



Centre for Peace Studies

University of Tromsø

Johan Galtung:

TOWARD PEACEFUL WORLDS

A Guide to Peace

CPS WORKING PAPERS NO 3. April 2002

ISSN 1503-1365

Tromsø Papers

Centre for Peace Studies at Tromsø University here present Working Papers No 3.

This paper is written by Johan Galtung, dr hc mult and director of Transcend. It reflects the thinking behind the new museum MEMORIAL in Caen, France. The paper is written in form of a dialogue and takes the reader through a process of critical thinking. Many of the core concepts of Peace Studies are discussed and challenged. In an appendix Galtung takes the reader through the process of developing the new museum which is a genuine Peace-museum rather than an anti-war museum.

CPS working papers will cover topics presented at CPS and/or produced by people connected to CPS. These Papers will reflect the work carried out at CPS but not necessarily present the opinions by the Centre. It will be published irregularly and can be subscribed to by contacting the editors.

Tromsø April 2002

CPS Working Papers:

- No 1** **Three articles by Johan Galtung:**
What is Peace Studies?
The Epistemology and Methodology of Peace Studies
Constructing a Daoist Social Science Epistemology
- No 2** **Arne Kommisrud:**
State-building, Nationalities, and Conflict Dynamics in the Soviet and Habsburg Empires. A Rokkanian Approach.
- No 3** **Johan Galtung:**
Toward Peaceful Worlds - A Guide to Peace

Editors:

Jorgen Johansen, jorgenj@peace.uit.no
Vidar Vambheim, vidarv@peace.uit.no

Address:

Centre for Peace Studies
University of Tromsø
9037 Tromsø,
Norway

www.peace.uit.no
www.transcend.org



T O W A R D P E A C E F U L W O R L D S

A Guide to Peace - prepared for MEMORIAL, Caen

By Johan Galtung, dr hc mult, Professor of Peace Studies
Director, TRANSCEND: A Peace and Development Network
E-mail: <galtung@transcend.org> Site:<www.transcend.org>

Contents:

Preface

1. Peace and Violence
2. Conflict Transformation
3. Peace Cultures Around the World
4. Dialogue of Civilizations
5. Approaches to Peace
6. Peace Movements, Education, Journalism, Studies
7. Could the Second World War Have Been Avoided?
8. Could the Cold War 1949-1989 Have Been Avoided?
9. Toward Peaceful Worlds: A Summary and a Conclusion

APPENDIX: Developing a Museum for Peace in Caen, Normandie
About the author

Versonnex and Alfaz del Pi, January 2001

Preface

On 6 June 1944, early in the morning, an Anglo-American fleet invaded Normandy beaches. There was fierce struggle, including Allied bombing of Caen to force the Germans into the countryside.

Many people were killed. A young man helped the ambulances in the rescue operation. To commemorate invasion and liberation, hwe later on, as mayor of Caen and national politician, created the museum MEMORIAL (Esplanade Eisenhower, Caen), the most visited museum in France outside Paris.

A "secteur B" on the Cold War and a "secteur C" on Peace have been added, and will be inaugurated this year, 2002.

I was invited to be the consultant on "secteur C". The work has been fascinating and is by no means completed. What has been done can no doubt be made better. The logic of a museum is much like TV, "don't tell'em, show'em". But some text is nevertheless useful. The texts made available here can be heard if the visitor pushes a button in the museum while viewing the many exhibits. Needless to say, the word "Memorial" in the text does not stand for an official view of the museum, rather for "peace researcher".

Some readers have commented that the text, in dialogue form, may also serve as a useful introduction to peace studies. So here they are, for whatever they are worth - in no way a substitute for the museum itself.

I would like to express my gratitude to Christophe Bouillet, Claude Quetel and Nathalie Worthington for a fascinating challenge and fine cooperation - also hoping that readers will feel that Caen is worth a travel.

Kyoto, April 2002 Johan Galtung

PEACE AND VIOLENCE

I: Basic Needs: Met or violated

Memorial: This is a museum about, and for, peace - -

Skeptic: Why, then, do you choose to start with violence?

Memorial: An idea is best understood with its opposite; as some kind of totality. Can we understand women without understanding men? not implying that women are always peaceful and men always belligerent. We are talking about human relations; sometimes peaceful, sometimes violent. We want to tip the balance in favor of peace; like we try to tip the woman/man relation known as marriage in favor of love. We cannot understand that relation in terms of one party alone. It has to do with harmony, synergy, ups and downs together. If one enjoys the suffering of the other, then something is very wrong. Happy together, unhappy together; working together, constructively, to reduce suffering.

Skeptic: But how do you know that either or both are suffering?

Memorial: Maybe we have some yardsticks that can be used: basic human needs. That which people cannot do without; rock bottom, non-negotiable. Left unsatisfied, there is suffering, dukkha, operationalized by Ralph Siu. We could use insulting human needs to define violence, and then define peace as "satisfaction of basic needs, for all." But we could also define peace as "absence of violence" or as "reduction of suffering".

Skeptic: But you have not named the basic needs, or indicated how we can identify them. Without that this becomes empty talk!

Memorial: The best way to identify basic human needs is to ask people what it is they cannot do without, not to extract needs from the writings of, however brilliant, DOM (dead old men.) Here is a short list of four basic needs, suggested by people: survival, well-being, identity/meaning, freedom; best understood with their negations: death, misery, alienation, repression. We could identify peace with relations that produce the former, violence with relations that produce the latter. Others may come up with other lists, or see the whole problem differently.

Skeptic: So peace is long life expectancy, with such basics as food, shelter, clothing, health care, education, a sense of meaning with life, and freedom of choice in how to do all this?

Memorial: Something like that. Let us stick to fundamentals; we should not overdetermine peace. Peace should be something we could agree on. However, in the West the Left tends to pick up "well-being for all", and the Right picks up "freedom". Doing so gives them identity. But they easily forget survival, of Other, but also of Self, when promoting their needs. The genius of Gandhi consisted not only in standing for all four, but in showing us ways of meeting them: satyagraha (nonviolence) and sarvodaya (the uplift of all); respecting cultural diversity.

Skeptic: The 20th century was a hostage to both Left and Right?

Memorial: Yes. The Second World War, the Cold War were examples. But it was not all that bad. The century also produced Gandhi.

PEACE AND VIOLENCE. II: Human relations: peaceful or violent

Memorial: Human beings relate to each other with a basic question in mind: Will this relation satisfy or insult my basic needs? The Indo/Catalan philosopher Raimundo Panikkar uses knots and nets to illustrate the difference between actor-oriented and structure-oriented views of human relations. In the former actors act consciously to promote or insult the needs of Self and Other; in the latter parties behave, doing things "the way it was always done", "the way everybody does", with the same effects. Reality is a mix. A good marriage may be a fireworks of deliberate acts of love. But it may also settle in routines of mutual satisfaction; less romantic, but a pleasant "structural peace". Nations, states, can do the same and often do. One way of knowing that there is peace is that journalists don't know.

Skeptic: This is all too peaceful for me. How about violence?

Memorial: Violence comes in two varieties: as deliberate efforts to make Other suffer; death or misery to the body, repression or alienation to the spirit; and as routines, the slow but steady working of the structure, producing misery and death at the bottom of domestic or global society, imprisoning people behind walls or ignorance, alienating them in a religion and language not their own. Nobody may have intended mental debilitation through protein deficiency, but such structures also produce school dropouts that become very cheap plantation labor.

Skeptic: Sounds like a conspiracy theory to me!

Memorial: Conspiracies are deliberate, intended. They probably come into being when structures do not operate the way they used to do, leading to deliberate efforts to restore the structure. Maybe protection of a structure is even part of the structure, meaning that there is no conspiracy even in many conspiracies--

Skeptic: There are two forms of violence, direct and structural?

Memorial: As Mark Twain once said, using "terror" for violence:

"There were two "Reigns of Terror,"--
the one wrought murder in hot passion,
the other in heartless cold blood;
the one lasted mere months,
the other lasted a thousand years;--
but our shudders are all for the "horrors"
of the minor terror, the momentary terror,
so to speak.

We cannot accept as peace a world with no war but 100,000 dying of hunger every day. Peace negates both the deliberate, direct violence and the routine structural violence; the violence of the kshatriyah/warrior and of the vaishyah/merchant.

Skeptic: How about the brahmin/intellectual/professional/artist?

Memorial: Their specialty is cultural violence that legitimizes the other two. Look at the text of the Marseillaise, paintings by Delacroix, basic theses of mainstream economics -

PEACE AND VIOLENCE. III: Spaces and arenas: peaceful or violent

Memorial: Let us expand the vision, from two actors to the whole field. Question: where do peace and violence happen?

Skeptic: Do they have to happen at the same place?

Memorial: Being each other's negation, yes. Here is a list of eleven arenas, but one of them, outer space, is not activated:

NATURE SPACE as ecocide, against cosmo-, atmo-, hydro-, litho- or biosphere (micro-organisms, plants, animals) Arena: nature

HUMAN SPACE as self-destruction, even suicide, against body, mind and spirit of Self. Arena: self

SOCIAL SPACE as other-destruction, even homicide, against body, mind and spirit of Other, in:

micro-space, as child abuse, wife-battering, verbal harassment and mobbing. Arena: private space, family/home

meso-space I, individuals and gangs against each other; robbery, fights, sexualized violence. Arena: public space, school/street

meso-space II, violence against organizations; hacking, bribery and corruption in general, embezzlement. Arena: the office

meso-space III, individuals/gangs against State/Capital as abduction, assassination, capital punishment. Arena: the state

meso-space IV, across fault-lines: gender-generation-race-class-nation-territory, even genocide, Internal war. Arena: the society

WORLD SPACE, as societies against each other, even sociocide, in

macro-space I, states vs states, External war Arena: the region

macro-space II, regions vs regions, External war Arena: the world

macro-space III, planets etc vs planets etc. Arena: outer space

TIME SPACE, across generations, by trauma, triumph, decreasing sustainability, increasing readiness for violence. Arena: time

Skeptic: It makes me feel the end is near! Is it that bad?

Memorial: The list focuses on violence. There is co-existence most of the time, friendship, even love. Statistics often lie: one bad incident makes the whole year, even the world, look bad when 364 days actually were good and the incident took place only in a small corner. We have too little statistics of peace!

Skeptic: But aren't these crimes, punishable by law?

Memorial: Mainly in meso-space I-III, and even there success is limited. Violence, and our awareness, spreads - to new arenas. Look at killing by guns in some countries: used to be in wars, then the streets, then at home, then at school. What is next?

PEACE AND VIOLENCE.IV: Fault-lines: Bridged, stabilized, seismic

Memorial: The human condition is cut through by fault-lines; dividing humans/nature, genders, generations, races, classes, normal/deviants, nations, states. Each border defines at least two categories, Self and Other. Our capacity to manage the divides without violence is a measure of our maturity. We often bridge them. But we also "stabilize" with structural violence.

Skeptic: How do you fit genocide into this? Sounds too peaceful!

Memorial: That is the seismic possibility, the socioquake. With two types of violence and eight fault-lines we get 16 cases of
Genocide = Massive Category Killing

No.	FAULT-LINES	DIRECT VIOLENCE	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	middle-aged schools as ghetto "homes" as ghetto
[4]	DEVIANCE - criminal - mental - somatic	<u>Controlling dangerous</u> capital punishment euthanasia euthanasia	<u>persons</u> institution institution institution
[5]	RACE	<u>Controlling dangerous</u> eradication slavery	<u>racess</u> colonialism slavery
[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" as narrowly defined	the state as a prison of nations run by "majority"
[8]	STATE COUNTRY TERRITORY	war (killing for food, sacrifice, conquest)	imperialism isolating "pariah" states

Skeptic: That makes the shoa only one of many holocausts!?

Memorial: The killing of the female before and after birth; the structural violence making 100,000 die daily through starvation, the direct violence of colonial powers were worse in numbers.

Skeptic: But why do human beings do such terrible things?

Memorial: Structural violence paves the way through exclusion. And cultural violence justifies "believers" killing "heretics"; "superior" races/classes/nations eliminating the "inferior", economism punishing the "losers". The Dalai Lama: Compassion!

CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION

Memorial: The UNESCO-sponsored Sevilla Declaration makes a basic point: violence is not innate, like hunger and the need for sex; it is learnt. The capability for the violence of action, speech and thought is there, not a lasting, all pervasive drive for violence/aggression across all circumstances.

Skeptic: So why, then, do we get so much violence, all over?

Memorial: An answer: because we are so poor at handling conflict in a nonviolent and if at all possible creative manner. Each act of violence is a tragic monument over a conflict badly handled.

Skeptic: Take the common example of street violence: two boys on a moped, one of them snaps the bag of an old lady. After that I can see a perpetrator-victim conflict. But where is the conflict before this happened? To me they are just bad boys!

Memorial: And how did they become that bad? Gang pressure? Conflict between legality and material acquisition? Or, in religious-freudian terms: between Id/greed and Super-Ego/God? Conflict is a way of seeing human reality. At the root of a conflict there is always a contradiction, an incompatibility between goals held by the same party or by different parties.

Skeptic: But imagine that neither gang pressure, nor legality, nor any kind of bad conscience bothers the boys the slightest. They just want that bag! There is no other goal.

Memorial: There is the old lady's goal of keeping her bag. One approach is a solid shoulder bag, another to walk away from the curb but not too close to the gates. Or a body bag.

Skeptic: Blaming the victim for not engaging in prevention?

Memorial: We are all co-responsible, do not only blame the perpetrator. Not a good, meaning acceptable and sustainable solution, but she keeps the bag and the boy gives up or looks elsewhere, maybe even for a job. Any conflict takes place in a vast formation of actors, goals, clashes = Contradictions. But then things start happening: we develop a very negative Attitude of anything from the boiling point of hatred to the freezing point of apathy and negative Behavior, even massive violence against a whole category of people = genocide down to, again, apathy. Conflict is this A,B,C-triangle of attitudes, behavior and contradictions. At the root is the contradiction.

Skeptic: But doesn't it help to soften attitudes and behavior?

Memorial: If something is done to the contradiction, otherwise it becomes a band-aid. The usual liberal mistake is to locate conflict only in people's minds; the mistake of conservatives to locate it in behavior and control violence. Neither conversion to Christianity, nor brutal repression, solved the conflict between slave-owner and slave, colony-holder and the colonized. And the marxist mistake is to believe only in overcoming the contradiction, regardless of hatred and violence and what they breed: more violence, revenge, revanche, lives wasted in hatred.

Memorial: We need to work in all corners, A, B and C - not only one or two of them. And since people, including diplomats and statesmen are often conflict illiterates, we need conflict specialists, or more modestly: conflict workers.

Skeptic: How do they approach attitude, behavior, contradiction?

Memorial: Ideally they approach attitude with empathy, trying to find out why people think and feel the way they do, knowing their psycho-logic maybe even better than they do themselves. And they approach behavior with nonviolence, not only trying not to encourage disastrous spirals of violence, but getting at the roots of their violence which very often is fear. And they approach contradiction above all with creativity, trying to see the conflict in a new way, to go beyond - transcend - the conflict as the parties conceive of it. Using all three we may transform the conflict, changing it so that the parties themselves can handle it emphatically, nonviolently, creatively.

Skeptic: But the goals they state may not be the real goals?

Memorial: Let us add a third dimension to the triangle: depth.

Underneath all contradictions are deeper contradictions that steer the surface contradictions in the conflict struggle: the fault-lines in the human construction, gender, generation, race, class, "normal"/"deviant", nation/culture/ideology and, for world society, states/regions. Marx picked up only one of them, class; only economic class, not political, military and cultural; and only as ownership of means of production.

Underneath attitudes are deeper attitudes; in English they also start with an "A": assumptions, axioms. De-individualizing and de-mathematizing we get deep culture, a web of ideas about what is true, good, right, beautiful, sacred.

And underneath behavior is deep behavior, preprogrammed, partly by instincts, partly by basic needs. But even if there is something deeper down professed goals should be respected.

Skeptic: Fault-lines, deep culture, basic needs are basic. But you treat all goals as equal when some are legitimate, some not!

Memorial: Take slavery: Slave-owners valued slavery for labor and for the commodity market. They also valued having that goal. The slave certainly also had a value: freedom. Which value had more legitimacy? At the time of the US Civil War freedom had more legitimacy than slavery. That decided the conflict.

Take colonialism: In 1933 Norway and Denmark wanted Eastern Greenland; Norway legitimizing the goal by discovery, Denmark by having "civilized" the place. The World Court in the Hague decided in favor of Denmark. But the tide turned in favor of indigenous self-determination and both goals became illegitimate

That gives us a typology with three types of conflict:

- [1] The goals of all parties have (some) legitimacy
- [2] The goals of some parties are legitimate, of others not
- [3] The goals of all parties are illegitimate

The first type is by far the most frequent, and is our concern. Not only do the parties have their truths, but these truths are valid truths, Truths. As pointed out above, that is where the legal paradigm fails while it may be very useful in [1] and [2].

Skeptic: OK, we have parties, goals that are more or less articulated and more or less legitimate, and we have clashes.

Memorial: And we may get violence, that is the problem. Incompatibility means frustration, and more than we can handle. The result is aggression, outward, sideward, inward. Violence. Contradiction is the force motrice; the problem is "violence prevention", not "conflict prevention" but handling conflict. Hence, it makes sense to distinguish between three phases in any conflict: before violence, violence and after violence.

Skeptic: That sounds very deterministic!

Memorial: The criterion of personal, social and world maturity is, of course, not to enter phase II, violence, after which the conflict becomes much more complicated because of glory/trauma.

Skeptic: What can we do then, to prevent violence?

Memorial: Remove the frustrations by solving the conflict, or by transforming the conflict so that the parties can solve it. Essentially there are four or five approaches:

[1,2] One of the parties prevails, by force, bribery, charisma or by law because the court decides that is justice.

[3] Neither party gets what they want, they withdraw, give up, or the court decides neither of them has any legitimacy.

[4] Both parties get something, compromise, often leaving both unsatisfied or leading them into overstating their goals.

[5] The conflict is transcended, uprooted from where it was and rooted somewhere else as when the centuries of badly handled conflicts between Germany and France suddenly became a conflict of how to handle the European Common Market/Community/Union.

Through transcendence humanity may move forward, with new goals. What is needed is empathy with deeper attitudes, nonviolence and respect for basic needs, creativity and respect for the fault-lines of the human construction even if not mentioned. If deep culture, basic needs and fault-lines are not taken into account any peace treaty rests on quicksand, clay, whatever.

Skeptic: Evidently, this does not always work!

Memorial: One reason is that big powers intervene in conflicts between states and nations with their own agendas, goals and make use of the conflict. They are parties, not mediators.

Violence breaks out. Resolution efforts must continue, but now is the time for peacekeeping to control violent behavior -- but not by killing neighbors/families like in a war. We need more nonviolent peacekeeping like International Peace Brigades; witnesses, peace hostages, people accompanying those threatened. The UN charter Chapter 6 is important, but limited to states.

Skeptic: For whatever reason, sooner or later violence ends.

Memorial: It does, otherwise you and I would not have been here. Of course, conflict resolution continues, also after violence. But then comes reconstruction and reconciliation. The 3 R's. None of them is meaningful without the others.

Memorial: Imagine now that we are in Phase III: After violence. What has happened is more than bad enough. There was the root conflict. Then it all escalated in a torrent of hatred and violence; a million conflicts between perpetrators and victims over life and death of victims and the bereaved, over the right to live one's life unmolested by somatic and mental wounds intentionally inflicted, over rape and displacement, over material property destroyed wantonly. And deeper down the hatred eating up the heart, crying for revenge and revanche -- matched by victors basking in the glory of a war "won" as if anybody can ever win a war like they win a soccer game.

Skeptic: OK, you have made the point. Wars are bad. What then?

Memorial: The point is that any Phase III is already a Phase I. The logical and empirical sequel to a war is another war. The task is to stay in Phase I and break that vicious circle. Here is a list of things to do, only the headlines, as indicators:

Reconstruction After Violence: An Overview

Rehabilitation: the collective healing approach

Rebuilding: the development approach

Restructuration: the peace structure approach

Reculturation: the peace culture approach

Reconciliation After Violence: An Overview

[1] The exculpatory nature-structure-culture approach

[2] The reparation/restitution approach

[3] The apology/forgiveness approach

[4] The theological/penitence approach

[5] The juridical/punishment approach

[6] The codependent origination/**karma** approach

[7] The historical/truth commission approach

[8] The theatrical/reliving approach

[9] The joint sorrow/healing approach

[10] The joint reconstruction approach

[11] The joint conflict resolution approach

[12] The **ho'o ponopono** approach

Resolution After Violence: An Overview

The democracy, parliamentary approach

The nonviolence, extra-parliamentarian approach

Skeptic: **Ho'o ponopono**, peace structure and peace culture make a come-back on these lists; they were also on the approaches to peace. Does that not indicate that they were tried and failed?

Memorial: Very little is really tried, and since no method is perfect we better do a little of all. The task is formidable. Reconciliation = healing + closure, people cannot heal without closing the conflict and vice versa. In the West we know [4] and [5] and they do not work very well: leave the trauma of the spirit to the priest and the guilt against society to the judge. There is one brilliant advance, a great leap forward: the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa. Like **ho'o pono pono** it is more holistic than such Western approaches as post-traumatic stress disorder treatment.

Skeptic: Good. But where are the people who can do all of that?

Memorial: If we had faculties of peace we would have had them--!

PEACE CULTURES AROUND THE WORLD

Memorial: There is no such thing as one human peace culture; there are peace cultures, plural; dozens, hundreds, thousands. All over the world experience with frustration and conflict has crystallized into what is true, good, right about violence, war and peace; in other words culture. To some "balance of power" is the obvious answer, as obvious as "nonviolence" to others. Of course, what they say and write may be one thing, what they do another: thought, speech and action do not always coincide.

Skeptic: Why, then, do you focus so much on speech, on quotes?

Memorial: We try also to focus on what people do, showing people in peace action, like American Indians smoking the proverbial peace pipe. By the way, wouldn't it be nice if we had something similar in our Western culture - some shared object that passes from one party to the other, in a circle?

Skeptic: Our focus, it seems, is on the signing of the treaty; sometimes the pen is shared and kept?

Memorial: And the photo opportunity: negotiators emerging at 5 am with peace at hand, opening a fridge, pouring the champagne, presenting peace as a gift to a grateful humanity with no access to the secret protocols. Our focus is on the word, on logos: "In the beginning there was the Word with God" (John 1:1). So there is also a basis for the focus on words, at least with us!

Skeptic: Is peace a thought, a word, an act, or, a thing?

Memorial: Why not all four? Anyhow, we decided to try with six cultures, big macro-cultures, some would say civilizations, around the world. As visitor you can start anywhere.

Of the six three are from the Occident, defined here as the cultural space spanned by the abrahamic religions of the Book, the kitab, the Old Testament: Judaism, Christianity, Islam. However, we start with two Europes, secular Europe and Christian Europe, and then travel East to--not "Middle East", that is a Western perspective seen from London, Paris etc--West Asia, dominated by Judaism and Islam, and the cradle of Christianity.

Continuing on our travel eastward we come to South Asia, the home of what is conveniently called "Hinduism" and its offspring, Jainism and Buddhism. And further east, not to "Far Orient" but to East Asia, picking up the Chinese and Japanese cultural amalgams with a Confucian core, Buddhism, and then daoism in China and shinto in Japan. In other words, we shall look at three religions from West Asia, three from South Asia, three from East Asia, the European secular tradition from Greco-Roman Antiquity and the Modern period. And secular daoism.

Skeptic: The major, "world" religions, forgetting the rest?

Memorial: We try to avoid that. The eastward travel continues, a second round, into Pacific-American-African spaces, picking up a Polynesian, an Amerindian and an African tradition. Six stops. For each one we highlight some key ideas: pax/eirene, agape/bellum iustum, shalom/salaam, shanti/ahimsa, ho ping/heiwa and ho'o ponopono/shir. A dozen peace concepts; human treasures.

Skeptic: Around the world in 80 seconds?

Memorial: Hopefully you'll dedicate more time, dear Visitor!

I. EUROPE: Pax and Eirene

The Roman and Greek traditions

Peace can be interpreted narrowly as absentia belli, the absence of organized violence between groups defined by country, nation (culture), race, class or ideology. International or external peace is the absence of external wars: inter-country, inter-state, or international (in the sense of inter-cultural). Social or internal peace is the absence of internal wars: national, racial, class or ideological groups challenging central governance or each other. This concept is carried by the Roman pax, related to pact, as in pacta sunt servanda, "treaties must be observed". Peace as a contractual, mutually agreed relation is the source of Western international law.

Another Roman legacy, si vis pacem, para bellum, "if you want peace prepare for war" is the source of Western military peace theory. Peace is obtained by balance of power, deterring the aggressor at home with defensive defense, and abroad with offensive defense. Offensive offense (attack/aggression), and defensive offense (pre-emptive warfare), are not peace concepts.

Skeptic: Where is God in this kind of thinking?

Memorial: There is no God. There is ratio, rationality. Aggression is controlled from above by pacts--the Roman Empire was capable of enforcing the pacts--or by balance of power.

Skeptic: But this only works against direct, open violence!

Memorial: A better word for this kind of peace is security. And there is a basic dilemma: the military capability used to deter can also be used to attack, even if the motivation is defensive. The result can be an arms race, a cold war, even a hot war.

Skeptic: Where is structural, indirect violence in all of this?

Memorial: The Greek eirene is closer to "peace with justice", absence of direct and structural violence, among the Greeks. But which part has priority? What if they think justice can only be obtained through war? That idea was also picked up by the marxist tradition as class war, national and international, legitimized as necessary and sufficient to obtain a just, socialist society. The Roman thinking led to the liberal tradition, tolerant of enormous inequalities, nationally and internationally, but strongly against war, both internally and externally. And Roman warfare was picked up by the conservative tradition, extolling still more inequality by wars provided they could be won; even empire-building. We are still there, Year 2K.

Skeptic: Let me try to identify four problems:

- [1] I see no transcendental force, no God behind this peace.
- [2] I know the Romans said, homo res sacra hominibus, humans should be sacred to humans, but I see no reason why they should.
- [3] It is all so external, outer peace; how about inner peace?
- [4] And, I want a peace concept against both types of violence!

Memorial: The Abrahamic religions-Christianity/Judaism/Islam-have answers to [1] and [2]; South Asia to [3] and [4]. Move on!

II. EUROPE: Agape and Bellum Iustum The Christian traditions

The European Antiquity tradition, carried into the modern and postmodern periods, is secular. But there are also the three Christianities (Orthodoxy/Catholicism/Protestantism) and the many smaller sects. Paradise/Hell become models for Peace and War, making peace remote and static and war hell on earth.

Peace is seen as ordained by a God whose Law is the only valid law, and valid for all of humanity. But who is God, and how does He relate to human beings, in search of peace?

A theological distinction is very useful here, between God as immanent, inside us, making us god-like, sacred; and God as transcendent, above us, saving, choosing some persons and peoples; rejecting, condemning others. We may even talk about soft and hard Christianity depending on which God-concept is picked up, in what proportion. They do not exclude each other.

Agape (Greek: "love") can be used as a name for the peace of a soft Christianity based on an immanent conception of God. There is God's love for humankind, through Jesus Christ; the human love for God and the love of one's fellow beings as being God-loved. The Lord's Supper and the Eucharist are close to this concept: a community of humans, God-enlightened, in God.

Skeptic: But don't you find this in all religious traditions?

Memorial: Probably. But maybe particularly as an in-group idea, separating "us" from "them". The face-to-face corpus mysticum is based on an identity with others so strong that there is a limit to the number of members. This may be a reason why very egalitarian, interactive, direct peace concepts spring out of smaller Christian sects, like the Quakers and the Mennonites.

Skeptic: But how about the transcendent God, some male person residing above our planet, and his relation to non-believers, pagans and worse still, to the heretics who have rejected God? Is that where hard Christianity enters, administering Hell=Torture (Inquisition) and Holy War to the heretics?

Memorial: Yes, and as some kind of peace concept it takes the form of bellum iustum, the Augustine-Aquinas just war tradition:

- [1] Wars must be waged by a lawful authority,
 - [2] Wars must be waged for a just cause, to correct injustice
 - [3] Wars must be waged with the right intention, not vengefully
 - [4] Wars must be waged as a last resort and prospects of success
 - [5] Wars must be waged with proportionality and minimum force
 - [6] Wars must be waged only against combatants
- The first are ius ad bellum; the last two are ius in bello.

Skeptic: That sounds like legitimation of war rather than peace?

Memorial: It was an effort to limit war even if accepting war as the last resort. But there is no nonviolent alternative, and it may be used to attack any kind of injustice however defined. In addition, it is not biblical but St Augustin and St Thomas. But this cost-benefit thinking is still with us. We move on!

III. WEST ASIA: Shalom and Sala'am

The Judaic and Islamic traditions

Memorial: We are dealing with the religions of the book, kitab in Arabic, the Old Testament, Yahweh's revelations to Abraham. The original religion was, of course, Judaism, one basis for Jesus and the Apostles to create Christianity, in turn one basis for Mohammed to create Islam - as revealed to them by God and Allah. Given this genealogy the three abrahamitic religions, as they are also called, have basic similarities, illustrated below with two quotes from each, one soft, one hard:

	Judaism	Christianity	Islam
Soft peace	And he shall judge among the nations -- and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. (Isaiah 2:4)	How blest are the peacemakers God shall call them his sons. (Matt. 5:9)	And whoever saved a human life, should be regarded as though he had saved all mankind (Qur'an 5:32)
Hard Peace	For in the cities within the boundaries of the Promised Land you are to save no one; destroy every living thing. (Deut. 21:16)	Don't imagine that I came to bring peace to the earth. No, rather, a sword (Matt.10:34)	Fight for the sake of Allah those that fight against you but do not attack them first (Qur'an 2:190)

Skeptic: The second line looks more like a War Culture to me. Why conceive of it as a hard approach to peace?

Memorial: Because all three have a tendency to see certain Others as peace obstacles in need of a "war to abolish wars" before peace prevails. The First World War was argued that way.

Skeptic: What is the peace message in these quotes, then?

Memorial: Maybe that ambiguity is the message? It is neither unconditional peace, nor unconditional war. It is peace under certain conditions, war under certain other conditions. The problem is to spell out those conditions. One reading of the Judaic shalom and the Arabic sala'am is peace with justice. Without justice, no peace; hence war for justice is seen as legitimate. But what is justice? Absence of structural violence whereby people, nations, states are repressed, exploited, alienated as a permanent condition? That leads to bellum iustum, as injustice abounds! That should not be confused with jihaad, a term that translates as "exertion" for the faith. Defending the faith by violence, against Crusades, zionism, communism, is the fourth stage. "Do not attack them first. Allah does not love the aggressors", but "if you do not fight /in defense/ He will punish you sternly" (9:39).

Skeptic: The secular version is Hobbes: punish deserters!

Memorial: And his fighting direct violence with structural violence, with Yahweh/God/Allah using Jews/Christians/Muslims, chosen by Providence, to bring order to the world. But a part of humanity as self-appointed peace-maker for the rest of the world is indeed problematic. Dear Visitor, are you one of them?

IV. SOUTH ASIA: Shanti and Ahimsa

The Hindu, Jainist and Buddhist traditions

Memorial: Hinduism is the mother. The other two are partly protest religions, with much more emphasis on nonviolence and peace. But also Hinduism has this inclination toward unconditional peace by ahimsa, nonviolence. The major carrier of this message of all times, Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948), used the formula There is no way to peace, peace is the way. This is a strong stand, ruling out violence as immoral and also unproductive. The way to struggle against violence, direct or structural, is by nonviolence. And, as becomes clear from Gandhi's adulation of the small social unit, the village: peace in the sense of absence of direct violence, cannot be built top-down by heavy international and national hierarchies, in the pax and hobbesian traditions. To use a metaphor popular with the peace movement: violence for peace = intercourse for virginity. A non sequitur; as often pointed out by Jainists and Buddhists.

Skeptic: But how about the problem that nonviolence, however morally superior and consistent, may not always work?

Memorial: There are ways of protecting the true believers in nonviolence against that objection by focussing inward, on attitudes and intentions, rather than outward on behavior and consequences. And that is one reading of shanti, inner peace. Ahimsa has shanti as a necessary condition: with no inner peace, no nonviolence. In psychologese: "Unprocessed traumas" will be acted out aggressively. If nonviolence does not lead to change of heart in Other, it is for lack of change of heart in Self. Nonviolence then turns into self-purification, practiced in the little community of believers, the sangha, like a monastery. If we cannot manage outer peace let us at least manage inner peace!

Skeptic: Hinduism also has a warrior caste, kshatriyah, like the Western aristocrats, and the Japanese samurai?

Memorial: They certainly did and do. Warrior was a varna, a calling, a profession. The epic Mahabaratha praises Arjun's loyalty to his varnadharma, the ethics of his warrior caste, not giving in to own personal feelings and ethics, the swadharma. Hinduism is not a pure culture of peace. Jainism and Buddhism come much closer. But they can also be corrupted into warriors as seen by the buddhists in Sri Lanka and Thailand today.

Skeptic: Why is Gandhi a saint, but not followed in India?

Memorial: He built on one part of Hinduism, not the warrior, state-building, part. Gandhi may be the best the past century gave us, with Martin Luther King Jr., Nelson Mandela and Desmond Tutu in his footsteps. None of the four was a white Westerner, incidentally. Gandhi left behind a theory and practice of satyagraha, "clinging to truth" as he called it. Look at the list of nonviolent campaigns: to play a major role in delivering the colored part of the world from white man's colonialism, and the white part of the world from its own Cold War, leaving no thirst for bloody revenge behind, is no minor achievement. That gift came from South Asia, not from the West. Our contribution was to create problems. The burden of proof is on those who teach peace by violence, like "military solutions".

Skeptic: Does nonviolence always work or not? Yes or No!

Memorial: Nothing always works. But violence almost never works, because of the thirst for revenge and for more glory. The war may look so final, like an extinguished fire - except for some lows in the ashes. Visitor, do you know cases of violence with no violent after-effects after some time?

V. EAST ASIA: Ho p'ing and Heiwa
The Chinese and Japanese traditions

Memorial: The standard translation of ho p'ing (Chinese) and heiwa (Japanese) is harmony. And one reading of "harmony" would be not only "absence of violence", but "absence of conflict." The task of conflict resolution has already been carried out. Indications of conflict are brushed under the carpet; the person articulating conflict is frozen out of harmonious society, or so deep frozen on the inside that no articulation is forthcoming.

Skeptic: But "harmony" is not a bad definition of peace!?

Memorial: It may even be the clearest. But it raises problems.

Skeptic: Why is peace so problematic, so difficult to define?

Memorial: Maybe because peace, like "health" at the individual level, is supposed to stand for so many human wishes. Different parts of humanity project different wishes into the concept and forget the others. The definitions are incomplete, not wrong.

Skeptic: What is so good about the East Asian approach, then?

Memorial: Take the metaphor of Chinese boxes, in Russia the matrushka dolls, with one box/doll inside the other and so on, till they become as small as you can get them. They all look alike. In modern fractal/chaos theory they talk about self-similarity as something stabilizing. Maybe the basic East Asian point is that harmony is produced not by a particular structure, be that pyramid or wheel or whatever, but by the same structure, repeated at the personal, social and world levels, within and between - well, we do not have the between-worlds level, yet.

Skeptic: I see two problems with that. The same structure at all levels runs against the ecological principle of diversity. And, imagine mental ideas organized in a pyramid with some axiom on top, people organized the same way in national hierarchy, countries organized the same way in an international hierarchy! Same pyramidal structure with enormous power given to the leading idea in the mind of the leading person in the leading country. A recipe for global dictatorship rather than for peace?

Memorial: That would be heavy structural violence, incompatible with peace; and could even justify direct violence as a means to bring about that structure. The Japanese came dangerously close in Kokutai no hongi (Fundamentals of Our National Policy) during the Pacific War 1931-45: "War--should be a thing for the bringing out of great harmony, that is, peace--". Decisions in such matters could well be sealed with a beautiful tea ceremony. In Tao Te Ching we find the opposite: small, detached countries: "Though they have armor and weapons nobody displays them--they leave each other in peace while they grow old and die" (No. 80).

Skeptic: The People's Communes were not necessarily peaceful?

Memorial: Do not confuse them with the Cultural Revolution. Both China and Japan rank far below the West in attacking others. But they could develop the "harmony" idea further! Any suggestion?

VI. PACIFIC, AMERICA, AFRICA: Ho'o ponopono, Peace Pipe and Shir
The Polynesian, Cheyenne and Somali traditions

Memorial: We continue our travel eastward, leaving the Chinese and Japanese traditions behind. We are looking for traditions that to some extent have been buried under Western colonialism; and they are numerous. We shall focus on three: one from the Pacific, one from the Americas, and one from Africa.

Skeptic: But these are primitive, at best traditional cultures. What can they offer in terms of peace-making and peace culture?

Memorial: The general tendency in human history has been that what we dare call higher civilizations, sedentary, urbanized, agrarian or industrial, hierarchical and centralized, are highest in belligerence. War has much to do with territory, and the formation of a state to administer that territory. The Roma are a nation without a state and also without a history of war; they might be interesting as peace-makers in our present world. But we shall look at three traditions with territory and state not absent but less articulated, and start with Polynesia:

Memorial: Ho'o ponopono: The conflict resolution circle
A man is at sleep in his nice home. There are some noises, he gets up, catches a young boy on his way out of the window, with some money. The police arrives, they know the young boy: "Three strikes and you are out". But the place is Hawai'i, with a rich tradition combining restoration, reconciliation, and conflict resolution, the ho'o ponopono (setting very straight)'; known to the white owner of the violated house. He looks at the boy, the twenty years in prison, and tells the police "Let me handle it". It transpires that the boy's sister is ill, the family is too poor to pay for medicine. Every little dollar counts.

Ho'o ponopono is organized. The man's family, neighbors, the young boy and his family sit around a table. There is a moderator, the "wise man", not from the families/neighbors.

Four stages now start operating in this conflict circle.

First, each one is encouraged sincerely to present his/her version; why it happened, how, and what would be the appropriate reaction. The young boy's cause is questioned, but even if it is accepted, his method is not accepted. Everybody accepts some part of the responsibility, not only the boy, like being stingy.

Second, sincere apologies are then offered and accepted; forgiveness is demanded and offered.

Third, the young boy has to make up for the violation by doing free garden work for some time. The rich man and the neighbors agree to contribute to the family's medical expenses.

Fourth, in the end the story of the burglary is written up in a way acceptable to all; and that sheet of paper is then burnt; symbolizing the end to the burglary. But not to the aftermath, the construction of a new relation among all of them.

Skeptic: Too beautiful to be true! I am attracted by the idea that they all share responsibility, and that the good thing you did not do counts as much as the bad thing you did. But: how about hypocrisy? It is so verbal! And heavy crimes like murder?

Memorial: Important points; but then no method is perfect. What matters is a rich variety of perspectives, traditions.

Memorial: The Peace Pipe: The conflict resolution symbol
This is not about the specifics of conflict resolution, or about reconciliation, but about the general, underlying pattern of behavior: nonviolence. From nonviolence and the peace pipe symbolism of togetherness resolution/reconciliation will flow:

"We have a council of 44 peace chiefs - instituted by Sweet Medicine, our culture's hero. - They were not to engage in any quarrels within the tribe regardless of whether their families or children were involved. They were not to engage themselves in any force or violence, even if their son was killed right in front of their tee-pee. You are to do nothing but take your pipe and smoke. - You do not take revenge. Being a chief actually is a way of life. - The chief's home becomes a kind of sanctuary /where/ tribal members can be safe.- One of the more traditional ways of practicing nonviolence is for the chiefs to meet together in making peace-/and/ ultimately have the ritual of smoking a pipe (carried by the four principal chiefs) together with the adversary.- The chiefs mediate disputes. The chiefs don't take sides- /they are/ the peacemakers.- Ritual-tends to unite us so that we can think- with one mind, one heart. - Everyone has a right to talk. No one is interrupted and we talk around the circle until we are finished.

Skeptic: You mean they are just sitting there passing a pipe?

Memorial: That pipe becomes a unifying tie, a materialized promise, I assume; maybe even beyond the way we celebrate a document signed and sealed by all the parties. In short: a zone of peace at the top of society, with the leaders being models of nonviolence to be emulated by the rest.² We move on, to Africa:

Memorial: Shir: The conflict resolution market
"A traditional conflict resolution structure that brings together all the mature men in the clans involved in a conflict. Women, children and young hot-blooded warriors are excluded. Men lounge under the thorn trees during the hot, dry day. They chat and drink tea. They also spend long hours chewing qat, the mildly euphoric drug grown in the Horn of Africa, smoking, greeting each other, delighting in the pleasure of meeting old friends - or old foes. - At some point, things will jell. The various pieces that make up the main issue for which the shir was called will fall into place because a social climate conducive to a solution will have slowly emerged. The result will be proper peace-a peace felt from the inside-a peace that will have nothing in common with the quick-fix conferences in air-conditioned hotels in Addis Ababa organized by the UN--"³

Skeptic: But the market is where you go to get a good deal!

Memorial: Precisely! Conflict resolution has been hitched on to an old institutions in human history, the market, based on exchange for mutual benefit: I give, you give (do ut des, I give so that you give), and the principle of equal exchange, equity (quid pro quo). A thinks B owes him X, B does not agree but thinks A owes him Y, very far from A's idea. They may agree that X=Y and settle on that basis. Or they bring in C who has a grievance, Z, with both of them. Or, A with B, B with C, C with A, multi/bi-lateral. The market is a powerful model.

Skeptic: But doesn't that foster a very calculating spirit, and above all, how can I get the better deal?

Memorial: You may be thinking of contemporary capitalist markets, essentially aiming at capital accumulation, and mainly in the pockets of those who have already capital. Traditional markets may have been more concerned with preserving everybody. A hunter gets a good catch, shares with everybody - but under the assumption that when somebody else gets a good catch he will also share. The conflict markets aims at conflict resolution accumulation, but resolution by definition has to be shared.

Memorial: These three are examples of the enormous variety of human experience of rooting peace culture in conflict resolution culture. Conflicts there will always be, but tell me how you handle conflicts and I'll tell you how much peace you have! If you handle them with violence, like duels at the individual, and battles at the collective levels, you do not have peace; if you handle them nonviolently you may in addition avoid the violence that flows from unresolved conflicts and unrevenged violence.

Skeptic: I see that point. There is a lot of quiet talk around the table, in the teepee, in the market-place. The method is essentially verbal. They talk, interact, exchange till there is some kind of feeling of fit, some "click". But I am missing the more positive aspect of peace, something like just relations to start with, so that such situations do not arise.

Memorial: Maybe those relations are created through ho'o ponopono by setting them "straight"?

Skeptic: Do they always have to have a crisis before things can be set straight? Hawaiian society was very vertical, much power to the ali'i, chiefs, to men over women. Maybe that was why they had to straighten out something all the time.

Memorial: How about the Somali approach?

Skeptic: They all bring conflict, goods and willingness to seek solutions to the market-place. Then they exchange, in pairs, triples or more complex geometries. But it cannot possibly always be equitable? A is hunting down a cattle thief, B is a murderer, C is the lover of his wife - - -.

Memorial: They could throw in conventional goods, combining the ordinary market with the extraordinary conflict market.

Skeptic: That brings in much flexibility. But how about positive peace? Again I am missing that aspect. It is not good enough to have a fire brigade come each time there is a fire. Even better would be care with fire, fire-proof houses, etc.

Memorial: Well, dear Visitor, what do you think? Anything you personally can learn for your personal life, in your family, in your neighborhood, from these three perspectives on peace?

1. See E. Victoria Shook, Ho'o pono pono, Honolulu: East-West Center, 1985. For a more general perspective, see Bruce E. Barnes, "Conflict Resolution Across Cultures: A Hawaii Perspective and a Pacific Mediation Model", Mediation Quarterly, Vol. 12, no. 2, Winter 1994, pp. 117-133.
2. Excerpted from Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, "Indigenous Traditions of Peace: An Interview With Lawrence Hart, Cheyenne Peace Chief", in Subverting Hatred (Boston: The Boston Institute, 1999), pp. 85-94.
3. See Gerard Prunier, "Somaliland Goes It Alone", Current History, May 1998, pp. 225-28; the quote is from p. 227.

VII. PEACE CULTURES AROUND THE WORLD: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Skeptic: I am now confused. I fail to get the message if there is any. What happened to peace culture if there ever was one?

Memorial: Why should there be just one? Look at these cultures: we have different foods and eat differently, we have different ideas of love, and we make love (somewhat) differently. Why not also have different ideas of peace, and make peace differently? And then we learn from each other, and combine the best ideas. Thus, in Japanese hotels they used to have one room for Japanese and one for Western breakfast. But now tend toward one room where people can make their own Combi breakfast of both dishes.

Skeptic: But how can we combine peaces? You cannot even say the word in plural, it becomes so strange! I am even more confused.

Memorial: So let us use a more universal language, geometry:

EUROPE, secular: <u>Balance of power</u> <u>Rule of Man, Law</u>		
EUROPE, Christian: Soft: <u>agape</u> Hard: <u>bellum iustum</u>		
WEST ASIA: <u>shalom, Sala'am</u> Soft: the Wheel Hard: the Pyramid		
SOUTH ASIA: <u>The sangha wheel</u> <u>Shanti/Ahimsa</u> both soft		
EAST ASIA: <u>Harmony by the Wheel</u> <u>Harmony by similarity</u> Both soft and hard		
PACIFIC-AMERICAS- AFRICA: <u>Ho'o ponopono</u> <u>peace pipe</u> <u>shir</u> Soft: the Wheel		

We get Five Archetypes for Peace: the vertical, big Pyramid for the hierarchic Rule from above, of Man, or of Law; the Wheel for the smaller, tight, equal exchange; the Symmetry, like the Garden of Versailles for balance of power; the Sun for the nonviolence radiating from inner peace, and the Chinese boxes of harmony based on self-similarity, from micro to macro levels.

Skeptic: Abstract. Can you say it again, in some other words?

Memorial: The Napoleonic peace by a Prince/Lawmaker; the silent peace by groups of ordinary humans, or countries; the Nixon-Brezhnev summit negotiated peace, the Gandhian peace as process, not only outcome; the anonymous peace as built-in harmony.

DIALOGUE OF CIVILIZATIONS

Memorial: If we assume that culture tells us what is good/bad, beautiful/ugly, sacred/profane, right/wrong, true/false, then a peace culture would define peace as good/beautiful/sacred/holy; peace action as right, and the thesis "peace is attainable by peaceful means" as true. A war culture would glorify war and talk about just war and holy war, killing in war as righteous duty and "peace is attainable, but by violent means" as true. Western civilization is probably closer to the latter, because our deep culture steers our choice between peace and war culture

Skeptic: Isn't ordinary culture deep, and complex, enough?

Memorial: Deep culture is simple, even simplistic. Located in our collectively shared subconscious it does not benefit from conscious, verbal elaboration. It is a set of primordial ideas that come to us via myths, museums, curricula in history and culture, national anthems and icons, calendars, architecture, use of space. In short, things we share, tacit messages, not directly observable, but steering our thought, speech, action.

Skeptic: But doesn't this lead to stereotypes about a people?

Memorial: Perhaps about the culture. A deep culture is a set of hypotheses to be tested, much like a psychologist would test hypotheses about deep personality. But people internalize this deep culture more or less. The nation's capital is often dense, maybe men are more receptive than women, etc. A nation's leader would incur great risks acting, speaking against deep culture. Deep culture can be left unarticulated, but never contradicted.

First hypothesis: deep culture steers decisions that are
-representative, on behalf of the nation;
-surrounded by complexity, with good arguments pro and con;
-made during a crisis, with great risks and opportunities;
-made under time pressure, there is urgency; and made
-under pressure for consensus among leaders and with the nation.
Problems of peace and war whips the nation into one person.

Second hypothesis: knowing deep culture may be liberating.

Skeptic: But this is all form, not the content of deep culture!

Memorial: OK, here we go, with a list of what to look out for:

TIME	drama/up-down, crisis paradise or hell	smaller ups-downs oscillating	both
SPACE	pyramid/star:vertical dualist:Self vs Other	circle: horizontal monist:Self & Other	both
KNOWL- EDGE	contradiction=error Self=Good Other=Evil	dialectic/holistic Self=Other=Good&Bad	both
HISTORY	Struggle God vs Satan war/hero, peace/saint	the work of people ordinary people	both
CHOSEN	by God, exceptional	God inside us all	both
MEMORY	traumas and glories	past is processed	both
CONFLICT	winning, using power	compromise/transcend	withdraw

Skeptic: The first column predisposes for war, the second for peace?

Memorial: Yes, and the third can go either way; looks tolerant but may also easily be corrupted. Both-and may also mean neither-nor.

Skeptic: But isn't this scheme in itself a case of Western dualism?

Memorial: Well, the buddhist both-and with neither-nor, is there, and the daoist peace-in-war and war-in-peace is actually also there.

The first column portrays a civilization living in drama, make it or break it; always striving to place itself in the center, at the top, organizing the rest of the world as inferior and peripheral, even seeing them as evil. They are low on ambiguity--you are either for me or against me--and see history as a struggle between God and Satan. They themselves are chosen by a God that changes names all the time--like God=Democracy+Free Market--and hence above the law. They have suffered deep traumas and enjoyed high glory; and have the right, even the duty, to win, being the carrier of that much Truth. A clear recipe for war, genocide, imperialism, hitlerism, stalinism. But there is also a hidden recipe for peace by peaceful means. One day the name for God may become Peace, in the nonviolent sense.

Skeptic: What would bring that about?

Memorial: This is written 12 March 2000, a historic date. The Pope has apologized for the violence of the Catholic Church; a heroic, saintly act; a switch from a hard to a soft Christianity. What brought it about? Insight in their own belligerent deep culture. Maybe the same will happen to other major carriers of that culture?

Skeptic: Where is the war in the peace of that second column?

Memorial: Imagine the column as a person: much more pleasant, probably a lady, not the stern, strong lord of the first column! More Oriental, less Occidental, meaning accidental, to many. There is some truth to Man:Woman = Occident:Orient = War:Peace as a rule of thumb, with almost equally many exceptions. But the question is whether Peace is strong enough not to be seduced by a Hero of War who says that war is actually peace. There is also the temptation to become a Saint of Peace; inspiring, but also standing in the way of millions, billions who want peace and would like to work for peace, but fall short of saintly status. Occidental civilization is a cult of the strong individual; obsessed with Orwell's Enemy of the People (Saddam Hussein, Slobodan Milosevic right now), eulogizing Gandhi, but without learning anything from him. The second column may be too tolerant, not wishy-washy like the third, but too weak. There is a tremendous potential for peace when taken seriously. But peace is hard work, based on knowledge, skills, compassion, perseverance.

Skeptic: The second column is as good as form, but short on content?

Memorial: Yes, and this is where the dialogue enters. If we call them Hard and Soft, the Hard-Soft dialogue may soften the Hard and strengthen the Soft. The Soft-Soft dialogue will enrich them. The Hard-Hard dialogue may end with war, both wanting to be the center. But it may also lead to joint domination for their joint peace, from the top down, from center to periphery. This is what we have today. Humanity should be able to do better. The dialogues have to continue. And Soft has to be better prepared, with more concrete answers.

Skeptic: But this all sounds like crude building blocs from the history of ideas. Where is the action?

Memorial: They have to be crude for the subconscious of millions of people to be accommodated. They are building blocs, perhaps written in the universal language of structures, geometry. Curves with larger and smaller amplitudes may correspond to male and female sexuality. Stars and pyramids/wheels and circles are ways of organizing physical and social space. The bilateral opposition of forces are found in representations of symmetry. The outside/inside distinction is used to locate God and Satan: above and below for transcendent God/Satan; inside for God/Satan immanent. "God inside us all" reads like peace.

And, a very basic idea expressed in the postmodern geometry of fractals, chaos: self-similarity, the idea of Chinese boxes, the Russian matrushka. Open a structure and find it replicated on the inside, open that one and find the same. Organize your mental ideas with axioms at the top and chains of deduction to lower level ideas, project the pyramid outward and organize society, world the same way.

Skeptic: What comes first, mental, social or world organization?

Memorial: Less important. Maybe pyramid, or wheel, comes first? But the collectively shared memory of trauma and glory certainly matters. The "lessons of history" are used to shape or justify our crude building blocs, at the personal, social, world levels. And that is where conflict enters: how do we handle conflict: incompatible goals. I want something, you want something, we cannot both have it. There are essentially four ways out: victory of one party over the other (by force or threat, by bribery/corruption, by persuasion including law, or by charisma, the "gift of the Holy Spirit"); withdrawal, they stop pursuing the goals compromise, often unsatisfactory to both; or transcendence, they transform the conflict, go beyond, to something satisfactory to both. In a context of complexity, crisis and urgency deep culture decides the approach to conflict. Since world history has traumatized so many nations; collective memory is often invoked.

Skeptic: And the three columns produce three conflict styles?

Memorial: The first column predisposes for winning, prevailing over Other by the methods mentioned. The person, or nation, or region, sees itself as chosen by higher forces, exceptional, above all laws, confronting Evil/pure hatred, with one goal: destruction. To give in to Evil, let alone losing, opens for apocalypse. Worse still: to lose means that God has withdrawn the mandate; to win reconfirms our chosenness as instruments of God, History, Justice. Much is at stake. Each conflict is a cosmic drama with godliness bestowed on the winner.

The second column harbors quiet drama: people struggling to find ways out, without prevailing upon each other. Conflicts are problems to be solved, not raw material for aggrandizement. We are entitled to have goals but also the duty to search for acceptable and sustainable compromise or transcendence. Be aware of, and process, individual and collective baggage of trauma/glory; don't let it steer you! And: vasudaiva kuttumbakam, the world is my family, we are in it together.

The third column, Italian and Indian deep culture?, predisposes for postponement, withdrawal, maybe because it is too complex.

Skeptic: There is a limit to complexity, even for peace?

Memorial: There is a limit to what we can process, even for peace.

APPROACHES TO PEACE

Memorial: We have skimmed the surface of the vast reservoir of peace ideas in human cultures. There is much more in the corners of world space and in the layers of human history. Each society, community, family, person has ways of being peaceful by peaceful means, but they also often have ways of being violent. Our concern is to tilt the balance in favor of peace. We want peace cultures to be dominant cultures, as simple as that.

Skeptic: Another word for what you just said is bla-bla-bla.

Memorial: Agree. The point now is to give it concrete content. There must be things people can do at home, at school, at work, between generations, genders and races and classes; nations and civilizations, between states and regions.

So let us have a look at peace as geometry again. And let us focus on the world as a whole, divided into, say 200 states and 2,000 nations--with countless inter-state and inter-nation conflicts, not to mention conflicts between nations and states.

The two Europes and West Asia have one idea in common: the hierarchy, the pyramid. Essentially it is peace from above, whether from a big power, a concert of big powers, or from some central authority. Let us call it global governance, based on global architecture. Regional versions may produce peace among members, but be against non-members. We want world peace.

Skeptic: You are thinking of the European Union?

Memorial: The point is the ambiguity. Peace between Germany and France is beautiful; the inability to do the same with Orthodox/Slavic and Muslim Europe less so. But let us continue.

We leave out balance of power because it stimulates arms races that easily lead to wars, and because it is based on the threat of direct violence, not on peaceful means. A similar objection for the pyramid: it is based on structural violence.

Skeptic: You throw it out, then?

Memorial: We cannot do without. Some big is necessary. But we pick up the counterpoint to the pyramid, the wheel, found in five cultural spaces, as peace from below. Small is beautiful, inspiring the search for alternative peace structures. And then we would certainly add the shanti-ahimsa combination from South Asia: the source of peace is inside you, its expression is nonviolence, which makes war abolition a realistic utopia. And we pick up the idea of conflict transformation, with East Asian harmony as outcome, ho'o ponopono-shir-peace pipe as process.

Skeptic: Don't you lose a lot of detail when you do this?

Memorial: Certainly. But there is some value in having a short list of six approaches, for quick reference. They even divide into two groups: global governance, war abolition and conflict transformation are more familiar; nonviolence, peace structures and peace cultures perhaps more unfamiliar and challenging. So let us proceed with them in that order, from the familiar to the unfamiliar. The task now is to use these general ideas and forms to generate concrete content. Dear Visitor: Move on!

1. GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

Memorial: Violence and war are about power, the power to force, to coerce, by harming and hurting. Peace, being politics, is also about power, reducing force to a minimum, using soft political, economic and cultural power instead. Wars are traditionally the prerogative of states. Peace, like violence, knows no limits as to actors who could be the carriers of peace.

Skeptic: But the world is essentially a system of states. Except for some that do not have armies they are prepared for war. How can you possibly tame them when the UN cannot?

Memorial: States are important, but they are not the only global citizens. There are inter-governmental organizations (IGOs); the most important being the United Nations system, today overshadowed by the only remaining superpower and rivals. There are the transnational corporations (TNCs) whose peace potential nobody has really tapped. The political left are afraid of touching them, and the political right think they do best when left to themselves as "market forces". And then there are domestic and global civil society, essentially consisting of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), local authorities (LAs; (cities, towns, municipalities) and just people and their networks of affinity and vicinity. With the exception of some IGOs known as alliances, and some domestic NGOs known as nations or "ethnic groups", these global citizens do not carry arms. They may compete, even be nasty, but they do not kill. NGOs like Amnesty International, Greenpeace and Médecins sans frontières are today seen as major sources of moral authority, far above governments and churches. Global governance, then becomes a question of joint governance by state and non-state.

Skeptic: That sounds like a recipe for chaos, not governance.

Memorial: We could strengthen the United Nations by reducing state power and increasing non-state power. The veto power is a relic of feudal times and will disappear, sooner or later. The UN General Assembly, UNGA, could become what it actually is: The UN Governmental Assembly. And then there could be a UN Peoples' Assembly (UNPA), based on free and secret vote in member states, of one representative for each million of inhabitants (minimum one). A UN NGO Assembly already exists as a consultative organ; a UN Local Authorities Assembly could be created, and we could have a UN Corporate Assembly. Complex, but then the world is complex. Gradually the UNPA would get more power, like the European Parliament. The world would move toward democratic global governance; much more than the sum of democracies.

Skeptic: How about force, you cannot leave it out!

Memorial: Of course there would be peace-keeping, -making and -building actors, like police, conflict workers, development workers, humanitarian forces, environmental workers. We could even make it a duty for world citizens to serve in such forces. We might even get global taxes to pay for this and maybe also global human rights as the states gradually recede into the background. They are already disappearing as economic actors. In short, at the end of global governance is a world government!

2. WAR ABOLITION

Memorial: We are talking about the abolition of a social evil. There are two very relevant models and we are in the middle of a third. The two are the abolition of slavery (19th century), the abolition of colonialism (20th century), and the third is the abolition of patriarchy (21st century?). The processes are painful for those who lose privilege and those who struggle for parity; but in the end liberating for both. To abolish war means nothing less than to liberate some from the duty to kill, and others from the duty to be killed. Heavy, bad duties, indeed.

Skeptic: But can you really compare them; isn't war and violence so deeply ingrained in human nature that the only way to abolish war is to abolish human beings all together?

Memorial: They used to say the same about slavery and colonialism, and even the latter is today history. In our efforts to move toward a non-killing society (the felicitous term by the US peace researcher Glenn Paige) capital punishment as a right and duty of the state will also end up in the dustbin of history. Moving toward a non-killing world, war will vanish.

Skeptic: But this is against the very essence of the state!?

Memorial: There are essentially three approaches: from above, regulating warfare by means of rules about ius ad bellum and ius ad bello; from above by unilateral examples; and from below through resistance, non-cooperation, conscientious objection.

Skeptic: But we have had rules about war even before Augustine!

Memorial: Indeed, and they have also served to legitimize war. It gives no comfort to the bereaved to know that their beloved ones were killed by the UN, or by an organization of democratic countries. Slavery was not abolished by slave-owners agreeing to softening chains and whipping; nor was colonialism abolished by colonizers agreeing to standardize that institution. They yielded to public opinion pressure, and bought survival of that wicked institution for some more years by softening it. Much more important was English unilateral abolition of slave trade, and French abolition of slavery. Gandhi offered the English an alternative to being militarily beaten; with India gone not only English colonialism, but colonialism in general, was gone.

Today about 30 small countries and dependencies do not have armies, although many of them have some arrangements. If a big, heavy country could be an example from above, it would help. But it also makes sense to try to slim the war machines by reducing the inputs of natural resources, labor--both as arms workers and as soldiers--capital, technology, and officers. A Hippocratic oath committing scientists to enhance, not to destroy life, is also meaningful. Conscientious objection is only one approach.

Skeptic: How about turning the war machineries over to the UN?

Memorial: This happened to the local war lords in the process of state-building. But just like states could become very violent against its citizens, a war-prone world government could be dangerous. We would still need to tame that government!

3. CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION

Memorial: Conflict is as human as life itself. Conceived of as contradiction, there is only one conflict free human being: a dead human being. The same goes for societies and societies of societies: world communities. Conflict-free is to be lifeless. To talk about "conflict prevention" is like talking about "life prevention". What is harmful, counterproductive, unnecessary and avoidable is violence. "Violence-prevention" makes sense.

The problem is not conflict, but our approach. Conflict means that two or more goals, of the same or different actors, are incompatible, contradictory. That calls for creativity, a maximum of empathy with the actor behind that other goal, and to remain nonviolent. We may manage this alone, in dialogue with that Other. Or we may have to call on outside actors for help. But do not wait for violence--which always makes things worse--and do not fall into the trap of confusing ceasefire and peace.

Skeptic: But isn't violence sometimes necessary?

Memorial: Take a medical example: the conflict between saving a life, and saving a leg with gangrene. The "solution" known as amputation kills the leg, and is a major violence to the body. Much better would be therapy for the gangrene. Pending that the amputation/violence may be indispensable provided [1] nonviolent alternatives have been tried, [2] the violence used is much less than the violence avoided, and [3] there is no worship of the amputation/violence, but continued search for better solutions.

Skeptic: But most people seem to know only three possibilities: the other side gives in, there is a compromise, there is a fight

Memorial: That is a lot relative to the medieval tradition of seeing conflict as opportunity to fight--duels for individuals, and battles for groups--and the fight as an opportunity to come higher up. Efforts to solve a conflict by finding an outcome acceptable to all parties were acts of treason committed by some clergy, commoners and women. As feudalism came to an end some of the nobility took that spirit with them into the new state-system, as heads of armies and navies, and as foreign ministers. Excellencies. Even today many conflicts could easily be solved, but certain powers prefer war, and believe in a war culture.

Skeptic: How about conflict transformation and peace culture?

Memorial: Absolutely essential for a peace culture to grow is a variety of nonviolent alternatives to violence. Example: two kids and one orange: what happens? They may fight. But there are at least 15 other outcomes. Most people identify only 7, 8. The more alternatives you know, the less likely the violence.

Skeptic: Provided there is a will to avoid violence.

Memorial: That is another and basic part of peace culture. But the will can increase the more attractive the peaceful outcomes. One of the many conflict transformation NGOs, TRANSCEND, makes such proposals, based on deep dialogues with the parties. Look at <www.transcend.org> to find out whether they look reasonable. If you can come up with something better, tell them!

4. NONVIOLENCE

Memorial: Maybe a point of departure is to remind ourselves that if violence is to hurt and harm life--body, mind and spirit--and to destroy material non-life, then minimum, negative nonviolence is to abstain from harming, hurting, destruction. A positive definition is Gandhi's nonviolence=love=truth=god. Nonviolence then shows its other side, enhancing life--body, mind and spirit--and constructing non-life, things, property.

Skeptic: This sounds like all good things, a summum bonum, wrapped together in one negative word, starting with non?

Memorial: The word has that negative connotation, like non-intervention. Many confuse this rich concept with imaginative demonstrations in front of the authorities of State and Capital. They are extremely important and meant a lot in important cases that made a major difference in the second half of 20th century:

- [1] the liberation of arrested Jews in Berlin, February 1943
- [2] Gandhi's swaraj campaign in India; Independence from 1947
- [3] Martin Luther King Jr.'s campaign in the US South from 1956
- [4] the anti-Viêt Nam war movement, inside and outside Viêt Nam
- [5] the Buenos Aires Plaza de Mayo mothers against the military
- [6] the "People's Power" movement in the Philippines, 1986
- [7] the Children's Power movement in South Africa, from 198
- [8] the intifadah movement in Occupied Palestine, from 1987
- [9] the democracy movement Beijing, spring 1989
- [10] the Solidarność/DDR movements which ended the Cold War

In all of them public space--plazas, roads, streets--were major battle-fields, but not in the European tradition as barricades, as burning of cars and tires, as teargas, throwing of stones.

Skeptic: But if public space manifestations are so crucial, why are you complaining about confusion and narrow approaches?

Memorial: Nonviolence should not only be action, but also in speech. Using language, including body language, that does not hurt and harm is important, particularly in the special space around the negotiation table. Respect for Other, empathy, can be combined with verbal nonviolence in efforts to identify the strong points of Other, not to exploit his weak points. Gandhi even helped his opponent formulate his view. Nonviolence of the thought enters here, the most difficult of them all: not hating, not nourishing the anger that eats up your heart. Nonviolence covers all human activity in general, and political action in particular, always demanding love, respect, positive action.

Skeptic: But that is very different from how politics is done!

Memorial: Politics as we know it is profoundly adversarial. It may be nonviolent in action, but certainly not in words, like in the verbal violence of the debate - a verbal duel aimed at the weak spots in Other. Not much love in the thoughts either - -

Skeptic: But that means that nonviolence is very demanding!?

Memorial: You said it. But high ideals never harmed anyone.

5. PEACE STRUCTURES

Memorial: Structures are patterns of interaction. They refer to behavior and are external to us human beings. We live inside them. They are often strongly enforced by institutionalization. try to change traffic rules and you will see what happens in terms of sanctions from the outside. They are robust relative to the preceding four approaches which are more like concrete policies. To change structures and cultures, that is radical.

Skeptic: Radical is no guarantee that they are peace productive.

Memorial: Agree. The change from "capitalism" to "socialism" in what became the Soviet Union was no doubt radical, but not peace productive. The theory was that capitalist states go to war to secure resources and markets, no doubt a factor. But states also go to war to enforce the "socialism" of neighboring countries.

Skeptic: Socialism was not the door key to the Realm of Peace. How about democratic, not autocratic; civilian, not militarist; participatory, not authoritarian; gender parity, not patriarchy?

Memorial: The point is probably that each factor, including socialism, has something peace productive. Or, take capitalism: linking us all together with trade may also be peace productive, but driving us apart through exploitative trade is violence.

Or, take democracy. Democracies attack each other less, but why should they? They are also the richest and strongest, they rule the world, better be united. Besides, that a country is democratic does not mean that the foreign policy is decided democratically and not by a small elites. And even if it were decided democratically the people could be very belligerent. "Civilian, participatory, gender parity" sounds good, however. Add to that a world more run by local authorities and NGOs.

Skeptic: But women in charge can also be quite belligerent!

Memorial: Maybe they were the women patriarchy could accept? Maybe they wanted to prove that they could do anything men could? Right now, not necessarily forever, women seem to be less risk- and violence-prone than men. More peace-productive.

But there is another, very simple structural factor: size. Tao Te Ching, verse 80, mentions smallness. Today there are 30 or so countries without armies; they are mainly small but tend to survive. Some have defense treaties, some have militias. Big countries make us wonder: How did they become that big? How do they remain that big? Do they want to become even bigger? Big countries have big cultures, and they tend to be very ambiguous, always having hard peace by (very) violent means as a reserve. Many smaller countries, loosely linked together might be better.

Skeptic: But that is the sticky point, how do you link them?

Memorial: By the two basic structures above: star and wheel, linking people, linking countries. The star generates resistance further out that may lead to war; the wheel is better. But there is a limit to how many can relate equitably, peacefully, meaningfully to each other. This is the price the EU may have to pay for expansion. But, maybe we could invent something new?

6. PEACE CULTURES

Memorial: Cultures are patterns of intra-action, they refer to attitudes, assumptions. Cultures live inside us. They are often strongly enforced by "internalization". Try to act against norms and values you used to believe in, and see what happens in terms of bad conscience. They differ from the peace approaches of [1]-[4] above and the deeper changes of [5]: they touch our identity. Most people favor peace, and favor their own culture, and reject the idea that their culture is war rather than peace productive.

Skeptic: Is the UNESCO definition of peace culture threatening?

Memorial: UNESCO's definition is a list of eight policies:

- nonviolent action for conflict resolution, social change and social justice;
- protection and respect for human rights;
- democratic participation in governance;
- tolerance and solidarity including across conflict lines;
- sustainable development;
- education for peace and nonviolence;
- the free flow of sharing of information;
- equality of men and women.

No doubt, making these eight national/state policies is already a change of culture; the last bringing in female deep culture. A world of such states would be a more peaceful world. And yet we may have to go down to the deep culture underlying policies. There may be bad patterns that reproduce war and violence.

Skeptic: Again a search for problems! Is peace that difficult?

Memorial: Imagine a country firmly believes it is chosen by God to bring order to the world; and sees itself as exceptional, beyond the laws of ordinary people and countries. That country may go in for peace. But it is likely to be their peace, not peace as a product of joint efforts bringing together states and nations, genders, races and classes. This point has been raised for human rights, not that they are wrong but that they are incomplete, not reflecting the values of non-Western cultures. The West tends to accuse such critics of being non-democratic.

Or, imagine a country deeply troubled by traumas they have suffered, and are yearning for the glories of the past. Or, a country with a culture very high on dualism, easily seeing Self as only good and Other as bad only. If somebody deviates from their concept of peace they might react very violently.

Skeptic: But such deep cultural patterns are well protected!

Memorial: Yes. But maybe we can learn from Freud and Jung? The deep culture is located in the collective subconscious. It steers the behavior of states, particularly when there is a need for consensus and quick action. Better become aware of such inclinations, articulate them, challenge them, change them.

Skeptic: A Sisyphus task? Or worse, Herculean madness?

Memorial: Neither. One more challenge, worthy of human beings.

7. APPROACHES TO PEACE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Memorial: Crucial for the six approaches to peace is synergy: do all of this so that the approaches reinforce each other. Global governance makes more sense if combined with a peace culture that has the courage of examining deeper assumptions; is based on more wheel and less star/pyramid structures; spreads the ethos of nonviolence all over; makes conflict transformation a part of our common culture like literacy and personal hygiene; and has war abolition as a major goal, including for big powers.

Skeptic: But isn't this like asking slave-owners and colonial power to propagate the culture of freedom?

Memorial: Some did, and were then caught in the contradictions, like after the Second world war. But we need other actors, like:

- **peace studies**, to explore further all these complex problems, being free to question all assumptions including their own, independent of governments and of other political actors;

- **peace education**, to spread at all levels of education, formal and informal--from kindergarten via universities to the third cycle--knowledge and skills, about peace and peace policies;

- **peace journalism**, to focus attention on conflicts and their transformation and not only on violence/war and who wins/loses;

- **peace movements**, to translate ideas into peace politics, with NGOs lobbying governments and intergovernmental organizations in favor of such peace policies as anti-personnel land mine treaty, debt forgiveness, an international criminal court, a clean environment, economic policies that satisfy basic needs, and in general in favor of all human rights, indivisible and universal.

Skeptic: Could that task simply be too big for us?

Memorial: Politics has been called the art of the possible, which is not much of an art. Peace politics is the art of the impossible, meaning what people thought was impossible. Like eliminating slavery and colonialism as institutions, not too different from the task of eliminating war. Like improving health enormously through a health culture of very concrete "policies" at the individual level: brush your teeth, wash your hands, watch what enters and exits from the openings of your bodies, exercise your body, your mind, your spirit! We have been able to control, reduce, even eliminate a number of diseases, not too different from the task of reducing violence.

Take some inspiration from the map of Paris! There is the central axis Avenue de la Grande Armée-Arc de Triomphe-Champs Elysées. Meaning Paradise. But also Death. But then there are ten more avenues. You guessed the names for peace, to the right: **Global Governance, War Abolition, Conflict transformation**; left: **Nonviolence, Peace Structures, Peace Cultures**; and as back-up: **Peace Studies-Peace Education-Peace Journalism-Peace Movements**

Skeptic: I doubt they are going to change the names!

Memorial: Peace starts in the minds, not in the street names -

PEACE MOVEMENTS

Memorial: We can divide modern society in three parts: State, Capital and Civil Society. The latter are people, with their numerous organizations by vicinity and affinity. Most important today are the cities/towns, or local authorities, LAs in general, and the nongovernmental organizations, the NGOs. The peace movements are a part of the NGOs and as such a part of civil society. But there are also LAs that organize for peace. During the Cold War they created nuclear-free city-zones, doing at the meso-level what states try to do at the macro-level.

Skeptic: Does this mean that the peace movement is, almost by definition, against the State, and maybe also against Capital?

Memorial: There is some tension. After all, the State has the monopoly on major means of violence, the famous ultima ratio regis (the Emperor's last argument). According to an American saying, "if your only tool is a hammer, all problems look like nails". It is not the only tool any longer, the situation is improving. But the State also turns direct violence against its own citizens, as genocide and capital punishment. And Capital has a way of creating structures that deprive lower strata of their means of livelihood, like many states that create other ways of imprisoning people by depriving them of freedom. Both exploitation and repression are forms of structural violence. The peace movement is directed against either form of violence, but would prefer to work with, not against, State and Capital.

Skeptic: I associate peace movements mainly with left-wingers marching in the streets with big banners, against something.

Memorial: Watch out: when people turn to the streets it is very often because there is no alternative. The media are closed to them because the topic is taboo, they cannot afford renting a meeting place, etc. Freedom of expression and assembly is empty unless there is a place to express and assemble. But, given that people have a tendency to take on a problem only if they see a solution, the peace movement has to be constructive, like the Nobel Peace Prize holders International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Amnesty International and Médecins Sans Frontières, today doing constructive peace work all over.

Skeptic: But they are today almost a part of the system!?

Memorial: Why not? The system is made more human. New movements come up, often in coalitions, to ban anti-personnel land-mines. They may demonstrate, advocate or lobby to change State and Capital, or do the job when State/Capital are unable/unwilling, like the three Nobel Peace Prize holders and many of the Right Livelihood Award holders, the alternative nobel peace prize. Or courageous individuals, the conscience of their nation, like Victor Hugo, Emile Zola, Jean-Paul Sartre in France.

Skeptic: But these people are professionals in their fields!

Memorial: And in a democracy they should relate to people in dialogues, being neither on top, nor at the bottom as servants. They should be peace, not only advocate peace.

PEACE EDUCATION

Memorial: Peace education is a question of pedagogy, so there are at least three elements involved: who teaches whom, what:

-what: peace = handling conflicts creatively and nonviolently;
-whom: everybody, we all need this kind of knowledge and skill;
-who: nonformal/formal education; K, primary/secondary/tertiary levels, adult education, continued education, all over.

Skeptic: But that means peace pedagogues behind every bush?

Memorial: Let us proceed by analogy, trying to be pedagogical. Building on violence:peace = disease:health (violence relates to peace like disease relates to health) look at health education. Last century health education focused on personal body hygiene: brushing teeth, washing hands, contraception, exercise, diets. Then there was the social level approach: sewage systems, massive inoculation, quarantine, better standards of living with adequate housing and clothing protecting the human body against excessive temperature and humidity, and environmental measures. Health education made people see the connections between micro-organisms and the ups and downs of the immune system. We did not get eternal life. But we doubled the life expectancy!

Skeptic: At the expense of Big Brother State steering? And, who owned all that health, the individual, the company or the state? Who exploited healthy lives, healthy workers, healthy soldiers, with the reproduction of it all guaranteed by healthy mothers?

Memorial: All three, also according to who paid the bills. More recently health education took on a more controversial aspect: mental health. Like somatic disease, mental disorders have to be understood very holistically, not only in terms of one cause. Educating people to handle personal stress and conflict better is important, like the conflict focus in peace education.

Skeptic: But states want patriotic soldiers, not citizens who have been through a lot of training in conflict transformation!

Memorial: Patriotism loses much of its meaning when the borders of the patria, the father country, disappear with the impact of globalization. Just like health education made the individual more than before the master of his/her own health, conflict and peace education would make common people more able to handle conflicts more constructively, less destructively, violently. When conflicts are handled better there will be less hatred and violence because people know peaceful alternatives and become less manipulable. A key peace educator, Anatol Pikas in Uppsala, uses mobbing, as an opening to make everybody a mediator.

Skeptic: And the kindergarten?

Memorial: Well, get a table with two kids, one--only one--orange, and discuss what happens. We have identified sixteen approaches, only one of them violent. General assumption: the more alternatives to violence, the less likely the violence. But this, like stories about successful conflict transformation, has to be learnt. Like health, peace does not come by itself.

PEACE JOURNALISM

Skeptic: The expression "peace journalism" smacks of propaganda, of a ministry instructing journalists how to write, supervising their job performance. I want journalists to report facts!

Memorial: I agree. But would you react the same way if someone specialized in health journalism was competent enough not only to ask questions about epidemics and hunger, but also about sewage systems, nutrition, diets, hygiene, and possible cures?

Skeptic: But that would be based on science!

Memorial: We also know something about peace and some knowledge about disease, health and their causes is not that solid. The point is that the media report war and violence, damage to life and property but not much about underlying causes and what could be done about it. When they report about disease they also say something about why, and what could have been done, even if not yet a fact. There is Minister of Peace to interview; often not a word about peace. The journalists have a possibility: they can say "he did not mention - -", "he did not elaborate" more often.

Skeptic: But you cannot let violence pass unreported; moreover, don't reports about violence stimulate action for peace?

Memorial: Of course violence and war should be reported. But then also report the invisible effects of violence, like the suffering of the bereaved, the destruction to the environment; the hatred accumulating towards the next war; the triumphalism of the victor, possible also pointing to the next war; the war structures and war cultures that are emerging. But I am not so sure that this approach stimulates peace. More likely, it fans the flames for revenge or more victory. Or a feeling of apathy, or perverse enjoyment, or violence pornography.

Skeptic: What is missing, then, in the usual reporting?

Memorial: Peace journalism would focus more on the underlying conflict and what can be done about it, and less on war and violence and who is the winner, as if war were a football game. That is also a reason why they see only two parties. Generally speaking war, and violence in general, are monuments over conflicts badly handled. Focus on the conflicts formation, who are the actors, what are their goals, how do goals clash. Most conflicts are between true and true; standard reporting of most media is in terms of Us and Them, Good and Bad. They also confuse the conflict formation with the conflict arena where the violence is, like ex-Yugoslavia, forgetting external powers. Civil wars, intra-state wars are things of the past.

Skeptic: That sounds like turning media into academic seminars!

Memorial: No, the key focus is on how to solve these conflicts, looking for creative alternatives to violence, based on peace studies, peace education and the peace movements, in addition to State and Capital. The journalist has to be at home in all. The reader/listener/viewer should demand more of the media: don't to fan the flames, but to prevent destructive fires! (see sheet).

PEACE STUDIES

Skeptic: Do we need peace studies when we have political science and international studies at most universities?

Memorial: First: the opposite of peace is not only war between states, but violence across all human divides, fault-lines; humans vs nature, between genders, generations, races, classes, the normal and the deviant as Foucault pointed out, between nations as groups of people of the same culture and territorial attachment, and, of course, between states. Peace studies covers them all; not only inter-state studies covered by the other two.

Second: the peace focus is on what can be done about violence; not only diagnosis and prognosis but also therapy, to use medical jargon. We do not want physicians who limited to diagnosis/prognosis. Fortunately, the goal of medical studies is health. The goal of peace studies is peace, not only studies.

Third: peace studies covers skills, not only knowledge, and training, not only teaching. Conflict and peace specialists must know about conflict transformation before-during-after violence, how to do reconstruction and reconciliation after violence, etc.

Skeptic: But isn't violence between states, war, the most important form in terms of numbers killed and wounded?

Memorial: The most serious in terms of numbers is women killed by abortion, infanticide and sheer brutality. We may talk about 100 million during the 1980s, and the name of the responsible system is patriarchy, not the state system. And, if we expand the vision from direct violence to the structural violence that weakens the body through malnutrition, denying it satisfaction of basic needs, making it easy victim of diseases and hunger, then the name of the responsible system is class. To limit peace studies to war studies between states is like limiting medical science to, say, cardiovascular diseases. Peace studies are open to all forms of major violence across human divides, and particularly to massive category killing. Genocide is the killing of Other just because she/he is different, to eliminate, or reduce, that category. Shoa is the best known case from the horrible 20th century. Often the state machinery is used by one nation to kill other nations in the area controlled, for instance by colonialism. But wars are also massive category killing, like in "there is only one good German, a dead German".

Skeptic: How about violence in the family, in the streets?

Memorial: Violence and peace apply not only to the macro level between states and nations, to the meso level of big categories within countries, but also to the micro level of inter-/intra-personal relations. There are conflicts to be transformed so that they can be handled without violence all over. Including peace with nature and the inner peace, with oneself. Much to do!

Skeptic: Can peace studies so committed to peace be scientific?

Memorial: Like medical studies committed to health peace studies are publicly accessible. Others can check the findings and test the theories about peace. Secrecy is incompatible with science, a reason why secret services and military make so many mistakes.

COULD THE SECOND WORLD WAR IN EUROPE HAVE BEEN AVOIDED?

Memorial: Let us explore whether the six peace approaches, singly or combined, could have changed history, saving Europe, and the Jews in particular, from the horrors of WWII and shoa.

Skeptic: What kind of nonsense is that! History is what really happened, not some wishful alternative, some "as if". History is in the indicative, not in the subjunctive mode!

Memorial: You are of course right. We know what happened, see sector A of this museum. But we humans make decisions all the time. Our "nature" does not determine unambiguously what we do. Maybe we could have made other decisions? For better or worse?

Skeptic: OK, as long as we don't forget what really happened. There may be official history, history as seen by the victors, as seen by the vanquished, and revisionist history. I find AJP Taylor The Origins of the Second World War fascinating. He portrays the 1930s as rather confused, no big scheme on either side, not even Hitler, except to undo the Versailles Treaty. He was a superb poker player, holding his cards close to himself, out-tricking them all. But that is not the point. All these histories have one thing in common, however much they diverge in interpretation: they try to establish what really happened. You are asking us to do something entirely different, to try to find out what might have happened, if - -. History "as if".

Memorial: Yes, and there is a certain philosophy behind this. Human behavior is not predetermined, as some people believe. History is not like water flowing in a deep, solid riverbed toward a predetermined ocean, some kind of "end of history". Rather, if each molecule is an individual, or an individual act, add a little wind, a little sunshine, and they could combine in other ways, dig their own, new riverbeds, feed into bigger, old rivers, or get lost in the desert sand, coming up again as a giant water reservoir. True, what happened happened. But with even small variations it could all have been different.

Skeptic: I can agree to that. But don't we learn more from what really happened than from what might have happened?

Memorial: From both. In this museum we focus on what happened, violence, war, and on what might have happened, peace. We are concerned with the unspeakable suffering of violence, and with the promise of peace, not only with less suffering, but with alternative history. There is nothing so devastating to the spirit as the idea of the inevitable. Since we are talking about Germany, there is a saying in German, Der Krieg ist ein Naturgesetz, "war is a law of nature". Nonsense. They once said that about slavery, and about colonialism. Rather, as Americans often say, let us "get on top of history" rather than letting "history get on top of us". We search for alternatives in our daily life. We say "I wish I had acted differently yesterday, next time around I'll do better". Why not also in politics?

Skeptic: But that means sitting in judgment of politics!?

Memorial: It does. Democracy is about that. Let us get started!

[1] Global Governance

Memorial: Global governance means world central power, and there are four types of power: political decision-making; moral power, persuasion; economic power, bargaining; military power, force. Would world central power have changed history in the 1930s?

Political decisions, resolutions: no, states were sovereign and one of their rights was the right to declare and go to war.

Moral persuasion: probably not, but maybe much more could have been done via the Christian churches. They were anti-communist, however, meaning no impact on the Soviet Union.

The League of Nations also had diplomatic and economic boycott/sanctions on the repertory. Had they been used with determination they might have strengthened Hitler politically ("see, they are all against us") and economically and militarily ("we have to produce what we need, and conquer what we cannot produce"). The same may even have applied to any other global authority. Sanctions might simply have been counterproductive.

Skeptic: How about a world central authority bombing Germany to submission, with the legitimacy of international law, killing the Nazi bud before it started sprouting, using robust force?

Memorial: If this had happened in the first phase, 1933-1938, Nazism had not yet shown its expansionist and repressive color. The attack would probably have unified Germans even more. They would most likely have resisted violently any attack and any occupation, any "back to Versailles", after Hitler had undone some of the Treaty (Ruhr, Rheinland). And an occupation might have been as repressive as the repression it hoped to stop.

In the second phase, 1938-1942, a land war inside Germany, not only against Germany with massive bombing might have stopped expansion and the shoa. But it might also have accelerated them. Autocrats may turn an attack both downward and outward. Austria would have resisted "liberation". The Czechs might have been jubilant. And rapid deployment might have saved the Jews.

In the third phase, 1943-1945, a war defeating Germany took place; and yet Germany brought even more terror to occupied countries and carried out the shoa. There was inner resistance, but no real uprising. This might also have happened in Phase II.

Skeptic: Your whole project of "counterfactual history" leads to nothing. For Phase I you conclude that nothing could be done. For Phase III, when Hitler's bluffing no longer worked, your conclusion coincides with real history. You open a maybe window for Phase II, but add that it could have been counterproductive.

Memorial: We assume a much stronger world central authority, capable and authorized to intervene, not accepting sovereignty as a cloak for atrocities against the people within its borders. But you are right. This first scenario, global governance, did not yield much. The world was, and still is, not ready.

And there is also that other problem: military force and boycott/sanctions may be counterproductive, stimulating aggression rather than preventing it. A victory considered unjust may stimulate revenge/revanche. Decisions will only work when backed by moral authority, and that authority is not found at the top of today's world. And civil society was far too weak to be a moral authority. But, dear Visitor, what do you think?

[2] War Abolition

Memorial: This can be done in many ways. For the sake of the argument let us consider two methods: outlawing war from above, and from below, through strikes, conscientious objection, etc.

Skeptic: Not very promising, I think. Sovereignty was and is still a major value, even seen as a right for states, and particularly so for states dissatisfied with their position in the world. And: to be a soldier was more than just conscription like it may be in today's Germany. It was a Beruf, a vocation, even a calling, some kind of sacred duty, and a basic right!

Memorial: No problem with the first point, and even more so since the Allies would not have given up the right to wage war, being, all of them, also colonial powers. And, any action aimed only at Germany--like the famous Article 9 in the Japanese Constitution, depriving that country of the right of war--would only be seen as a part of Versailles, in fact even going beyond Versailles. A non-runner. War between states was forbidden anyhow, by the League of Nations, as it is today by the United Nations. Moreover, there was the Kellogg-Briand treaty of 1928 making this point very clearly, signed by all major states, with the usual exceptions (self-defense, collective defense). That approach was tried, unsuccessfully. Governments were not ready.

Skeptic: You see, again, there was no alternative!

Memorial: You forget the other approach, from below: strikes, conscientious objection. The question is, however, whether the number of objectors would be high enough to make an impact and overwhelm even the Nazi repression machinery.

Skeptic: Even in the 1930s they put tens of thousands in forced labor-concentration camps, later hundreds of thousands, millions, dying of diseases, working, shooting, gassing them to death.

Memorial: All your points are no doubt valid. But they saw the opposition as illegitimate, being enemies anyhow: Communists, social Democrats, trade union people, Jews. Only opposition from mainstream Germany might have counted. And even so we know how they treated their own if their loyalty was in doubt.

The basic point is simply this: we were not there, yet. We were not at the point we have come to in connection with slavery and colonialism: relics of the past even if they reappear in some form. But that doesn't mean that strong nonviolent action against war of all kinds and in all countries, aiming not only at Germany, but also at the allies and others, could not have had an impact. But Europe would have needed movements thousand, ten thousand times stronger than War Resisters' International and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Skeptic: I am not so sure. The pacifists only see the armies as instruments of attack. They don't see that we may need them for defense. There are wicked countries around. Nazi Germany was one. There are also some very good countries with a mission for the world - they may put an army to some good use.

Memorial: Well, we leave it here. Visitor, what do you think?

[3] Conflict Transformation

Memorial: Whereas the first two thought experiments were negative, this third approach may be more promising. But let us first make one thing clear. By "conflict transformation" we are not thinking of somebody shuttling between the parties, secret diplomacy using carrots and sticks to bribe the parties, etc. Rather, we are thinking of efforts to understand what the conflict is about, deeper down, and then trying to do something. At the root of each conflict, with all its confusing emotions, distortions of truth, threats and actual violence, there are always the parties, their goals that may clash, be incompatible, producing contradictions. Is there, nevertheless, some way out?

Skeptic: Certainly not with Hitler - fanatics cannot be bribed!

Memorial: But what were the European/world goals of the Nazis, and Hitler in particular? Try this list:

- [1] to undo the Versailles Treaty
- [2] to humiliate the humiliator, France
- [3] to stop bolshevism
- [4] to colonize Slavic Europe
- [5] to expel all Jews from Germany; The Final Solution
- [6] to have all Germans/Austrians in one state
- [7] to be on top of a European Neuordnung

Then, what were the goals of the Allies? Try this list:

- [1*] to keep the Versailles treaty as symbol of victory
- [2*] to avoid any war
- [3*] to stop bolshevism
- [4*] to get markets, also in Slavic Europe
- [5*] to keep the Jews out of politics, anti-semitism
- [6*] to keep Germany small and the Germans fragmented
- [7*] to have a (however uneasy) Anglo-French Europe

If these lists mirror reality seven conclusions follow:

- I: as time passes the Versailles Treaty wanes in significance
- II: resolutions, persuasion, bargaining rather than war
- III: cooperation for the same goal: stop bolshevism
- IV: opening markets for Germany and Allies in Slavic Europe
- V: no major, only minor, action to rescue Jews
- VI: if Germany goes beyond undoing Versailles, then war
- VII: if Germany threatens Anglo-French dominion, then world war

This is what happened. München was more agreement than appeasement, moving Hitler eastward, against bolshevism. That whetted his appetites. He attacked Poland. The war followed.

Skeptic: All you get, at best, is to explain what happened!

Memorial: The alternative would have been to amend Versailles, undercutting Hitler's best argument, [1]. The Kaiser, not all Germans, could have been held responsible. Abdication cleared the way for redoing/undoing the Treaty. There was no enthusiasm in Weimar Germany for his other points. But clearing Versailles might have saved us from Hitler, the Second world war, the shoa. Failure to do so makes the Allies co-responsible.

After the Second world war the aggressor was defined as Nazi Germany. Hitler's suicide, the Nürnberg trial and some denazification cleared the way for a joint anti-bolshevism, contributing to the Cold War. Dear Visitor, what do you think?

[4] Nonviolence

Memorial: This seemingly very idealistic approach may turn out to be among the more realistic (not "realist" in the sense of militaristic) counterfactual possibility. There was an important case: the liberation of arrested Jews in Rosenstrasse, Berlin, February 1943. Of course, there were complications. Many Jews who returned to work after having been released were rearrested, in such a way that nonviolent action was much more difficult (they did not know about each other). They were killed. Others were able to hide. Nonviolence is not a single-shot action. But this peace of factual history, along with the courageous priest who stood up against euthanasia, belongs to the realms of what is, not of what ought to be. We can build on that.

Skeptic: For the sake of the argument, let me accept the story as you tell it. But this was at the spur of the moment. The wives of the arrested Jews who were heading for extermination were doubly motivated: they were their husbands, and they were facing death. Their action may not even have been politically guided, just a spontaneous outburst of utter despair. In short, it is not a model of how the ordinary German citizen facing the hardship of war, including terror bombing by Germany's enemies, hating the latter, hoping for his own government to solve all problems, could act. The German wives of Jews were atypical.

Memorial: I agree with all that. But you are missing the basic point. In counterfactual history we make minimum changes hoping for maximum effects.

So let us assume that the German population had been given at least as much knowledge about nonviolence--Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr. --as the German population under another German dictatorship, DDR.

Let us further assume that they were better equipped with such guides to moral political behavior as human rights, and reacted against the censorship, the absence of freedom of assembly, speech, thought, the political violence and so on.

Further, and this is a basic assumption, let us not assume that Nazi hearts melted under the sunshine of nonviolence, but that the Nazi regime was essentially based on bluffing. Their politics was based on a self-fulfilling prophecy: behave as if you expect unconditional obedience, and you get unconditional obedience. Nonviolence is based on the same idea: return evil with good, with nonviolence, and the other side may reciprocate; return evil with evil, and you reap more evil, as in July 1944.

Skeptic: OK, that is the theory. How about the practice?

Memorial: Each profession and municipality plans the nonviolent response to crises of that magnitude. The plans would go far beyond manifestations and demonstrations, and include massive non-cooperation, civil disobedience, parallel regimes, and how to engage oppressors in dialogues while disobeying his orders.

Skeptic: But wouldn't that kind of planning, presumably by an anti-Ministry, make nonviolence morally less persuasive? And how about the population turning against a lawful government?

Memorial: Important points. Visitor, what do you think?

[5] Peace Structure.

Memorial: Would the Second world war have been avoided if we imagine that Germany were:

- [1] democratic, not autocratic under Kaiser or dictator?
- [2] socialist, not capitalist?
- [3] civilian, not militarist?
- [4] participatory, not bureaucratic/authoritarian?
- [5] androgenic (gender parity), not patriarchic?

A Germany with people in control, as opposed to control by a political clique, by people with economic power, with military power, with social power ("authority"), by men? As opposed to a patriarchic, authoritarian, militarist, capitalist autocracy?

Skeptic: I protest! German women were also Nazi to a large extent; the military were not necessarily on top, they were also bribed; much of the economy was guided by the state, and for the benefit of the working class and their gainful employment; and even if Germany were a dictatorship the popular support was so overwhelming that there probably was popular consent.

Memorial: That may have been the situation in the 1930s. But imagine a solid democratic tradition, a tradition of giving high economic priority to the needs of the common people, a military under solid civilian control, and male competitive behavior challenged by more cooperative female behavior, to the extent there is such a difference. The list above portrays Germany for centuries, not challenged before after the First world war. The Weimar republic was weak and short-lived. Hitler was continuity in German history more than discontinuity. Moreover, you left out participatory, as opposed to authoritarian. Imagine children and pupils, students, workers, citizens encouraged to ask why rather than to say Jawohl to parents, teachers, superiors!

Skeptic: All of that taken together over some time would have had an impact. But we did not have that much time. To change a structure may take a generation or two. However, such changes do not rule out war. Today many countries are democratic, have public welfare, control the military, are participatory, with lots of women all over the place. And yet they plan wars behind the back of the citizens, break international law, with massive consent. Look at the Gulf, Yugoslavia and Indonesia wars.

Memorial: That use of force indicates that we are far away from global governance. Democracy is not only about majority rule but also about minority rights, including the right to be well informed and to get answers to reasonable questions. A peace structure at the domestic and global levels is a long term job. Legitimate force, conflict transformation, refusing army service nonviolence by the citizens would then have come more quickly.

Skeptic: But why should we only think of Germany in the 1930s? Most of the points in the list above also applied to, say, England and France. How about a peace structure for them?

Memorial: Very important. And in addition there is the European peace structure which we essentially had: lots of communication, trade, intermarriage. By and large it was in place but did not serve to prevent what happened. Dear Visitor, what do you think?

[6] Peace Culture.

Memorial: If building a peace structure takes decades, building a peace culture may take generations. Something more specific, like conflict transformation or nonviolence, may not take that much time. But if we mean questioning deep assumptions in the culture, breaking taboo, opening for critical/constructive dialogue, substituting a new culture, then it may take time. Maybe it is like a person, any one of us, questioning deep assumptions about ourselves and others? Like always seeing ourselves as victims, unjustly treated? Or seeing ourselves as superior to others, also unjustly treated? In either case, we may be filled with ressentiment, looking at that unjust world with fear and hatred, never questioning our own behavior and how that could influence the way the world treats us.

Skeptic: Too general for me. Let us return to Germany.

Memorial: Would the Second world war have been avoided if Germans, deep down, did not believe:

- [1] that the German state is above individuals, with the task of realizing a German national will above the wants of citizens?
- [2] that labor as well as capital should serve that higher goal?
- [3] that military is the key instrument for that national will?
- [4] that citizens from childhood should learn to obey that will?
- [5] that men produce and conquer, and women reproduce and serve?
- [6] that Germans are superior to everybody, and indeed to Jews?

Skeptic: I know what you are aiming at: the first five of these beliefs justifies the five structures, making them look normal and natural, like laws of nature. On top, German Herrschaft over Europe, even the world! At a still deeper level the Germans, and not only they, had still deeper beliefs justifying the beliefs you have listed, making them deep rooted, indeed.

Memorial: That is a very real problem. In general terms we can talk about such deep ideas as being a chosen people, destined to be above others or separate from them; that glorious past that should be reenacted as a glorious future; and the betrayal and trauma, with the search for the guilty scapegoat. We find some elements of that in most nations. In Nazi Germany it took well known forms: Herrenvolk; old Norse, Wagnerian myths; the hideous use of Jews, also claiming to be chosen, as scapegoats. But key Allies, English, French, Americans, also had such ideas. There were Chosen Peoples with clashing glories and traumas all over.

Skeptic: They do not talk, nor do the others, about that. But deeper down, in the subconscious, such ideas may linger on. Could there even be a joint European Chosen Peoples, in plural?

Memorial: The point is that we have to watch out for such signs. And at a still deeper level is this idea of dualism, seeing the world as a struggle between good and evil, God and Satan. If we are good and God-loved, then others are easily seen as evil and chosen by Satan. Conclusion: No demonization of Germans only!

Skeptic: Let us start by questioning ourselves. How about you, Visitor? Do you question us? And, do you question yourself?

WELL, COULD THE SECOND WORLD WAR IN EUROPE HAVE BEEN AVOIDED?

Memorial: In this particular case I find that the most promising policy against Nazi Germany would have been a combination of five measures, in descending order of efficacy:

Conflict Transformation: Revising the Versailles Treaty

Nonviolence: Massive use of nonviolence, supported from abroad

Peace structure: Strengthening the progressive forces

Peace culture: Critiqueing the German/Nazi faith syndrome

War abolition: Encouraging massive conscientious objection

A preventive war would probably have been counter-productive.

Skeptic: But there was a war, Germany was defeated, and changed.

Memorial: But Germany was also defeated militarily after the First world war; however, the seeds of aggression against others were not uprooted. Maybe what was different after the Second war was that Germany was also defeated morally. Confronted with the reality of Nazism, the horror of the shoa and the terror in the occupied countries, particularly in the East, Germans were simply ashamed of themselves. But the condition was the unfolding, in all its horror, of nazism. At any time before 1938 most Germans had dreams of glory, maybe even up to 1942. After that only the fundamentalists, and they were numerous, had such visions. To have killed the Nazi state before 1938, 1942 would have been to kill a dream. To kill the Nazi state in 1945 was to reveal a nightmare. The Germans drew that conclusion. But before that the conclusion would have been to continue, at least realizing parts of the dream. Shoa. Or wait a generation or two

Skeptic: Are you arguing that we had to let nazism unfold?

Memorial: Not at all. But was the consequence of the military approach. Added to the Nazi/German horror/terror came the Allied terror of carpet bombing; and yet Nazism continued unfolding. The alternative was to stop it at an early stage: revising the treaty, stimulating a culture of human rights with democracy and nonviolence-the latter being indispensable.

Skeptic: But the allies would not have permitted any revision!

Memorial: Depends on how it is argued. But, if you are right, then a heavy part of the responsibility for the Second world war rests with the Allies for the act of omission when not revising.

Skeptic: And England was in the throes of Gandhian nonviolence; how could they have argued a therapy that was their own undoing?

Memorial: Precisely; again the problem is not only with Germany alone. Counterfactual history brings that out, maybe the major reason why there is so little of it. Anyhow, the initiative had to be German for the five measures above; but that does not exclude foreign support, from people rather than governments.

COULD THE COLD WAR 1949-1989 HAVE BEEN AVOIDED?

Memorial: Let us explore whether the six peace approaches, singly or combined, could have changed history, saving the world from the enormous human suffering in repressive societies, forty years of heavy military expenses and threat of nuclear omnicide.

Skeptic: What kind of nonsense is that. History is what really happened, not some wishful alternative, some "as if". History is in the indicative, not in the subjunctive mode!

Memorial: You are of course right. We know what happened, see sector B of this museum. But we humans make decisions all the time. Our "nature" does not determine unambiguously what we do. Maybe we could have made other decisions? For better or worse?

Skeptic: OK. As long as we don't forget what really happened! There may be official history, history as seen by the victors, by the vanquished, and revisionist history. I myself find the book by Gabriel Kolko, Century of War, fascinating. According to mainstream history it was all due to Stalin and the Soviet Union, and the West had to defend itself. To Kolko it is much more interactive, not just good guys and bad guys. But that is not the point. All these histories have one thing in common, however much they diverge in interpretation: they try to establish what really happened. You are asking us to do something entirely different, to try to find out what might have happened, if - -. History "as if".

Memorial: There is a certain philosophy behind that. We do not believe, like many do, that human behavior is predetermined. History is not like water flowing in a deep, solid riverbed toward a predefined ocean, some kind of "end of history". Rather, if each molecule is an individual, or an individual act, add a little wind, a little sunshine, and they could combine in other ways, dig their own, new riverbeds, feed into bigger, old rivers, or get lost in the desert sand, coming up again as a giant water reservoir - -. True, what happened, happened. But with even small variations it could all have been different.

Skeptic: I can agree to that. But don't we learn more from what really happened than from what might have happened?

Memorial: From both. In this museum we focus on what happened, the Cold War, and on what might have happened, peace. We are concerned with the losses incurred by the former, and with the promise of the latter. Let us define a "cold war". It has arms race and militarization of both sides in common with a hot war. Then there is polarization of the mind, seeing only good aspects of oneself and only bad aspects of the other camp; and social polarization, with all positive interaction within the two camps ("East" and "West") and only negative interaction between them. A cold war is some kind of mental and social pathology. The hot war is very close, and easily triggered. Let us now "get on top of this history" rather than letting "history get on top of us".

Skeptic: But that means sitting in judgment of politics!?

Memorial: It does. And democracy is about that. Let us start!

1. GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

Memorial: The Cold War added something to the feudalistic idea of having big (even "great"!) powers and ordinary countries; with veto power for the former and voting rights for the latter. The Cold War added the concept of "superpower", meaning super-Big power: the USA and the Soviet Union, not in the UN Charter. The veto powers blocked UN efforts to handle the Cold War with super-vetoes. The superpowers went one step further: they took the conflict out of the UN. They constructed their own system: the Summit, their summit among countries, and inside them the meetings of a US President and a Soviet Secretary General.

Skeptic: UN resolutions would not have worked anyhow. Where is the military power that could force a superpower, let alone both of them, into submission? We are back to the balance of power, neither the rule of law, nor the rule of any central power.

Memorial: There was no balance. Remember, there was also the Western superiority in economic and cultural power. Superior Western economies, particularly consumer goods, no doubt played some role. The cultural dynamism of the West, as opposed to the static bureaucracies in the East, made West attractive to elites who migrated in great numbers. But, what did not work with the UN as a political forum worked with a new, ad hoc, political forum, Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe, CSCE, later to become the Organization for Security and Cooperation, OSCE. And you also leave out non-governmental forces, civil society, in West and East - they are parts of global governance from below. Let us return to that under nonviolence, below.

Skeptic: The governmental system did nothing useful?

Memorial: They were the hard core of the conflict. But the neutrals-nonaligned: Finland (Kekkonen), Sweden (Palme), Austria (Kreisky), Yugoslavia (Tito) and Switzerland became the natural venues for mediation efforts. Had it not been for those five the cold war might even have become hot. If more countries had been actively non-aligned more could have been achieved earlier.

Skeptic: But you couldn't remain neutral or nonaligned faced with the gulag, just as little as with the shoa!

Memorial: No argument with that, nor with strong stands against colonialism, the miseries caused by our economic system, and the distortions of mind and society known as militarism. The problem is how to overcome these and other pathologies. Many of them are carried by the governments themselves. Is it likely that they will work against themselves? Did slave-owners abolish slavery? Did colonial governments decolonize voluntarily?

Skeptic: Maybe not. But slave-owners were ultimately forced by governments, and colonial governments ultimately had to sign.

Memorial: Global governance has to pass through governments. But it may have to be initiated by others. Maybe it works like this: where NGOs agree, governments follow. And: where the nonaligned agree, the "aligned" may follow. More efforts by more nonaligned countries and NGOs might have helped when UN governance failed.

2. WAR ABOLITION

Skeptic: The efforts to abolish war did not succeed: we ended with the biggest war machines ever. Two Damocles swords were hanging over our heads, and, as the US peace research Anatol Rapoport once said, there is little comfort in their equal size.

Memorial: But the Cold War at least did not really become hot.

Skeptic: We did not get what many referred to as the Third world war; not because war was effectively abolished but because they did not dare, being too afraid of the other side.

Memorial: Nuclear arms deterred nuclear arms, but remain a major world problem. We got interventions inside the East, DDR/Berlin-Hungary-Czechoslovakia-Afghanistan; and from the West much belligerence to prevent some dependent territory like East Timor and many places in Latin America from going "communist". We got clients/satellites of the superpowers fighting each other in Korea and Việt Nam. We got interventions by superpowers. But not direct warfare between superpowers: that was against the Nixon-Brezhnev "traffic rules" for the Cold War.

Skeptic: And that shows that nuclear deterrence worked!

Memorial: We cannot say that unless we know that there was an intention to attack and that it probably would have been carried out had the other side not had nuclear arms. I doubt that we know that for certain. Thus, even if we know that the Soviet Union had war plans for Europe west of the Iron Curtain, it does not follow that these were plans for offensive offense, attack. More likely, they were plans for offensive defense, bringing the war outside their territory. That position was not unreasonable, given their horrible experiences during the Second world war.

Skeptic: But they wanted to conquer, to "communize" the world.

Memorial: They were national bolsheviks and wanted a socialist world under Soviet leadership, a Soviet Union under Russian leadership and a Russia under Bolshevik leadership. But they also believed that capitalism will collapse due to its own inner contradictions. The danger was a Western attack. The result was a quantitative (how much) and qualitative (what kind) arms race. With one exception (Sputnik) the USA was ahead with all the new types of weapons. driving the arms race spiral.

Skeptic: But there were arms control and disarmament talks?

Memorial: The conditions of "mutual, balanced and controlled" effectively ruled out any serious steps since they could not agree what was "balanced". Arms systems are multidimensional. Only when Gorbachev practiced the gradual approach of another great US peace researcher, Charles Osgood, with one party taking a step, not insisting on balance but open to control, hoping for the other party to follow suit, did we come to the spiral's end. The GRIT policy, graduated, reciprocated initiatives for tension reduction could have been tried earlier. But Gorbachev did it. Several peace researchers in the West had proposed "defensive defense" as military doctrine: Gorbachev also picked up that.

3. CONFLICT TRANSFORMATION

Memorial: What was the Cold War about; parties, goals, clashes?

There was a conflict of interests coming out of the Second world war: Who is to be master of Eastern Europe? The Soviet Union had substituted for Germany, and Anglo-French economic interests. There was Churchill's famous division formula.

Much more basic was the conflict of values, over the road to the good society. The Soviet position was dictatorship of the proletariat (in practice the Party); a planned economy for basic needs and capital/military goods; and marxism/scientific atheism culturally. The Western position was democracy (dictatorship of 51%, but with time-limit and free elections); and liberalism with Judeo-Christianity culturally. The USA is based on the trinity of democracy/free market/Judeo-Christianity. The USSR was against all three. Both claimed universal validity. This catapulted them into a multi-dimensional arms race.

Skeptic: You forget the unspeakable brutality of Bolshevism!

Memorial: When people think they know the final truth those who disagree are disregarded, ridiculed, suspected, excluded, banned - and, sometimes, killed. This also happened in the West.

Skeptic: Nothing like Stalinism in the USA, England, France.

Memorial: Correct, for most of the Cold War period. But, to a marxist imperialism and colonialism were parts of the West: also unspeakably brutal. Marxism is about systems like capitalism, not only about individual and often very attractive countries.

Skeptic: You make them more similar to arrive at some solution?

Memorial: Depolarization, seeing good and bad in both sides, would have helped enormously. Both camps had dissidents who picked up the bad things in their own side. They fought Western imperialism in Algérie, Viêt Nam and communist dictatorships in the East in East Berlin 1953, Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia 1968, Afghanistan 1979. And there were those who picked up the good things in the other camp: socialist dedication to full employment and basic needs for all, and liberal dedication to freedom, politically and economically. Both were often naive, denying dark sides. There was good and bad; in Self and Other.

Skeptic: Where in all this would there have been some solution?

Memorial: Not in "co-existence". Much had to change, in both. The human rights covenants of 1966 offered a universal platform, meaning more welfare state in West and more freedom in the East. "More social in the West, more democracy in the East" points to social democracy as a meeting ground, with many variations. The West made major steps by decolonizing; the East by accepting the Helsinki Final Act. But Thatcher-Reagan reversed the economy, and we got the jungle capitalism of the 1990s and beyond. The conservative West wanted to prevail, not to meet, "converge".

Skeptic: But Thatcher-Reagan were democratically elected?

Memorial: By UK and US, yes. But not by Europe and the world.

4. NONVIOLENCE

Memorial: There was some nonviolent conflict transformation taking place, with the 1975 Final Act of Helsinki as a crowning achievement. But the Cold War went on. Other forms of power were needed to put an end to the Cold War.

Skeptic: Yes, such as the economic superiority you mentioned. The West made the arms race too expensive for the East.

Memorial: Soviet archives show no increase in arms expenditure after Reagan's rearmament. They continued producing the same destructive and invulnerable weapons. No, nonviolent power.

Skeptic: Like the peace movement marching in the streets?

Memorial: The peace movement was in the USA and in Western Europe, particularly in West Germany. Then there was the dissident movement in the East. Nonviolence took two important forms: nonviolent protest against the arms race, particularly against nuclear arms, and the noncooperation/civil disobedience against post-stalinism, in Poland and DDR, with heroic individual acts in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

Skeptic: Again, things are not decided in the streets.

Memorial: No, but they are communicated, made visible, in parks and streets as important part of public space. On June 12, 1982, in connection with the UN Special Session on Disarmament, there were 750,000 in the Central Park in New York to protest against the arms race. In Germany they mobilized up to 400,000 across the country. One reason was that another important part of public space, the media, was by and large closed to views that differed from the political elites. Democracy was in the streets and in countless forms of people's diplomacy with all kinds of groups traveling east to present the views blocked in the West to the leadership in the East. Very important were the Nobel Peace Prize winners Pugwash (started by Einstein and Russell), IPPNW, International Physicians Against Nuclear War. When a people/West-government/East alliance emerged, a deal was near. Inside the USA the Catholic and Methodist Bishops were crucial.

Skeptic: But the peace movement was willing to sacrifice freedom and human rights for arms control and disarmament.

Memorial: And there were those who would sacrifice millions in a nuclear war for democracy. But the peace movement in the West and the dissident movement in the East soon (Perugia 198) came out in favor of nuclear disarmament and human rights. Again the same: where NGOs can agree, governments will tend to follow.

Equally important was the courageous nonviolence in Gdansk and Leipzig, the Nobel Peace Prize Winner Lech Walesa in the former and tens of thousands unrewarded heroes in the latter. In DDR they also used a very powerful, ancient form of nonviolence: they migrated, left, voting with their feet. Like the arms protesters, their nonviolence went beyond protest. The arms protesters had defensive, non-offensive defense as concrete alternative, the dissidents had human rights and democracy. In the end all of this overwhelmed the governments.

5. PEACE STRUCTURES

Memorial: Societies are sets of people, the world is a set of societies. But there is more to it. People relate, interact as sociologists say, exchanging goods and services, do politics, talk, make families. Society has a structure. Is that structure peace productive or violence productive? We know that the socialism of the East produced murder, even genocide, and put people into gulags. We know that the capitalism of the West produces wealth but also misery. One was repressive, the other exploitative. Maybe making capitalism more social and socialism more democratic would make both of them more peace productive?

Skeptic: Nice theory. Except for one thing; it did not happen.

Memorial: It did not. Maybe the East could have moved in that direction, but autocracies are not good at reforming themselves. They lose faith in their own dogma, become demoralized, and collapse rather than making compromises. And the West moved in the opposite direction; the gap between rich and poor is growing. The world, or that part of the world that we used to call the "East-West system" also has a structure. Was that structure peace productive or violence productive?

Skeptic: But how could that help if the parts are no good?

Memorial: By making them more peaceful toward each other. The Rule of Law is based on the assumption that laws regulate their behavior and make potential villains reasonable, if not angels.

Skeptic: I see a lot of crime and law-breaking all over.

Memorial: No social theory works perfectly in practice. Law could also protect repressive and exploitative structures. A more peace productive structure could have been woven during the Cold War. There could be more sympiosis, more "mutual benefit". But it would have to be based on equity, non-exploitation, with equal benefits. It is not sufficient for harmony that both get "something" out of it, meaning that neither ends up worse off (the so-called Pareto equilibrium masks increasing inequality).

Skeptic: But how!? The East had nothing or so little to offer!

Memorial: At some stage they made good tractors at good prices. Avoid the trap of buying raw materials with some luxury goods; such exploitation may lead to aggression. To build equity they needed joint institutions like the UN Economic Commission for Europe in Geneva. Many smaller conflicts were solved creatively, including some arms control measures. But a peace structure is not only between governments, it would include people-people and people-government links. Toward the end the link between people in the West and governments in the East, and people-people links across borders became very important: Citizen's Diplomacy.

Skeptic: So what are you complaining about? This all happened!

Memorial: Yes, but it took decades to build peace structures. So much polarization! More bridges, earlier, media cooperation, and then patient work to make the societies more peaceful.

6. PEACE CULTURES

Memorial: There are two different levels to peace culture.

There is surface culture. Both East and West developed a peace culture; governments in the East, and people in the West. The former celebrated peace in gigantic youth festivals. The latter made their demonstrations festive, aesthetic, with memorable music and lyrics. Colors, dances, sports, especially in Catholic countries. Picasso doves united East and West.

Skeptic: The question is, of course, whether what was celebrated was peace or the word "peace". The Soviet Union had big posters Za miru mir! Peace to the World, while at the same time crushing brutally the Hungarian revolution in 1956. And the peaceniks in the West often didn't say utter a word of protest!

Memorial: Some did, some not. And that touches the other level. There is a deep culture, basic assumptions, codes, about reality that seem so obvious that they are not even formulated.

Skeptic: If they are not even spoken or written, who cares?

Memorial: Because they steer us when we get lost in crises.

Skeptic: But how! How were the superpowers steered by "codes"?

Memorial: Controversial. But here are two simplified hypotheses:

Russian code: **dualist, vertical, pessimist**; there are only two alternatives; decisions come from the top; it won't work anyhow.

American code: **dualist, horizontal, optimist**; there are only two alternatives; what people do matters; and we shall overcome.

Skeptic: Highly stereotypical. There are enormous variations!

Memorial: This is about culture, like slavic bogomil tradition, or Christian dualism in general; not about public opinion or depth psychology. Both deep cultures were predisposed to see communism vs capitalism, party rule vs people rule as the only two possibilities; that ruled out social democracy. Russians believed in governmental control of any peace culture, were skeptical of Western peace movements and tried to control them. The West saw the peace culture of the East as propaganda; the Russian people might agree, and assumed that it would not work. Western governments overplayed individual Eastern dissidents, and Eastern government believed too much in summit meetings. But the Western peace movement, buoyed by optimism, was finally taken seriously in the East. When that strange alliance started growing, the Western governments had to enter into a dialogue.

Skeptic: There you see, it ended well in spite of deep culture!

Memorial: Deep culture can be overruled, but it takes hard and conscious work; and it helps to be aware of these hidden forces. They steered the deep polarization, and a sense of dark destiny. The Cold War came to an end. But so did communism and the Soviet Union. They saw only two alternatives, and the government caved in to capitalism, unlike the yin/yang oriented Chinese. And Russian verticality and pessimism became self-defeating.

7. COULD THE COLD WAR 1949-1989 HAVE BEEN AVOIDED?

Memorial: The answer to this question is not, "The Big Hot War was successfully avoided!". We are talking about 40 years of partly wasted history, of a whole generation of half a billion people East and West living in fear, spending too much energy on a stupid conflict. The process also took much too much time.

Skeptic: What are you saying? We got the fall of the wall! A terrible system, first stalinist, then softer, post-stalinist collapsed! With the exception of Romania, as by a miracle nobody was killed by these falls. What more can you ask for?

Memorial: I am talking about avoiding the Cold War. There was a deep conflict over values, a shallow conflict over interests. What we should learn to demand from conflict transformation is not only to be nonviolent, avoiding destruction of life, things. We should also learn to be constructive, to use a conflict as energy than can be turned in a constructive direction. We, East and West, should have emerged from the Cold War with gulag and nuclear nightmares behind us, but also with a higher synthesis.

Skeptic: Romantic, nostalgic, utopian. Do you have an example?

Memorial: Not long since we had bitter class struggle in Europe. Capital demanded free market, Labor demanded state planning, for a decent life. Social democracy, social capitalism emerged as more than a compromise. It transcended the contradiction. A mixed economy based on negotiation between the public and the private sectors, with guarantees for basic needs for all, from the cradle to the grave, emerged. There was beauty and decency in the combination of the social and the democratic. Another example: inside 200 countries there are 2,000 nations wanting sovereignty. Switzerland managed the incredible: a country where four nations feel relatively comfortable. The formula was confederation; today more like a federation. There is no political violence like in so many other countries.

But what did we get? West declared it had won the Cold War because East somehow imploded, and started even before the end to tear down the social aspect, in West, in South, even in East. Economic growth, joblessness and misery come together, all over.

Of course East Germany was repressive, but also had social achievements. Instead of building on the good in the bad, the West imposed itself. Instead of the Truth and Reconciliation of that superior peace culture of South Africa, Germany produced revenge in the name of rule of law, Rechtsstaat.

Instead of confederations when the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia broke down we got 20 new countries and 20 new armies; some of them already at war with each other.

Instead of a European House we got Europe divided in three parts: a Catholic/Protestant Latin/Germanic European Union, an Orthodox Slavic part searching for coherence and a Turko-Muslim part with Ottoman roots. Nothing to be that proud of. We got rid of one big conflict and created numerous others. Bad job.

Skeptic: But very many are rather satisfied with what happened!

Memorial: True. But peace is hard work, and we should learn to demand higher quality products. Dear Visitor, how do you feel?

TOWARD PEACEFUL WORLDS: A SUMMARY AND A CONCLUSION

Skeptic: Let us see, what do we have here:

- you started with Peace and Violence, arguing that violence insulted basic needs and that peace had to respect them, that this had to be built into human relations to avoid direct, structural and cultural violence--the specialties of the three upper layers of the Indo-European construction--that violence and peace found their expression in ten different spaces plus time and that underlying all of this were eight fault-lines in the human construction with direct and structural genocide which you then defined as massive category killing;

- you then identified poor handling of conflict as a major root of violence and nonviolent, creative Conflict Transformation as a major root of peace;

- after these general principles you started relativizing, searching for Peace Cultures Around the World, exploring asking six cultural clusters for their peace message, identifying in the end five peace archetypes, unevenly found in the cultures;

- but you were not satisfied with that. For a Dialogue of Civilizations you wanted deeper approaches to culture, sometimes crude, not brahmin/intellectual/artist sophistication. You identified two deep cultures relevant for the peace issue, Hard and Soft--I recognized some of the five peace archetypes! And you recommended dialogues Soft-Soft--like between Quakers and Buddhists I assume--for mutual enrichment, and Hard-Soft for the Hard to soften and the Soft to become more practical, concrete. The Hard-Hard dialogue may lead to alliances, but not to peace.

- then you went on to six Approaches to Peace. They did not exclude each other, and I assume you can find some of them in all cultures, but again unevenly distributed.

- obviously, peace approaches do not become peace policies by themselves so you introduced possible advocates and carriers: Peace Movements, Peace Education, Peace Journalism, Peace Studies.

- and finally one way of testing all these concepts and theories: you applied them to the recent past, asking Could the Second World War in Europe Have Been Avoided?, and Could the Cold War 1949-89 Have Been Avoided? - by using the six approaches. The answers were far from unambiguous, but maybe asking questions of the past is even more important than the answers?

Author: A good skeptic certainly knows what he is skeptical about!

Skeptic: Don't be arrogant. I now have two basic questions:

- isn't there some simple way of summarizing even this summary?
- how do we move towards peaceful worlds in the third millennium?

Author: Fair questions as long as you do not demand reduction to one single concept and one single peace formula. They tried that in the field of health and it was not very successful. Nature gives a good answer: diversity, with symbiosis among the parts. Use diverse approaches, and then the synergy among the approaches.

Author: If I should start again at one point, I would start with Conflict = Attitudes + Behavior + Contradiction. ABC, at least in English. At the root of the conflict is the contradiction, so "in the beginning is the contradiction". I distrust such formulas, but I can use that triangle to try to identify deep attitudes, deep behavior and deep contradictions, assuming that they steer or at least influence the surface level of what people say they feel or think, the behavior we can observe, and the incompatible goals.

Skeptic: "Deep" meaning subconscious, hidden, under the surface?

Author: Precisely. And I would then identify those three with deep culture, basic human needs and deep structure, in the sense of fault-lines in the human social construction. They are explored in Peace and Violence and Dialogue of Civilizations, above.

Skeptic: Very general. How do you get peace approaches from that?

Author: By trying to change them, all six, attitudes, behavior and contradictions; and then deep culture, basic needs and deep structure. And at this point I would introduce a new concept: generations of peace approaches. Let us try:

First generation of peace approaches: Till the Second World War:
A-oriented: peace movements, advocating, demonstrating
B-oriented: war abolition, eliminating war as social institution
C-oriented: global governance, globalizing good government

Of course, the three were related, with the people expressing themselves through the movements and the governments building institutions for regional, even global harmonization and abolishing war through such mechanisms as democracy, human rights and free markets. Motto for this generation: Peace is too important to leave to the generals/soldiers.

Second generation of peace approaches: After the Second World War:
A-oriented: peace education/journalism, for knowledge and empathy
B-oriented: nonviolence, fighting, but nonviolently
C-oriented: conflict transformation, solving conflicts creatively.

Again the three are related, and evolve from the first generation. People start doubting that peace is necessarily among the national interests pursued by governments, and also doubt their capability, watching them stumble at the brink of the abyss through the Cold War. People start demanding education/journalism for peace and turn to the streets not only to advocate but to fight, deeply inspired by Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr., Mandela and Tutu. Patterns of people's NGO diplomacy start emerging to solve conflicts rather than to wait for governments. Motto for this generation: Peace is too important to leave to the politicians.

Third generation of peace approaches: After the Cold War:
A-oriented: peace cultures, going into deep cultures if needed
B-oriented: basic human needs, as non-negotiable pillars
C-oriented: peace structures, repairing fault-lines like gender

We are now below the surface, searching for foundations, generalizing Freud (culture and needs) and Marx/Jung (needs and structure). Motto: Peace is too important for shallow approaches.

Skeptic: And where would you put Peace Studies in all of this?

Author: All over. Good peace studies is the intellectually disciplined inquiry that recognizes no boundaries in its quest to understand the conditions for a more peaceful world; sometimes leading people's approaches, sometimes lagging behind. People may be more dialectic than the researchers. The first generation was a reaction against war with people demanding abolition through governmental steering above nations and states. In the second generation there is distrust of governments with people wanting to work for peace themselves. In the third generation there is a growing realization of complexity. The explorations into alternative history were efforts to clarify the problems.

Skeptic: The ABC-triangle became a piece of cake with the third dimension added, and you said that the road to peace was to try to change all six. But I heard nothing about changing basic needs, only that they were non-negotiable. Are they also non-changeable?

Author: Gandhi eliminated sex, and lived on a low calorie diet with very few ingredients. That was part of his way. I would like to argue that peace can be combined with satisfaction of all reasonable basic human needs for survival (of course!), for well-being, for freedom and identity. And I argue that violence in general, and war in particular, is the antithesis of human needs.

Skeptic: So much for the summary. The conclusion for the future?

Author: How many third millennium peace policies do you grant me?

Skeptic: Maximum five to ten, maximum one or two lines each!

Author: Let me use the ten approaches above for a peaceful world:
Peace Movement: extend this concept to include commitment to peace by all governments and corporations, with clear peace programs.
War Abolition: treating offensive arms like hard drugs, outlawing research, development, production, distribution, possession, use.
Global Governance: democratizing the United Nations through direct elections to a People's Assembly and abolition of the veto power.
Peace Education: to be introduced in at all school levels all over like civics, hygiene, sex education, knowledge of own culture.
Peace Journalism: that all decent media also focus on ways out of a conflict, building a solution culture, not only on violence.
Nonviolence: that nonviolent ways of fighting for a cause and to defend own integrity=basic needs becomes a part of common skills.
Conflict Transformation: that knowledge and skills in handling conflict become a part of the training of citizens anywhere.
Peace Culture: that people start discussing their own culture, what can be done to make it more peace-productive, and then do it.
Basic Needs: that respect for the basic needs of everybody, and indeed the most needy, becomes a basic guideline for politics,
Peace Structure: from exploitative and repressive structures with nature, genders, races, classes, nations, states to equity, parity

Skeptic: A tall order, indeed!

Author: Humanity has been through much more. And increasingly military and civilians, politicians and people will do all of this together. More knowledge, will, and optimism will move us forward!

DEVELOPING A MUSEUM FOR PEACE IN CAEN, NORMANDIE, FRANCE

By Johan Galtung, dr hc mult, Professor of Peace Studies
American, EPU, Ritsumeikan, Tromsø, Witten Universities
Director, TRANSCEND: A Peace and Development Network

1. Circuit A, La Seconde Guerre Mondiale: Some Impressions

We are talking about spaces for peace, and scenography for the younger generations; maybe as opposed to the many veterans, now somewhat aged, for obvious reasons being attracted by Circuit A. At the same time, many, most (we do not know) of those who visit Circuit C - Decouvreurs de Mondes - on peace, will also have seen Circuit A and Circuit B (Le Monde a l'Heure de la Guerre Froide), maybe in alphabetical order. Circuit A, Circuit B and the surrounding neutral landscape is the context for the visitor. Hence, first some observations on Circuit A.

The invasion story could hardly be better told (even if today it has to compete with Saving Private Ryan). Juxtaposing Allied and German footage is mind-boggling; I found myself training to train my eyes at both, comparing the story-telling, not only the stories. But the general war story is less convincing; among other reason because it isn't a story; it is and can be viewed from any angle. The angles chosen are:

- [1] **military**, very little about the role played by civilians (outside the *résistance*) except for the top politicians;
- [2] **bellicist**, very little about elite and people trying to reach across and work for some kind of peace during the war;
- [3] **actor-oriented**, very little about the roles played by deep structure (patriarchy, patriotism) and deep culture (codes);
- [4] **empiricist**, very true to data, no room for criticism (what was or went wrong) and constructivism, how about alternatives;
- [5] **past-oriented**, nothing about the future of wars, how they are likely to develop if the process continues unchecked;
- [6] **state-oriented**, very little about the decision-makers as persons, psycho-history at the personal, subconscious level;
- [7] **occidental**, very little about occidental colonialism at the expense of the non-occident all over, and the occidental codes;
- [8] **middle/older age oriented**, the museum reflects their life and world, also in the many artefacts that inspire nostalgia;
- [9] **elite-oriented**, the wars are seen from upper/middle class angles, not from worker/peasant angles, those who are killed;
- [10] **male-oriented**, almost everything is of, by and for men, not about women as victims and co-perpetrators behind the front.

However, another aspect is more problematic: a war museum tends to portray war as a normal human condition. To the contrary, I would argue that war is abnormal, peace normal, and that many researchers in the field make a methodological error.

Consider a world with 10 states, meaning 45 dyads. Choose a year, and we find, say, war in two dyads; one state appearing in both dyads. Classifying the year as belligerent is a major methodological mistake. We have found only 2 wars in a context of 43 "peace's" (the word does not even have a plural, being so reified, essentialist, it is or it is not). Studying those two wars we may develop a theory of one bully/hegemon and two victim states/clients, forgetting that the bully was at peace with 7 states, and that 43 peaces may be equally worth understanding.

Having established that the year was $43/45=96\%$ peaceful and 4% belligerent, we may now ask: were they at war the whole year? In fact, $2 \text{ dyads} \times 365 \text{ days}$ give us 730 dyad-days; if at war only, say, 460 of them, 63% , we come down to 2.5% . The rest was peace, maybe a negative, vulnerable, unsustainable peace, but peace.

We may then ask: was the whole population in the countries 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-dyads rather than country-dyads? We end up with $0/00$'s, which only serves to show that we have become mesmerized by war, and blind to the prevalence of peace as the normal, human, condition. Of course, one reason for non-war is non-contact, but why not count distance as a paxogenic factor? We could go on from there and study positive peace, the good things people do in these dyads, and ask: how can we prevent interaction from turning violent?

This bias in the perspective may be related to the ten factors mentioned above. Adding them all up, conceiving of them as profiles, we may sense some connections. The combination male/elite/older/Occident/state (étatique) is more bellicist and military in general orientation than its negation. If we combine this with the epistemology of actor/empiricist/past-oriented, then we also sense how they are protected in their views: no search into the deeper crevices of the social construction; no critique, no alternatives; no forward-looking perspectives.

And yet this is no critique. A war museum is a war museum; all that is said is that there is more to the discourse than just telling a story about military activity. A discourse is best understood by understanding what is left out, and we have to understand the subtext (war is normal), context (there will always be spectators and "innocent bystanders") and supertext ("to win is not everything, it is the only thing").

The point is that war is only part of the war story. It would be interesting to interview people exiting from the MEMORIAL as it is constructed today, simply asking them whether they are missing something, whether they felt that something has been left out, etc. An educated guess would be along the lines given above: those with the profile of the last five points may declare themselves contented; those with other profiles probably less so. And what they are missing may be located exactly in the direction of the first five points.

This is the point where empirical data would be welcome. Why not simply make an exit-museum study, to get some guidance? A sample of one hundred, and open-ended questions might be very useful; particularly for understanding the younger generations.

Concluding this section a note on the perpetrator-victim portrayal in war museums; in four levels of increasing maturity:

Level 1: One party is portrayed only as perpetrator, the other only as victim. Totally unrealistic and morally dubious.

Portraying Self as perpetrator only and Other as victim, is masochistic; but portraying Self as victim only and Other as perpetrator is also wrong. Both may lead to hatred of the party portrayed as perpetrator, and increase levels of aggressiveness.

Level 2: Portraying both as both, both places is more realistic, more yin/yang, more true to the nature of war. Both sides will necessarily both receive and send violence, anywhere.

Level 3: Over time this perspective gains in realism; wars over time beget other wars. One side was more perpetrator in the first war, the other takes revenge in the next war, and so on. More mature; more reciprocity, less absolutism (Piaget); "he behaves like this because I once behaved the same way". The next war may be displaced aggression, like taking it out on weaker parties in colonial wars. But look and you'll find it.

Level 4: But instead of using these labels on the parties look at the logic of the system they are in: an inter-state war system. Both sides are playing roles. We understand chess through the rules more than through the players' personality. We may find the logic of war repulsive, horrible, and reject it. For the First World War, now 80 years ago, we have come to that point, but not yet for the Second World War (only 50+). The same goes for frozen, structural violence: slavery, colonialism, (class, patriarchy); brought about and maintained by violence. The topdog always tries to portray the underdog as aggressive, as perpetrator when they try to protest, violently or not.

2. War Museums, Anti-war Museums and Peace Museums

There are **war museums** telling the history of war, or of one particular war. Some of them glorify, directly or indirectly, and may inspire action supporting the next war.

There are **anti-war museums** focusing on the suffering, the insanity of war, or of one particular war. Some of them may inspire action against the next war.

And then there are, presumably, **peace museums**. But what do they exhibit? A museum is a discourse, the exhibits are the statements, their arrangement in museum space and museum time is the syntax, the museum walk is the reading/listening. What, how?

To approach this we might proceed by analogy. What would we exhibit in **health museums**, using health:disease = peace:violence as point of departure? We would have **disease museums** presenting diseases in time (history), in space (around the world), their causes and consequences focusing on epidemic/endemic/pandemic diseases (not necessarily contagious), roughly corresponding to local/regional/world wars. We would have **anti-disease museums**, with sections dedicated to the horrors of dying from cardiovascular diseases, cancer, home/job/traffic accidents; ending with displays of burials and the cemeteries of major religions. Heavy arguments against premature, avoidable and painful death.

Needless to say, that museum would leave us as unsatisfied as any visit to an "objective, "value-free", doctor who, after having made his diagnosis and his safe prognosis ("you will die sooner or later"), thanks you for coming, having delivered those precious data for his next article in the scientific field of pathology. We would shout: But where is your health section? Where is your therapy? **What are you going to do about it?**

No argument against war and anti-war museums. We need both the dialectic between war, anti-war and peace; and between disease, anti-disease and health. But the former focuses too much on the negative, and the latter on the positive.

What would be the discourse, the exhibits of a health museum? Not photos of Nobel Prize winners in medicine, we hope? Some do not even look healthy, many of them reportedly smoked. To answer that we need a theory of health that can give us some guidance through the wilderness. Here is one suggestion.

If we conceive of disease as an excess of **Exposure** to pathogens (micro-organisms, pollutants/stress, hazards) relative to human **Resistance**, then we get two approaches to health:

Reduce or remove the exposure: hygiene, no smoking, less stress;

Increase the resistance: immunity, diet, exercise, spiritual: control what enters your body/mind/spirit, and health follows; identify the anti-pathogens, the "sanogens", strengthen them!

This gives us two wings of the museum, one for "reduce E", the other for "increase R"; and a third for curative medicine, rehabilitation, if primary and secondary prophylaxis fail. But this will become boring propaganda from a health ministry (wash your hands after toilet, use condoms against AIDS, live in peace with everybody, learn how to stop smoking, use 500 healthy food recipes, engage in daily/hourly exercises) unless we have:

A negative anchor: The anti-disease section/museum; see above

A positive anchor: What a healthy life can offer all of us!

One routing could be from disease via anti-disease and the "do and don't" sections to positive health as much more than high resistance capacity. Or any other route; no one-way signs, rather some extra space for traffic jams! What matters is that people leave the museum inspired, optimistic, filled with ideas.

So let us develop an image. Let us stand at the very heart of France, in Paris: under the **Arc de Triomphe**, at the Place d'Etoile. Behind us is the **Av. de la Grande Armée**, we have walked its long distance up to the triumph arch; that Path of Glory, which, says Evelyn Waugh, Leads But to Death. In front of us is the beautiful display of the heavenly fields, **Av. des Champs Elysées**, about as far as we can see. So often this was the avenue traveled: the Army, the Glory, the Death. We look around; there must be some other roads, less traveled, where are they!

We see them; three to the right, three to the left, now using the map of peace theory, inspired by the health exercise. How about seeing violence, war and peace in terms of "bellogens" and "paxogens", pulling toward war and peace? The exposure is the destructive power, the resistance is the invulnerability; like arrow/lance and shield/armor, or the bomb and the bunker.

From this image we derive one road to peace, traveled by many: **war limitation**, through **ius ad bellum**, **ius in bello** and arms control; and **war abolition**, by refusing military service (COs!), capital, R&D (Hippocratic Oath for scientists!), A9, disarmament. Or, no army at all, today in 30 countries and 17 territories. More invulnerability only leads to encapsulation.

Bellogens have to be reduced or modified, paxogens to be strengthened. How about bad actors, bullies, individuals or states, that become perpetrators, hurting and harming others? Sure, but maybe there are two very different approaches to them.

First, we may like to control them through the rule of law, assuming they will get at each other's throat in Hobbes' **bellum omnium contra omnes** unless checked by a central authority; world governance, created in the image of a good, peaceful state.

Second, we may ask, how did those actors become that bad? Assuming that our nature makes for both harmony and violence, we are left with structure and culture as the big bellogens we have to turn into paxogens, into structures and cultures of peace.

How about paxogens, something not to struggle against but to strengthen? One has already been mentioned: a world society, building on the rule of law. Two others loom high in the peace discourse: conflict transformation, and nonviolence. The former is particularly useful when the conflict is open and the parties are equal; nonviolence is more relevant when the conflict is hidden and one party is suppressing the other like under slavery and colonialism, or threatening to do so through occupation.

So there they are, let us say three "reduce/modify bellogen" roads to the right, and three "strengthen paxogen" roads to the left, not in the usual political sense of conservative and radical, by maybe in the sense of old and new, of 19th century versus 20th century. Conflict Transformation, Nonviolence and World Governance on the one hand, and War Abolition, Peace Structures and Peace Cultures on the other.

Six roads not travelled; roads not taken (Robert Frost).

A major task of a peace museum would be to let the visitor travel, even walk, with many stops, those roads. But this should not be done in *abstracto*, like a theory of peace, or even worse, philosophy of peace, lecture. This should be done concretely, contrasting the roads of peace not travelled with that broad avenue that was traveled, in other words using a concrete war as a point of departure. This could be any war; any war is a monument over general human inability to handle such problems, and the inability of politicians in particular.

This brings up an important point: of course no self-respecting war museum would ever dream of presenting a war without a deep look into the decision-making (or lack thereof) of key politicians and military, including in that deep look both deep culture and deep personality. Indispensable if we want to attach a peace component, whether we go via an anti-war museum or not. We have to understand how they thought and felt with their head-brains and their gut-brains, to develop alternative understanding. Example: MacNamara's Việt Nam book.

In our image we have allocated one avenue to war and six to peace. Wars can be fought in different ways, using violence for political ends, including the "peace enforcement" of UN Charter, Chapter VII. The six avenues of peace also have one thing in common: "by peaceful means". But that can lead us in many directions. Which directions lead to creative and nonviolent solution of the underlying conflict depends on the case. There is only one rule: **better small successful steps along one road than one giant step in the wrong direction.** Walk all roads, in theory, in practice and in the museum; and there are many more.

As the roads of peace had not been traveled successfully, otherwise there would not have been a war, the museum would be an exercise in counterfactual history asking the absolutely basic question: **what could have been done, at some point, why wasn't it done, and how could it have been done successfully?**

By building alternative scenarios for the past, we overcome the fatalism of historical determinism; coming on top of history rather than letting history come on top of us. After all, we know more about the past than about the present and the future. Unblocking the past may serve to unblock the other two.

Let us try the peace roads as alternatives to World War II; the counterfactual history, in the subjunctive, "as if", mode:

Avenue Conflict Transformation: reframe the conflict by revising the Versailles Treaty, say, in 1924; abandoning the idea of Germany as sole perpetrator and all Germans as collectively guilty, sharing responsibility, thereby eliminating Hitler's most successful argument. For the Pacific War: early admission that Western colonialism was wrong, with a plan to dismantle it, thereby eliminating both the "Asia for Asians" and "Asia for Japan" arguments of Japanese militarism. What would have been the counter-arguments, counter-forces, and how to overcome them?

Avenue Nonviolence: spreading knowledge of nonviolence in Germany, creating not one but thousands of Rosenstrasse, Berlin, February 1943, and thousands of Bonhoffers, satyagraha brigades (Gandhi) entering Germany peacefully. Counter-arguments? Many!

Avenue World Governance: under what conditions would the League of Nations nevertheless have been successful? What could others have done for Germany (Italy, Japan) to be more peaceful? More emphasis on positive, less on negative sanctions? More on nongovernmental organizations, weaving webs of interdependence?

Avenue War Abolition: under what conditions could disarmament or conscientious objection have been successful? A condition would have been massive denunciation of war as social institution, like the denunciation of slavery and the incipient denunciation of colonialism. One approach: numerous anti-war museums.

Avenue Peace Structures: would a less capitalist, more socialist or at least social democratic, economic structure have helped? A more democratic, even directly democratic, political structure? Less authoritarianism at home, at school, on the job?

Avenue Peace Cultures: would a conversion to softer Christianity or to, say, buddhism have been useful? How about massive peace education, and, for the media, peace journalism?

We let that do. Seven is the maximum complexity; we have 7.

Down the museum walk there would be texts and illustrations of what this would mean in practice, drawing on case stories, around the world. Peace approaches are given a fair viewing, and so are arguments against. Along the roads there would be some chances to sit down, reflect, discuss. Usually no clear answer will emerge. The avenue will become an increasingly narrow road, a lane, a "garden of forking paths" (Borges), the visitor, like humanity will easily get lost in a labyrinth with no exit signs.

And that is the time to go back to the point of departure, the museum equivalent of the Place d'Etoile, trying another peace avenue. And perhaps ending with the conclusion that none of them taken alone was a viable alternative, but that traveled together in parallel, by the same and by different persons and states, they might have changed the course of history.

We then enter the next part of the museum, dedicated to the **alternative scenarios for the present**. After all, past is past; present options are limited but not down to one road, the road traveled. The visitor would be introduced to key conflicts of the day (obviously this will have to be changed quite often), and then invited to interact, in one way or the other, person-person, person-computer, computer-computer, to do the ground work for the peace roads. The six roads from counterfactual history will be available, possibly also what the visitor may have learnt if he has devoted time to get more deeply into the issues. The visitor may break out of that discourse, suggesting roads of his own. The museum discourse is not a prison. The good visitor creates his own syntax; his own sentences, too.

This would also be a good occasion for mini-courses on conflict transformation; on how to empower peace actors, for instance by networking NGOs; on school and university curricula in peace education; on peace zones; on peaceful reconciliation. And there would be much advice about how to get more material.

We then enter the last section: **alternative scenarios for the future**. We are now much more free; the cone of the future opens up, rich with possibilities. There is much more space for imagination. Instead of the focus on negative peace--how could war have been avoided--we now turn toward positive peace.

What would we like to pour into that concept? Peace is also our **summum bonum**, the projection screen for our dreams, our utopias. An excellent opportunity to ask the visitors how they envisage peace, not worrying so much about how to get there, and particularly not about alternatives for the past. Give power to imagination! An excellent opening for educational workshops during weekends, particularly for younger generations.

One approach is well known: **economic opportunity costs**. Compare the world military budget with basic needs for the most needy, distribute the money liberated through disarmament.

Another would be **social opportunity costs**: dismantle the open or hidden militarist structures in the world, resting on patriarchy, distribute personal and social energies liberated.

Still another would be **cultural opportunity costs**. This would go far beyond ridding the language of gender and violence bias, toward a critical examination of deeper layers. Imagine a culture (Viking) with a deeply pessimistic view of the future, and a pantheon of evil, tricky, violent gods. If human beings are inspired by their eschatologies we would expect aggression more than empire-building, for that Christian optimism may be needed. And then: were Protestants more cruel as slave-owners than Catholics (Tannenbaum), Virgin Mary having been removed?

We want the visitors to leave the museums with a feeling of empowerment. They should be optimistic, feeling that there is so much work to do, feeling inspired, more up to the task, that the world is filled with opportunities. The point is not to blame the past, but to learn, dialectically, dialogically, creatively, in order not to repeat the errors. And particularly so for the younger generations: they have more life to live.

4. A Note on Peace Museums as Education for Peace.

[1] To use peace museums as a contribution to world peace, we need theories of education, museums and peace.

[2] Education (German "Bildung", different from schooling, "Ausbildung"), comes mainly from the inside as self-study, from peers as co-study, from teachers as study; always interactive, dialogical, critical, constructive, dialectically negating and transcending. Unlike linear schooling along a prescribed track, the person in search of education designs his own trajectory; using any curve known or unknown to geometry. Good students see education and schooling as non-exclusive.

[3] A Museum is in principle total education (in German that would be "Gesamtbildung", like Wagner's conception of opera as "Gesamtkunstwerk"). It impinges on all faculties, not only like usual education on the eyes (reading, viewing), the ears (listening) and the vocal chords (speaking), but on motion (walking through), touching (when permitted, usually not!), smelling (religion does this better, incense), tasting (drinks and foods in the cafeteria should be adjusted to the exhibits.)

A good museum suggests a track, but facilitates designing alternative trajectories to avoid feeling processed by some museum designer with messages to be walked in the correct order.

A good museum would include a library for self-study, small discussion rooms or corners for co-study, lectures for study.

[4] Peace can be defined as peaceful reduction of violence or as peaceful, creative transformation of conflict, which also has to be dialogical, dialectical and transcending. Violence is then defined as anything that insults the basic human needs for survival, a minimum of well-being, freedom (space) and identity.

Peace is the normal state of human affairs; violence in the sense of direct or actor violence is the exception, the black spots on trajectories of individuals, as victim and perpetrator.

Violence in the sense of indirect or structural violence, repressing, exploiting and alienating, forcing people together or apart, is so ubiquitous, so normal that it becomes invisible.

Violence in the sense of cultural violence legitimizing the other two, is also ubiquitous. This is the violence of the brahmins, as opposed to the direct violence of the kshatriyas and the indirect violence of the vaisyas. Their victims are above all the common people, the shudras, and the excluded people, the parias (these terms have local interpretations).

That gives us three more precise meanings of peace:

- personal peace, security = absence of direct violence;
- structural peace or absence of structural violence; and
- cultural peace or absence of cultural violence.

We can talk about peace inside and between individuals. But a major focus should be the major fault-lines between groups: nature, gender, generation, race, class, deviants, nation, state. Thus, there is more direct gender genocide, and structural class genocide, than direct race or nation genocide today. Highly misleading is a focus on inter-state violence and security only.

The peace studies discourse broadens not only the concept of violence, but also the concept of war. A peace museum should pay attention to the 100 million women who disappeared between 1980 and 1990 (Amurtya Sen), and the discrepancy in livelihood at the top and the bottom, of world society (the UNDP Human Development Yearbooks have a wealth of data). The peace studies discourse would also include violence against nature.

[5] How would we exhibit peace as a state of affairs?

Human, social and world normality, with little or no violence. Peace images would vary in space (geography) and time (history). and we are no better than physicians imaging health. It might be worth while to remind ourselves that normal life as we conceive of it is harmonious, not quarrelsome, not violent, friendly, loving, and not for that reason boring.

Some key perspectives, building on the above:

- personal peace: livelihood, meeting basic human needs (sukha) reducing suffering (dukkha), productive, reproductive, creative;
- structural peace: not compromising the livelihood of others now (equity) or in the future (sustainability); and
- cultural peace: aligning all human spiritual and material resources with such goals, justifying peace, not violence/war.

It should be made very clear that everybody can contribute to this state of affairs, from brahmins to pariahs; not only Buddha/Christ/Gandhi and (alternative) Nobel Prize Winners, etc. **Peace should be seen as people creation, not as elite donation.** And creation would cover both material and spiritual production.

[6] While peace exhibits would serve as positive anchors we also need war exhibits as negative anchors for our work. One day the health profession will learn from the peace profession how to make a health museum: project what a healthy person is capable of and how ill-health, illness, reduces that potential. To portray how war and violence reduce the human potential the invisible consequences of violence have to be made visible, and no war museum, called peace museum or not, does that. And they are numerous, including bereavement, the thirst for more glory and for revenge for the traumas suffered, the nature destroyed.

[7] How would we exhibit peace as a process?

The answer depends on what peace arena (which fault-line) and what concepts/theories we have of peace, and they are numerous.

To use the conceptualization above:

- for actor peace: peaceful conflict transformation, as one factor underlying violence is usually unresolved conflict;
- for structural peace: peaceful structural revolution, using as examples revolts against slavery (abolitionism), colonialism (freedom struggle), exploitation (class struggle), patriarchy (feminism), wars (peace movement), puberty revolts (adolescence) Democracy and human rights and their possible cultural bias.
- for cultural peace: peaceful cultural revolution, against violence on TV and the media in general. But I know of no major examples, reflecting the power of the brahmins to operate unopposed, protected by the freedom of expression as opposed to the rules regulating the other two. The many efforts to rid language of violent expressions ("single-shot", "killing two flies with one stroke"); and to make it more gender-neutral. And how about a competition for a new text to the **Marseillaise**?

Peace should be seen as an ongoing struggle that easily can lead dialectically to violence along another fault-lines instead, not as something to be "ushered in" once and forever. Like health and marriage peace should not be taken for granted.

[8] How would we use the implicit discourse of museums for this? By playing fully on its potential, see above. Thus, each museum should have its peace research/studies/action wing, and invite visitors to participate. Discuss, and exhibit, the roads **not travelled**, the policies by which such major wars as the US Civil War, WWI and WWII could have been avoided.

Johan Galtung was born in Oslo, Norway in 1930. He was very much influenced by the Nazi Germans occupying his country 1940-45, putting his father in concentration camp, and by Mahatma Gandhi, whom he considers the true founder of peace studies.

For more than 40 years Galtung has been working on two tracks:

- as a peace researcher, producing many books and articles, and holding professorships in peace studies in many countries around the world, and
- as a peace worker, particularly in the field of Conflict Transformation By Peaceful Means (the title of a manual in handling conflict prepared for the United Nations), the last decade as director of TRANSCEND, a network for peace and development.

Galtung's general approach is modeled on the formula violence:peace like disease:health. Violence is a pathology with many roots, today competing with many other pathologies in terms of morbidity and mortality. As for disease there are preventive approaches like building capacities for peaceful transformation of conflict at the personal and social levels. And there are curative approaches, like intervening when there is violence through "soft" peacekeeping, seeing to it that the cure does not become worse than the disease. The diagnosis-prognosis-therapy triangle holds for violence as it does for disease. But the focus should be on building peace (like strengthening the human body-mind-spirit), not waiting, as is so often done, for violence (disease) to break out.