

Peace: a complex humanizing system

La paz: un sistema humanizador complejo

*Harold Armando Juajibioy Otero**

Abstract

The present article raised as a research problem, the dispute, dispersion and disintegration of different notions of peace, at the time of approaching the founding and start-up of the nascent process of peace building in Colombia. Subsequently, urged to challenge this disintegration and isolation from the representation of an alternative category capable of integrating, putting into symbiosis and hybridity the perspectives to gain corpulence.

Under a qualitative methodological approach of exploratory-descriptive type, an effort was made to seek, recognize, describe and expand the contents, foundations and perspectives that may be the content and the broad body of peace building. A perceptual challenge that required associating complex / systemic methods to open a field of discussion in order to re-imagine an alternative category: A complex and consciously humanizing system of peace.

As a result, a tentative taxonomy of the current and ancient conceptual positions was obtained, as well as the description of their attributes, dimensions and functions. In addition were analyzed, their incommensurabilities, restrictions, limitations, as a crea-

* Harold Armando Juajibioy Otero. Multiversity Real World Edgar Morin. Center for Regional Cooperation for Adult Education in Latin America and the Caribbean. Mail: harold.juajibioy@gmail.com
Received on September 04, 2019. Accepted on September 30, 2019.

tive vortex of the diverse, that led to the possibility of facing an emerging conception of peace capable of integrating, putting into dialogue and relating some research advances in the field of peace-building.

Keywords: notions of peace, dimensions, perspectives, complexity, pacifying system.

1. Introduction

The conceptual predominance and application of some notions of peace over others has led the State, academics, researchers and society in general to establish unfinished, inconclusive and unsuccessful forms of construction. Hence, the importance of addressing the problem of his unfinished invention and its limitations to overcome the armed conflict that is placed before him, for a posteriori, to be able to move from the dispersion of notions to the meeting-distinction that leads to the birth of a tentative category able to establish a dialogue and cooperation.

This approach to investigative work, already has a significant advance, represented in the invention and implementation of the different categories of conception of peace, such as: *positive and negative peace* (Galtung, 1985, p. 76), peace as a process (Lederach, 2007, p. 101), the complex peace (Muñoz, 2005, p. 10), among others, that are relevant to the current negotiation agreement between the State and the FARC, which innovated to end the armed conflict in Colombia.

Due to the above, the study is limited to a bibliographic review of texts produced by researchers for peace, as well as different scholars on the conflict in Colombia, in order to find the necessary content to support the thesis of work on a problematic terrain where a one-dimensional conception of peace is insufficient and inefficient.

Under this approach, a qualitative empirical work of the specific realities is not sought, with facts and characteristics that allow to foresee their impact in the life of the human beings, nevertheless, it makes use of some significant milestones that are referring to visualize, examine, and position to give consistency to the arguments that support the problem.

In this way, the study focused on the analysis and integration of currents of thought about peace, the intertwining of heterogeneous contents, and the opening of a scene where the dissimilar possibilities manage to intercommunicate, cooperate and function together; tried to specify two purposes, first, cover an open and unfinished category of peace building, and second, leave as reflection academics, governors, researchers and social activists the urgent need to avoid reducing and simplifying their constitution.

As an interpretation field, the work was based on the conflictive and problematic reality of Colombia, and taking into account the current transition from war to the negotiation and consolidation of agreements focused on establishing a just, democratic and territorial perspective peace.

2. Method

The application of a qualitative methodology of exploratory-descriptive type focused on recognizing different conceptions of peace and detailing some properties and integrated features among these conceptual currents, and then describe and ground a broader conceptual category that contains all the elements described.

To give content and substance to this comprehensive category of peace, it was necessary to use four reflective principles inherent in complex and systemic thought. Principles that when working together granted the possibility of thinking and re-inventing the representation of the content of peace, as a system of life that humanizes.

The principle of multiple, facilitated the identification of various theories, perspectives and events that account for the need for a re-construction of the idea of peace from its complexity. The dialogue/distinction opened the way for analysis from the recognition of diversity. The heterogeneous relationship led the researcher to recognize and observe the phenomenon in all its amplitude and systemic complexity. And finally, the hologram principle, without neglecting the parts of a whole, interwove the theoretical and experiences that contribute to the understanding of the current peace process.

To describe concepts, perspectives and tentative categories of comprehension, we resorted to documentary information of researchers who contribute to the foundation of peace, and the follow-up to briefs analyzing the current situation in Colombia in terms of the definitive termination of the armed conflict. The information collected was systematized in synthesis matrices to recognize emerging categories based on the relationship of information under a search logic of an alternative category of understanding of peace from complexity.

Being a preliminary analysis of a tentative conceptual category, more than a population sample, it was used to describe events that impact Colombian society and regional realities that mark the content and substance of one or another peacebuilding tendency.

Under this logic, a tentative analysis of the new possibilities of thinking and starting the construction of peace in Colombian society was built.

3. Results

I. Dialogue with conceptions of «peace»

The conceptual innovation of peace, founded on the division of heterogeneous conceptions and foundations, has led to the stagna-

tion of its evolution as a human process and ideal. On the other hand, its implementation under this logic of reduction, separation and simplification has caused a limited impact in overcoming the armed conflict in Colombia.

It is clear that peace cannot be instituted with a one-dimensional content and meaning, hence the interest of grounding an alternative category under the analysis of complex and systemic thinking. An analysis that allows to install in the same field of observation, reflection and dialogue their historical conceptions, dimensions, maneuvers, actors involved, and at the same time, possible attempts of sustainability in order to contribute to the arduous process that is being carried out in the country.

To achieve this challenge, it is necessary to find ideas of encounter and relationship between complex thinking and systemic thinking.

According to Morín, complex thinking consists in the human ability to «reconnect what was artificially separated. His mission is set in the Latin adagio «*sparsa colligo*», which implies «reconnecting what is dispersed» (Morín, 2014, p. 8).

On the other hand, systemic thinking allows analyzing the phenomenon as a whole constituted by heterogeneous parts in interaction, and that therefore requires the researcher to «expand the vision, and take into account all the aspects, and the interactions between the different parts of the problem». (Checkland, 1993, p. 19), that is, calls for a position of dialogue between the «relationships, dynamics, and synergy, of each of the pieces of the puzzle to fit perfectly into a coherent whole» (Maldonado, 2009, p. 4).

Bearing in mind that what complex is, «all that, which cannot be summarized in a master word, be traced back to a law, or reduced to a simple idea» (Morín, 1990, p. 21). The attempt to define peace cannot be submitted to, to a unified and concluded word, mainly because its conceptions always cross controversies, tensions and disputes (intellectual, ideological, social and cultural) in order to finally reach a social acceptance.

If we analyze the different conceptions involved in its foundation or installation, we can notice the tensions and struggles generated between them; tensions that arise either by their own contents, ends, predominance of one dimension over the other, ignorance of their multidimensional constitution, and especially by the struggle between precursors and opponents.

Under this logic, it is very necessary to first analyze the barriers that prevent the encounter between the described notions, to advance in the construction of a renewed and comprehensive conceptual system. Striving, within this relationship and dialogue, to find hidden dimensions, bridges of intercommunication, and emerging elements that open up, it has moved on to a new tentative, open and inclusive category of that which is conceptually and empirically dispersed.

In Colombia, a widespread tendency to build peace is associated with the claim to relate to it or to demand the sole purpose of security; not human security (in its breadth), but, rather, a one-dimensional conception of security based on strengthening the public force for the submission or elimination of the enemy, and consequent of the war. A highly dangerous perspective due to its negative impacts on human life.

According to Valencia, analyzing the statistics of the Unified Victim Registry (RUV), during the Pastrana government period and the democratic security boom of the Uribe government, there were the highest rates of victimizing acts:

In the government of Andrés Pastrana Arango there were 2,453,628 victims and in the two mandates of Álvaro Uribe Vélez 3,374,270. There are 12 years that go from August 7, 1998 to August 7, 2010. There are 5,827,898 victims, that is, 70.13 percent of the total number of victims existing in the conflict in Colombia (Valencia, 2016).

This apparent militarist security, under the logic of perverse effectiveness indexes, provoked in its time the most atrocious and inhuman crimes, precisely because its conception does not directly

confront the origins of conflicts, it resists the change of the enemy's imagination, and it defines as the only way of stability the increase of the armed force to maintain the established order. Tortosa, describes this position as «the easy way to produce and coexist with violence under the logic of thinking about laws, police and army» (Tortosa, 2001, p. 11), and at the same time the falsified, myopic and comfortable way of welfare of a few, at the expense of the insecurity of others.

In the same direction, the minimalist, specialized notion, in reducing violence based on the generation of conditions for dialogue between the parties, has another focus and purpose, seeking to reach a definitive agreement to end the armed conflict. This perspective is known and applied at a global level, and Colombia already has its referents (negotiation with the M19, EPL, PRT, and Quintín Lame), being able to «agree on the termination of the armed conflict and laying the foundations for the demobilization, all this in the framework of unilateral ceasefires prior to negotiations» (Romero, 2013, p. 6).

As a process, it integrates actions of dialogues, pacts, and agreements for the abandonment of weapons, humanitarian demining, reincorporation of the armed actors, and other actions to overcome the conflict. It has the tendency to fix in a specific space where confrontation occurs, and the intervention time is limited to the moment of overcoming the war.

or of generalized violence. However, in its operation it does not confront other systems of social functioning (political structures, economic dynamics, territorial domains, functioning of the State, etc.) that caused the origin of controversies, conflicts and war.

At the other extreme, the maximalist notion relates all the variables involved in the construction of peace, analyzes the structural causes that caused the conflict and at the same time the possibilities of change from it, setting its objective not only to mitigate the war, but also, in preventing new outbreaks of conflict and violence. According to Rettberg the maximalist conception «would seek

to generate the bases to overcome the» structural «causes of conflicts, such as poverty, inequality and exclusion» (Rettberg, 2002, p. 3), and has the vision of «generating the conditions conducive to promoting the economic, political and social development of the country in question» (Rettberg, 2002, p. 2).

Its approach requires a long-term process that goes through the reduction of war, the overcoming of it and the concretization of positive conditions that transform its origins; therefore, it is not governed by a single pact, but by multiple pacts that encompass other systems of social, political, economic and territorial life. Its intention to cover a greater number of factors that explain the conflict goes beyond the analysis of the actors in confrontation and goes into knowing the structural causes that led to the emergence of violence, to put on the table the possibilities and alternatives not covered. By having a comprehensive approach, it may be too idealistic and not applicable in a context where political, economic and legal conditions are permeated or closed by rigid structures.

The United Nations, leave us the legacy of cosmopolitan peace, understanding peace as a right to be protected and promoted globally.

In 1992, the Secretary General of the United Nations, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, launched the «Program for Peace», making clear four modalities of work to prevent and deal with armed conflicts in the world:

First, preventive diplomacy, understood as the efforts of the international community to prevent the armed conflict from occurring, second, when the conflict is inevitable, we seek to find the origins of its emergence to solve it (peacemaking), third, development of negotiations and agreements to maintain the peace (peacekeeping), and fourth, the construction of peace (peacebuilding) focused on rebuilding social bonds, institutions, and systems of life affected by war (Ghali, 1992, p. 6).

His contribution has two valuable aspects, first establishing peace as a universal right, and second, installing a process of prevention, promotion and protection of it, under international cooperation for the entire global sphere.

Against the previous proposal, Kant already in the eighteenth century, also urged nations to implement the notion of perpetual peace, as a right that must be placed universally between the States and under common moral principles of action of these and their populations. Its perspective calls for the rescue of the republican constitution based on the freedom of all citizens, dependence on all before the law and equality among populations (Kant, 1998, p. 15). In the same sense of the United Nations, Kant establishes that it is imperative the existence of an international organization that seeks to advance in the prevention and installation of peace among nations, as well as re-imagine the States to promote human freedoms, and to solve the inequalities that generate tensions and conflicts between the populations, and of these with the State. For Kant it is not enough an agreement between hierarchical parts, or a pact between the actors in conflict, being rather a set of pacts between peoples that contributes to the construction of peace as a political, moral and ethical duty.

In the experience of Colombia, it is possible to run into other emerging notions of peacebuilding, which have to do *with peace in relation to*: development, the construction of territory, re-invention of the State, strengthening of democracy, transitional justice, among others. *Peace related to*, allows readjusting or re-inventing the notions of development (rural development, fair development) of justice (such as access to truth and reparation for victims, discussion of forms of prosecution and amnesty for armed actors, and the debate on social justice) in democracy (re-imagining the forms of political representation and citizen participation) and in the construction of territory (claims the potential of peasant, Afro and indigenous societies as affected by the conflict and precursors of new dynamics of pacification).

The embryonic perspectives of peacebuilding in relation to a specific end can contribute in the endowment of content to the maximalist, cosmopolitan, and peacebuilding peace, to the extent that they respond to resolve inequities, encourage citizen participation, expand political parties, re-imagine regions with the relationship with the state, resolve other violence, rebuild broken relationships between population sectors, and promote reconciliation from various perspectives; However, for the Colombian experience, its contents and start-ups lack strength and practicality. An example of this is the euphoria over the requirement that the construction of territorial peace implies, which is already criticized for its incipient applicability according to the current context:

Territorial peace will be concentrated in areas of the territory characterized by large gaps in the provision of public goods and services, but also by the weak presence of the State (Vargas, 2017, p. 3).

Precisely speaking of territorial peace, by emphasizing the «territorial», it shows a serious structural failure that Colombia has suffered throughout its existence with some short historical exceptions and poorly implemented: a clumsy and acute centralism that has caused many of our problems, among These various violent conflicts (Gonzales, 2016, p. 2).

The two arguments in the form of criticism, predict a structural risk in the consolidation of territorial peace, due to the weak structure of a State in the face of the transformation challenges of historically excluded regions. For now, all the ideas of peace in relation to, are premature attempts that can easily be corroded by the new political conjunctures, or diluted by the lack of long-term financing and absorbed by the prevailing dynamics.

Finally, a final perspective has to do with the self-biography of the construction of peace. As that understanding and at the same time human capacity to recognize that we can all make peace from the interpersonal point of view (agreeing to non-violence), social (recognizing the other as legitimate another in coexistence) and institutional (strengthening democracy and local governance)

(Martínez, 2008, p. 2). As a call to «integrate the personal dimension in the problem of peace» (Tortosa, 2001, p. 23) based on the faculties and experiences of the people; that is, assuming «a pacifying empowerment» capable of adhering pacifist practices, actions and capacities to transform reality (Sandoval, 2015, p. 88).

Peaceful empowerment calls for the emblematic recognition of individuals and leaders, organizations, political movements, researchers, population groups and institutional actors; this, as an encouragement to his work to inspire a society in the construction of a new way of human relationship. This perspective calls for «re-taking the human referents of non-violence, internal pacification and the promotion of non-violent attitudes towards the human and nonhuman outside (Sandoval, 2015, p. 87).

It may be that these notions (from human security, minimalist peace, maximalist, with respect to and autobiographical) are not enough to continue cementing the need for a pacifist human evolution, but they are basic to continue delving into this complex conception of peace.

For the next part, we try to resolve the relationship of the different conceptions based on the following questions: what are the dimensions, components and valuable substances that these conceptions contribute? How can these dimensions and components be linked in a conception that integrate them without isolation? What new structure can arise from the integration that contributes to a broader conception of peace? How can that multidimensional conception of peace work? In addition, if this new tentative conception does it have the possibility to settle in Colombia based on the progress made in the current peace agreement between the State and the actors in confrontation?

II. The Peace: Symbiosis and multidimensional integration

In the previous contribution we realized the efforts to find a viable conception of peace; In that same journey, dimensions were ap-

pearing between one and another conception, so that from now on we will look for an answer to what are the dimensions that may be contained in the different conceptions? Moreover, how can they be found in relation and mutual contribution? This, with the purpose of finding bridges of communication and relationship.

Peace cannot be thought of, without the analysis of the past and interpellation of the present, without the implementation of the historical dimension, which allows auscultation the reasons and origins of the perpetuation of the war and at the same time the bets to transcend its prolongation. As a question, it is fundamental to analyze the multiple origins of the conflict: going through the debate of the emergence of victimizers, victims, and the omission of the State, exclusionary opulence, the monopoly of power, and human poverty and indignity. In addition, they have to be integrated into the analysis, the reasons for social skepticism and the low involvement of people in the ways of peace building.

Doing the exercise of intercommunicated questions and answers as a reflection, allow us to activate the ability to see in a hologram way, the dimensions contained in the historical fabric of reality, which implies «reintroducing the phenomenon to explain in its context, to recognize the part and the whole, to distinguish without separating, to find symbiosis, complementarities and combinations between everything that is interacting» (De Almeida, 2008: 21), avoiding biasing before what is complex, and overestimating a problem at the expense of others.

Therefore, the historical dimension facilitates recognizing two paths in dispute and relationship, the path of the origins of the conflict versus the path of recognition of the possibilities of cultivating peace; History is the source of the healing transition of the stories of violence towards stories capable of supporting the building of positive, just and dignified peace for all.

By the same path, to stop the confrontations, the medical dimension of treating the symptoms appears, of procuring the cure, that is to say of what the historian Diana Uribe mentions, «Stop

the war, stop killing us and save lives» (Uribe, 2016). Cure that is good, but not enough, because the patient can relapse back into his harmful adventures, or even worse, knowing that the current context in which we live is the continuous producer of perpetrators of different forms of violence.

This warns us that stopping the war is not enough if the politico-military and economic mega structures of illegality continue. We are in default of dismantling the entire structure that sustains the armed conflict and especially of learning to prevent its repetition; this, through the recognition and empowerment of those things that human beings do well, without the use of violence. Reclaimed those moments in which we are able to resolve conflicts through dialogue, agreement, law, morals and the installation of peaceful agreements.

From another angle, there is also the concern for those responsible for pacification, that political dimension that requires human capacities to assume the challenges of peace. Dimension that calls for the democratic involvement of all the actors that erect their efforts from the public, private, institutional and social spheres. Its functionality must guarantee pacts between the direct actors of the conflict, broad sectors of political movements, circles of thought, victims and victimizers, pacts that broaden the results hologram and dismantle forms of power and violence in which communities, neighborhoods, cities are submerged and the nation.

If we look from the political performance of current rulers in Colombia, President Santos plays an important role. It has created an umbrella based on the coalition of political parties that facilitates the agreements, involves sectors of civil society as activists and promoters of social pedagogy, invites the United Nations to be guarantors of the agreement, integrates a broad support of academics, and even involves the media as critical and supportive of the process, opens the debate on peace from various fronts. In this sense, political actors are not only those who imagine peace, but also those who find their implementation empty.

In relation to the previous dimension, the question arises: for whom peace?, evoking the social dimension, the one that reveals the human face of harm, those affected by the conflict, but also the active subjects capable of getting involved in a process of human reconstruction.

In this web of damages, affectations, sufferings, exclusions and inequalities, the discussion of human rights arises continuously. The need to delve into the what war is so dehumanizing, in that it affects the dignity, integrity, freedom and equality of human beings. Universal moral stance that requires telling the harmful thing that happened, and unveiling its disastrous impact on human life, in order to put on the public table the decline of a minimum of coexistence and respect for the rights of others.

In this area, peace is thought and positioned as a cosmopolitan right that can not be postponed, with all that its content and installation implies: access to truth, respect for life, termination with cruel and inhuman treatment, the final culmination of the war, the peaceful resolution of conflicts, and especially the generation of conditions so that the population can enjoy a fair and comprehensive treatment. Therefore, peace as a fundamental human right not only seeks the decline of the armed conflict, but also the construction of a culture in which everything that makes us more human is strengthened.

Another aspect, supremely relevant, has to do with the continuity of the debate on the space-time dimension, where should peace occur? How much time does it need to consolidate? The notions of peace have been characterized by using the lantern approach, where light the space, there, immediately we resort to analyze and apply the measures. This eager act, reduces, delimits and divides the spaces as if they were not interconnected, therefore, it is necessary to overcome this logic by a new look that can see the relationships and tensions from one place to another, and advance in that relationship towards pacification lasting.

It is good that the cure of the disease is prioritized in the places most affected by violence: namely, the territories excluded by development such as the Municipality of Tumaco-Nariño, affected by an illegal hegemonic economy (cocaine), with a high rate of murders in the country: 70 per 100 thousand inhabitants, acute poverty rates, and where the territorial dispute is re-taken by other armed actors (Semana, 2017, p. 34). However, the argument about a peace like integrating law, based on equality, justice, freedom and fair treatment, beyond the spaces in confrontation, in a national geography of law.

It is necessary for cities to stop growing behind the backs of rural territories, trying to have their relationship re-imagined in reciprocity, and based on the transfer of all fields of knowledge, opportunities, forms of development, ways of living well, therefore, of equitable distribution of well-being. Times and spaces should not be dissociated in a peace process, especially because they are social constructions characterized by being plural and highly contributors in the production of peace experiences such as resistance to war, search for truth, forgiveness, reconciliation.

By continuing to scrutinize the parts of the visible and invisible body of peace, it is possible that we will always come up against the challenges for the State, a call to reinvent this entity.² The reinvention of its entire operating structure. Not only to guarantee the necessary pacts against the definitive cessation of confrontations, but also, in relation to their own way of operating. Providing that it has the conditions and capabilities to solve the social demands demanded by the construction of peace, and at the same time development, justice, the relationship between cities and territories, the alternative to the political, the reinventing of democracy, and having a more active role in the protection and promotion of human rights. It really requires consolidating in a social State of law, with a multidimensional look and intervention in the face of complex realities.

In this way of doing State, it is also important to start up the economic dimension with all its implicit contents. Bearing in mind that the financial resources are necessary to install peace, and must be used efficiently, both to stop the war and to overcome poverty, favor access to rights, modernize the countryside, integrate the regions, overcome the economies illegal, and advance towards the just development, the good living and the improvement of the quality of life.

Another relevant element in the construction of peace has to do with the ethical evaluation of what we do, that philosophical sense of respect for life, human dignity, and resistance to degrading and inhuman events. Return to integrate in our lives the ethical dimension that constitutes us, and implicates us with duty and obligation in the debate of peace.

Catholic priest Roux mentions that «in the midst of this human mess we are a society locked in simplicity. Convinced that the problem is not with us, that everything has been caused by a perverse and minority enemy that acts against the good ones» (Roux, 2009, p. 1) We have lost and ceased to exercise moral duty. In this way, we transfer the responsibility of resolving the problem to the State and if it fails we are ready to criticize its weak resolving capacity. To solve this, it is necessary for all of us to face the challenge of locating ourselves and acting on the experiential paths of coexistence, solidarity, cooperation and concord.

In the interaction of the previous aspects, it is also urgent to understand the repulsions and unions that are generated. Recognize their relational dimension. Just as the body needs the inhalation of oxygen present in the contour, the relational dimension is always present in the multidimensional interaction. A dimension that is not contained within each of the above, but appears precisely from their encounters and allows you to see other elements of analysis. For example, the State's effort produces a lesser effect in the search for peace, if it is not synergistically associated with the effort of the academy, political actors, experts in legal analysis and

justice, with civil society, the sectors economic and international actors.

Equally, the overabundance of resources for peace has no validity and effectiveness without the clarity and firmness of the ex-combatants in their decision to renounce war, the transparency of the territorial authorities in the use of resources for peace and the constant effort of society to overcome situations of illegality and the use of different forms of violence.

Always the joint relationship of multiple actors with common aims of pacification integrates poly-capacities and at the same time provokes poly-results in simultaneity.

Finally, as peace is underway, it will always be going through thresholds of equilibrium and back to turbulence, precisely because of the different problems it addresses.

This problematic dimension is not excluded, it always appears in the form of controversy to claim fundamentals, needs and demands that are not integrated; It comes at a time of little clarity and uncertainty that requires creativity to establish new understandings, alternatives and agreements. It is a dimension of alert for positive action against what was not conceived, to solve a problem not discussed and to integrate something or someone excluded; therefore, the construction of peace does not separate disputes, disputes, gaps, turbulences and imbalances, but rather works with all this, in order to reach new understandings.

According to Magendzo, *problematizing* reality allows confronting ideas, increasing disagreements, and disagreements (Magendzo & Pevéz, 2015, p. 75), but also opening up new ideas, positions and novelties that can reinforce the construction process, in special, because this process is part of the socio-political discussion in which we must reflect, discuss, agree and propose possibilities to carry out what is important. It contributes to the creative and creative imagination of new legal, political, educational, cultural and social ideas, capable of mutating a negative reality from reasonable and plausible attempts.

In this journey through the body of peace, the last two dimensions are essential to understand the others, since without exception they are present, either as interaction, as a result of synergies or as tensions, misalignments and readjustments. Its not delimitation and evasion, a posteriori makes them appear surprising. Hence, the great difficulty of the actors of peace lies in the impossibility of thinking about the processes in relation, synergy, and communicability.

It is possible that in this journey of encounter with the heterogeneous dimensions of the body of peace are not yet described in their vast majority, but with the detailed so far, we could say that they are sufficient to support the need to overcome the restricted notions and isolated operations, from the staging of an alternative notion.

III. Search for a complex system of pacification

Up to this moment, we have noticed four things: firstly, the existence of separate notions of peace, incommunicado and in dispute, among themselves; secondly, limited or partial scope due to restricted definitions, dimensions functioning separately and with partial results; thirdly, distances and controversies sustained by the different argumentative positions of the actors that build them; and fourthly or lastly, we find possibilities for dialogue and relationships between different meanings from its components, which allow us to envision and argue the creation of a tentative category that opens up possible scenarios of conceptual symbiosis.

Hence, the urgency of finding a more conciliatory, dialogical, comprehensive and implicit category of notions that have functioned separately. A category that makes possible the dialogue between these and their actors under the recognition of their potential multi-dimensionality, the meeting outside their limits in distinction and empowerment of their dimensions, characterization of their interactions, tensions and disputes, and with the possibility

of inventing a content association, which results in a broad unit: a complex system of pacification. This, trying to understand the complex as what travels beyond what was intended to be taken for granted, conceptualized, specialized, focused and implemented in isolation. Of that which perpetuates the selection of a conception under the repulsion of others, which privileges certain dimensions in oblivion more than others, it pays attention to some actors in exclusion of others, privileges a space unlike others, etc.

Result that emerges from the analysis of the phenomenon of peace as a complex event based on evolutionary systems, especially because it calls for linking, associating and bringing together under the distinction of diverse notions, fields of knowledge, heterogeneous dimensions, interactions, tensions, and controversies in the same field of problematizing analysis, and at the same time, that summons the collective curiosity to re-imagine the interaction of the multiple in the form of self-organization, functionality and evolution as an organized whole and in continuous self-production.

It is necessary to reflect on the complex, as a «fabric (complexus: that is woven together), composed of heterogeneous constituents inseparably associated, and that therefore presents the paradox of the one and the multiple» (Morín, 1990, p. 32); that is, under the warning of Weaver cited by Rodríguez, that complexity is organized from the «intervention of a wide number of factors or interrelated variables that make up an organic whole» (Rodríguez & Aguirre, 2011, p. 6). Being complex that which is not separate, but seeks the interrelation and heterogeneous conjunction to become a systemic phenomenon. Under this premise, complex peace can be accepted as a process that unites multiple contents, conceptualizations and meanings, and characterized by combining multiple components, operate simultaneously in different directions and cause impacts in the same direction.

In addition to the above, a complex system is «a representation of a cut of a reality, conceptualized as an organized whole, in

which the elements are not» separable «and, therefore, cannot be studied in isolation» (García, 2006, p. 21), and whose movement has as functionality principle: «a disposition of its elements by levels of organization with their own dynamics, but interacting with each other; and an evolution that does not proceed by continuous developments but by successive reorganizations» (García, 2006, p. 80).

That said, peace also meets the conditions to be analyzed and conceptualized as a systemically complex process. Requiring to take into account the fabric and dialogue of its multiple conceptions and attempts of application, the dialogical interaction of its heterogeneous dimensions, the possibility of tentatively describing a form of self-organized functionality from its interactions without excluding tensions, and of being able to suppose its possible evolution in continuous processes of consolidation.

Therefore, in order to install this category of complex system of pacification, it is not enough to recognize its multiple meanings and dimensions, which was discussed in the previous sections, but also requires positioning those dynamic principles that constitute it as a system capable of achieving functionality and self-reproduction. These dynamic principles are the following:

The principle of the one and the multiple. The construction of peace cannot be conceptualized and endowed with meaning, from a single perspective; it requires gathering and linking the different perspectives. Its operation cannot be governed by the exclusive functionality of one dimension in exclusion or lack of attention of the others.

The same political dimension of peace has its complex fabric of actors. The political dimension of peace is incomplete, without the motivation and active awareness of the social dimension, hence, that pacts are not enough between the State and the armed actors, but also pacts between the State and society, between political, economic, cultural and social movement actors. It is urgent in Colombia to continue providing substance to the dimensions of peace from a position of intercommunication, interaction and

start-up simultaneously, only then will poly-effects or simultaneous poly-results be produced. The one and the multiple, is constitutive of a peace process, and involves not separating or isolating what begins to weave together, what appears alternative, and even what generates tension in that process of non-violent human reconstruction. The principle of the one and the multiple as human acts and self-produced events must be recognized and strengthened without restriction in the continuous search for forms of harmony.

On the other hand, the one and the multiple, *requires a fabric from the multiplicity* of notions and dimensions, of conceptual contents, of forces and capacities of involved actors, of forms of State as a mirror of response to social, economic, cultural and territorial needs of searching for balances between spaces in Anthropos-social construction, anchoring the subjects of rights from various approaches and based on reconciliation, forgiveness based on truth, the exercise of human rights, resumes the ethics of life (reverence for life itself and search for the dignity of all).

This notion deserves transdisciplinary researchers, citizens and activists capable of opening alternative scenarios of encounter between local, regional, national and international knowledge; disengaged political actors of conservative patterns of governing and doing politics, activation of collective forces from the victims to rebuild social fabric, community and resumption of citizenship, and in particular, forms of reincorporation of the armed actors with support in the active insertion in the social, economic, political and cultural life from the local, region or country.

Without the use of this principle of knitting the multiple at the time of greasing the devices of operating peace, we will continue exposed to chances of false information, to radicalisms, to unfounded oppositions, and especially, to be part of human routes who expose us again to violence and war. I will put in this respect only one case of non-relational perceptions.

Currently we generate a balance between the differential treatment that the State has with the demobilized in comparison to citizens and educators, and we assume that there is an unfair treatment before those who strive to comply with the democratic order. But nevertheless, we take into account the double impact of the first temporary deal. The first, that once the armed actors reincorporated, many populations recover their peace of mind regarding their freedom and security; and second, the possibility of opening conditions for the recovery and return of those human beings unfit for the democratic and peaceful order of the country.

In this journey of the one and the multiple, the principle of distinction must always be present. We cannot recognize the multiple, if we do not make the effort to distinguish the contents, elements and characteristics of that which is unique, and without distinguishing what emerges as new and alternative from the interaction of the multiple.

The principle of distinction is key when it comes to implying what works dispersed in the search for a process of pacification, first, because it allows recognizing what is constituted heterogeneously; second, find key contents of each dimension involved; third, it makes it possible to delimit the effects of that interaction of the multiple, fourth, it transcends the isolated divisions and operations, therefore, it opens spaces of synergic functioning, and fifth, it allows us to contemplate its simultaneous and diverse impacts. Distinguishing the actors involved in the construction of peace allows us to enhance their various forms of action and re-imagine their continued involvement with the other actors that go in the same direction.

Distinguishing the forms of justice in a peace process allows us to transcend the limited sanction and prison justice, towards justice for rehabilitation, reparation, equity and fair and dignifying treatment. Distinguishing the normalized impacts of war against the nascent positive impacts of a negotiation scenario can help us to

create references for new ways of solving problems without the use of violence.

The two previous principles cannot be possible without the dialogic principle, which opens the space for meeting, meeting, distinguishing and recognizing notions, perspectives and dimensions; it is the dialogical principle that fosters the relationship, interaction and association towards fundamentally humanizing ends.

If we try to find communicating and complementary elements between notions and dimensions, and place them in a scenario of joint work, it is possible that this new complex unity of peace will be more effective in the purpose it pursues. This principle makes it possible for the purposes of seeking peace from the conception of security, or from the minimalist, maximalist, cosmopolitan, and autobiographical perspectives to be linked and set in motion in different ways to be more efficient in ending wars, resolving conflicts of non-violent way, recompose the damage, integrate broadly the actors, correct the structural factors that marginalize and produce inequalities, and at the same time relate the peace effort with other notions that are part of the human life system.

It contributes to the fact that the dimensions described can be associated in a new and tentative scenario of self-organization, which maximizes its poly-powers in association with others coming from other fields of operation and at the same time provoking emerging poly-powers that did not exist in the isolated maneuver of each of them. It allows precursors of one or another perspective to open debates capable of re-uniting what is disjointed, of creating scenarios of reflection and joint work, of transforming their perceptions and positions, of changing their stagnation of ideas, and of re-imagining new categories more reasonable in the challenge of building peace. Therefore, they contribute to having a greater impact in the transformation of the problematic reality.

In the predisposition to dialogue with the multiple, we may have to be alert to the inevitable principles of balance and imbalance,

principles that arise with consistency when we integrate notions, heterogeneous dimensions, ways of functioning and actors in a complex process of pacification.

In the dialogue to arrive at the association of divergent notions, it is inevitable to go through the detection and recognition of points of disagreement, tensions, controversies, but also of the possible forms of conjunction, not only to create an alternative category, but to put in your innovation marches

Balance and disequilibrium as principles for the constitution of peace make it possible to assess what has been programmed and achieved, as well as the new challenges that are required to face the problems that were not expected to be addressed.

The construction of peace will always be summoning new tensions, resistances and demands of those involved, therefore, these manifestations should be part of its own constitution and installation. This has already happened in the process that is being carried out in Colombia, when the State established as the only perspective of peace from a minimalist approach, where the reincorporation of the armed actors, on the exclusion of others, was privileged as central. But this stumbled, with the local actors (under advice and activism from academia, researchers, NGOs) positioning the need to agree on peace agreements in relation to development, gender, access to rights, reconstruction of territory, efficient reparation of victims and social justice based on overcoming poverty.

Two cases are exemplary, from the social demands to integrate proposals to agreements in Havana: First, incidence of women's organizations before the negotiation table, which resulted in:

The systematic inclusion of the gender perspective in all six points of the negotiation agenda. In general terms, this Agreement recognizes women as subjects of law and political actors, who experienced the internal armed conflict differentially, paying particular attention to their role in the implementation phase (Gómez, 2017, p. 14).

Second, the demands of the peasant movements urged the government to open the debate on integral agrarian reform as a sustainable solution to the eradication of illicit crops, therefore:

The negotiations in the Single Table of the Government and the Agrarian Summit are fundamental pieces in the re-elaboration of strategies of integral development that must respond to the problems of families, zones and regions that have been involved in the economy of declared illicit crops (González, 2015, p. 7).

In this way, the tension and imbalance between the agreed and the unforeseen, opened a new branch of peace content and demanded other forms of implementation. That is why, by integrating notions and dimensions in the field of application, you can prevent a priori the effects and impacts, but also be amazed at the spontaneous, emerging and alternative impacts not contemplated, but assertively contributing.

The look of equilibrium and imbalance allows us to observe Colombia as the alternative laboratory for peacebuilding; mainly because it has mirror processes, adopted from other experiences of the world, however, it also experiences its own production of definitive exit from the war with an armed actor, integrating different approaches and fields of action.

These principles do not prevent the pre-established, determined, linear and stable construction of peace, but rather integrate it into a larger field of operation where the foreseeable and unpredictable is appearing simultaneously. A field where both the pre-established or scheduled, as what appears potentially spontaneous, emergent and novel. A field where it is not excluded, rather it integrates what appears as the result of a whole self-organized process. It is thus, that in Colombia the mobilization of young people was not foreseen after the fall of the plebiscite trying to shield the peace process, the activation of critical intellectual mass, movements for peace and victims from the regional, requesting to safeguard the agreed scope for end the armed confrontation.

Given the excessive confidence of the State to ensure what was agreed by the democratic way, little attention was paid to the need to anticipate the pedagogy for peace, now it is a process that is installed from several fronts. The resistances and setbacks of the armed actors were not foreseen in the search for an agreement, but under the premise of negotiating even within the war, a definite scenario was created for their termination as an illegal armed actor.

In this way, immersing ourselves in the principles that unite complexity and systems, we are reaching the point of equating the building of peace as a systematic process of self-organization.

According to Foerster quoted by Morín, a «self-organizing system is a system that must work, build and rebuild its autonomy and, therefore, waste energy» (Morín, 1994, p. 69). This premise, from the human perspective of peace, calls us to be the provocateurs of their self-organization as part of our lives. Recognize the human being as the self-producer of the system that produces it: The construction of peace.

Therefore, the principle of self-organization essentially requires the potential involvement of knowledge, experiences and inventiveness of the actors at their maximum amplitude. Being human beings who are creating the notions, contents and dimensions, associations and relationships, forms of work for dialogue, alternative solutions to crises, and especially experiences and events that transform the harmful realities towards more peaceful realities.

For Moriello, the principle of self-organization «is the property that some systems have of being able to generate order from chaos» (Moriello, 2016, p. 3) and this can be detected and characterized as progress in the different processes of construction of peace in Colombia, same people who have always tried to open alternatives within the continuous crisis of violence and armed confrontation. These referents of intent to provide order within the chaos can be found in successful pacts with armed actors (with the M19), reincorporation of paramilitaries, opening of new political parties as counter powers before the traditionalists, reparation

measures to the victims, significant reduction of violent deaths, more determined involvement of the State in the regions, expansion of the critical mass in search of humanizing experiences, involvement of the academy, researchers and media in the positioning of knowledge and experiences that nourish the challenge of moving towards a more reunion dignifying

In this way of achieving, a self-organized process of peace, from the authorship of human beings, requires that we all cultivate a complementary principle: the hologram principle, which allows us to observe continuously in the «smallest point of the image of the hologram the content of almost all the information of the represented object» (Morín, 1990, p. 121). A social hologram of creative minds that connect to analyze and recognize the challenges of peace and the barriers that impede its reach, without avoiding those contradictions that enrich the debate.

Begin to learn, contemplating with caution the whole in the part, in each one of those continuous micro-social actions, and see the part as contributor of the whole, in those results that interpenetrate us. A new mental attitude that can work as a tool of analysis for researchers, academics and agents that move peace processes. Contribute to the State to open its field of intervention towards social demands that not only remedy the symptoms of war, but also the symptoms of exclusion and social inequality. Induce organizations, collectives, and society in general to recognize and take consciences of necessary routes to definitively exit war and generalized violence.

In short, observing the relationship of the parties in the whole and vice versa, allows us to recover a human aptitude to connect and not disintegrate, and to take up the responsibility of being part of the construction of new relationships, interactions, and consensus.

Finally, we reach the last principle, the most essential, the principle, autobiographical: knowing that peace requires human transformation itself, which can only arise from the reflection and action of people who pursue that fundamental goal of peaceful, dignified relationship, fair, balanced and reasonable for everyone.

It is a path full of challenges to weave under the question: what aspiration of the future do we have from the transformation of the present? Therefore, there is no concept or dimension that is not implemented, principles that give content to a humanizing system in the search for self-organization and self-perpetuation, where the human being as a collective is not involved. So peace has always been in the radius of human reflection and action, the important thing is not to lose sight of that potential that is in each one of us and in the performance of society as a whole.

In that sense, the complex pacification system cannot be a theory that supports a significant notion, it cannot be one-dimensional, reduced to a few actors or left in the hands of experts, but on the contrary, a continuous journey of society and society. Its authorities seeking to transform all causes of the production of violence and confrontation, and at the same time, enhancer of all ideas, notions, strategies, fields of action, actors, experiences, events, impacts and results that travel along the way of the establishment of systems of non-violent, humanizing, equitable, just and human-enhancing life.

The complex system of pacification can only be achieved under the recognition of all the possible dimensions, interactions and operating principles that will endow it with a structure, self-production and prolongation over time.

The complex system of pacification can only be erected by a broad and continuous innovation of human beings participating in work areas that travel beyond the planned and pre-established.

Peace is a call to the continuous creativity of human beings who are part of a society.

3. Discussion

In the present study it was found that the conception of peace in its conceptual and operational evolution has been based on separate perspectives, simplified and reduced in content, and that, there-

fore, its impact in overcoming conflicts and generalized violence has been reduced and little effective.

The predominance of a conception applied in a certain period caused the detriment of the other conceptions, as happened with the attempt to reach peace through armed security, a time when higher rates of human rights violations were generated and little simplified the armed confrontation.

Under the analysis of a systemic and complex approach, it was made clear that the dispersion and low communication of conceptions and practices to pacify human relations occurs due to the absence of dialogue between fields of knowledge when opening the theoretical debate; the predominance of some dimensions over the concealment of others, the application of separate alternatives to resolve conflicts, and the disintegration of the actors that sustain and set them in motion.

In order to counteract this situation, it was proposed to base a complex system of pacification, constituted by the contributory relation of conceptions, intercommunication of heterogeneous dimensions and the development of simultaneous actions for the transformation of the conflictive reality and advance in the improvement of economic, social, cultural and territorial dynamics.

This, in order to institute continuous and progressive dynamics of new operations of the State, of reconstruction of the social and economic life of society, respect and promotion of human rights, re-imagination of democracy, dissimilar forms of peaceful resolution of conflicts, empowerment of alternatives for development, good living and fair and dignifying treatment of society.

In that sense, it is emphasized the need to consolidate peace beyond a period of government, of restricted negotiation with actors in conflict, and of a certain period, to forge a continuous and evolving human culture process; possibility that demands to start up the human creativity in front of the reinvention of systems of life, theories, conceptions and perspectives of work. This must be revealing in human beings when it comes to acquiring the courage

and strength to lead us along this creative path that reveals itself in a non-violent way against all types of violence.

Under this logic, systemic and complex thinking are fundamental contributors to build a structured, comprehensive, sustainable and lasting peace. Its connection both in the theoretical construction and in the practical installation allows keeping open and creative minds to integrate everything that can be potential to constitute a pacifying world based on the resolution of multiple crises.

Bibliographic references

Term coined by the sociologist Boaventura de Sousa Santos. See book *Reinventing Democracy Reinventing the State*.

CHECKLAND, P. (1993). *Systems thinking, systems practice*. Systems Department, University of Lancaster.

GALTUNG, J. (1985). *On peace*. Barcelona: Fontamara.

GARCÍA, R. (2006). *Complex systems Concepts, method and epistemological foundation of interdisciplinary research*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

GHALI, B. (1992). A peace program. Preventive diplomacy, establishment of peace and maintenance of peace. United Nations.

GÓMEZ, D. (2017). Woman, gender and peace agreement. *Debates: Processes of Peace in Latin America*, 13-17.

GONZALES, A. (2016). What is territorial peace? Bogotá: Corporación Viva la Ciudadanía.

GONZÁLEZ, C. (2015). The Havana agreement and the new policy on crops for illicit use. Institute of Studies for Development and Peace. Bogotá: Observatory of Crops and Cultivators Declared Illicit –OCDI– Indepaz Project Phase II Indepaz-OSF.

KANT, I. (1998). *Peace perpetuates*. Editorial Tecnos, Sixth edition.

Lederach, J. (2007). *Building Peace Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Companies*. Bogotá: Red Gernika Collection.

MAGENDZO, A., & PEVÉZ, J. (2015). Education in Human Rights: A proposal to educate from a controversial perspective. Mexico: Human Rights Commission of the Federal District. Mexico.

MALDONADO, C. (2009). Complexity is a problem, not a worldview. *UCM Research Journal*, 42-54.

MARTÍNEZ, V. (2008). Philosophy and Culture to Make Peace. *Philosophy and Culture to Make Peace* (pp. 1-12). Seville: UNESCO Chair Philosophy for Peace.

- MORIELLO, S. (2016). Dynamics of complex systems. In Complex Thought Community. Available in: www.pensamientocomplejo.com.ar
- MORIN, E. (1990). Introduction to Complex Thought. Argentina: Editorial Gedisa.
- MORIN, E. (1994). The notion of subject In D. Fried-Schmitman. New paradigms, Culture and Subjectivity. Argentina: Paidós, pp. 67-86.
- MORIN, E. (2014). For a thought of the south. Retrieved from: http://ipcem.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/pensamiento_sur_edgar_morin.pdf
- MUÑOZ, F. (2005). A complex, conflictive and imperfect peace. Retrieved from: <http://www.ugr.es/~fmunoz/documentos/pazcompconfimperfdraf.pdf>
- RETTBERG, A. (2002). Prepare the future: conflict and post-conflict in Colombia. Bogotá: University of the Andes. Foundation ideas for peace.
- RODRÍGUEZ, L., & Aguirre, J. (2011). Theories of complexity and Social Sciences. New Epistemological and Methodological Strategies. *Nomads Scientific journal of social and legal sciences*.
- ROMERO, M. (2013). Factors of success in the negotiated resolution of armed conflicts. Center for Thinking and Monitoring the Peace Doogies. Retrieved from http://pensamiento.unal.edu.co/fileadmin/recursos/focos/piensa-paz/policy_papers/documento_de_politicas_publicas_0.pdf
- ROUX, F. (2009). Speech by Father Roux at the Graduation Ceremony of the students of the Universidad de los Andes. Bogotá: University of the Andes.
- SANDOVAL, E. (2015). Pacifist empowerment for other possible worlds. Peace and Conflicts, pp. 75-95.
- Semana Magazine*, (2017). Trip to the Heart of Tumaco, p. 34.
- TORTOSA, J. (2001). *The long Road from Violence to Peace*. Zaragoza: University of Alinante, Rafael Altamira Chair.
- UNAM, P. P. (September 9, 2016). Postgraduate UNAM. Recovered the 21 of Mayo of 2017 of: <http://psicologia.posgrado.unam.mx/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/258193358-Libro-Manual-de-Publicaciones-APA-Re.pdf>
- URIBE, D. (June 19, 2016). Let's stop killing ourselves. The spirit of the peace agreement. Bogotá: Recovered in: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kVw_19Kltwc.
- VALENCIA, L. (September 2016). Pastrana and Uribe, 70.13 percent of the total victims. *Week*.
- VARGAS, G. (2017). The challenges of territorial peace. Bogotá: University of the Andes. Interdisciplinary Center for Development Studies-DIDER.