PEACE, MEMORY AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

Johan GALTUNG

TRANSCEND Peace University

This paper is presented at the V. International Congress of Educational Research as a keynote speech.

What an excellent idea, to combine "peace" with "memory", and both of them with education, or. more precisely, the lack of it! In this conference on memory ground between the origin of the Ottoman Empire in Bursa, Troy of Homer fame, and Gallipoli of modern Turkey.

So I will divide my address in two parts. one devoted to an operational definition of "peace, the fact peace, not the word; and one to the present crisis in Turkey to see whether the definition of peace can give us some ideas about, say, the Taksim square-Gezi Park. There is no value to peace theory unless it is peace practice indicative.

1. What is peace? An operational definition

Peace cuts across history, geography and levels of human organization; from intra- and inter-personal peace via states-nations to regional- civilizational relations. Definitions should reflect positive peace as cooperation and harmony, and negative peace as absence of violence; the latter not only as absence of direct, intended violence, acts of commission, but also absence of indirect structural violence by acts of omission, and by cultural violence, justifying one or the other. Peace is incompatible with massive, lethal, social inequality--like health is incompatible with tumors and circulation problems with no overt pain or fever. Peace and health are ideal sums of good things.

Definitions should serve thought and speech, and indicate action. This formula defines peace operationally, in terms of four tasks[i]:

$$Peace = \frac{Equity \times Harmony}{Trauma \times Conflict}$$

The formula applies across time, space, level and academic discipline: no academic discipline, or civilization, has any monopoly on "peace".

There are two factors in the numerator: <u>the more the better</u>; and   two in the denominator leading to violence, <u>the less the better</u>. The definition relates to the reality of peace, not to literature about peace and is operational, neither semantic, nor "essentialist".

The four factors or tasks can be spelt out:

[1] <u>More Equity</u>: cooperative behavior for mutual and equal benefit;

[2] <u>More Harmony</u>: empathic attitudes of emotional resonance, in the daoist sense of enjoying the joy, and suffer the suffering, of Other;

[3] <u>Less Trauma</u>: reconciliation, clearing the past by acknowledging wrongs, wishing them undone, dialogues to create a future together;

[4] <u>Less Conflict</u>: resolution, acceptable-sustainable, incompatible goals made compatible, changing negative attitudes and behavior.

Using marriage as an example: parity and empathy are basic, but unreconciled traumas from the past, and unresolved conflicts, may cause verbal or physical violence, and cannot be left unattended.

Political examples of the four tasks carried out successfully:

<u>Equity</u>: the 1950-1958-1992 French-German, then as EEC, then as EU European cooperation on reasonably equal terms, among themselves, their foreign policy being traditional Western aggressive, against somebody, particularly Islam (including Turkey); now (2013) threatened by the economic inequality between Germany and the EU periphery;

<u>Harmony</u>: the feminist revolution has made many men understand how the man-woman divide or fault-line looks from a woman point of view; women being familiar with the prejudices associated with patriarchy.

<u>Reconciliation</u>: the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission   exchanging confession of political crimes (and contrition and compensation, if possible) for amnesty.

<u>Resolution</u>: black-white relations in the USA, moving toward racial equality of opportunity.

How good EU is at the other three is now being tested; the same applies to the feminist revolution, race in South Africa and the USA. Peace defined operationally by the four tasks is a demanding agenda.

Some insights in <u>how to</u> are provided by world views, religion and philosophy, but they are not unproblematic. Thus, reconciliation in South Africa built on the Zulu <u>ubuntu</u>, "I exist because you exist, we are in each other", defining a strong spiritual coupling in a <u>we-culture</u>. The unit of suffering and joy is a we, not two separate, parallel I's; problematic to an individualistic West that may prefer negative peace to being coupled together in positive peace.

Compare this to the <u>Golden Rule</u>, positive (or negative):

<u>Do (do not) unto others what you (do not) like them to do unto you</u>.   The subject for violence avoidance and peace is an individual "you"; the ethical budget is egocentric I-culture, not collective we-culture. In addition, be

careful: "their tastes may be different" (GB Shaw).

The same applies to the Kantian categorical imperative: "Act so that the principle of your intention always could serve as the basis for world law" (be generalizable, universalizable). This is a traffic rule for co-existence: Kant wanted a multilateral normative umbrella, not only Golden Rule bilateralism. Both are useful rules for positive co-existence in an I-culture, but do not produce the resonance of a we-culture. Or Mo Tzu's universal love as opposed to partiality[ii], long before the universalism of christianity, Kant, or human rights.

Being well together by fulfilling each other is positive peace; with MAB, mutual assured bliss, as the extreme--an abstraction found in religious discourses, but also in love defined as the union of the unions of body, mind and spirit. Inflicting suffering on each other is found in direct violence-war, with MAD, mutual assured destruction of the Cold War nuclear arms race, as the extreme; not an abstraction.

One doing well and the other doing badly is found in structural violence. Neither fulfilling each other, nor inflicting suffering, is typical of negative peace: there is passive peaceful co-existence, neither violence, nor positive peace; mutual irrelevance.

Peace politics can be seen as intended efforts to reduce direct and structural violence for negative peace-- not accepting exploitation of one by the other as "peace" even if there is no verbal or physical violence--moving on to positive peace with ever more cooperation for mutual and equal benefit, and more empathy for harmony; feeling each other's suffering and fulfillment as parts of one's own. Two traps on the way: ignoring exploitation and repression as justified by cultural violence--economic and cultural power are seen as "soft power"--and being satisfied with the negative peace of mutual irrelevance[iii]. If past traumas and present conflicts are not mediated, negative peace will be lost, and unless the coupling is not equitable and harmonious, there will be no positive peace, and sooner or later acts of violence.

2. A Case Study: Turkey right now, Taksim Square-Gezi Park.

Turkey did the impossible, moving almost without violence from a military secular dictatorship to a civilian Sunni majority democracy. Turkey got unstuck. Sarkar's circulation of elites at work; military elites, then religious-intellectuals, then business, then ordinary people--and once again the military. Second cycle.

Big Business would knock at the door, as it did in the Thatcher-Reagan revolution of the mid-1980s. Hence, not surprising that a big mall was one of the projects, together with an opera, a mosque and a monument from the Ottoman period for the Taksim square-Gezi Park project. Every element a gift for Istanbul's 14 million. But, at the expense of a park, green nature, lungs, in that part of Istanbul.

Whether it escalated from this point to an extra-parliamentary confrontation between the winners (AKP) and losers (CHP) of the last two elections--the losers carrying much of the infelicitous past--or the other way round, or both, can be and is debated.

Other processes are going on. Syria. Rather than the policy of zero problems with neighbors that has functioned so well the AKP takes a stand for the opposition, against the Alevite regime. Not without reasons, but regime change is better done through FAFE, fair and free elections, well monitored. Violence stimulates military take-overs, not democracy. And the AKP chooses as name for the third Bosporus bridge Yavuz (The Ferocious)

Sultan Selim I--reported to have killed 45,000 Alevis; adopting Sunni Islam. A strong stand. Necessary?

The Taksim square protests spread all over Turkey. Very violent police reactions, some of it denounced by Erdögan, the prime minister. There are flames, violence to property, tear gas, and people dancing in the streets all over. The Arab spring has gone Turkish? Yes and no; what happens in Turkey calls above all for Turkish causes. So let us return to the square-park, well knowing there is more going on.

Regimes of all kinds: <u>be careful with parks</u>. Humans are of, by and for nature; parks are domesticated nature.   Don't pour asphalt, do not "develop". And be extra careful with trees. They are live organisms like everything organic entitled to a natural death, not to replanting or being put to the saw. They are witnesses to history, a part of our lives and that of our predecessors, like old buildings. Care, care--"develop", and like in Osaka there will be bitter regrets.

The conflict can be phrased in terms of government action against people, or as modernity-development against history-nature. There are deep commitments and good arguments on both sides; and unresolved conflict leading to massive violence, verbal, physical.

Can peace studies help in the Gezi case? Let us put the formula

and its four factors to work, but backwards, starting with <u>conflict resolution</u>. A both-and is called for; it is hard to believe that Istanbul cannot have both the park and the projects, even if not all at one place. Example: put the mall under the park-square, like in Alcoy-Spain, residences, the opera and the mosque elsewhere, the monument to history maybe there. An alternative worked out from the very beginning (the May 27 demo) would have communicated better than critique leaving to polarization, even if less attractive to aggressive minds. Peace is constructive.

Regimes of all kinds: <u>be careful with history</u>. Centennials of glory and trauma are coming up. There is Gelibolu, aka Gallipoli, Mustafa Kemal's brilliant 20th century victory over a 19th century relic, Winston Churchill, and the Aussies and others (half a million killed in 8 months!) he sacrificed. Kemal Atatürk's Turkey emerged, like everything organic evolving. There is much to celebrate in what emerged <u>and</u> in what declined, and much to regret. Focus on both.

<u>Harmony</u>: what is called for is empathy with all parties. No need to demonize, much need to empathize; not for or against, only to know. For one who the last 60 years have had dialogues with all kinds of conflict parties to all kinds of conflicts one basic experience is etched on the mind: all parties have some perfectly legitimate goals. Know them, chances are that some solution come up.

<u>Cooperation for mutual and equal benefit</u>: in a conflict this is often known as <u>debate</u>, negotiating for some compromise. There is a better approach: <u>dialogue</u>, searching together for something new. As has been pointed out so often during this conflict: democracy is not only about multi-party elections every four years, but also about transparency and ongoing dialogue.

Nobody has a monopoly on truth; if a government backed by a majority thinks so, democracy becomes majority dictatorship. Watch how those clever Swiss do it, coalition governments in permanent dialogue benefiting from good ideas right, left or middle. For seven hundred years, into the eighth century.

It is not good enough for a president to say that the message has arrived, his reaction and the reaction to that reaction matters. It is not good enough for a prime minister to refuse dialogue, nor for a foreign minister to deplore the damage to Turkey's image abroad. The problem is how to move on, solving the conflict with a respect for the past sensitive to the victims of the expanding Ottoman empire, fearful of a repetition. And sensitive to the martyrs of the May 1 1977 Taksim square demonstrations, making the square sacred to many.

The AKP has moved Turkey politically into leadership position and economically toward a mixed public-private economy and welfare state. The distance to becoming a victim of one's own success, refusing dialogue is short as history bears countless witnesses to. Opt for dialogue in all directions, searching for solutions is the way out.

And Turkey will become unstuck, again.

3. Implications for education research.

Solution-orientation, reconciliation, empathy across conflict borders and cooperation for mutual and equal benefit are taught except experimentally in some schools and kindergartens in Norway: SABONA-project run by the TRANSCEND Peace Development Environment Network.[iv] Resarch indicates that teaching conflict handling early liberates teachers from much of the discipline burden. And hopefully, in the longer run, produce adults better at handling conflict.

[i.] The formula logic is structural peace--equitable cooperation--and cultural peace--empathic harmony knowing and feeling the reality of other--threatened by direct violence from unreconciled trauma and unsolved conflicts.
For more details, see Johan Galtung, A Theory of Peace, TRANSCEND University Press, 2013, Part One. For more about the formula, see Johan Galtung and Dietrich Fischer, Peace Mathematics, TRANSCEND University Press, 2012, pp. 28-32.

[ii.] Mo Tzu (one of the "hundred philosophers" 551-233 BC) argues universal love, also of one's enemies, as opposed to the partial love only of one's friends. The rulers must start: "Now universal love and mutual benefit are both profitable and easy beyond all measure. The only trouble, as I see it ia that no ruler takes any delight in them. If the rulers really delighted in them, promoted them with rewards and praise, and prevented neglect of them with punishments, then I believe that people would turn to universal love and mutual benefit as naturally as fire turns upward or water turns downward, and nothing in the world could stop them". Mo Tzu, Basic Writings, New York, London: Columbia University Press, 1963, p. 49.

[iii.] Mutual isolation is problematic in a globalizing world with the means of transportation-communication reaching every corner of the world; sometimes as means of structural violence like means of destruction are the means of direct violence; as important in human history as Marx' means of production.

[iv.] See www.transcend.org/tup; the book SABONA by Lars Thyholdt and Synöve, Aase Marie and Vigdis Faldalen.