

## Exploring Relationships for Positive Peace

Dr. Heather Devere  
Director of Practice  
National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies  
University of Otago  
Dunedin  
New Zealand  
[heather.devere@otago.ac.nz](mailto:heather.devere@otago.ac.nz)

As an aspiration, positive peace is envisaged as a goal for society that requires an inter-relationship between non-violence, social justice and ecological sustainability, as proposed by Harris (2004). In this article, I am exploring a concept that is often taken for granted in analyses of positive peace, but which is often not discussed explicitly, although it is vital for establishing and ensuring positive peace. This is the concept of human relationships.<sup>1</sup>

The debate about positive peace in Western scholarship has been traced back to Jane Addams (1907) who broke away from the traditional anti-war 'negative peace' focus of conventional pacifism (xiv), to concentrate on 'positive ideals of peace' (xvii). Martin Luther King also referred to the concept of positive peace as the presence of love and justice. However in the academic field of peace and conflict studies one of its founders, Johan Galtung, is usually credited with making the distinction between negative and

---

<sup>1</sup> The importance of ecological sustainability and relationships between people and the environment is acknowledged too as vital, but this is not the focus of this article, although some obvious links will be able to be drawn.

positive peace a feature of the study of peace and conflict, as opposed to the study of war and conflict.

Reference to 'relationships' is one that crops up repeatedly in this field of study, but is not often defined or specified, although the assumption is that these should be some sort of 'good relationship'.<sup>2</sup> And while we often refer to relationships, we sometimes gloss over the people or things that form the very basis for the relationship. This article begins this exploration by firstly defining 'positive peace', then looking at the sorts of relationships between people that might contribute to positive peace, with a focus on four relationship categories: relationships based on emotion; relationships based on cognitive awareness; relationships based on social conscience; and relationships based on trust.

### **What is Positive Peace?**

The main focus of peace research over the fifty years of its existence has been on negative peace, in the sense of reducing war and violence. However, as Gleditsch *et al* point out in a study of what have been identified as two important journals for peace research, *Journal of Peace Research* and *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 'positive peace, in the sense of cooperation or integration, has also always been on the peace research agenda' (2014, 145).

Positive peace can be distinguished from 'durable peace' described as 'when former combatants reconcile their differences and rebuild security, governmental and economic institutions' (Wagner and Druckman 2017, 45). Definitions of positive peace include the absence of war but also 'the absence of internal and external exploitation of both human and non human resources, gender equality and respect for human rights' (Bockerie 2002, 118).

Newsom and Lee (2009, 6), drawing on Galtung (1967), Hulme and Goodhand (1999), Harris (2004) and King (1964) contrast negative peace with:

a positive or peace-building/peace-making approach where programs, institutions, and other efforts are made by individuals and political entities to create a condition or infrastructure which encourages peace,

---

<sup>2</sup> Betty Reardon, Adam Curle and John Paul Lederach, however, do discuss very explicitly the importance of relationships for positive peace.

rather than attempt to remove a condition that makes peace a challenge.

They recognize that positive peace efforts 'often take a lifetime of work, or an extended series of efforts before they begin to be recognized'.

Shields and Soeters (2017, 324) also see positive peace as a process and an 'end-in-view'. For them, the ideal of positive peace incorporates 'social justice, social equity, cooperation, community engagement, collaboration, effective-governance, and democracy'. They point to Jane Addams' ideals of peace 'more than 100 years ago', as not distinguishing specifically between negative and positive peace, but as 'unquestionably within the scope of positive peace', incorporating a 'feminism that is derived from female experience'. For Addams (1915/2003, 117):

There is nothing negative in the idea of peace. War is negative. Peace is the highest effort of the human brain applied to the organization of the life and being of the peoples of the world on the basis of cooperation.

### **Relationships and Positive Peace**

It is Shields and Soeters who point to Addams' focus on peace as being concerned with relationships (p.329). Just as war is characterized by violent, conflict-ridden relationships between nations, Addams's theory of peace 'begins by focusing on *relationships* in the home and neighbourhood. She eventually extends these outward to incorporate nations.' (330).

The centrality of human relationships and people within the field of conflict transformation is evident in the work of Lederach (1997 and 2005; see also Shields and Rissler, 2016). In his *Little Book of Conflict Transformation* (2003) Lederach envisages conflict transformation as a 'person on a journey, comprised of head, heart, hands and legs and feet, so includes how we think, feel emotionally, what we do, and where we do it'. He defines conflict transformation as being:

... to envision and respond to the ebb and flow of social conflict as life-giving opportunities for creating constructive change processes that reduce violence, increase justice in direct interaction and social structures, and respond to real-life problems in *human relationships*. (reproduced in *Peacework*, 2006, 26).

The literature on relationship theory focuses mainly on dyadic relationships such as mother and child, or couple relationships, the psychology of ‘how’ and ‘why’ relationships develop. There are different ways in which relationship theories are categorized, such as attachment theory (see for example, Bowlby) and social network theory (see for example Scott 2017). There are grand theories (Freud, Piaget, Werner, Skinner 1985) and domain-specific theories. Furnari (2013, 233) whose work explores the importance of relationships in peacekeeping, refers to Deutsch’s typology which describes relationships as fitting into two overarching categories of ‘socio-emotional or task-oriented’. Peacekeepers in her research described good relationships as ‘cooperative, trusting, with some degree of shared goals’ (Furnari 2015, 4).

In this article, I am focusing on the attributes or values that contribute to relationships that are most likely to contribute to positive peace. These might be classified as ‘good relationships’ – the sorts of relationships that help to reduce violence and increase justice; that might help to create environments and societies where positive peace is possible. These relationships should be able to assist in preventing or addressing conflict, and enabling non-violent communication and behaviour. While this may be useful for dyadic interaction, the focus is directed to relationships between people who share a community, a society, a nation or as global citizens.

For this purpose, I am categorizing these relationships as to whether they are based on emotion, cognitive awareness or insight, social conscience, or trust. This categorization of relationships is not meant to imply that these are discrete categories with no overlap. In fact the opposite is the case, where the importance for positive peace is interlinking and interweaving of positive relationships. I will describe and analysis different concepts or values that are associated with each of these four types of relationship. (see Table of Relationships).

**Table of Relationships for Positive Peace**

<b>Based on Emotion</b>	<b>Based on Cognitive Awareness or Insight</b>	<b>Based on Social Conscience</b>	<b>Based on Trust</b>
Love Affection Kindheartedness Compassion	Respect Tolerance Acceptance Empathy	Justice Equality Fairness Ethics	Honesty Openness Sincerity Genuineness

	Concern Care Friendship Cooperation Harmony Peacefulness Forgiveness	Rightness Helpfulness Generosity Hospitality Empowerment	Integrity Trustworthiness Reliability Confidence Confianza
--	--	--	--

### ***Relationships based on emotion***

In his work on Perpetual Peace, Immanuel Kant insisted that it is our moral duty to seek peace. He was concerned with peace between nations, and the standard view of Kant is that duty rather than emotions should guide our behaviour. However, Boxill (2010, 274) argues that even Kantians now believe that emotions can sometimes motivate us to act in accordance with certain duties.

Emotions can come unbidden or emotions can develop over time. We can learn to control our emotions, but we are often controlled by our emotions. Emotions are instinctual or intuitive feelings, often contrasted with cognitive reasoning. Emotions appropriate for positive peace would include love, affection, compassion for other people and kindheartedness towards others. These emotions can be fostered, or even manipulated. In the field of conflict resolution, there are strategies suggested for regulating emotions to change attitudes and behaviour ‘in order to promote peace’ (see for example Halperin, Cohen-Chen and Goldenberg 2014, 1). However, this is a challenging undertaking and not always successful.

*Love* is one of the most difficult words in the English language to define.<sup>3</sup> It covers a wide range of feelings from inanimate objects (such as chocolate), to activities (such as sport), to the environment or physical space (such as love for one’s land or country), to other living beings (such as animals), to other humans (such as one’s friends), to romantic and erotic love, to the deep unselfish (and not always attainable) love, referred to by the Greek term *agape*, used to describe such emotions as parental love, or

---

<sup>3</sup> Some reference will be made in this article to the origin of the English words describing the concepts, but it is not intended as an authoritative semantic analysis. Rather the aim is to begin a debate about the various meanings and connotations of good relationships.

the love of God for his/her people. C.S. Lewis (1960) identified ‘four loves’ that include *eros* ‘the state of being in love’; charity or *caritas* that is a spiritual concept related to ‘the love of God’; friendship, or *philia*, less about passion and emotion than about companionship and activity; and affection or *storge* the least discriminating and most comfortable of the four loves. Some kinds of love would be more likely to cause conflict rather than contribute to positive peace. However, love that is a strong passionate and/or spiritual emotion is also part of the motivation that drives people to be peaceful and unselfish, and to care about others.

*Affection* has connotations of gentleness, fondness, tenderness towards someone. The English word comes through Latin and Old French from the verb ‘to affect’, which means to have an effect on, or to make a difference to someone or something. It implies that one is emotionally moved in the relationship with the other – not as in the uncontrolled passion of erotic love, nor in the sense of the goodness of unselfish love, but touched by a feeling of genuinely liking for the other person. These feelings of affection can be trifled with, can be spurned, but are also the basis for firm friendships, and caring for each other.

The concept of *kindheartedness* is an innate goodness of spirit or beneficence that enables the person to understand and share in particular the sorrows and pains of another, with the intent of easing that pain and suffering. When we experience a powerful emotion, adrenaline causes acceleration of the heart. Historically, the heart has symbolized moral courage, energy, happiness, joy and love. Kindness is the quality of being friendly, generous and considerate, but kindheartedness implies that the motivation to be kind is deeply seated within the character. Sometimes it is used synonymously with compassion.

*Compassion* is identified with fellow-feeling, understanding, tenderness and consideration. It comes from the Latin meaning ‘to suffer with’. Compassion is often seen as synonymous with sympathy. However, the latter has been associated with pity and to some extent condescension. While love, affection and kindheartedness seem to stem from innate qualities that give rise to these emotions, compassion could also be a more conscious response. For example, Clements (2016) talks about the politics of compassion which ‘asserts the dominance of social criteria in political decision making’. He sees this as contributing to the creation of ‘functional, empathetic and empowering relationships’ (15).

### ***Relationships based on cognitive awareness or insight***

The relational concepts that represent cognitive, conscious acknowledgement of other people are based on an understanding of positive interactions. The range of cognitive positive attitudes and behaviours towards others are linked by the other-regarding nature of these sorts of relationships. In contrast to emotion or feeling, relationships based on cognitive awareness are seen as rational, considered, ethical, altruistic, but in the negative sense can be viewed as instrumental, not genuine.

*Respect* represents an important value in relationships, in that most people want respect shown to them, whether there is conflict or a difficult situation, or not. The concept of respect comes through Latin and late middle English verb 'respectus' or 'respicere' meaning to 'look back at' or reconsider. Respectful relationships hold others in high regard. It is about being aware of the rights and wishes of others and valuing the perspectives of others. Respect honours others and pays attention to them. It involves accepting people as they are. Behind showing respect is a tacit acknowledgement that one is open to being wrong. However, there is also the understanding that respect is earned, and that in order to be respected one should be dependable, practice integrity and humility.

*Acceptance* in relationships allows for the possibility that one considers the other to be wrong, but nonetheless to be valued for who they are and not as someone needing to change or improve. Accepting relationships are openly welcoming, giving recognition to others and showing them positive approval and encouragement. Acceptance comes from the Old French 'accepter' and an aspect of its meaning is connected to receiving a gift. While there is the understanding that acceptance does not need to be earned, there is an element within the idea of acceptance that the other may not be up to a particular standard, and so acceptance could imply some kind of condescension.

*Tolerance* is lack of prejudice or bias, showing understanding for the beliefs and practices that differ or conflict with one's own and a willingness to allow others to express their beliefs and to follow their chosen practices. To tolerate can also mean to put up with something that one does not like and comes from the Old Latin 'tolare' meaning to endure pain. In some senses, tolerance, like acceptance, can be seen as involving patronizing attitudes or condescension, as a superior person, able to put up with, or endure the pain of dealing with the weaknesses and inadequacies of other people.

*Empathy*, originally from the Greek word for ‘feeling along with’ is a concept that came into more general use in the English language only in the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Empathy goes further than tolerance in that it involves the ability to understand and share in the feelings of another. Empathy is associated with the capacity or ability to imagine what it might be like to be in the other person’s position and to feel from the other’s frame of reference. Empathy is often compared to sympathy denoting feelings of pity or sorrow for another person’s misfortune, and is similar to compassion but is distinguished from sympathy which has come to imply a sense of superiority, associated with feeling pity for those less fortunate, and sometimes only for those who are deserving of our pity. Empathy is closer to compassion but shows more of a cognitive understanding of the difficulties experienced by the other.

Relationships that show *concern* are based on feeling responsible and often worried or anxious about the other. Being concerned can be seen as the opposite of having peace of mind. In medieval Latin concern is related to being relevant to, or being important to someone, and in this sense the opposite might be indifference. So concern in relationships is caring about someone, as an issue of importance. Concern can be considered to be what is expressed, whereas care involves the action to relieve or address the concern.

*Care* is conceptualized as including custodial responsibility, friendship, self-care, and emotional reciprocity. The two main aspects of care are ‘caring about’ and ‘caring for’. ‘Caring about’ is similar to concern. It is about attaching importance to something or somebody, troubling oneself about people, and being concerned about someone in need. Originating from High German, Old English and Old Norse, care was related to ideas of grief, lamentation and sickness. So ‘caring for’ involves the physical taking care of, ministering to, looking after someone. This includes attending to needs, protecting and watching over, nursing, providing sustenance and assistance. Care tends to imply a response to need, and so does not have quite the same connotations of patronizing or condescension associated with some of the other relationships. The ethics of care advocates the importance of appropriate self-care as well as the care of others (see Gilligan 1982; Noddings 1984; Baier 1994; Held 2006, Kittay 1987, 1999; Ruddick 1989, and Tronto 1994).

Friendship as a concept is intrinsically reciprocal. Within relationships based on *friendship* are many of the concepts associated with 'good relationships'.

There needs to be affection, caring for each other, some sort of commitment and reciprocity. Friendship is associated with attachment, closeness or intimacy, mutuality, esteem and respect. It requires being loving, supportive, and wishing well. It is about tolerance and putting up with the idiosyncrasies of your friends. Friendship can range from close to cordial, from affinity to rapport. It has been associated with gentle liking or passionate emotion. Friendship has been described in kinship terms: brotherhood or fraternity, and sisterhood. It can be applied to sexual, political and/or business partners, or even relationships between nation states. (Devere 2014b).

Peace scholar Adam Curle (1971, 15) coined the term 'befriending' as determining both peaceful personal relationships and those on a larger scale that would 'imply active association, planned co-operation, and intelligent effort to forestall or resolve potential conflicts'. Lederach (2014) builds on Curle's concept of 'befriending', to develop what he calls 'the radical notion of diplomacy as friendship',<sup>4</sup> characterized by 'care, concern, honesty and commitment and never taken up for purposes of instrumental engagement to achieve ulterior purposes, even if those are noble'. Friendship has an intrinsic element of equality because it cannot be a one-way relationship. But as a two-way relationship, friendship cannot always necessarily be considered altruistic, as important for maintaining friendship is recognition and returning favours. The notion of 'befriending' could also imply some element of condescension with the idea of 'taking on' someone as a friend.

The idea of mutual support is also captured in the concept of *cooperation*, working as partners towards a shared end. Cooperation demonstrates unity and is associated with synergy, the combined effort producing superior outcomes to individual efforts. Those who are cooperative are considered to be thoughtful and helpful, willing to participate and share the burdens. While similar to collaboration, cooperation has more positive connotations. Collaboration has been associated with traitorous cooperation with an enemy. Both cooperation and collaboration have origins in the Latin referring to the activity of working together or co-working.

---

<sup>4</sup> See also the literature on friendship in international relations (Devere et al 2014a).

*Harmony* relies on cooperation. The word is used to describe musical notes that are sounded simultaneously to produce a pleasing sound as a consistent whole. This element of balance, consonance and compatibility is also present in the idea of people being in a state of agreement or concord, from the Greek word meaning joining together. Harmony as the basis for relationships focuses on the maintenance of the relationship, avoiding aspects that might cause upset. This may imply that conflictual elements of relationships are not necessarily addressed, but rather are avoided, by concentrating on what is the same or similar and avoiding difference.

There are similarities between harmony and *peacefulness* as the basis for relationships. Peacefulness is associated with quiet and calm, and possibly avoiding conflict. But also peacefulness could indicate that there may be lack of conflict or worry, and thus no need to be anxious. Lederach's (1997b) story of the 'meeting place' in his work on reaching reconciliation explores the conflicting values of truth, mercy, peace and justice, and illustrates how peacefulness is needed for justice to flourish, but equally if peacefulness is prioritized, then this might result in injustices remaining hidden.

*Forgiveness* has also been seen as standing in the way of justice. According to Lederach, forgiveness (or mercy) can mean that justice is not fulfilled, those who are guilty are not punished but pardoned, and victims are not compensated. And Derrida (2001), questions whether there are not some actions that are unforgiveable, especially if the victims are no longer there to forgive. Nevertheless, forgiveness is essential for positive peace and reconciliation. Forgiveness is related to giving up resentment or the wish for revenge or recompense, to not wish harm on another, or want her/him punished. It is recognizing weaknesses in others and oneself, and acknowledging the provocation that caused the other to perform harmful actions. It is stopping the blaming. While some are more easily able to forgive, it is also a deliberate decision made to release unhealthy feelings of resentment or vengeance. There need be no moral worth or action from the other. It is distinguished from forgetting or condoning.

### ***Relationships based on social conscience***

While treating people well, showing understanding and working to keep relationships harmonious and peaceful is part of positive peace, this is insufficient without relationships that show understanding of the negative societal elements such as injustice, inequity, and unfairness. These are related to what I have called relationships based on social conscience. In

these relationships there is an awareness of the problems and challenges faced by many people in society, a concern about these, responsibility accepted for injustices, and a conscious effort to do something about this.

Relationships that reflect *justice* are concerned with fairness and equity. Originally, the word 'justice', from Latin and Old French, was related to administration of the law. However, the term 'social justice' has evolved to emphasise human rights and equality based on the belief that each person has value and possesses an innate human dignity. Just relationships are non-discriminatory, treating others as equal, without being patronizing. Just relationships incorporate respect for others' rights and concerns. They are fair, unbiased, and do not use favoritism or preferential treatment. The concept of human rights is enshrined in international law to promote the belief that every person in the world should have equal access to rights and freedoms.

*Equality* is about regarding and treating other people as the same. From the Latin, equality has been used increasingly since the 15<sup>th</sup> Century. Equal relationships are where everyone has the same right or entitlement. Neither person feels superior to the other in the relationship. They value each other's qualities equally. Equal treatment, or treating each other the same, however, does not necessarily result in equality in that relationship. This is the fundamental issue with the concept of equality, and philosophical, economic and political debate focuses on two main aspects of equality: equality of opportunity and equality of outcome (see for example Mitra et al 2015, Abdullah et al 2016, Montoya et al 2013). One person might bring to the relationship more than the other, perhaps in terms of disposable income, or ability to empathise. Each person might need different things from the relationship, maybe at different times throughout the relationship. In order for each person's needs to be satisfied, there may be unequal contributions required from one or the other. There may be more given by one party to a relationship, and more received by the other, in order to keep the relationship on an equal footing.

*Fairness* or equity has been described as 'quite a different matter' from equality (see for example Moscrop and Warren, 2016, 2). Equity takes into account more than just equal shares or same treatment, but also incorporates what is seen as fair and just. Fairness is a perception that no one has more than they deserve or are entitled to. This can result in feelings of harmoniousness or peacefulness. Underlying relationships that are equitable is an awareness that some people are able to contribute more, due to personal attributes and/or circumstances. Some people might need more

assistance than others in order that the outcome is fairer. This is reflected in the slogan popularized by Karl Marx 'from each according to his [sic] ability, to each according to his need'.

Relationships based on social conscience also need to incorporate actions, not just ideas. They demonstrate *ethical* behavior, conduct that can be recognized as reflecting upstanding, morally good practices. Ethical relationships involve following ethical principles and codes. So, for example, following the principles of virtue ethics would mean consciously working out what virtues are needed for people to lead good lives. The next step is to practice these virtues conscientiously until it becomes a habit to be a good person and to behave towards people in an ethical way. Following the ethics of care would mean working out what caring relationships one is involved in and making sure that caring is carried out appropriately. Kantian ethics requires that the motivation for your action needs to be taken into account for ethical behaviour.

*Right* relationships can be similar to ethical relationships that are right in the sense of being morally good, decent, honest and incorporating integrity. In theological contexts right relationships refer to relationships with God, with others and with the earth. Right relationships within Christianity can be similar to the concept of spiritual friendship that involves relationships that are mediated through the godhead. The relationship with the Christian God is the most important part, and then other relationships will be good, pure and right. In some Christian contexts, this right relationship emphasizes social justice and the concern for those disadvantaged and requiring assistance. On the other hand, right relationship can also be used to mean a relationship that is appropriate, suitable, beneficial or fulfilling for you. Many self-help books and websites give advice about what might be the 'right' rather than 'wrong' relationship for people based on compatibilities, desires and expectations.

*Helpfulness*, support or useful assistance needs to be made available in relations in order to combat inequities and injustices. Helping is a response to what is needed and has to have some beneficial practical or emotional outcome as perceived by the person receiving the assistance. Otherwise the response is unhelpful, even if well intentioned. Wanting to give help or provide aid is considered to be an ethical motivation, but can sometimes give more satisfaction and benefits to those 'helping' rather than to those requiring the help. Criticisms of international aid projects illustrate some of these problems where sometimes well-intentioned assistance causes more harm than good.

*Generosity* involves giving to others, usually practical gifts including money, but also giving of one's time and labour. It is the concept of giving without expecting anything in return. Originally associated with nobility of birth, during the 17<sup>th</sup> century the idea of generosity became associated with nobility of spirit or character, and then later in the 18<sup>th</sup> century had connotations of liberality in giving of money and possessions to others, and as an antidote to greed. If there is an intention of receiving benefit for the gift-giver, however, then in some accounts it is no longer regarded as generosity, which should be carried out without the expectation of receiving something in return. If gift-giving is used instrumentally then it can be interpreted as treating relationships as transactional or trying to 'buy' a good relationship. If there are more deliberate intensions of buying relationships for some malevolent purpose, then this would be seen as bribery.

An aspect of generosity is *hospitality*. The word originally comes from the Latin 'hospes, from the word 'hostis' that originally meant 'to have power'. The host receives guests, who could be visitors known to the host or strangers, with goodwill. It is about welcoming, providing accommodation and sustenance. The current use of hospitality as the name for the industry of accommodation and food provision involves exchange of these 'courtesies' for money, as a trade or exchange. Derrida distinguishes between conditional hospitality, which he identifies as being from the Western heritage and unconditional hospitality that for him is pure, real, genuine and absolute (see Kakoliris 2015, 144).

The concept of *empowerment* refers to enabling the increase of power and autonomy. Empowerment has been defined as 'an intentional, ongoing process centered in the local community, involving mutual respect, critical reflection, caring, and group participation, through which people lacking an equal share of valued resources gain greater access to and control over those resources' (Cornell Empowerment Group, 1989). Empowerment has a sense of being a process whereby people become stronger, achieve rights, and gain more independence. In terms of relationships it is about ensuring that the others in the relationship gain control themselves in order for them to determine *for themselves* their future direction. Empowerment does not imply doing things *for* others but enabling them to develop on their own and to make their own choices. However, as with other relational concepts, there is also a sense of giving to someone who is lesser in some way, and it still contains elements of condescension. There is also a danger of lack of empathy with empowerment, with the responsibility given back to

the other, who may or may not succeed, having been 'empowered' and thus not deserving of the rights or benefits that they are seen to have squandered.

### ***Relationships based on trust***

Trust comes from the Old Norse 'traustr' meaning strong. Trust is the confidence or belief that someone is truthful and reliable or able to do something. A trusting relationship is one where both parties feel safe, both physically and emotionally. Relationships based on trust mean the other person is relied upon and is reliable. Trust involves honesty, openness, sincerity and genuineness. Relationships based on trust are without guile, without deceit. Trust cannot survive too much secrecy and sometimes privacy can be interpreted as secrecy. Trust can take some time to be built up, but it can be very easily destroyed and brought down.

As a fundamental ethical quality necessary for trust, *honesty* stands for moral correctness and uprightness. It is considered to be a high, noble principle of honour and integrity. Virtuous attributes such as integrity and truthfulness are associated with honesty and with conduct that is absent of vices such as lying, cheating and theft. Diogenes' search for an 'Honest Man' is an acknowledgement of the difficulty of achieving the virtue of honesty. Apart from being sincere, genuine and sometimes too blunt, honest people are considered to be incorruptible, and therefore can be trusted.

Trusting relationships also involve *openness*, based on frankness, lack of concealment, not hiding anything, being direct. As Planalp (2003, 89) states: 'we move toward openness and expressiveness when we feel curious or excited; we move towards closeness and protectiveness when we feel anxious or threatened'. Openness is considered to be on the opposite end of the spectrum to secrecy (see for example Cottey 2016, 320). Openness is also associated with tolerance, as being open to diversity (see Luring and Selmer 2012, 795).

There is the danger, however, that honesty and openness in relationships can sometimes be cruel, or lacking in tact, so trusting relationships also need to be *sincere* incorporating connotations of kindness, not based on manipulation, subterfuge, trickery or intrigue. There is no pretense, deceit or hypocrisy, but in the honesty there is also good will. Here, the notion of tact is considered to be a positive attribute, as opposed to deceit and concealment (see for example Cottey, 319). Whereas sincerity also incorporates seriousness about commitment, without being flippant or

lighthearted it is nevertheless also associated with spontaneity because there is no need to pre-plan if one is acting genuinely.

Sincerity and *genuineness* are almost synonymous. The subtle difference is that being genuine is related to reflecting the real or original as a core. Trusting relationships are genuine and authentic. There is no trying to be someone you are not. Genuineness is often defined in terms of what it is not. The quality of being genuine is being non-corrupt, not phony, fake or counterfeit. Genuineness is associated with being proper and natural. Honesty and clarity are aspects of being genuine and there is the sense of being 'real', not someone who is constructed, or is posing, pretending to be someone different. Genuine relationships rely on there being no subterfuge, no pretense or deceit.

*Integrity* is tied to more consciously acting in accordance with moral principles, rather than just acting consistently with one's feelings, thoughts and desires. Integrity comes from the Latin term 'integritas' meaning wholeness. Integrity builds trust as it is associated with people who have strong moral principles and then act according to those principles. Integrity is about knowing what is right and wrong, and acting on that knowledge. Words and actions need to be integral to each other, coherent and consistent. The maintenance of moral integrity requires moral courage. People with integrity are described as confident, with a personal moral code and conscience that guide their decision-making and behavior. They know where they stand on issues and they have the courage to stand up for what they think is right, despite the consequences to them personally or professionally (see for example Laabs, 2001 433). Relationships based on integrity therefore may take time to develop, but are strong and enduring.

*Trustworthiness* has been described as a virtue (Flores and Solomon 1998) 'that governs the intensity of trust' (Bews and Rossouw 2002, 378). Trustworthiness is not just about benevolence, openness, loyalty, concern, but also requires reliability, having the competence or ability to do what is promised or intended. In addition there needs to be a history of interactions that demonstrate that the trust placed in the other is justified. However, according to Husted (1998, 239, cited in Bews and Roussouw, p.383) there are limitations as 'there is no element inherent in the trust relationship to assure that the trustor's good is good for the trustor'. Trust also involves discretion and integrity on the part of the person being given the trust.

Annette Baier defines trust as 'reliance on others; a competence and willingness to look after, rather than harm things one cares about which are

entrusted to their care.’<sup>5</sup> The focus of *reliability* is consistency, always following through, always being honest. People who are reliable can be depended on, for being well informed, so that they are able to provide useful and relevant help, advice, or information. They will not let you down. However, depending on others has also been interpreted as not being independent enough, and self-reliance is encouraged as a strategy for building character, resilience and for dealing with being let down by people that had been mistakenly considered trustworthy.

If relationships have been shown to be trustworthy then there is *confidence* about interactions between people. Behr (1945 cited in Cottey 319) uses the term confidence as necessary for an open world and distinguishes between confidence in others (trust) and self-confidence (as necessary for openness). As Cottey points out, self-confidence makes openness psychologically possible. Without self-confidence, it is claimed that people are fearful of exposure, of scandal, and are therefore more secretive.

The Spanish term *confianza* has been adopted by Lederach (2006, 89) because he believes that trust or confidence are inadequate as translations. For him *confianza* is ‘a profoundly cultural term’ that describes relationships that are built over time, and include sincerity, security, inspiration and not being betrayed. The importance of *confianza* is that it comes from personal connections and human interactions. Thus it is not expected that institutions are trustworthy. Trust or distrust are a function of the behaviour and attitudes of the people in those institutions.

## Discussion

It is clear from the above that identifying what are ‘good relationships’ that would contribute to or are necessary for positive peace, is a complex and debatable task. There are other concepts that could have been included, so this will not be an exhaustive list. My intention is to start a conversation about what sorts of human relationships might assist in working towards positively peaceful societies that are non-violent, socially just, and sustain the environment that provides us with life.

However, it also needs to be acknowledged that behaviour usually associated with more negative concepts might be necessary to ensure justice in peace. Emotions such as anger, disgust, disappointment and resentment

---

<sup>5</sup> Cited in Elizabeth Porter (1999) *Feminist Perspectives on Ethics*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education, p.44.

might be necessary to motivate people to take action against injustices, and to resist repression. The rational and logical application of insight and cognitive awareness might calculate that, for challenging the people and institutions that are responsible for injustice in order to bring about the conditions for positive peace, requires additional or alternative virtues. Relationships between resisters of violence and oppression would need to be based on such concepts as commitment, courage, resourcefulness and persistence. Trust that is naïve or foolish can allow corruption and dishonesty to remain hidden and allow possibilities for further harm to be caused.

The semantics of the concepts discussed reveal the nuances and sometimes contradictions inherent in language. While there is universality in some of the concepts required for positive relationships, different languages and cultures give priorities to different aspects for building good relationships. In this article, we are evidently using the English language focusing on the Western tradition that incorporates elements from Greek, Latin, German, French and Spanish. However, there are concepts in other languages not easily translated into English that would enhance this discussion. I acknowledge that this terminology is limited and does not embrace all of the types of relationships that might be helpful or even essential for bringing about positive peace.

### **Conclusion**

This article puts forward the idea that the three elements proposed by Harris that contribute to Positive Peace, non-violence, social justice and sustainable ecology, need to be added to with a fourth element, 'good' relationships. The focus here is on human relationships and the sorts of relationships that are needed to produce and sustain positive peace. To start a conversation about relationships that would enhance this goal, four categories of good relationships are considered, based on emotion, cognitive awareness and insight, social conscience, and trust.

Love, affection, kindheartedness and compassion are positive emotions that enable people to connect to each other based on innate feelings. On the basis of rational, cognitive and logical insight, there is a range of relationships that can be developed that are very likely to create conditions conducive to positive peace. These include respect, tolerance, acceptance, empathy, concern, care, friendship, cooperation, harmony, peacefulness and forgiveness. For a sustained peaceful society, people also need to examine their social conscience to ensure that the way they relate to

each other addresses social justice issues. So relationships need to be based on justice, equality, fairness, ethics, rightness, helpfulness, generosity, hospitality and empowerment. And lastly, without trust, relationships are likely to deteriorate, so trusting relationships, based on honesty, openness, sincerity, genuineness, integrity, trustworthiness, reliability, confidence and *confianza* are essential for positive peace.

Without 'good' relationships, societies are unlikely to be able to sustain peace, but the conversation remains open as to what other sorts of relationships are required to advance efforts within societies whether they are experiencing immediate conflict or not.

## References

- Abdullah, Carolyne, Christopher Karpowitz & Chad Raphael (2016). Equality and equity in deliberation: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Journal of Public Deliberation*; Berkeley, 12(2).
- Addams, Jane (1907). *Newer ideals of peace*. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press,
- Addams, Jane (2003). Women and internationalism. In J. Addams, E.G. Balch, and A. Hamilton (Eds), *Women at the Hague: The International Congress of Women and its results* (pp. 107-115), Champaign: University of Illinois Press (Original work published 1915).
- Azarmandi, Mahdis (2017). Colonial Continuities: A Study of Anti-Racism in Aotearoa New Zealand and Spain. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Otago, Dunedin.
- Baier, Annette (1994). *Moral prejudices: Essays on ethics*. , Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Bews, N.F. & G.J. Rossouw (2002). A role for business ethics in facilitating trustworthiness. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 39(4), 377-390.
- Bockerie, Abu (2002). Peace Education in a wartorn small state: The case of Sierra Leone *Peace Research*. 34(2), 117-128.
- Boxill, Bernard R. (2010). The duty to seek peace, *Social Philosophy and Policy*, Oxford, 27(2), 274-296.
- Clements, Kevin (2016). The politics of compassion in a world of ruthless power. Paper presented to the Centre Research Seminar, National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand, 18 August.
- Cottey, Alan (2016). Openness and stability. *AI and Society*. 31(2), August, 319-325.
- Curle, Adam (1971). *Making peace*. Tavistock: London.
- Curle, Adam (2006). *The fragile voice of love*. John Carpenter: Oxford.

- Derrida, Jacques (2001). *Cosmopolitanism and forgiveness*. Routledge: London.
- Devere, Heather (2014a) Friendship in international treaties. In Simon Koschut & Andrea Oelsner (Eds.) *Friendship and international relations*. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke and New York.
- Devere, Heather (2014b) The many meanings of friendship. *AMITY: The Journal of Friendship Studies*, 2(1), 1-3.
- Furnari, Ellen (2013). Understanding Effectiveness in peacekeeping operations: Exploring the perspectives of frontline peacekeepers. Unpublished PhD thesis, National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Otago, Dunedin.
- Furnari Ellen (2015). Relationships are critical for unarmed peacekeeping. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*. 27(1), 25-30.
- Galtung, Johan (1969) Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*. 6, 167-191.
- Gilligan, Carol (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Jonas Nordkvelle & Håvard Strand (2014). Peace research – just the study of war? *Journal of Peace Research*, 52(2), 145-158.
- Halperin, Eran, Smadar Cohen-Chen & Amit Goldenberg (2014). Indirect emotion regulation in intractable conflicts: A new approach to conflict resolution' *European Review of Social Psychology*. 25(1), 1-31.
- Harris, Ian (2004). Peace education theory. *Journal of Peace Education* 1(1), 5-20.
- Held, Virginia (2006). *The ethics of care*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press..
- Kakoliris, Gerasimos (2015). Jacques Derrida on the ethics of hospitality. In E. Imafidon (Ed.) *The ethics of subjectivity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan: London (pp.144-156).
- King, Martin Luther, Jr (1964/2009). The Nobel Peace Prize 1964 Nobel Lecture, December 11, The Nobel Foundation, Retrieved from [http://nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/peace/laureates/1964/king-lecture.html](http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1964/king-lecture.html).
- Kittay, Eva Feder (1999). *Love's labor: Essays on women, equality, and dependency*. New York: Routledge.
- Kittay, Eva Feder & Myers, Diana T. (Eds.) *Women and moral theory*. USA: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Laabs, Carolyn (2011). Perceptions of Moral Integrity: Contradictions in Need of Explanation. *Nursing Ethics*. 18(3), 431-440.
- Lauring, Jakob & Jan Selmer (2012). Openness to diversity, trust and conflict in multicultural organizations. *Journal of Management and Organization*. 18(6), 795-806.
- Lederach, John Paul (2014). Remembering forward: The visionary practical scholarship of Adam Curle. Delivered at the Bradford University Conference, May 3.

- Lederach, John Paul (2006). *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation across cultures*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Lederach, John Paul (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lederach, John Paul (2003). *Little book of conflict transformation*. New York City: Skyhorse Publishing (also cited in *Peacework* (2006), 33, 26-27).
- Lederach, John Paul (1997a). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*, Washington DC: United States Institution of Peace.
- Lederach, John Paul (1997b). The meeting place <http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/transform/jplchpt.htm>.
- Lewis, C.S. (1960). *The four loves*. London: Font.
- Mitra, Aniruddha, James T. Bang & Arnab Biswas (2015). Gender equality and economic growth: Is it equality of opportunity or equality of outcomes. *Feminist Economics*. 21(1), 110-135.
- Montoya, R. Matthew, Mu-Qing Huang, Bridget P. Lynch, & Cassondra M. Faiella (2013). Is equality perceived as a solution to societal problems? *North American Journal of Psychology*, Winter Garden 15(1), March, 39-48.
- Moscrop, David R.H. & Mark E. Warren (2016). When is deliberation democratic? *Journal of Public Deliberation*. 12(2), Article 4, <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol12/iss2/art4>, accessed 1 August 2017.
- Newsom, Victoria Ann & Wenshu Lee (2009). On nourishing peace: The performativity of activism through the Nobel Peace Prize *Global Media Journal*. 8(5), 1-16.
- Noddings, Nel (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Planalp, Sally (2003). The unacknowledged role of emotion in theories of close relationships: How do theories feel? *Communication Theory*, 13(1), February, 78-99.
- Porter, Elizabeth (1999) *Feminist perspectives on ethics*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.
- Reardon, Betty (1988). *Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, Betty (1997). Human rights education as education for peace. In George J. Andreopoulos & Richard Pierre Claude (Eds.) *Human rights education for the twenty-first century*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.
- Ruddick, Sara (1989). *Maternal thinking: Toward a politics of peace*. New York: Ballentine Books.
- Scott, John, (2017). *The Sage handbook of social network analysis*. London/New Delhi/Singapore/Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Shields, Patricia M. and Grant Rissler (2016). Positive peace: Exploring its roots and potential for public administration. *Global Virtue Ethics Review*. 7(3), 1-13.
- Shields, Patricia M. & Joseph Soeters (2017). Peaceweaving: Jane Addams, positive peace and public administration. *American Review of Public Administration*. 47(3), 323-339.
- Tronto, Joan (1994). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. New York: Routledge.
- Wagner, Lynn & Daniel Druckman (2017). Drivers of durable peace: The role of justice in negotiating civil war termination. *Group Decision Negotiation* 26, 45-67.
- Woodhouse, Tom (2010). Adam Curle: Radical peacemaker and pioneer of peace studies. *Journal of Conflictology*. 1(1), 1-7.