

## Comparing Galtung's Theory of conflict resolution with Freud's Psychoanalytical Theory

Antonino Drago<sup>1</sup>

Enviado: 24/05/2023 / Evaluado: 30/05/2023 / Aceptado: 04/06/2023

**Abstract.** Galtung's definition of an A-B-C conflict is entirely general. In particular, it applies to the inner conflicts treated by Freud's psychoanalytic theory. Galtung's A-B-C is then applied to both Patient and Analyst during the interaction of analysis' sessions; in which these two triads actually fuse into a single triad so that they represent a single personality elaborating through the analysis his internal conflict. In addition, Freud's short paper on the beginning of the psychoanalytic treatment leading to solve the conflict, is interpreted in a rigorous logical way which attributes a great importance to the doubly negated propositions for starting Analyst's healing process. The propositions of this kind occur within many other theories as a characteristic feature of a theoretical organization which is aimed at solving, like Freud's theory, a given problem and hence it is alternative to the usual deductive-axiomatic one. The development of this theoretical organization is composed by four steps converging to the resolution of the problem at issue. The non-mechanical nature of the last step is illustrated and it is limited to a realistic attitude by means of two constraints. By recognizing both the four steps and the two constraints within Freud's theory, the entire dynamics of the inner conflict resolution emerges. These four steps are then attributed to the dynamics of conflict resolution in general.

**Keywords:** Galtung's definition of a conflict as an A-B-C; Freud; 's psychoanalysis; Patient--Analyst interaction; its interpretation by A-B-C; Freud's description of the initial process of an analysis; Alternative theoretical organization; its four steps of problem resolution of a given problem; constraints of reality; dynamics of a conflict resolution.

### [es] Comparando la Teoría de la resolución de conflictos de Galtung con la Teoría psicoanalítica de Freud

**Resumen.** La definición de Galtung de un conflicto A-B-C es de uso completamente general. En particular, se aplica a los conflictos internos tratados por la teoría psicoanalítica de Freud. Luego, el A-B-C de Galtung se aplica tanto al paciente como al analista durante la interacción de las sesiones de análisis; en el que estas dos triadas en realidad se fusionan en una sola triada para que representen una sola personalidad elaborando a través del análisis su conflicto interno. Además, el breve artículo de Freud sobre el inicio del tratamiento psicoanalítico conducente a la solución del conflicto, es interpretado de una forma lógica rigurosa que atribuye una gran importancia a las proposiciones doblemente negadas para iniciar el proceso de curación del analista. Las proposiciones de este tipo aparecen dentro de muchas otras teorías como un rasgo característico de una organización teórica que está dirigida a resolver, como la teoría de Freud, un problema dado y, por lo tanto, es alternativa a la habitual deductivo-axiomática. El desarrollo de esta organización teórica se compone de cuatro pasos que convergen a la resolución del problema en cuestión. Se ilustra la naturaleza no mecánica del último paso y se limita a una actitud realista por medio de dos restricciones. Al reconocer tanto los cuatro pasos como las dos restricciones dentro de la teoría de Freud, emerge toda la dinámica de la resolución del conflicto interno. Estos cuatro pasos se atribuyen luego a la dinámica de resolución de conflictos en general.

<sup>1</sup> Universidad "Federico II" di Napoli. ORCID 0000-0002-2529-7256of Naples – Italy – [drago@unina.it](mailto:drago@unina.it)

**Palabras clave:** A-B-C de Galtung; Freud; psicoanálisis; interacción paciente-analista; proceso inicial de un análisis; organización teórica alternativa; cuatro pasos de resolución de problemas; constricciones de la realidad; dinámica de resolución de un conflicto.

**Sumario.** 1. Introducción. 2. The roles played by the Patient and the Analysts. 3. The crucial role of the doubly negated propositions within Patient-analyst's verbal communication. 4. The final step: Analyst's application of Leibniz's principle of sufficient reason. 5. Galtung's theory of conflict resolution and the PSR.

**Cómo citar:** Drago, A. (2023), Comparing Galtung's Theory of conflict resolution with Freud's Psychoanalytical Theory, en *CIC. Cuadernos de Información y Comunicación* 26, 57-66.

## 1. Introduction

A century and half ago, Sigmund Freud's therapeutical and theoretical attention to human inner conflicts was an extraordinary event within the history of Western society, where the conflicts were usually solved by struggles unto the suppression of the adversary; as a matter of fact, Western society experienced a lot of conflicts, but its culture was unable to theorize them.

By breaking a long tradition of metaphysical conceptions of person's interior conflicts, Freud started a theory and a therapy of this kind of conflicts. Living within a society where both the electroshock was a common therapy and the suppression of weaker persons was considered almost a social necessity, Freud's kind of resolution was new: To look for a non-violent solution. It anticipated the non-violent method of conflict resolution, whose Mohandas K. Gandhi's leadership of the Indian movement for political independence was the highest historical event.

After him, some decades elapsed before a conflict was defined in general terms. Johan Galtung suggested that a conflict is an A-B-C<sup>2</sup>; that means that a conflict is composed by three dimensions, substantially defined as follows (Since in Galtung's writings this definition may change, I fixed it according to the following notions): A Assumptions, B Behavior and C interior Contradiction<sup>3</sup>. The triadic nature of a conflict gives reason of the absence of a Western theorizing on it; since Greek's times, Western thinking is confined to conceive single ideas or at most two opposed ideas (e.g. true/false, good/evil, proletariat/bourgeoisie, etc.); never it conceived three ideas coalescing into one idea (apart from the idea of Christian Trinity, on which, however, the reflections are inconclusive owing to some unsolved oxymora<sup>4</sup>).

Galtung's definition covers all kind of conflicts, from the wars (e.g., Clausewitz' theory of war) to the social conflicts (e.g., Marx' theory of class struggle), the interpersonal conflicts and the inner conflicts. Yet, this definition is static. What is the

<sup>2</sup> Galtung, J. (1996).; *Peace by Peaceful Means*, London: Sage, Chap. 2. Galtung, J. (2010).; *A Theory of Conflict. Overcoming Direct Violence*, Transcend University Press, pag 27.

<sup>3</sup> Drago, A. (2016). "Improving Galtung's A-B-C to a scientific theory of all kinds of conflicts", *Ars Brevis*. Anuari de la Càtedra Ramon Llull Blanquerna, 21 pàgs: 56-91.

<sup>4</sup> However I recently suggested a solution of the many oxymora of the classical notion of Trinity in "Intuitionist reasoning in the tri-unitarian theology of Nicholas of Cues (1401-1464)".; *Journal of Logics and their Applications*, 6(6) (2019), pàgs. 1143-1186. My suggestion is to make use, as in present paper, of also non-classical logic.

dynamical process of a cooperative conflict resolution? Many suggestions have been advanced: either to apply a triad to each aspect of the conflict (violent, non-violent, inner, manifest, cultural, behavioral, etc.), or to analyze a temporal sequence among A, B and C (being these three elements ordered in a whatsoever way), or to apply to any actor only one triad A-B-C and then compare the corresponding elements of actors' triads two by two. The experience of a great number of applications of these methods did not suggest a decision on the best one.

In present paper Galtung's definition is applied to a well-studied case of conflict, the inner conflict which is healed by a psychoanalyst. Patient-Analyst interaction is interpreted by applying the triad A-B-C to each of them. The corresponding elements are compared two by two according to the characteristic features of a psychoanalytic dialog. A sharing of the elements of the two actors emerges, so that they partially fuse into a single personality elaborating through the analysis' sessions his internal conflict. This kind of fusion gives justification of the healing power of the psychoanalytic process.

Fortunately, in a short paper of the year 1925 Freud described how to begin a healing dynamics. A rigorous logical interpretation of this description leads to attribute a great importance to the doubly negated propositions for starting Analyst's process of healing. Propositions of this kind also occur within many theories (also theories of natural sciences) as a characteristic feature of a theoretical organization which, instead to be the deductive-axiomatic one of the Newtonian paradigm, is aimed at the resolution of a given problem. As such, psychoanalytic theory belongs to the alternative theories to the dominant ones. By a comparative analysis of the above theories a previous paper extracted the ideal model of development of this theoretical organization; it is composed by four fundamental steps converging to the resolution of the problem at issue. In particular, the last step is the application of the principle of sufficient reason. It indicates that the true resolution of a conflict is never a mechanical step, but is based on a faith, at least the faith in the rationality of the world and therefore of also the adversary; however, this faith must be subjected to two criteria of reality which are specified as two constraints on this application. By recognizing these steps within Freud's theory, the main steps of psychoanalytic dynamics of inner conflict resolution are elucidated.

Then this dynamics is generalized to all kinds of conflicts.

## **2. The roles played by the Patient and the Analyst**

The three dimensions of a conflict parallel the three theoretical objects described in a "personified" way by Freud, respectively: Super-Ego, Ego, Id. The parallelisms of the first two are manifest; the third, C, is the result of Id's pulsions which are in contradiction either among themselves or with Super-Ego and/or Ego.

However, a definition of Freud's psychoanalysis as a scientific theory is controversial because some usual criteria for recognizing a theory as a scientific one fail: experimental basis, falsifiability, operationism, assured principles or axioms, etc. In my opinion the problem is worsened by the common tenet that only a formulation of a theory as deductive-axiomatic assures to it a dignity of a science. As a historian of science, I performed a comparative analysis of all the scientific theories – in Logic, Mathematics, and Physics: (Lazare Carnot in mechanics, geometry and calculus, S.

Carnot in thermodynamics, Lobachevsky in non-Euclidean geometry, Galois in his algebraic theory, Klein in group theory of geometries, Einstein in his 1905 paper on quanta, etc.) – which have been presented by their respective authors in a different way from the deductive one, as e.g., Euclid's one and Newton's one are. I obtained an alternative model of the organization of a theory. Its first step is to be based not on axioms from which derive all results, rather on a problem, whose resolution requires discovering a new scientific method. I call it a problem-based organization (PO). The four next steps of its theoretical development will be presented in the following.

Let us now consider Freud's therapy. It adds to a person suffering an inner conflict (the Patient) one more person (the Analyst); in other words, it doubles the person taking care of the conflict of the original system. In terms of persons, this is a least generalization performed by means of the adjunction of one person. Why? Because an adjunction simplifies the search for a solution of the problem – as Lazare Carnot suggested it about a mathematical system: “To generalize is to simplify”<sup>5</sup>. The adjunction starts a cyclical process. Once this solution is obtained, in order to come back to the original system, being equipped with the wanted solution, one has to put aside in a formally correct way the adjunction.

Several founders of scientific theories of a not-axiomatic kind have applied this method<sup>6</sup>. Also, the first non-violent person in Europe, Aldo Capitini, founded his philosophical theory of non-violence by applying exactly the notion of “adjunction”<sup>7</sup>. Galtung also explains a non-violent conflict resolution by means of an adjunction; as an instance he suggests the well-known tale of the three sons inheriting 17 camels, to be parted in the proportions of  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{3}$  and  $\frac{1}{9}$ . The rebus (of dividing e.g., 17 by 2) is solved by the adjunction of one camel, which at the end of the wanted divisions can be freed, leaving to the three brothers respectively 9, 6 and 2 camels, whose addition is exactly 17. In the case of Freud's therapy also the above suggested adjunction is aimed at making easier the search of the solution of the illness. Once the wanted solution is obtained, the (interaction with the) Analyst is left by mutual agreement by the healed-up Patient<sup>8</sup>.

But what is this interaction? Freudian therapy rationalizes a component of the therapy, i.e., the transference between Patient and Analyst. In order to explain it I double Galtung's triad A-B-C in correspondence to previous adjunction. Now we have to think through a complex system of six dimensions in their cooperative interaction; at glance it seems an obscure process.

<sup>5</sup> Carnot, L. 1971.; “Dissertation sur la théorie de l'infini mathématique » (1781), in C.C. Gillispie (ed.), *Lazare Carnot Savant.*; Princeton: Princeton U.P., pàg: 258.

<sup>6</sup> Drago, A. (2012).; “Pluralism in Logic. The Square of opposition, Leibniz's principle and Markov's principle”, in *Around and Beyond the Square of Opposition*, edited by J.-Y. Béziau and D. Jacquette, Basel: Birkhauser, pàgsp: 175-189. This paper presents all those details of the above-mentioned theories which will be referred to in the following.

<sup>7</sup> Capitini, A., (1969)., “L'avvenire della dialettica”, in Cacioppo, G. (ed.): *Il messaggio di Aldo Capitini.*, Manduria TA: Lacaita, pàgsp. 187-194; Drago, A. (2014). “Peace Profile: Aldo Capitini”, *Peace Review*, 26(3), July, pàgsp. 434-439, sect. 3.

<sup>8</sup> More details on this method are presented by two papers: Drago A., (1992).; ““Sulla negazione” di S. Freud e i fondamenti della scienza”, in Sala, G. and Cesa Bianchi, M. (eds.); *La presenza di Gustavo Iacono nella Psicologia italiana.*; Napoli: Dip. Sci. Relazionali, Univ. Napoli et al. Dept.s, pàgsp: 137-150, pàg. 145; Drago, A. and Zerbino, E. (1996). “Sull'interpretazione metodologica del discorso freudiano”, *Riv. Psicol. Neurol. Psichiatria*, 57, pàgsp: 539-566, sect. 2f.

However, under a closer inspection the situation is simple. In his interactions with the Patient the Analyst actually suppresses his B, besides of his behavior regarding of speaking in a gentle way, so much to never hurt or shock the Patient. In other words, Analyst's B is reduced to suggesting merely appealing ideas, which could be considered by the Patient as coming not from a different person, but from himself, like any new idea which born in his mind or any his inner feeling. Patient's B instead is present; this behavior is of a soft nature, because he merely talks on his unconscious life, as dreaming and similar experiences; and moreover, Patient does it without responsibilities or even without awareness.

Patient's A is made completely silent. On the contrary, Analyst's A is very present; he/she puts in place his professional preparation and personal assumptions, his/her human experience of a mature person; and interiorizes the contents of Patient's verbal communications, elaborates these contents, and takes decisions on this elaboration in order to eventually suggest (no more than) some hints to the Patient, aimed at opening his/her mind to productive novelties.

Moreover, along the time of a session Analyst's A forces his C to simulate Patient's C (Only outside the session the two actors have different C's; in particular, Analyst's C re-gains its freedom to interact with the other two Analyst's dimensions A and B in order to support the elaboration of the material of the session; while Patient comes back to live his everyday life of mutual interaction of his three dimensions A, B and C).

Let us now consider the interactions of the two actors through the complex of their three dimensions. We see that, in the absence of Patient's A, Analyst's A interacts rarely and in a very soft way, although it plays a dominant role in orienting the interaction. In particular, their verbal communication is highly unbalanced: while the Analyst is almost silent, the colloquial behavior of the Patient (B) dominates their interaction; it occasions a lot of subjects of conversation through which the two persons interact. However, whereas Patient's contribution is very great in quantity, but only occasionally relevant in quality, Analyst's contribution is small in quantity, but is so much important in quality to be decisive in orienting their interaction.

Let us now notice that by superimposing the triads A-B-C of the two actors living a session of therapy, we obtain 1) a unique C, coming from the fusion of the C's of both, 2) a unique B, i.e. (almost) only Patient's talk 3) and a unique A, i.e. Analyst's orientation of the session. In sum, the interaction of the two persons defines an intimate, visceral symbiosis of two distinct persons through their common sharing a same C, plus only Patient's B and only Analyst's A. We may say that in total, they compose an "augmented person". In sum, during a session the therapeutical process is experienced by two persons, but it works as a living experience of one person, the augmented one; therefore, it does not exit out the life of a human being. This fact guarantees that the therapy works as a sane human process. Evidence for this conclusion is given by the result of this superposition of the two A-B-C's: the two persons gain a mutual and calm cooperation, encouraging them to have a mutual transference of feelings and even mutual love (C).

In conclusion, a crucial notion of Freud's therapy is the transference process. In my opinion, previous studies on it were defective because they considered this process in a vacuum. It is rather a conception of the human person that addresses the recognition of this therapeutic process. It is a complex of elements: fusion of the two C, living exchange of Patient's dreams, Analyst's stimuli, etc.

### 3. The crucial role of the doubly negated propositions within Patient-analyst's verbal communication

A clearer representation of this dynamics is given by the notion of a logical adjunction and the cycle of operation it generates. Fortunately, we can exploit a very important reflection made by Freud about his therapeutical method in a short paper titled *Die Verneinung* (1925)<sup>9</sup>. There, Freud explains that a linguistic negation represents an affective negation, i.e., a Patient's repression of a psychical trauma, which occasionally slips out his inner repression and hence emerges into the objective world.

Freud remarks: "The negation is already a taking into account of the repressed trauma... yet it is not a [conscious] acceptance of it." Therefore, Freud invites Analyst to catch each negation of Patient's talking; for instance: "It is not my mother [that I wanted to kill]". From this, Freud deduces an affirmative proposition: "Thus (German: *Also*), it is the mother". This word ("Thus") represents a strange kind of logical implication because Freud has no evidence for supporting this affirmative conclusion, at least because not all Patient's negations refer to this element of his subconscious; as a fact, a Freudian therapy does not end at the first Patient's negation. Moreover, it cannot be a single deduction – and even less a purely deductive process – which can address Analyst to a sure recognition of Patient's trauma or whatsoever is at the origin of his illness. In addition, this Freudian "deduction" is incorrect because at this step of the therapeutical process he correctly should rather advance no more than a suspect. As such, it has to be represented by a doubly negated proposition, i.e.: "It is not true that he did not want to kill his mother"<sup>10</sup>.

Actually, in a retrospect view, we see that Freud's illustration missed to explain through which kind of investigation an Analyst can transform a suspect into a productive hypothesis for recovering Patient's well-being<sup>11</sup>.

Let us remark that during Freud's time no logician gave relevance to a doubly negated proposition. Yet, this logical feature gained great relevance later because it was proved that the failure of the double negated law ("Two negations do not affirm") constitutes the best borderline between classical logic and intuitionist logic (or, more in general, most non-classical kinds of logic)<sup>12</sup>. Hence, when a text presents a doubly negated proposition which does not correspond in meaning to its corresponding affirmative proposition, it represents a case of failure of the double negation law and therefore it belongs to intuitionist logic (DNP). It is remarkable that the original text of each of the above listed scientific theories includes a lot of DNPs. Also for this reason,

<sup>9</sup> <https://dokumen.tips/documents/die-verneinung-freud-negation.html>.

<sup>10</sup> Notice that Freud has suggested to the Analyst to "disregard Patient's negation". This suggestion does not represent a Hegelian move. In Hegel's dialectic one starts from an affirmative term (or proposition), negates it and then adds a new negation in order to obtain a new term (as a double negation) indicating a transcending term with respect to the previous two; i.e. he gives reality to all three propositions (respectively: affirmative, negative and doubly negated). Instead, here the negative proposition is an unreal living experience; moreover, when through the addition of a one more negation it is translated into a doubly negated term, it expresses a suspect, to be elaborated in order to eventually state something on the real world, not certainly an affirmation of classical logic as Freud's proposition: "... it is the mother".

<sup>11</sup> A similar interpretation of non classical logic is given by Horn, L. (2018); "Contradiction", in Zalta, E.N. (ed.). *Stanford Encyclopedia of philosophy*, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/contradiction/>, sect. 4.

<sup>12</sup> Prawitz, D. and Malmnaas, P.-E.; (1968); "A survey of some connections between classical intuitionistic and minimal logic", in Schmidt, H.A., Schütte K. and Thiele H.-J. (eds.); *Contributions to Mathematical Logic*, Amsterdam; North-Holland, pàgs: 215-229.



I suggested that the proposition to be built on Patient's proposition is rather a DNP. Moreover, the suggestion of a DNP is justified also because classical logic, based on the bivalence principle (true/false in a mirror way), cannot deal with an idea composed by three dimensions, as a conflict is; it is this triadic nature of a conflict, i.e., the conflict caused by a trauma, that obliges Analyst to make use of non-classical logic.

Let us now come back to the above description of a therapeutic session. This description is of a static kind. The crucial step of Freud's method is rather the following one: How Analyst can reason about a suspect on Patient's trauma? Surely, Analyst has to compare all the elements in his possession for theorizing in an Abstract way Patient's interior situation and then answer to the following question: Does Analyst's accumulations of elements of his analysis leads to compose a consistent framework with Patient's personality and illness? Notice that Analyst cannot surely decide about the mutual consistency of two elements by deriving them from assured axioms, because here axioms are lacking. And even if some fixed points there existed, Analyst cannot attribute a logical deduction to Patient's life, since the mind of the latter one is disturbed by illness.

Rather, notice that several DNPs may be linked together into an *ad absurdum* argument (AAA), as it occurs within the scientific theories of the above list. (It is not an objection that the content of a DNP is not circumscribed in a clear-cut way, because such is the nature of an inductive reasoning, like the reasoning within the above listed theories and also in Analyst's method). Also, Freud's paper implicitly suggested an AAA, although not well formulated. Last propositions of the above quoted paper are aimed at validating previous analysis of the role played by negation in the analysis. For brevity and clarity's sake I translate his propositions as follows: previous analysis is valid; *otherwise* a negation would come out the Id; that is *absurd, because never* this event has been discovered within the Id. The last proposition constitutes *Freud's methodological principle* (it is comparable to a principle often applied in theoretical mechanics, i.e., the *impossibility* of a motion *without* an end).

Notice that in an AAA concerning a Patient's life the absurd is represented neither by a general, unique absurdity, nor by a single method to decide the absurdity of something at issue, but by a specific absurdity of very strange situations which are peculiar to Patient's illness. This specific absurdity characterizes a kind of logic which is weaker than not only classical logic, but also intuitionist one: it is the minimal logic<sup>13</sup>. This characterization of the peculiar kind of logic in Freud's analyses gives reason of one more difficulty met by scholars wanting to understand the transfer: minimal logic is rarely used.

The conclusion of an AAA, again a DNP, may work as a premise of a next AAA. These AAAs compose a chain of arguments, as it occurs in some of the above listed scientific theories (Sadi Carnot's thermodynamics 1824, Lobachevsky non-Euclidean geometry 1840, Kolmogorov's theory of intuitionist logic 1932). Hence, we can conceive that also Analyst can reason through a chain of AAAs in order to step-by-step build a theoretical framework of Patient's inner situation. The historical novelty of the Freudian method was to have made this logical reasoning a systematic practice scattered in innumerable therapies which were peculiar to very different psychical illnesses.

<sup>13</sup> Grize, J.-B. (1970). "Logique" in Piaget, J. (ed.), *Logique et connaissance scientifique, Écyclopédie de la Pléiade*.; Paris: Gallimard, pàgspr: 206-210.

#### 4. The final step: Analyst's application of Leibniz's principle of sufficient reason

At last, a chain of AAAs obtains a conclusion which is again a DNP. As next step the theoretical development of each of the above-mentioned scientific theories presents an application of the principle of sufficient reason (PSR)<sup>14</sup>.

The application of this principle translates the final DNP into the corresponding affirmative proposition, which, only because it is affirmative, can be tested with reality. This translation implies a change of the kind of logic, from the non-classical one to the classical one<sup>15</sup>, i.e., from an inductive search to deductive derivations.

Therefore, the application of PSR does not belong to any specific kind of logic; it is rather the translation between two kinds of logic; as such it cannot be a rational implication; rather it is an extra-rational act. It is a logical translation from the likelihood into a real world. In Analyst's practice it is a vital act, including a faith in the rationality of the world, or in the common human nature. It is an appeal to a meta-scientific world. Here the PSR is a vital act; it is an attribution of the rationality of our mind to reality.

In the past the PSR was applied to various subjects, but it obtained also metaphysical and unrealistic conclusions. However, the paper of a scientist (Andrej Markov) founding the theory of constructive numbers declared this logical step in his theory; moreover, he suggested two constraints that in his opinion avoid uncontrolled results: the final DNP must be the conclusion of a previous AAA and decidable. They apparently represent the strictest criteria one can impose to the passage from the realm of the possible to the real world.

Let us investigate whether these constraints apply to Freud's method. 1) *To be derived from an AAA*: a correct Analyst's reasoning should draw a conclusion from some AAAs that he should build about his knowledge of Patient and previous Freud's methodological principle. 2) *Decidability*: surely the material of a dream does not constitute a decidable matter: rather, Analyst has to refer to both Patient's objective behavior, i.e. past actions, and already discovered traumas of Patient's life.

By summarizing, after having elaborated some AAAs constituting a consistent theoretical reasoning on Patient's (disturbed) personality, Analyst applies the principle of sufficient reason to his final DNP; he obtains a hypothesis which, only because it is affirmative, can be tested with reality by wondering whether it explains Patient's past and present life. Now Analyst reasons no longer in an inductive way, rather from his reasoned hypothesis he explains in a deductive way all what Patient has said within the sessions about his past life.

In conclusion, I stress that Analyst's work is not only the result of a human empathy towards Patient, but rather a reasoning according to a sophisticated method, which actually reiterates the ideal model of some scientific theories suggested centuries ago. The above-mentioned chain of AAAs manifests the highly speculative nature of Analyst's work of interpretation. However, his professional capability consists mainly in recognizing the best moment for applying the principle of sufficient reason. At last, he obtains a scientific theory, although a theory of a non-axiomatic

<sup>14</sup> Drago A., (2017).: "A Scientific Re-assessment of Leibniz's Principle of Sufficient Reason"; in Pisano, R. et al. (eds.). *The Dialogue between Sciences, Philosophy and Engineering. New Historical and Epistemological Insights. Homage to Gottfried W. Leibniz 1646-1716.*; London: College Publications, págs: 121-140.

<sup>15</sup> It is easily proved through the table of Dummett. M., (1977).: *Elements of Intuitionism*, Oxford: Clarendon,, págs: 29.



kind, and of a very particular field of experiences, those pertaining to the inner world of only one person.

## 5. PSR Galtung's theory of conflict resolution and the PSR

The above comparison of Galtung's theory of conflict resolution with Freud's theory of inner conflicts resolution suggests some considerations.

- 1) Galtung suggests accumulating triads characterizing several aspects of a conflict, e.g., the violent, non-violent, deep, apparent, manifest, etc. However, since the definition of a conflict through a triad is of a static nature, the application of all these aspects are mere descriptions, which do not represent the most relevant point of a process of a conflict resolution, i.e. its dynamics. In my opinion, it is better to apply one triad to each actor involved within the conflict; already two and even three triads constitute a complex system to be dealt with, having in mind to characterize their dynamical interaction. Previous kind of application to the psychoanalytic process (i.e. a triad A-B-C to Patient and one to Analyst) was productive of new theoretical results; hence, it is preferable to others kinds of applications of the triads.
- 2) In the psychoanalytic sessions the roles played by the different elements (A, B and C of each actor) are set in advance: Patient's A and Analyst's both B and C are made almost mute. Instead in a generic process of non-violent conflict resolution surely each couple of the similar elements of the two triads has to adjust themselves in order to achieve an agreement of not all-or-nothing nature. In this sense a not psychoanalytic process of resolution is more difficult to be described.
- 3) *Per se* Galtung's triadic representation of a conflict excludes classical logic; otherwise, we could reduce each his triad to a list of either consonant or antagonistic couples A&B, A&C, B&C; instead they are mutually in-dependent; this DNP shows that their relationship are managed by intuitionist logic. Yet, Galtung gives no suggestion for thinking outside classical logic and does not make use (even inadvertently) of DNPs<sup>16</sup>.
- 4) Truly, Galtung suggests one element of a conflict dynamics, "adjunction". However, he did not make clear in general how it may generate a dynamic and at what stage of the dynamics of the conflict resolution it has to be located. In Freud's theory we have two instances of adjunction which generate two dynamics, leading together to solve the conflict. The former adjunction is the addition of a person (the Analyst). This kind of adjunction is similar to the

---

<sup>16</sup> Galtung's thinking conforms to a logic of terms; he defines a conflict as a composite idea of three terms– A, B and C; through these terms he suggests much more terms. With all them he compiles lists and tables, each time leaving to the reader the task of composing a consistent and suggestive synthesis. In the history the logic of terms characterizes the pre-modern period. In that time Aristotle was capable to suggest through terms formal arguments and moreover list all possible syllogisms. In modern times, by following the mathematical reasoning, logic changed into logic of propositions and formalized also predicates (including existential and total quantifiers). At this stage of development logic is capable to represent theories and also present several theories of logic. Unfortunately, present theories of conflict resolution are very limited; they make use of only classical logic and only logic of terms. The introduction of syllogisms would represent a first decisive improvement.

adjunction in a case considered by Galtung: the addition of a mediator in the case of two actors in conflict<sup>17</sup>. Here Galtung suggests a dynamical process composed by a long list of steps, which are managed by the mediator on the basis of the two actors' trust in him. The steps of this process do not include adjunctions, but only clever ideas of the mediator. Hence, no general method is recognizable, apart a fixed list of steps of mediator's action. In Freud's theory the second adjunction is the addition of Patient's dreams to his objective behavior; this adjunction generates the dynamics of a so deep dialog between the two actors that it allows Analyst to interpret Patient's inner life. No similar adjunction is envisaged by Galtung.

- 5) In Freud's theory the crucial step of the non-violent dynamics is the application of the PSR; it constitutes an Analyst's creative process, aimed at conjecturing the wanted a non-violent resolution. This is Freud's theoretical lesson, whose nature is still debated after a century and half. In general, the non-violent conflict resolution must include PSR as its hard core, because otherwise the resolution of the conflict would be a merely mechanical move; this application of PSR makes creative and unrepeatable the resolution process. Unfortunately, all theories of conflict resolution ignore this point. Truly, Galtung seems appealing to PSR when invokes "transcendence" and qualifies his entire method by means of the word "Transcend"; but what is the exact meaning of this word is not explained.
- 6) The application of PSR gives a realistic process only if it is supported by the fulfillment of the two Markov requirements on the conclusion of Analyst's arguing about the entire Patient's situation: this application must concern a DPN resulting from an *ad absurdum* argument and be decidable. To my knowledge, no theory of non-violent conflict resolution mentions similar requirements on the result of a non-violent actor's arguing.

In conclusion, the above comparison qualifies Galtung's contributions as an impressive advancement of the theory of non-violent conflict resolution because he has overcome all descriptions of a conflict in only subjective and/or objective terms. Through the three dimensions of a triad he has qualified his theory in structural terms, not only of actors' lives, but also of their intellectual structures. Overall, Galtung gave birth of this theory of conflict resolution through the suggestions of its basic definitions and its first representations. However, his theory is incomplete because lacking of a dynamics. Present paper developed a comparison with Freud's theory which put a remedy to this shortcoming by providing an introduction to a conflict resolution dynamics.

---

<sup>17</sup> Galtung, J. (2004). *Transcend and Transform, An Introduction to Conflict Work*, London: Pluto. Galtung, J. (2010). *A Theory of Conflict. Overcoming Direct Violence*. Kolophon, pàgs 88-92.