



LA RAZÓN HISTÓRICA
Revista hispanoamericana de Historia de las Ideas
ISSN 1989-2659
Número 61, Año 2024, páginas 104-125
www.revistalarazonhistorica.com

The concept of Irenology in Johan Galtung and its contribution to the Social Sciences

Beatriz Martínez Pérez

Doctora en Estudios de Paz y Conflictos por la Universidad de Murcia, Máster en Intervención social y Mediación, Diplomada en Trabajo Social por la Universidad de Murcia, vicepresidenta del Instituto Galtung España para los estudios de Paz. Profesora en la Universidad de Murcia (España).

Rosa María García Navarro

Doctora en Intervención Social y Mediación por la Universidad de Murcia, Licenciada en Criminología, Diplomada en Trabajo Social por la Universidad de Murcia. Profesora en la Universidad de Murcia (España).

Jesús Adolfo Guillamón Ayala

Doctor Internacional en Política social por la Universidad de Murcia, Máster en Intervención social y Mediación, Diplomado en Trabajo Social por la UNED. Profesor en la Universidad de Murcia (España).

Abstract. Johan Galtung's concept of 'irenology' is based on the need to prevent violence to solve unfinished conflicts by supporting the human ability to depolarize learned skills that justify the use of violence concerning those conflicts. Therefore, it is essential to start walking down the path leading to the construction peace being aware of the fact that peace must be approached from the knowledge of its origins, world views, cultural and traditional differences, and first reflections. Finally, the arrival point has been the development of the science of Peace as an applied social science. Galtung has contributed to a great extent to the social sciences with the inception of the sciences of Peace as a discipline based on the scientific rigor of data, theories, and values of the epistemological research. Thus, he has contributed to developing a richer concept of peace, which is not only used by specialists in state-of-the-art research but also accepted by international agencies. The premises of this research study are based on that definition of negative peace as the absence of personal violence, and positive peace as the absence of structural violence, and its focus

will be on a more humane and empirical concept, namely, that of social justice as a positively defined condition.

Keywords: Irenology, epistemology, negative peace, positive peace.

Título: El concepto de Irenología en Johan Galtung y su contribución a las Ciencias Sociales

Resumen. El concepto de Irenología en Johan Galtung parte de la necesidad de la prevención de la violencia, el fomento de las capacidades humanas para adquirir habilidades en la solución de conflictos de manera que se vaya hacia una despolarización de las capacidades aprendidas en el uso de la violencia como instrumento solucionador de conflictos inconclusos. Para ello es imprescindible caminar hacia la construcción de una cultura de paz. El primer paso será partir del conocimiento del concepto de paz desde sus orígenes, cosmovisiones, la paz en las costumbres y tradiciones de las distintas culturas, los primeros pensadores hasta llegar a la elaboración de las ciencias de la paz como ciencia social aplicada. Galtung realiza su gran contribución a las ciencias sociales con la elaboración de las ciencias de la paz como disciplina. El rigor científico de datos, teorías y valores en el estudio epistemológico, hasta desarrollar el concepto más rico de paz, utilizado por organismos internacionales, textos de investigadores y especialistas.

El concepto Paz positiva y Paz negativa: la ausencia de violencia personal como paz negativa y la ausencia de violencia estructural como paz positiva, la cual será el punto de partida para ocuparse de un concepto más humano y empírico, la justicia social como condición definida positivamente.

Palabras clave: Irenología, epistemología, paz negativa – paz positiva.

1. Introduction

From the origins of civilization to the present day, humanity has been swinging like a pendulum from peace to war and vice versa. Since peace is a necessity and an innate human potential, this instability has become a great concern for some wise humans who have focused on how to hinder war. This continues being so until today. It has been in the aforementioned context that the figure of Johan Vincent Galtung, a mathematician and sociologist of Norwegian origin and Viking ancestry, an active and tireless citizen of the world, who faced the future with a positive spirit, must be recognized. For more than sixty years, he has undertaken the search for peace together with other thinkers and activists. They didn't pretend to fix the world since this would be a chimera. Instead of that, they rather aimed at meeting two urgent needs: Firstly, to promote the human capacity to acquire skills in conflict resolution, achieving depolarization of learned skills, that generate violence as a way of addressing unfinished conflicts. Secondly, to contribute to the establishment of a culture of peace preventing the violence entrenched in macro-cultures.

As Galtung has suggested, the first step towards achieving peace would be the enhancement of such knowledge that allows us to understand the complexity of human condition regarding conflict management. Even if such measure would enable to

move on to action and then construct peaceful systems, it must involve the promotion, acquisition, and use of skills and techniques, not in an isolated way, but combining Knowledge, Skills, and Practice as suggested in the formula consisting of the aforementioned three elements as follows:

Basis Formula: K + S + P

Note that, in such a formula, the three summands are knowledge, Skills, and Practice.

Galtung has been one of the most important theoreticians of our time since thanks to him the social sciences have been provided with the rigorous scientific elaboration of a discipline called the sciences of Peace and the concept of Positive Peace - Negative Peace has spread around the world of today and is currently used by great international organizations.

In this article, an overview of Professor Galtung's concept of irenology is proposed. On one hand, such review is based on in-depth studies of two relevant civilizations, namely, the Western and Eastern cultures, and their subcultures, which are the main axes in the historical analysis of peace according to which the first organizational and associative systems of peace were established. On the other hand, it is also based on the first studies on peace by great thinkers and activists, who provided an understanding of the difficult task of promoting peace on earth. Following that, the concern of this article has been to raise awareness of the epistemological project of the sciences of Peace as a scientific and applied discipline. In the last part of this contribution, the focus has finally been on Galtung's concept of positive and negative peace.

2. Origins and Cosmovisions of the Peace Concept in Two Macrocultures: West and East

In ancient Greece, the term *eirene* meant peace and was considered synonymous with the term *homonoia* (harmony); it was used to refer to the calm and peaceful relationships that took place within the Greek city-states during periods when there was no war. Thus, the term *eirene* not only referred to the inner and social unity of the people but also to the individual, mental, inner, and spiritual harmony bound to calm and peaceful feelings and behavior. Furthermore, it also referred to their goal of achieving perfection and unity, what according to Lederach explains why peace has to do with idealistic expectations that are desired instead of being tangible. For the Greeks, group and individual harmony and unity is a state, which is contrary to violence and conflict.

The term which was later used by the Romans to refer to peace was that of *Pax*. Even if the content of that term was similar to that of the Greek culture, there are some differences due to the fact that the *Pax Romana* had legal meaning and was based on the agreements with a legal value between persons or peoples. As a result of that, the term referred to peace of law and order and lost the spiritual and intimate nuances that it had in the Greek culture.

The context of the Roman Empire was also a new one. Such a context was conditioned by a vast empire, which included most territories of Europe, parts of Africa and Asia. It had such a geographical extension and such diversity of cultures that it was difficult to control. To solve that problem, they established norms and laws in order to maintain order and calm. The result was the Roman law, that in these days is still a study manual for jurists.

The term Pax Romana is a legal system to maintain order by protecting and benefiting people who followed the system of law. However, even if according to the law no violence would be committed, that term wouldn't have the nuance of prosperity, reciprocity, and equality for all.

According to Galtung, it is essential to study the time or perspective to analyze peace. Peace is a characteristic of a system, namely, a characteristic of the set of rules and procedures that assures the functioning of individuals, groups or collectivities, at an intrapersonal, interpersonal, intrasocial, intersocial, intraglobal level. Therefore, the concept of peace must be analyzed because it varies depending upon the civilizations since each one is conditioned according to their habits, customs, and traditions.

The focus of this research article is on the concept of peace in the two macro-cultures or great civilizations, East and West, and, in particular, on the customs and traditions of some of their subcultures. Concerning the West, following customs, namely, Hebrew, early Christian, Islamic, Greek, Roman, medieval, and modern, will be reviewed. As for the East, we focused on the following traditions: Indian, Sinic, and Japanese. By doing so, those characteristics, which are inherent to each civilization, have been identified to contribute to a deeper understanding of their concept of peace.

In the West, according to Hebrew customs, the word 'shalom' meant peace or well-being, referring not only to peace between two parties, especially between man and God, but also to inner peace, personal tranquility, and to the peace that is enjoyed when going back to balance and justice. But questions like the following arise: Justice and balance between whom? Only among Hebrews or between all peoples? And who imparts justice?

For the ancient Hebrew people, the word Shalom, translated as peace, designated their relationship with their only God, Yahweh, who chose them as people to reveal through the prophets the fundamental principles of God on earth. To choose them, Yahweh sealed an alliance or pact exclusively with the chosen people. Such a pact would lead them to future justice, equality, and prosperity. Therefore, God would establish a physically, emotionally, and spiritually unbreakable covenant only with those chosen by him and with his prophets in the world. According to such a pact, a party was the other party's successor and representative on earth and agreed to spread God's message through the world, if necessary, going to war to prove the almighty right to be obeyed and so impose the divine will. Like all agreements, such pact implied a counterpart, namely justice, harmony, and prosperity. The result was thus vertical peace.

In early Christian customs, it was no longer Yahweh who was at the top of the pyramid designating and choosing the people, to which his successors belong. Instead of that, it was his only son, that had become a man embodied in the figure of Jesus of Nazareth, who had been sent to transmit and fulfill his father's words with some changes. He didn't disqualify any previous law or prophet. However, there were no longer chosen people, but the message to be spread still existed.

For early Christians, peace continued to have the meaning of the people's relationship with God and with Jesus so that if such relationship is a harmonious one, there will be peace among the members of the society. The great difference was that, other than in the Hebrew civilization, in early Christian customs, all communities were equal and there was not a chosen one.

Nevertheless, it is important to be aware of the fact, that when the Romans inspired the constitution of the church in a deeply hierarchical way, the message of Jesus Christ was distorted because they believed that the message was that there were chosen ones who would transmit the essence of God. the result of that belief was vertical peace.

According to Islamic customs two terms are employed: dar-al-islam (the house of peace) and dar-al-harb (the house of war). By doing so, the Western dichotomy, namely, peace among our people and war against non-believers, is clearly represented in the Islamic civilization. Therefore, such tradition sustains an attitude of hostility and aggression against those who are neither bond to Allah nor have established any relationship with the Islam (Galtung, 1985:80).

In the Greek tradition, peace was a matter of harmony (homonoia) and balance, not only between fellow people and the state but also harmony within oneself, that is, spiritual harmony. Thus, the intra-group concept of peace in the Greeks is highlighted, that is, peace among the Greeks and war against foreigners, who are, according to Plato, barbaric and natural enemies of the Greeks. (Galtung, 1985:82)

For the Romans, peace included the dimension of rules and order with which to achieve unity under one center or government. The Romans took the concept of peace from the Greeks and adapted it. Like the Greeks, they also distinguished between peace among the Romans, on one hand, and peace between the Romans and those who were outside, the barbarians or enemies, on the other hand. The Pax Romana replaced religion at the apex of the pyramid and the absence of violence was ensured through law and order. Currently, this is the concept of peace that prevails in the Western world.

In the year 476, as the Roman Empire in the West had fallen and the medieval period was in course, the resulting system was based on a large number of small units. Those units, instead of being organized at a normative level, were unified under the faith provided by the church. Even in that new situation, the social system continued being unicentric. Furthermore, there was still a level at the top of the pyramid which was closer to God and above the rest of the people. at that level of the pyramid, in the High Middle Ages, we find the so-called 'pax oecumenicae' or 'pax ecclesiasticae',

which was a concept of peace coming from the Christian community and, particularly, from St. Augustine's work "De Civitate Dei". In such a book, he exposed the dichotomy of good and evil and developed the contraposition between the city of God, that represented Christianity or the spiritual truth, on one hand, and the pagan city, that represented decadence and sin, on the other hand. In the Late Middle Ages, a new concept of peace was defined by Waldensians, Cathars, and Franciscans. According to such a concept, poverty as a source of peace, harmony, and supreme good was promoted. On the contrary, violence was condemned and weapons were prosecuted. Consequently, in the Middle Ages the concept of peace was rather introspective, in other words, rather based on soul and mind. (Galtung, 1985:84).

From the 15th century onwards, as the transition from the Middle Ages to the modern age took place, the medieval renaissance developed and the obscurantism and medieval rigidity of the theocentrism were abandoned, the arts and sciences were influenced by a cultural movement which vindicated certain elements of the Greco-Latin period and focused on man and nature. Moreover, in 1648, the system of small feudal, territorial and political units disappeared with the Peace of Westphalia (Galtung, 1985: 86).

It was in Central Europe, where the concept of the nation-state with a delimited territory and a permanent population and government was originated.

However, the history of the western concept of peace is characterized up to now for having two clearly defined axes: In the first place, the relations with those, who are inside, and outside the group, and, in the second place, the universalism of occidental peace, which result or the fact the West considers itself to be the center of the whole world.

According to the dichotomy interior versus exterior peace, the configuration of the nation-states didn't follow the line of a broad and extensive peace for all territories, but rather that of changing alliances between the states of Central Europe with common interests, no matter whether such binding alliances were based on licit or on illicit interests. Consequently, peace was for those who were within the group, not for those who were outside. Some examples in this sense were suggested by authors such as Machiavelli, Jean Bodin, Thomas Hobbes, Hegel, Fichte. All of them emphasized the vital importance of the authority of the monarch or ruler who must do his best and stand out for his qualities while the people must obey. Nietzsche, Rousseau, and Machiavelli emphasized the value of war. The latter considered that the military apparatus is key to unstable situations, but also bet on the democracy of the Italian city-state. Taking Murty as a source, Professor Galtung referred in his book "On Peace" to the logical culmination of all this as Nazism and Fascism. As Aristotle once stated, it is the right of the sovereign state based on inequality to demand sacrifice from people when necessary according to the thought, that man is fundamentally bad and needs that the elite establishes a dictatorship. The pact was clear: everything people need, namely, food and internal security, is provided by the elite and, in exchange, absolute freedom of action is given to the dictator (Galtung, 1985:89).

The universalism of Western peace was present in the thought of the authors of that

time, such as Desiderio Erasmo, Hugo Grocio or Immanuel Kant and there is even the revision that Galtung makes of peace in Marxism in which he concluded that Marx wasn't concerned about how the socialist states should be organized to guarantee peace and avoid violence. On the contrary, the focus of his concept of peace was avoiding exploitation. Therefore, no peace plan was included in Marxism.

Up to now, the western idea of peace keeps being universalistic and vertical. Until now, according to the fact that the International Court of Justice was inspired by the ideas of Grotius (1625) and the United Nations followed in the footsteps of Pierre (1713), little progress has been made. As reflected in the NATO, the Warsaw Pact, the OECD, the EEC, and the UNO and its universalism, there are two axes, namely, interior peace on one hand, and exterior peace on the other that still are established in the West. Having said that, the question would be whether or not there is room for homonoia in such a situation.

In the East, particularly in India, the concepts of non-violence and inner peace are specifically contained in the ancient sacred texts of Upanishad, which date back to the 7th century BC, and in the 6th century BC, those ideas were integrated into the two Hindu religions, Jainism and Buddhism. Jainism expressed the concept of ahimsa, which referred to the renunciation and rejection of the will to kill or harm anything since everything possesses a soul. That concept was based on the belief that the universe would be an organic whole, governed by the cosmic order, and that all beings of the universe are twinned with each other. Buddhism went a step further in the interpretation of ahimsa moving from the passive attitude which involved not doing any harm to the active behavior which implied doing good. Furthermore, in Buddhism, the connection between human beings was even greater than in Jainism. Later, in the modern era, the concept of ahimsa acquired greater depth and a worldwide dimension thanks to Gandhi, who added a positive method, namely, that of satyagraha or civil disobedience or nonviolent disobedience (Galtung, 1985:84).

This brief review of the customs of India does not demonstrate the pacifism nor the peacefulness of the Hindu society. On the contrary, note that there existed a caste that had been trained to master the warlike spirit and that only the members of that caste would be allowed to practice war. Nevertheless, such caste of warriors was inferior to the caste which stayed at the top of the pyramid.

As in India, in the Sinic customs, the concept of peace was oriented inwards, in other words, towards the state of the spirit, towards calm, harmony, and the development of virtues. Therefore, violence was avoided through Buddhist, Daoist, and Confucianist tendencies. Furthermore, the ideal pursued in the Sinic traditions is a state of retreat from the outside world.

Finally, concerning the Japanese customs and their relation to war and peace, the term 'samurai', referring to those who serve, must be mentioned. The samurai warriors had a very strong superego and were able to sacrifice their lives to fulfill their tasks. Moreover, they occupied an important and dominant position within the hierarchical social system. Nevertheless, their powers were reduced with the period of

peace established by the Tokugawa dynasty, which imposed Confucianism as an official doctrine to promote those moral values of the people's submission to the government. Following that, the Meiji era saw the establishment of Shintoism and a context in which the emperor was considered a divine being who deserved to be blindly obeyed. However, that faith was weakened in 1945 through a radio message pronounced by Emperor Hirohito himself (Arrupe, 2010). The result is an ancestrally vertical and collective concept of peace.

Throughout history, the concept of Peace in the East has been turning around two clearly defined axes. Instead of being linear, it has encompassed the whole embracing differences and heterogeneities in an inclusive rather than an exclusive way. The tendency among Eastern peoples has been to live in peace in a closed way instead of universalizing their concept of peace. Furthermore, that concept of peace is centripetal, since the effort to achieve that peace by connecting each being of the cosmos is focused inward.

Galtung focused on the study of the uses and customs that have been configuring the concept of peace in both cosmologies so that he would acquire the knowledge about the functioning of a certain civilization. Such knowledge would also facilitate a dialogue between both cosmologies in which their differences and similarities would become manifest. In that dialogue, dualisms and ethnocentrisms would be eliminated so that the view on any civilization would become more open, holistic, superior, and essential for the elaboration of the sciences of Peace as applied science.

3. Peace Organizational Systems

The enhancement of knowledge and understanding of human complexity in relation to war and peace has been a permanent object of study throughout intellectual history, thus explaining the development of many different trends about how to achieve and maintain peace and harmony in societies. Examples of those tendencies are the constitution of pyramidal peace policy systems from top to bottom, where the authority was centered on the monarch, on the ruler or under on the papal arbiter; in the first place, the evolution towards other forces that contributed to the political balance such as in Italy's city-state system, in the second place and the Peace of Westphalia systematic policy formula, in the third place.

Then, it took place the development of other peace thinking trends, according to which a more clearly directed peace was constituted. In the fourteenth century, in Europe, emerged the first proposals for organizations or associations of states emerged to maintain international peace having been distinguished during four centuries two approaches to that problem competing against each other to prevail.

The first approach with monocentric tendency was the continuation of monopolistic power. It is based on the idea that Europe should be organized in the form of a single political system consisting of one or more states with more or less monopolistic power and that such a system should be maintained by a single political authority.

Thinkers such as Dubois, Dante, Campanella, and Leibniz defended this approach (Galtung, 1967:12). The other approach, known as the federal approach, was based on the idea that Europe should be organized as an international organization of separate states, each of them participating on an equal footing. Intellectuals such as Emiric Cruce, William Penn, John Bellars (Galtung, 1967:10-11) advocated federalism. Despite that, the majority of intellectuals made proposals for some kind of monopolistic union of nations with a common council or some central authority.

In the 19th century a third approach to peace thinking, called the confederal approach, emerged. According to it, a mixed way between a complete merger of the independent states and the absence of any international organization was suggested. Basing on the idea of cooperation or an alliance between states as a sufficient guarantee against war, an international organization whose aim would be strictly limited to the peaceful solution of international problems was created. Attempts to bring these ideas to life led to the foundation of The Holy Alliance furthermore the Concert of Europe, which begun with the phase of the System of Congress and was then dominated by Austria, Prussia, Russia, England, and France. Partisans of the confederal approach proposed some kind of diet for government representatives with very limited authority. They also considered essential arbitration and the establishment of an international tribunal, which led to the First Hague Conference on May 18, 1899, with 26 governments present, and in 1902 the Second Hague Conference. Nevertheless, it wasn't paid attention to these proposals until the second half of the century. At this point, mention should also be made of the Scottish public law professor James Lorimer, who proposed an international parliament and tribunal, which would have a jurisdiction strictly limited to international disputes and of the Swiss jurist Johann Kaspar Bluntschli, who advocated for an international legislature with government delegates and all six major global powers being favored (Galtung, 1967:12).

Monocentric and federal tendencies never ceased to exist. In the first years of the 20th century, the federal approach prospered in England, and so did the confederal approach, not only in the early 20th century but also in the late 19th century, especially due to the begin of the First World War, as the need for a broader organization which would include non-European nations urged. Confederal ideas were thus implemented first with the establishment of the League of Nations and, then with the United Nations.

Not all tendencies were able to remain and consolidate because each of them was subjected to concrete conditions and circumstances. The fact is that the thought on peace changed after 1919, the year of the Paris Peace Conference, and multiple tendencies were presented.

So we get to the first rigorous studies on peace with contributions of peace not only through research but also through action aimed at eliminating or reducing violence. That way, peace was configured and developed as a discipline. The contribution to the studies of Peace of thinkers like Tolstoy, Gandhi, Luther King, Panikkar, Arendt, the Boulding couple, Adam Curle, and Lederach reached one half of that contribution; the other one, we owe to Galtung.

4. The epistemologic project of sciences of Peace as a discipline

For the elaboration of the epistemological basis of the sciences of Peace, Galtung starts from the precept of achieving peace by peaceful means. In his thinking on peace, that doctrine is a constant in international relations and diplomacy. However, achieving peace is much more than just bringing the violence of war to an end. The sciences of Peace must go much further. On one hand, peace is for Galtung a continuum, in other words, when peace is at stake, violence is an element to be extinguished or gradually diminished since peace is the absence or the reduction of violence of any kind. On the other hand, Galtung adds another compatible definition of peace, namely, peace as a creative and non-violent transformation of conflicts. Both definitions constitute his starting point.

From these definitions, two statements should be noticed: Firstly, that the binomial of work to follow is peace – violence and, secondly, that for the definition of peace as a creative and non-violent transformation of the conflict, the study on peace is based on three elements. As follows, they have been described according to the image of the fire and the resulting smoke. The first object of study is violence, which has been represented by the smoke that is seen. The second object of study is the conflict, which has been represented by the fire from which the smoke is emitted and last but not least, the non-violent and creative transformation of conflicts, which is the most important object of study. Moreover, that second definition of peace is more dynamic than the first one, but both of them focus on the relations of the individuals of a social environment between themselves (intra) and within themselves (inter). The result is the fact that the study of peace, not only has become a social science which is oriented towards values, but also an applied social science which is focused on solving concrete problems.

The epistemological turn suggested by Galtung allowed us to understand the nature of peace, which should be researched with scientific rigor, practical perspective, and active use of techniques. That way, the applied discipline of the sciences of Peace was developed with scientific rigor by Galtung, who was strongly influenced by the eastern worldview and inspired by Gandhi.

Concerning scientific research, Galtung's epistemological project complies with the standards of sciences, since scientific data, values and theories, collaboration and interdisciplinary participation of experts are required. Moreover, the conclusions of such scientific research must be open to the public as well as subject to the analysis of the rest of the scientific community.

In accordance to Galtung's contribution to the discipline of peace, peace research is divided in three branches (Galtung and Pina 1996: 133-165). Beginning with the empirical research as the first branch, the study should be based on the systematic comparison between theories and the empirical reality described by data. In the empirical research, it is reviewed whether coincidence theories and data can be found or, on the contrary, if data carry more weight than theory. As for the second branch, mention is made of the critical research, which is based on the systematic compari-

son between data provided by the empirical reality and values. The aim of such comparison is to determine if they coincide. Note that if there is not such coincidence, values would have more weight than data and reality would be promoted by values through words and/or actions. As for the third branch, an analysis of the constructive research, which is based on the systematic comparison between theories and values, should be conducted. In the case that values have more weight than theories and theories should be adjusted according to them, it should be interpreted that visions of a new reality would be produced.

Those three branches are important, necessary, and complementary. Firstly, empiricism is supported by data as indicators of a pathological society, which is disrupted by wars and its costs (human and material, visible and less visible) as well as by structural violence. Secondly, criticism is guaranteed by values, which not only provides evidence of the change of reality from the past to the present but also predicts a future to be confirmed. Thirdly, future visions of a new reality or what Eleonora Masini and Galtung had defined as visions of a future dimension, are generated through constructive research, which focuses on theories. Therefore, the past, the present, and the future subject to the investigation conducted by peace studies (Masini and Galtung, 1983).

Following triangle (Table 1) is Galtung’s graphical representation of the combination of the two categories of concepts:

Figure 1. The data triangle, theories, values.¹



Therefore, Galtung points out that the sciences of Peace are composed of three dimensions, that are represented by three sides of the data-theories-values triangle. According to that triangle, there are three approaches to peace research, namely, empiricism, criticism, and constructivism. Each element has internal connections with each other. As for data, the world is divided into the perceived and the unperceived. Through theories, there is a division between the predicted and the unforeseen. Considering values, a distinction between the desired and the rejected is made. The logic of empiricism is to adjust, on one hand, the theories about what is perceived with what is foreseen and, on the other hand, to achieve a coincidence between the non-perceived and the unforeseen. The logic of criticism is to adjust reality in such a way

¹ Galtung, Johan (2003). *Paz por medios pacíficos: paz y conflicto, desarrollo y civilización*. Bilbao: Bakeaz.

that the future produces data according to which what has been perceived as theory is desired and what has not been perceived is considered as undesired. The logic of constructivism is to find new theories, which are adjusted to values so that the desired is foreseen and the rejected isn't expected. Furthermore, Galtung suggests that there is nothing new in this logic from which the theory of fear had been extracted. On the contrary, the perception of reality has been manipulated following this procedure to influence individuals and collectives making them believe in a better world.

The sciences of Peace belong to the category of the applied sciences for two reasons: Firstly, because they allow the empirical reality to be explored. A second reason is that through the analysis, other options, resources, and ideas are provided to make reality, in principle, potentially better. Such sciences aim to eliminate the manipulative perversion according to which individuals are led to believe that the empirical reality is conditioned by a closed, immobile, and invariable system, in which reality is not only considered as foreseen but also as desirable. The solution would be to find the theory, whose cognitive bridge is not only open enough to foresee what is not perceived, but also what is in concordance with the values that mark, on one hand, what is rejected and, on the other hand, what is desired. To reach that goal, a systematization exercise, that will serve as a guide for data collection, theory formation, and report writing, is required. Moreover, in that systematization exercise, the conceptualization of the geographical location concerning the analyzed problem or the author must be avoided to prevent that globalism as a characteristic of the sciences of Peace could be contradicted.

According to Galtung's proposals to the applied sciences of Peace, the contribution to the deeper understanding of Peace should be developed through the following three paradigms (Galtung, 2003:52-57):

- The Health Sciences Paradigm; Diagnosis, Prognosis and Therapy (D-P-T)

Given the fact that there is parallelism between the sciences of Peace and the health branch, the three sides of the data-theories-values triangle and the diagnosis-prognosis-therapy paradigm are compared as follows: the side of the triangle representing the diagnosis as an analysis based on data is compared not only to the diagnosis of the patient's symptoms but also to his anamnesis so that both his medical history and the information of the context are included. Concerning the side of the triangle representing the prognosis, the probable evolution of the patient's illness is predicted according to theories about the context and its variables. Finally, continuing with the parallelism with the health branch, the side of the triangle referring to values has been compared with the patient's treatment and/or therapy, which is based on other cases' general results so that, in the case of the health sciences, the aim of such treatment and/or therapy would either or both be the positive intention of building more defenses or the negative one of making the symptoms disappear.

As a result of the success of the dynamic work attained applying the D- P-T paradigm, there is a wide variety of achievements that range from the optimal health surplus to the limited life extension. Even if they are all considered successful, the degree of

success reached in each case is different.

D-P-T maps are drawn, but they are still generic cartographic representations which are subject to temporal and spatial changes since the variables time and space depend on the multiple contexts that condition concrete and specific human beings. In short: every disease from which patients suffer is different. As a matter of fact, the sciences of Peace share the same complexity as the health branch.

Concerning the sciences of Peace and their intimate link to violence, three aspects of the D-P-T paradigm are described as follows: First, diagnosis is most of the time the existence of direct violence, which is more visible than indirect violence. Second, there is the prognosis that without intervention, more violence will be generated as a consequence of existing violence and, third, disabling the body through amputation, sterilization, castration, torture, punishment, even elimination by death penalty as the generally established therapy. As we have seen, generic maps do not guide us through all territories. On the contrary, we have witnessed that these procedures do not take us very far. Thus, alternative and less violent treatments are necessary for the sciences of Peace. Alchemy cannot be composed of the same elements as the disease. In short: The lost potential must be recovered.

- The paradigm of peace research: six spaces, inter/intra systems

According to the review of the first model that we have carried out, it should be remembered that diagnosis, prognosis, and therapy in the sciences of Peace have been described as follows. There is a diagnosis, which is a state of violence. There is also a prognosis, which refers to growing, constant or decreasing processes of violence. Last but not least, there is a therapy, which refers to two kinds of processes depending on whether peace is understood as negative, in which case the process aims at decreasing violence, or as positive, in which case, the goal is the empowerment of life as peace. From there it is not only possible to glimpse what will be the concept of positive and negative peace but also to develop in-depth knowledge of the violence - peace binomial, that is to say, to develop knowledge about the causes and consequences of violence and those of peace.

To acquire further knowledge on the V - P binomial, Galtung establishes the need to elaborate a typology consisting of the following six elements: space (world), time, nature, person, society, and knowledge (culture). Moreover, combining that scheme with the distinction of intra/inter systems, twelve factors are provided. That makes a third paradigm, comprising the elements body, mind, structure, and culture, all relevant for the sciences of Peace. The six elements which were developed by Galtung to acquire further knowledge on the V - P binomial can be subdivided in the following sub-types:

- Concerning space or world (W): northwest, northeast, southwest, territorial southeast, non-territorial state system, capital, civil society, and community.
- Concerning time (T): inner time (kairos), and outer time (cronos).

- Concerning nature (N): human beings, animals, plants, microorganisms, and viruses.
- Concerning culture (C): Western I, Western II, Indic, Buddhist, Sinic, and Japanese.
- Concerning persons (P): need to survive, well-being, freedom, and identity.
- Concerning society (S): nature, gender, generation, race, class, nation, and country.

Since it becomes hard to work with the V-P binomial going through all the sub typologies, Galtung simplifies such task distinguishing between violence and peace concerning the following spaces: nature, actors, structures, culture, and time.

The study of violence in the mentioned spaces, whether such violence is intentional or not, entails the following types of violence: First of all, the object of analysis will be natural violence, which isn't originated intentionally, but in a natural environment where humanity is included. Secondly, there is also the so-called direct or actor violence, which is not only direct but also intentional since it is the result of voluntary actions that are carried out by individuals either unilaterally or as members of collectivities. Thirdly, there is also indirect violence, also called structural violence, which is embedded in personal, social, and global spaces. It should be emphasized that, in principle, there is no intentionality in structural violence. Furthermore, cultural violence must be added to all previous classifications of violence. It legitimizes direct and structural violence, no matter if it is committed intentionally or not. Another issue, which is part of this analysis, is the temporality of violence and how negative for future generations the consequences of long-duration violence are.

As for intentional violence, note that there is no intentionality in the violence of an earthquake nor in that of an animal attack. Intentionality can only arise when some type of violence is exerted by human beings individually or as members of a collective, that is to say, taking into account the social context or not. Having considered all spaces, it is suggested that the harmful consequences of intentional violence are found everywhere: in humanity, nature, cultures, civilizations, and cosmologies...

Please, remember that negative peace had been defined as the absence of any kind of violence. As follows, concerning positive peace, we will comment out the following six spaces: First of all, we must take into account the fact that due to natural peace, instead of struggle, there is cooperation and collaboration among all species. We must also take into account the fact that direct, positive peace is related to all three levels of body, spirit, and mind. Furthermore, it should be mentioned that direct, positive peace is not only achieved by taking care of oneself and the others but also by spreading the goodness of word and deed in order to satisfy all basic needs, namely, the need for survival, well-being, freedom, and identity. In short: direct, positive peace involves compassion and love as the union of bodies, minds, and spirits. Last but not least, there is structural positive peace, thanks to which repression will be

replaced by freedom, exploitation by equity, penetration by respectful and reinforcing dialogue, division, and segmentation by mutual solidarity and marginalization and exclusion by participation. Thus, it is emphasized how necessary great vertical structures are in certain specific contexts. As Galtung suggests, alpha structures are necessary, but small horizontal beta structures are more beautiful and avoid excessive structuring (Galtung, 2003:58).

At last, we will focus on positive inner peace, the aim of which is to achieve harmony and balance of body, spirit, and mind to oneself and others by establishing an internal and external dialogue with oneself and with the others. In other words, instead of only listening to yourself, you should also dedicate continuous listening to the people in your environment: "We must recover the ability to be with ourselves while we are with others" (Naranjo, 2014) and last but not least, we have positive cultural peace, which means replacing the legitimization of violence through culture with the legitimization of peace, namely, through culture (hymns, festivals, art, religion, etc.).

According to the six spaces scheme, violence and peace are similar to the states of matter, specifically to violence as matter and to the process as the succession of the various states of matter. The process of violence and peace is characterized by movements, that grow, stabilize, or decrease, that are fast or slow, and in which there is or not any human intervention. In the case of violence, death is the limit of the process, but in the case of peace, there is no limit. The terms that represent violence in its extreme, such as homicide, genocide, culturecide, ecocide, omnicide, are known, but what terms would represent peace taken to the extreme? The homeostasis as peace in extremis may be the answer to that question.

- The paradigm of peace research; four factors: body, mind, structure and culture (Galtung, 2003:65)

Methodological systematization is essential to elaborate a science, but it is also complex. In the previous model, it was possible to have an overview of the journey of violence and peace through the six spaces. Thereby, the fundamental distinction of the intra-inter (internal - relational) systems is still pending. From such distinction, two different and compatible perspectives of analysis emerge. The problem that exists in social and global spaces is the consequence of the difficulty of making compatible what is internal with what is relational according to different units or elements. Due to such difficulty, conflicts arise.

As proposed by Galtung, four factors, namely, body, mind, structure, and culture, are included in the following three perspectives on which to formulate hypotheses about violence and peace:

The perspective of causality: violence and peace take place in one space. For example, internally, whether inside the individual (intrapersonally) or inside the society (intrasocially) and is reflected elsewhere. The hypothesis is: intrapersonal or intrasocial fear will be reflected horizontally in the same space, for example, in the intra-

family system, in other words, in the children. Thus, the fear that immobilizes children and becomes a trauma that is transmitted generation after generation.

The perspective of isomorphism, which will serve to generate hypotheses: each space can serve as a mirror for the other if both have structural similarity or equality. The hypothesis is: An autonomous organizational structure that frequently occurs vertically will serve as a mirror to the local one.

The perspective of causal isomorphism: patterns are transferred between spaces by individual or collective, conscious or unconscious learning. Therefore, learning or imitation involves the expansion of social Darwinism to spaces where, thus, the hypothesis of the survival of the fittest becomes in the natural space a norm of the deep culture (cosmology).

The result is a model that simplifies the model of spaces and makes it easier to understand and to acquire perspective on the violence-peace binomial. The following Table helps to visualize it clearly:

Table 1. Four factors - four hypotheses²

Factors	Hypothesis	
	Producers of violence	Producers of peace
Body	Male	Female
Mind	Not empathetic	Empathic
Structure	Vertical (alpha)	Horizontal (beta)
Culture	Centrifugal (Western)	Centripetal (Eastern)

We shouldn't forget that this table will facilitate coping with the complexity of the broad theory of violence and the sciences of Peace without falling into reductionism. On the contrary, it will allow us to take interrelationships into account.

The second column doesn't represent the solution since constructing a social world only with feminine, empathic, vertical, and centripetal elements is not only unrealistic and unbalanced but also impossible.

As conclusion, we will explain the relationship that exists between the individual and the collective levels. While structures such as bodies are material, palpable and physical, mind and culture are immaterial, ethereal, and spiritual. As for the cultural hypothesis, its weight results from the fact that culture shapes the mind. Therefore,

² Galtung, Johan (2003). *Paz por medios pacíficos: paz y conflicto, desarrollo y civilización*. Bilbao: Bakeaz.

we live and coexist in a culture where the patterns of interaction are allowed to be implanted in our mind, which is formed and structured through socialization. Consequently, the body not only receives commands on the side of the mind, which is partly not pure, but also from the social context or social structure, but there is even more: some minds can influence the internal microculture, the environment of each person and even the macroculture. We must also take into account the fact that the body, which is wise, can not only cope with the norms of the structure and its internalized and institutionalized norms but also with mandates of the mind.

The task is difficult although not impossible. The obedience to the rules of the mind can be reduced knowing that the voice inside must be listened to and that the internal authority must be respected.

In summary, considering that objectivity is a reflection of an underlying reality that is unalterable and immovable is an approach that is on the rise in the natural sciences. Nevertheless, objectivity is for the sciences of Peace as applied science an intersubjective dialogue.

Finally, in the epistemological project of the sciences of Peace, Galtung considers as essential the acquisition of skills, imagination, compassion, constancy, and techniques as tools for action and performance. They are all necessary for the intervention both inter and intra, since the construction of the sciences of Peace research alone isn't sufficient to reduce direct or structural violence, nor to delegitimize cultural violence and build negative or positive peace. On the contrary, it is essential to move from knowledge to techniques. Previously to the use of techniques, it will be necessary to analyze the means, conditions, and alternatives that can lead to peace in society at an intra and inter level. Therefore, it must necessarily be followed by an analysis of the possible scenarios, the favorable conditions, and the most natural way to reach peace (Galtung, 2003:87).

What kind of scenarios? Perhaps democratic scenarios, state systems, association systems, dissociation systems, federal state systems, confederal state systems, unitary state systems? Or perhaps not state organizational systems but an alternative way

As for the ways to be considered, Galtung proposes four (Galtung, 1984:43): Firstly, the resolution of conflicts due to opposing systems; secondly, the balance of power; thirdly, disarmament; and, fourthly, alternative security policies.

Finally, the focus of this study will be placed on Galtung 's concept of negative and positive peace since it is used in peace works all over the world.

5. The concept of negative and positive peace

Throughout his long career in peace research, Galtung didn't limit himself to making a review of the different approaches which had been developed by disciplines such as anthropology, religion, sociology, psychology, law, political science, international

relations, among all other disciplines which had also contributed to that field. On the contrary, his objective was to elaborate and to offer to the world different means and alternatives so that peace would be reached. Such a new approach would lead to a theory, which would have more humane equality, balance, and the 3c's, namely, construction, compassion, and conscience included. For Galtung, even if the entropy perspective continued to have its place, it was no longer predominant. As we have seen, Galtung's investigation is rather systematic than a chronological. Thereby, the proposed three premises are as follows:

The term peace has been used for social objectives which were at least verbally accepted by many but not necessarily by the majority.

Achieving these social goals can be complex and difficult but not impossible.

The statement that peace is the absence of violence is considered as valid (Galtung, 2013:87).

The link between the terms peace and violence should be emphasized so that peace can be considered as the absence of violence. Such knowledge will be central for the acquisition of a more humane and empirical concept of peace, namely, that of positive peace.

In peace research, the relationship between violence and peace is the cornerstone of a definition of peace in which the distinction between personal violence and structural violence is central. In the same way as violence, peace is also divided into two sides. Those two sides are negative peace, which is how Galtung has called the absence of personal violence and, in his words, positive peace, which is how he describes the situation where there is no structural violence.

Violence is conceived as negative peace while social justice is considered as positive peace. The reason for this is that the absence of personal violence does not lead to any positively defined condition, whereas the absence of structural violence points to social justice as a positively defined condition. Therefore, peace is conceived not only as a matter of control and decrease of open violence but also of what in the other part was called vertical development (Galtung, 2003). This means that the concept of peace is intimately connected not only with the theory of conflict but also with the theory of development so that, while the first theory is more relevant to negative peace, the second one is more relevant to positive peace.

According to Adam Curle, peace is defined as human development and so did Galtung. Both authors proposed a peace conception that has been a game-changer for research on how to overcome war. They suggested that peace had two sides: the positive side, which for Galtung has to do with the development of life and its potential, and the negative side, which has to do with overcoming the three types of violence.

Laying the focus of research on the reduction of personal violence and openly neglecting research on structural violence would lead directly to the acceptance of normative societies of law and order or reward and punishment. In that case, instead of

going deeper within the source, our approach would remain superficial, in other words, we would just be patching up. Galtung's concept of peace emphasizes redressing social wrongs and achieving social justice even if the use of personal violence must be accepted since the long-term costs of personal violence are insignificant compared to the material and human costs of continued structural violence.

In summary, stressing only the absence of personal violence or social justice unilaterally as two isolated extremes will result in an imbalance, since both situations are in their essence closely related and are often a dialectical reaction to the other. When they intervene, they can easily become well known social orders that don't manifest any of the components of peace and where social injustice is maintained through undeniable personal violence according to an action-reaction effect). In this vein, Galtung points the following two scenarios (Galtung, 2003:11):

Concerning the first scenario, in which peace is interpreted as an effort to bring into play the absence of personal violence and social justice, there is the obvious danger of being ambiguous and resorting to hypothetical similarities. In that case, it would take place an effort to be objective like an attempt to deal so with peace as if we were sailors carefully moving the rudder a so that the ship doesn't hit any of the two extremes that represent direct violence, on one hand, and structural violence, on the other. However, that can easily happen since the acceptance of either or both kinds of violence is a feasible threat. For example, when there are two options of correcting a social wrong, either through personal violence or through the absence of action, there must also be awareness of the fact that the second alternative means that the forces underlying social injustice are being supported and, on the contrary, the use of personal violence could easily mean that neither absence of violence nor social justice are going to be achieved on the long run.

Concerning the second scenario, if what we want is not only social justice but also to avoid personal violence, we risk that social justice will only be represented in those societies in which many liberal social values, as well as considerable freedom of expression and assembly, have been reached and where there are already organizations for the effective articulation of political interests. Apart from that: What about highly and openly repressive societies if we restrict personal violence to achieve the absence of repressive structural violence?

What is the value of this formula for peace? To answer that question, Galtung proposes following approaches:

- Rejecting the above definition of peace as our objective is that peace refers to something feasible and achieved instead of utopian, as in the case of aiming at the simultaneous achievement of the absence of personal violence and the presence of social justice. That is why, according to the definition of peace, the focus should be laid either on the absence of personal violence or the absence of structural violence according to our priorities. As we have suggested, either option must be treated symmetrically and no preference must be given to any of them.
- Abandoning the term peace and just expressing our interest in one or both of the

values. This is less satisfactory due to the generally widespread use of that term. Thus, we are in favor of maintaining the term *pace*, although it has many semantic possibilities.

- Combining the first two approaches. That is to say: talking little about peace and abandoning one of the two objectives, namely, absence of violence or absence of social justice. This attitude has been embraced today in different circles, but it shouldn't be ignored that neither in normative systems such as the racist society, the primitive, the capitalist society, nor in the openly repressive post-revolutionary society, peace has been achieved. Instead of that, laws have been established to constitute social systems in which it has been decided if direct violence or social injustice seemed to be the lesser evil choosing it to eliminate the other (Galtung, 2013).

As Galtung theorized, it is preferable to take the two previously mentioned values as objectives, since their importance is key and trying to decide which one is more important than the other would be a disservice to humanity. Besides, we shouldn't ignore that the link between both of them is so close that it seems difficult to overcome both evils. Achieving just one of them is no small feat considering the significant number of systems that fail to attain any of them. Nevertheless, there are currently many forms of non-violent social action that successfully combine both objectives. That is the case of dissociative non-violence, which serves to keep the parties separated so that the weaker one has its autonomy and identity. Furthermore, that is also the case of associative non-violence, which can serve to bring the parties together when, in the acceptability region, there is compatibility in the acceptability space as a basis for the development of an egalitarian and non-exploitative partnership.

6. Conclusion

The author of this research article has conducted an exploration of the concept of peace based on how it has been developed and formulated in the different Western and Eastern cultures and subcultures. Following that, it contains a brief review of Professor Johann Vincent Galtung's relevant thinking that has contributed to the beginning and the elaboration of the sciences of Peace as an applied social discipline. As a matter of fact, Galtung developed the fundamental concept of negative-positive peace combining two concepts: the absence of direct violence, in his words, negative peace, and social justice as the absence of structural violence or positive peace. According to such a contribution, both concepts are considered by researchers, teaching experts, and any other collectives working and participating in today's non-violent construction of peace systems as their common means and final objectives.

Bibliographic references

- Arrupe, P. (2010). *Yo viví la bomba atómica*. Bilbao: Mensajero.
- Breines, Ingeborg, Robert Connell and Ingrid Eide (2000). *Male Roles, Masculinity and Violence: A culture of Peace Perspective*. Paris: Unesco.
- Bouthoul, G. (1965). *Avoir la Paix*. Paris: Bernard Grasset.
- Freire, P. (1974). *Pedagogia do Oprimido*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Galtung, J. (1967). Theories of Peace A Synthetic Approach to Peace Thinking. available online at: https://www.transcend.org/files/Galtung_Book_unpub_Theories_of_Peace_-_A_Synthetic_Approach_to_Peace_Thinking_1967.pdf. [Accessed 25 February 2023].
- Galtung, J. (1984). *¡Hay alternativas! Cuatro caminos hacia la paz y la seguridad*. Madrid: Tecnos.
- Galtung, J. (1985). "Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses". *Journal of Peace Research*, 22(2), 141-158.
- Galtung, J. (1985). *Sobre la paz*. Barcelona: Fontamara.
- Galtung, J. (1996). *Investigaciones teóricas: sociedad y cultura contemporáneas*. Madrid: Tecnos.
- Galtung Johan, Sohail Inayatullah. (1997). *Macrohistory and Macrohistorians, Perspectives on Individual, Social and Civilizational Change*. London: Praeger.
- Galtung, J. (2003). *Paz por medios pacíficos: paz y conflicto, desarrollo y civilización*. Bilbao: Bakeaz.
- Galtung, J. (2009). *Theories of conflict: Definitions, Dimensions, Negations, Formations*. International Peace Research Institute, Oslo: Prio.
- Galtung, J. (2013). "A Theory of Peace Building Direct Structural Culture Peace". Oslo, *Transcend Univ. Press*.
- Galtung, J. (2013). "A Theory of Civilization". *Transcend Univ. Press*.
- Malinowski, B. (1984). *Una teoría científica de la cultura*. Madrid: SARPE.
- Masini Eleonora, Galtung Johan, Osorio Tafall Bibiano. (1983). *Sociedad y utopía*, (documentos presentados en la 2a. reunión celebrada en la sede del CEESTEM en la ciudad de

México entre los días 15 y 28 de mayo de 1979). México, D.F, Centro de Estudios Económicos y Sociales del Tercer Mundo: Nueva Imagen.