

The MmE-method

by Pat Patfoort¹

Many violent conflicts and wars in the world occur in situations where two or more groups with different ethnical and/or cultural backgrounds are confronted with one another.

But not only on that level, also on the individual level, people, every time again, get in trouble, quarrels, fights, when they are faced with different points of view, or interests, or habits, or values, or feelings. This happens in the family, on the workplace, in meetings, in the neighborhood, in the street. Also between an adult and a child, or among children.

It looks like it's generally difficult to find ways to deal with differences of other people, which don't produce stress, anger, violence, pain and sorrow.

There are several ways to deal with differences between people. In a broad way we can make the distinction between

- on the one hand **the destructive or violent way, the M-m model or Major-minor model;**
- on the other **the constructive or nonviolent way, the E- or Equivalent model.**

Most people never learned about the existence of this distinction, and even less about how to make concrete the constructive or nonviolent way. Too often people only get interested in knowing more about it when they are in the middle of a crisis, as well on the personal as on the societal level. Even if it's still possible even then to learn about and to make Conflict Transformation concrete, it's as a matter of course much harder in a middle of a crisis.

Education in a destructive vs constructive way

How can we 'teach' children and youngsters to behave in a constructive, Equivalent way?

There are three paths to do so. There are three paths by which we can teach them to behave either in a destructive Major-minor-way or in a constructive Equivalent way:

1. The A-A path or adult-adult path: this is the model adults offer to children by their own behaviour. Everytime a child sees and hears adults behave with one another in a M-m way (also how they talk about one another), the child is educated in the M-m model. Everytime a child sees adults behave in an Equivalent way with one another, the child is educated in the E-model.

This can happen between the two parents, between a parent and a teacher, between a parent and a neighbour, adults in a movie, etc.

2. The A-CH path or adult-child path. Everytime an adult behaves towards a child in a M-m way, the adult is teaching the M-m way to the child. Everytime an adult behaves towards a child in an Equivalent way, the adult is teaching the Equivalent way.

3. The A-CH/CH path or adult in front of two children. Everytime an adult considers the relationship between two children in a M-m way, the adult is teaching the M-m model to the children. Everytime an adult does this in an Equivalent way, the children are educated into the E-model.

Adults often teach the M-m model to children through this path when they compare children with one another, or in a fight between children when they look for the guilty one, the bad one, for who should be punished.

The destructive way to deal with differences

The start situation -as well for the destructive as for the constructive way- is one of two different points: the two different points are different characteristics, or behaviors, or points of view of two people or two groups

¹ See www.patpatfoort.be

of people. This start situation by itself doesn't contain any problem.

The ordinary way to deal with those two different points is the one based on **the Major-minor model or M-m model**: each tries to present its own characteristic or behavior as better than the one of the other. Each tries to be right, to dominate, to win. Each tries to put oneself in the M-position, and the other person or group in the m-position. This doesn't always happen consciously and wished. And this can happen with many different means: in a nonverbal way (facial expression, ironic smile, gestures, turning one's back), with words (negative criticism, judgments, labeling, insults), with the body (punching, cuffing on the ears, kicking, biting), with an object (any daily used object, a broken bottle, a stick, a knife, a gun).

But nobody likes to be in a minor-position. People want to get out of it.

The consequences of this are **the three mechanisms of violence** (see fig.1):

1. The escalation of violence: putting oneself into a Major-position against the person who first did put him or herself into the Major-position;

Illustrations:

- *Between two parents, Jim and Suzy: Jim starts to wash the dishes, Suzy says he should use more detergent, he answers she shouldn't put her nose in his activities, she adds she knows it's better to use more, he throws a plate in the water and shouts she just can do it herself if she all knows it better, and so it can continue to escalate.*

- *Between a parent and a child: Mam says David has to eat his soup, but David doesn't eat. Mam says if he doesn't eat his soup, he won't get dessert. David says he anyway wasn't going to eat dessert, it's disgusting. Mam shouts: "If you don't eat your soup, you won't go to the swimming lesson!". David snickers: "Hm! You don't want me to drown, do you?"*

- *Between two groups of youngsters, the group of Dimitri and the one of Peter: On the playground group D always laughs at the clothes of the boys of group P, making all sorts of jokes about them. In the classroom group P laughs everytime when someone of group D makes a mistake, or when the teacher is blaming or punishing one of them. Group D tries to make fun of group P in front of the girls, group P tries to be at the side of the teachers against group D.*

2. The chain of violence: putting oneself into a Major-position against a third party;

Illustration:

Paul had a bad day at work: he didn't feel appreciated at all but only criticized although he feels he did lots of efforts to do well his work. When he returns home, he drives quite aggressively, so that another driver, Bernard, needs very suddenly to brake not to hit his car. Bernard is furious: he almost had an accident! When he gets home he immediately complains to his wife she is not ready with the meal. She then shouts at one of the children he is not doing his homework. The child hits his sister when she comes to her mother. Etc.

3. The internalization of violence/aggression: when one cannot put oneself into a Major-position either against the person by whom one felt put in a minor-position or against a third party, one turns the available energy to defend oneself against oneself.

This can lead to depression, psychosomatic diseases (anorexia, migraine, eczema, ulcer, cancer), self mutilation, drug addiction, suicide.

The M-m model is at the basis of these three mechanisms of violence. It is **the root of violence**.

Is aggression inherent to human beings?

Behaving following the M-m model is so usual, seems so normal, that people often have the impression this is the only possible way. Most of the time people even think that this fits with the natural impulses of the

human being, with the human instincts.

Now, what is inherent to the human being, is indeed at the basis of the transition from the start situation of two different points to the M-m model. It is **the instinct of self-preservation or survival instinct** that brings us to want to get out of the m-position, which produces energy to do so. The need to protect and to defend oneself is indeed inherent to human beings. But to do this following the M-m model is absolutely not inherent to the human being. This way is only one of the possible ways to achieve this. It is the way that on first sight seems to be the most easy one, and (probably therefore) also the one that in most human societies is taught from childhood on, and that afterwards continues to be built up and fed in all possible ways.

Another way to go on with the start situation of two different points, is **the Equivalency-model or E-model** (see fig.2). This model is at **the basis of Nonviolence**. This model also responds to the instinct of self-preservation of the human being. The E-model, the nonviolence, indeed also permits us to get out of the m-position, to defend and to protect ourselves, but not at another's expense, not against someone, not attacking, as it is the case with the M-m model.

So not the aggression is inherent to human beings, but what's at the basis of it: the self-preservation instinct.

The instruments of the M-m model

Now we shall more particularly discuss situations where the two different points of the start situation are points of view. Two (or more) parties have different points of view, they disagree. When the M-m model is used, that situation is known as a "**conflict**".

In the M-m model the instruments used are what we call **arguments**. They **are put forward to try to be right, to win**.

There are four important kinds of arguments:

- 1) **the positive arguments**: one presents positive aspects of one's own point of view, to move oneself up toward the M-position;
- 2) **the negative arguments**: one mentions negative aspects of the point of view of the other person, to push down the other person toward the m-position;
- 3) **the glorifying arguments**: one says positive aspects about oneself, again to push oneself up ("I never should say something like that!", "I did do all those good things for him.")
- 4) **the destructive arguments**: one cites negative aspects of the other person, to push the other person even more down to the m-position. Among these devices are racist, ageist and sexist remarks. A way in which another differs -skin color, youth or age, gender- will be presented as negative and used to devalue the other's point of view, a view usually unrelated to the attribute referred to.

Using arguments is a **superficial** feeding of the situation. They stimulate an escalation of the conflict, feed the fire so to speak. Both parties use whatever they can find to make their own point of view stronger in opposition to the one of the other and to surmount it. One simply expands the conflict from above, feeding fuel to the fire.

The constructive way to deal with differences and conflicts: The instruments of the E-model

By contrast with the instruments used in the Major-minor system, the Equivalency model works with **foundations**, not arguments. As the word indicates, foundations are the underlying factors of both points of view (see fig.3). They are **the reasons why** both parties have the points of view they do: their motivations, needs, feelings, interests, objectives, values, habits, etc. These elements can be either intellectual-rational or emotional. They are revealed through "Why" questions: "Why do I have this point of view?", "Why does this other have his or hers?" Through exploring foundations in the E-model, one gains an opportunity to

understand and to work on the conflict **in depth** rather than simply to be stuck in the M-m model pattern of feeding it at the surface. Foundations of different points of view are often not expressed. People may not be conscious of them. Nevertheless, they are present, and identifying them is essential.

Resolving a conflict

Disagreement is handled in totally different ways by the M-m and E models. With the M-m model, there are only two possibilities. Either I am right or you are. We are in a two-dimensional system and each solution proposed or reached stimulates the same kind of reaction : "You see? I was right!" or "Who did win finally?" But often the M-m model doesn't offer any out way at all: every time we defend ourselves we do this in an attacking way, by which another person is provoked to defend him or herself, again in an attacking way, again provoking us or another person. And so it goes on.

By contrast, the E model leads us to innumerable solutions, which emerge from a way of thinking which transcends the two-dimensional restriction. They are created by understanding and respecting all of the foundations of both parties involved in the conflict.

While with the M-m model finding a solution is predominant, with the E-model the process by which one finds it is most important. The people in conflict enter that process by revealing the foundations of both sides, acknowledging and respecting those of the opponent as much as one's own, then following a series of steps toward solution (see fig.3) ⁽²⁾.

Transformation toward Nonviolent Conflict Management : three cases

1. Between a parent and a child: The child doesn't want to eat

A very classic situation of a conflict between a parent and a child is at the table: the parent wants the child to eat, and the child doesn't want it. So often it becomes an escalation, a fight. So often there are real 'wars' at the family table. The parent uses arguments, like:

- "You will become strong if you eat" (positive argument)
- "You will be sick if you don't eat" (negative argument)
- "Look: I always eat everything that is on the table!" (glorifying argument)
- "You always are so difficult!" (destructive argument)

And the parent often also uses threats : "If you don't eat, you won't go to the party of your friend!" All these are instruments of the Major-minor system.

When children are very young, most of the time they naturally use foundations, like "I don't like it", "I am not hungry", "I don't feel like eating", etc. Foundations are I-messages, telling something about oneself. But the parent often doesn't listen to those foundations, or destroys them, or laughs at them: "Don't be silly! Eat now!", "Well, if you don't like it, you will learn to like it by eating it!", "Stop being difficult! You just eat now!", etc. That means the parent doesn't listen to and respect the foundations of the child, but pushes them down and so transforms them into negative or even destructive arguments. In fact the child was communicating in Equivalency, but the parent brings the communication back into the Major-minor system. And so, when the child becomes older, it quickly also will learn to use arguments and will communicate in a Major-minor way. That means that the child will not listen to the adult, and not respect the foundations of the adult (his or her needs, feelings, values, etc.), but also counter-attack what the adult says. And before the child can talk, he or she already will counter-attack without words, by shouting, crying, refusing to eat, throwing the food on the ground, etc.

² : For further reading : see Patfoort, Pat. '*Se défendre sans attaquer. La puissance de la nonviolence*', Jeugd & Vrede/Baeckens Books, Mechelen (B), distribution ed. Lannoo (Tielt), 2004 (ISBN : 90- 77826-05-X).

Let us have a look what could be foundations³ of the two different points of view of the parent and the child⁴:

<u>Parent: I want you to eat (what I prepare)</u>	<u>Child: I don't want to eat (what you prepare)</u>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I did a big effort to still prepare a meal after coming home from my work. 2. I am afraid you will be too weak to go to school. 3. I am convinced it is not enough what you are eating. 4. I am afraid you could have a food deficiency. 5. I did use natural ingredients that I believe can help you grow better. 6. I am afraid if you don't eat now at the table you will want to eat sweets later (with ingredients I think are not healthy). 7. I feel better when I see you eating. 8. I am worried for your health. 9. I am afraid of the criticism and judgments of people who consider you as thin. 10. I am afraid not to be able to stimulate the appetite of my child (with adequate food). 11. I feel happy when I see you eat things I prepared with love. 12. I am convinced that the food you eat outside of the house is not good for you. 13. I am convinced that having eat a good meal makes you feel good the whole day. 14. I am afraid you could have problems in the future. 15. I have the feeling my work is not appreciated. 16. I need to be appreciated, to feel thankfulness. 17. I feel bad when we are not close. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I don't feel like eating. 2. I am not hungry. 3. I did eat cookies with my friends. 4. I feel full. 5. I don't like the smell. 6. I don't feel weak. 7. I have the feeling I have enough 'fuel'. 8. I feel good like I am. 9. I am angry against Dad. 10. I would like you to help me to eat. 11. I feel tired. 12. I have the feeling you give more attention to my little brother. 13. I need more attention. 14. I would like to eat pizza. 15. I feel bad when you are insisting constantly when I am eating. 16. I am convinced what I'm eating is sufficient for me. 17. I am happy when I eat at school.

To put Equivalency in practice, the parent should look for and discover his or her own foundations, admit them -there are no good and bad foundations, just foundations-, and if the parent wants to express them, do it in a non-aggressive way, not in a Major way, but with the formulation of the frame above. So the parent should not transform his or her foundations into positive arguments, f.i. :

- « I am afraid you will be too weak to go to school » (fd 2) → « You need to eat to be able to go to school! »

- « I am afraid of the criticism and judgments of people who consider you as thin » (fd 9) → « People will laugh at you saying you are like a skeleton ! »

The formulation is very important, but also the intonation and the facial gesture as the words are expressed. So depending of the intonation and the accents put in the sentence, the same words can become a foundation or an argument, like for fd 1, 2 and 3.

The parent also should listen in an open and respectful way when the child expresses his or her foundations,

³ To bring about and to formulate foundations, some particular instructions need to be observed, see exercise no 37 in 'Se défendre sans attaquer. La puissance de la nonviolence', see above.

⁴ To read these two lists of foundations, we should take care of not reading them left-right-left-right, but first all the ones of the left column, and afterwards all the ones of the right column.

thus not react like :

- when the child says « I am not hungry » (fd 2) : « Don't be stupid! Don't tell things like that ! You must be hungry after such a day. »
- when the child says « But you always give attention to him, and not to me ! » (on basis of fd 12) : « That's not true ! I do much more for you than for him ! How do you dare to say something like that ?! You are an ungrateful child ! How can you be jealous of your own sweet little brother ?!»

In this way all foundations can be brought together. And out of this gathering of foundations, solutions can be created. Some can be very simple, f.i. if the child quarrelled with his father before the meal (fd 9), then it can perhaps be sufficient to listen to the feelings of the child after this quarrel, and he will eat immediately afterwards. But often a solution is a compound of several pieces, which all together satisfy all the foundations of the different parties involved. In this case the solution, that means the different pieces of the compound of the solution, could be :

- speak with other parents and listen to their experiences (for fds 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 14 of the left column, and 2, 6, 7, 8 of the right column) ;
- work on oneself (our expectations), look for being appreciated by other people than the child (the other parent f.i.) (for fds 1, 15, 16 of the left column) ;
- let the child participate in the organisation of the menu (for fds 5, 14, 17 of the right column) ;
- take care of having enough quiet and close times with the child, have regularly activities with the child alone, which he or she likes (for fds 12, 13 of the right column) ;
- take care of how we behave when we are at table with the child, put ourselves in his or her skin (for fd 15 of the right column).

And in this way probably the child will eat much more easily, so that the last foundations of the parent (11 and 17 of the left column) are being satisfied too.

2. Between a teacher and a parent: A mother wants to talk with a teacher, and the teacher doesn't want it

This is about a situation which already was going on in a Major-minor way since a few weeks. Everytime when the mother arrives on the playground at the end of the schoolday to get her daughter and she sees a certain teacher, she immediately runs towards that teacher: she wants to talk with her. When the teacher sees the mother coming, she says to the other teachers around her: "There she is again! That woman just thinks her daughter is the only one here in this school! If I would do what she wants, I would be spending all my evenings with her. What a bitch!", and she runs away. The mother sees the teacher run away and thinks: "Damned! She is again running away! Every day it's the same! When she is not paid for it, then she doesn't do anything! Is that a teacher?!... Completely irresponsible!"

And this happens already since a few weeks everytime again. In her thoughts or loudly, at the moment itself or/and also afterwards with others (= gossiping), each puts the other one in a minor-position. And this because each is feeling put in a minor-position by the other one. They are in an escalation.

How can they deal with this situation in an equivalent way? For instance from the side of the teacher: The teacher makes a little group of 4 colleagues teachers, to set up together two parallel lists of (possible) foundations. The result looks like following:

<u>Teacher: I don't want to talk with you about your child</u>	<u>Mother: I want to talk with you about my child</u>
1 . I have the feeling the former conversations were not very constructif	1 . I have the feeling my child means everything for me
2 . I have the feeling the main problem is not	2 . I am afraid my child will have to suffer as I did

<p>about your child</p> <p>3 . I am afraid the way we were talking until now is going to make my task as a teacher in the classroom more difficult</p> <p>4 . I feel exhausted after such conversations</p> <p>5 . I am afraid to become authoritarian/agressif against you</p> <p>6 . I don't understand what kind of problems you think there are</p> <p>7 . I don't feel confident with the agreed proposal</p> <p>8 . I feel disappointed and irritated everytime when you are doubting</p>	<p>3 . I am afraid my child will have difficulties in the future as I had</p> <p>4 . I am looking for support and security</p> <p>5 . I am afraid my child is not completely seen as she is</p> <p>6 . I myself am not sure my child feels good</p> <p>7 . I would feel happy if I could spare my daughter all possible pain, disappointment, frustration, misfortune</p> <p>8 . I everytime again have new questions preoccupying me</p> <p>9 . I don't dare to take decisions myself</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

We again observe how foundations differ from arguments:

- not: "Talking with her anyway doesn't help!", but "I have the feeling the former conversations were not very constructif." (fd 1, left),

- not: "She is distroying people! She is making I won't be able to teach anymore!", but: "I am afraid the way we were talking until now is going to make my task as a teacher in the classroom more difficult." (fd 3, left).

- not: "My child means everything for me", but "I have the feeling my child means everything for me." (fd 1, right). We indeed find yet in her other foundations that her child doesn't mean 'everything' for her, but that she herself is also important for her, happily...

Sometimes just the intonation can make a foundation becomes an argument, that we step back from the Equivalency to the Major-minor. So for instance "I feel exhausted after such conversations" (fd 4, left), depending of the intonation and the facial gesture can come across as foundation or argument. This is also the case for "I don't understand what kind of problems you think (or 'she thinks', if one would be talking about her to others) there are" (fd 6, left). And for "I feel disappointed and irritated everytime when you are doubting." (fd 8, left), it will be important to pay attention very well to the intonation, because the quite strong words have to be well set off by the intonation, to come to Equivalency.

During the exercise we also see, as we often see during this kind of exercise, the atmosphere in the group is changing. In the beginning the atmosphere is still quite vicious, agressif, mocking, judging towards the (absent) mother. But progressively there is more and more understanding and empathy for her: "Yes, it's difficult for her...She is raising her kid on her own. She had a very difficult childhood...And afterwards she still had quite difficult times...She had a difficult life." In this way this exercise is a good preparation for having an actual conversation in Equivalency with a person with whom one has a conflict, in this case the teacher with the mother. After such an exercise one is better able to listen with full openness, respect and tolerancy when the mother says:

- "I am afraid my child will have to suffer as I did" (fd 2): not to react like "But you should not be afraid of that. It surely won't happen.", but: "I understand you are afraid for that. And I think this shows how much you love your child. That's beautiful." Or "I have the feeling you went through very bad experiences, that you are so afraid of this..."

- "I am afraid my child is not completely seen as she is" (fd 5): not answer "No, we do see her very well as she is. Meanwhile we know her already very well. Don't worry!", but: "What do you mean? What do you think we don't see of her?"

- "I would feel happy if I could spare my daughter all possible pain, disappointment, frustration, misfortune" (fd 7): not react like "But you shouldn't raise your child on such a basis! This is completely wrong! A child has to learn to deal with frustration and pain. It even is good for a child. That's life!", but: "I hear how deep the pain is inside of yourself, how difficult it all has been for you, that you would like to spare your daughter all this..."

And then here again the nonverbal language is so important: the facial expression, the glance, nodding with the head, eventually a pat on the back. And also insert silences, or short questions or sentences, which are giving space to the mother to tell what she needs to tell.

After having listened long enough the teacher can of course also express his/her own thoughts, as long as it is not in a way of “I hear how deep the pain is inside of yourself, how difficult it all has been for you, that you would like to spare your daughter all this, BUT...” This means, as long as it is not again in a Major-minor way, with arguments, to try to convince.

The foundations of the mother “I am looking for support and security”, “I everytime again have new questions preoccupying me” and “I don’t dare to take decisions myself” (fdn 4, 8 & 9) finally were the ones that offered a path to a concrete solution to the teacher. After having assimilated all foundations of both parties she selected those three and decided those three foundations could be answered by meeting the mother in a different way. Untill now the teacher usually was telling mostly to the mother what her daughter had done, what she should do, what she could do better, what the mother should do or not for her daughter. And now she planned to have a conversation with the mother in a completely different way: not anymore talk as much herself, but listen to the mother, to her questions and doubts, to help her clarify her thoughts, to give her positive affirmation, to support her in taking decisions. This means that it does not become ‘Will they talk or not, yes or not?’, the bipolar Major-minor way of thinking. It does not become yes or not, but HOW, how the talking will happen. This is very often the case in creating an equivalent solution.

This is indeed what then happened. And this meeting worked out very positively. And the mother didn’t ask afterwards to talk again with the teacher.

3. Between different groups of populations, different ethnical and religious groups : About Shari’a law in Nigeria⁵:

I like to add here at the end a case that is not in the field of education of children, but on the inter-ethnical, inter-religious level, because the consequences of the Major-minor model (ethnical violence, war, genocide) are often taken much more seriously on that level than on the one of education. It’s interesting to see how the same way of thinking and working can be applied on this level. So it is clarifying for a better understanding of how educating our children in an Equivalent way can prepare them to build up Peace in the world.

In Equivalency, in nonviolence, there are no good and bad ones, no right and wrong ones, no civilized and primitive ones, but just two parties with all their foundations. And each party needs to be listened to with openness and tolerance, no one more than the other one. Let us try to read all following foundations without any judgment or derisive smile, without wanting to discuss or object to any, but with openness and respect:

<u>We want “Shari’a Law”</u>	<u>We don’t want “Shari’a Law”</u>
1 . We need to strengthen the belief of the Muslim population	1 . We fear that Islamisation will lead to fundamentalism
2 . We try to prevent all types of criminal acts/social misbehaviours	2 . We are afraid that forced Islamisation will destroy a secular nation
3 . We are afraid of increasing social disorder	3 . We have the feeling that “Shari’a Law” will affect the social life of the people
4 . We look for ways to give security to our society	4 . We believe that the existing penal codes are
5 . We value our religion	

⁵ Shari’a law is the body of Islamic legal system which regulates the public and private aspects of life of Muslims. The Shari’a law has been quite a bit in the world news when it has sentenced a Nigerian woman to be stoned to death for adultery in 2002. Presented in a general way: In Nigeria the North part (predominately Islamic part) is in favor to Shari’a law, and the South part (predominately Christian part) is against it.

6 . We need to strengthen our belief as Muslims	effective and efficient
7 . We are afraid our daughters and sons will abandon our religion	5 . We feel bad when we have the feeling rights of people are violated
8 . We would feel awful if pagans would desecrate our holy places	6 . We are afraid to see a conflict between “Shari’a Law” and the penal system
9 . We find it difficult to see and to understand why our daughters sell their bodies for money	7 . We are afraid of being isolated by the International community
10 . We work on eliminating criminals and armed robbery in our society	8 . We have the conviction that “Shari’a law” is full of capital punishments
11 . We believe that Islam can provide a platform for national Unity and Integration	9 . We think these are not good in case of miscarriage of Justice
12 . We see more cooperation and economic growth with other Islamic countries	10 . We are afraid to see our children or ourselves threatened by the Death penalty or other very painful punishments
13 . We feel threatened by the invasion of the West	11 . We saw that even in the North with the introduction of the “Shari’a Law” there was violence and lives and property were lost
14 . We are trying to protect our society against it	

We need to learn to accept people as they are, so people feel accepted and respected. It doesn't mean we (have to) think and feel like them, or we agree with their point of view. In this way we can create a climate of confidence, dialogue and well-being, a strong basis for building solutions.

All over the world there are many conflicts, between adults and children or adolescents, between individuals, between groups, between populations or different ethnical or religious groups. The people involved in those conflicts are in Major- and minor-positions towards one another, so in the Major-minor model, out of which escalations, fights and wars develop. In all those situations, foundations similar to the ones in the three cases above are present, and it is possible to work on basis of them toward Equivalency, to get out of the fights, the violence and the wars.

And conflicts grow out of dealing with differences in a Major-minor way. So dealing with differences in an Equivalent way is prevention of conflicts, avoiding to get into a conflict.

If we work on transforming our conflicts and our ways of dealing with differences from the Major-minor system toward the Equivalency system, it is clear that this can be the base of a transformation of the society in which we are living. And the more people do this, the more we all work on transforming our conflicts from the Major-minor system toward the Equivalency system, the more we transform our societies and the world from negative judgment and prejudice toward respect and tolerance, from violence and war toward harmony and peace.