for the people and by the work of the people. As stated by the commodity approach, an individual has needed to be fulfilled and desires to be quenched. However, focusing too much on this pleasure or happiness would not result in what can be considered as a real representation of the well-being of the person. It is part of the intrinsic nature of the person to desire and finds happiness but it is not the totality of the person's well-being, especially by being too dependent on the other. The well-being of the person cannot be compromised by the unwell-being of the others. This is also recognized by the capability approach. The compromise of desires, pleasure, utility, and freedom must be seen as a part of the overall understanding of the well-being of the person and society.

The well-being of the individual is not also limited to the understanding of the desires, pleasures, utilities, and freedom. One has to understand also the application of the approach in general. The Justice as fairness approach provides the idea that it is not just about the individual. The capability approach recognizes this and develops the idea on how one should be able to apply an approach that is both for the fulfillment of the person's desire, pleasures, and utility and at the same time adheres to the individual's needs while not neglecting one's freedom and capacity and be able to apply it in the society fairly.

The capability approach goes even further in recognizing that the completeness of such an approach is only possible when applied socially. This important detail is not just like the idea of justice as fairness or giving equal opportunities and equal command over resources. The focus is not on recognizing that it must be applied socially to everyone in need while maintaining the freedom of the individual but on the understanding that such an approach can only be possible to work once applied socially and interdependently. The capability approach does not focus on giving equal opportunities but on acquiring the ability to access these opportunities and accepting that these opportunities come with the recognition of the importance, need, pleasure, desire, commodity, and freedom of the others.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The new interpretation of the capability approach of Amartya Sen with the improvements following those that were pointed out by its critics is a viable framework for peace and development. By analyzing what is lacking in the approach as also admitted by Amartya Sen, the researcher comes up with a framework to provide a probable solution where the concept finds its applicability in the field of peace and development specifically for social development.

Since the capability approach is widely discussed by scholars due to the attractiveness and implications, people tend to forget in finding the connections and relationships they create to other aspects of human life. As the research about the concept progresses throughout the study, the researcher finds out the necessary and significant connections that when studied properly the capability approach promotes structural completeness and applicability of the concept.

This research undertakes the approach as a framework for peace and development with a new foundation. It lays out the relevance of Sen's capability approach to the definition of peace and development. After finding out that peace and development are also part of Sen's notion of freedom, the capability approach finds an avenue to share a common ground of social development framework to work. The research then progresses to finding out its applicability to the socials.

As part of the development of the idea of the capability approach over time by contemporary scholars, as well as its critics, the researcher utilizes these improvements to find out where the approach would be most applicable. The applicability of the approach is tested in the field of social development where it is theorized to work. Seemingly, the use of instrumental measurements to see if it works is not yet actualized, but the criteria for accepting its possibility to work is recognized as valid. By understanding the process of its development, the research established a framework for peace and development.

As a philosopher of peace and development, Amartya Sen's new capability approach adapted to meet the challenges and definitions needed of the modern understanding for wellbeing and understood in social criteria prove to be a viable framework for social development.

REFERENCES

- Alkire, S. (2002). *Valuing Freedoms: Sen's capability approach and poverty reduction*. New York: World Bank/Oxford University Press.
- Anand, S., & Sen, A. (2000). Human development and economic sustainability. *World development*. Elsevier Science Ltd. Great Britain
- BusinessDictionary. (n.d.) *Social responsibility*. Retrieved on September 27, 2018, from <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/social-responsibility.html>.
- Barnett, J. (2008). *Peace and Development: Towards a New Synthesis*. *Journal of Peace Research*, 45(1), 75–89. DOI:10.1177/0022343307084924
- Batabyal, A. A. (2000). Amartya Sen, development as freedom. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*
- Beck, U. (2005). *War Is Peace: On Post-National War*. *Security Dialogue*, 36(1), 5–26. DOI:10.1177/0967010605051921
- Burchardt, T. (2006). *Foundations for Measuring Equality: A discussion paper for the Equalities Review - CASEpaper 111*. London: CASE/STICERD.
- Clark A. (2000), “Capability and Development: An Essay in Honour of Amartya Sen”, University of Lincolnshire and Humberside
- Chernus, I. (1993). *Order and Disorder in the Definition of Peace*. *Peace & Change*, 18(2), 99–125. DOI:10.1111/j.1468-0130.1993.tb00170.x
- Clement, G. (1998). *Care, Autonomy, and Justice: Feminism and the ethic of care*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Dang, A. (2014). *Amartya Sen's Capability Approach: A Framework for Well-Being Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. Centre d'économie de la Sorbonne, Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, Paris, France
- Dean, H. (2009) *Critiquing capabilities: the distractions of a beguiling concept*. *Critical social policy*, 29 (2). pp. 261-273. ISSN 0261-0183
- Dreze, J., & Sen, A. (1999). India: Economic development and social opportunity. *OUP Catalogue*
- Evans, P. (2002). *Collective capabilities, culture, and Amartya Sen's Development as Freedom*. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 37(2), 54–60. DOI:10.1007/bf02686261
- FamousPhilosophers.org (2019). *Karl Marx*. Retrieved from <https://www.famousphilosophers.org/karl-marx/September/19/2019>
- FamousPhilosophers.org (2019). *John Rawls*. Retrieved from <https://www.famousphilosophers.org/john-rawls/September/19/2019>
- FamousPhilosophers.org (2019). *Martha Nussbaum*. Retrieved from <https://www.famousphilosophers.org/martha-nussbaum/September/19/2019>
- FamousPhilosophers.org (2019). *Thomas Hobbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.famousphilosophers.org/thomas-hobbes-September/19/2019>
- Fishburn, P.C. (1973): *The Theory of Social Choice*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1973
- Galtung, J. (1969). *Violence, Peace, and Peace Research*. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191. DOI:10.1177/002234336900600301
- Galtung, J. (1980). *The Changing Interface between Peace and Development in a Changing World*. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 11(2), 145–149. DOI:10.1177/096701068001100209
- Garnet, J. (2002). *John Rawls on Justice*. Retrieved from <https://people.wku.edu/jan.garrett/ethics/johnrawl.htm/September 19/2019>

- Green, R. H. (1999). *Rehabilitation, sustainable peace, and development: Towards reconceptualization*. *Third World Quarterly*, 20(1), 189–206. DOI:10.1080/01436599913992
- Hettne, B. (1983). 'Peace and Development: Contradictions and Compatibilities', *Journal of Peace Research* 20(4): 329–342.
- Honneth, A. (1995). *The Struggle for Recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity.
- James, P. (2018). *Creating Capacities for Human Flourishing: An Alternative Approach to Human Development*. In Paola Spinozzi and Mazzanti Massimiliano (ed.). *Cultures of Sustainability and Wellbeing: Theories, Histories, Policies*. Routledge.
- Kára, K. (1968). *On the Marxist Theory of War and Peace*. *Journal of Peace Research*, 5(1), 1–27. DOI:10.1177/002234336800500101
- Kenton, W. (2019). *Trickle-Down Theory*. Investopedia. Retrieved from <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/t/trickledowntheory.asp>
- Miletzki, J., & Broten, N. (2017). *Development as freedom*. Macat Library
- Nussbaum M. & Sen. A. (eds., 1993), *The Quality of Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2001). "The Enduring Significance of John Rawls," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 20, 2001.
- Nussbaum, M. (2000b). *Women and Human Development: The capabilities approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha (2011). *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. pp. 33–34. ISBN 978-0674072350.
- Przetacznik, F. (1999). A definition of peace. *Sri Lanka J. Int'l L*
- Robeyns, I. (2005): *The Capability Approach: a theoretical survey*, *Journal of Human Development*, 6:1, 93-117/ doi.org/10.1080/146498805200034266
- Robeyns, I. (2000). *An Unworkable Idea or a Promising Alternative? Sen's Capability Approach Re-examined*. Wolfson College Cambridge CB3 9BB, UK
- Rood, S. (2005). *Forging sustainable peace in Mindanao: the role of civil society*. East-West Center Washington
- Saito, M. (2003). *Amartya Sen's Capability Approach to Education: A Critical Exploration*. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 37(1), 17–33. DOI:10.1111/1467-9752.3701002
- Sen, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Peace and Democratic Society*. Cambridge: Open Book. Retrieved January 24, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5vjstn
- Sen, A. (1976). Poverty: an ordinal approach to measurement. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*
- Sen, A. (1977). *Social Choice Theory: A Re-Examination*. *Econometrica*, 45(1), 53. DOI:10.2307/1913287
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Sen, A. (2000). *A Decade of Human Development*. *Journal of Human Development*, 1(1), 17–23. DOI:10.1080/14649880050008746
- Sen, A. (2005). Human rights and capabilities. *Journal of human development*. Lamont University Professor at Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA
- Sen, A. (2007). *Peace and Democratic Society*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Open Book Publisher.
- Sen, A. (2008). Violence, identity, and poverty. *Journal of Peace Research*
- Social Philosophy. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.slideshare.net/roxannetiffanydotillos/social-philosophy/September/19/2019>

- Sugden, R. (1993), “*Welfare, Resources, and Capabilities: A Review of Inequality Reexamined by Amartya Sen*”, *Journal of Economic Literature*,
- The Borgen Project (n.d). *What is the definition of social responsibility?* Retrieved on September 27, 2018, from <https://borgenproject.org/definition-social-responsibility>
- Turner, B. (2006). *Vulnerability and Human Rights*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University.
- Vizard, P., & Burchardt, T. (2007). *Developing a Capability List: Final Recommendations of the Equalities Review Steering Group on Measurement - CASEpaper 121*. London: CASE/STICERD.
- VI, P. P. (1967). *Populorum progressio*. *Revista Facultad de Derecho y Ciencias Políticas*, (41), 3-26.
- Welch, D. A. (1997). *The Ethics of War and Peace: Religious and Secular Perspectives* Terry Nardin, ed. *Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996, pp. x, 286. Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 30(03), 605. DOI:10.1017/s0008423900016280
- Williams, G. (2019). *Thomas Hobbes: Moral and Political Philosophy*. Retrieved from <https://www.iep.utm.edu/hobmoral/September/19/2019>

