Creating a Municipal Positive Peace Index:

Ranking the Top 20 U.S. Cities

By

Timothy A. Henry

An Applied Research Project

(Public Administration 5398)

Spring 2017

Abstract

The Institute for Economics and Peace defines Positive Peace as "the attitudes, institutions, and structures which create and sustain peaceful societies" (Peace, Positive Peace Report, 2015, p. 4). This differs from negative peace, which is "the absence of violence or the fear of violence" (Peace, Positive Peace Report, 2015, p. 7). With the civil unrest that happens in recent years, such as in Ferguson, MO, cities should be looking for ways to enhance and sustain peaceful communities which will likely decrease the impetus to react through civil unrest.

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to create a municipal Positive Peace Index in order to describe positive peace in United States cities. After it is constructed, the Municipal Peace Index will be applied to U.S. cities – thereby creating a positive peace ranking.

Method

This research is important because it will describe how peaceful a city is using community relations, government transparency, and high levels of human capital, free flow of information, gender and racial inequality, a sound economic environment, and a well-functioning government as criteria. Government officials, businesses, and political actors in the cities can use this data to evaluate what new policies can be implemented to increase the cities peacefulness, which can then be determined if it will generate new business and if it would be a destination for existing businesses.

<u>Findings</u>

This research found that San Francisco, Austin, and San Dieago score the highest on the municipal positive peace index. These three cities serve as examples of cities that have implemented institutions and structures to create and sustain peaceful societies.

The Institute of Economics and Peace came out with a U.S. Positive Peace Index in 2015, which described 162 countries based off of eight positive peace indicators. Using these same indicators, it would behoove the federal and state governments to have a peace index that ranks the top U.S. cities.

About the Author

Timothy Henry graduated from the University of Georgia with a Bachelor's degree in Romance Languages and Linguistics in 2003. He moved from Atlanta, GA to Austin, Texas to pursue a Master's of Public Administration from Texas State University-San Marcos. He is currently working as a Call Center Manager at Logisticare. He intends to pursue a PhD in Educational Policy.

Table of Contents

Chapter I

<u>Introduction</u>

Research and scholarly journals have traditionally focused on one indicator of peace, which is the absence of war. This is the definition of negative peace. "Prior to 1945, more than two-thirds of the awards were for negative peace" (Diehl, 2016, p. 3) . The negative peace definition has led scholars to primarily focus on war and other violent conflict. (Diehl, 2016). Since war has been the central focus of the dominant notion of peace, it has largely been ignored as a tenet of public administration. However, this should not be the case. Public Administration has a responsibility to the public to "be part of the fabric of positive peace" (Shields and Soeters, 2017). Positive peace, which is defined by the Institute for Economics and Peace, as "the attitudes, institutions and structures which create and sustain peaceful societies" (Institute for Economics and Peace, 2015). Shields and Soeters elaborated on the core themes of positive peace as: social justice, social equity, cooperation, community engagement, collaboration, effective-governance, and democracy (Shields and Soeters, 2017). Positive Peace addresses the impetus for violent conflict, which war does not accomplish. "An emphasis on war does not address the underlying conditions such as poverty, injustice or inequality, which stimulated violent conflict" (Shields, 2017).

Shields and Soeters introduce peaceweaving as a way to conceptualize positive peace. "Peaceweaving is about building the fabric of peace by emphasizing relationships. Peaceweaving builds these positive relationships by working on practical

problems, and engaging people widely with sympathetic understanding while recognizing that progress is measured by the welfare of the vulnerable" (Shields and Soeters, 2017). With civil unrest in cities such as Ferguson, MO, Baltimore, MD, and Orlando, FL, public administrators can adapt a peaceweaving approach which will foster a relationship between government and its citizens, right injustice and inequality, and engage the community as an alternative.

Purpose

The Institute for Economics and Peace came out with a Positive Peace Index in 2015, which described the attitudes, institutions, and structures based off of the aforementioned indicators of 162 countries. Using these same indicators, it would behoove scholars to develop a positive peace index that ranks the top U.S. cities. This can be an indicator of the resilience of the city to either plan change or the effects of negative peace.

In response to criticism that their index emphasized negative peace, the Institute for Economics and Peace developed a positive index for countries. None of the reports generated by the Institute for Economics and Peace explained why they used particular components in their index. Also, they did not develop a positive peace index for cities, a level of government particularly applicable for public administration.

The Institute for Economics and Peace used the following criteria for its Positive Peace Report in 2015:

1. Sound business environment

2. Equitable distribution of resources

3. High levels of human capital

4. Good relations with neighbors

5. Free flow of information

6. Well-functioning government

7. Low levels of corruption

8. Acceptance of the rights of others

Government officials, businesses, and political actors in the cities can use this framework to adapt an index for cities. A municipal index would help determine a city's peacefulness by what structures it has in place to mitigate violent conflict.

The purpose of this research is to adapt the Positive Peace Index in order to develop a counterpart for U.S. cities. After it is constructed, the Municipal Peace Index should be applied to U.S. cities – thereby creating a positive peace ranking.

This paper draws heavily from the Institute for Economics and Peace's approach and adds to it. The positive peace index developed here draws heavily from components used by the Institute for Economics and Peace. In addition, it links and justifies these components to the literature and argumentation.

        The literature helps to define what positive peace is. The categories can be

adapted for public administrators to use to create a positive peace index and evaluate

cities. The categories needed by public administrators are: community relations,

government transparency, high levels of human capital, free flow of information,

equitable distribution of resources, acceptance of the rights of others, a sound economic

environment, and a well-functioning government.

Chapter II

Literature Review

This chapter examines the literature that focuses on the components of positive peace and the definitions of peace. The Institute for Economics and Peace introduces a definition of peace as "the attitudes, institutions and structures which when strengthened, lead to a more peaceful society" (IEP, 2015, p. 70) and then elaborates on the complexities of peace and the factors associated with peace with the following: "Rather than attempting to isolate singular factors associated with peace, this approach is focused on identifying the broad and complex associations that exist between the drivers of violence and a multitude of formal and informal cultural, economic and political variables" (IEP, 2015, p. 70).

Definitions of Peace: Positive and Negative

The literature provides many definitions of peace. Johan Galtung (1969) points out the variations of the definitions of peace, and attempted to simplify it by using three principles. The first principle being that it would be used for social goals, the second principle relates to those social goals and their complexity and difficultness, and the third principle entails the absence of violence. Nils Petter Gleditsch, Jonas Nordkvelle, and Havard Strand (2014) define negative peace as "reducing war" and positive peace as "cooperation or integration". To help clear up the ambiguity in the definitions of the word peace, Galtung (1985) explores the different connotations of the word "peace" in different languages. He begins by looking at the Roman word "pax". "The Roman *pax*

typically means 'absence of violence', under the rule of law (pacta sunt servanda)" (Galtung, 1985, p. 16). After examining this definition, Galtung moves east on his semantic voyage to look at their definitions of the word "peace". "The Greek *12irene*, the Hebraic *shalom* and the Arabic *sala'am* point more towards peace as justice, in other words 'absence of structural violence'" (Galtung, 1985, p. 16). *Shanti*, the Hindu word for "peace" is more towards "inner peace" and not necessarily pertaining to structural or direct violence. The Buddhist/Jainist word *ahimsa* is defined as "non-violence". The next two languages that Galtung looked at were Chinese and Japanese. Both words *ho p'ing* and *heiwa* "carry connotations of social harmony, peacefulness, adjustment" (Galtung, 1985, p. 16). After looking at these vastly different definitions, Galtung comes to the conclusion that there "was once a rich, holistic peace concept which was then split into components, one component being given to each part of humankind!" (Galtung, 1985, p. 16)

"Peace Research—Just the Study of War?"(Gledistch et. al, 2014) could easily be applied when examining the criteria used to evaluate negative peace. Negative peace is defined as the "the end of personal violence and absence of war" (Shields, 2015, p. 1). Negative peace is what the Institute for Economics and Peace used to focus on for their 2012 peace index report on the United States and its cities. The criteria used to evaluate negative peace consist of the following: homicides, violent crime, incarceration, police employees, and small arms. All of these characteristics can be applied to war/violence and in turn has altered the role of the police force.

Peace research explores peace through the lens of "the absence of violence". Gleditsch, Nordkvelle, and Strand (2014) in "Peace research –Just the study of war?"

review articles from the *Journal of Peace Research* and the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* with regards to the concept of peace. The authors make the argument that negative peace has been the main focus of research from the inception of the journals. When peace research was first started in 1959, the World Wars and the Korean War were still fresh. The authors look at the concept of peace with a wider scope, which they deem was influenced by the positive peace as the reversal of structural violence. They state that peace research has "returned to its original agenda, although the main attention has shifted from interstate war to civil war and to some extent to one-sided and non-state violence" (Gleditsch et al. 2014, p. 145). They go on to add that "Articles dealing with patterns of cooperation, the traditional meaning of positive peace, now tend to address the liberal agenda and ask how they can foster a reduced probability of violence" (Gleditsch, 2014, p. 145). These statements demonstrate that peace research needs to focus not only on cooperation, but also on how to establish the tenets of positive peace outside of the terms of "the absence of violence".

In "Exploring Peace: Looking Beyond War and Negative Peace", Paul Diehl (2016) details the problems with "narrow and negative conception of peace" and that this "definition is common, even dominant, in the way scholars and policy makers think about peace". Diehl notes that "Widespread violence in civil conflict has to meet some threshold of severity to be labelled a war; all other situations that fail to exceed that threshold are categorized as peaceful" (Diel, 2016, p. 1). This is problematic because a country may have civil unrest and consistent violence, but will be considered peaceful due to the absence of war. This is a classic example of negative peace.

Peace Index

In 2012, the Institute for Economics and Peace used negative peace criteria to develop a Peace Index report. The Global Peace Index consisted of 23 indicators of violence or fear of violence, which were used to measure and determine the level of peace of countries. Diehl (2016) mentions how problematic this is in his article when he states: "Even in the Global Peace Index, created by the Institute for Economics and Peace, virtually every one of the 27 indicators of internal and external peace used to build an aggregate index of peace for every country deals with negative peace; some examples include the homicide rate, access to small arms, military expenditures, and involvement in external conflicts" (Diel, 2016, p. 1). The Global Peace Index's definition of peace is the "absence of violence".

Both Diehl (2016) and Shields and Soeters (2017) explain the reasons why negative peace is so problematic. Diehl (2016) made the following argument: "Ending violence is certainly a laudable goal, but defining peace in negative terms leads to perverse outcomes for scholarly analysis and policy making" (p. 1) and "Beyond the risk of renewed warfare, negative conceptions of peace have two potentially pernicious effects if they become the centerpiece of strategy. First, there is the tendency to halt peacekeeping, military intervention, and other actions once the fighting has stopped" (p.4) while "second, the focus on stability as the primary or exclusive goal might

undermine any efforts undertaken at peace in the broader sense, even by other acts such as nongovernmental organizations (NGO)" (p.5). According to Shields and Soeters (2017): "The absence of war definition is easily operationalized and studied using impressive databases and applied to sophisticated, quantitative methods. Also, perhaps the state of war makes its absence, or peace, an imperative in a way that reducing ongoing societal structural violence (an early component in the definition of positive peace) would not" (p.1). Both of them look at how scholarly analysis and policy making is easier when evaluating peace through a negative prism, and both make the argument that the negative definition is not useful in peacekeeping efforts particularly when it is the sole conceptualization of what encompasses peace. Diehl (2016) states it best when he proclaimed: "The absence of high levels of violent conflict is certainly a component of peace, but should not be considered the only one". (Diel, 2016, p. 2)

Shields and Soeters (2017) explore peacekeeping efforts and the police force serving as a *peace*-keeper. The police force as a peacekeeper has changed, and this is pointed out with the concept of the peace officer. "Traditionally, border control agencies and police organizations have been assigned the task of keeping the peace in everyday society" (e.g., Bittner, 1967; Wilson, 1968). The peace officer has the task of maintaining order and enforcing laws. Fundamentally, this connotes the task of making sure that there isn't any form of negative peace. The *peace*-keeper should have the task of making sure that the tenets of positive peace specifically those structures that could be reinforced to make society more peaceful. This could be as simple as having money allocated in the budget for community relations.

"Contemporary scholars voice concerns over the blurring of local police and military functions, suggesting there insights retain currency" (Shields, 2017, p.2). This is especially important when measuring negative peace. With the increase in police employees and their role becoming not just a peace officer but taking on a more militant role, it begs the question of what absence of violence that peace officers represent. Diehl added in his article the following: "Its replacement, stability and support operations, is more nuanced in its treatment of the "nonwar" category, but the primary emphasis on stability—suppressing violent forces—places priority on negative peace outcomes"(p.1). Police would be providing the stability in the day-to-day operation, and would have to take on the role of suppressing violent forces. The end result would be negative peace.

Diehl (2016) and Shields and Soeters (2017) advocated for the other aspect of peace known as positive peace. Shields and Soeters (2017) argued that positive peace has a place in public administration because of the ideals of positive peace, which are "social justice, social equity, cooperation, community engagement, collaboration, effective-governance, and democracy" (p.2). Diehl (2016) argued that positive peace would take more of a commitment from international leaders. "A second concern is that building positive peace is a long-term process that requires extensive and ongoing commitments by the international community. Such long-term efforts do not usually fit into the short-term political windows of democratically elected leaders" (p.6). According to Shields and Soeters (2017) "positive peace is itself complicated and demarcated as a continuum because a community may not be at war, yet filled with structural violence and militarism" (p.2).

The modern concept of peace has changed with peace research. With the heavy emphasis on physical violence with the inception of peace research, peace was conceptualized to mean a reduction in physical violence or the opposite of war. Alfred Bonisch confirms this in his article "Elements of the Modern Concept of Peace" when he states "As early as in the first periods of history, peace was not only understood as a contrast to war, as a state of non-war, but also identified with material well-being and socio-economical progress" (Bönisch, 1981, p. 2). Bonisch (1981) added to this concept by pointing out the elements of positive peace such as "well-being" and the "socio-economical progress". He also makes note of positive peace when "Greek philosophers characterized peace as 'the greatest good'. That means that the concept of 'positive peace', which has been tackled in scientific discussions for more than two decades, is by no means a new one, but has been existing for a long time" (Bönisch, 1981, p. 2). He also adds that "the elaboration of a peace strategy and the formulation of a peace definition thus have to include an analysis of the causes of war. This shows that war and peace are derived from class struggle" (Bönisch, 1981, p. 7). Galtung made this same assertion that however war is defined, then peace must be defined in that same way. He states: "If peace now is regarded as absence of violence, then thinking about peace (and consequently peace research and peace action) will be structured the same way as thinking about violence" (Galtung, 1969, p. 7). Peace research will have to analyze the causes of war, and think about peace in the same way and construct a modern concept of peace.

Chapter III

<u>Building a Peace Index</u>

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the components of the positive peace index for major U.S. cities drawing from components of the positive peace index created by the Institute for Economics and Peace for nation states. The Positive Peace Index has criteria that it uses to describe how peaceful a country is. These criteria are akin to descriptive categories. These descriptive categories are what the Institute for Economics and Peace use to construct the index and evaluate the peacefulness of countries. These descriptive categories are used to construct an index that can serve a blueprint for public administrators who find their communities are "wrestling with creating a positive peace" (Shields and Soeters, 2015). These components include:

- Community Relations

- Government Transparency

- High Levels of Human Capital

- Free Flow of Information

- Equitable Distribution of Resources

- Acceptance of Rights of Others

- Sound Economic Environment

- Well-functioning Government

Community Relations

The first component of the index "good relations" captures the relations notion so central to positive peace. Voting is one of the aspects of good relations between neighbors. To create a peaceful city that is absent of both structural and direct violence, the laws in place must be there to benefit all of its citizens. This is a good indicator of positive peace due to the sheer nature of community relations foster a better environment for all of its citizens. One of the pillars of positive peace is having a system in place that will avoid structural and direct violence. Barbara S. Gamble took a look at ballot initiatives that would restrict the rights of minorities. What she observed is: "Between 1959 and 1993, 74 civil rights initiatives found their way onto state and local ballots across the nation" (Gamble, 1997, p. 10). The results were even more startling because "Of the 74 civil rights initiatives that citizens have voted on, 78% resulted in outcomes that constituted a defeat of minority interests" (Gamble, 1997, p. 10). Gamble looked at housing and accommodations, school desegregation, gay rights, English language laws, and AIDS policies.

Each of these initiatives would have a direct impact on the rights of minorities. For example, public housing and accommodations. Gamble discovered that "fifteen percent of all civil rights initiatives have occurred in this issue area. Ten of the 11 initiatives sought to restrict access to housing and public accommodations and the voters approved 80% of the majoritarian measures" (Gamble, 1997, p. 11). Gay rights is one of the minority groups whose rights have been put to the popular vote many times. "Almost 60% of the civil rights initiatives have involved gay rights issues" (Gamble, 1997, p. 13). And "Voters approved 79% of these restrictive measures" (Gamble, 1997,

p. 14), which would suppress the rights of their neighbors. English language policies were on par with housing and accommodations initiatives with the initiatives passing with unprecedented support. AIDS policies fared better than the gay rights initiatives and to housing and accommodations with only "two of the five that appeared on the ballot" (Gamble, 1997, p. 17) passing for AIDS initiatives. Gamble ends her article with a good summation of the rights of minorities when voting is put to the test: "As groups that have been excluded from participating fully in the social, economic, and political life of the nation fight for their civil rights, their confrontations with those who have already secured their place threaten to rend the very fabric of the communities in which we live" (Gamble, 1997, p. 262). The fabric of communities has a direct correlation with positive peace since it takes the community working together to stave of structural and direct violence.

Barbara S. Gamble's (1997) findings that certain minorities' rights are thwarted or limited due to the popular vote. Putting the rights of minorities to the popular vote by the majority, who also possess more power than the minorities, removes minorities' access to public goods and services. Access to these necessities could be used to ameliorate the lives of citizens by moving them from one socioeconomic class to another. This leaves minorities with little options. This frustration has a tendency to lead to violence. By using direct democracy to restrict the rights of minorities, the majority is setting their city up with a foundation for negative peace.

Rosemary Thorp, Frances Stewart, and Amrik Heyer (2005) show how the poor and very poor can be disadvantaged when the empowered have the ability to make decisions for them. The authors explore the causes for group formation, the economic

function of the group, political, and the social and political aspects of groups. They point out that groups sometimes have people that act in their best interest. They make a strong argument about structural violence, which are structures that are put in place that disadvantage individuals, and how it works against the poor and very poor. "If individuals are sufficiently intimidated by, or accepting of, the power of those in control, they may do what is required without much monitoring or use of sanctions" (Thorp et al. 2005, p. 2). Continuing with what Gamble (1997) states in her argument about direct democracy and how the rights of minorities are restricted, Thorp, et.al (2005) shore up that argument by pointing out that "Poverty, and in particular chronic poverty, is associated with lack of education, capital, labor, social status, and other assets" (Thorp et al. 2005, p. 7), which is often mitigated by those in power. For example, when the housing and accommodations was put to the popular vote. The determination of those votes are the deciding factor on whether minorities in that case will remain in poverty or will they continue to be disadvantaged. Thorp et al. (2005) discovered that "groups do indeed potentially, and in numerous instances in practice, benefit the poor, with examples from a wide range of cases illustrating the dynamics that lead to success" ((Thorp, 2005, p. 11).

In order for the voting structure to reflect positive peace, rights that could disenfranchise minorities would not be put to the popular vote.

For this study, the municipal positive peace index will look at the police budget for community relations and the sanctuary city status. Sanctuary City status is important to look at because it shows the city has developed a "public and private space for unauthorized immigrants" (Villazor, 2008, p.135). The amount of money that the police

are investing into the community will correlate with the relationship between citizens and police. If the city is a sanctuary city, then it has all of the citizen's best interest in mind.

Government Transparency

The second component of a positive peace index measures government transparency. Transparency connotes trust and public confidence in government operations hence one would expect low levels of corruption and a well-functioning government. Trust builds relationships, which are necessary for positive peace. Cory Armstrong (2010) makes the claim that "scholars, and others, have suggested that as more information appears on government- based websites, trust and confidence in government leaders tends to be more positive" (Armstrong, 2011, p. 2). Transparency can aid governance by opening up discussions between policymakers, citizenry, and public administrators before decisions are made, and it prevents mishaps with government due to the citizenry being able to vigilantly monitor government actions. Armstrong (2010) argues that "organizations which promote visible decision-making, are open to public input, allow the public the maximum choice of services, and work in cooperation with other organizations for common public purposes" (Armstrong, 2011, p. 2). Further, the more information available to citizenry, the more positive that their attitudes were about legislative openness. Armstrong (2010) references one study that individuals who received social security statements "about their individual benefits felt more positively toward governmental transparency than those who didn't" (Armstrong, 2011, p. 2). In 2003, Pew Research Center conducted a survey on E-government, and found that "individuals who contact government though the internet were generally satisfied with their online interactions" (Armstrong, 2011, p. 2). Government can put its

public records online and any other documentation that citizens have the right to access to, which would show the citizenry that the government is open and available for decision-making.

Government collects information and disseminates it to the public, which makes it both the regulator of information and the generator of policy making. Sharon S. Dawes (2010) explores the idea of government information being the generator of policy making when she states "government treats information as an object of policy, that is, information itself is the subject of policy making. These policies tend to provide broad general guidance and to treat government as the regulator of societal information flow" (Dawes, 2010, p. 1). She continues with this idea when she states as a regulator, government treats information as an instrument of policy. In doing so, it makes decisions about whether and how to collect, develop, disseminate, analyze, and preserve information in the service of some other policy principle" (Dawes, 2010, p. 1). By being both the regulator of information and the generator of policymaking, the government runs into tensions such as the usefulness of detailed data, how to make the data easily digestible for citizenry, and how to protect the confidentiality of data subjects while making it useful. Another tension that the government runs into is data being misconstrued due to contextual problems. One way that the government can counter this problem is set up policy frameworks that help craft how the data is disseminated and how the public will be able to access it. The government possesses the power to both establish openness to the public and provide an opportunity for its citizenry to be part of the decision-making process. An informed public is more connected, and builds

relationships between citizens and government laying a strong foundation for positive peace.

Private contractors should be held to the same expectations as a government agency. The first expectation would be for companies to have to comply with open records mandates like government agencies. Some private contractors use their expertise of law to evade having to come forward with their records. Rani Gupta (2007) pointed out in his article "Privatization v. The Public's Right to Know" that third-party contractors should have easy accessibility to public records. "'These are not isolated incidents,' Bodney said. 'More and more, public bodies are outsourcing basic government services to third-party contractors whether legislatively or by court action if necessary, these efforts to frustrate access to public records must be resisted'". By contractors not being held to same standard as government agency, then it goes against the government being open and transparent. And by the government not being transparent and open, then the populace loses confidence and trust in its government. Private government contractors, who receive public funds, should be held to the same expectation as a government agency having their public records available for any citizen to view.

In fact, data.gov is where citizens can find transparent information relating to their city with regards to crime budget, zoning, spending service requests, procurement contracts, and code enforcement violations just to name a few.

<u>High Levels of Human Capital</u>

High levels of human capital begin with education. Education begins with an investment from parents in their children's human capital. Oded Galor and Daniel Tsiddon (1997) elaborate on human capital as a resource that parents invest in. "The individual's level of human capital increases with the resources invested in its formation and with the parental level of human capital. Parents have a dual effect on the incentives of their children to invest in human capital" (Galor, 1997, 94). This statement looks at how parents can facilitate the educational growth of their children, which in turn makes them human capital available for businesses and productive members of society. Galor and Daniel note that parents influence their childrens human capital in direct and indirect ways. "First, parents affect their children directly through a home environment that facilitates better schooling for a given level of investment in human capital. Second, parents affect their children indirectly, by their contribution to the average level of human capital in the society as a whole, which in turn affects the magnitude of the labor augmenting technological progress in the next period" (Galor, 1997, 94). Parents demonstrate that they facilitate better schooling by taking an active role in their children's education, which includes being involved in their school and providing their children with resources to help them to succeed.

An educated populace is one of the institutions that creates a peaceful society. Public education is one of the building blocks of this institution, and education evens out income distribution. "It is shown that there need not be a negative relationship between growth and redistribution as public education increases the level of human capital in the economy and, at the same time, tends to produce a more even income distribution"

(Saint-Paul, 1993, 399). This is achieved by having more businesses attracted to a community because there are more skilled and educated employees. These same employees will then create a middle class decreasing the divide between the rich and the poor. Gilles Saint-Paul and Thierry Verdier (1993) illustrate this concept by using 19th century France and its push for public education. With the increase in public education, it created a more peaceful society "of middle-income and white-collar people having less incentive for further revolutions or high redistributive social struggle" (Saint-Paul, 1993, 407). This middle class will also improve on the next generation having improved on the generation before them.

High levels of human capital begins with education. The more educated the populace is, the more involved that they will be in their government and in improving their community. Education begins with parents investing in their children as human capital. These increase in human capital will attract businesses to the community, which will increase the income distribution, which will make the citizens less likely to cause civil unrest.

High levels of human capital are the driving force the city's economy. With economic development comes peacefulness and a citizenry that are educated and are less likely to have violent civil disobedience. For this study, the municipal positive peace index will look at the citizens who are high school graduate or higher and the citizens with a Bachelor's degree or higher.

Free flow of information

Access to government information and the free flow of information is vital for citizens. An educated, informed city is a more peaceful city due to having access to how the city allocates its resources, and again are related to positive peace which has a strong basis in openness. Access to government information and the free flow of information are the foundation of democratic governance. Paul T. Jaeger and John Carlo Bertot (2010) state it best with the following: "The right to access government information has long been viewed as essential to participation in the democratic process, trust in government, prevention of corruption, informed decision-making, the accuracy of government information, and provision of information to the public, companies, and journalists, among other essential functions in society" (Jaeger, 2010, 371). Passing of the Freedom of Information Act in 1966, gave American citizens the right to request information from their government. Access to government information and the free flow of information is vital for citizens because a well-informed populace will make better decisions that will benefit all and it leads to a peaceful society because the citizens are able to respond more effectively in a time of crisis.

Citizens have better access to government agencies now than in previous times. Previous access to government information relied on going to government agencies to request information or relying on the press for government information. With new technology and access to the internet, citizens can now easily google information about government and government agencies. The Obama administration advocated for the openness of government and even developed "the www.data.gov site to provide direct access to enormous amounts of unrefined government data with the hope that the

visitors to the site will find new uses for the data and that these new uses can create previously unavailable insights into government activities and larger societal issues" (Jaeger, 2010, 372).The proliferation of electronic government or e-government continues to make access to government that much easier. One caveat of e-government is that the user has to have access to the internet. "Nearly 40% of homes lack internet access, and many of those families have no interest in or ability to get internet access" (Jaeger, 2010, 373). This is not a deterrent for citizens who are requesting information from the government. There are public libraries available in every city, which citizens can use to access government information. "Not only do the people without home access come to the library for access to e-government, but many people with home access also use library computers for e-government access because they either lack sufficient access speeds at home to accomplish their tasks or because they lack government literacy to find what they are searching for without help" (Jaeger, 2010, 373). Requiring faster speed to retrieve documents and to download large files and not completely understanding government websites has increased the number of citizens frequently libraries. "Among patrons using e-government in libraries, 52.4% do not own a computer, 42.4% lack access both at home and at work, 40% are there because access is free, and 38.1% rely on the assistance of librarians" (Jaeger, 2010, 373).

Having access to computers is not the only hurdle that citizens have with obtaining government information. The government contracts out essential government functions, which makes it difficult for citizens to get access to information. Per the Freedom of Information Act, private contractors are not required to have open records because they do not qualify as an agency. And when requests are made, it can be a

lengthy process obtaining that information. For example, when the requests for the names of bus drivers in Milwaukee by Bob Segall. Before the information could be released, all 1400 bus drivers "were entitled to a notice" (Gupta, 2007, 2). Jaeger and Bertot state that "transparency can only exist when things that are being sought can be located and retrieved" (Jaeger, 2010, 374).

Using social media as an option to access government information can be both positive and negative. The positive aspects are: citizens can easily access government information through their social media accounts, they can get the necessary information in clear, concise language that will make it easy for them to understand, and it can be broadcast to a larger audience. The negative aspect of using social media is the reliability. Social media websites have different life expectancies. For example, Myspace is no longer a viable option to publicize government information since its popularity has declined significantly. Jaeger and Bertot make the following point: "The embrace of social media and other new internet-enabled technologies as a means of disseminating government information may create long-term challenges in the preservation of and access to such government information in later years" (Jaeger, 2010, 373). Government should still use social media as an option to disseminate government information because it can reach a larger audience.

Access to government information and the free flow of information is important for citizens due to the sheer nature of it educating the populace. There are hurdles such as information from private companies not being available, and not all of citizens having home access to a computer or the internet. However, in this point in time, citizens have easier access to government information and the transparency of government agencies.

Jaeger and Bertot dictate what it takes for government to be transparent and for the accessibility of information, which is: "To truly provide access to the information and data, transparency must encompass all aspects of information access. Users must have physical access (be able to reach the content), intellectual access (be able to understand the content), and social access (be able to share the content) for government information to become completely transparent" (Jaeger, 2010, 374).

Equitable Distribution of Resources

Equitable distribution of resources plays an intricate part in positive peace, which is the distribution of resources throughout the community. It contributes to positive peace due to men of a lower social economic status who are frustrated with their socioeconomic status resort to violence as a means to obtain resources. Galtung (1969) reinforces this notion when he mentions that unevenly distributed resources leads to violence. That could be low education, availability to resources, low job options, or low health choices. When women are in this same socioeconomic bracket and are competing for the same resources, it aggravates the situation making it fertile ground for violence. Lynne M. Vieraitis, Sarah Britto, and Tomislav V. Kovandzic (2007) provide further insight into this concept in their article "The Impact of Women's Status and Gender Inequality on Female Homicide Victimization Rates Evidence From US Counties." The authors reiterate this point when they state "Feminist theories posit that female homicide victimization is in part a result of women's economic, legal, educational, and occupational status in society, particularly as this status relates to men's power in these same areas" (Vieraitis, 2007, p. 1). They add that "Once women legally have equal access to employment, equal pay for their work, and equal protection

in the courts, the rates of female homicide victimization should decline", which would mean that it would change their environment to one with less crime, it would change who they associate with, and would make them less prone to violence. Vieraitis, et.al, reference to the power dynamics associated with male dominance. The authors mention Joyce E. Williams and Karen A. Holmes' (1981) book *The Second Assault: Rape and Public Attitudes* who contend that "that rape and female homicide victimization rates will increase as gender inequality declines because men will try to recapture their lost power through force" (Vieraitis, 2007, p. 4). To combat this inequality, women should be presented more options via social networks so that they can achieve success, which would in turn, promote positive peace.

Minorities have a smaller social network, which hinders them from changing their status and improving their community. Though blacks have a large social network consisting of their neighbors and relatives, it does not compare to Whites social networks or to Hispanic networks. Blacks being tied to this social network makes finding avenues out of the community, for example for socioeconomic reasons, that much more difficult. Using those social networks, which can be small compared to other races' networks, lowers the earnings of the individual who is using the network. Luis M. Falcon (1995) in his article "Social Networks and Employment for Latinos, Blacks, and Whites" found that Boston Latinos "use of personal networks lowers their earnings" (Green, 1999, p. 3). Gary Paul Green, Leann M. Tigges, and Daniel Diaz (1999) looked at the differences in job-search strategies in Atlanta, Boston, and Los Angeles in their article "Racial and Ethnic Differences in Job-Search Strategies in Atlanta, Boston, and Los Angeles". They argue that "informal recruitment strategies may permit race to play a

more significant role in the hiring process, which would thus hurt minorities' chances of getting good jobs " (Green, 1999, p. 3). Green, et. al, state that blacks have a higher success rate at obtaining jobs with formal methods because "formal methods provide more explicit criteria by which employers can judge job candidates" (Green, 1999, p. 3). However, when looking at job searches through multiplex relationships, which is defined as a relationship where the person could be a coworker and a neighbor, this hinders minorities from changing their status and improving their community because they are being relayed information from someone who is in the same circumstances as they are.

Acceptance of Rights of Others

Acceptance of the rights of others means that basic human rights and freedoms are provided for everyone in a society. A society that is keenly aware of basic human and rights and freedoms are sympathetic to the plight of others. This ties into the notion of peaceweaving due to it "captures the pragmatist, feminine standpoint emphasizing use and an expansive interconnected democratic community" (Shields, 2017, p. 7). This interconnected democratic community would be a positive society, specifically a positive peaceful society, because it has put in place structures to make sure that equality is provided for everyone.

Huffman & Torres (2001) make a strong case for equalizing the job market for minorities and women with formal job searches, which relies on job postings, newspaper advertisements, and employment agencies. "Recently, Drentea (1998) has advocated women's use of formal search methods as an effective way to address workplace inequality. This argument is based on her finding that women who use formal job search strategies tend to be employed in jobs that are, on average, less female-

dominated than women who rely on personal networks (and other informal search strategies) to locate job opportunities" (Huffman, 2001, p. 129). These authors note that traditional female-dominated jobs tend to pay less than equal gender jobs. This also ties into peaceweaving which transcends female sensibility and gender roles. Jobs that have equal pay allow workers to obtain their basic needs.

The municipal positive peace index will examine cities that prohibit discrimination based on gender identity in public and private employment and the number of women-owned firms, minority-owned firms, and nonminority owned firms.

Sound Economic Environment

A sound economic environment means that the city has institutions in place that allow the private sector to flourish. A positive peaceful society has business competitiveness and strong economic productivity. Issues with urban redevelopment, which is determined by businesses wanting to invest in a city, has hindered the mobility of lower class. With urban redevelopment being stalled due to issues of postindustrialism and globalization, urban areas that have been categorized as "ghetto" have been largely left behind, which in turn, leaves a community behind in availability of resources, jobs, investment, and social mobility. This leaves the community powerless and hopeless. Decades of being marginalized, the citizens of these enclaves have succumbed to their surroundings making their circumstances commonplace. The only way to combat these issues is for the community to coalesce into a group, and make their voices heard. One way of doing that is by exploring and using the openness of the

government websites, so that their politicians can hear them. Another option is to expand their social network to encompass individuals that have power to change their circumstances. With new interest and a desire for urban redevelopment in areas that have been largely populated by the lower class, these citizens will be granted a chance to change their circumstances.

Low-income citizens could organize into church-based community organizations and use their political capital to change their circumstances. Church-based community organizations bring together people in a community via a social network, so that they can work together to better their community. The church-based community organization demonstrates that when a community rallies together to make changes that their political capital increases. These church-based community organizations have done their research of the laws that can assist them with their cause. For example, a church-based community organization in Oakland worked together with members of their community and with the city council to get an abandoned Montgomery Ward building torn down to make space for something that benefited their community. "Under close questions, De la Fuente committed to all three goals and to use of eminent domain powers—noting that he and the city were already engaged in negotiations with Montgomery Ward" (Wood, 1997, p. 3). By achieving this success, the church-based community organization was able to "receive extensive coverage in the media, including a highly sympathetic report on local television news and a prominent story in the local newspaper. By early 1996, the Montgomery Ward building would begin coming down" (Wood, 1997, p. 4). Wood (1997) points out that church-based community organizations have been successful at changing the political landscape. "In the past 15 years, the kind

of community organizing effort just described has probably become the most extensive and successful effort by low-income urban residents (both citizens and undocumented) to shape the social, political, and economic conditions of their existence" (Wood, 1997, p. 5).

Well-functioning Government

A well-functioning government will deliver quality goods and services to a community, will be trusted by its citizens, and will have high civic involvement.

The delivery of quality goods and services to a community is essential for a well-functioning government. It is essential because goods and services are what the citizenry expect of their government when they pay taxes and elect officials to represent them.

The citizens trust a well-functioning government that is transparent in its actions. Transparency of the government, another component of positive peace, connotes trust. If the government lacks corruption and has put in place laws that will help its citizens instead of hindering them, then it will be viewed at by its citizens as being a well-functioning government.

Civic involvement is one of the ways to determine if a government is well-functioning. "Many scholars of community attachment and integration have contended that residential mobility—or individual length of residence in a community—is one of the most important factors influencing individuals' local social bonds and associational ties"

(Kang, 2003, p. 82). The citizens are invested and attached to their community and government and will participate to make sure that their community continues to thrive.

Private firms are most likely to loan money to a well-functioning government that has a strong bond rating. The bond rating reflects how functional the government is by the investment grade and its credit rating. Further, a strong bond rating reflect the government's commitment and the likelihood that payment obligations will be made.

Summary of Conceptual Framework

Conceptual framework for municipal Positive peace index. The purpose of this research is to describe the components of positive peace in major U.S. cities. These criteria have been adapted to evaluate positive peace in the 20 most populous U.S. cities. Table 3.1 exhibits the descriptive categories and literature associated with a municipal positive peace index.

Conceptual Framework

Table 3.1 Conceptual Framework Table: U.S. City Positive Peace Index

Title: U.S. City Municipal Positive Peace Index
Purpose: The purpose of this descriptive research is to evaluate major cities in the United States based off of the Positive Peace Index.

Descriptive Categories	Literature
1. **Community Relations**	Doan, P. L. (2007); Frey, B. S., & Goette, L. (1998); Gamble, B. S. (1997); Musterd, S., & Ostendorf, W. (Eds.). (2013); Thorp, R., Stewart, F., & Heyer, A. (2005); Villazor, R. C. (2008)
2. **Government Transparency**	Armstrong, C. L. (2011); Dawes, S. S. (2010); Graham, F. S., Gooden, S. T., & Martin, K. J. (2014); Ionescu, L. (2016); Jaeger, P. T., & Bertot, J. C. (2010); McDermott, P. (2010); Piotrowski, S. J., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2007); Tat-Kei Ho, A. (2002); Davenport, T. C. (2010); Kang, N., & Kwak, N. (2003); Portney, K. E., & Berry, J. M. (1997); Wood, R. L. (1997);
3. **High levels of human capital**	Boulding, K. E. (1990); Read, H. (2012); Reardon, B. A. (1988); Wiberg, H. (1981); Brantmeier, E. J. (2011); Chang, E. T., & Diaz-Veizades, J. (1999);Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2001);
4. **Free flow of information**	Anderson, K. (2003); Gladwell, M., & Shirky, C. (2011); Gupta, R. (2007); Jaeger, P. T., & Bertot, J. C. (2010); Shirky, C. (2011)
5. **Equitable distribution of resources**	Harris Jr, R. L. (1999); Kawachi, I. (2002); Kearns, A., & Forrest, R. (2000); Matthews, P. (2015); Stewart, P. E. (2015)
6. **Acceptance of the rights of others**	Cohen, P. N. (1998); Green, G. P., Tigges, L. M., & Diaz, D. (1999); Huffman, M. L., & Torres, L. (2001); Lobmayer, P., & Wilkinson, R. G. (2002);
7. **Sound Economic Environment**	Bates, T. (2006); Portney, K. (2005); Portney, K. E., & Berry, J. M. (2010) Wilson, D. (1993); Wilson, D., & Grammenos, D. (2000)
8. **Well-functioning Government**	Davenport, T. C. (2010); Kang, N., & Kwak, N. (2003); Portney, K. E., & Berry, J. M. (1997); Wood, R. L. (1997)

Chapter IV

Methodology

This chapter explains the methodology used to build the municipal positive peace index. It does this using the components of the conceptual framework to develop measures which combine to form the municipal positive peace index. The positive peace index was constructed using eight indicators.

Table 4.1 operationalizes the components of the municipal positive peace index. The measure used to capture each component is defined briefly in the indicator column. The "measurement" column provides the details of measurement. For example, community relations are measured by the percentage of the police budget devoted to community relations and whether the city is a sanctuary city.

The details of how each component is constructed are detailed in subsequent sections of this chapter. Each component is then assigned a value between 1 and 5. One equals low or no levels, which indicate weak positive peace; 5 equals high levels which signify strong positive peace. The total index can take on a value between 8 (low positive peace) and 40 (high positive peace). The final column identifies the data source (e.g. U.S. Census, City Budgets, Governing.com, etc.).

Table 4.1 Descriptive Categories Operationalization Table: U.S. City Peace Index

Descriptive Categories	Indicator	Description per capita	Source
Community Relations	Police budget used for community relations and sanctuary city status	Percentage of police budget devoted to police community relations and sanctuary status.	City Budget; Sanctuary City List
Government Transparency	Ranking of Online Spending Transparency	U.S. City Open Data Census	Data.gov
High levels of human capital	High school graduate or higher and citizens with a bachelor's degree or higher	Percentage of citizens who are high school graduate or higher and the number of citizens who have a bachelor's degree or higher	U.S. Census
Free flow of information	Household Internet Connection and Public Libraries	Percentage of households with internet connection; Number of Public Libraries per capita	Governing.com; each city's public library website
Equitable distribution of resources	Poverty gap	The percentage of persons in poverty	U.S. Census
Acceptance of the rights of others	Non-Discrimination Ordinances	Non-discrimination ordinances; number of minority and women owned firms	HRC.Org; U.S. Census
Sound Economic environment	GDP per capita	The number of firms located per capita	U.S. Census, Bureau of Labor Statistics
Well-functioning government	Bond Rating	The bond rating based off of Standard & Poor's Moody's and Fitch	U.S. Census

Each measure is converted to a numeric formula where 1 = low levels of this characteristic and 5 = high levels of the characteristic. The United States Census, the

most recent being 2010, has the United States cities ranked from 1 to 20 using

population. These will be the cities that the index will use to describe positive peace

(See Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 U.S. Census Bureau Top 20 Cities, Highest Ranking Cities

Title: U.S. Census Bureau Top 20 Cities, Highest Ranking Cities
1. New York City, NY
2. Los Angeles, CA
3. Chicago, IL
4. Houston, TX
5. Philadelphia, PA
6. Phoenix, AZ
7. San Antonio, TX
8. San Diego, CA
9. Dallas, TX
10. San Jose, CA
11. Jacksonville, FL
12. Indianapolis, IN
13. San Francisco, CA
14. Austin, TX
15. Columbus, OH
16. Fort Worth, TX
17. Charlotte, NC
18. Detroit, MI
19. El Paso, TX
20. Memphis, TN

Community Relations

The first indicator, community relations, looks at police community relations. This

is an important indicator of the positive peace of a city due to positive relations is a good

indicator of a better functioning government and lower internal conflict. The city budget

would have the police budget, which entail would have how much the police department

has budgeted for community services or projects. This budgeted amount will be used to

measure "police community relations". The numerical values assigned are as follows:

5= the police department has budgeted between 1% to 4% for police community relations

4= the police department has budgeted between 0.0100 and 0.9999 percent for police community relations

3= the police department has budgeted between 0.0050 to 0.0100 percent for police community relations

2= the police department has budgeted between 0.0001 and 0.0050 percent for police community relations

1= the police department has not budgeted for police community relations.

Sanctuary city status

1 = Yes

0 = No

The two points combined will give the score of the city on community relations with a 6 indicating strong levels of positive peace and 1 indicating weak levels of positive peace. Table 4.3 shows the score for each city.

Table 4.3 Community Relations

City	Police Budget	Total Budget	Percentage of police budget devoted to community relations	Budget Year	Sanctuary City	Numerical Score
New York City, NY	$14,434	$5.2 billion	0.0003%	2017	Yes	3
Los Angeles, CA	$29,621	$1.189 billion	0.0018%	2016-2017	Yes	3
Chicago, IL	$431,950	$1.4 billion	0.0309%	2017	Yes	5
Houston, TX	0	$850,421,125	0	2017	Yes	2
Philadelphia, PA	0	$650,176,870	0	2017	Yes	2
Phoenix, AZ	$1,136,000	$613,942,012	0.1850%	2017	Yes	5
San Antonio, TX	$20,000	$456,624,626	0.0044%	2017	No	2
San Diego, CA	$47,826	$438,789,263	0.0109%	2017	Yes	5
Dallas, TX	$1,822,391	$513,052,628	0.3552%	2016-2017	Yes	5
San Jose, CA	$1,493,500	$346,977,957	0.4304%	2016-2017	Yes	5
Jacksonville, FL	0	$423,110,925	0	2016-2017	No	1
Indianapolis, IN	0	$232,421,065	0	2017	No	1
San Francisco, CA	$5,932,964	$566,270,469	1.0477%	2016-2017	Yes	6
Austin, TX	$2,180,061	$401,624,830	0.5428%	2016-2017	Yes	5
Columbus, OH	$10,720,118	$318,621,471	3.3645%	2017	Yes	6
Fort Worth, TX	$225,083	$226,302,414	0.0995%	2017	Yes	5
Charlotte, NC	$3,448,246	$246,644,617	1.3981%	2017	Yes	6
Detroit, MI	$797,814	$286,509,954	0.2785%	2015-2017	Yes	5

El Paso, TX	0	$131,318,39 4	0	2017	No	1
Memphis, TN	0	$255,950,39 4	0	2017	No	1

Government Transparency

The next indicator to be evaluated, government transparency, correlates with the importance of having an open, accessible government in a city. If the city is deemed opaque, then it will less likely be a positive, peaceful city. Data.gov has a scoring and ranking of cities based off of its access to open data and transparency titled U.S. City Open Data Census. The criteria that the survey looks at are the following: crime, budget, zoning (GIS), restaurant inspections, transit, property assessment, parcels, construction permits, property deeds, campaign finance contributions, business listings, spending, service requests (311), procurement contracts, code enforcement violations, public buildings, lobbyist activity, web analytics, and asset disclosure. Each city will be evaluated on its ranking and its score on a scale of 1 to 5.

5= the total score is be between 2000 and 1500

4= the total score is between 1500 – 1000

3= the total score is between 1000 – 500

2= total score is between 500 and 1

1= There is no data available for the city

Table 4.4 shows the government transparency rating developed for each city.

Table 4.4 Government Transparency

City	Ranking	Score	Numerical Score
New York City, NY	6	1650	5
Los Angeles, CA	5	1670	5
Chicago, IL	2	1720	5
Houston, TX	77	235	2
Philadelphia, PA	8	1535	5
Phoenix, AZ	94	0	1
San Antonio, TX	46	635	3
San Diego, CA	9	1510	5
Dallas, TX	37	720	3
San Jose, CA	27	920	3
Jacksonville, FL	79	195	2
Indianapolis, IN	0	N/A	1
San Francisco, CA	4	1675	5
Austin, TX	3	1700	5
Columbus, OH	82	140	2
Fort Worth, TX	0	N/A	1
Charlotte, NC	32	790	3
Detroit, MI	35	70	2
El Paso, TX	0	N/A	1
Memphis, TN	0	N/A	1

High Levels of Human Capital

The third indicator is high levels of human capital. This indicator looks at the percentage of citizens who are high school graduate or higher and age 25 years +, and the percentage of persons age 25+ who have a Bachelor's degree or higher. All of this data was collected by the U.S. Census.

5= More than 80% high school graduate or higher and more than 40% with a bachelor's degree or higher

4= More than 80% high school graduate or higher and more than 30% with a bachelor's degree or higher

3= More than 80% high school graduate or higher and more than 20% with a bachelor's degree or higher

2= More than 70% high school graduate or higher and more than 30% with a bachelor's degree or higher

1= More than 70% high school graduate or higher and more than 10% with a bachelor's degree or higher

Table 4.5 shows the numerical score for each of the cities.

Table 4.5 High Levels of Human Capital

City	High school graduate or higher	Bachelor's degree or higher	Numerical Score
New York City, NY	80.3	35.7	4
Los Angeles, CA	75.5	32	2
Chicago, IL	82.3	35.6	4
Houston, TX	76.7	30.4	2
Philadelphia, PA	82	25.4	3
Phoenix, AZ	80.7	26.7	3
San Antonio, TX	81.4	25	3
San Diego, CA	87.3	43	5
Dallas, TX	74.5	30.2	2
San Jose, CA	82.7	38.8	4
Jacksonville, FL	88.2	26.3	3
Indianapolis, IN	84.9	28.3	3
San Francisco, CA	87.0	53.8	5
Austin, TX	87.5	46.9	5
Columbus, OH	88.5	34.2	4
Fort Worth, TX	80.8	27.3	3
Charlotte, NC	88.4	41.3	5
Detroit, MI	78.3	13.5	1
El Paso, TX	78	23.2	1
Memphis, TN	83.7	25.2	3

Free flow of information

The fourth indicator is free flow of information. This indicator looks at information

for the citizens; the percentage of citizens with internet in their household and the

number of public libraries which would allow citizens to interact with their government

easily. The data collected by Governing States and Localities and Public Library System

of each city will be used to determine the score for this indicator. Numerical scores for internet access per capita and public libraries per capita are as follows:

Internet Access Per Capita

5= 15 to 12 percent of its households have internet access.

4= 11 to 9 percent of its households have internet access

3= 8 to 6 percent of its households have internet access

2= 5 to 3 percent of its households have internet access

1= 3 to 0 percent of their households have internet access

Public Libraries Per Capita

5= 0.00004 to 0.00003 public libraries

4= 0.000029 to 0.000025 public libraries

3= 0.000024 to 0.000020 public libraries

2= 0.000019 to 0.000015 public libraries

1= 0.000014 and 0.000010 public libraries

The city will then get a combined score between 1 and 5. Table 4.6 has results for Free Flow of Information

Table 4.6 Free Flow of Information

City	Share of Households with internet	Number of households without internet	Per Capita	Number of Public Libraries	Number of Public Libraries Per Capita	Numerical Score	Combined Score
New York City, NY	78.1%	675,906	8%	92	0.000011 253640	3, 1	2
Los Angeles, CA	78.3%	287,017	8%	72	0.000018 984233	3, 2	2.5
Chicago, IL	75.1%	256,481	10%	80	0.000029 678016	4, 4	4
Houston, TX	75.1%	202,782	10%	44	0.000020 957860	4, 3	3.5
Philadelphia, PA	70.2%	173,795	11%	56	0.000036 697103	4, 5	4.5
Phoenix, AZ	75.9%	124,822	9%	17	0.000011 759563	3, 1	2
San Antonio, TX	74.7%	124,833	9%	31	0.000023 353802	4, 3	3.5
San Diego, CA	88%	57,625	4%	36	0.000027 535525	2, 4	3
Dallas, TX	71.5%	135,640	11%	29	0.000024 210730	4, 3	3.5
San Jose, CA	88.4%	36,361	4%	24	0.000025 371534	2, 4	3
Jacksonville, FL	78.9%	66,312	8%	21	0.000025 554160	3, 4	3.5
Indianapolis, IN	74%	84,818	10%	24	0.000029 252418	4, 4	4
San Francisco, CA	85.1%	52,995	7%	28	0.000034 772458	3, 5	4
Austin, TX	85.1%	51,895	7%	23	0.000029 099558	3, 4	3.5
Columbus, OH	80%	65,954	8%	27	0.000034 306058	3, 5	4
Fort Worth, TX	78.2%	58,622	8%	16	0.000021 586442	3, 3	3
Charlotte, NC	82%	53,926	7%	21	0.000028 711117	3, 4	3.5
Detroit, MI	60.1%	101,923	14%	23	0.000032 222949	5, 5	5

| El Paso, TX | 71.3% | 63,047 | 10% | 13 | 0.000020 027083 | 4, 3 | 3.5 |
| Memphis, TN | 67.7% | 80,922 | 13% | 18 | 0.000027 825485 | 5, 4 | 4.5 |

Equitable Distribution of Resources

The fifth indicator is equitable distribution of resources. This indicator looks at social mobility and the poverty gap. It specifically looks at the percentage of persons in poverty. The aggregated data of the U.S. Census Bureau will be used to determine the value of this indicator. The numerical score comprises the following:

5= Poverty rate between 10 and 15 percent

4= Poverty rate between 15 and 20 percent

3= Poverty rate between 20 and 25 percent

2= Poverty rate between 25 and 30 percent

1= Greater than 30 percent

Table 4.7 Equitable Distribution of Resources

City	Persons in poverty, percent	Numerical Score
New York City, NY	20.6	3
Los Angeles, CA	22.1	3
Chicago, IL	22.3	3
Houston, TX	22.5	3
Philadelphia, PA	26.4	2
Phoenix, AZ	23.1	3
San Antonio, TX	19.8	4
San Diego, CA	15.4	4
Dallas, TX	24.0	3
San Jose, CA	11.3	5
Jacksonville, FL	17.7	4
Indianapolis, IN	21.3	3
San Francisco, CA	13.2	5
Austin, TX	18.0	4
Columbus, OH	21.7	3
Fort Worth, TX	18.8	4
Charlotte, NC	16.8	4
Detroit, MI	40.3	1
El Paso, TX	20.3	3
Memphis, TN	27.6	2

Acceptance of the rights of others

The sixth indicator is the acceptable of the rights of others. This indicator looks at

gender inequality in the workplace and laws discriminating against minorities. The data

collected by the U.S. Census Bureau and HRC.org will be used to determine the value

of this indicator. The numerical score is the sum of women-owned firms, minority-owned firms, and a non-discrimination ordinance. The breakdown of the points are as follow:

Women-Owned Firms

5= has 6 percent women-owned firms per capita

4= has 5 percent women-owned firms per capita

3= has 4 percent women-owned firms per capita

2= has 3 percent women-owned firms per capita

Minority Owned Firms

5= has 6 and 7 percent minority-owned firms per capita

4= has 5 percent minority-owned firms per capita

3= has 4 percent minority-owned firms per capita

2= has 3 percent minority-owned firms per capita

1= has 2 percent minority-owned firms per capita

Non-Discrimination Ordinance

Yes = 1

No = 0

Table 4.8 has the results for this component.

Table 4.8 Acceptance of the Rights of Others

City	Cities that Prohibit Discrimination Based on Gender Identity in Public and Private Employment	Women -owned firms (2012)	Minority -owned firms (2012)	Numerical Score for women-owned firms	Numerical Score for minority-owned firms	Combined Score
New York City, NY	Yes	5%	7%	4	5	5
Los Angeles, CA	Yes	5%	7%	4	5	5
Chicago, IL	Yes	5%	5%	4	4	4.5
Houston, TX	No	5%	7%	4	5	4.5
Philadelphia, PA	Yes	3%	3%	2	2	2.5
Phoenix, AZ	Yes	3%	3%	2	2	2.5
San Antonio, TX	No	3%	5%	2	4	3
San Diego, CA	Yes	4%	4%	4	3	4
Dallas, TX	Yes	4%	5%	3	4	4
San Jose, CA	No	3%	5%	2	4	3
Jacksonville, FL	No	3%	3%	2	2	2
Indianapolis, IN	Yes	3%	2%	2	1	2
San Francisco, CA	Yes	5%	6%	4	5	5
Austin, TX	Yes	4%	4%	4	3	4
Columbus, OH	Yes	3%	3%	2	2	2.5
Fort Worth, TX	Yes	4%	5%	4	4	4.5
Charlotte, NC	No	4%	4%	3	3	3
Detroit, MI	Yes	5%	7%	4	5	5
El Paso, TX	No	3%	7%	2	5	3.5
Memphis, TN	No	6%	7%	5	5	5

Sound Economic Environment

The seventh indicator is sound economic environment. This indicator was assigned a weight of five. If the environment is conducive for business, then it must have a strong police force, relatively low crime, and a city that is welcoming businesses to further encourage economic vitality. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has the unemployment rate for each city and the U.S. Census has the median household income. The two scores will be tallied together to give a final numerical score. The scoring is breakdown is the following:

Median Household Income Per Capita

5= median household income per capita is more than $50,000

4= median household income per capita is more than $30,000

3= median household income per capita is between $25,000 and $30,000

2= median household income per capita is between $20,000 and $25,000

1= median household income per capita is less than $20,000

Unemployment Rate

5= the unemployment rate is less than 3.6%

4= the unemployment rate is less than 4%

3= the unemployment rate is between 4% and 4.4%

2= the unemployment rate is between 4.5% and 5%

1= the unemployment rate is more than 5%

Table 4.9 has the results of the scoring.

Table 4.9 Sound Economic Environment

City	Median Household Income Per Capita	Unemployment Rate	Numerical Score Median Household Income Per Capita	Numerical Score for Unemployment Rate	Combined Score
New York City, NY	$33,078	4.7	4	2	3
Los Angeles, CA	$28,761	4.5	2	2	2
Chicago, IL	$29,486	5.3	3	1	2
Houston, TX	$28,503	5.9	3	1	2
Philadelphia, PA	$22,919	4.9	2	2	2
Phoenix, AZ	$24,231	4.4	2	3	2.5
San Antonio, TX	$22,960	4.2	2	3	2.5
San Diego, CA	$33,902	4.2	4	3	3.5
Dallas, TX	$28,693	4.3	3	3	3
San Jose, CA	$35,811	3.6	4	4	4
Jacksonville, FL	$25,554	4.5	3	2	2.5
Indianapolis, IN	$24,280	4.2	2	3	2.5
San Francisco, CA	$52,220	3.5	5	5	5
Austin, TX	$34,015	3.7	4	4	4
Columbus, OH	$24,990	4.5	2	2	2
Fort Worth, TX	$25,225	4.3	3	3	3
Charlotte, NC	$32,254	4.7	4	2	3
Detroit, MI	$15,038	5.9	1	1	1
El Paso, TX	$20,154	5.4	2	1	1.5
Memphis, TN	$22,121	5.1	2	1	1.5

Well-Functioning Government

The eighth indicator is a well-functioning government. Specifically, a component

of a well-functioning government would provide a wide array of services designed to

ensure proper delivery and efficient use of resources. Moreover, a well-functioning

government would have a strong bond rating, which would entice banks and private

firms to loan money to cities. The U.S. Census has a bond rating for each city, which will be used determine the city's infrastructure and economic vitality. The scoring breakdown is the following:

5= Standard and Poor's Triple A, Moody's modifier 1, Fitch "+"

4= Standard and Poor's Double A, Moody's modifier 2, Fitch "-"

3= Standard and Poor's A, Moody's modifier 1

2= Standard and Poor's Triple B, Moody's modifier 1

1= Standard and Poor's Double B, Moody's modifier 3

Table 4.10 has the results of the scoring.

Table 4.10 Well-Functioning Government

City	Standard & Poor's	Moody's	Fitch	Numerical Score
New York City, NY	AA	Aa3	AA-	4
Los Angeles, CA	AA-	Aa2	AA-	4
Chicago, IL	AA-	Aa3	AA	4
Houston, TX	AA	Aa3	AA-	4
Philadelphia, PA	BBB	Baa1	BBB	2
Phoenix, AZ	AAA	Aa1	(NA)	5
San Antonio, TX	AAA	Aa1	AA+	5
San Diego, CA	A	A2	A+	3
Dallas, TX	AA+	Aa1	(NA)	4
San Jose, CA	AAA	Aa1	AA+	5

Jacksonville, FL	AA-	Aa2	AA	4
Indianapolis, IN	AAA	Aa1	(NA)	5
San Francisco, CA	AA-	Aa2	AA-	4
Austin, TX	AAA	Aa1	(NA)	5
Columbus, OH	AAA	Aaa	AAA	5
Fort Worth, TX	AA+	Aa2	AA	4
Charlotte, NC	AAA	Aaa	AAA	5
Detroit, MI	BB	Ba3	BB	1
El Paso, TX	AA	Aa3	AA-	4
Memphis, TN	AA	A1	A+	4

The positive peace index was constructed using eight indicators, which are: community relations, government transparency, high levels of human capital, free flow of information, equitable distribution of resources, acceptance of the rights of others, a sound economic environment, and a well-functioning government. These eight indicators were used to determine the positive peacefulness of a city. The total numerical score, if a city received a 5 on each indicator, would be 55. The higher the value the more important it is for a peaceful environment. The final score for these eight indicators will be used to determine the municipal positive peace index score for the Top 20 U.S. Cities.

Chapter V

Results

This chapter describes where the top twenty cities rank on the municipal positive peace index. Chapter three presented the conceptual framework defining the components of positive peace and developed measures which combine to form the municipal positive peace index. The complete index is located in Appendix A. This section will describe the results of the top twenty cities.

Table 5.1 Ranking of U.S. Cities from Most Positively Peaceful to the Least Positively Peaceful

Ranking	Top 20 Cities
1	San Francisco, CA
2	Austin, TX
3	San Diego, CA
4	Charlotte, NC
5	San Jose, CA
6	Chicago, IL
7	New York City, NY
8	Columbus, OH
9	Fort Worth, TX
10	Dallas, TX
11	Los Angeles, CA
12	San Antonio, TX
13	Phoenix, AZ
14	Houston, TX
15	Philadelphia, PA
16	Jacksonville, FL
17	Memphis, TN
18	Indianapolis, IN
19	Detroit, MI
20	El Paso, TX

The top four most positive peaceful cities are: San Francisco, Austin, San Diego, and Charlotte. San Francisco had the highest score with 39. It is worth noting that three of the top five cities are located in California. The three least positive peaceful cities are: Indianapolis, Detroit, and El Paso. El Paso received the lowest score with 18.5.

Table 5.2 Community Relations

Ranking	Top 20 Cities	Community Relations
1	San Francisco, CA	6
2	Charlotte, NC	6
3	Columbus, OH	6
4	Austin, TX	5
5	San Diego, CA	5
6	San Jose, CA	5
7	Chicago, IL	5
8	Fort Worth, TX	5
9	Dallas, TX	5
10	Phoenix, AZ	5
11	Detroit, MI	5
12	New York City, NY	3
13	Los Angeles, CA	3
14	San Antonio, TX	2
15	Philadelphia, PA	2
16	Houston, TX	2
17	Jacksonville, FL	1
18	Indianapolis, IN	1
19	Memphis, TN	1
20	El Paso, TX	1

San Francisco, Charlotte, and Columbus were the top three cities to receive a "6" with regards to community relations. Each of these cities had substantial money in their police budgets earmarked for police community relations, and each one of these cities is listed as a sanctuary city.

Table 5.3. Government Transparency

Ranking	Top 20 Cities	Government Transparency
1	San Francisco, CA	5
2	Austin, TX	5
3	San Diego, CA	5
4	Chicago, IL	5
5	New York City, NY	5
6	Los Angeles, CA	5
7	Philadelphia, PA	5
8	Charlotte, NC	3
9	San Jose, CA	3
10	Dallas, TX	3
11	San Antonio, TX	3
12	Columbus, OH	2
13	Phoenix, AZ	2
14	Detroit, MI	2
15	Houston, TX	2
16	Jacksonville, FL	2
17	Fort Worth, TX	1
18	Indianapolis, IN	1
19	Memphis, TN	1
20	El Paso, TX	1

San Francisco, Austin, San Diego, Chicago, New York City, Los Angeles, and
Philadelphia have the most transparent government with all of them receiving a perfect
score of "five". Indianapolis, Memphis, and El Paso are the three cities with the least
transparent government. This also has to do with the fact that all three of the cities have
minimal data available with regards to budget, zoning (GIS), restaurant inspections,
transit, property assessment, parcels, construction permits, property deeds, campaign

finance contributions, business listings, spending, service requests (311), procurement

contracts, code enforcement violations, public buildings, lobbyist activity, web analytics,

and asset disclosure.

Table 5.4 High Levels of Human Capital

Ranking	Top 20 Cities	High levels of human capital
1	San Francisco, CA	5
2	Austin, TX	5
3	San Diego, CA	5
4	Charlotte, NC	5
5	Chicago, IL	4
6	New York City, NY	4
7	San Jose, CA	4
8	Columbus, OH	4
9	Philadelphia, PA	3
10	San Antonio, TX	3
11	Phoenix, AZ	3
12	Jacksonville, FL	3
13	Fort Worth, TX	3
14	Indianapolis, IN	3
15	Memphis, TN	3
16	Los Angeles, CA	2
17	Dallas, TX	2
18	Houston, TX	2
19	Detroit, MI	1
20	El Paso, TX	1

The top three cities with percentages of citizens who are high school graduate or

higher and have a Bachelor's degree or higher are: San Francisco, Austin, and San

Diego. The three cities with the lowest percentage of high school graduates or higher or

have a Bachelor's degree or higher are: Houston, Detroit, and El Paso. One of the

things that San Francisco and Austin have in common are that their tech industry is

larger than other cities, which requires highly educated employees.

Table 5.5 Free Flow of Information

Ranking	Top 20 Cities	Free Flow of information
1	Detroit, MI	5
2	Philadelphia, PA	4.5
3	Memphis, TN	4.5
4	San Francisco, CA	4
5	Chicago, IL	4
6	Columbus, OH	4
7	San Antonio, TX	4
8	Indianapolis, IN	4
9	Austin, TX	3.5
10	Charlotte, NC	3.5
11	Jacksonville, FL	3.5
12	Los Angeles, CA	3.5
13	Dallas, TX	3.5
14	Houston, TX	3.5
15	El Paso, TX	3.5
16	San Diego, CA	3
17	San Jose, CA	3
18	Fort Worth, TX	3
19	New York City, NY	2
20	Phoenix, AZ	2

The top three cities who have access to the internet or internet connection in

their homes or have a substantial number of library branches are: Detroit, Philadelphia,

and Memphis. The cities who have the least access to the internet or do not have

internet connection in their homes or have a finite number of library branches are: Ft.

Worth, New York, and Phoenix.

Table 5.6 Equitable Distribution of Resources

Ranking	Top 20 Cities	Equitable distribution of resources
1	San Francisco, CA	5
2	San Jose, CA	5
3	San Antonio, TX	4
4	Austin, TX	4
5	Charlotte, NC	4
6	Jacksonville, FL	4
7	San Diego, CA	4
8	Fort Worth, TX	4
9	Chicago, IL	3
10	Columbus, OH	3
11	Indianapolis, IN	3
12	Los Angeles, CA	3
13	Dallas, TX	3
14	Houston, TX	3
15	El Paso, TX	3
16	New York City, NY	3
17	Phoenix, AZ	3
18	Philadelphia, PA	2
19	Memphis, TN	2
20	Detroit, MI	1

The cities with the lowest percentage of persons in poverty are: San Francisco

and San Jose. San Antonio, Austin, and San Charlotte complete the top five cities with

the lowest percentage of persons in poverty. The cities with the highest percentage of

persons in poverty are: Philadelphia, Memphis, and Detroit.

Table 5.7 Acceptance of the Rights of Others

Ranking	Top 20 Cities	Acceptance of the rights of others
1	San Francisco, CA	5
2	Los Angeles, CA	5
3	New York City, NY	5
4	Memphis, TN	5
5	Detroit, MI	5
6	Fort Worth, TX	4.5
7	Chicago, IL	4.5
8	Houston, TX	4.5
9	Austin, TX	4
10	San Diego, CA	4
11	Dallas, TX	4
12	El Paso, TX	3.5
13	San Jose, CA	3
14	San Antonio, TX	3
15	Charlotte, NC	3
16	Columbus, OH	2.5
17	Phoenix, AZ	2.5
18	Philadelphia, PA	2.5
19	Jacksonville, FL	2
20	Indianapolis, IN	2

Table 5.7 describes the cities with the most women-owned firms, minority-owned

firms, and cities with non-discrimination ordinances. San Francisco, Los Angeles, New

York City, and Memphis have the most women-owned and minority-owned firms and

have non-discrimination ordinances that protect all citizens. The cities that fall short in

these areas are: Jacksonville and Indianapolis.

Table 5.8 Sound Economic Environment

Ranking	Top 20 Cities	Sound Economic Environment
1	San Francisco, CA	5
2	Austin, TX	4
3	San Jose, CA	4
4	San Diego, CA	3.5
5	Charlotte, NC	3
6	New York City, NY	3
7	Fort Worth, TX	3
8	Dallas, TX	3
9	San Antonio, TX	2.5
10	Phoenix, AZ	2.5
11	Jacksonville, FL	2.5
12	Indianapolis, IN	2.5
13	Chicago, IL	2
14	Columbus, OH	2
15	Los Angeles, CA	2
16	Houston, TX	2
17	Philadelphia, PA	2
18	Memphis, TN	1.5
19	El Paso, TX	1.5
20	Detroit, MI	1

The city with the soundest economic environment is San Francisco. San Francisco has the highest median income salary per capita and the lowest unemployment rate out of the top twenty cities. Austin and San Jose come in second place.

Table 5.9 Well-Functioning Government

Ranking	Top 20 Cities	Well-functioning government
1	Austin, TX	5
2	San Jose, CA	5
3	Charlotte, NC	5
4	San Antonio, TX	5
5	Phoenix, AZ	5
6	Indianapolis, IN	5
7	Columbus, OH	5
8	New York City, NY	4
9	Fort Worth, TX	4
10	Dallas, TX	4
11	San Francisco, CA	4
12	Jacksonville, FL	4
13	Los Angeles, CA	4
14	Chicago, IL	4
15	Houston, TX	4
16	Memphis, TN	4
17	El Paso, TX	4
18	San Diego, CA	3
19	Philadelphia, PA	2
20	Detroit, MI	1

Table 5.9 describes the bond rating of the top twenty cities. Austin, San Jose, and Charlotte are the top three cities with the best bond rating. Detroit is the city with the lowest bond rating. Philadelphia is the next city with the lowest bond rating.

Summary

Each of the tables describes what indicators comprised the overall municipal positive peace index and how each of the cities scored on the indicators. The top

ranking cities, San Francisco, Austin, San Diego, and Charlotte did not necessarily

score high on every indicator. Although both San Diego and Charlotte scored equally on

some of the indicators, San Diego scored higher in three of the eight categories

evaluated. Six of the twenty cities evaluated scored thirty points.

Chapter VI

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to create a Municipal Positive Peace Index in order to describe positive peace in United States cities. After it is constructed, Municipal Positive Peace Index should be applied to U.S. cities – thereby creating a peace ranking. The Municipal Positive Peace Index described the elements of positive peace in the top twenty U.S. cities. Chapter 2, the Literature Review, discussed positive peace from a scholarly point of view helping to further define it and its aspects. Chapter 3 discussed the indicators of positive peace and introduced the conceptual framework. The eight indicators of positive peace evaluated are:

- Community Relations
- Government Transparency
- High levels of human capital
- Free flow of information
- Equitable distribution of resources
- Acceptance of the rights of others
- Sound Economic Environment
- Well-functioning Government

This research is important because it will describe how peaceful a city is based off of community relations, government transparency, high levels of human capital, free flow of information, gender and racial inequality, a sound economic environment, and a well-functioning government. Government officials, businesses, and political actors in the cities can use this data to evaluate what new policies can be implemented to increase

the cities peacefulness, which can then be determined if it will generate new business and if it would remain a destination for existing businesses.

Below are the city profiles of the top four cities:

San Francisco, CA

Population	805,235
High levels of human capital	High school graduate or higher, percent of persons age 25 year+: 87.5 Bachelor's degree or higher, percent of persons age 25 years +: 46.9
Free flow of information	Share of Households with internet: 85.1% Number of households without internet: 51,895 Number of Public Libraries: 23
Equitable distribution of resources	Percentage of Persons in Poverty: 18
Acceptance of the rights of others	Prohibits Discrimination Based on Gender Identity in Public and Private Employment
Sound Economic Environment	Median Household Income Per Capita: $52,220 Unemployment Rate: 3.7
Well-functioning Government	Standard & Poor's: AA- Moody's: Aa2 Fitch: AA-

Austin, Texas

Population	790,390
High levels of human capital	High school graduate or higher, percent of persons age 25 year+: 87.5 Bachelor's degree or higher, percent of persons age 25 years +: 46.9
Free flow of information	Share of Households with internet: 85.1% Number of households without internet: 51,895 Number of Public Libraries: 23
Equitable distribution of resources	Percentage of Persons in Poverty: 18
Acceptance of the rights of others	Prohibits Discrimination Based on Gender Identity in Public and Private Employment
Sound Economic Environment	Median Household Income Per Capita: $34,015 Unemployment Rate: 3.7
Well-functioning Government	Standard & Poor's: AAA Moody's: Aa1 Fitch: (N/A)

San Diego, California

Population	1,307,402
High levels of human capital	High school graduate or higher, percent of persons age 25 year+: 87.3% Bachelor's degree or higher, percent of persons age 25 years +: 43%
Free flow of information	Share of Households with internet: 88% Number of households without internet: 57,625 Number of Public Libraries: 36
Equitable distribution of resources	Percentage of Persons in Poverty: 15.4
Acceptance of the rights of others	Prohibits Discrimination Based on Gender Identity in Public and Private Employment
Sound Economic Environment	Median Household Income Per Capita: $33,902 Unemployment Rate: 4.2
Well-functioning Government	Standard & Poor's: A Moody's: A2 Fitch: A+

Charlotte, North Carolina

Population	731,424
High levels of human capital	High school graduate or higher, percent of persons age 25 year+: 88.4% Bachelor's degree or higher, percent of persons age 25 years +: 41.3%
Free flow of information	Share of Households with internet: 82% Number of households without internet: 53,926 Number of Public Libraries: 21
Equitable distribution of resources	Percentage of Persons in Poverty: 16.8
Acceptance of the rights of others	Does Not Prohibit Discrimination Based on Gender Identity in Public and Private Employment
Sound Economic Environment	Median Household Income Per Capita: $32,254 Unemployment Rate: 4.7
Well-functioning Government	Standard & Poor's: AAA Moody's: Aaa Fitch: AAA

Comparison to U.S. Peace Index Report

The top twenty cities differ from the Metropolitan U.S. Peace Index Report. The indicators used for the negative peace index were: homicides, violent crime, incarceration rate, police employees, and small arms. Below, in order, are the top twenty cities for the U.S. Peace Index Report:

1	Cambridge-Newton-Framingham, MA
2	Edison-New Brunswick- NJ
3	Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA
4	Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI
5	Peabody, MA
6	Providence-New Bedford-Fall River RI-MA
7	Lake County-Kenosha County, IL-WI
8	Nassau-Suffolk, NY
9	Salt Lake City, UT
10	Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA
11	Warren-Troy-Farmington Hills, MI
12	Tacoma, WA
13	Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT
14	Camden, NJ
15	Raleigh-Cary, NC
16	San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA
17	Pittsburgh, PA
18	Santa Ana-Anaheim-Irvine, CA
19	Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN
20	Phoenix-Mesa-Glendale, AZ

Table 6.1 compares the top twenty cities on both the U.S. Peace Index and the Municipal Positive Peace Index.

Table 6.1 U.S. Peace Index and Municipal Positive Peace Rankings

Negative Peace Ranking 2012	Top 20 Cities	Municipal Positive Peace Ranking
1	San Jose, CA	4
2	Phoenix, AZ	10
3	Columbus, OH	7
4	San Diego, CA	3
5	Austin, TX	2
6	Fort Worth, TX	8
7	Dallas, TX	8
8	San Francisco, CA	1
9	New York City, NY	6
10	San Antonio, TX	9
11	Philadelphia, PA	11
12	Chicago, IL	5
13	Charlotte, NC	3
14	Los Angeles, CA	8
15	Jacksonville, FL	12
16	Houston, TX	11
20	Detroit, MI	14
N/A	Indianapolis, IN	13
N/A	El Paso, TX	15
N/A	Memphis, TN	12

The U.S. Peace Index did not include Indianapolis, El Paso, or Memphis in their study. Based off of both studies, San Jose, CA is the most peaceful city ranking number one on the U.S. Peace Index and number five on the Municipal Positive Peace Index. San Jose received perfect scores on Community Relations, Equitable Distribution of

Resources, and a Well-functioning government. Based off the high rankings on both lists, San Jose has institutions in place to establish both positive and negative peace.

Positive Peace research is still a relatively unexplored field of study, and the research from this municipal positive peace index would be a starting point for future research in the field of positive peace.

Bibliography

Anderson, K. (2003). Is There Still a Sound Legal Basis: The Freedom of Information Act in the Post-9/11 World. *Ohio St. LJ*, *64*, 1605.

Armstrong, C. L. (2011). Providing a clearer view: An examination of transparency on local government websites. *Government Information Quarterly*, *28*(1), 11-16.

Austin City Budget

https://assets.austintexas.gov/budget/1617/downloads/Approved_Volume_1_FINAL.pdf

Austin Public Library

http://library.austintexas.gov/locations

Bailey, W. C. (1984). Poverty, inequality, and city homicide rates. Criminology, 22(4), 531-550

Bates, T. (2006). The urban development potential of black-owned businesses. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, *72*(2), 227-237.

Bönisch, A. (1981). Elements of the modern concept of peace. Journal of Peace Research, 18(2), 165-173.

Boulding, K. E. (1990). Future directions in conflict and peace studies. In Conflict: Readings in management and resolution (pp. 35-47). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Brantmeier, E. J. (2011). Toward mainstreaming critical peace education in US teacher education. Critical pedagogy in the 21st century: A new generation of scholars, 349-375.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. Local Area Unemployment Statistics.

https://www.bls.gov/web/metro/laummtrk.htm

Chang, E. T., & Diaz-Veizades, J. (1999). *Ethnic peace in the American city: Building community in Los Angeles and beyond*. NYU Press.

Charlotte City Budget
http://charlottenc.gov/mfs/budget/Documents/FY2017%20Strategic%20Operating%20Plan.pdf

Charlotte Public Library https://www.cmlibrary.org/branches

Chicago City Budget
https://www.cityofchicago.org/content/dam/city/depts/obm/supp_info/2017%20Budget/2017BudgetOverviewFinal.pdf

Chicago Public Library https://chipublib.bibliocommons.com/locations

Christie, D. J., Tint, B. S., Wagner, R. V., & Winter, D. D. (2008). Peace psychology for a peaceful world. American Psychologist, 63(6), 540.

Cities and Counties with Non-Discrimination Ordinances that Include Gender Identity

http://www.hrc.org/resources/cities-and-counties-with-non-discrimination-ordinances-that-include-gender

Cohen, P. N. (1998). Black concentration effects on black-white and gender inequality: Multilevel analysis for US metropolitan areas. *Social Forces*, *77*(1), 207-229.

Columbus City Budget https://www.columbus.gov/finance/financial-management-group/budget-management/2017-Proposed-Operating-Budget/

Columbus Public Library http://www.columbuslibrary.org/locations

Conklin, J. E., & Jacobson, J. (2003). Why crime rates fell. Crime and Justice International, 19(72), 17-20.

Cordner, G. W. (1989). Police agency size and investigative effectiveness. Journal of Criminal Justice, 17(3), 145-155

Dallas City Budget https://dallascityhall.com/Budget/proposed1617/FY17-ProposedBudgetBook.pdf

Dallas Public Library https://dallaslibrary2.org/hours.php

Davenport, T. C. (2010). Public accountability and political participation: Effects of a face-to-face feedback intervention on voter turnout of public housing residents. Political Behavior, 32(3), 337-368.

Data.Gov U.S. City Open Data Census. http://us-city.census.okfn.org/

https://www.data.gov/cities/open-data-census/

Dawes, S. S. (2010). Stewardship and usefulness: Policy principles for information-based transparency. *Government Information Quarterly*, *27*(4), 377-383

Detroit City Budget
http://www.detroitmi.gov/Portals/0/docs/budgetdept/City%20of%20Detroit%20FY%202015-17%20Triennial%20Budget.pdf

Detroit Public Library http://www.detroitpubliclibrary.org/branch-locator

Diaz, T. (2013). *The last gun: How changes in the gun industry are killing Americans and what it will take to stop it*. New Press, The.

Diehl, P. (2016). Thinking about Peace Negative Terms versus Positive Outcomes. Strategic Studies Quarterly.

Diel, P. F. (2016). Exploring Peace: Looking Beyond War and Negative Peace. International Studies Quarterly. 1-10

Doan, P. L. (2007). Queers in the American city: Transgendered perceptions of urban space. Gender, Place and Culture, 14(1), 57-74.

El Paso City Budget
https://www.elpasotexas.gov/~/media/files/coep/office%20of%20management%20and%20budget/fy17%20budget/fy17%20preliminary%20book.ashx?la=en

Ft. Worth City Budget http://fortworthtexas.gov/budget/fy2017/general-fund/

Ft. Worth Public Library http://fortworthtexas.gov/library/branches/

Frey, B. S., & Goette, L. (1998). Does the popular vote destroy civil rights?. American Journal of Political Science, 42(4), 1343-1348.

Galor, O., & Tsiddon, D. (1997). The distribution of human capital and economic growth. *Journal of Economic Growth*, *2*(1), 93-124.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. Journal of peace research, 6(3), 167-191.

Galtung, J. (1985). Twenty-five years of peace research: ten challenges and some responses. *Journal of Peace Research* 22.2, 141-158.

Gamble, B. S. (1997). Putting civil rights to a popular vote. *American Journal of Political Science*, 245-269.

Gay, W. C. (1999). The language of war and peace. Encyclopedia of violence, peace, and conflict, 2, 303-312.

Gladwell, M., & Shirky, C. (2011). From innovation to revolution: Do social media make protests possible?. *Foreign Affairs*, *90*(2), 153.

Gleditsch, N. P., Nordkvelle, J., & Strand, H. (2014). Peace research–Just the study of war?. *Journal of Peace Research*, *51*(2), 145-158.

Graham, F. S., Gooden, S. T., & Martin, K. J. (2014). Navigating the Transparency–Privacy Paradox in Public Sector Data Sharing. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 0275074014561116.

Green, G. P., Tigges, L. M., & Diaz, D. (1999). Racial and ethnic differences in job-search strategies in Atlanta, Boston, and Los Angeles. *Social science quarterly*, 263-278

Gupta, R. (2007). Privatization v. the public's right to know. *News Media & the Law*, *31*(3), 1-7.

Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2001). Philosophy of peace education in a postmodern era. Educational Theory, 51(3), 315-336.

Harris Jr, R. L. (1999). The rise of the black middle class. The World & I, 14(2), 40.

Houston City Budget
http://houstontx.gov/budget/17budadopt/FY2017_Adopted_Budget.pdf

Houston Public Library http://houstonlibrary.org/find-it/find-library-location

Huff, C. R., & Stahura, J. M. (1980). Police employment and suburban crime. Criminology, 17(4), 461-470.

Huffman, M. L., & Torres, L. (2001). Job search methods: Consequences for gender-based earnings inequality. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *58*(1), 127-141

Indianapolis City Budget
http://www.indy.gov/eGov/City/OFM/Finances/City/Documents/2017/2017%20ADOPTED%20Budget%20Book.pdf

Indianapolis Public Library http://www.indypl.org/locations

Institute of Economics and Peace (2012). United States Peace Index. Retrieved from http://static.visionofhumanity.org/sites/default/files/2012-United-States-Peace-Index-Report_1.pdf

Institute of Economics and Peace (2015). Global Peace Index. Retrieved from http://economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Global-Peace-Index-Report-2015_0.pdf

Institute of Economics and Peace (2015).Positive Peace Report. Retrieved fromhttp://economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Positive-Peace-Report-2015.pdf

Internet Connection Household Adoption Rates

http://www.governing.com/gov-data/city-internet-connection-household-adoption-rates-data.html

Ionescu, L. (2016). E-Government and Social Media as Effective Tools in Controlling Corruption in Public Administration. *Economics, Management, and Financial Markets*, *11*(1), 66-72.

Jaeger, P. T., & Bertot, J. C. (2010). Transparency and technological change: Ensuring equal and sustained public access to government information. *Government Information Quarterly*, *27*(4), 371-376.

Jacksonville City Budget http://www.coj.net/departments/finance/docs/budget/fy16-17-annual-budget.aspx

Jacksonville Public Library http://www.jaxpubliclibrary.org/sites/default/files/Hours-FY2015-16.pdf

Kang, N., & Kwak, N. (2003). A multilevel approach to civic participation individual length of residence, neighborhood residential stability, and their interactive effects with media use. *Communication Research*, *30*(1), 80-106.

Kawachi, I. (2002). Income inequality and economic residential segregation. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, *56*(3), 165-166

Kearns, A., & Forrest, R. (2000). Social cohesion and multilevel urban governance. Urban studies, 37(5/6), 995.

Los Angeles Police Department Budget

http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/112415/BUDGET.pdf

Los Angeles Public Library

https://www.lapl.org/branches

Lobmayer, P., & Wilkinson, R. G. (2002). Inequality, residential segregation by income, and mortality in US cities. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, *56*(3), 183-187.

Matthews, P. (2015). Social media, community development and social capital. *Community Development Journal*, bsv040

Memphis City Budget

http://www.memphistn.gov/Portals/0/pdf_forms/FY2017_adopted_OP/GFOA_Section.pdf

Memphis Public Library

http://www.memphislibrary.org/about/locations/

McDermott, P. (2010). Building open government. *Government Information Quarterly*, *27*(4), 401-413.

Miller, M., Hemenway, D., & Azrael, D. (2007). State-level homicide victimization rates in the US in relation to survey measures of household firearm ownership, 2001–2003. *Social science & medicine*, *64*(3), 656-664.

Moore, J. (1996). Bearing the burden: How incarceration weakens inner-city communities. The unintended consequences of incarceration, 67-90

Musterd, S., & Ostendorf, W. (Eds.). (2013). *Urban segregation and the welfare state: Inequality and exclusion in western cities*. Routledge.

New York Police Department Budget http://council.nyc.gov/budget/wp-content/uploads/sites/54/2016/06/nypd.pdf

New York Public Library https://www.nypl.org/about/locations

Philadelphia City Budget
http://www.phila.gov/finance/pdfs/MayorsFiscalYear2017OperatingBudgetBookII.
pdf

Philadelphia Public Libraries https://libwww.freelibrary.org/locations/

Phoenix City Budget
https://www.phoenix.gov/budgetsite/Budget%20Books/Detail%20Budget%20201
6-17.pdf

Phoenix Public Library https://www.phoenixpubliclibrary.org/locations-hours

Piotrowski, S. J., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2007). Citizen attitudes toward transparency in
local government. *The American Review of Public Administration*, *37*(3), 306-
323.

Portney, K. (2005). Civic engagement and sustainable cities in the United States. *Public
Administration Review*, *65*(5), 579-591.

Portney, K. E., & Berry, J. M. (1997). Mobilizing Minority Communities Social Capital
and Participation in Urban Neighborhoods. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *40*(5),
632-644.

Portney, K. E., & Berry, J. M. (2010). Participation and the pursuit of sustainability in US
cities. *Urban Affairs Review*, *46*(1), 119-139.

Raphael, S. (2014). How Do We Reduce Incarceration Rates While Maintaining Public
Safety? *Criminology & Public Policy*, *13*(4), 579-597.Pelfrey, W. V. (2007). Local
law enforcement terrorism prevention efforts: A state level case study. *Journal of
Criminal Justice*, *35*(3), 313-321.

Read, H. (2012). *Education for peace* (Vol. 25). Routledge.

Reardon, B. A. (1988). Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global
responsibility. Teachers College Press, 1234 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, NY
10027

Saint-Paul, G., & Verdier, T. (1993). Education, democracy and growth. *Journal of
development Economics*, *42*(2), 399-407.

Sanctuary Cities, USA http://ojjpac.org/sanctuary.asp

San Antonio City Budget
https://www.sanantonio.gov/portals/0/files/budget/fy2017/FY2017FinalAdoptedBu
dget.pdf

San Antonio Public Library http://mysapl.org/Visit/Locations#188472014-a-z-library-
locations-list

San Diego City Budget
    https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/fy17_adopted_budget_-_full.pdf

San Diego Public Library https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/liblocation-rev20160713.pdf

San Francisco City Budget
    http://sfmayor.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/mayor/budget/SF_Budget_Book_FY_2015_16_and_2016_17_Final_WEB.pdf

San Francisco Public Library http://sfpl.org/pdf/libraries/sfpl421.pdf

San Jose City Budget http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/61771

San Jose Public Library https://www.sjpl.org/locations

Shields, Patricia M. Ed. (2017). *Jane Addams: Progressive Pioneer of Peace, Philosophy, Sociology,Social Work, and Public Administration*. New York: Springer

Shields, Patricia (2017). An Introduction to the Life of Jane Addams. In Shields, Patricia M. Ed. (2017). *Jane Addams: Progressive Pioneer of Peace, Philosophy, Sociology,Social Work, and Public Administration*. pp. 3 – 15. New York: Springer

Shields, Patricia (2017), Jane Addams Peace Activist and Peace Theorist. In Shields, Patricia M. Ed. (2017). *Jane Addams: Progressive Pioneer of Peace, Philosophy, Sociology,Social Work, and Public Administration*. pp. 31-42. New York: Springer

Shields, Patricia and Rissler, Grant (2016). Positive Peace: Exploring the Roots and Potential for Public Administration. *Global Virtue Ethics Review*. 7(3), 1-15.

Shields, Patricia. (2016). Building the Fabric of Peace: Jane Addams and Peaceweaving. *Global Virtue Ethics Review* 7(3), 21-33.

Shields, Patricia M. and Joseph Soeters (2017). Peaceweaving: Jane Addams, Positive Peace, and Public Administration. *American Review of Public Administration* 1– 17.

Shields, P., & Rangarajan, N. (2013). *A Playbook for Research Methods: Integrating Conceptual Frameworks and Project Management*, Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Shields, P. & Tajalli, H. (2006) Intermediate Theory: The missing link in successful student scholarship. *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 12(3), 313-334.

Shields, P. & Whetsell, T (2017) Public Administration Methodology: A Pragmatic Perspective. In Eds Raadshelders, J and Stillman R. Foundations of Public Administration. (75-92) New York: Melvin and Leig.

Shirky, C. (2011). The political power of social media: Technology, the public sphere, and political change. *Foreign affairs*, 28-41

Singer, S. I. (2014). *America's Safest City: Delinquency and Modernity in Suburbia*. NYU Press

Stewart, P. E. (2015). You Moved Up, Did You Forget Us?: The Influence of African American Intra-familial Social Mobility on Extended Family Relationships. *Journal of African American Studies*, *19*(2), 214-232.

Swanson, C. B. (2008). Cities in Crisis: A Special Analytic Report on High School Graduation. *Editorial Projects in Education*.

Tat-Kei Ho, A. (2002). Reinventing local governments and the e-government initiative. *Public administration review*, *62*(4), 434-444.

Thorp, R., Stewart, F., & Heyer, A. (2005). When and how far is group formation a route out of chronic poverty? *World development*, *33*(6), 907-920

Uchida, C. D., & King, W. R. (2002). Police employee data: Elements and validity. Justice Research and Policy, 4(1-2), 11-19.

U.S. Census Bond Rating

https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/2010/compendia/statab/130ed/tables/11s0444.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau Top 20 Cities, Highest Ranking Cities. 2010. https://www.census.gov/dataviz/visualizations/007/508.php#

Vieraitis, Lynne M., Sarah Britto, and Tomislav V. Kovandzic. "The Impact of Women's Status and Gender Inequality on Female Homicide Victimization Rates Evidence From US Counties." Feminist Criminology 2.1 (2007): 57-73.

Villazor, R. C. (2008). What is a Sanctuary? *SMUL Rev.*, *61*, 133.

Wiberg, H. (1981). JPR 1964-1980—What Have We Learnt about Peace? Journal of Peace Research, 18(2), 111-148.

Wilson, D. (1993). Everyday life, spatiality and inner city disinvestment in a US city. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 17(4), 578-594.

Wilson, D., & Grammenos, D. (2000). Spatiality and urban redevelopment movements. *Urban Geography*, *21*(4), 361-370.

Wood, R. L. (1997). Social Capital and Political Culture God Meets Politics in the Inner City. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *40*(5), 595-605.

Appendix A

Summary Data by City

Ranking	Top 20 Cities	Community Relations	Government Transparency	High levels of human capital	Free Flow of information	Equitable distribution of resources	Acceptance of the rights of others	Sound Economic Environment	Well-functioning government	Overall Score
1	San Francisco, CA	6	5	5	4	5	5	10	4	44
2	Austin, TX	5	5	5	3.5	4	4	8	5	39.5
3	San Diego, CA	5	5	5	3	4	4	7	3	36
4	San Jose, CA	5	3	4	3	5	3	8	5	36
5	Charlotte, NC	6	3	5	3.5	4	3	6	5	35.5
6	Chicago, IL	5	5	4	4	3	4.5	4	4	33.5
7	New York City, NY	3	5	4	2	3	5	6	4	32
8	Columbus, OH	6	2	4	4	3	2.5	4	5	30.5
9	Fort Worth, TX	5	1	3	3	4	4.5	6	4	30.5
10	Dallas, TX	5	3	2	3.5	3	4	6	4	30.5
11	Los Angeles, CA	3	5	2	3.5	3	5	4	4	29.5
12	San Antonio, TX	2	3	3	4	4	3	5	5	29
13	Phoenix, AZ	5	2	3	2	3	2.5	5	5	27.5
14	Philadelphia, PA	2	5	3	4.5	2	2.5	4	2	25
15	Houston, TX	2	2	2	3.5	3	4.5	4	4	25
16	Jacksonville, FL	1	2	3	3.5	4	2	5	4	24.5
17	Indianapolis, IN	1	1	3	4	3	2	5	5	24
18	Memphis, TN	1	1	3	4.5	2	5	3	4	23.5
19	Detroit, MI	5	2	1	5	1	5	2	1	22
20	El Paso, TX	1	1	1	3.5	3	3.5	3	4	20