



# HUMAN NATURE: RESPONSIBLE FOR NEGATIVE PEACE

<sup>1</sup>DR. MUHAMMAD TAHIR RASHID, <sup>2</sup>DR. SAPNA MUMTAZ, <sup>3</sup>A TEEQA TANVEER KHAN

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Sciences & Humanities, FAST NUCES, Lahore, Pakistan.  
tahir.rashid@nu.edu.pk

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Politics & IR, Lahore Leads University, Lahore, Pakistan.  
sapna104@hotmail.com

<sup>3</sup>Lecturer Political Science, Higher Education Department, Punjab, Pakistan. [atiqatanvir@gmail.com](mailto:atiqatanvir@gmail.com)

## ABSTRACT

*Human nature plays a role in how we approach peace, as our inherent tendencies and behaviors can either contribute to or hinder the establishment of positive and sustainable peace. Negative peace, often defined as the absence of violent conflict without necessarily addressing the root causes of said conflict, is a controversial subject within peace studies. However, this study explores the concept of negative peace, primarily focusing on humanity's role as the potential instigator.*

*Human nature, socio-economic factors, and political structures are investigated as possible drivers of this temporary and potentially harmful peace. Through a comprehensive literature review, methodological research, and an in-depth analysis, this paper aims to foster a nuanced understanding of negative peace and its relation to human behavior and societal systems.*

**Key words:** Human nature, Negative Peace, Positive Peace, Social Structure

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Peace is a universal aspiration, a state anywhere on the planet tirelessly strive to achieve. However, peace is not monolithic; it takes different forms and manifests in varied ways. Traditionally, peace has been divided into two categories: positive peace and negative peace. Positive peace is a state where justice and equity prevail, where societal relationships are harmonious and free of tensions. Negative peace, on the other hand, is the absence of direct violence or conflict without necessarily addressing the underlying issues that cause conflict (Bloomsburg, 1995; Aarne, 2005).

Johan Galtung, a renowned sociologist known for his work in the field of peace and conflict studies. He has proposed various theories and frameworks related to conflict resolution, peacebuilding, and structural violence, which could be applied to analyze the socio-political context of many countries, including Sri Lanka.

This dichotomous perspective on peace was first proposed by Johan Galtung in his seminal work in 1969. Galtung, often considered the father of peace studies, described positive peace as the integration of human society, while negative peace was merely the absence of violence. This distinction has since become a cornerstone of peace and conflict studies, influencing our understanding of peace processes and conflict resolution.

Negative peace, as Galtung described, is a peace that isn't truly peaceful. While it might be devoid of direct violence or open conflict, the underlying causes of such violence remain unaddressed. These causes can include socio-economic disparities, political repression, and systemic injustices. As such, societies experiencing negative peace often harbor simmering tensions just beneath the surface. This type of peace is often temporary and unstable, as the unresolved issues can eventually lead to the resumption of conflict.

One of the prominent concepts in Galtung's work is the distinction between positive and negative peace. Negative peace refers to the absence of violence, while positive peace refers to the presence of



social justice and equality. It involves addressing underlying systemic issues and structures that cause conflict. This concept could potentially be applied to examine Sri Lanka's post-civil war recovery and peacebuilding process. Galtung's model of conflict transformation is based on three key components: conflict, violence, and peace. He developed these ideas further into what is known as the Conflict Triangle, which consists of attitudes, behaviours, and contradictions (or conflict issues). According to Galtung, conflicts arise when goals that are perceived as incompatible meet. These conflicts can manifest as attitudes, behaviors, and contradictions, which can all interact and influence each other. Here's a brief outline of the three components:

- 1.1. **Attitude:** This involves parties' perceptions and misperceptions towards each other, which can range from stereotypes to prejudices. It also includes emotions, such as fear, hostility, or empathy.
- 1.2. **Behaviour:** This involves cooperation or coercion, including violence. It can range from verbal abuse to physical attacks or even war.
- 1.3. **Contradiction/Conflict:** This is the root cause of the conflict, involving incompatible goals between parties. These could be tangible things like resources or intangible aspects like values, needs, desires, etc.

For Galtung, the key to transforming conflicts is to address all three sides of the conflict triangle. This means working to change attitudes, behaviors, and the underlying contradictions that cause the conflict. This process involves the promotion of empathy, cooperation, and the development of creative solutions that can satisfy the fundamental needs and goals of all parties involved.

One of the major aspects of Galtung's conflict transformation theory is the distinction between negative peace and positive peace. Negative peace is the absence of violence, or the cessation of violent conflict, but the underlying issues or contradictions are not addressed. Positive peace, on the other hand, involves resolving the root cause of the conflict (the contradiction) and building structures that promote peace, leading to social justice and harmony.

- 1.4. **Negative and Positive Peace:** One of the most significant contributions Galtung has made to our understanding of peace is the distinction between negative and positive peace. Negative peace, according to Galtung, is the absence of direct violence, such as war, physical violence, or verbal abuse. Positive peace, on the other hand, is the presence of social justice and the absence of structural violence - a kind of harm that results from oppressive or harmful societal structures, like systemic racism or economic inequality.

The role of humanity in the establishment and maintenance of negative peace is complex and multifaceted. On one hand, human actions, decisions, and behaviors are the driving force behind societal phenomena, including peace and conflict. Humanity, through its social, political, and economic structures, shapes the conditions that lead to either positive or negative peace. In this sense, humanity can indeed be considered the architect of negative peace.

However, this perspective might oversimplify the issue. It can place undue blame on individuals without considering the broader systems within which they operate. Human behaviors and decisions are heavily influenced by societal structures and systems. Economic systems, political structures, cultural norms, and historical contexts all shape individual and collective behaviors. These systems can perpetuate inequalities and injustices, creating conditions ripe for negative peace.

For example, an oppressive political regime might suppress dissent and maintain a façade of peace, but this peace is likely to be a negative peace. The absence of open conflict doesn't mean that grievances and tensions don't exist. Instead, they are merely hidden, often simmering beneath the surface, ready to explode if given the opportunity. In this scenario, is it fair to blame individuals for the negative peace? Or should the blame lie with the oppressive political system? These are the questions that this paper aims to explore.

In order to truly understand the relationship between humanity and negative peace, it is necessary to examine the interplay between individual human actions, societal systems, and the resulting peace



outcomes. This requires a comprehensive and nuanced approach, one that goes beyond simplistic blame attribution. It requires an exploration of societal structures, a critical analysis of human behavior, and an understanding of how these factors interact to shape peace processes.

This paper will delve into the intricacies of negative peace and its relationship with human action and societal systems. It will examine the potential dangers of negative peace, including the likelihood of conflict recurrence and the perpetuation of social injustice. Through this exploration, the paper aims to foster a deeper understanding of negative peace and to shed light on the role of humanity in its establishment and maintenance. Ultimately, this study seeks to contribute to the broader discourse on peace and conflict, providing insights that could inform future peacebuilding efforts.

## 2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The prevalence of anarchy in the human nature is quiet superfluous according to many theologians of idealistic perspective. On the contrary, realists regard the antagonistic nature of human toward each other, as a product of their desire to be dominant in the chain of power & fear. Peace has always been a longing desire of human civilization as the continuous cycle of blood & soulless massacre has just led to cool-down periods, which presents a substantial vacuum of power for every governance or ruling authority to grasp upon. This idea is the basis of formation of the negative peace we know of today. However, the fundamental rising argument constructs a narrative against humanity as a civilization itself, seeing it as the true culprit of negative peace based on contemporary conflict resolutions, post liberal peace, and role of human agencies & societal structures in the balancing of scales around the globe.

## 3. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature offers a comprehensive understanding of negative peace, its implications, and the need for a transition towards positive peace. However, the role of individual human actions and behaviors in this process is less explored and requires further research. This paper aims to fill this gap by investigating the impact of human agency on the manifestation of negative peace, contributing to a more holistic understanding of the subject. It highlights the multidimensional nature of peace, the potential dangers of negative peace, and the significant role of societal structures in shaping peace processes.

(Galtung, J. 1969) seminal work, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research" introduced the fundamental concepts of positive and negative peace. Galtung defined negative peace as the absence of violence or war, while positive peace referred to the presence of social justice and equality. His work set the foundation for the understanding of peace studies, marking a significant shift in the way scholars conceptualized peace and conflict. Galtung's work became the reference point for future research in the field, with his ideas still influencing contemporary peace studies.

(Wallensteen, P. 2018), in his book "Understanding Conflict Resolution" expanded on Galtung's initial theories. Wallensteen highlighted the importance of addressing the underlying causes of conflict to achieve sustainable peace, thereby underscoring the limitations of negative peace. He introduced the idea that peace isn't merely the absence of war but includes the transformation of conflictual relationships and the promotion of justice and equality. Wallensteen's work further emphasized the need for comprehensive peacebuilding efforts that move beyond the cessation of violence.

(Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2011) in "Contemporary Conflict Resolution" delved deeper into the implications of negative peace on societal stability. The authors suggested that the absence of direct violence doesn't guarantee lasting peace, particularly when the root causes of conflict remain unaddressed. They proposed that negative peace often leaves societies in a state of latent tension, which may eventually erupt into renewed conflict. This work provided a significant insight into the potential pitfalls of negative peace, stressing the importance of resolving underlying tensions to achieve sustainable peace.

(Richmond, 2011) made a significant contribution in "A Post-Liberal Peace" to understand the role



of societal systems and structures in perpetuating negative peace. Richmond proposed that liberal peacebuilding, with its emphasis on state-building and top-down approaches, often led to the imposition of negative peace. He argued that these approaches overlook local realities and needs, leading to a form of peace that is unstable and lacks societal buy-in. Richmond's work highlighted the potential dangers of a one-size-fits-all approach to peace building, emphasizing the need for context-specific, locally led efforts.

In the "Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding" (MacGinty, 2013) further explored the role of societal structures in shaping peace processes. Mac Ginty suggested that the global peace building architecture, often dominated by Western ideologies and interests, significantly influences the type of peace achieved in conflict-affected societies. He argued that this dominance often leads to the establishment of negative peace, as peace processes guided by these structures may not adequately address local grievances and root causes of conflict. Mac Ginty's work provided a critical perspective on the influence of global structures on peace processes, highlighting the need for a more inclusive and context-sensitive approach.

(Lederach, & Hampson, 1998) in "Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies" emphasized the need for transformative approaches to peacebuilding. Lederach argued for a shift from negative peace, characterized by the absence of violence, to positive peace, characterized by the presence of justice and reconciliation. He proposed that sustainable peace requires a bottom-up approach, involving local communities in peacebuilding processes and addressing socio-economic and political inequalities. Lederach's work has become a cornerstone in peace studies, underlining the importance of social justice, reconciliation, and local participation in peacebuilding efforts.

Finally, (Barash, 2000) in "Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies" presented a comprehensive overview of various peace theories and approaches. Barash's work underscored the dangers of negative peace and stressed the need for a paradigm shift towards positive peace. He suggested that the pursuit of negative peace, while perhaps easier in the short term, often leads to the perpetuation of harmful power structures and injustices, thereby undermining long-term peace and stability. Barash's book reiterated the importance of striving for positive peace, emphasizing social justice, equitable resource distribution, and conflict transformation.

The body of literature on negative peace reflects a consensus on its inherent limitations and potential pitfalls. However, the role of human agency in perpetuating negative peace remains underexplored and somewhat contentious. While Galtung's work laid the groundwork for understanding the concept of negative peace, subsequent researchers have developed nuanced perspectives on the societal systems and structures that often foster negative peace. Richmond's work and Mac Ginty's research suggest that global peacebuilding structures, heavily influenced by Western ideologies, often contribute to the establishment of negative peace, as they may fail to address local realities and grievances adequately.

In contrast, Ramsbotham emphasize the potential for recurring conflict within societies experiencing negative peace, with unresolved tensions and underlying issues remaining intact. Their work underlines the need for comprehensive peacebuilding efforts that address root causes of conflict, thereby transforming negative peace into positive peace. Wallensteen, Lederach and Barash echo this sentiment, advocating for a shift towards positive peace, marked by social justice, reconciliation, and the resolution of deep-seated conflictual issues.

#### 4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What role do human actions and societal systems play in the establishment of negative peace?
2. How does negative peace impact societal stability and the potential for future conflict?
3. What strategies can be implemented to transform negative peace into positive peace?



## 5. METHODOLOGY

This research employs a mixed-method approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis methods to create a comprehensive understanding of the topic: negative peace and humanity's role in it. This amalgamation of methodologies allows for the holistic exploration of negative peace, its interrelations with human agency, and societal structures. The methods used in this study were majorly constructed based on two types, Qualitative & Quantitative; where the qualitative leans towards analysis such as a literature review, case study analysis, & content analysis.

A systematic literature review forms the foundation of this research. This process involves the meticulous sourcing, reading, and analysis of existing literature related to negative peace, human agency, and societal structures. The literature review provides a broad context within which this research is situated. It aids in understanding the current scholarly discourse, the primary theories and models in the field, and the gaps that this study aims to address. This review focuses on academic articles, reports, and books from the fields of peace and conflict studies, sociology, political science, and psychology. Literature is sourced from reputable databases such as JSTOR, EBSCOhost, ProQuest, Google Scholar, and university libraries. Special attention is given to seminal works and the most recent publications to ensure a balanced understanding of the research topic's evolution.

A Case Study analysis allows us to add depth to the insights drawn from the literature review, the research employs case study analysis. This method involves the detailed examination of instances of negative peace in various societal contexts. The case studies are chosen based on their relevance to the research questions, their representativeness of different societal and political contexts, and their availability of data. It enables a more nuanced understanding of the role of human agency and societal structures in the establishment and perpetuation of negative peace. Each case is analyzed using a standardized framework to ensure consistency and comparability. This framework includes factors such as the nature of societal structures, the role of human agency, the manifestations of negative peace, and the subsequent impacts on societal stability.

Content Analysis: Content analysis of historical and contemporary peace processes and negotiations forms a significant part of this research. This method involves the systematic coding and interpretation of text data to identify patterns, themes, and biases. It allows for the exploration of the discourse surrounding peace processes, providing insights into the underlying motivations, power dynamics, and societal structures that may contribute to negative peace. Primary sources such as peace treaties, negotiation transcripts, political speeches, and policy documents are analyzed, as well as secondary sources such as media reports, academic articles, and commentaries. This analysis provides valuable insights into how societal structures and human agency interact in real-world peace processes, complementing the theoretical understanding derived from the literature review and the contextual insights from the case studies.

Quantitative Analysis: While the bulk of this research leans towards qualitative methods, quantitative analysis plays an essential role in validating and supplementing the qualitative findings. This analysis involves the statistical examination of data related to negative peace, societal stability, and potential conflict recurrence. Data are sourced from international databases, including those managed by the World Bank, United Nations, and various non-governmental organizations working in the field of peace and conflict studies. Quantitative analysis allows for the identification of correlations and trends over time and across different societal contexts. It provides empirical evidence that supports or challenges the theoretical assumptions and qualitative findings of the research.

The mixed-method approach offers a balanced and comprehensive exploration of the research topic. The qualitative methods provide a deep, nuanced understanding, while the quantitative methods offer broad, generalizable insights. This methodology, therefore, ensures a robust and holistic understanding of the role of humanity in the manifestation of negative peace.





## 6. DISCUSSION

The exploration of negative peace, characterized by the absence of overt conflict while latent tensions and unresolved issues remain, is a topic of profound complexity and significant relevance in the field of peace studies. This paper examines the intricate role humanity plays, through individual actions and societal structures, in the establishment and perpetuation of negative peace.

Societal structures have a significant influence on the dynamics of peace within a society and can directly and indirectly contribute to negative peace. These structures encompass political systems, socio-economic institutions, and cultural norms that can either foster or hinder peace. In societies marked by significant social inequalities, power disparities, and restricted access to resources, negative peace often prevails. In such societies, those in power might suppress overt conflict to maintain the status quo, ignoring the underlying issues that may cause conflict.

An example is an autocratic government that suppresses dissent to maintain a semblance of peace. However, without tackling the root causes of dissent, such as economic disparity or political exclusion, the society remains trapped in a state of negative peace. The societal peace is superficial, and the suppressed dissent can eventually lead to an outbreak of violence or conflict if the root issues are not addressed.

Individual human actions or human agency is another crucial factor in perpetuating negative peace. While individuals function within societal structures, their actions and decisions can either challenge or reinforce these structures. For instance, individuals might avoid conflict to maintain peace, reinforcing negative peace. However, this avoidance does not resolve the underlying issues that could lead to conflict. Conversely, individuals can challenge societal structures and advocate for positive change, thus disrupting negative peace and encouraging the resolution of root issues.

The role of individuals in this context is multifaceted and depends on various factors, including their position within societal structures, their access to resources, and their personal beliefs and values. This suggests that while societal structures have a significant influence on the manifestation of negative peace, human agency can also play a crucial role (Goodhand, 2003).

Negative peace has significant implications for societal stability. Societies experiencing negative peace often harbor unresolved tensions and disparities that can undermine societal cohesion and stability. For example, societies with significant socio-economic disparities may experience widespread discontent and resentment among marginalized groups. While such feelings might not immediately lead to violent conflict, they can undermine societal cohesion and potentially escalate into conflict if not addressed (Roggers, 1999).

Negative peace often coincides with social injustice. In societies where negative peace is prevalent, certain groups might be marginalized, and their rights and needs may be overlooked. These injustices can further contribute to societal instability. They can foster resentment and discontent, which can potentially escalate into conflict if not addressed.

The transformation of negative peace into positive peace requires addressing the root causes of conflict, promoting social justice, and fostering harmonious relationships within society. According to Lederach and Barash, transformative peacebuilding approaches can be instrumental in this regard. These approaches emphasize the need for comprehensive and inclusive peace processes that take into account the needs and rights of all societal groups (Giddens, 1984).

The transformation of negative peace into positive peace is not a straightforward process. It requires a deep understanding of the underlying causes of conflict, as well as a commitment to addressing these issues. It also necessitates the involvement of all societal groups in the peace process to ensure that everyone's needs and rights are acknowledged and addressed. Moreover, it involves challenging existing societal structures that perpetuate inequality and exclusion, and fostering new structures that promote equality, inclusion, and justice.

In many societies, the transformation from negative to positive peace also requires a shift in



mindset. This involves recognizing that peace is more than just the absence of conflict - it is also about the presence of justice and harmonious relationships. It requires acknowledging that while negative peace might bring temporary calm, it does not address the root causes of conflict and can potentially lead to future conflicts. Therefore, the pursuit of positive peace is not just a moral imperative, but also a pragmatic strategy for ensuring long-term societal stability and progress.

Education and awareness-raising can play a crucial role in promoting this shift in mindset. By educating people about the dangers of negative peace and the benefits of positive peace, societies can foster a culture of peace that goes beyond mere conflict avoidance and actively seeks to address the root causes of conflict. This involves not only formal education in schools and universities, but also informal education through media, community dialogues, and other platforms (Boulding, 1977).

In addition to education, advocacy and activism can also play a vital role in promoting positive peace. Individuals and groups can advocate for social justice, challenge oppressive societal structures, and push for the resolution of underlying conflicts. They can also support peacebuilding initiatives that aim to transform negative peace into positive peace, such as mediation, reconciliation, and community development programs.

The role of international actors and institutions is also worth noting in this context. These actors can support the transformation from negative to positive peace by providing financial and technical assistance, facilitating peace processes, and promoting international norms and standards related to peace and justice. They can also exert pressure on governments and other powerful actors to address the root causes of conflict and promote positive peace.

## 7. RESULTS

The results from this study reveal a complex network of influences that contribute to the establishment and maintenance of negative peace. While societal systems seem to play a larger role in this process, individual human actions, often driven by these systems, also have a significant influence.

- 7.1. Role of Societal Structures:** The study underscores the role of societal structures, particularly those related to socio-economic and political domains, in fostering negative peace. These structures often create disparities in wealth, power, and opportunities, thereby breeding underlying tensions within the society. While these tensions may not immediately result in violent conflict, they contribute to a state of negative peace, where harmony exists only on the surface. The absence of direct violence, in this case, does not signify genuine peace but rather a temporary hiatus in open conflict, often due to an imbalance of power or the suppression of dissent.

For example, authoritarian regimes may maintain negative peace by curtailing civil liberties and stifling opposition. This semblance of peace, however, is often marked by fear and oppression, with the potential for conflict simmering beneath the surface. Similarly, economic systems that perpetuate inequality can contribute to negative peace by creating divisions and grievances within society that are not openly addressed, leading to a fragile peace that could easily devolve into conflict.

- 7.2. Human Action:** This research indicates that human actions, influenced by societal structures, play a crucial role in the manifestation of negative peace. Individuals, acting within the constraints and possibilities offered by their societal systems, can either challenge or uphold negative peace. Actions that uphold negative peace often involve passive acceptance of injustice or active participation in oppressive structures. For example, individuals may accept discriminatory practices due to social conditioning or fear of reprisals, thereby contributing to a state of negative peace. Conversely, individuals can challenge negative peace by advocating for justice, equity, and the transformation of oppressive societal structures.

However, the role of individual actions in establishing negative peace should not be overstated. Human actions do not occur in a vacuum but are shaped by broader societal structures. Therefore, while individuals can influence the type of peace that prevails in a society, their actions are often constrained



by the societal systems in which they operate.

**7.3. Potential dangers of Negative Peace:** The findings of this study also highlight the potential dangers of negative peace. Negative peace, by its nature, is unstable and carries the risk of leading to future conflict. The case studies analyzed as part of this research clearly demonstrate this risk. Societies experiencing negative peace often harbor unresolved tensions and grievances that can erupt into conflict if not adequately addressed. These tensions may stem from various sources, including social, economic, or political disparities, and can be exacerbated by oppressive societal structures or discriminatory practices.

Furthermore, negative peace often coincides with social injustice, further undermining societal stability. In situations of negative peace, injustices may be ignored or suppressed rather than addressed and resolved. This not only perpetuates these injustices but can also breed resentment and hostility, thereby sowing the seeds for future conflict. As such, negative peace can create a vicious cycle of conflict and temporary peace, with unresolved issues continually resurfacing and disrupting societal harmony.

The results of this study suggest that both societal structures and individual human actions contribute to the establishment and maintenance of negative peace. However, societal systems, particularly those that perpetuate inequality and injustice, appear to have a more significant influence. Negative peace, characterized by the absence of direct violence without addressing the root causes of conflict, can undermine societal stability and perpetuate social injustice. As such, efforts to transform negative peace into positive peace, marked by justice, equity, and harmonious relationships, are essential for achieving sustainable societal progress.

## CONCLUSION

The concept of negative peace, characterized by the absence of direct conflict without necessarily resolving the root causes, poses a complex and multifaceted issue. This study aimed to explore the role of humanity in perpetuating negative peace and its implications for societal stability. Our findings suggest that both human agency and societal structures play pivotal roles in the manifestation of negative peace. However, it's crucial to acknowledge that these two elements are intricately linked, influencing and shaping each other continuously.

Societal structures, particularly those that perpetuate inequality and injustice, were found to have a profound influence on the establishment and maintenance of negative peace. These structures, which can encompass economic, political, and social systems, often create conditions where conflict is suppressed but not adequately addressed. Such a scenario can lead to a situation where the peace that prevails is essentially negative, characterized by the absence of conflict rather than the presence of justice and harmony.

On the other hand, human actions, though influenced by societal structures, also contribute to the creation and maintenance of negative peace. People's choices, behaviors, and interactions can reinforce negative peace by avoiding conflict or suppressing dissent without addressing underlying issues. However, it's also important to note that human agency, despite being influenced by societal structures, has the potential to challenge and change these very structures. It is this dual role of human agency, as both a product and a producer of societal structures that makes the relationship between humanity and negative peace so complex and intriguing.

## 8. RECOMMENDATIONS

Understanding the complexities of negative peace and its connection with human behavior and societal structures is just the first step. Implementing strategies to transform negative peace into positive peace is the next critical challenge. This section outlines a comprehensive plan for moving forward, offering recommendations that cater to the multi-faceted nature of peace.

**8.1. Promotion of Social Justice:** The Promotion of Social Justice is central to transforming negative





peace into positive peace. Social justice refers to a societal condition where all individuals have equal access to resources and opportunities, and their human rights are respected and protected. In the context of negative peace, societal structures often perpetuate inequality and injustice, leading to the suppression of underlying tensions rather than their resolution. This suppression can lead to the absence of direct violence, but the presence of structural violence, thereby maintaining a state of negative peace. Implementing social justice begins with recognizing and addressing structural inequalities. Governments, NGOs, and international organizations should work in concert to identify these inequalities and develop policies that target their root causes. This could involve reforms in areas such as education, healthcare, and economic policy to ensure equal access to opportunities and resources. It is important to note that the promotion of social justice is not a quick fix. It requires a long-term commitment and continuous efforts to make incremental changes that can eventually lead to significant societal transformation.

- 8.2. Inclusive Peace Processes:** Inclusive Peace Processes is another crucial step towards transforming negative peace into positive peace. Often, peace processes are controlled by a small group of powerful actors, which can lead to the exclusion of marginalized groups. This exclusion can result in peace agreements that do not address the needs and grievances of all parties, thereby perpetuating negative peace.

To ensure inclusivity, peace processes should be democratized, allowing for the participation of diverse groups, including women, ethnic minorities, and other marginalized communities. Their unique perspectives and experiences can provide valuable insights into the root causes of conflict and potential pathways to sustainable peace. Furthermore, an inclusive peace process can foster a sense of ownership among all stakeholders, increasing the likelihood of successful implementation and long-term stability.

- 8.3. Education and Awareness:** Education and awareness are potent tools for transforming societal attitudes and behaviors. Raising awareness about the dangers of negative peace can challenge complacency and stimulate efforts to strive for a more sustainable, positive peace. This can be achieved through formal education systems, media campaigns, community workshops, and other forms of public engagement.

In the formal education system, curricula should incorporate peace studies, emphasizing the difference between positive and negative peace, and the importance of social justice in achieving sustainable peace. Media campaigns can also play a vital role in disseminating these concepts to a wider audience. Community workshops can offer a more interactive platform for discussing these issues, providing opportunities for individuals to engage in dialogue, share experiences, and develop a shared understanding of peace.

Additionally, awareness should be raised about the role of societal structures in perpetuating negative peace. Understanding the impact of these structures can empower individuals to challenge and change them. This could involve advocating for policy reforms, participating in peaceful protests, or engaging in social entrepreneurship to address structural inequalities.

Transforming negative peace into positive peace requires a comprehensive approach that addresses both the symptoms and root causes of conflict. The promotion of social justice, inclusive peace processes, and education and awareness are crucial components of this approach. By implementing these strategies, societies can move beyond the mere absence of direct violence and work towards a state of peace characterized by justice, equity, and harmonious relationships.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Barash, D. P. (2000). *Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies*. Oxford University Press.
- [2] Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167- 191.
- [3] Lederach, J. P., & Hampson, F. O. (1998). Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies. *International Journal*, 53(4), 799.
- [4] Mac Ginty, R. (2013). *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding*. Routledge.



- [5] Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T., & Miall, H. (2011). Contemporary conflict resolution. Polity.
- [6] Richmond, O. P. (2011). A post-liberal peace. Routledge.
- [7] Wallensteen, P. (2018). Understanding conflict resolution. *Understanding Conflict Resolution*, 1-448.
- [8] Bloomsbury, Dictionary of Word Origins, p. 387, quoted in ‘Buddhism and Peace’ written by Ven. B. Khemanando, (Calcutta: Lazo Print, 1995).
- [9] P. Aarne Vesilind, Peace engineering: when personal values and engineering careers converge, (USA: Lakeshore Press, 2005), p. 43.
- [10] Boulding, Kenneth, 1977. ‘Twelve Friendly Quarrels with Johan Galtung’, *Journal of Peace Research* 14(1): 75-86.
- [11] Galtung, Johan, 1985. ‘Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses’, *Journal of Peace Research* 22(2): 145.
- [12] Giddens, Anthony, 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- [13] Rogers, Paul & Oliver Ramsbotham, 1999. ‘Then and Now: Peace Research - Past and Future’, *Political Studies* 47(4): 740-754.
- [14] Goodhand, Jonathan, 2003. ‘Enduring Disorder and Persistent Poverty: A Review of the Linkages Between War and Chronic Poverty’, *World Development* 31(3): 629-646.