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**No Impact – Direct Violence OW’s**

**Direct violence outweighs structural violence**

**Maley 85** (William, The University of New South Wales at Duntroon, “Peace, Needs and Utopia”, Political Studies, XXXIIl, 578-591, Political Studies) CH

The difficulties in Galtung's approach can be seen clearly when one recalls his view that it is probably a disservice to man to try to see either direct or structural violence as the more important. To this it can be replied that, particularly in its most recent formulations, Galtung's idea of structural violence embraces a number of forms which scarcely *anyone* would regard as seriously as the crushing, tearing, piercing, burning, poisoning, evaporation, strangulation, dehydration and starvation which constitute personal somatic violence,'^ To treat being deprived of 'cultural stimuli' as an evil commensurable with being torn to pieces is a step so audacious as to demand very specific moral justitication. This Galtung fails to supply, and as a result, his notion of peace is a very unsatisfactory ideal against which to evaluate a social order.

**A2: Structural Violence = Root Cause**

Discrete causes of war do exist – Structural violence isn’t the root cause

**Patomaki 2** (Heikki, U of Helsinki, The Challenge of Critical Theories: Peace Research at the Start of the New Century’, JPR 38(6), http://www.prio.no/misc/Download.aspx?file=%2Fcscw%2Frd%2FReplication+Data%2Ffile41602\_wjprappendix1.doc.)

What Galtung fails to do is spell out more generally the essential ontological qualities of society. Social systems are open: neither the intrinsic nor the extrinsic condition of closure is, in general, applicable. Social entities – including socio-historically formed social actors and their understandings and relations – can and do change, and any social whole, specified in whatever manner, is susceptible to extrinsic influences, including influences from non-social layers of reality (physical, biological, ecological etc.). In a sense that every event has a real (structured and complex) cause, ubiquity determinism holds; but causality does not have anything to do with constant conjunctions. Causality is about the production of outcomes. Moreover, socio-historically formed human/social beings and their contextual reasons for action are also causally efficacious.

The focus on structural violence instead of direct violence makes preventing war impossible.

Thompson 3 (William, Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for the Study of International Relations at Indiana University, “A Streetcar Named Sarajevo: Catalysts, Multiple Causation Chains, and Rivalry Structures,” International Studies Quarterly, 47(3), AD: 7-10-9) BL

Richard Ned Lebow (2000–2001) has recently invoked what might be called a streetcar interpretation of systemic war and change. According to him, all our structural theories in world politics both overdetermine and underdetermine the explanation of the most important events such as World War I, World War II, or the end of the Cold War. Not only do structural theories tend to fixate on one cause or stream of causation, they are inherently incomplete because the influence of structural causes cannot be known without also identifying the necessary role of catalysts. As long as we ignore the precipitants that actually encourage actors to act, we cannot make accurate generalizations about the relationships between more remote causation and the outcomes that we are trying to explain. Nor can we test the accuracy of such generalizations without accompanying data on the presence or absence of catalysts. In the absence of an appropriate catalyst (or a ‘‘streetcar’’ that failed to arrive), wars might never have happened. Concrete information on their presence (‘‘streetcars’’ that did arrive) might alter our understanding of the explanatory significance of other variables. But since catalysts and contingencies are so difficult to handle theoretically and empirically, perhaps we should focus instead on probing the theoretical role of contingencies via the development of ‘‘what if ’’ scenarios.

**A2: Structural Violence = Root Cause**

There is no root cause of war

**Ahmed 8** (Jan, Bill, Asia Observer, Staff, http://www.asiaobserver.com/component/option,com\_fireboard/Itemid,453/func,view/id,3803/catid,26/.)JR

War arises because of the changing relations of numerous variables--technological, psychic, social, and intellectual. There is no single cause of war. Peace is equilibrium among many forces. Change in any particular force, trend, movement, or policy may at one time make for war, but under other conditions a similar change may make for peace. A state may at one time promote peace by armament, at another time by disarmament, at one time by insistence on its rights, at another time by spirit of conciliation.

All empirical reality denies their claims – Reducing structural disparities has not reduced the tendency toward war and the causes of war are complex

**Rummel 79** (R.J., *Understanding war, power, and peace*, U of Hawaii, http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/NOTE13.HTM#CHAP)

There have been about 350 wars of all kinds since the Battle of Waterloo in 1815, which once and for all defeated Napoleon's lust for power. If this number fairly well represents the frequency of war in history, there have been nearly 13,600 wars since 3,600 B.C.1

The toll of human misery measures around 30,000,000 direct battle deaths since Waterloo and 1,000,000,000 since 3,600 B.C.1a Then there are the uncountable deaths, the broken bodies and lives from the ravages and effects of these wars.

Nor has war abated. Not with civilization. Not with education and literacy. Not with burgeoning international organizations and communications. Not with the swelling library of peace plans and antiwar literature. Not with the mushrooming antiwar movements and demonstrations. In the 25 years after World War II, for so many the war to create and insure peace for generations, some 97 internal and international wars occurred. Total deaths about equal those killed in World War II. On any single day during these 25 years slightly more than 10 internal or international wars were being fought somewhere.1b

Nor is war increasing. Although there are ups and downs in the intensity and scope of warfare, the historical trend is level: a little more than six major international wars per decade and 2,000,000 battle deaths. Around this trend there are at least three cycles of warfare, showing different peaks around every 10, 25, and 50 years.

Empirical analysis is effective and liberating

**Rummel 79** (R.J., *Understanding war, power, and peace*, U of Hawaii, http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/NOTE13.HTM#CHAP)

After all, it is through an intimate, personal experience with our close friends and relatives, with all their virtues and vices, that enables us to see them as individuals and develop reliable expectations (predictions) of their behavior. But yet, we also find that for an understanding of those close to us we must push toward common elements. Certain common needs (hunger, sex), certain common interests (status, love), certain common psychological mechanisms (frustration, ego), certain social and cultural factors (peer-group pressure, cultural norms). Even in our closest relationships, understanding seems to presuppose a mixture of intimate personal knowledge and an insight into common causes, conditions, explanations, and so on.

Similarly with war. To understand a war or a situation in which war is likely is partly to know the war or situation intimately, of course. As historians, journalists, and diplomats do. But to understand also requires knowing what this war or situation has in common with other such wars or situations.

There is no root cause of violence

**American Psychological Association 7** (http://www.apahelpcenter.org/featuredtopics/feature.php?id=38&ch=2.) JR

Violence is a learned behavior. Like all learned behaviors, it can be changed. This isn't easy, though. Since there is no single cause of violence, there is no one simple solution. The best you can do is learn to recognize the warning signs of violence and to get help when you see them in your friends or yourself.

Perm Solves – Generally

We don’t need to exclude the aff

Cuomo 96 (Chris J. Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies, and Director of the Institute for Women's Studies at the Univerity of Georgia, “War Is Not Just an Event: Reflections on the Significance of Everyday Violence”, Published in Hypatia 11.4 nb, pp. 31-48) CH

I propose that the constancy of militarism and its effects on social reality be reintroduced as a crucial locus of contemporary feminist attentions, and that feminists emphasize how wars are eruptions and manifestations of omnipresent militarism that is a product and tool of multiply oppressive, corporate, technocratic states.' Feminists should be particularly interested in making this shift because it better allows consideration of the effects of war and militarism on women, subjugated peoples, and environments. While giving attention to the constancy of militarism in contemporary life we need not neglect the importance of addressing the specific qualities of direct, large-scale, declared military conflicts. But the dramatic nature of declared, large-scale conflicts should not obfuscate the ways in which military violence pervades most societies in increasingly technologically sophisticated ways and the significance of military institutions and everyday practices in shaping reality. Philosophical discussions that focus only on the ethics of declaring and fighting wars miss these connections, and also miss the ways in which even declared military conflicts are often experienced as omnipresent horrors. These approaches also leave unquestioned tendencies to suspend or distort moral judgement in the face of what appears to be the inevitability of war and militarism.

Treating structural and direct violence as a zero-sum game makes both worse – Should do both

Maley 85 (William, The University of New South Wales at Duntroon, “Peace, Needs and Utopia”, Political Studies, XXXIIl, 578-591, http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=6&hid=7&sid=fbf7951e-fa9b-4ac2-ba3b-2c07e8326bd2%40sessionmgr2) CH

Given the cogency of the case against methodological essentialism, there is no desire to argue here that there are any logical grounds for preferring one usage of a term in political theory over another,''\* However, there can be sound practical reasons for favouring a particular usage, A particular usage might provide distinctions of meaning which a different usage might obliterate,^- Furthermore, it might be so well entrenched that any departure from it would be liable to cause confusion. Finally, a particular term, when used consistent to refer to one thing, may acquire irremediably favourable or unfavourable overtones, to the extent that to use it to mean anything else might give the new referent an unwarranted lustre or tarnish, A Russian anecdote reported by Vladimir Bukovsky illustrates this clearly: A Jew came to his Rabbi and asked: 'Rabbi, you are a very wise man. Tell me, is there going to be a war?' 'There will be no war,' replied the Rabbi, 'but there will be such a struggle for peace that no stone will be left standing,'-\* The difficulties in Galtung's approach can be seen clearly when one recalls his view that it is probably a disservice to man to try to see either direct or structural violence as the more important. To this it can be replied that, particularly in its most recent formulations, Galtung's idea of structural violence embraces a number of forms which scarcely anyone would regard as seriously as the crushing, tearing, piercing, burning, poisoning, evaporation, strangulation, dehydration and starvation which constitute personal somatic violence,'^ To treat being deprived of 'cultural stimuli' as an evil commensurable with being torn to pieces is a step so audacious as to demand very specific moral justitication. This Galtung fails to supply, and as a result, his notion of peace is a very unsatisfactory ideal against which to evaluate a social order,

Perm Solves – Generally

**Perm solves− peace and violence are coexistent parts of life, making the maintenance of human rights and social services possible**

Kemp 3 (Graham, Associate Professor at Chalmers University of Technology, “Keeping the Peace: Conflict Resolution and Peaceful Studies around the World”, October 2003, p. 14-15, AD: 7-11-9) MW

The thesis that violence coexists with peace can be illustrated in reference to Colombia, considered one of the most violent places on earth. Colombia has endured an armed conflict among the army, guerrillas, and paramilitaries for more than fifty tears, Statistics show that the rate of assassinations in Colombia has grown as high as 89.5 per 100,000 inhabitants per annum (Comision Interamericana de Derechos Humanos 1999:34). However, whereas about 250,000 men and women fighters engage in deadly confrontation, the remaining 40 million people go about their work peacefully, raising children, building a home, having a family, interacting with friends and neighbors, believing that a better future is yet to come. In effect, widespread direct violence and many forms of structural and cultural violence coexist with a very strong sense of family, community, and cooperative networks. In Colombia, interpersonal relations are easily established, and people are renowned for their friendliness and warmth. More impressively, in the face of conflict, entire communities have established themselves as "peace areas," where participants in conflict are not allowed to use the territory as part of the war scenario or involve members of the community in it. Additionally, there are many efforts involving peace building, campaigns for human rights, expanding participation in the public sector, and improving social services. Finally, many other informal forms of solidarity exist among ordinary people as they go about their daily lives. Ultimately, this observation explains why a war-torn society does not collapse. The existence of peace does not count on the partial or total abolition of violence or war. There is peace amidst great violence; there is violence associated with fighting for peace. In the same way, it is unrealistic to believe that the more likely peace, the less likely violence, and vice versa. In fact, both phenomena can increase or decrease simultaneously, or can be present at the same time and place. Viewing peace and violence as coexisting has practical consequences. Rather than opposing extremes of a continuum− like different ends of the same cotton string− peace and violence each make cotton strings of their own. And both peace and violence, together with many other social entities, wave the fabric of life.

Perm Solves – Exclusive Focus Bad

Inclusive solutions for peace are preferable to exclusive notions – Do both solves

Duncan 2 (Grace, Student of Peace and Conflict, School of Political Science and International Studies, UQ, Winter, “Peace, Action and Consequences”, http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=9&hid=7&sid=fbf7951e-fa9b-4ac2-ba3b-2c07e8326bd2%40sessionmgr2) CH

This theory is based on a few key ideas. First, it rests on the assumption that ‘global problems’ such as genocide, war and poverty are ultimately the result of human failings and imperfections. This is a psychological, rather than a political or structural understanding of the world. By that I mean that while institutions, economies, ideas and perceptions obviously play a central role in creating or destroying peace, they are understood to have been constructed by previous societies, by human beings with psychological motivations that are not dissimilar from our own. The power of economic forces, for example, could be seen as the power of greed and fear of poverty. The power of nationalism derives from the human desire to be accepted and protected within a group. Through this understanding of the world, it can be seen that people have a profound ability to determine their collective destiny. Just as the present condition of society was constructed by the past, so the future condition will be created by the present. Second, negative peace and positive peace will be considered as existing along a continuum. While negative peace is merely the absence of armed conflict, positive peace is much more. Drawing upon Johan Galtung’s (1969) definition, positive peace will be taken to mean a condition in which no human being is influenced so that their physical and mental realizations are below their potential realizations. While it may seem somewhat utopian, this definition is useful for describing the aim of an action. Thus, this discussion includes under its umbrella of ‘action for peace’ any act that could conceivably lead to such a condition and contribute to a more peaceful world.

Exclusive focus on either form of violence is worse – Examining both solves their impacts

Schnabel (Albrecht, Senior Research Fellow at Swiss peace and a Lecturer in International Organizations and Conflict Management at the University of Bern Institute of Political Science, “The human security approach to direct and structural violence” http://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2008/files/SIPRIYB0802C.pdf) CH

Galtung’s differentiation between direct and structural violence is not an undisputed approach, but it makes sense in the context of human security analysis. If human security generally means ‘the security of people—their physical safety, their economic well-being, respect for their dignity and worth as human beings, and the protection of their human rights and fundamental freedoms’,9 then threats experienced by individuals and communities that are part of specific social, cultural, economic and political communities are not limited to direct armed violence. Such threats may be overt expressions of violence committed by specific and identifiable actors or covert expressions of violence inherent in the disadvantaged position of individuals and communities in a social, political or economic system that is upheld by power structures beyond their control. Without violence there is greater potential to provide and meet at least basic human needs, and to develop possibilities to satisfy needs that determine not only survival but also well-being and quality of life. Galtung seems to have sensed the need to give greater consideration to the structural aspects and sources of violence and to shift exclusive (or primary) focus, particularly by governments, from the prevention of direct violence to the prevention of structural violence. Whether done voluntarily due to a sense of national and international responsibility or forced by others promoting such norms, such a shift would lower violence and increase human security.

Perm Solves – Links

Idealistic conceptions of peace do not need to exclude external manifestations of war and political changes to avert them

Rinehart 95 (Milton, July, “Title: Understanding the concept of `peace'”, Peace & Change, 01490508, Vol. 20, Issue 3, ) CH

The Numinar paradigm includes concepts of peace that are more idealistic, intra- and interpersonal, both internal and external. Peace is idealistic in that nonmaterial goals and processes are valued. Peace is not necessarily related to economic prosperity. In addition, peace is idealistic in that it is constructed and maintained through social processes that can be progressively revised. Peace is intra- and interpersonal in that the best level at which to begin peacemaking is internal. Peace must first exist within the individual in his or her relationship to others; peace is more the product of interactional patterns or subjective states than of social structures. Yet external concepts of peace are not excluded. Social systems must also be changed. The problem of peace is the problem of the internal, but shared, subjective states of people: the manner in which we interpret each other's actions and the value preferences that underlie our own actions. Cox comments, "To make peace with people, we need to understand them. To understand them, we need to engage in a holistic and participatory research which treats social reality as structured in purposive, value-laden, institutional and non-axiomizable ways."[19]

We don’t preclude an interest in structural violence

Rinehart 95 (Milton, July, “Title: Understanding the concept of `peace'”, Peace & Change, 01490508, Vol. 20, Issue 3, ) CH

For example, Galtung and Gandhi represent the fuzzy area in between the peace paradigms. Galtung's social justice concept suggests the creation of intra- and interpersonal peace by changing the social structures that prohibit the possibility of such peace. Here the ends appear Numinar, but the means are clearly Popular. Further, I have argued in this article that the worldview hidden beneath this concept remains fear based while containing some degree of faith in human potential.

Their alternative is additive – Doesn’t exclude our conception of war

Rinehart 95 (Milton, July, “Title: Understanding the concept of `peace'”, Peace & Change, 01490508, Vol. 20, Issue 3, ) CH

Even though I have used some opposing terms to contrast the Popular and the Numinar paradigms, they do not appear to be dialectically related as polar opposites. Rather, the Numinar appears to integrate yet go beyond the Popular in some key ways. First, although the emphasis on peacemaking in the Numinar view is on the intra- and interpersonal level, the need for structural change is accepted. Peace is found through the integration of both internal and external processes. Second, the idealistic peace of the Numinar is not the antithesis of the materialistic peace of the Popular. Rather, it subsumes the material aspects of social reality in the larger process of the reconstruction of that reality.

Perm Solves – A2: Co-optation

Defense posture doesn’t preclude solutions to structural violence

Groten and Jansen 81 (Hubert and Juergen, Doctorate in International Studies and Peace Lobbyist, “Interpreters and Lobbies for Positive Peace”, Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 18, No. 2, Special Issue on Theories of Peace 175-181, Sage Publications, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/424209>, A.D.: 7/9/09) JH

In the absence of any even partly suc- cessful alternative procedure, there is nothing to lose if we suggest the following: Interpreters and go-betweens are needed to communicate the important message of critical peace research to the people. They must be women or men who can relate to both groups, or can be brought to do so. The group of people closest to the workers be- cause they are together on the job and have other things in common are what we might call 'skilled workers'. In the general way we suggest this term be used it applies to all oc- cupations. The 'skilled worker' would also be in a good position to collaborate with committed peace researchers towards the common goal. Thus the 'skilled worker' could be a medium and a contact for both sides involved. She or he would act as an interpreter and a link between the mass of democratic voters, the niches of democratic workers and the peace researchers. She or he would be the vital link in a network of people of good will united under the com- mon aim of communicating to the voters what peace research has to say about struc- tural violence and positive peace and about possible activities. There would be com- munication among all those involved but the main job would lie with the 'skilled workers', i. e., to pass on the information to the people at work. This network of people of good will would have to be loosely organized. Most emphatically it would not be a state organization. It would not engage in research as such. Rather, it would draw on the findings of critical peace research and transpose them to other levels of thinking and language use. 'Skilled workers' would be essential. Trade unions could help to prepare them. School teachers could be in it, though not qua school teachers. The local and regional press would be instrumental in communicat- ing information and raising consciousness. This may sound utopian but there is no harm in trying this road. Civic action groups have proved through their involvement in ecology that a group of dedicated people can influence politics. It is not the group itself, or in our case the network, that can influence high politics but they can form lobbies that are sure to find some politicians who are glad to bring their influence to bear on high politics once they receive support from their voters. Even small groups could produce results to begin with. And once there are results it is never difficult to find more dedicated people among all those whose main concern is positive peace. Peace researchers know there is structural violence and that we must work for positive peace. They only need people of good will to help them pass on this knowledge to those who can decide by using their democratic vote. Interpreters and lobbies ought to be used as links. Perhaps this will work.

Eschewing security proposals won’t create positive peace and security plans aren’t coopted

Jahn 83 (Egbert, Author of “Nationalism in Late and Post-Communist Europe: Nationalism in the Nation States” and Doctor of Relations, “Peace Research and Politics within the Field of Societal Demands”, Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 20, No. 3, Sage Publications, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/423797>, A.D.: 7/9/09) JH

Peace cannot be the result of just one policy, but of different and opposing policies. Otherwise, an absolute world dictatorship would be the precondition which would merely make the will of others an object of a peace dictator. That is why the label 'German peace research' is as absurd as for example social- liberal peace research. The very day when peace research agrees with German foreign policy either total world peace will have come true, or - and this is more probable - the scientific death of peace research will have come. Peace research which corresponds completely to the policy of a national govern- ment, a party or a peace organization is no more than peace ideology. Peace research has to keep permanent distance to a policy with peace intentions and to question national, partisan and bureaucratic prejudices which blur scientific reasoning. This cannot be accomplished without distance to everyday politics. Without effective leisure, time and work no scientific reasoning is possible. Therefore, I would like to have at least one room in the ivory tower devoted to applied science within the turmoil of political expec- tations and attacks. Distance does not imply shunning contacts with parties, government departments and peace organizations. On the contrary, without an approach to and knowl- edge of political life in detail, one cannot observe at a suitable distance; at best one would reject politics out of prejudice. Value- oriented peace research is a science which draws its questions and problems from society and takes no refuge in the ivory tower. How- ever, peace research cannot let itself be directed by societal expectations. There must be an appreciation of the fact that peace research cannot formulate a scientifically well-founded analysis with regard to every violent incident on earth. Peace researchers may utter political statements concerning Afghanistan, El Salva- dor or the NATO decision on the moderniza- tion of missiles in Europe, but then they do not act as scientists, but as politicians with the borrowed reputation of their scientific institu- tion or their function.

Perm Solves – Militarism

The permutation prevents a military-focus, prescribing nuanced solutions

Schnabel 7 (Albrecht, Senior Research Fellow at Swiss peace and a Lecturer in International Organizations and Conflict Management at the University of Bern Institute of Political Science, “The human security approach to direct and structural violence” http://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2008/files/SIPRIYB0802C.pdf) CH

As discussed in the previous section, the human security concept implies that the provision of human security requirements is largely the responsibility of states. Many states need to rethink and refocus their security policies and systems in order to provide effective human security for their population and—in cooperation with other states and coordinated by intergovernmental organizations—assist or encourage states that lack the necessary capacities to follow suit. The ‘responsibility to protect’ concept seems a suitable response to these calls for the provision of universal human security. Yet it is for this very reason that scepticism prevails about the legality of a new norm that considers human security as an innate right and the provision of human security as the responsibility of states. Such expectations seem to be at odds with states’ rights to sovereignty and non-intervention. Protagonists of the concept point out that their work—and the accompanying evolving global norm—applies only to direct violence and, in that context, the extreme action of military intervention under the responsibility to protect concept is concerned only with the most grievous crimes: mass atrocities and genocide. However, the basic assumptions of the concept justifying measures short of military intervention are applicable to direct violence in more general terms and to structural violence ‘committed’ by national and international cultural, social, economic and political structures—a major paradigm shift in international norms and values

Focusing on both provides balanced solutions

Schnabel 7 (Albrecht, Senior Research Fellow at Swiss peace and a Lecturer in International Organizations and Conflict Management at the University of Bern Institute of Political Science, “The human security approach to direct and structural violence” http://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2008/files/SIPRIYB0802C.pdf) CH

Galtung argues that ‘there is no reason to believe that the future will not bring us richer concepts and more forms of social action that combine absence of personal violence with [the] fight against social injustice [i.e. negative and positive peace] once sufficient activity is put into research and practice’.10 This appendix suggests that human security may well be the concept that offers this opportunity. Focusing on the impact that both types of violence have on the human security of individuals and communities, without prejudicing one over the other in terms of strategic, political or economic significance, allows a more effective focus on the basic needs of individuals, compared to the security needs of states as expressed in more traditional national security thinking. This approach responds to one of the original components of the human security concept: that national and international political and security structures should consider human security equally important to national security. At this juncture, the human security concept is able to advance the distinctions between direct and structural violence and between negative and positive peace. In combination with a heightened sense of (or a moral and legal call for) responsibility by human security providers—those who govern individuals and communities, the referent objects of human security—both accountability and responsibility for the prevention of human insecurity might eventually enter the theory and practice of international law and custom.

We’re a Prereq to the Alt

Events of war preclude solutions to structural violence – No alt without our action

Rabie 94 (Mohamed, professor of International political economy, Georgetown University, Praeger, “Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity”, 1994, http://www.questiaschool.com/read/14788166?title=Conflict%20Resolution%20and%20Ethnicity, AD; 7/11/9) TR

In countries where democracy does not exist and where the control of authoritarian states over peoples' lives and fortunes is real, the nonviolent resolution and prosecution of political conflict is an impossibility because violence is the major tool of the oppressor rather than the oppressed. Democratization as the first order of concern, which the proponents of a limited definition of peace further advocate, cannot be effected without freedom and liberty, two conditions for access to cherished values. Therefore, a realistic definition of peace ought to take both arguments into consideration. This is particularly important since the proponents of positive peace tend to view it more as a process and less as a stationary state of political affairs, while the others see it generally in opposite terms. In fact, human experience seems to indicate that the absence of war and violence cannot be maintained without social justice, and social justice cannot be achieved under conditions of war and violence. Consequently, an operational definition of realistic peace would probably describe it as the absence of violence under conditions and relationships that provide for the nonviolent resolution of political conflict and the freedom to pursue legitimate individual and group goals without threat or coercion. Peace, to be real and human, must be understood and employed as a continuous process to lessen social tension, resolve political conflict, and create conditions to pursue freedom and justice through a gradual evolution of human perceptions and socio-political institutions. Thus, a strategy for universal peace must deal not only with war but also with the very forces and conditions that cause the eruption of war and induce the spread of violence in the first place. It must also strive to change a people's perceptions of the other in order to humanize the adversary, acknowledge his grievances, and legitimize his basic concerns. Above all, it must lay the foundation for transforming existing group relationships and state and civil society institutions, with a view to creating new more dynamic ones committed to promoting compatible visions and values with developing shared interests.

War causes structural violence

Schnabel 7 (Albrecht, Senior Research Fellow at Swiss peace and a Lecturer in International Organizations and Conflict Management at the University of Bern Institute of Political Science, “The human security approach to direct and structural violence” http://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2008/files/SIPRIYB0802C.pdf) CH

Among the causes of insecurity, armed violence is a factor of unique significance because it: (a) causes human insecurity and prevents the adequate provision of human security through its debilitating direct and indirect effects; (b) acts as an accelerator of human insecurity, with knock-on effects that increase the negative impact of existing levels of violence and harm; and (c) is often the articulation of underlying, protracted and unresolved structural violence and thus an indicator of societal and political instability. Armed violence is a highly visible pointer to the long overdue necessity of addressing structural violence and its manifestations.

A2: Positive Peace – Innate Violence

Violence is inherent in human nature, solving innate violence precludes any hope of “positive peace” solutions

Rabie 94 (Mohamed, professor of International political economy, Georgetown University, Praeger, “Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity”, 1994, http://www.questiaschool.com/read/14788166?title=Conflict%20Resolution%20and%20Ethnicity, AD; 7/11/9) TR

The varied peace definitions have given rise to the concepts of "positive peace" and what might be called "passive or negative peace." [23](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/14788190) James H. Laue, for example, defines peace not only as a cherished goal sought by all individuals and states, but also as "a process of continuous and constructive management of differences toward the goal of more mutually satisfying relations, the prevention of escalation of violence, and the achievement of those conditions that exemplify the universal well-being of human beings and their groups from the family to the culture and the state." [24](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/14788190) It is a definition of positive peace that moves from the elimination of violence to dealing with the causes of conflict and proceeds to achieving universal happiness. Positive definitions of peace transform conflict resolution into a continuous peacemaking and peacekeeping process to deal with social conflict and create the socio-economic and political conditions that guarantee social justice. Thus, to the proponents of positive peace, the elimination of hunger and poverty and the establishment of justice are the true conditions of real peace and the most effective social measures to reduce the threat of war and undermine the causes of serious conflict. For such a peace to become a reality, they advocate, among other things, the creation of international superstructures to deal with regional and interstate conflict and limit the powers of the nation-state. In addition, they call for the establishment of a new international economic order that guarantees a more balanced distribution of global resources among nations, and effects the restructuring of trade relations between the industrialized and the developing countries on more equitable terms. [25](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/14788190) However, proponents of passive peace argue that the order of priorities should be reversed. They maintain that the tendency to commit mass violence, which characterizes many intergroup and international relations, is in itself a primary obstacle to the establishment of justice and the fulfillment of human goals. Thus, as Robert Pickus says, "establishing the minimum conditions for the non-violent resolution and prosecution of political conflict becomes the first objective." [26](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/14788190)

A2: Positive Peace – No Equality

Positive Peace is impossible because transactions can’t be equal for everyone

**Maley 85** (William, The University of New South Wales at Duntroon, “Peace, Needs and Utopia”, Political Studies, XXXIIl, 578-591, Political Studies) CH

Galtung's notion of exploitation is open to similar criticism. For Galtung it is not sufficient that everyone benefit from an exchange transaction; the benefit must be equal. This leads to the paradox that a state of peace—an absence of both structural and personal somatic violence—may be disturbed by a trans action which makes one person better off without making any other person worse off, a transaction which would constitute a Pareto improvement. By this curious usage, Galtung risks infringing his own requirement that a definition of peace 'should not be entirely subjectivistic ("agreed to by many")'."\*" Many writers, of course, do dismiss Galtung's concern for relative as opposed to absolute benefits from trade. A good example is W. Arthur Lewis, who know the answer and . . , since I think what matters is the absolute progress of the ldcs and not the size of the gap, 1 do not care,

A2: Positive Peace – Justifies Violence

Turn- Positive Peace Justifies human violence by stopping rational priorities among peace objectives

**Maley 85** (William, The University of New South Wales at Duntroon, “Peace, Needs and Utopia”, Political Studies, XXXIIl, 578-591, Political Studies) CH

The normative dimension of Galtung's notion of positive peace is clear. However, it is in the writings of Galtung's fellow Norwegian Christian Bay that the danger that a notion of positive peace might be used to justify coercive or violent action emerges more clearly. Bay is generally sympathetic to Galtung, but sets out a more sophisticated and carefully elaborated theory in which the concept of needs plays a greater role than in Galtung's writings.•'^ Bay accepts the distinction drawn by Galtung between personal and structural violence (although on at least one occasion, he has treated violence as the negation of freedom rather than peace'"), and like Galtung, he proposes a very broad meaning for the word 'violence'. For Bay, violence signifies the infliction, by commision or omission, of any damage or harm to any human being. Any broader-than-conventional concept of violence and of peace as the absence of large-scale violence, brings us back to the necessity of establishing rational priorities among peace objectives, too, just as we have seen that rational priorities are needed among human rights claims. All kinds of violence, under this broad umbrella term, are obviously not equal. This insight marks a considerable advance from Galtung's undiscriminating formulation. Bay continues that we require positive as well as negative peace: the latter meaning the absence of war, the former meaning the achievement of social and international justice. This leads us back to the problematique of human rights priorities, for social justice refers to securing access of all persons to the where withal that will meet their essential needs

A2: Positive Peace – Violent Authoritarianism

Positive Peace justifies Authoritarian regimes and Direct Violence

Maley 85 (William, The University of New South Wales at Duntroon, “Peace, Needs and Utopia”, Political Studies, XXXIIl, 578-591, http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=6&hid=7&sid=fbf7951e-fa9b-4ac2-ba3b-2c07e8326bd2%40sessionmgr2) CH

The 'positive' sense of the word 'liberty' derives from the wish on the part of the individual to be his own master, I wish to be a subject, not an object; to be moved by reasons, by conscious purposes, which are my own, not by causes which affect me, as it were from outside,\*'' The notion that freedom consists in self-mastery, insofar as it implies that man can be in a condition of lack of self-mastery from w hich he must be liberated,\*-"' parallels the notion that positive peace is a condition in which structural violence is absent because man's needs are being satisfied. Notions of both positive liberty and positive peace, conceived in terms of the satisfaction of needs, derive their content ultimately from particular subjective conceptions of the nature of man. Berlin's philosophical pluralism\*\* is directed against the moral and political authoritarianism which can result from an attempt to derive a specific political programme from a single dogmatic conception of human nature which does not take account of the diversity of individuals. Notions of positive peace have also been used to justify political authoritarianism, and even the resort to direct violence. This is perfectly illustrated in an article by Lars Dencik. Dencik defines conflicts as 'incompatible interests' and writes that incompatible interests are here defined objectively, i,e, by the observing scientist according to his theory and is Isicl independent of the actual subjective consciousness of the actors involved. This means that incompatible interests are conceived of as structural (actor independent), the structure defined according to the theory of the scientist.

A2: Positive Peace – Revolution

Positive Peace Leads to Revolution

**Maley 85** (William, The University of New South Wales at Duntroon, “Peace, Needs and Utopia”, Political Studies, XXXIIl, 578-591, Political Studies) CH

From this crude notion of objective interests, Dencik draws the conclusion that in certain situations "revolutionary violence" may be the necessary means to obtain conflict resolution proper', Nor is Dencik the only writer to justify revolution by reference simply to his own conception of the interests of others. As Jenkins writes: Whereas negative peace results in the stabilization of the status quo, positive peace has much more revolutionary implications. There is a clear analogy in medical science; the goal of health is pursued via the negative route of surgery and drugs, and through the positive route of preventative medicine. One focuses on the curing of illness once it has occurred, whilst the other seeks to create an environment where disease does not occur,\*' One might equally regard the contrast as one between piecemeal and Utopian social engineering, to use the terminology popularized by Sir Karl Popper."

A2: Positive Peace – Utopian

Positive Peace is Utopian

**Maley 85** (William, The University of New South Wales at Duntroon, “Peace, Needs and Utopia”, Political Studies, XXXIIl, 578-591, Political Studies) CH

This contrast suggests another direction from which the question of the possible implications of the ideal of positive peace might be approached: can concepts of positive peace first be labelled and second criticized as Utopian! This largely depends upon the characteristics by which one chooses to identify a Utopia. Mannheim dubbed as Utopian those orientations transcending reality which, 'when they pass over into conduct, tend to shatter, either partially or wholly, the order of things prevailing at the time','' Frank and Fritzie Manuel wrote: Utopians are almost always tragic or tragi-comic figures who die unfulfilled; the future does not begin to conform to their fantasy. Then appear the disciples or curious readers who have not been shaken in their innermost being with anything like the intensity of the original Utopian visionary, and they adapt, prune, distort, refine, render banal, make matter-of-fact the Utopia, so that it re-enters the world as a force for good or evil. Compromises with existence are affected. The ironclad formula is relaxed,'^ With the possible exception of Marcuse, none of the thinkers discussed in this paper deserves so harsh a judgment. Yet clearly writers such as Galtung and Bay would concede that the achievement of their peaceful ideal worlds demands a radical alteration of existing attitudes and institutions. Thus, the idea of Utopia which provides most scope for a critical appraisal of the notion of positive peace may be that set out by Leszek Kolakowski: First, we shall talk about Utopias having in mind not ideas of making any side of human life better but only beliefs that a definitive and unsurpassable condition is obtainable, one where there is nothing to correct any more. Second, we shall apply the word to projections which are supposed to be implemented by human effort, thus excluding both images of an otherworldly paradise and apocalyptic hopes for an earthly paradise to be arratged by sheer divine decree. Consequently, conforming to the second criterion, the revolutionary anabaptism of the sixteenth century may be included in the history of Utopias so conceived, but not various chiliastic or adventist movements and ideas which expect the Kingdom on earth as a result of Parousia, On the other hand, according to the first criterion, I would not describe as Utopian various futuristic technological fantasies if they do not suggest the idea of an ultimate solution of mankind's predicament, a perfect satisfaction of human needs, a final state,^

A2: Positive Peace – Violence Key

Turn: Direct Violence is Key to positive Peace

**Maley 85** (William, The University of New South Wales at Duntroon, “Peace, Needs and Utopia”, Political Studies, XXXIIl, 578-591, Political Studies) CH

In conclusion, the problem with Bay's and Galtung's notions of positive peace is thus not that they are Utopian, but rather that they can accommodate the use of direct violence and coercion as means to achieving 'peace'. This suggests at the very least that if 'positive peace' is to be defended as a social goal, it needs to be justified with much more plausible moral arguments than have hitherto been adduced in its favour. Needs theory, in the vague and confused form set out by Bay, is unable to provide such justification. This does not mean that a concept of peace going further than the minimalist cannot be developed and defended. A concept of peace stressing negative liberty as well as the absence of direct violence would permit a peaceful society to be distinguished from a well-run prison. However, until such a concept attains general acceptance, the clarity of scholarly discourse may well be fostered by the use of the minimalist concept of peace rather than the positive notions considered in this paper.

A2: Positive Peace – Vagueness

“Positive peace” as a term is so vague and inclusive that distinguishing it from other peaceful measures is difficult

**Fogarty 00** (Brian E., professor of sociology, College of St. Catherine, “War, Peace and the Social Order”, http://www.questiaschool.com/read/85687291?title=War%2c%20Peace%2c%20and%20the%20Social%20Order, AD: 7/10/9) TR

"Positive" definitions of peace seek to be more comprehensive. The mere prevention of war, or negative peace, is viewed as a limited goal at best, because it does not address many of the other forms of structured violence that are so prevalent in the world. Many countries are not at war, yet they are ruled by cruel despots or are exploited by corrupt elites or distant empires. These, it is argued, should not be considered societies at "peace." Others are so poor and dis-integrated that they are rife with violence, crime, and self-destruction. Even in the absence of war, it violates the sensibilities to think of such places as peaceful. It is worth an ironic note, too, that these are frequently the conditions in societies where "peace" has been imposed by a foreign power. The trouble with expanding the definition of peace is that it is difficult to know where to stop. When I teach the sociology of medicine, it is common practice to engage students in a discussion of what "health" is. We often begin with the simple definition of health as the "absence of disease," but it soon becomes apparent that such a definition is of little use. Discussion progresses to social definitions, such as "ability to carry out normal role obligations" and social "normalcy." Before long the class has progressed all the way to the World Health Organization's ( WHO) definition of health: "a state of complete physical, mental, and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity" ( World Health Organization 1958 ). The problem with this sort of definition is that it is so inclusive and so general that it becomes difficult to distinguish health from any number of other desirable things. Health, according to the WHO, seems to be goodness and truth and justice and equality and beauty and self-fulfillment, all rolled into one. No doubt this could serve fairly well as a definition of peace, too. And this is the kind of problem encountered in defining peace: Ideas about peace become so imbued with one's own values that one is unable to distinguish it from other desirable states. Consequently, "positive" definitions of peace tend toward vagueness. Attempts to arrive at a positive definition of peace have ranged from the introspective to the cosmic, and include "universal responsibility" ( Brenes 1990 ), "global cooperation" ( Fischer 1996 ), and "respect for life" (Harris 1990).

Structural violence is a term so incogent that it makes solutions to problems less likely

**Maley 85** (William, The University of New South Wales at Duntroon, “Peace, Needs and Utopia”, Political Studies, XXXIIl, 578-591, Political Studies) CH

The distinction between direct and structural violence has not met with universal acceptance. To one critic structural violence was simply 'anything that Galtung didn't like',-^' To Johnson, Galtung's efforts 'to combine peace with justice in the notion of "positive peace" appear strained, an unrealistic attempt to keep the best of both worlds'," And J, David Singer, after noting the new notion of structural violence, charged that radical peace researchers had 'corrupted the communication channels, sown conceptual confusion, and

discredited the scientific mode',-'"' However, Galtung's approach is also open to a more specific criticism, which relates to the value of the term 'positive peace' in scholarly discourse. It is that the notion of structural violence runs together ideas better kept apart.

Peace as the absence of war is more conceptually coherent, allowing concise analysis

**Maley 85** (William, The University of New South Wales at Duntroon, “Peace, Needs and Utopia”, Political Studies, XXXIIl, 578-591, Political Studies) CH

Thus, although the idiosyncrasy of Galtung's usage is not logically objectionable, his running together of inequity, exploitation and imperialist under the common rubric of violence, obliterating distinctions which other writers might wish to make or indeed investigate, provides some basis for preferring a more exact definition of peace, such as the minimalist one.

A2: Positive Peace – Ethnocentrism

Positive peace is inherently ethnocentric, favoring Western ideals of truth, justice, and freedom

**Fogarty 00** (Brian E., professor of sociology, College of St. Catherine, “War, Peace and the Social Order”, http://www.questiaschool.com/read/85687291?title=War%2c%20Peace%2c%20and%20the%20Social%20Order, AD: 7/10/9) TR

But the most troublesome problem with defining "positive" peace is that its confusion with other valued states creates a strong tendency toward ethnocentrism. To even use the term "positive" is to engage a system of values in thinking about the concept. Thus students of peace in Western societies tend to define peace in terms of democracy, social equality, and "justice." In a roundtable discussion in the *U.S. Institute of Peace Journal*, Carl Gershman asserted: It should be self-evident that a society organized democratically according to the principles of consent, the rule of law, and respect for the rights of the individual will behave more peacefully in its foreign relations than a society governed by force and repression. The case for this view . . . should not need to be restated. ( United States Institute of Peace 1990 ) In the same discussion, R. J. Rummel concluded that "In sum, democracies are the least violent regimes, totalitarian states the most." This sort of thinking is expressed in religious terms as well. For example, Catholic social teaching asserts: The Catholic tradition has always understood the meaning of peace in positive terms. Peace is both a gift of God and a human work. It must be constructed on the basis of central human values: truth, justice, freedom, and love. ( Second General Council of Latin American Bishops 1970, italics mine). But are these really "central" human values? Would these all be held in equally high esteem by Muslims, Hindus, or devotees of nontheistic or animistic religions? Or more pointedly, would they be defined in the same way? The appeal to freedom may mean individual, personal liberty to a Westerner, but quite another thing to peoples of more traditional cultures, in which individuals are deeply rooted in kinship and community obligations. And "truth" may be even more difficult to pin down as scientific, religious, and ideological knowledge systems alternatively lay claim to truth in various of the world's cultures. Finally, justice may be the most problematic of all, for it is clear that ideals of justice vary widely from one culture to the next. In contemporary American society, for example, one basic tenet of justice is that all people should have equal opportunities for success or failure, but that neither success nor failure should be guaranteed (the extent to which this ideal is practiced is another matter). But there have been, and still are, many cultures in which this definition would be considered a grave injustice, or a nonsensical ideal. In some cultures tradition may specify that birthright or religious status, or age, or gender justly ascribes status and confers privilege on some, subservience on others. In a cross-cultural survey, Pen ( 1971) identified twenty-one different views of economic justice alone. The problem with many positive conceptualizations of peace is that they are at best value-bound, hopelessly tied up in a variety of Western cultural beliefs and values. Defining peace in terms of "truth" or "justice" ignores real differences among cultural ideals. At worst, these ways of thinking about peace are little more than ideological slogans. Either way, they exert very strong influence over the kinds of questions asked about peace, and also over the sorts of actions people are likely to undertake to make it.

A2: Positive Peace – Efficacy

There are no guarantees that positive peacebuilding could work in every society

Barnett et al 7 (Michael, Hunjoon Kim, Madalene O’Donnell, Laura Sitea, Global Governance, “Peacebuilding: What is in a Name?”, 2007, http://www.questiaschool.com/read/5021483861?title=Peacebuilding%3a%20What%20Is%20in%20a%20Name%f, AD: 7/10/9) TR

Because there are multiple contributing causes of conflict, almost any international assistance effort that addresses any perceived or real grievance can arguably be called "peacebuilding." Moreover, anyone invited to imagine the causes of violent conflict might generate a rather expansive laundry list of issues to be addressed in the postconflict period, including income distribution, land reform, democracy and the rule of law, human security, corruption, gender equality, refugee reintegration, economic development, ethnonational divisions, environmental degradation, transitional justice, and on and on. There are at least two good reasons for such a fertile imagination. One, there is no master variable for explaining either the outbreak of violence or the construction of a positive peace but merely groupings of factors across categories such as greed and grievance, and catalytic events. Variables that might be relatively harmless in some contexts can be a potent cocktail in others. Conversely, we have relatively little knowledge regarding what causes peace or what the paths to peace are. Although democratic states that have reasonably high per capita incomes are at a reduced risk of conflict, being democratic and rich is no guarantor of a positive peace, and illiberal and poor countries, at times, also have had their share of success. Second, organizations are likely to claim that their core competencies and mandates are critical to peacebuilding. They might be right. They also might be opportunistic. After all, if peacebuilding is big business, then there are good bureaucratic reasons for claiming that they are an invaluable partner.