WILEY
InterScience®
DISCOVER SOMETHING GREAT

THE FOUR CHAMBERS OF THE HEART OF PEACE: THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, COUNSELLING SKILLS, AND LIVING SYSTEMS THINKING IN THE TRANSFORMATION OF VIOLENT CONFLICT: PART ONE

HILDE RAPP, Centre for International Peacebuilding, UK

ABSTRACT *The first half of a longer piece – itself the second of a series of four articles looking at working with conflict – in which a generic ground map is presented signposting four key tasks that peacebuilders need to bear in mind in any conflict transformation work. The four tasks involve mapping the 'what' of peacebuilding: 1 Personal Resources; 2 Interpersonal and Intercultural Issues; 3 Bio-psycho-social Determinants; 4 Organizational and Systemic Dimensions. In the current paper the first two of these are described and discussed. Copyright © 2006 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.*

Key words: emotional intelligence, conflict, peacebuilding

The pain of love's work not done

Let us be still
let us experience together
the pain of love's work not done

Let us not turn a blind eye
but look

at the wounds of the suffering
and let us not turn a deaf ear
but listen
to the cries of the wronged

Let us breathe together
as we grow in strength
committed

to uproot the violence
from our own hearts

Let us join hands
and with single pointed purpose
pull up
the weeds of doubt
and plant
the seeds of hope

Let us open our being
in awe and wonder
to the pattern from before
as we grow in courage
daring
to be beautiful

Let us be bold
as we stand together
shoulder to shoulder
determined
to outface the unjust

Let us walk together
with steady feet
persevering
on the long hard road
to renewal

Willing to bear witness
ready
to be
the change

[Poem read at the First People's Summit for Departments of Peace, held in London, October 18–19, 2005.]

PART ONE: REVISITING KEY CONCEPTS

The ground map offered in this article is intended to signpost four aspects of conflict work that people working for peace need to bear in mind in any conflict transformation work, be this as soldiers, diplomats, non-governmental organization (NGO) personnel, business people, or members of a civil society-based non-violent peace force.

This second in a series of four articles is based on live presentations and workshops I have given in different locations over the last few years to resource peacebuilders on the ground in practical ways. A first, more theoretical article (Rapp, 2003a) was published in a previous edition of this journal, and it covers some of the arguments and background to this second article, which applies the key messages to creating a ground map for informing the task of peacebuilding. The first article can be found on the *ministry for peace* website (www.ministryforpeace.org.uk).

In the earlier article I address the 'why' of peacebuilding, and I cover the use of the terms 'direct violence', 'cultural violence', and 'structural violence' from a more theoretical perspective. I also discuss in more detail the rationale for the four-quadrant approach, which was previously represented as an octagon in order to highlight that the knowledge signposted in each of the four quadrants does not join up seamlessly to make an integrated whole. Rather, we need to actively interpolate and integrate across knowledge gaps between the four perspectives that we need to use in order to understand the whole territory in a holistic way.

Let me briefly recapitulate the main conceptual co-ordinates of this way of thinking.

Peace, conflict, and direct, cultural, and structural violence

Peace is not the absence of conflict

Conflicts are an inevitable aspect of the human condition, and peacebuilding work almost never leads to the resolution of conflicts. Rather, peacebuilding work is designed to bring about a *transformation* of the conflict positions currently held by the participants or actors in the conflict. This is only possible if conflict parties are willing to engage with one another as dialogue partners and are prepared to move away from entrenched positions towards a change of

hearts and minds. Also, if dialogue is to be fruitful, it must lead to a transformation of the structures which govern participation so that all stakeholders are given the time and space to communicate their needs and have them heard, and have their grievances listened to. There needs to be trust and confidence that decisions will be made fairly, with proper consultation and participation, and that there is a sincere commitment to translate into *concrete action* any agreements and decisions that are being reached in the course of peacebuilding meetings. We are continually engaged in negotiating the gap between human needs and the resources available to meet them.

Peacebuilding aims for the cessation of violence, not for the resolution of conflict

Peacebuilding seeks as a crucial outcome that conflicting needs are negotiated by non-violent means and that democratic or at least acceptable forms of governance, collective decision-making, and resource-sharing are put in place which lead to the creation of conditions of sustainable security or peace.

In most civilized societies the principles of socialization and education involve teaching children to learn to ask to have their needs met, to accept frustration, disappointment, or delayed gratification without resorting to violence. As soon as we leave the womb we experience inner conflict as our wishes and wants are not, or not completely, satisfied, forcing us to deal with the experience of frustration as we are attempting to manage the pain and the feelings of anger that arise from lack of gratification. As soon as our basic needs are no longer met automatically through the umbilical cord, we need to communicate via sound, word, and deed across this gap between feeling hungry and being nursed, between feeling cold and wet and being changed, and between feeling lonely and in pain and being comforted. Most civilized societies require by law that adults recognize and acknowledge these needs as non-negotiable by enshrining them in a declaration of basic human rights or freedoms, namely, the freedom to live free from want, free from fear, and free to live with dignity (Annan, 2005, *see further below*). It is the duty of care of members of a civilized society to meet these needs in a non-violent manner. All legal frameworks and the majority of spiritual traditions revolve around outlawing the use of violence as a means of getting human needs met. These principles are first taught in the family and then at school, university, and in the workplace. It is considered to be a violation of human rights not to grant these freedoms; in other words, to condone that human beings should live in poverty, in fear, and without dignity constitutes condoning that violence is being done to them.

Peacebuilding, in that sense, consists of applying these principles on a larger scale, to the way collectivities, communities, and society at large negotiate their social contracts (Durkheim, 1960; Rawls, 1993) with their members, which regulates how people conduct their social relations. In contexts where the rule of law has broken down or where the principles of non-violent negotiation of needs were never fully established in the first place, peacebuilding must address itself to the task of regulating relationships at all levels of society. This means creating the conditions in which people can learn to build non-violent families, non-violent schools, non-violent businesses, non-violent neighbourhoods, and non-violent political organizations. In too many societies this requires that we address existing patterns of sanctioning *direct*, *cultural*, and *structural* violence (*see next paragraph for definitions*) against women and children by focusing on asserting their basic human rights.

Peace is not the absence of conflict: peace is the absence of violence

Peace only becomes possible when we accept as *inevitable* that conflicts will arise between people whenever there is a disruption in the mechanisms which mediate the exchange of goods and services, resulting in the opening up of a gap between demand and supply. In our as yet imperfect societies, where neither democracy nor human rights have as yet been fully implemented, conflicts about distributive justice (Rawls, 1967, 1971) almost always involve not only *direct* verbal, emotional, sexual, or physical violence but also less easily visible forms of violence, that is, *cultural* and *structural* violence (Galtung, 1996). Too often we think of violence solely in terms of *direct* violence. We equate violence with inflicting *physical or emotional harm* on a human being, living creature, or the environment. However, when we diminish other people by discriminating against them, or by suppressing the cultural expression of their beliefs, their faith, their values, and their cultural and religious practices, they feel humiliated, hurt, and angry because they experience our words and actions as a form of *cultural* violence. When we prevent social groups from gaining access to essential resources, be it food and shelter, education, work, or power in the form of representative or direct participation in decision-making, we become guilty of a form of institutional or *structural* violence.

Our challenge, in a 'civilized' or 'decent' society lies in the first instance in containing so-called 'negative emotions', such as rage or anger, jealousy, or unbridled lust. These usually arise when there is a fault in the chain of physical, emotional, social, or political 'supplies'. This disruption in the gratification of our needs and desires can act as a trigger or driver for violent behaviour. The Hungarian psychoanalyst Melanie Klein talks about this *gap* between the arising of a desire and its satisfaction in terms of the 'bad breast' as the symbol of the source of a frustrating experience (Klein, 1975). The French analyst and philosopher Jaques Lacan calls it a 'lack' (Lacan, 1977). This absence, lack, or gap is, of course, also the source of human creativity, the reason for our developing resilience in the face of adversity, and the driver behind our extraordinary capacity and passion for problem solving. It is the motor for scientific, artistic, and social 'progress'.

For peacebuilders, the gap between *what is* and *what might be* translates into the challenge of becoming ever more resourceful in improving the means for negotiating a fair and transparent social contract (Durkheim, 1960; Rawls, 1993) between the different actors in a conflict. This includes the management of 'inner conflicts', that is, the conflicts inside people which arise when desires and outside pressures, ethical imperatives, and survival needs vie for different emotional responses, each of which requires a different course of actions to lead to a solution. People suffer, whether we are dealing with unmet survival needs, such as hunger, lack of shelter, or lack of work; unmet psychological needs, such as lack of love; unmet social needs, such as lack of esteem, as well as unmet spiritual needs, such as lack of meaning. This suffering is experienced as deprivation, disappointment, and frustration, and is likely to lead to protest, in the form of anger, or collapse, in the form of despair. Both anger and despair require practical action in order to establish coping and emotional as well as practical equilibrium. The task becomes either to effect a repair of the rupture in socio-political relationships, or a redressing of the balance through reformist or revolutionary changes in governance.

- When our *direct* needs are not met we suffer physically and emotionally from lack of contact, food, shelter, and so on, and our human task becomes one of meeting our *survival needs*.
- When our *cultural* needs are not met, we suffer from lack of meaning, poor communication, and lack of self-esteem, and our human task becomes one of finding a *social role* in which we can recover our sense of identity and purpose.
- When our *structural* needs are not met, we lack access to meaningful participation in the decision-making and governance of our society, and our task becomes one of negotiating a just social contract (Durkheim, 1960; Rawls, 1993), which obliges societies to grant 'life-chance guarantees' (Kitchen, 2005) by means of which our human rights will be met, so that we gain access to the education, infrastructure, and resources that will allow us to lead healthy lives (Labonte et al., 2005) and to participate in sustainable wealth creation and self-determination.

A social contract constitutes a commitment to creating a society built on a foundation of social justice; that is, the implementation of structural justice, cultural justice, and direct justice on the ground. These three dimensions of social justice need to co-evolve through interdependent processes which mutually co-create the conditions for the just and fair sharing of power and resources via transparent processes of social exchange. Only a parent who can earn a fair living through a fair trade (*structural* justice) can create a family environment built around respect and fairness (*cultural* justice) in which individual family members get enough food and shelter (*direct* justice).

In order to fulfil the task of meeting our needs without resorting to direct, cultural, or structural violence, we need to understand and create the appropriate forms of relating and communicating at each level. While it is the task of ethics to delineate what counts as justice, on the one hand, and violence, on the other, it is the province of aesthetics to help us to recognize and link forms of justice and forms of violence across levels, so that we understand in what way a slum is an expression of:

- *direct* violence because it makes people sick to live amongst sewage, and it denies them the larger *freedom from want*
- *cultural* violence because it demeans people and violates the *freedom from fear*
- *structural* violence because it cuts people off from the most ordinary participation in society because they live on the margins of those habitats where social, cultural, and political life is lived and where they are denied the *freedom to live with dignity*.

Considered from this perspective, all forms of violence are *resource distribution strategies*. Although they may lead to the gratification of unmet needs by securing access to supplies through denying them to others, these strategies are, in the long term, not only unsustainable, but they are both unlawful and morally reprehensible.

Direct, cultural, and structural violence are, in that sense, strategies which arise in relation to different time frames and at different levels of complexity. Both politics and war are strategies for regulating social relations. War efforts have historically tended to involve direct, cultural, and structural violence, but this need not be so. Modern military strategy, theory, and doctrine are designed to operate according to the principles of international law and are designed to eliminate violence in favour of justice. Where killing is permitted as a form of administering retributive justice (Baird and Rosenbaum,

1995), violence is defined as unlawful killing. What is at issue here is that war cultures (Galtung et al., 2002) tend to encourage responding to social and political conflict with methods which encourage, sanction, and perpetuate direct, cultural, and structural violence, rather than employing legally grounded, politically justified methods for re-establishing law and order, justice, and peace, by means of legal or 'just warfare' within the bounds of international law.

Although I am personally not in favour of war as a means for settling conflicts, since I believe that aggression in any form only ever begets further aggression, it would be a grave category error to equate all forms of war faring with violence. Within the so-called 'just war' tradition, which goes back to the Middle Ages, originating with Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologica* (1266–1273), a so-called 'just war' may be justified both in theoretical terms by taking recourse to ethical arguments, on the one hand, and by referring to the historical body of national or international rules, laws, or agreements aimed at limiting certain kinds of warfare, such as the Geneva and the Hague Conventions, on the other. It is the role of ethics to examine these institutional agreements for their philosophical coherence and for their relevance to contemporary circumstances in the light of prevailing public debate.

Although there are exceptions, there is a general consensus that the use of force in a 'just war' may only be justified

- as a last resort, after all non-violent options have been exhausted
- in order to pursue a just cause, such as self-defense against an armed attack
- in pursuit of the only permissible objective of redressing a wrong or injury suffered, that is, with the 'right intention'
- only by a legitimate authority, sanctioned by whatever criteria legitimacy is accorded

by a given society and the international community
- provided it has a reasonable chance of success; that is, it is not morally justifiable to incur deaths and injury in a hopeless cause
- with the ultimate goal of re-establishing peace, where such peace established after the war is deemed to be preferable on moral and political grounds to the peace that would have prevailed if the war had not been fought
- using only reasonable force that is proportional to the injury suffered, respecting international law which prohibits states to use any force beyond that necessary to attain the limited objective of addressing the injury suffered
- using only weapons capable of discriminating between combatants and non-combatants, making every effort to avoid killing civilians who are never permissible targets of war, even though they may exceptionally be considered to be unavoidable victims of a deliberate attack on a military target (*see* Ferraro, 2006).

We must then distinguish clearly between the use of *reasonable force* in the pursuit of a *just war* aiming to *keep or restore peace*, and the use of naked aggression in pursuit of blatant self interest.

- *Direct violence* is a strategy for achieving very *short term* gains – it serves to win a *fight*.
- *Cultural violence* is a strategy for diminishing, subduing or demonising a group of people in the *medium term*, such as in tactical propaganda campaigns – it serves to win a *battle*. Usually cultural violence operates by manipulating unconscious fears, both in the perpetrators and in the victims.
- *Structural violence* is a *long term* strategy for creating and maintaining unequal

forms of resource distribution which go hand in hand with one social group having political, social, and economic power over another. Examples might be class or gender wars, the colonization of one ethnic group by another, or the long-term occupation of annexed territory, as in the case of Palestine (*see* Rapp, 2003).

In his posthumously published prison notebooks, the Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci (1971) used the term 'hegemony' to denote the sustained use of cultural violence as a means for justifying and maintaining structural violence. For instance, in the case of 'bourgeois hegemony', one social class dominates over others. In order to legitimize grasping and maintaining political and economic control out of self-interest, the dominant group asserts its own way of seeing the world (*Weltanschauung*) through controlling the media and naturalizing its ideology in such a way that those who are subordinated by the dominant group accept as 'common sense' and 'natural' the world view of the dominant group (*see* Eagleton, 1991, 2005). Frantz Fanon (1967) exposed this form of cultural violence in relation to the dominance of one race over another in his discussion of the colonization of the mind of Black people who have been consistently invited or coerced to identify with the White man's ideology to the point of self-hatred in the form of 'internalized racism'. Adorno (1950) made similar observations in relation to Jewish anti-Semitism and the 'capo mentality', where Jewish concentration camp inmates ended up identifying with the aggressor to terrorize their fellow inmates instead of feeling and showing solidarity with their own cultural or religious group. Hegemony leads to a constant contradiction between an ideology which distorts the description of reality in favour of a particular social, cultural, racial, religious, eco-nomic, or political interest group, and thereby, enshrines *cultural violence* as the norm, creating an illusion of a cohesive and inclusive society in which the dominated group accepts its domination as 'normal'. However, once a group which is subject to cultural violence gains any degree of awareness of the structural inequalities that consistently disadvantage their particular segment of society, people will begin to experience dissonance between the 'preferred story' (Hall, 1980) and their actual social experience. In this way the eruption of violent conflict is often the culmination of a prior and invidious ideological struggle (Gramsci, 1971), where the dominated 'awaken' to become aware or conscious of the contradiction between their reality and the fiction they are invited to believe in. Once the mystifying veil of ideology has been lifted, people begin a struggle to free themselves from the shackles of cultural violence and the fetters of *structural violence* that bind them into cycles of economic exploitation, leading to a life dominated by the *direct violence* of poverty, ill health, and crime. This power struggle between emancipatory and oppressive forces which often lies at the root of violent conflict must be recognized and acknowledged by all parties round the table if any transformation of the current direct violence into structural non-violent power sharing through negotiation is to be made possible.

Crucially, it needs to be recognized that no discourse is ideology-free. The rhetoric of critical Marxism, framing conflict in terms of social contradictions which result in a struggle for liberation accompanied by 'unveiling the dominant ideology', and the 'awakening of consciousness' in the oppressed is situated within a particular context of historical and cultural interpretation. This applies equally to the arguments of 'just war' theorists for the 'use of reason-

able force' in waging a war in circumstances where war is deemed to be preferable on moral and political grounds to the peace that would have prevailed if the war had not been fought, as is usually argued in order to justify World War Two as the last resort to respond to the injuries inflicted by the Nazi regime.

Nor is there any self-evident truth to the world view of peacebuilders who argue against the use of any means likely to perpetuate violence of any kind and who advocate that peace should be maintained or brought about by peaceful means. This article is not ideology-free, even though I make every effort to lay open and critically examine my own assumptions and to present arguments across a range of different ideological positions.

Despite my sincere advocacy for creating a world free of violence in which the three larger freedoms outlined by Kofi Annan (2005) become the norm rather than the exception, I actually believe that we can only ever hope to lessen the three forms of violence which perpetually infringe these freedoms. The mere fact of our human embodiment will always work against our wholly succeeding in our aim to end all violence, and democracy and human rights will de facto only ever be incompletely implemented on this our earth (Rapp, 2006). Nonetheless, in this article I advocate passionately that we must aspire to bring all forms of violence to an end and to do everything in our power to move ever closer to closing the gap between our ardent wish and the ever-frustrating reality!

Conflicts are multifactorial and multidimensional

Conflicts vary in the extent to which they involve direct, cultural, or structural violence and in the manner in which this violence is manifested. The ground map offered

in this article takes us through a four-stage process which examines the relationship between conflicts which arise *in a given environmental, economic, and political context within people, between people, and between groups of people at different levels of social organization.*

The first step in the process of serious peacebuilding involves recognizing and mapping the extent to which different actors contribute in their own particular ways to the violent manner in which conflicts are played out. The second step requires us to situate the conflict in its historical context, and to explore the cultural and ideological narratives which favour a violent staging of the current conflicts between the diverse conflict actors.

Active peacebuilding works to reduce violence in our own ways of relating to ourselves and our bodies, in the way we communicate and relate with one another, and in the way in which a given administration uses its authority to govern. Proactive peacebuilding endeavours to put safeguards in place that stabilize the situation and prevent new violence from flaring up whenever possible. Peace education helps us to recognize, understand, and take responsibility for the many ways in which each of us is (often unwittingly) complicit in creating and maintaining unjust forms of social organization, and it resources us with us practical peacebuilding and conflict transformation skills.

A four-quadrant ground map for four fields of enquiry and action

In this article I adopt an integrative, living systems approach. My earliest and most formative beginnings lie in the teachings of the Frankfurt School during my work there in the 1960s, especially the thinking of my teachers, Theodore W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, and Juergen Habermas. Most significantly, the approach

consists of impressing on us that knowledge creation is an *ever-evolving, living process*. The ideas and concepts of those who have gone before us, prompting and inspiring certain lines of enquiry are both *time-bound* and *contextualized*, but they are also *transcendent*, that is, they point to a future in which they will themselves be contradicted and superseded. Within a living systems approach the theoretical assumptions are framed in such a way that the means for proving them no longer useful, applicable, or relevant, inhere already in the theory of which they form a part. We are invited to think continually with and through these ideas in order to arrive at novel understandings. As historical and political contexts change, so social relations will change, and therefore our theories about the nature of social relations will also change. The content and nature of the relationship between the ownership of the means of production, the nature of what is produced, forms of governance and well-being, changes over time and varies between societies; however, the fact that there is relationship between these variables is not itself subject to change. In the same way, given the nature of social change since the World War Two, Gramsci's concept of hegemony is no longer interpreted as the *stable configuration of ideological power relationships*, which might have accurately characterized social relations in the first half of the last century. Rather, today it is used to describe a fluid process of negotiating meanings in which all aspects of an ideology will, in fact, be continually contested, defended, dethroned, and reasserted in an ongoing process of socialization, represented by the ebb and flow of ideological and aesthetic trends that punctuate political struggles around power sharing, rather than class struggles as such.

The intense interest in psychoanalysis meant that the Frankfurt School teaching always stressed the incompleteness of our knowing and the largely unconscious nature of our wishes, intentions, and actions. Reason must always be twinned with intuition and we must always be mindful of our bodily-ness and the ancient biological roots of our emotions as they erupt into our daily lives and become subject to socialization pressures. *Our actions are informed by both intentions and reasons, and by coincidences and causes*. Structures are what you see when you fix a process in a moment of time in order to see how things are configured at this very moment in history. What you see is always interpreted by means of emotional and cultural filters. Our duty and our aspiration is to endeavour to make conscious that which we can shed light on and to respect that our appreciation and comprehension will be subjective, partial, flawed, and subject to change. However, we can be honest and sincere in our communications, even if we may never be in possession of any objective truths. We can be humble and clear in our social and political actions, even thought we may neither fully know their causes nor indeed their effects. We can take responsibility for our *intentions*, even though we cannot predict or control the *outcomes*.

This is why in we tend no longer to talk in terms of peace and peace treaties and peace agreements as *ends in themselves*, but rather we see these as *turning points* or significant junctures; that is, moment-to-moment constellations in a peace process which must be ongoing long after any peace treaty has been signed if it is to lead to any lasting change and stability. It is for this reason, that the term 'peacebuilding', rather than 'peace' is the preferred term used by the Centre for International Peacebuilding, since as it is the participle form of a verb that signals that we are never done with the great work of building *Jerusalem on earth*, as the Christian nations of the European lan-

guage communities used to describe their quest for peace on earth: In the beginning was the *Verb*.

In this article I therefore propose four key tasks, four activities, or four processes of engaging in questioning and analysing the effect of ideologies, world views , and value systems on the manner in which we:

1　Understand ourselves.
2　Communicate and relate to one another.
3　Understand the conditions necessary for our bodily and psychological development and psychosocial functioning.
4　Organize our social structures and systems to distribute the resources necessary to meet our physical, environmental, economic, and political needs.

The Frankfurt School teaching has been particularly concerned with exploring how we attribute meaning and how we interpret the social and political world, and most particularly how such meanings are *socially negotiated* through our participation in public discourse, mediated by *communicative competence* which leads to the formation of public opinion and consensus or open discussion and debate about differences (what Juergen Habermas calls *Oeffentlichkeit*) (Habermas, 2001). Both consensus and divergence become visible in the output of the media and the 'culture industry'. Like Gramsci, and later Stuart Hall, the exponents of critical theory in process focus their analysis on how power élites privilege 'preferred meanings' which express an ideological world view that is designed to maintain and reinforce existing, usually inequitable, power structures to the detriment of large segments of society. The thrust of this method of critical theory and analysis is hermeneutic (Gadamer, 1976), focusing on what Clifford Geertz (1973) was to call 'thick description' and categorization, mindful that we are always participant observers, and that we are therefore never wholly objective, uninvolved, and impartial observers.

The hallmark of the work of adherents of the Frankfurt School consists of paying scrupulous attention to the surface forms of social interactions by deconstructing their aesthetic signification while interrogating, by means of ethical enquiry, the deep structure of the normative practices which constitute authority and maintain social order and social cohesion. Its teaching arose in response to the urgent post-war need to transcend and transform the legacy of the Third Reich in order to create the conditions for building a viable democracy. It was imperative to understand the roots of violence and to trace the visible as well as the underground relationships between direct, cultural, and structural forms of violence. The motto was: 'Never again' should there be a form of governance in which the inhumanity of man against man evidenced in the Holocaust should become possible in Germany, or indeed, in the world. Germany was to learn how to build a peaceful society in which conflicts were to be negotiated by peaceful means. The project of Germans of my generation was to create a peace culture in which the role of citizens and of intellectuals in particular is to scrutinize the language of political discourse, the hands-on performance of political actors, and the actions of political institutions with a view to detecting and indicting any remnants or resurgence of totalitarian ideology. Reconstruction and peacebuilding in postwar Germany was to be proactive peacebuilding through politics and statebuilding, centrally involving full participation by civil society actors across sectors and levels of society.

This agenda dominated my first 20 years of growing up. We were living and breathing

this endeavour to understand and to transmute social and political theory into a new way of living. Although we observed, read, discussed, and wrote continuously, and even though many of us were academics, this was not an intellectual pursuit but hard graft made up of personal development, continual peer scrutiny, and intense involvement in political activity, continually generating novel forms of democratic participation in decision-making and governance, in schools, universities, on the shop floor, in theatres and the media, in galleries, publishing houses and courts of law, in the street and in parliament.

We examined the physical space in which we meet, the way we sit or stand, the language we use, where and how we work and what we produce, and how people wield or grab authority. We analysed whether we ourselves use our power to protect or to threaten, to empower or exclude, and how this manifests in word, gesture, and deed. We experimented with new ways of living communally and working together in collectives.

My second formation in Oxford in the 1970s added a wealth of experimental and observational methods and data as well as different forms of conceptual analysis to this grounding, to expand on which would require an entire article in its own right (*see* Rapp, 2000). These were daily tasks for my generation of young Germans, Jews, and non-Jews alike. We took an intense interest in what was happening in Israel, both admirable and worrying. Our childen went to *Kinderlaeden* modelled on the kibbutz education we learnt in Israel, and at the same time we wrote a prize-winning report about the cultural and structural inequalities which obstructed the participation of Palestinian Arabs in Israeli society in 1965.

We were intensely self-reflective – and we continually watched one another's backs to make sure that we were not succumbing to a re-indoctrination with authoritarian attitudes, a re-staging of authoritarian behaviours, and a restitution of authoritarian systems of governance. We analysed how power relationships become institutionalized, and what are the signs that a social administration is on its way to becoming structurally violent. We studied the extent to which government agencies encourage or discourage inclusion in or exclusion from decision-making and access to vital resources be they education, work, food, water, shelter, money, belonging, or happiness. And we continually scrutinized what Theodor Adorno called 'cultural productions', that is, how the media, newspapers, television, radio, film, theatre, popular and serious music and visual arts, architecture, dress – all the things that Clifford Geertz (1973), after Clyde Kluckhohn (1949), calls 'culture' are, at one and the same time, *instruments for manufacturing ideologies* and *vehicles for their demystification and deconstruction*.

Historically, our social institutions have often stood in a dialectical relationship with those psychological mechanisms and cultural forms that reproduce domination, repression, and other forms of violence. The psychological and the cultural mutually constitute one another; the cultural and the social mutually constitute one another; and the biological and the personal mutually constitute one another in a never-ending cycle of co-evolution, co-construction, and mutual influence and reciprocal causation. This dialectical interplay between the small direct forms of relating, the cultural framework which simultaneously shapes our interpersonal behaviour and our social communication, as well as the form of governance we create to organize our society, can be, and has often been, manipulated by power hungry demagogues to perpetuate a

culture of violence. The project of peace-building is to reverse this historic tide that is sweeping us further and further into a war culture, and to use the same knowledge about social mechanisms and the same communicative competencies to create a culture of peace through institutionalizing forms of non-violent communication and forms of participatory democracy. Aesthetics and ethics interpenetrate one another to create both beauty and evil, as well as virtue and vice, depending on whether a society invests in implementing and sustaining a war culture or a peace culture. *Violent forms in one system help to engender and reproduce violent forms in another.* Political oppression often leads simultaneously to self-hatred, anger, and rage towards the oppressor, and contempt for one's fellow oppressed. In such circumstances, peacebuilding needs to begin with building self-esteem and solidarity in order to generate hope, without which people do not have the motive power to dream a new future in which they can envision that path towards social justice and spiritual renewal opened up for millions of Black

people by Martin Luther King. Low self-esteem and oppression engender stress and anxiety, make us more vulnerable to physical illness and can leave us broken by the wayside.

The four-quadrant ground map offered here (Figure 1) allows us to track these transformations from one field of enquiry and action to another as we search for the *deep roots*: the *deep structure* of a given conflict mapping different manifestations of violence and their relationship to one another. In order to describe the different facets and *surface forms* of *deep-seated contradictions* we endeavoured to develop a language that is capable of discriminating with the same sensitivity and finesse between the texture of seduction and empowerment as the trained fingertips of the cloth merchant can tell the difference between cheap nylon and precious silk.

For example, if we were track the salient features of a totalitarian form of governance which uses direct, cultural, and structural violence to maintain its power, we might use the four-quadrant framework to look for evi-

Quadrant 1 The *self-structure of an authoritarian personality*, characterized by the inability to tolerate uncertainty and not knowing. Rigid, super ego-driven defences against vulnerability are associated with an autocratic and self-righteous stance and the need to dominate others through cruelty and contempt.	**Quadrant 3** The *glorification of a hard and inviolable masculinized body* displayed in heroic postures, denigrating feminine features as a defence against fear, vulnerability, and mortality. Bodily urges are denied and repressed until they erupt in uncontrolled violence.
Quadrant 2 Repressive *forms of communication*, defined by the censorship of free speech and the censure of free cultural expression. Any kind of questioning via dialogic forms of critical enquiry is suppressed. The media is tightly controlled and misused for propaganda and the normalization of the dominant ideology.	**Quadrant 4** *Monumental architecture* that towers over us with implacable facades which look more like temples of power than buildings constructed by humans on a human scale for human use. Open public spaces are controlled and free assembly is forbidden. The *structure* of violence is mirrored in *rigid bureaucracy* and in serious *human rights violations* which open the way for a reign of terror.

Figure 1. A four-quadrant ground map.

Upper left = Interior	Upper Right = Exterior
I – self and consciousness, self-subjectivity	It – brain and organism, empirical atomism
Lower Left = Interior	**Lower Right = Exterior**
We – culture and worldview, collective subjectivity	Its – social systems, empirical sociology

Figure 2. Wilber's notation.

dence and manifestations authoritarian features in:

A four-quadrant approach is also advocated by Ken Wilber, who uses it to underpin his own recent writings (Wilber, 2000). At a superficial level, the two approaches are quite similar, perhaps because Ken Wilber has also been influenced by the Frankfurt School, especially by the work of Juergen Habermas. Wilber's notation involves using the following frame (Figure 2).

I respect Wilber's breadth and depth, and I appreciate that he, too, sees his work as work in progress rather than a finished end product. At the same time I have reservations about an approach which offers itself as a 'theory of everything' or as a model of 'inte-gral' philosophy or psychology. My own four-quadrant ground map is most certainly not yet inte-gral, but very much still at the integra-tive stage. It is decidedly not a theory of everything, but rather is a simple and expedient *heuristic* which aims to make it possible to describe and locate the salient features of human psychology, cultural meaning making, biosocial development, and social organization in relation to current frameworks of enquiry and interpretation *in process*. It is no more and no less than a framework under construction, ever ready to undo any of its own assertions.

In the context of this article, the framework is intended to help peacebuilders to *organize, orient, and map* the key concepts and practices they use in their daily work in the field. The main focus in this second article is on the 'what' of peacebuilding. The

third article in the series will address the 'how'. The four fields are meant to function like a *mandala*, as it is used in many ancient approaches, namely as a tool for mapping our knowledge and observations *about the world*, on the one hand, (Wilber's *I* and *it*) and our experience *of ourselves in the world*, on the other (Wilber's *me* and *thou*). The human mind seems to naturally gravitate towards making fourfold distinctions: the circle or square divided by a cross; a cross *simpliciter*; the Vitruvian Man of the renaissance; the four worlds of the *kabbalah*; the four-leafed clover and the celtic knot; the native Indian medicine wheel, the Sanskrit swastika (and alas its sinister Nazi version), Buddhist *mandalas*, the four gospels and the four holy animals, and so forth. Similarly, there are numerous scientific and mathematical models which use the Cartesian coordinates, and, of course, we have sometimes modelled time and space as a four-dimensional continuum.

PART TWO: A GROUND MAP FOR PEACEMAKERS AND PEACEBUILDERS

Understanding the determinants of conflict and the methods for transforming their violent expression: the 'What?' of peacebuilding

The ground map in this article (Figure 3) is intended to provide a common orienting frame for locating a particular model, method, and tool used in conflict work. There are many excellent approaches avail-

	Inner world	Outer world
Individual level	1 *Personal resources* It is vital to recognize and deal with the roots of violence in our own hearts from a place of mindfulness and spiritual commitment to peacebuilding. This means becoming aware of our feelings and sensations, our thoughts and attitudes, our wishes and fears, and to take responsibity for regulating them so that we don't act on our anger by committing impulsive acts of 'direct violence': *Do people have peace in their heart?* *Do people have a sense of self worth?* *Do people have a sense of identity?* *Are people self- aware and self-reflective?*	3 *Bio-psychosocial determinants* In order to foster non-violent behaviour, we need to examine and research in scientifically rigorous ways the biological basis of our capacity for aggression ('direct violence') as well as our biologically primed propensity for co-operation, and for the repair of relationship ruptures in the context of social and educational influences that help to shape our cognitive, social, and emotional development. *Are people cold, hungry, frightened, ignorant, or lacking in basic resources?* *Can people manage their emotions?* *What are the blocks to healthy biopsychosocial development?*
Collective level	2 *Interpersonal and intercultural issues* If there is to be real dialogue, we need to listen empathically to the grievances of the other and to speak our own pain with sincerity, respecting the dignity of cultural, ideological, and religious difference. We need to track and make conscious the metaphors and the hidden grammar of violence that informs the language we use in our everyday lives, our media, and our public discourse if we are to bring 'cultural violence' to an end: *Do people quarrel about who has the better story (informed by religions or political ideologies, for instance?* *Do they denigrate other members of society?* *Do they close down the space for open debate?* *Do they justify command-control, hierarchical domina-tion as 'normal'?*	4 *Organizational and systemic dimensions* We need to analyse the historic, social, economic, environmental and political determinants of 'structural violence'. This means encouraging non-governmental organizations, the business community, governments, and civil society to work together in a joined-up way to address the persisting inequities and gross inequalities that stand in the way of a just and sustainable peace: *To what extent is the conflict to do with the fact that the governance of the region is not just, not democratic, not effective, or efficient?* *What are the geographic and demographic challenges?* *Does the region lack basic infrastructure or resources?* *To what extent is it marred by poverty, exclusion, oppression, corruption, ill health, destitution, national debt, environmental despoliation, and so on)?*

Figure 3. Four key tasks for peacebuilders working to heal a hurting world.

able which link to in-depth training. Many of these will pick out similar tasks and use similar language. This ground map is *not a substitute* for a coherent, theoretically thorough approach to conceptualizing the roots of conflict, the means for mapping conflict, and the methods for intervening in it.

We need to work with conflicts in four main areas

Non-governmental organizations and, of course, governments and intergovernmental and international bodies and businesses, are inevitably working in areas of conflict. Conflicts may or may not involve direct violence, but they almost always involve cultural vio-lence and structural violence. Cultural vio-lence is the suppression of voices and the exercise of discrimination, and the accep-tance of and tolerance for direct violence and, in general, domination relationships. Structural violence is the visible or veiled outcome of institutionalized disadvantage. Governments on the whole do not manage to distribute resources fairly and evenly and non-governmental organizations increas-ingly act as civil society partners to broker between those who have the resources to provide humanitarian and development aid and people and communities in need. This requires that we focus on four equally impor-tant key areas. In practice, usually, one of these is of particular relevance to the remit

of our own particular organization or department, providing the main focus for our projects.

Engage in lifelong individual inner work

The first chamber of the heart of peace houses our individual spiritual needs and practices.

In the first chamber belong initiatives that target educational and spiritual practices which centre on personal development designed to make us more loving and peaceful.

All of us who work to improve the lives of people living with violence are struggling emotionally and intellectually to make sense of the persistent and unacceptable inequities and injustices we are confronted by. Poverty is the outcome of cultural violence and can be experienced as a form of direct violence when hunger and sickness ravage one's life. Most of us are hurting inside as we extend our empathy to the people who suffer, and we feel pain, anger and hopelessness as we witness the inhumanity of man against man: men, women, and children. To be able to go on witnessing without losing faith or burning out and without becoming consumed with either helplessness or righteous anger takes a great deal of composure and inner strength. This can only be achieved through hard, sustained, and disciplined inner work on ourselves. We must start with making peace in our own hearts so that we can face the tasks of intervening in a hurting world with equanimity.

In the first chamber, we work with the personal freedom which gives each of us the choice of how to interpret secular or religious ethical principles in our own particular geographical and historical context, as the person we are, with our own strengths and failings, right here, right now. Our spiritual grounding gives us the signposts – but

each of us walks the hard road of practice anew in each and every life. The meaning that I attribute to the word *spiritual* extends also to humanistic and secular worldviews and practices: I am pointing to that within us which gives us a sense of meaning and purpose and that gives us the will and the strength to live our values in the face of adversity and that motivates us to reach out to others in need.

The first chamber is centrally about identity: Who am I?

Painstakingly follow through collective interpersonal work

The second chamber houses our shared practices and stories, which give meaning to our identity and actions.

As well as getting to know ourselves, we also need to know our onions; that is, like the farmer knows under what conditions his onions or his rice will thrive or fail, we need to know our facts about the soil in which the conflict has grown, who has been tending the seeds of discontent, and how we might uproot violence and sow the seeds of peace. In order to pitch our efforts to help effectively, we need to be aware of the history of the current situation. We need to have an understanding of the cultural stories, the articles of faith, and the political ideologies which give meaning to people's lives and which inform the viewpoints of the key players and stakeholders in the field. From the basis of this understanding we must create a safe space within which people can fully and frankly air their grievances without being attacked. Our task is to ensure that everyone can speak out and is properly listened to. Initially, this often requires private, one-to-one conversations because the public airing of disagreements cannot be safely contained at first.

In the second chamber our focus is on how culture and religion help us to understand the world through the telling of stories which serve to make meaning of our experience. Every work of art, every artefact, building, song, play, dance, novel or poem, and every prayer or parable leads us to particular interpretations of who we are and provides pointers to how we should live our lives.

Religions and political ideologies give rise to different legal and administrative frameworks for governance. There is no religion, nor any truly humanistic system of beliefs, which does not teach a commitment to peace and justice. There is no religion which does not teach a commitment to truth. And there is no religion which does not ask us to reach out with love to one another and all that lives. *Re-ligio* means tying ourselves into the web of life and of Life. It is our bond with our family, our cultural group, and with the Divine. Religion is the friend of peace as long as no religion lays claim to being the *only* door to G'd and the *only* path to truth. In many zones of violent conflict religion is the main social glue which provides the social cohesion that stands between despair and destitution, between fragile societies and anarchy. Without engaging with the religious beliefs and practices of ordinary people, and without working respectfully with religious leaders we cannot meaningfully relate to the people with whom we want and need to work to reduce the level of violence in their lives, little by little, steadily, for a long time.

No one story can tell the whole truth, for no human mind can encompass the whole truth. No human heart can hold the whole truth, and no human tongue can speak the whole truth. Rather, for the religious person the Divine Truth encompasses the human heart and It holds us and It speaks through us! For the humanist there are transpersonal deep structures which permeate the culturally specific narratives about what is true, beautiful, or good, and which allow us to communicate across our different frames of reference.

We need to reach deep inside and work hard on ourselves in order to understand viewpoints that are very different to our own, and perhaps even alien or distasteful to us. Advocacy for compassion, human rights, social justice, and many of the issues which are dear to many who work to build peace, requires consistent dialogue which is built on non-violent communication. Non-violent communication (Rosenberg, 2003) means deep and respectful listening, followed by engaging the other party in personally and culturally meaningful conversations that do not demonize the other party nor denigrate their views in any way. It requires that we respect and uphold the dignity of difference (Sacks, 2002).

The onus is on us to take real trouble to explain and argue cogently and persuasively why another approach might be preferable to the one currently favoured by our dialogue partner or partners. Crucially, we should never make promises that we cannot keep, nor should we offer 'solutions' which are not sustainable in the long term. Capacity building must ensure future development and independence.

The second chamber is centrally about dialogue, belonging and relationship: What are my ties? What are our shared values?

[To be concluded in a subsequent issue.]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Nick Totton for their encouragement and helpful suggestions.

References

Adorno TW, Frenkel-Brunswik E, Levinson DJ, Sanford RN. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.

Annan K. In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All. United Nations, 2005.

Aquinas T. Summa Theologica. Available from Summa Theologica website www.ccel.org/a/aquinas/summa/home.html (accessed 9 July 2006).

Baird RM, Rosenbaum SE. Punishment and the Death Penalty: The Current Debate. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1995.

Durkheim E. Montesquieu and Rousseau. Forerunners of Sociology. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1960. [Also available in French on http://classiques.uqac.ca/classiques/Durkheim_emile/Montesquieu_Rousseau/Rousseau/Rousseau.html (accessed 9 July 2006)].

Eagleton T. Ideology: An Introduction. London: Verso, 1991.

Eagleton T. Holy Terror. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Fanon F. Black Skin, White Masks. New York, NY: Grove Press, 1967.

Ferraro V. Principles of the Just War. Mount Holyoke College website. Available from www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/pol116/justwar.htm (accessed 9 July 2006).

Gadamer H. Philosophical Hermeneutics (edited and translated by David E Linge). Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1976.

Galtung J. Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization. Oslo: International Peace Research Institute, 1996.

Galtung J, Jacobsen CG, Brand-Jacobsen KF (eds). Searching for Peace: The Road to TRANSCEND. London: Pluto Press, 2002.

Geertz C. The Interpretation of Culture. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1973.

Gramsci A. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1971.

Habermas, J. From Kant's 'ideas' of pure reason to the 'idealizing' presuppositions of communicative action: reflections on the detranscendentalized 'use of reason'. In: Rehg W and Bohman J (eds) Pluralism and the Pragmatic Turn. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001; 11–39.

Hall S. Encoding/decoding. In Hall S, Hobson D, Lowe A, Willis P (eds) Culture Media and Language. London: Hutchinson, 1980; 128–38.

Kitchen B. Life-Chance Guarantees: A New Agenda for Social Policy. Toronto, Ontario: Centre for Social Justice, 2005. Available from: www.socialjustice.org/pdfs/LifeChances.pdf (accessed 9 July 2006).

Klein M. Love, Guilt and Reparation, and Other Works 1921–1945. New York: The Free Press, 1975.

Kluckhohn C. Mirror for Man: The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life. New York: McGraw Hill, 1949.

Labonte R, Schrecker T, Gupta AS. Health for Some: Death, Disease and Disparity in a Globalizing Era. Toronto, Ontario: Centre for Social Justice, 2005. Available from: www.socialjustice.org/pdfs/HealthforSome.pdf (accessed 9 July 2006).

Lacan J. Ecrits. Paris: Seuil, 1966 [English translation published by Routledge, 2001].

Rapp H. Working with difference: culturally competent supervision. In: Lawton B, Feltham C (eds) Taking Supervision Forward. London: Sage, 2000; 93–112.

Rapp H. The importance of emotional literacy for building a peace culture: understanding individual and social meanings and individual and social realities. Psychotherapy and Politics International 2003; 1(2): 77–92.

Rapp H. Erfolgreiche Friedensarbeit bedarf Gütekraft, Dialogfähigkeit und Organisationswissen. In: Konrad Tempel (Ed.) Werkheft einer Tagungs-Kooperation der Evangelischen Akademie Iserlohn, der Internationalen Ärzte gegen den Atomkrieg (IPPNW) und der Akademie für Konflikttransformation im forumZFD. ZFD impuls Band 3: Begegnen und Verwandeln. Zur Psychologie der Friedensarbeit, 2003.

Rapp H. Citizen peacemakers. In: World & I, Innovative Approaches to Peace, pp. 75–85. Washington: Interreligious and International Federation for World Peace, 2006.

Rawls JA. Political Liberalism. The John Dewey Essays in Philosophy, 4. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Rawls J. Distributive justice. In: Laslett P, Runciman WG (eds) Philosophy, Politics and Society: Third Series. London: Blackwell, 1967; 58–82.

Rawls J. A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971.

Rosenberg MB. Nonviolent Communication. A Language of Life. Encinitas CA: Puddledancer Press, 2003.

Sacks J. The Dignity of Difference: How to Avoid the Clash of Civilisations. London: Continuum, 2002.

Wilber K. A Theory of Everything: An Integral Vision for Business, Politics, Science, and Spirituality. Boston: Shambhala, 2000.

Correspondence:
E-mail: rapp.biip@blueyonder.co.uk