

Christie, D. J., Wagner, R. V., & Winter, D. A. (Eds.). (2001). ***Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century***. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Note: Copyright reverted to editors (2007). Permission is granted for downloading and copying.

CHAPTER 23

TOWARD A PSYCHOLOGY OF STRUCTURAL

PEACEBUILDING

Cristina Jayme Montiel

This chapter describes concepts related to the process of changing structures of violence to structures of peace, a *transformative* process called structural peacebuilding. I will begin with two stories depicting structural peacebuilding in the Philippines.

A STRUCTURAL VIEW OF VIOLENCE AND PEACE

Two Social Narratives

The first account illustrates a group's efforts to transform structures of economic injustice. Seventeen farmers engaged in a hunger strike, struggling against the economically exploitative conditions of landlessness (Lasay & Macasaet, 1998a, 1998b). The second narrative talks about political oppression. After 14 years under dictatorial rule, millions of Filipinos banded together in a mass-based movement called People's Power to dismantle structures of political authoritarianism (Licuanan, 1987; Magno, 1986; Mercado, 1986).

Against Economic Exploitation: Farmers Hunger Strike for Land. The hunger strike story started when the Philippine government awarded 144 hectares to the landless farmers, in an effort to distribute agricultural land more equitably. The landowner was a multimillionaire who owned other vast lands outside this contested estate. He refused to give up the 144 hectares and hired paramilitary forces to guard the farm peripheries (Lasay & Macasaet, 1998a). At this point, the farmers considered three options. First, they could give up the land and go landless. Going underground with the New People's Army and facing the landowner's military strength with their own armed force constituted a second option. The final choice was to embark on a hunger strike until either the land was given to them or they died of hunger. In late 1997, they decided to go on a hunger strike.

To generate support from sympathetic groups the farmers began networking with nongovernment organizations (NGOs) in MetroManila.¹ I first met them at this juncture when they consulted with me about the psychopolitical strategies of a hunger strike. We planned some media coverage to mobilize public pressure, and talked about what happened to one's mind and body when one stopped eating. We also discussed the psychological and political implications of an irreversible-till-death commitment. Then their hunger strike began. They set up camp in front of the Department of Agrarian Reform, and called daily press conferences. After a few days, the weaker ones collapsed and were hospitalized. As more farmers collapsed from hunger, Philippine President Fidel Ramos intervened in the conflict, granting one-third of the land to the single landowner, and the remaining two-thirds of the estate to the 17 farmers. The farmers saw this allocation as a victory, so they called off their strike, celebrated, thanked their NGO allies, and re-

¹ MetroManila refers to the primary metropolitan area of the Philippines where national government offices, media stations, financial centers, and leading universities are located.

turned home to their land (Lasay & Macasaet, 1998a). I will stop my story here, but add that the farmers' "victory" was only short-lived, and their peaceful saga for land ownership continues (Lasay & Macasaet, 1998b).

Against Political Oppression: People's Power for Democratic Structures. The second narrative details the People's Power movement to dismantle authoritarian political structures (Mercado, 1986). In September 1972, after Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos declared martial law, thousands of prodemocracy Filipinos were arrested, tortured, and killed. In 1983, Marcos's political archrival Senator Benigno Aquino returned from his U.S. exile to persuade Marcos to grant more freedoms to the nation. After Senator Aquino's plane landed, military men pulled him out of the plane, shut the door behind them, and in a few seconds Aquino's dead body lay on the tarmac. The Marcos administration blamed the local communists for the brutal slaying, but almost every Filipino knew otherwise (Mercado, 1986).

The burial march of Senator Aquino, attended by millions, marked the first massive but peaceful show of collective anger against Marcos's rule. This nonviolent display of force by MetroManilans set the political tone for the next three years in which citizens were no longer paralyzed by fear. Under the leadership of Senator Aquino's widow Corazon Aquino, Filipinos poured out of their homes to join the escalating protest rallies, braving the hazards of arrests, police beatings, snipers, tear gas attacks, and water cannons (Mercado, 1986).

As soon as Marcos announced his presidential bid in the snap national elections in early 1986, oppositionists from various ideological positions united behind the dictator's electoral rival, Senator Benigno Aquino's widow, Corazon. Marcos then declared himself the victor in an election widely perceived as rigged. The public anger against rampant electoral cheating ripened

the atmosphere for sociopolitical change.

In February 1986, Marcos's longtime allies Defense Minister Juan Ponce Enrile and Armed Forces Vice Chief of Staff Fidel Ramos announced over the radio that they no longer supported the Marcos government. In a few hours, hundreds of thousands of pro-Aquino civilians surrounded the military camps where the breakaway military faction of Enrile and Ramos fortified their armed defense. The unarmed swarm of Filipinos functioned as human shields between the Marcos tanks and the Enrile-Ramos military wing. The throng of nonviolent protesters sat, ate, sang, prayed, and slept on the main highway in front of the military camps. On the fourth day of what became popularly known as "People's Power," Marcos escaped to Hawaii by helicopter. He was toppled without much bloodshed. In a few days, Corazon Aquino set up office as the new President of the Republic of the Philippines (Mercado, 1986). In the next twelve months, the new democratic government appointed local government heads to replace the Marcosian minions throughout the country. A year after the peaceful upheaval, Filipinos went to the polls to elect their local leaders, causing the Philippine authoritarian political structure to become more egalitarian.

The stories of the farmers' hunger strike and the Philippine People's Power movement can be used to elucidate concepts about social structure. The discussion below refers to the two social narratives to concretize some structural ideas.

Social Structure

Social structure pertains to patterns of relatively permanent hierarchical relations among groups or collectivities in a social system (Parsons, 1961). This definition highlights three properties of

social structure. First, social systems are the primary *unit of analysis*, not interpersonal relations (Blau, 1969). For example, in the hunger strike, the structural basis of the incident was the configuration of relations between the landless and the landed in the Philippines, not the interpersonal relations between the landowner and the 17 farmers. A second property of social structure is that it is marked by *social differentiation* that is not only heterogeneous but also unequal (Blau, 1977). This means that differences among collectivities in a structure are not horizontal but vertical in nature (Galtung, 1978) with those on the top having the most wealth and power. A structural perspective is sensitized to *social power differentials* between groups. A third characteristic of social structure is its invariance or tendency to resist change, even though there may be lower-amplitude shorter-time-duration alterations in a social system (Parsons, 1961). For example, in the Philippines, the unequal intergroup relations based on land ownership have been embedded in the social system for about four centuries.

Structural Violence

A social structure is violent when its vertical arrangement of inequality prevents huge numbers of collectivities from satisfying basic human needs (Christie, 1997; Galtung, 1975, 1978, 1980a, 1980b, 1996). Resources are controlled by a privileged few. Massive deprivations underneath a layer of elite overindulgence characterize structurally *violent social configurations*.

Galtung (1980a) separates the sources of violence into two types: actors and structures. For example, if students who lead a prodemocracy march are beaten up and then detained by government forces, the youths' needs for security and freedom are blocked by specific armed individuals. The violence on the protesters is interpersonal and is traced to the people in the military who behaved aggressively. Peace workers who focus on the individual actor tend to employ

strategies aimed to change the mental processes and/or behaviors of aggressive persons, and may remain oblivious to the goal of restructuring vertical intergroup relations embedded in the social system.

The primary aim of peace workers with a structural perspective is to restructure *vertical systems* toward more equal systemic configurations. For instance, an unequal distribution of agricultural land ownership in a country gives rise to economic misery. Likewise, a system of political authoritarianism squashes self-determination needs and alienates the citizenry from their own government. The challenge of structural peace work remains as long as social inequalities persist in the social system, even when direct violence and other human rights violations are no longer manifest.

Variables related to structure-dependent deprivations are unlike the variables of violence that psychologists traditionally examine within an intrapersonal or interpersonal framework (Berkowitz, 1993). Structural violence lacks intent, subject, object, and interpersonal action (Galtung, 1975). For example, collective identity deprivations caused by an authoritarian system arise from the hierarchical intergroup relations between the military forces and ordinary citizens. This pervading *vertical configuration of political powers* cannot be described as possessing aggressive intent because the problem is embedded in a system and is not due to the motivation of an individual or collectivity.

Violent conditions that are actor-dependent and structure-dependent can be separated from each other only on an abstract analytical plane. In real life, structure-related violence and individual actions support each other. An episode of interpersonal violence may occur in which a military officer hits a student. On one level, the violence is between two actors. On another level, the

violence is supported by the vertical arrangement of power.

Structural Peace

The absence of structural violence is structural peace (Galtung, 1975). *Structural peace* is a *utopic system* (i.e., it does not exist in its pure form in the real world) marked by egalitarian configurations, wherein decision-making powers over resource allocation are distributed equally in a society. Structurally peaceful social systems are marked by equitably-distributed decision-powers in the production, allocation, and utilization of economic, political, and cultural resources. Structural peace conditions contain social differentiation, but the intergroup variations are horizontal rather than vertical.

Mallman (1980) clarifies the relationship between resource control, structural peace, and access to need satisfiers. He explains that when the distribution of available need-satisfiers are controlled by the elite, an inequitable sharing of satisfiers tends to arise and produce massive deprivations among those at the bottom of the system. By definition, when decision-making over vital resources is distributed *horizontally*, each group will protect its interests but at the same time will have to make its interests compatible with other groups' interests. The process of equally-shared decision-making brings about a more equitable distribution of basic needs satisfiers and lessens conditions of massive need deprivations that mark structural violence.

Let us use the farmers' narrative to illustrate structural peace. In the Philippines, land is inequitably distributed and the landowning elite decide how to utilize their land resources. Predictably, unilateral decisions of the landowner in the hunger strike case favored self-interest and resulted in chronic poverty among the landless tillers (Lasay & Macasaet, 1998a, 1998b). In a

utopic condition of structural peace, landowners would possess less land and farmers would acquire a greater portion of the land through cooperatives owned collectively and managed by themselves. Tillers of the soil would then have more decision-making powers over the land harvests. In the hunger strike story, the farmers were already organized into a cooperative called *Mapalad* (Blessed), as they prepared alternative peaceful structures and struggled to transform the inequitable system (Lasay & Macasaet, 1998a, 1998b).

STRUCTURAL PEACEBUILDING

Building peace entails changing structures of violence to structures of peace. More specifically, *structural peacebuilding* is (a) a social psychological process of transforming (b) relatively permanent unequal relationships among collectivities in a social structure (c) to new sets of inter-group relations where all groups have more *equitable control over politico-economic resources* needed to satisfy basic needs.

Structural Peace Is Not Structural Peacebuilding

Structural peace is very different from structural peacebuilding. First, peacebuilding is a means while structural peace is an end. Second, peacebuilding is characterized by disequilibrium and strain, as collectivities disengage from a structurally violent system. On the other hand, structural peace is an attribute of a utopic social structure, marked by equilibrium and harmony. Finally, peacebuilding is dynamic while structural peace is relatively invariant. I will now expound on the nature of structural peacebuilding.

Building Social Strain

Since structural peacebuilding necessitates systemic transformation, one needs to take a closer

look at sources of structural change. From where does change originate? Structural shifts usually arise from strains internal to the system (Godelier, 1978; Merton, 1968; Parsons, 1961). *Structural strain* exists in relationships between groups in a system when there is pressure to change the relationships to new ones incompatible with the *dominant structure* (Parsons, 1961).

Paradoxically, the route to creating *horizontal structures* includes the production of strain within vertical systems. Structural change arises as the social system seeks ways to reduce the pervasive strain. There are other ways to lessen strain, such as bringing back full conformity with the dominant structure, or some accommodation, but these efforts do not result in *structural transformation* (Parsons, 1961). Since vertical structures are deeply embedded in social systems, structural peacebuilding involves the creation (not the cessation) of social strain, conflict, and disequilibrium between two or more structural collectivities, producing movement toward more horizontal relations. The idea of increasing conflict to produce transformative strain in structural peacebuilding disagrees with current conflict resolution and peacemaking strategies that seek to reduce strain (Rubin et al., 1994).

Structural change transforms inequitable relationship patterns in the social configuration. When structural strain is resolved too early and equilibrium is restored prematurely, the “peaceful” process rebuilds full or partial conformity with inequitable structures. Structural peacebuilding is hindered by such circumstances. For example, at one point in the hunger strike, the Philippine government’s Office of the Presidential Adviser for the Peace Process (OPAPP) met with the protesting farmers. One official from OPAPP pleaded with the strikers to stop their hunger strike for the sake of peace but the farmers refused. If farmers had agreed, the landowner would have retained all 144 hectares of the agricultural plot.

As psychologists and peace activists carry out peace work in the midst of social conflict, they confront the invisible danger of prematurely restoring structural equilibrium, even when peacebuilding requires precisely the opposite, *systemic disequilibrium*. Strain resolution, or what psychologists may refer to as conflict resolution (Rubin et al., 1994), may interrupt the ripening structural change process with untimely calls for intrapersonal forgiveness and interpersonal reconciliation.

Discussion of the effectiveness of strain resolution begs the question: when the structural status quo is restored in the name of forgiveness and reconciliation, which structural groups stand to gain? I am not purporting that there is no room for forgiveness and reconciliation in the broader scenario of structural peace and peacebuilding. Only that untimely forgiveness and reconciliation may be the new “opium of the people” (Marx, 1844/1975, p. 175), and cause people to disengage from the strain and disequilibrium involved in structural peacebuilding.²

Groups in the dominant structure tend to control local arsenals and use these to resist attempts to change systemic configurations. For example, the landowner in the farmers’ situation hired local paramilitary troops to barricade the peripheries of the controversial land. Likewise, during the rise of nonviolent demonstrations in the Philippines, military forces fought the rallyists with tear gas and bullets. Margarita Cojuangco (1986), a Filipina prodemocracy activist, recorded her experience during an armed military street offensive with these words:

I’m writing you while events are still vivid in my mind...I am writing about the

² Karl Marx (1844/1975) claimed that religion was the opium of the people because beliefs in the supernatural and the afterlife artificially satisfied poor people and pushed them to accept their earthly destitutions without much discontent. Similarly, premature calls for forgiveness and reconciliation may result in artificial social harmony, enticing structural victims to accept the predominant vertical structures instead of changing the systemic violence.

Quezon Boulevard rally...I had a borrowed gas mask. The others brought theirs too, along with lemon juice and water to protect their faces from tear gas...We locked our arms tightly to keep from breaking ranks...Suddenly, the water hoses were turned on us...A few minutes later, I heard (tear gas) cans fall on the pavement...Suddenly, a composite³ shouted: “Armalites!” ...I saw a long gun behind a military man’s shield...I took a deep breath and remained unafraid. I cannot explain how I mustered all that courage. Then, fire trucks and truncheon-and-shield-bearing soldiers came at us...Gunshots were fired. The order came: “Run!” My partner⁴ Guila Maramba and I ran, arm in arm. (pp. 35–36)

Persistent systemic resistance and the relatively invariant nature of social structures make structural peacebuilding a formidable challenge to human societies. As a protective counterforce to structural invariance, the production and management of strain necessitates some kind of social power. The following section explains some social psychological ideas related to social power and structural peacebuilding.

Structural Transformation Is Possible

Social structures are implemented through *embedded power systems*. Blalock (1989) defines *power* in terms of *dependency*. Party X is dependent on Y to the degree that Y controls X’s access to X’s valued goals. The power of Y over X is the degree to which X’s dependence on Y exceeds Y’s dependence on X. Structural verticality means the elite at the top hold power over the

³ Seasoned street protesters, usually from the ranks of the students or urban poor.

⁴ For safety, street marchers were required to arm-lock with a buddy or partner at all times, even when running away from military firing.

production, allocation, and utilization of resources needed to satisfy basic needs (Galtung, 1975; Mallman, 1980; Parsons, 1961). For example, in the farmers' story, the landowner claimed economic monopoly over the land resources needed to alleviate the farmers' misery. Similarly, under martial law's authoritarian structure, Philippine military forces controlled the political resources needed by the citizenry for *self-determination*, which means political representation and voice in matters that affect their well being. But social power is implemented through human action. The nature of human action carries the key to the possibility of structural change despite structural rigidity and resistance.

Action is a behavior that is purposive and cognitively informed (Porpora, 1987). The mental facilities of purpose and cognition make it possible to disconnect human action from the deterministic hold of oppressive and exploitative social structures. These mental abilities place importance on one's subjective facilities as distinct from the objective structural conditions surrounding the action. When the farmers chose to go on a hunger strike to obtain agricultural land, they made a subjective choice outside the boundaries of a structural reaction that would have kept them subservient and locked in the position of landless structural victims. Accompanied by subjective purpose and cognition, the farmers' action became structurally transformative and disconnected from an automatic (human) response to (structural) stimuli.

Producing Force: Networking, Mobilizing, Conscientizing. What is the basis of the force of hunger strikes, People's Power, and other structural peacebuilding methods? Certainly the force is not attributed to the traditional power-bases of a violent social structure, which concentrates capital, land, and military arsenals. The social power of peaceful structural transformation emanates from collective human actions, mobilized into a synchronized social force, purpose-

fully directed toward disequilibrating vertical structures and building new egalitarian systems. To produce systemically transformative power, structural peacebuilders face three concrete tasks: networking, mobilizing, and political education.

Networking involves creating an alternative collectivity outside the oppressive structure, by building organizational links with sympathetic individuals and groups. For example, when the farmers decided to go on a hunger strike, they networked with nongovernment groups in Metro-Manila. The prodemocracy movement during the Marcos dictatorship established an extensive web of sympathizers among church workers, students, laborers, business leaders, and—more discretely—even within the ranks of military institutions.

The human potentials available in the counterstructure networks do not generate social power until the groups are mobilized into a single coordinated social force. *Mobilization* aims to produce collective action where the networked individuals operate in unison to oppose the actions emanating from the vertical structure. Among the farmers, the mobilized action was their hunger strike, while prodemocracy activists consolidated their networks during mass protest actions.

Political education pertains to the discussion of underlying structural issues related to the mobilized action. Networking and mobilization aim to change verticality in the objective structure, while education transforms the corresponding subjective verticality within one's consciousness. Political education functions to create a collective cognition and purpose directed toward disequilibrating exploitative systems and creating alternative peaceful structures. The pedagogical style of political education should promote nonverticality, or else a new *hierarchical culture of intellectual domination* may rise out of the peacebuilding movement. Filipinos working for structural transformation often used Paolo Freire's (1970) process of nonvertical education called

conscientization, where the emphasis is on relationships that are horizontal instead of authoritarian and hierarchical.

My own peacebuilding experiences during the Marcos dictatorship included networking and mobilizing tasks, though most of my energies went to running political education workshops around the Philippines. We facilitated conscientization sessions covering topics such as structural analysis, vision of person and society, Philippine political spectrum, active nonviolence, and strategies for change. Understandably, the military forces grew suspicious of our seminars. At one workshop in a rural town in the Ilocos Region, as we held our discussions under a huge mango tree, two military tanks came down the road and parked a few meters away in an attempt to harass us. We felt afraid, but continued our political discussions, and were much relieved when the tanks rolled away without harming anyone in the workshop.

Creative Social Power and Structural Roles. The production and management of a peacebuilding force demands three social psychological processes related to roles. First, a conscientization process is experienced as people grow *aware* of their respective structural roles. Second, individuals *disentangle* from the behaviors and cognitions prescribed by their positions in the embedded inequitable system. Third, individuals *acquire* new roles needed to create and utilize social disequilibrium. These three requirements apply across-status, regardless of one's structural position in the *exploiter-victim relationship*.

For example, when landlords and landless farmers interact, they may either play out their structurally determined roles or choose to step out of these roles. Those who opt to remain in their structural roles do not produce any social strain and may even obtain rewards for such behaviors. For instance, it was widely rumored that farmers who remained subservient and did not

join the hunger strike received cash incentives from the landowner. On the other hand, the 17 hunger-striking farmers demonstrated the possibility of stepping out of their subservience roles in the structure, as they took more strain-producing counter-structure roles vis-à-vis the landowner.

In another example of structure-free creative actions, civilians who joined protest actions showed that it was possible to step out of structural roles at the juncture where citizens interacted with their military role partners. Creative action is not limited to victims; the top dog can do likewise. For example, during street rallies where police beat up protesters, a police officer would occasionally intervene and ask for mercy in the name of the victim. And even at the height of martial law, I had the personal experience of having a prison guard smuggle out a letter to me from a political prisoner who was being held incommunicado inside a military camp.

In summary, the *forcefulness of structural peacebuilding* comes from: (a) creative—i.e., not structure-determined—action (b) skilled in the production and management of *nonviolent social strain* (c) collected or mobilized into *conscientized social power* (d) purposefully directed by the dual goals of removing structural inequities and crafting more equitable structural configurations. These procedural requirements open up systemic transformation to the positive contributions of structure-sensitive psychologists. The following section explores some psychological aspects of structural peacebuilding.

APPLYING PSYCHOLOGY TO STRUCTURAL PEACEBUILDING

Producing Nonviolent Social Strain

The production of nonviolent strain includes at least three psychological ingredients: a sense of

sacrifice and shared spirituality among participants, practical politico-organizational tactics while facing a militarized enemy, and leadership which is ascetic, pragmatic, and decentralized.

Sense of Sacrifice and Shared Spirituality. Stepping out of one's structural role expectations usually produces negative consequences for those who do so. At the very least, the vertical system fails to reward role-deviant behaviors materially, psychologically, and/or professionally; at worst, the deviance is punished. In our example of the land distribution controversy, the 17 hunger-striking farmers were ostracized by other community members who followed the wishes of the landowner. Furthermore, the act of disequilibrating embedded structures, while simultaneously refraining from countermilitary offensives, demands much personal sacrifice from the peacebuilders. The siren call of counterviolence is constantly present. For example, the protesting farmers could have joined the New People's Army to fight the landowner. Instead, they chose to embark on a hunger strike—a collective act that destabilizes a system through *group self-sacrifice*. Likewise, during the People's Power Revolution in the Philippines, large numbers of unarmed civilians placed their bodies in front of military tanks. Engaging in structural peacebuilding often calls for a readiness to lay down one's life if things do not go well. In a sense, it is this openness to pain and/or death that helps bring forth the human force to dismantle a structure without creating additional violence.

In structural peacebuilding, sacrifice is not an individual behavior, but rather a collective act by a group determined to produce its own purposive social force. Usually, the collective activity is accompanied by a sense of *shared spirituality* among the participating members. For example, the hunger-striking farmers requested spiritual reflection sessions at the height of their struggle. One biblical phrase that caught their attention was that a person does not live “on bread alone”

(Matthew 4:4, The New American Bible). To this, one of the farmers responded, “We can continue going hungry until we get justice.” At the People’s Power rallies, street protesters celebrated masses and prayed the rosary through their political vigils. In prayer sessions during critical political times, Filipinos petitioned the resurrected Christ to be beside them in case they got killed. Belief in the Resurrection helped the protesters become more courageous as they faced the military tanks and the possibility of death. In other new democracies, there are many examples of the blending of spirituality with structural peacebuilding efforts: Cambodia’s Walk-for-Peace led by Buddhist monk Venerable Maha Ghosananda (Mahoney, 1998; Moser-Puangsuwan, & Maure, n.d.; Mydans, 1998 September); and Eastern Europe’s Lutheran church-based candlelit protests that sparked the implosion of the Soviet Empire (Schoensee & Lederer, 1991). A spiritual orientation provides the psychological strength needed to engage in nonviolent structural transformation. Furthermore, when a group triumphs in their structural peacebuilding efforts and obtains transformative power, a spiritual disposition may likewise help members remain detached from the seductive attractions of personal ambition, material extravagance, and post-conflict revenge.

Psychological Dimensions of Facing the Militarized Enemy. Creating a social force for restructuring requires that individuals act collectively and purposefully. When a group produces social strain, individuals in the system may react with direct violence. It becomes a challenge to continue managing social strain in an active nonviolent way, without either backing out or engaging in direct counterviolence. Some social psychological features of *collective active nonviolence* are a high level of psychological tolerance for the enemy, knowledge of and insistence on one’s human rights, the *buddy or partner system* (i.e., always being with one other person to de-

ter abduction by military agents), unquestioned obedience to the group's security marshals, and protective, not offensive collective behaviors in case of physical violence (e.g., lying down and taking cover instead of standing up or going against water cannons, explosives, and tear gas; see box on p. 292).

Collective nonviolence likewise requires an attempt to win over the goodwill of the militarized enemy. Examples of such behaviors are offering symbols of peace like flowers, candies, and cigarettes, to the front-line police forces or tank personnel; or speaking gently to the military to persuade them to join the street protesters. The Philippine experience has shown that military forces are less angry and fearful toward women and religious leaders. Therefore, individuals from these subgroups were the most effective rally frontliners in persuading the military to receive flowers and other gifts of peace.

One reason why structural peacebuilding is a collective rather than an individualistic process is that different individuals are needed at different points of the structural peacebuilding process. Many protesters involved in structural disequilibrium (e.g., during the bleak days of authoritarianism) are too psychologically scarred with *traumatic memories*. When it is time to build *alternative peaceful structures*, they are unable to shed their fears and anger which makes it difficult for them to undertake structural change in a forceful but nonviolent manner.

A personal incident showed me how past fears may interfere with collective nonviolence. At a People's Power rally, I was a security marshal. I had previously instructed the marchers under my care that in case of violent dispersal, they were to sit down rather than run. During the rally, I saw my friend, who was around 15 meters away from me, being snatched by a plainclothes intelligence agent. I screamed out my friend's name to catch the attention of our fellow rallyists. See-

ing the military snatch my friend triggered fears associated with my past military-caused traumas, so I automatically began to run away from the intelligence agents. I failed to follow my own instructions not to run away in case of violence. Luckily, when I began to run, I was armed with my rally buddy, and he shouted at me “Don’t run. Sit!” After he said this, I realized that everyone else was sitting on the pavement and I sat down, too. Because we were seated, the agents did not chase us (with their truncheons!), but instead engaged in peaceful negotiations with our rally leaders. At this juncture both victims and oppressors had stepped out of their structural role scripts and began to relate with each other in new ways.

Leadership. Often, *structural peacebuilding leaders* fuse contemporary *asceticism* with practical political power. Their social influence emanates not from their ability to wield brute force, but from a capacity for self-sacrifice and kind acts effectively coupled with pragmatic political tactics. As we begin the twenty-first century, examples of world-recognized peacebuilders are Cambodia’s Venerable Maha Gosanda, Burma’s Aung San Suu Kyi, South Africa’s Nelson Mandela, and the Philippines’ Corazon Aquino.

If one were to look more closely at the structural peacebuilding process, however, one would realize that there is not a single leader but many leaders who take on various responsibilities in the struggle for structural change. Leadership roles are not centralized for pragmatic reasons. The collective spirit of a huge protest movement is more resilient when leadership is diffused rather than resting on a single person. Hence, even if some influential personalities are detained or killed, the process of peacebuilding tends to move onward. Furthermore, the psychological requirements of self-sacrificial readiness constitute a choice that cannot be imposed by centralized leadership. Self-sacrifice is a daily personal decision that is carried out in the context of a small

group

Reminders for Rally Participants*

What to do when:

1. There are provocateurs:
 - a) There may be attempts to taunt rally participants so that there will be trouble. Provocateurs may infiltrate the ranks or may pose as bystanders who may taunt participants by shouting invectives, throwing stones, and using other physical methods to instigate trouble.
 - b) Do not retaliate or do anything that may cause trouble. Maximum tolerance is the rule.

Notify marshals or line leaders if you see agitators or if anybody in the ranks has reached the point of blowing up.
2. There is dispersal:
 - a) Wait for instructions from the marshals.
 - b) Do not break the ranks or leave your line or buddy. “Kapitbisig” (arm-locking) can be done to prevent the ranks from splitting up.
 - c) If there is need to withdraw, be sure you know where the rendezvous point is. Do not move alone.
3. You are detained/picked up:
 - a) Make sure you are not alone. It is important that the buddy system is maintained.
 - b) Shout if you have to call the attention of others in the group.
 - c) Ask for the identification of the person detaining you.
 - d) Insist on your rights. You cannot be detained without charges.
 - e) Report cases of physical abuse by the police/government forces (secure a certification from a doctor regarding the extent of physical damage as soon as possible).
4. There is tear gas:
 - a) Cover mouth and nose with a wet handkerchief.
 - b) Crouch low to avoid inhaling the fumes.
 - c) Do not break the ranks, this will only create confusion and may open the ranks to infiltration or illegal detention. Follow instructions of the marshals.
5. Facing water cannons:

- a) Follow instructions of the marshals and do not run away from the ranks.
 - b) Keep down. Do not stand up against the force of the water cannons.
6. An explosion takes place:
- a) Lie down and take cover when an explosion takes place.
 - b) Do not run without your group. Await instructions from the marshals where to regroup.
 - c) Notify the medical team in case you see casualties.

*An Example of Practical Instructions for Collective and Peaceful Force—Excerpt from a Leaflet Handed out during a People’s Power Rally

SUMMARY

This chapter used two social narratives to illustrate the concept of structural peacebuilding as a process of transforming unjust social systems into more peaceful structures. Structures work through social power which, in turn, is implemented through human action. Structural peacebuilding involves stepping out of structural roles, building social strain, and creating forceful collective actions by mobilizing and conscientizing large networks of people. Networking and mobilization transform external vertical structures while conscientization (Freire, 1970) changes the corresponding subjective verticality in an individual’s consciousness. The transformation of objective and subjective verticalities affect each other reciprocally and are equally important in structural change. A sense of spirituality, skillful confrontation of the militarized enemy, and appropriate leadership styles help produce effective but nonviolent structural change. I will end this chapter with a look at what psychologists can contribute to structural peacebuilding in the twenty-first century.

TOWARD THE FUTURE

As humankind welcomes the twenty-first century, populations are wracked with social antagonisms related to inequalities between conflicting groups. Amidst these conditions of inequality,

effective ways of structural peacebuilding will continue to evolve. In the new century, psychology can make significant contributions through applied and theoretical work related to the nature of structural violence and the process of structural peacebuilding. Psychological advances related to systemic violence in a variety of countries include work on *structural victimization* (Lavik et al., 1994; Pilisuk, 1997; Schwebel, 1997) and *cultural inequalities* such as prejudice (Brown, 1995; Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986; Ehrlich, 1973; Stephan et al., 1994; Swim & Stangor, 1998), ethnocentrism (Brewer, 1986; Grant, 1992; Grant & Brown, 1995; Greeson, 1991; Smith, 1992; Triandis, 1990), stereotypes (Karim, 1997; Stephan et al., 1994) and group bias (Bar-Tal, 1990; Karim, 1997; Mullen et al., 1992).

The conceptual difficulty of psychology vis-à-vis peacebuilding is in the understanding that the social system's configuration is not only a cause of human behaviors and mental processes but also an effect. Psychologists tend to focus on individuals' structural victimization, but not on the discovery of social psychological processes involved in changing social configurations. A paradigm expansion is needed.

Beyond observing the psychological ramifications of injustice and asking how humans are victimized by inequalities, a new question in the twenty-first century can be this: What psychological factors are involved in equalizing power relationships in a social structure? There are examples of structural peacebuilding in different parts of the world, especially among the disadvantaged groups in violent structures. Peacebuilding narratives are evolving out of the experiences of the oppressed groups in the First World, in Third World societies, and in new democracies. For example, the phenomenon of *People's Power* demonstrates how large groups can use peaceful but forceful means to disequilibrate well-oiled authoritarian political structures. Recent People's

Power experiences in Indonesia (Kristof, 1998; Landler, 1998; Mydans, 1998 May, 1998 November), Philippines (Licuanan, 1987; Magno, 1986; Mercado, 1986), and Eastern Europe (Schoensee & Lederer, 1991) show that it is possible to restructure authoritarian rule in a forceful but bloodless manner.

Psychologists may also want to begin looking at restructuring global inequities. In the global context, structural peace is an international configuration of political and economic equitability (Galtung, 1980b). *Global structural peacebuilding* refers to human-based processes that distribute power and wealth more equitably among the different nations and regions of the world.

Psychologists need not shy away from the theoretical and practical challenges of structural change. There are numerous psychology-related issues that can be explored. To cite a few examples, there is little known about the mental processes activated during and after structural destabilization, psychological resources of peacebuilders while undergoing external and internal strain, cognitions and affects of participants engaged in the production of nonviolent social force, and building a collective culture of forceful nonviolence.

Indeed, psychology holds a vital key to structural peacebuilding, to the crafting of a more *forceful peace*. But perhaps psychologists are looking in a different direction. We search for peace through interpersonal harmony. We avoid social strain and remain insensitive to power inequities. And as long as we pursue harmony and avoid strain, we may remain disconnected from a majority of the world populations that bear the yoke of structural inequities.