



University for Peace



Number 13 – July 2017

## Peace: A Peace Practitioner's Guide

Prof. Dr. mult. Johan Galtung

### *Abstract*

In this edition of Ideas for Peace, Prof. Johan Galtung outlines peace concepts that are applicable across history, geography and levels of human organization. The encyclopedic entry presents typologies for peace, violence, underlying contradictions- the faultlines that drive conflict, and interventions. The practice that stems from the theoretical understanding presented in the paper is reinforced by an eclectic tapestry of cultural understanding and practice from around the world. The proposed framework for understanding the dynamics of peace and conflict sets forth the path to the ultimate goal- peace by peaceful means- via conflict transformation, healing past traumas, and building cooperation for the future. The essay is a crash course in the work of one of the most profound thinkers of the field of peace studies, and gives a glimpse into his holistic method and approach to conflict transformation.

Ideas for peace



## Peace: A Peace Practitioner's Guide

By Prof. Dr. mult. Johan Galtung\*

Johan Galtung founded the first academic department of Peace Research in 1959. He is considered the founder of the academic discipline of peace studies. He is also the founder of the mediation network *TRANSCEND International* as well as the rector of its all online *TRANSCEND Peace University*. Prof. Galtung has published more than 1500 articles and book chapters, over 484 Editorials for *TRANSCEND Media Service*, and more than 170 books on peace and related issues, of which more than 40 have been translated to other languages, including *50 Years: 100 Peace and Conflict Perspectives* (2008) & *The Art of Peace – Global Peace Studies 101: Theory and Practice* (2017) published by *TRANSCEND University Press*.

*The opinions presented in this academic paper, in addition to the analyses and interpretations herein contained, constitute the exclusive responsibility of its authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the University for Peace or the institutions it is affiliated with.*

*Las opiniones que se presentan en este trabajo, así como los análisis e interpretaciones que en él contienen, son responsabilidad exclusiva de sus autores y no reflejan necesariamente los puntos de vista de UPAZ ni de las instituciones a las cuales se encuentran vinculados.*



**P.O. BOX** 138-6100, San José, Costa Rica  
**TEL** (506) 2205 9000  
**FAX** (506) 2249 1929  
**WEB** [www.upeace.org](http://www.upeace.org)

## Peace: A Peace Practitioner's Guide

### Peace - definition

Peace concepts should be applicable across history, geography and levels of human organization, from inner peace to civilizations, not only to state systems. They should serve not only thought and speech, but also be indicative of action. They should reflect positive peace as a relation of cooperation and harmony, and negative peace as a relation of absence of violence; not only the absence of direct, intended violence of acts of commission, but also the absence of indirect structural violence by acts of omission. If not, we accept as peace flagrant inequality, like accepting as healthy anybody with no overt symptoms like pain or fever.

This formula for peace by peaceful means may serve as a basis<sup>1</sup>:

$$\text{PEACE} = \frac{\text{EQUITY} \times \text{HARMONY}}{\text{TRAUMA} \times \text{CONFLICT}}$$

There are two factors in the numerator: the more the better. There are two factors leading to direct and structural violence--the negations of negative peace--in the denominator: the less the better.

And four tasks, to be elaborated later, to build peace, all requiring training, skills, education:

- [1] Constructing Equity: cooperation for mutual and equal benefit;
- [2] Constructing Harmony: emotional resonance in the daoist sense of enjoying the joy and suffer the suffering of Other;
- [3] Reconciling Past Trauma: clearing the past, acknowledging wrongs, wishing them undone, dialogues about why and how, creating a future.
- [4] Resolving Present Conflict: making incompatible, contradictory goals more compatible, softening negative attitudes and behavior.

### Examples of the four tasks:

**For equity**: the 1950-1958-1992 French-German, then EEC, then EU European cooperation on reasonably equal term; threatened now (2012) by the economic inequality between Germany and the EU periphery.

**For harmony**: expanding zones of emotional resonance from villages to countries to regions, often limited by borders of civilizations.

**For trauma reconciliation**: the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa, and the German rewriting of textbooks.

**For conflict resolution:** social capitalism, welfare states as a new reality, with Capital and State negotiating a mixed economy.<sup>2</sup>

This concept of peace by peaceful means is contested by force- and state-oriented peace narratives from above:

- \* Problem: There are dangerous and unruly classes and countries;
- \* If let loose life becomes brutish, nasty and short for all;
- \* Remedy: Vertical economic-military-political-cultural pax from above
- \* and horizontally balance of power, si vis pacem parabellum.<sup>3</sup>

The formula above challenges that with a countertrend narrative:

- \* Problem: There are traumas to reconcile and conflicts to solve
- \* There are cooperation and harmony projects to be built
- \* Remedy: Solve traumas and conflicts equitably for negative peace
- \* Construct cooperation and harmony projects for positive peace

For other perspectives on peace we may move eastward, beyond the Western pax and balance of power, beyond the more justice-oriented Hebrew-Arabic shalom-sala'am and the Hindu inner peace, shanti, to the Buddhist focus on ahimsa, nonviolence, and on sentient life, guided by the emotions of dukkha-sukha<sup>4</sup>, suffering-fulfillment, and the Daoist focus on yin/yang dialectics, and on relations more than on actors. There are species and individual lives, but lives are related, coupled together for good and bad, locked into each other. Conflict-harmony, violence-peace all relate people, for bad and good, dukkha-sukha, for suffering-fulfillment. Individuals are not peace; relations may be. The coupling, the relation is basic, passing through the actors. Negative peace reduces the suffering, dukkha; positive peace increases the fulfillment, sukha. They are generic terms, so also peace.

From daoism we fetch an image of the harmonious coupling:

“Share in the suffering of others. Delight in the joy of others.--View the good fortune of others as your good fortune. View the losses of others as your own loss.”

Or from the Zulu ubuntu, “I exist because you do, we are in each other.” Both define a strong spiritual coupling in a we-culture. The unit of suffering and joy is a we, not two separate I's.

Compare this to the Golden Rule, positive (or negative): Do (do not) unto others what you (do not) like them to do unto you.

The subject for sukha, and dukkha avoidance, is an individual “you”; the ethical budget is individual I- culture, not collective we-culture. In addition, be careful: “their tastes may be different” (GB Shaw).

The same applies to the Kantian “categorical imperative”<sup>5</sup>, “Handle so dass die Maxime deines Willens jederzeit zugleich als Prinzip einer allgemeinen Gesetzgebung gelten könne.” This is a traffic rule for individual co-existence: generalizability implies validity. Kant wanted a multilateral normative

umbrella, not only Golden Rule bilateralism. Both are useful rules for positive co-existence in an I-culture, but they do not produce the union of a we-culture. Or the Mo Tzu universal love as opposed to partiality,<sup>6</sup> long before the universalism of christianity, Kant, or human rights.

With no grading, just sukha, dukkha and a neutral “indifferent”, and two actors X and Y coupled together, we get these combinations:

#### A Basic Paradigm for Peace and Violence

Y in <u>sukha</u>	structural violence		positive peace
Y indifferent		negative peace	
Y in <u>dukkha</u>	direct violence war		structural violence
	X in <u>dukkha</u>	X indifferent	X in <u>sukha</u>

Being well together by fulfilling each other is positive peace; with MAB, mutual assured bliss, as the extreme. Inflicting suffering on each other is typical of direct violence and war, with MAD, mutual assured destruction, as the extreme. One doing well and the other doing badly is typical of structural violence. And neither fulfilling each other, nor inflicting suffering, is typical of negative peace.

Typologies serve to define the basic problem of moving from the bottom left to the top right. There are two traps on the way: the structural violence of economic exploitation justified by cultural violence-- economy and culture by some called “soft power”--and the neither-nor of negative peace, like ceasefire- armistice. The action-indicative peace formula shows the ways: reduce the dukkha in the denominator, increase the sukha in the numerator. If past traumas and present conflicts are not mediated, negative peace will be lost and with it peace in general. And unless the coupling is not equitable and harmonious so will positive peace.

Peace and related concepts. This peace discourse can then be tested for its ability to accommodate ten related concepts.

Security is easy: anything but the bottom left, compatible with inequity as long as there is no effort to change that coupling--for instance, the division of labor--by violence. Security translates into stability, status quo, law and order. Those who benefit from inequity generally favor that concept. Positive peace, with equity, is

suspect in their eyes as a doubly revolutionary idea, both equality and a togetherness close to fusion like in a good marriage, community. Absence of positive peace opens for freedom, for exploitation, and for freedom to exploit; positive peace sets limits to that.

How does the Japanese concept of *kyosei*<sup>7</sup>, conviviality, fit into this? Maybe as positive peace, but with less emphasis on equity? As mutual *sukha*, but not necessarily equally much *sukha*? There is much of that in the classical construction of the Japanese company.

What kind of peace do we find in Article 9 of the Japanese peace constitution? Anything but participation in offensive war; no joint projects or communities, like an East Asian community, no equity. The preamble mentions trade, but Japanese trade is neither in theory nor in practice known for equity. The understanding of peace is very low.

Human security is more problematic. "Human" has positive connotations, but "security" also has the negative connotations above. Thus, "national security" conveys an image of a hedgehog turning inward, with non-inviting quills outward, attending to the inside at the neglect of the excluded outside. But inside seven types of human security may be met: food, health, environment, personal, economic, community, political security.<sup>8</sup> But there is no *kyo*, con, sym, co-creation with others at the same level. That is where "mutuality and equality" enters, like in the mutual and equal benefit of the panchshila of Zhou Enlai and Nehru for China-India in 1954.

How about the military, extending a violent arm to violent arms? Depends on how far. If only within the state the arms are defensive of Self, if also outside they are offensive, violent to Other. Even if not used the threat of use is direct psychological violence to the mind of Other as fear; and to the spirit of both by impeding projects. Purely defensive defense neither offends nor provokes. Not violence, nor positive peace, but the negative peace of mutual security.

How about justice? There are criminal and social justice; within the former punitive and restorative justice and within the latter distributive and equitative justice. Which one(s) do we mean?

Under punitive justice an actor is detained and arraigned into court for adjudication. If guilty, punishment follows; if not, not.

Under restorative justice an actor who has broken a law will be attempted restored to society, for instance through "community work".

Under distributive justice the focus is on "equality" for actors in a social or world structure as equal opportunity; on no correlation with gender etc., on low dispersion, on lifting the social bottom up.

Under equitative justice the focus is on pattern of interaction, on making the structure so as to generate mutual and equal benefit.

What are the implications of all four for peace?

Punitive justice, if seen as victor's justice, will not heal traumas, solve conflicts, or build projects. Restorative justice may help reconciliation, solve conflicts and open for projects.

Distributive justice promotes equality between parties which in turn may facilitate dialogue, empathy, nonviolence, equity, harmony.

Equitative justice builds peace directly into the structure.

Punitive justice may prolong violent struggle to deny the other side victor's justice, and be counter-productive when used against nonviolent struggle. The other three may be peace-productive.

How about rule of law? Western law, like the Ten Commandments for in-group life, is strong on forbidding bad acts of commission, but permissive of acts of omission, opening for huge structural violence; justified by cultural violence, and nobody doing anything for justice. It is weak on prescribing the good acts of commission. Thus, "Thou shalt not lie" changes character when adding "but share generously your truths with others". For world rule through world law a more positive rule of law is needed, with rewards, not only punishment. Moreover, social ills like slavery and colonialism, were not so much outlawed as overtaken by other structures, some of them liberating.

How about human rights? Better, but to the individualist Western focus a focus on collective, peoples' rights has to be added. Like the right of villages to survive as human habitats, the right of traditional crafts to survive, and the rights of clans and tribes to be recognized as collective actors. The right of (some) nations to (some) self-determination is not enough. More balance between individual and collective rights is needed for the human rights to serve, as they one day probably will, as a world constitution.

How about democracy? Fine, but add to the Western individualist one person-one vote majority rule, preceded by debate to win that majority, dialogue to consensus, more satisfactory to the we-cultures in which the human majority live. And add a democratic UN without the oligarchic veto, with an elected UN Peoples' Assembly, using the present member states as constituencies. Some may prefer debates-voting, others may prefer dialogue-consensus, opening for a both-and.

How about ho'o pono pono? Traveling east from Buddhism and Daoism leads us to Polynesia and this ingenious reconciliation and resolution method, based on acts of omission. The focus is not only on individuals, and on punitive and restorative justice for the perpetrator and compensation for the victim. It is on the community in which they are embedded as the deeper victim. Why did it not prevent acts of commission, violence, from happening? Because of too many acts of omission, too many doing nothing to prevent it. These acts are then identified, and turned into positive acts of commission.

There are many peace-related concepts. The purpose of such exercises is to test a concept through its capacity to identify what there is of peace in a concept, and what is missing.

Massive Category Killing as **summum malum**. Any concept can be better understood contrasted with its negations. The Black Plague stimulated health studies, and 20th century genocides stimulated peace studies. We are moved by contrasts. But not only genocide, also MAD, the mutual assured destruction, by the logic of the East-West cold war protracted conflict, and its accompanying nuclear arms race. Possibly because a mutual relation, the arms race, explained it as a harmful objective phenomenon, not as for the shoa as an evil perpetrator against an innocent victim.

For another perspective let us start with some definitions:

- \* Definition: Genocide = Massive Category Killing, MCK, meaning by
- \* Massive = All of a kind available, till exhaustion-saturation
- \* Category = The same ascribed or achieved characteristics
- \* Killing = Avoidable life-deprivation, by commission or omission

“There is no good German but a dead German”, or words like that, are typical of wars. The target is “all of a kind”, defined by an ascribed (ius sanguinis or ius solis) or achieved (immigration) attribute. The result can be massive air raids year after year. Or massive ethnic cleansing, year after year. By the MCK definition both are genocide, and the Lemkin<sup>9</sup> focus on genus, people, permits that. But the massive killing of Jews, was done by the losers of WW II; the massive killing of Germans by the victors. So was ethnic cleansing of Moors and Jews in Spain from 1492, but not Serbian acts in Yugoslavia. “Massive category killing” would cover all the cases.

But there is more to it. The “category” is a set of humans, but the violence is a relation, and so is a fault-line between categories:

- \* Definition: Fault-line = fundamentum divisionis between categories.

There are many fault-lines, defining at least two categories. Across fault-lines there may be massive structural violence: one category systematically, over time, exploiting, repressing, alienating another. And then the sparks of massive actor violence, across the fault-line. The concept of “genocide” rules out the effect, but not the cause.

This distinction brings up definitions for ready application:

- \* Actor violence = Intended, actors hurting-harming-killing;
- \* Structural violence = Unintended, structures hurting-harming (exploitation, repression, alienation);
- \* Cultural violence = Cultures legitimizing either violence.

Which are the fault-lines where such categories apply? Eight are analytically indispensable: humans/nature, men/women, middle-aged/young/old, white/colored, "normal"/deviants, high/low class (four types of class: economic, military, political, cultural; generally powerful vs powerless), ruling/ruled nations, center/periphery states.

If we combine the fault-lines with the two forms of violence, direct or actor violence, and indirect or structural violence (cultural violence is not itself violence, but very important as it serves to justify the other two), we get:

### **A Basic Paradigm for Massive Category Killing**

No.	FAULT-LINES	A: ACTOR VIOLENCE	S: STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE
[1]	NATURE	slaughter of "beasts, savages, wilderness"	depletion pollution
[2]	GENDER	killing women: abortion, infanticide, witch-burning	patriarchy as prison of women, putting them "in their place"
[3]	GENERATION	<u>Privileging the</u> abortion Euthanasia	<u>middle-aged</u> schools as ghetto "homes" as ghetto
[4]	RACE	<u>Controlling dangerous</u> eradication Slavery	<u>races</u> colonialism slavery
[5]	DEVIANCE -criminal -mental -somatic	<u>Controlling dangerous</u> euthanasia euthanasia euthanasia	<u>persons</u> exclusion exclusion exclusion
[6]	CLASS - military - economic - political - cultural	<u>Controlling dangerous</u> Elimination	<u>classes</u>  exploitation-body repression-mind alienation-spirit
[7]	NATION CULTURE IDEOLOGY	genocide narrowly defined	state as prison of nations ruled by "majority"
[8]	STATE COUNTRY TERRITORY	war (killing for food, sacrifice, conquest)	imperialism isolating "pariah" states

Here are sixteen types of massive category killing by pure logic, not by ideology. To focus on 7A only is selective, ideological.

The summum malum is the total table that peace is up against. 7A is atrocious, but 6-7-8S, massive structural killing of the poorest in ruled nations in periphery countries is worse in numbers. And 2A, killing unborn and newborn girls, has by far outdone 7A.

The focus in the Table is moving over time and depends on who looks, and who turns what eye away. But one factor remains: 1A and 1S against animals may serve subconsciously as training in taking human life, except in cultures (like Buddhism) high on vegetarianism.

The dominant world elite is human, male, middle-aged, white, "normal", powerful, from ruling nations, from center states: today challenged by all their fault-line opposites, including Mother Nature. But the discourse is focused on 7A, with cases like Armenia, Nanjing, Gulag-KZ, shoa, Hiroshima, Indonesia, Cambodia, Rwanda. "Genus" points to that, but the dominant discourse is the discourse of the dominant elites, and that discourse makes actors visible as perpetrators and victims, and structures invisible. The elites themselves are exempt, and any focus on their victims--women, colored etc.--would lead to scrutiny.

To restore law and order they bring perpetrators to "justice", meaning punitive justice--the Tribunals--and staff them themselves. The guilty are punished, even killed, but adjudication also serves to acquit the judges, non-indicted contemporaries, structures, cultures, and future generations. The focus is narrow, sharp on perpetrators.

This dominant discourse legitimizes omitting other foci:

Nature: because animals are seen as soulless, feeling no pain and no bereavement having no families; however, nature as resource is seen as a common concern of humanity, with human-made problems; Gender: because women were seen as born inferior to bear children, as emotional not intellectual, as temptresses, as being of Satan;

Generation: because the old generation has to make way for the next, and the young generation has to wait and first be adequately trained;

Race: because primitives are seen as animals or women, see above;

Deviance: because criminals have excluded themselves--mentally ill are unfit--somaticallly ill are a burden to themselves and society;

Class: because class sorts the fittest from the less fit;

Nation: because some nations are seen as up front in human history, others are parasites, or have to wait, and be adequately trained.

States: because states (except Japan) have the right to war, and wars sort the fittest states to rule the world from the less fit.

There is also cultural violence built into academic disciplines making many of the

16 invisible:

International (actually inter-state) studies covers only 8A, are often structure-blind, like international (actually inter-state) Law; actually best at 6A and 8A, like security studies. Thus, Lemkin's insistence on 7A was at the time a breakthrough, and resisted.

The micro- and meso-level social sciences, psychology-sociology, have made basic contributions studying prejudice and discrimination as cultural and structural violence; but rarely touch the MCK drama.

Peace studies, spanning all levels of human organization and all types of violence and peace, should in principle cover all 16, and stay away from any focus on 7A only (and within 7A from shoa only), at the exclusion of the suffering of other peoples.<sup>10</sup>

This selective approach to violence leads to a selective approach to peace, focused on actor, not structural violence, with a decreasing focus in the order [8]->[7]->[6]->[5]->[4]->[3]->[2]->[1].

Negative Peace: The Absence of Violence. Consider a world with 10 states, meaning 45 pairs. Choose a year, and we find, say, war in two pairs, with one state appearing in both. To classify the year as "belligerent" is a common methodological mistake. In fact there are only 2 wars in a context of 43 pairs in peace. The two wars may lead to a theory of one bully-hegemon and two victims, forgetting that the bully was at peace with 7 states and that the 43 cases of peace may be equally or even more worth understanding.

What kept them at peace, even if only negative peace? The peace formula at work?

Seeing the year as  $43/45 = 96\%$  peaceful and  $4\%$  belligerent, next question: were they at war the whole year? Two pairs 365 days give us 730 pair-days, for all 45 16,200. If at war, say, 460 of them, we are down to only  $2.8\%$  for the whole world and  $97\%$  peace; maybe vulnerable, unsustainable, but peace. At least as passive, peaceful co-existence.

We may then ask: was the whole population in those states personally involved, as sender, receiver, or both, of violence? Or only, say,  $10\%$  of the population on the average for the 460 dyad-days? Or even much less if we count person-pairs rather than state-pairs, and we end up with  $0/00$ 's. We have become too mesmerized by war and blind to the prevalence of peace as the normal, human, condition that we do not even see it. One reason for non-war is non-contact, but why not also count distance, social or spatial, as a paxogenic factor?

We could go on from there and study positive peace, the good things people do to each other in so many pairs, triples etc. and ask how to prevent interaction from turning violent? The formula again?

---

Peace is the general rule for humans. But such errors keep the lie about innate violence, by "human nature" alive, giving us humans a bad name and a worse reputation than humans deserve.<sup>11</sup>

Unsolved conflict has been repeatedly identified as a key cause of violence, and solution as the remedy. Violence is to hurt and harm to the point of incapacitating Other(s); conflict is incompatibility in the means-ends complexes pursued and used by the parties. But, from "Other pursues his goals with his means and impedes me from doing the same" does not follow that "Other stands in my way". What follows is that Other's goals-means stand in the way of my goals-means. A puzzle in search of a solution. There seem to be five approaches.

No. 1, modern war, is waning between states. The destructive power is too high and the invulnerability too low; hence the use of the weapons as state terrorism, unleashing destruction on soft targets that in addition are unable to hit back.

No. 2, guerilla, terrorism, are less lethal but more long-lasting. Said to be asymmetric against No. 1, even with state terrorism added, but asymmetric in favor of whom?<sup>12</sup> Seems to be No. 2, judging from Viêt Nam, Afghanistan, Iraq and other places.

No. 3, negotiation, does not challenge the basic war structure--polarization between two parties-- nor the basic war culture--winning or losing. It is the continuation of war by verbal means, debate, ideally so that the strongest arguments--based on data, values and theory; facts and deductions--can win and define the solution.

No. 4, negative nonviolence, prominent in the Arab world at the time of writing, is the continuation of war by such nonviolent means as non-cooperation and civil disobedience, with a winner and loser. As revolt probably quite effective, but as revolution, changing the system deeply? Probably not, too shallow, too negative.

No. 5, positive nonviolence, conversion, not coercion, engages Other searching for solution, without or with mediator, in a dialogue. They would do mapping of the conflict--who are the parties, what are their goals and means--testing the goals for legitimacy, legal? human rights? basic needs?--and bridging between legitimate goals, searching for a new reality. It calls for peace education in schools, peace journalism in the media, peace in the arts; like No. 1 calls for training to kill, militarized universities, etc.

No. 4 for struggle, and No. 5 for solutions, are normal ways for humans. The others are aberrations, and should be known as such.<sup>13</sup>

Unconiliated trauma; wounds from a conflict, even forgotten, have also been identified as cause of violence. The wounds may cry for release, catharsis; by wounding the perpetrator, known as revenge, or anybody, also known as displaced aggression. Five approaches:<sup>14</sup>

No. 1, revenge according to the classical rule of lex talionis, an eye for an eye, etc., carried out by the victim or by the state;

No. 2, displaced aggression, violence in any direction, also against self-Self. Violence leads to trauma leads to violence leads to trauma ad inf., like family feuds, vendetta, no end, no closure;

No. 3, negotiation, extracting compensation from the perpetrator also in monetary terms.

Superficial, but may lead to some closure;

No. 4 visibility, “see what you have done to me-us”; museums, parks, monuments for traumas already suffered, not new traumas.

No. 5, conciliation, opening for the whole complexity, bringing in the subconscious. If the perpetrator suffers from the trauma of having traumatized the victim, there may be a joint interest in clearing the past for an acceptable, sustainable future, and closure.

No. 5 one way or another is the normal way out for humans. The other four are aberrations, and should be known as such.

Positive peace: the presence of cooperation and harmony.

Level I: Symbiosis = Equity + Harmony. There is cooperation for mutual and equal benefit, and there is emotional resonance. Another term would be active peaceful co-existence, as opposed to the passive peaceful co-existence of negative peace.

Level II: Transcendence: A new actor is born. The parties are still there, but something new has emerged. In the integration language for states they start “talking with one voice”, “having a joint foreign and security policy”, etc. The term often used for Level I is community, confederation (German: Staatenbund); and for Level II the terms are union, federation (German: Bundesstaat).

Transcendence means something above, beyond; among states, as a minimum, multi-state conferences, then a permanent secretariat, a “commission” that gradually becomes more than the sum of the actors.

The process can be formulated as follows:

Negative peace: separate goals, separate means; avoiding violence; Positive peace I: separate goals, shared means-resources;

Positive Peace II: shared goals, shared means-resources.

In cohabitation the parties share their resources but preserve the autonomy of having separate goals.

In a marriage they share a goal, building a happy marriage beyond the sum of the two parties.

That brings us to the next level:

Level III: Transition: Old actors die. Feudal counties, duchies etc. die; a state is born. States gradually die, regions are born. Regions gradually die, a world is born. The resources, the means, have already been pooled; the goals have been aligned. They are not only compatible but identical. Out of numerous I-ness's a new we-ness, sui generis, of a new kind, has emerged. As old actors die the set of goals shrinks and so do the means; as a new actor is born the set of goals and-or the set of means expand. The old actors, like old people, have had their days, but the new actors are not like a younger generation merely replicating the old; but a transition to a new era.

Level IV: Absorption, like in nirvana, found in the religious discourse, but then often reserved for the beyond, the after-life, for souls only. The ultimate absorption-union is with God in Christianity and Islam, with each other in the Hindu concept, with the network of all life in Buddhism. But the human individual spirit is capable of imaging level IV without dying, as absorbed in humanity.

There is ambiguity in positive peace. At levels I and II between states, for instance, war has become "unthinkable" if the integration manages to handle complex conflicts, with high numbers of parties and goals, constructively. If not, the coupling may break up, parties decouple, hopefully only to level 0, negative peace, not to violence.

But the real crisis may come at level III, let alone level IV. As the process proceeds, the identity of the actors is eroding. Thus, for the UK, France and Germany to be absorbed into Europe, with no identity of their own, will be hard.

The solution lies in seeing the levels less as linear progress, and more as coexisting. A couple will delight in the kairos of the unions of body, mind and spirit as bliss, but very demanding. A union may be needed in crisis, but revert to level I under normal conditions. These are modes of existence, not life sentences.

### A Summary and Overview

The point of departure for peace is the basic dukkha-sukha, suffering-fulfillment distinction, for all life, and the double task of peace is to reduce the suffering, violence--negative peace--and increase the fulfillment--positive peace. The two can be combined. One basic diagnosis for violence is underlying, unresolved conflicts, simple, complex or structural.<sup>15</sup> In other words, the parties are coupled, and the task is to change this coupling, from contradictory to "condictory", or to no coupling at all. Another basic diagnosis for violence is traumas from the past, inflicted by the parties in the coupling, or by some other party. The task is to clear the past, closure, and create a future together. But reconciliation should not serve as a pretext to neglect the conflict resolution job lest it becomes pacification. In addition there is the equity job to take care of, not only mutual, but not too unequal fulfillment, and emotional resonance; but these two positive peace tasks may come to nothing if traumas and conflicts are not adequately handled.

The general peace task is the change from direct and structural violence to both negative peace and positive peace, by peaceful means. For the four stages war, guerilla-terrorism, negotiation and negative nonviolence the two tasks of mediation and reconciliation should be substituted for at least a negative peace to embark on positive peace. And that opens for four stages beyond negative peace: symbiosis, transcendence, transition, absorption. How far we want to go depends on the concrete case, but as a minimum there should be some project, some peace construction, with cooperation for mutual and equal benefit and harmony, attitudinal resonance. Transcendence and transition may come later, but only when old identities are waning and the capacity to handle new conflicts is waxing.

### Notes

1. For more details, see Johan Galtung, A Theory of Peace, TRANSCEND University Press, 2012, Part One.
2. For mediation based on diagnosis-prognosis-therapy, see Johan Galtung, 50 Years: 100 Peace & Conflict Perspectives, TRANSCEND University Press, 2008 [www.transcend.org/tpu](http://www.transcend.org/tpu).
3. "If you want peace, prepare for war".
4. The economic pain-pleasure is a materialist-somatic vulgarization of this idea.
5. "Act so that the principle of your intention could serve as the basis for world law".
6. Mo Tzu (one of the "hundred philosophers" 551-233 BC) argues universal love, also of one's enemies, as opposed to the partial love only of one's friends. The rulers must start: "Now universal love and mutual benefit are both profitable and easy beyond all measure. The only trouble, as I see it is that no ruler takes any delight in them. If the rulers really delighted in them, promoted them with

rewards and praise, and prevented neglect of them with punishments, the I believe that people would turn to universal love and mutual benefit as naturally as fire turns upward or water turns downward, and nothing in the world could stop them". Mo Tzu, Basic Writings, New York, London: Columbia University Press, 1963, p. 49.

7. See Yoichiro Murakami and Thomas J. Schoenbaum (eds.) *A Grand Design for Peace and Reconciliation: Achieving Kyosei in East Asia*. Cheltenham, UK, and North Hampton, Massachusetts, USA: Edward Elgar, 2008.
8. See, for instance, the Philippine Human Development Report 2005, p. 5.
9. Raphael Lemkin, 1900-1959, Polish lawyer.
10. Thus, nakba, the horrors suffered by the Palestinian at the hands of the Israelis, from 1948 up till today, was massive, directed against a category, but not massive killing.
11. The UNESCO Sevilla Declaration is one way of doing this, declaring that there is no scientific basis for the idea that violence-war is innate. Missing in the declaration is the idea that there are positive ways of handling trauma and conflict, maybe not innate either, but like war easily learnt.
12. The classical exchange when levels 1 and 2 Vietnam war turned into level 3, between USA and Viêt Nam:
  - "You were never able to beat us in open battle!"
  - "Correct. But it is immaterial".

It is worth remembering that at level 2 there is no beginning and no end, nor formal declaration of war nor capitulation. That plays in their favor, exhausting Other's resilience.
13. The rest is a question of knowledge and skills. This author's contributions are in the two books Transcend & Transform, 2003, and 50 Years: 100 Peace & Conflict Perspectives, 2008.
14. And the book corresponding to the preceding footnote is Joanna Santa Barbara, Johan Galtung, Diane Perlman, Reconciliation, 2011.
15. See Johan Galtung, A Theory of Conflict, TRANSCEND University Press, 2010.