ACT : Constructive Personal Reflections on
ACT as such and the ASIAS

ASSIGNMENT: What Theoretical, Methodological and Practice Indicative Insights have you acquired in ACT

From your very personal perspective – discern and comment on the following three aspects of the ACT course (length: as short as you feel adequate to convey your point but should not exceed 1,5 pages): What (1) theoretical, (2) methodological and (3) practice indicative insights would you say have been conveyed to you in this course. Can you imagine applying the basics of solution-oriented analysis as taught in this seminar in your future academic and field endeavors? Why?

1- MADELINE BRENNAN

(1) Theoretical Insights

Transcend's transformative peace theory is largely informed by the foundational principles of Ghandian ethics – empathy, creativity and nonviolence. These principles guide parties towards a sustainable solution to conflict by enabling parties to transform their initial stance in the dispute toward one that is more conducive to the attainment of a collective goal. Much of what we have learned is based on the premise that in order to prevent violence and realize the potential of a conflict, a transformation must occur, thus giving the name of advanced conflict transformation.

Central to this theory is the assumption that conflict is the result of incompatible goals and by adopting a solution-indicative approach one can find compatible goals for conflict parties– thereby creating potential for a positive peace. As such, foundational to Transcend's conflict transformation theory is the promotion of positive peace as distinct to negative peace, with positive peace being a sustainable peace that ensures the wellbeing and livelihood of individuals through the establishment of collaborative and supportive relationships. Furthermore, it should be noted the emphasis that this theory places on structural violence. This is considered the root cause of much injustice and consequently, much conflict. As such, discovering therapies to remedy structural, cultural and both indirect and direct violence is paramount to the Transcend approach. The theory also proposes the adoption of the DPT model for conflict analysis, wherein resolutions are formed based on a thorough examination of history of conflict and its root causes (diagnosis) and current tensions and forecast (prognosis). In the therapy section there is a strong emphasis on reconciliation and the remedying of past grievances between parties – which is achieved through healing based on historical analysis.

(2) Methodological Insights

In order to understand Transcend's methodology one must first understand the goals of resolution. What is the objective of transformative conflict resolution?

Ultimately, it is to create a viable, sustainable solution that placates all parties. First of all however, we must identify the underlying conflict. This is so that we might determine what each party involved wants in order to create a solution that placates all parties. This leads us to the adoption of Transcend's three-part methodology, which follows a model based on the following: Mapping – Legitimizing – Bridging.

Part 1– Mapping the Conflict: During the mapping process we must first determine who the main actors are and what are their wishes. What do they want from this conflict? Where do they stand in relation to others involved? What future do they envisage for themselves and the people they seek to represent? This can only be understood through proper, empathic dialogue, facilitated in an objective, nonpartisan manner by an external party that can exercise neutrality in the proceedings. Conflict parties must be dealt with separately and their trust must be earned in the process. In order to carry this out successfully one must exercise, patience, understanding and empathy – all characteristics of nonviolent communication.

Part 2– Legitimizing the Conflict: This component of the process requires a practical evaluation of the demands and desires as articulated by parties in the initial stage. One must determine whether individual demands can be considered legitimate or illegitimate. The legitimacy of a goal can be determined by assessing the demand within an ethical framework. Thus, in order to fulfill the legitimization component of the process one must exercise a strong knowledge of law, international law, human rights concepts, ethics, morality and a strong understanding of the basic needs approach. *Part 3 – Bridging*: The final component of the methodology involves finding a solution that bridges the distance between parties and satisfies the legitimate goals that were stated in the first instance of dialogue. In order to achieve this final method one must exercise creativity, imagination and innovation in the search to find an answer with which all parties are content. This bridging process also harnesses the aforementioned potential for conflict to be a source of creativity rather than a source of destruction – a fundamental underpinning of the conflict transformation process – the avoidance of violence.

(3) Practice Indicative Insights

Traditional approaches to peace-building and conflict resolution assume that there are four potential outcomes to a conflict: those being that either A or B wins; a solution is postponed; or a solution is created that neither A nor B are happy with. However, Professor Galtung proposes that there is in fact a fifth potential outcome to

resolution, if one follows the aforementioned methodology, with the fifth outcome being that a solution is reached that placates both A and B (and any additional parties), and that makes all parties feel as though they have "won" in some way or another. Integral to realizing this goal is a strong focus on basic human needs – such as physical wellbeing and cultural or individual identity.

In applying the aforementioned theoretical and methodological insights to the conflict analyses we have completed throughout the semester the importance of having a strong ethical framework from which to apply methodology has become clear – particularly in the case of negotiating a solution that placates all parties. Similarly, I have realized the significance of historical insights to dispute resolution – particularly in cases wherein structural and cultural violence is present, as in order to change present behaviors structural obstructions to peace must first be addressed, challenged and removed. I can certainly envision applying the basis of solution-oriented analysis in the future, as I believe it encourages a more holistic view of conflicts, thereby paving the way for the creation of more sustainable solutions – and a more sustainable peace.

2-SHEREE GREEN

When a patient presents with an illness a doctor of medicine would conduct their systematic checks and balances (a synthesis of intuition, analysis and deduction) based on the symptoms presented. The illness would then be diagnosed, and if no alleviation methods were to be applied, a doctor would be able to deduce a feasible prognosis of the case and its future implications on the patient and its environment pursuant to the nature and relation of the illness to the body and the outside world. The doctor will propose a cure to this illness and perhaps prescribe some medicine (therapy) to abate the symptoms and achieve this goal. If the doctor is competent and proficient and is able to view the problem in a holistic sense (across numerous discipline areas), they will understand that the patient is subject to a multitude of variations and influences in their life, all effecting the ability of the patient to function. Perhaps the patient is presenting with symptoms of severe fatigue and some malnutrition. By asking a broad range of questions, the doctor learns that the patient has a job in which their boss dictates an 85-hour working week. In continuity to this by looking into the patient's history the doctor learns the patient comes from a segment of society that has a predisposition to malnutrition (due to both cultural and economic factors). Is it enough that the doctor prescribes the patient with a sleeping tablet and instructs them to eat more green vegetables?

What factors and relations are causing the symptoms? If we analyze systematically

and thoroughly we see that therein lie some contradictions: boss wants worker at maximum capacity but worker needs rest to function; worker needs money to support family, boss exploits this advantage; worker needs nutrition however lives in a country far from their place of birth and does not have access to their general diet. However this is not all that the doctor needs to factor in. The worker is a member of society and also part of a hierarchical structure. The boss is in a position of power, which emanates from the top and from the world order in which the company sits. The boss has many powerful means at their disposal, the worker not so much. The boss recognizes that the worker forms part of a society in which culture dictates that working 85 hours a week is demanded – he further exploits this fact (in fact he may be a proponent to its genesis). The worker wants to be healthy but cannot afford to pay for help as the mechanisms to help are beyond his financial reach. The worker is the subject of direct and indirect violence (both structural and cultural). "Don't work and you will be fired, I will find someone else to work in these conditions!" "No money no food on the table for your family!" How does one seek help when the system robs the opportunity?

Fault lines show themselves. If contradictions are not mapped and bridged then they will inevitability turn into conflict. It turns out that our patient is not the only unhappy worker – there are many unhappy workers subject to the same conditions. Discontent rises throughout the company. Those in power try to quiet the discontent with tighter rules and regulations, threats and punishment. The management and the bosses are the ends of the limbs of creature that tries to control them all. Workers get sick, maybe even die. Economically, families suffer due to lack of income. Society suffers due to unhappy and unhealthy members who have no avenue in which to support themselves. Rights to self-determination are taken. The power echelons grow fearful as the decaying order in which they subscribe starts cracking from the periphery. What next? New company laws dictating unequal terms for workers, new State laws dictating companies have unfettered control of their workers and the right to abuse them. We see now how ignorant and ineffective the prescription of a sleeping tablet would be. Before this gets out of hand, let us sit down and talk about our issues, the worker suggests. Dialectics.

The worker and the boss sit down to discuss their values and goals in front of a third party. Who is this third party, the company's human resource manager? Most certainly not, they are part of the machine that seeks to control (much like the United States trying to mediate in the Palestinian/Israeli conflict; butt out America the stench of your self interest offends those you purport to help). Goals and values are discussed in front of an independent third party who puts the parties on equal terms. Boss insinuates that he needs his worker to preform 85 hours a week. The worker advises that he needs 8 hours sleep a night to function. What can we see?

Antagonistic goals. However the bosses request is an illegitimate goal, he does not need his goal he *wants* it in order to produce maximum capacity at minimum cost, the workers request however is a legitimate goal vis-à-vis basic human needs and human rights. The worker learns that the boss has a boss (imagine his surprise), one who is very demanding and intimidating, threatening to fire him if he does not make his workers perform. Aha! There are never just two parties to a conflict, introduce another actor (this is perhaps our mistake on our Venezuelan paper, we were so focused on fixing how the puppets danced together that we forgot to realize that the puppets can only stop dancing once the master stops pulling the strings!). We see here that both the boss and the worker would actually like to work less and are fearful of their management – complementary goals, symbiosis. The boss learns that the worker and his family are lacking in basic nutrition and cannot afford the means to help themselves. The worker learns that the boss has a severely ill child who cries all night and keeps him awake. Empathy.

How do we overcome all of the obstacles? What means do all of our actors have to employ? What is their positional relation in the system and how do we change the relations of interaction? One looks to empirical based evidence in order to propose solutions that are creative, concrete and constructive measures of fostering mutual and equal benefits in all patterns of interactions. Lets look into the past, what existed before this idea of an 85-hour working week, did we invent this? No, says the boss, I am Australian we actually invented the idea of 8 hours work, 8 hours rest and 8 hours play. How did we get so far from our cultural heritage? (much like the solution for Latin America, what existed before their colonizers bestowed their neoliberal model upon them – the answer may lie in the Integral Cooperation Accord). We need balance, ying and yang. The food education system in this country is not enough they agree, can we think of way in which based on our respective cultural needs and available mechanisms that we can change this? Solutions proposed as questions to be explored, not answers unilaterally directed from one in power to the other that is not. The worker expresses his dreams of working in an alternative field but the lack of social mobility within the system prevents this. Lets work together for mutual and reciprocal benefits to see what we can do to achieve this.

The above is an analysis of a conflict on a micro level. In saying this, the splendor of using DPT method means one can successfully analyze conflict on a micro, meso and meta level. So long as relations are analyzed adequately along the four main spheres of power, Political, Economic, Military and Cultural (PEMC) one will be able to obtain a holistic analysis of the symptoms presented. Starting from what is obvious and known and working back to the less so, exploring relations (ATIMIA), contradictions and identifying fault lines. Only accepting truth based on evidence, going as far back in history as required in order to see the complete picture. Not only can I imagine applying the fundamental basics of SICA, I have actually started implementing the

theory in my work practice. I have begun to analyze issues in a way in which I have never practiced before and I feel that I am getting very good results. The methodical nature in which it makes one almost involuntarily engage with is superb. In continuity to this, proposing solutions as questions is a very passive way to make a suggestion and to get parties thinking. I have been finding many more people receptive to my suggestions when I pose them as questions, or propose a mutually beneficial situation for both.

3-Mark Wagdy Abdelsayed

<u>Part One:</u>
Theoretical:
Throughout our studies of the relationship between Islam and the West, Africa, the Americas, Europe and Asia I have learned a number of new theoretical concepts and reconceptualised numerous ideas. Before this course I had no knowledge that there was such a variety of different interpretations about ownership in Africa (Galtung et al. 2014a). This greater recognition of the variety of different ways ownership is conceptualised by differing African cultures and groups has made me even more horrified over the imposition of European style statism into Africa; and emphasised the importance of advocating for federation (Galtung et al. 2014a).
Learning that developed states can be classified as Occident 1's which means states that are always expanding; has caused me to revaluate my life and the lives of people around me when contemplating what are the more sustainable and satisfying lifestyle choices then constant expansion (Galtung et al. 2014a).

When examining the concepts of 'soft' and 'hard' power throughout the course I've had to acknowledge that the distinction is rather absurd when considering that you're are just as likely to die if you do not have access to the right resources and people are still going to be disenfranchised if 'mainstream' culture and society marginalises them (Galtung et al. 2014b). The knowledge that free trade really just means preferential trade which has transformed my understanding and opinion of the speeches and polices recommended by most prominent economic institutions and governments (Galtung et al. 2014b). Furthermore, my ability to discern what goals and policies actors intends to pursue has improved by studying concepts which when contrasted to what an actor is saying and doing reveal contradictions and thus the truth (Galtung et al. 2014c). These concepts include the pretext, the subtext, supertext; and the geographic, historical and spatial contexts (Galtung et al. 2014c).

Johan Galtung's conception of what it means to be a world power with the emphasis on empathy, brilliant ideas and providing mutually beneficial and neutral solutions through dialogue is just completely different from the perspective espoused by most politicians and news media which emphasises GDP, military power and dominating other states (Galtung et al. 2014b). The idea of the Hippocratic Oath should apply to social scientists and administrators' is rather revolutionary in its simplicity; and I can't comprehend why the idea isn't more popular (Galtung et al. 2014a). The Solution Indicative Conflict Analysis (SICA) method that I have been studying throughout the last term is one of the most valuable tools I have acquired in my

academic career (Galtung & Grant-Hayford 2014). I've already began to consider how I will employ this method in upcoming major assignments; and if I become a mediator or administrator I can imagine that employing this method on a day-to-day basis (Galtung & Grant-Hayford 2014).

Methodological:
The SICA is built on mapping the relationships between participants to discern the contradictions to successfully transform the relationship (Galtung & Grant-Hayford 2014). The methodology of the Solution Indicative Conflict is divided into diagnosis, prognosis and therapy (DPT); politics, economy, culture and military (PECM); and mapping, legitimising and bridging (MLB) (Galtung & Grant-Hayford 2014). The Diagnosis-Prognosis-Therapy approach pioneered by Galtung unlike the vast majority of approaches in social-science is simultaneously solution and future-oriented; drawing upon engineering and medical sciences (Galtung 2008, p. 7). Galtung's methodology especially the prognosis and therapy sections are directly developed from Gandhi's fourth point: "Image the future or you will never get there" (Galtung et al. 2014c; Galtung 2007). From this perspective Galtung developed the four-field table with its focus on positive past, negative past, positive future and negative future (Galtung et al. 2014c).

The four-field table can be employed on both a macro and micro level to discern how an actors, organizations and nation-states previous experiences, fears and aspirations can shape their responses and positions (Galtung et al. 2014c). One of the most invaluable aspects of Galtung's methodology is the importance of structural fault lines which Galtung proposes are responsible for resurgences of conflict (Galtung et al. 2014b; Galtung & Grant-Hayford 2014). Through dividing a conflict into its political, economic, cultural and military aspects and then applying the DPT method SICA allows us to locate these structural fault lines and contradictions which stimulate ongoing conflict (Galtung et al. 2014b). The Solution Indicative Conflict Analysis is a more Oriental approach to locating contradictions rather than the traditional Western approach which examines cycles (Galtung et al. 2014c). I think that the Galtung approach is a fantastic tool for developing a healthy and sustainable future both personally and professionally because it's constructed on the basis that past experiences shape future endeavours; and the location of all the structural fault lines is dependent on how extensively the conflict is researched (Galtung et al. 2014b; Galtung et al. 2014c).

Practical:
There have been a number of practical insights conveyed throughout this course including the importance of engaging in open and honest dialogue which include perpetrators releasing appropriate apologies; constructing accurate education programs which emphasis human rights; the significance of further research into the reconciliation process; and the continuing devastating impact of the unresolved issue of colonialism (Galtung 2008, p. 235-236). Throughout this course I was appalled to learn how many conflicts throughout Africa and the Americas are still perpetuated by colonialism and Western influence (Keramati 2006, p. 89-91). Understanding these structural fault lines is crucial to resolving these conflicts through advocating for Truth and Reconciliation Commission(s) and education reforms.

Western powers need to construct apologies which acknowledge the atrocities committed; and formulate a future together with Non-Western states (Galtung 2008, p. 256-36). This course has emphasised once more that the United States of America needs to make significant adjustments in how it behaves and the policies it pursues (Galtung et al. 2014b). The United States government needs to make simple adjustments to their behaviour like being more respectful to improve their relationship with their Latin American neighbours as they become more economically prosperous (Galtung et al. 2014b).The United States could learn a lot from its South American neighbours with their extensive history of solving conflict through mutual co-operation and discussion (Galtung et al. 2014b).

The transcend approach to peacebuilding with its focus on promoting acceptable common interests and values between parties may have some insights into the Israeli-Palestinian crisis (Galtung et al. 2014c). Galtung suggests that having Israel and Palestine acknowledging and recognizing each other's tragic experiences could be a fundamental component of building peace between Palestine and Israel (Galtung et al. 2014c). This approach towards peacebuilding can have fantastic results as demonstrated by Northeast Asia Regional Peacebuilding Institute (NARPI) which works towards building trust, understanding and transforming relationships between Asians of different backgrounds (Galtung et al. 2014c).

4-DAVID HALE

PART 1 – PERSONAL REFLECTION

The significance of introducing and teaching the concept 'conflict transformation' cannot be overstated. Casual observers (and casual practitioners) are undoubtedly familiar with the phrase, but unfortunately this familiarity is largely in name only. Perhaps its the misfortune of the modern transdisciplinary, time-poor western world that phrases such as 'do no harm', 'conflict sensitivity', 'structural violence' and 'conflict transformation' are used as slogans rather than informed approaches. In light of that, I found the course extremely beneficial to frame my own work here in Myanmar.

Theoretical insights

Clearly, the course was underpinned by the preposition that whenever there is violence, there is an unresolved conflict. Moreover, there is an incompatibility of goals (including means) that has not been transformed or transcended. The benefit of this theoretical framework is its grounding in a practical solutions-based approach.

Two key concepts help inform this basic premise. The first, is the notion that conflict can be direct, or structural between parties (each with their own interests). This structural violence may be defined as the means through which a system prevents an individual from fulfilling their full potential. While a critical barrier to conflict

transformation, structural violence is only one of a range of variables that perpetuates conflict – be it violent or otherwise.

'Positive peace' is the second key concept. 'Conflict resolution' is commonly assessed as the absence of violent conflict. For Professor Galtung, this is defined as 'negative peace'. This is an important precursor to conflict transformation, but not a durable solution in and of itself. In the context of negative peace, conflict still exists – even if its expression is less obvious. For Myanmar, the negotiation of a nationwide ceasefire agreement will be universally celebrated; the 'guns will be silenced' for the first time in six decades. Yet, a comprehensive political dialogue process (wherein the competing goals are established and durable political, social and cultural solutions identified) is required to achieve 'positive peace'. This type of resolution is the sum of consensual values in the community, the creation of collaborative and supportive relationships in place of tensions.

Methodological insights

Undoubtedly, the primary value of the ACT course has been in introducing and enabling a range of methodological tools to promote conflict transformation. This analysis is structured into diagnosis, prognosis and therapy – wherein "healing is built on analysis and forecasting". The key approaches to this model include:

1. Analysing actors, the context and the observable antagonisms and contradictions of their goals through the PEMC model as the overarching framework.
2. Legitimising goals through three criteria – law (which is often problematic), human rights (including economic and social rights), and basic human needs (survival, wellbeing, freedom of the mind and identity of the spirit).
3. Bridging the legitimate goals through conflict sensitive solutions.

As noted during the course, this search for incompatible dynamics may become problematic when
the interests of the combatants – eg a state and a non-state armed group – overlap in entrenched conflict. The war economy in Myanmar (or indeed the stalemate in war on drugs) is a case in point. Clearly, there are a series of incompatible goals that sparked and sustained the conflict, but one must explore the common interests that are also prolonging the violence, eg exploitation of resources, taxation revenue, access to (forced) recruits. While not the driver of the conflict, it is an obstacle that must be transformed alongside the other contradictory goals – perhaps part of the broader holistic analysis, rather than the pure dialectic lens.

Practical insights

The solution-orientated analysis has provided two key practical insights that have already informed my work in Myanmar. First, unlike my previous work in strategic security analysis, I have come to favour a multiperspective and transdisciplinary approach to conflict analysis to develop a holistic vantage point (vertical analysis that

identifies the 'why', rather than simply the 'where'). The Myanmar Peace Center has recently commenced a retrospective analysis of conflict triggers, which is now including this theoretical outlook and analytical framework.

Second is the true importance of skilled conflict mediators. A combination of fear, pride and logistics have precluded the formal use of external (and independent) conflict mediators here in Myanmar. Informally, mediators, such as Professor Galtung, have engaged and advised stakeholders, but there remains no institutionalised modality for international conflict mediators. Seeing first-hand how significantly trust can inhibit the process has been telling. Talks remain cordial, but are floundering. Professor Galtung's advice that 'every sentence must end with a question mark not an explanation mark' resonates profoundly. There is little doubt this will change over time. Hopefully though the catalyst for this change is not more unnecessary suffering.

5-DAVID JEBAKUMAR

Part One

Coming into this course with no prior knowledge of conflict analysis, I feel I now have a better grasp of some of the broader principles involved in posing creative, holistic solutions to complex issues. Whilst my interests lie outside of the formal realm of peace and conflict studies, the skills I have learnt in this course complement my studies in development and secondary education. Conflict is ubiquitous. Though the nature of conflict may vary, the process of arriving at a solution is broadly the same. The DPT three step process of analysing a situation, anticipating how the situation might develop and providing specific, relevant therapies is a process I imagine I will find myself using to analyse anything from conflicts between development workers and locals to conflicts between students in the classroom. If I am to take anything away from this course, it is that conflict is a mess of tangled threads, but merely untangling the threads is not a solution in itself. Ultimately a solution must be daring, creative and sensitive enough to weave those threads into a tapestry. Below are some more specific insights I have gained from this course.

Theoretical

The most useful theoretical concept I gleaned from the course was the notion of moving beyond compromise, which suggests an outcome of mutual disadvantage, towards solutions which are mutually enhancing. Outcomes which are mutually enhancing must be creative and need to draw on new realities. These new realities can be found by looking at other epistemologies and by departing from deeply

ingrained, oppressive structures. For example, why do we construct understandings of territory around national borders? Structural violence is also a useful theoretical concept to apply alongside this.

Methodological

The DPT methodology has been incredibly useful. However, the idea of breaking up DPT into different areas (economic, environmental, military, social, cultural, etc) has been particularly interesting. This provides a very structured method of gaining a holistic view of a situation, and analysing the fault lines between these different strands really helps to shed light on tensions.

Practice

In reflecting on practice, I think back to the first video lecture by Professor Galtung that was shared with us. Two things come to mind. First was a comment about basic needs. The most important thing is that no solution should deprive an individual of basic needs, and it is the job of the mediator to keep these in focus. The second was a comment about human nature. Professor Galtung said that in mediation it is important to smile, even laugh to show that you can – but to always be careful, and to always pay attention.

6-IANTHEA CONELLY

PART 1

Professor Galtung's approach to peace studies is unique in its holistic focus. Exploring conflict in terms of power dynamics is nothing new, however Galtung goes further to explore the root causes of conflict from numerous perspectives, and propose creative solutions. Underpinning these solutions is the focus on mutual and equal benefits for all stakeholders, rather than a return to the previous power dynamics with some concessions made for the oppressed parties. This unique approach draws on eastern Daoist traditions, which see events in holistic terms and focusing on oppositions as arising from divergence. The Daoist approach allows for a deeper exploration of the context of conflict, encompassing relations, past, present and future that can create tension; referred to as fault lines. In this respect, Galtung views peace not as an end state, but an ongoing negotiation. This differs from other western-based approaches, based on Cartesian principles of duality, good or bad, right or wrong, in that it recognizes that the lines between defined categories are blurred, there is good in the bad, and bad in the good, and right and wrong are very

subjective terms. In this respect, Galtung's Daoist approach to peace studies is more flexible and holistic, holding far better prospects for creating ongoing peace than western-based Cartesian approaches.

The methodological aspect of Galtung's approach involves the use of Diagnosis-Prognosis-Therapy as a means of assessing prospects for peace. In the diagnosis phase, both historical and contemporary influences are explored in terms of relations between them. For the first part of the Prognosis, the situation is projected into the future with outcomes arising from the position of unaddressed sources of conflict. For the subsequent Prognosis, the projection assumes that conflict has been addressed and therapy applied. The Therapy aspect determines what measures need to be taken in order to achieve mutual and equal benefits for all stakeholders. Also, Galtung explores conflict in terms of Politics, Economics, Military and Culture, which cover the majority of the fault lines in any given conflict. The Diagnosis-Prognosis-Therapy and Politics-Economics-Military-Culture framework is an extremely useful and informative analytical tool to use in assessing conflict situations and prospects for peace. It does not seek to reduce conflict, but acknowledges the fact that conflicts are multi-dimensional and differ in significance between particular actors/groups of actors. Furthermore, the articulation of different actors and their goals adds a deeper understanding of conflicts in context. Galtung's approach makes complex phenomena more legible, allowing for predictability and projection, without reducing conflicts into abstraction. Using these frameworks and approaches to peace and conflict makes it easier to understand the nature of conflict, as well as enabling creative solutions to overcome the root causes of conflict.