Abstract
This chapter demonstrates the dynamism and utility of positioning theory, in the domain of social justice. The illustrative examples are drawn from international intergroup situations, particularly in Afghanistan and Iraq. These situations involve interpretations of rights and duties by different groups, rights and duties being central in positioning theory. The chapter critically explores the questions of whether there are universal in rights and duties, and whether people apply moral principles consistently across contexts. Both the traditional empirical research literature and positioning theory reveal that context has an important influence on moral thinking, including on the interpretation of rights and duties.
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Introduction
Give to everyone what you owe him: If you pay taxes, pay taxes; if revenue, then revenue; if respect, then respect; if honor, then honor. Romans 13:7, NIV (Old Testament)

"To each his own" (quam sui cogit) is an ancient Latin motto for justice, attributed to the Roman orator Cicero (106-43 BC) and alternately translated "to each what is his" (38). The concept appears in Plato's Republic when Socrates argues that justice is fulfilled when everyone receives "his own" (e.g., rights) and is not deprived of "his own" (e.g., rights, property, and customs: book 4, section 633b). Later, Byzantine Emperor Justinian I would codify this into Roman law, stating, "Justice is the constant and perpetual wish to render every one his due" (see Housner, 2003: 803). This definition seems straightforward. A thief is unjust, for example, because he takes what is not his own, or in other words, what is not his right to take, and may be assigned by a judge or arbiter the duty to return it. Very often, however, two parties cannot agree on different aspects of justice, such as who has a right to what, and who has a duty to whom. In such cases, positioning theory is a powerful tool for understanding how two parties can come to radically different stories on the basis of the same evidence.

A right is a demand placed on others by the person who possesses it, and a duty is a demand placed by others on the person who owes it (Moghaddam, Scoum, Finkel, Mois, & Hanté, 2000). These are intimately tied to notions of justice but also to a person or group's position. For example, a doctor is considered unjust if he neglects his duty to care for a patient. A murderer is unjust because he denies his victim a right, which is the right to life. But these positions are pliable and negotiated. Imagine a plaintiff who says, in a court of law, "I am a victim, your honor, my rights were violated by him," pointing to the defendant. The defendant, in turn, contestes, "He is not a victim, your honor. I am the victim here." The defendant may change both the storyline and his position in the storyline. Positioning theory assumes that storylines are being constantly challenged, negotiated, and transformed in social interactions.
Just as individuals are said to have rights and duties based on their positions, groups can also have assigned rights and duties. For example, Native Americans in Alaska maintain a right to fish without the interference of the United States government (see Botsford, 2002). In this context, it is said to have a duty to honor treaties and agreements with Native Americans. Like individuals, groups can also have duties, not only in their political, economic, and cultural contexts, but also in their social psychological aspects of who has which rights and duties, as long as the role is one in which people can distinguish what is expected of each person. For example, a patient's duty is to keep the doctor's appointment if he has a right to be served, and a duty to pay the bill. A son has a duty to obey his parent. A patient has a right to be treated. Accusatory positioning takes place whenever these positions are contested. For example, the doctor may accuse the patient of "I'm off duty." The "son may accuse the "real father." The father may say, "You don't need to pay tonight, you are our guest." Accusatory position-taking, therefore, also shifts the assigned rights and duties of those positions. A guest does not have a duty to pay the bill, and a doctor does not have a duty to see a patient if she is on vacation. Non-performative utterance, therefore, should be considered an "action" because it accomplishes things, based on the speech-act principles outlined by John Austin (1961). Others can argue that it ought to be seen in the context of discourse theory and narrative theory, based on the Wittgensteinian notion that language is critically important to constructing social reality and on Vygotsky's (1978) belief that linguistic and manipulative skills are needed to make narrative discourse and action possible. We can apply these three narrative lenses of positioning theory—positions, storylines, and speech-acts—to explain how language and context play a role in how we frame the situation at hand. One can be described as "rational" by one cultural storyline and "irrational" by another (for further discussion of rationality in storylines, see Harré & McGhee, 2013).

Origins and Assumptions

Positioning theory can be understood as part of the broader conceptual framework that includes social theories and methods characterized by an interest in the study of face-to-face interaction, conversation, and interaction among researchers across a wide variety of social science topics, from conflict (Tirado & Gávez, 2007) to organizational change (Zebi, 2009) to health psychology (Mol, 2007) to social psychology (Harré & McGhee, 2003; Kvale & Moeboe, 2010). Most of these studies have focused on interpersonal positioning. Increasingly, however, researchers are applying it to intergroup relations (see chapters 9-15 in McGhee & Harré, 2008), and this chapter contributes to our understanding of collective processes through positioning theory.

Positioning is organized into three parts: first, we review positioning theory's origins, basic assumptions, and major components in the context of the structural relations described by a text. In other words, it focuses on the organization of social demands based on shared context, offering principles that are widely recognized in social interaction. Second, we survey three general assumptions with other theories in its class:

1. Normative systems govern social interactions, based on assumed roles or positions.
2. Language and speech acts are meaningful components in the production of social reality.
3. Social reality is the product of negotiations between storylines.

Beyond these, it could be framed in the context of many different theories, as some have done. For example, Berth (2012) argues that positioning theory ought to be seen in the context of speech-act theory and "successive positions." For example, a patient who claims that she does not have the symptoms described by the doctor should be considered an "action" because it accomplishes things, based on the speech-act principles outlined by John Austin (1961). Others can argue that it ought to be seen in the context of discourse theory and narrative theory, based on the Wittgensteinian notion that language is critically important to constructing social reality and on Vygotsky's (1978) belief that linguistic and manipulative skills are needed to make narrative discourse and action possible. We can apply these three narrative lenses of positioning theory—positions, storylines, and speech-acts—to explain how language and context play a role in how we frame the situation at hand. One can be described as "rational" by one cultural storyline and "irrational" by another (for further discussion of rationality in storylines, see Harré & McGhee, 2013).

The unique contribution of positioning theory is it highlights the interpretative rights of speaking agents and duties as primary explanatory variables for social interaction. These are the outcomes of the intersection between positions, speech acts, and storylines. It assumes that in any social situation, individuals are assigned or identify with each other, and that these positions convey norms, rights, and duties that organize "correct" conduct (Harré, 2006). A position on a topic can be defined by a position, a storyline, or an emotional state, for example. This is how one can describe a position as "rational" or "irrational".

The unique contribution of positioning theory is it highlights the interpretative rights of speaking agents and duties as primary explanatory variables for social interaction. These are the outcomes of the intersection between positions, speech acts, and storylines. It assumes that in any social situation, individuals are assigned or identify with each other, and that these positions convey norms, rights, and duties that organize "correct" conduct (Harré, 2006). A position on a topic can be defined by a position, a storyline, or an emotional state, for example. This is how one can describe a position as "rational" or "irrational".

The unique contribution of positioning theory is it highlights the interpretative rights of speaking agents and duties as primary explanatory variables for social interaction. These are the outcomes of the intersection between positions, speech acts, and storylines. It assumes that in any social situation, individuals are assigned or identify with each other, and that these positions convey norms, rights, and duties that organize "correct" conduct (Harré, 2006). A position on a topic can be defined by a position, a storyline, or an emotional state, for example. This is how one can describe a position as "rational" or "irrational".
Qualley's rules, for example, as senator or Republican nominee, are static and unncessased. In that moral space of "who ought to be the president?" the storyline that Qualley is positioning himself as the one who will clean up the mess that says, "the president should be a person with experience, like Jack Kennedy, a Democratic favorite." However, Senator Bennetts then quotes Quality's positioning:

**Bennetts: Senator, I served with Jack Kennedy.**

- **Kennedy, Jack Kennedy, Jack Kennedy was a friend of mine. Senator, you're no Jack Kennedy.**

Bennett is not contesting Qualley's rules. He is contesting Qualley's positioning as the "right man for the job." on the basis of the claims that he is like Jack Kennedy. Bennetts is telling Qualley that he has the right to position himself as being another Jack Kennedy.

A common way of characterizing the different types of positioning is in terms of first-, second-, and third-order positioning. First-order positioning is identical to performing positioning. In other words, first-order positioning "refers to the way persons locate themselves and others within an essentially moral space" through utterances that collectively fashion that moral space (Langhorne, 1991, p. 396). If this storyline is contested by another person in the conversation, this is called second-order positioning. If the first storyline is contested by a third person talking about the conversation (i.e., not in the conversation directly), this is called third-order positioning. Verena Minow (2002) gives an example of third-order positioning, using a 2008 speech by then-Senator Barack Obama. Obama references previous statements by former senator William Clinton, saying, "I'm elitist, out of touch, condescending. Let me be clear: It would be pretty hard for me to be condescending toward people of faith since I'm a person of faith." Then Obama points to a "person of faith" he does what Harre and van Langenhove (1991) call acting "reductive to that original of positioning" (1991), and is engaging in second-order positioning.

**Major Components**

Positioning theory approaches discourse through triangulation of three units of analysis:

1. **Positions**, which determine a cluster of rights and duties as to receive or perform within a storyline. In a playbook, these would be the roles and character descriptions, though more fluid and dynamic than a typical role.

2. **Speech acts**, which are performed utterances with illocutionary force that shape a storyline (i.e., these must be meaningful in a social context, and cannot be word fragments or references to things that have no symbolic meaning or relevance in the context of a conversation). In a playbook, this would be the text of the discourse, including word statements, turns, explanations, declarative sentences, question statements, and so on.

3. **Storylines**, which are the unfolding of episodes according to a loose cluster of narrative conventions. In a playbook, these would be the plot—plural—as there may be many storylines operating at once.

The interaction and negotiations that take place between these three components results in a perception of "rights," or perceived entitlements, and "duties," actions that one is morally bound to perform (Figure 18.1). Where these are contested, conflict than arise.

Importantly, while the combination of these components is unique to positioning theory, the prominence of each component is not. As discussed earlier, positions build from role theory. Use of the term "right" and role theory became prominent in sociology in the 1920s and 1930s, but in the 1970s and 1980s, feminists such as Raewyn Connell (1979) criticized it, in combination with gender roles theory, as oppressive toward women. The major limitations of role theory is that the expectations and norms for a role are predetermined within a fluid. Roles cannot explain behavior that is deviant from expectations and norms if we say a person's position. Power dynamics, for example, are more clearly articulated by the relational position of one group or another to another rather than by one person's role in a situation. The term "speech act" (geschichtenmachen) appeared in discourse analysis, which approach language as a mode of action. (15) By highlighting storylines, positioning theory can address rights, duties, and narrative meanings in a way that is true to the complexity of social life, where multiple storylines and storylins can exist in the same moral space.

**Rights and Duties: A Psychological Perspective**

The central place of rights and duties in positioning theory contrasts with the social psychological research on rights and duties (for an early example, see Moghadam & Vukanovic, 1990). However, the psychological research that has been conducted (see Doise, 2002; Fiske & Meshkati, 2005) presents social psychological research on rights and duties (for an early example, see Doise, 2002; Fiske & Meshkati, 2005) presents an explanation of some of the relationships and norms of respect captured within the storylines. Social psychologists, for example, have shown that the perception of rights is based on the social psychological research on rights and duties (for an early example, see Doise, 2002; Fiske & Meshkati, 2005). This research suggests that people are increasingly endorsing the norms of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, perhaps reflecting an increasing individualization of moral values.

A solution to the universality issue vs. relativist debate is to acknowledge power dynamics while also allowing the possibility that a small number
of rights and duties appear stable across contexts. Positioning theory suggests this solution, by shifting attention to understanding positions, which include power dynamics, rather than broad philosophical or universalisms versus universalism. Increasingly, the debate has shifted toward the context of intergroup power dynamics and intergroup relations, for example, in a context of exposure and learning, the priority given to rights versus duties by those with more power, Moghadam and Ulfelder Unpublished paper). The term "generalist" refers to the individual's set of general rules that correspond to the language of rights and duties differentially on intergroup positioning. My colleague, H. Alba, has demonstrated that when groups are positioned against each other, such as when a country is being confronted with different cultures, groups with equal or less equal power give priority to rights, while groups that enjoy greater power give priority to duties. A related question concerns the way individuals give priority to rights and duties across different contexts. Based on a general model, the study of Alba and colleagues (1985) model social development. The study points out that individuals—those who have reached the highest level of moral thinking, the post-conventional or principled level—are guided by moral principles and consistently apply these principles across contexts. Through his analysis of responses to his moral dilemmas, Kohlberg points out that "the moral voice "is not consistent in its level of moral judgment" (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977, p. 54). Kohlberg's claim is that his model is universal, and that a person who has achieved a certain level of moral thinking will remain consistent at that level. If Kohlberg's model is true, then individuals at the principled level should not be influenced in their attitudes to the characteristics of the context. An alternative view is that most people are able to think in a principled way, but whether or not they follow their moral principles depends on how the issues are presented to them and how the people talk to them.
that international sacrifices in Afghanistan have been worthwhile, meaningful, justified.

However, as Begglo-Cossida (2013) notes, President Karzai did not advertise his signing of EVAW in Afghanistan internally, and it was imple-
mented in roughly only half of Afghanistan’s 34 provinces.

The same year Karzai signed EVAW, he also responded to demands from Afghan leaders to endorse the Shi’ite Personal Status Law, for which many Shi’a clerics, the Shi’ite Personal Status Law was a serious Shi’a Afghan being recognized, for the first time, in national law. It was a story about prog-
ress, with the minority religious group, Shi’a, posi-
tioned as advancing in society relative to Sunni.

However, international observers, signing the
law was a story of Afghanistan moving backward.
The English translation of Article 132 reads, “As long as a woman is bound to her husband, he has the
right to have sexual intercourse with his wife every fourth night . . . .” Although the wife is ill or has any kind of ill-
ness that intercourse could aggravate, “the wife is
bound to give a positive response to the sexual desires
of her husband” (Shi’ite Personal Status Law, 2005).
The law also allows a wife to leave the house “if
the extent that local custom allows,” but not more,
and renders the legal age for girls to marry two
years younger than for boys. Whereas Afghan males must obey the signing of the law and are fully
more, Shi’a rights, Western media described it as a
violation of women’s rights.

Using Positioning Theory for Analysis

One approach to using positioning theory for
intergroup relations and conflict is to draw a matrix
of the dispositions on the basis of storylines. We
review three examples of intergroup relations from
Afghanistan, then map these in terms of whether they
fostered or contributed to the exercise of a right, the
one hand, or violated a duty or right, on the other.
We then assess whether the storylines were accepted or
recontextualized.

Example 1

In 2007, the US military expressed regret for a
“hurtful and minds” campaign aimed at Afghan chil-
dren. The story was told as the result of thousands
of soccer balls being distributed to Afghan children that were decorated with the flags of
countries from around the world. The soccer balls
then infected the US military, the first example, killing a
soccer ball with holy verse violated an Islamic duty to
violate the Quran’s wishes. The intervention backfired,
inciting grievances, and the US military was forced to
collect the soccer balls and dispose of them in a
way that follows Islamic custom for destruction of
holy objects.

In the second and third illustrations, the story-
lines were effectively reframed to avoid perceived
violation of local rights and duties. While men are
seen to have a “right” to be the primary decision
makers in Afghan society, the storyline was changed
to focus on protecting mothers’ rights and appealing
the Afghan courts, the US holds the right to appeal
to their courts. Thus, Afghan society accepts “mothers” as
having a relative position of respect, and therefore Afghan
men’s duties toward them. For example,
in many parts of Afghanistan, a male mem-
ber has a duty to obtain the mother’s permission before
entering in jihad. The storyline also changed such
male rights no longer endan-
gered: whereas a council is a decision-making body,
forums are non-threatening, even if they are func-
tionally equivalent to a council. In the third exam-
ple, the storyline of gambling (i.e., an Islamic
practice) was transformed into a storyline of com-
mon, i.e., capitalism promoted by Islam, which
in turn transformed a violation of a duty (i.e., not to
gamble) into the exercise of a right (to participate in
a trade).

Positioning Theory and Social Justice

In this section we further clarify the
reasons that positioning theory is particularly
suitable for researching social justice issues. First,
we highlight the centrality of duties and rights in
different political contexts, and social justice in these
countries, for example, education, employment,
and unemployment benefits. However, an alternative
answer to the same question could be, “The parents
of these two children are neglecting their duties to
find employment and provide a minimum of food
and shelter for the family. By teaching the Moqan
parents to be dependent on welfare, the govern-
ment has violated the rights of the children, duties, and story-
lines in contexts where social justice is a theme, and
how positioning theory is especially suitable
for studying and unraveling disparate processes.
Third, we examine the strength of positioning
theory in exploring social and psychological pro-
cesses that are potentially open-ended, with the
possibility that one or a few of different storylines
could become dominant for a time but decline in
importance. In keeping with our earlier discussion
of Afghan and Iraqi, we will adopt the inva-
sion of Iraq as a central focus.

Common to both positioning theory and
social justice is the centrality of rights and duties.
Positioning theory explores how individuals and groups
attribute rights and duties to themselves and others, how such rights and duties are evolved,
disputed, or legislated, and how actions become influenced by the rights and duties introduced. Rights and
duties are also central to all social justice issues.

Examples in Afghanistan and Pakistan illustrate something as “simple” as the
question, “Why are eleven-year-old Neil Morgan and his nine-year-old sister firewall living in abject poverty?” An answer could be, “The rights of the Morgan family and poor people like them are being violated, because the government has failed to provide
them with basic social services, healthcare, and
unemployment benefits.” However, an alternative
answer to the same question could be, “The parents
of these two children are neglecting their duties to
find employment and provide a minimum of food
and shelter for the family. By teaching the Moqan
parents to be dependent on welfare, the govern-
ment has violated the rights of the children, duties, and story-
lines in contexts where social justice is a theme, and
how positioning theory is especially suitable
for studying and unraveling disparate processes.

Outcomes: Increased intergroup conflict

During intergroup conflict, the first example, killing a
soccer ball with holy verses violated an Islamic duty to
violate the Quran’s wish. The intervention backfired,
inciting grievances, and the US military was forced to
collect the soccer balls and dispose of them in a
way that follows Islamic custom for destruction of
holy objects.

In the second and third illustrations, the story-
lines were effectively reframed to avoid perceived
violations of local rights and duties. While men are
seen to have a “right” to be the primary decision
makers in Afghan society, the storyline was changed
to focus on protecting mothers’ rights and appealing
to an Afghan access of duty to honor those
righ ts. Afghan society accepts “mothers” as
having a relative position of respect, and therefore Afghan
men’s duties toward them. For example,
in many parts of Afghanistan, a male mem-
ber has a duty to obtain the mother’s permission before
entering in jihad. The storyline also changed such
male rights no longer endan-
gered: whereas a council is a decision-making body,
forums are non-threatening, even if they are func-
tionally equivalent to a council. In the third exam-
ple, the storyline of gambling (i.e., an Islamic
practice) was transformed into a storyline of com-
mon, i.e., capitalism promoted by Islam, which
in turn transformed a violation of a duty (i.e., not to
gamble) into the exercise of a right (to participate in
a trade).
Positioning theory is particularly appropriate for studying and deconstructing disputed storylines, rights, and duties. For example, positioning theory provides an excellent lens through which to view the 2003 US-led invasion and occupation—a major international event that galvanized different groups, in support of different storylines. The Iraq War narrative circulated widely in the United States and United Kingdom governments, in particular, at least hundreds of billions of dollars. Critics vehemently argue that the government of US President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom had not only violated the rights of the Iraqi people, but also the rights of American and British peoples. The enormous sums of money wasted on wars in the Near East "enriched" private companies such as those of Halliburton and Blackwater, besides being used to improve education, health, and social services for the masses in the United States and the United Kingdom. From this perspective, these wars were not only rights violations against American and British taxpayers and showed that Bush and Blair were not carrying out their duties toward their own nations. In response to the critics, some argue that by invading Iraq, Presidents Bush and Prime Minister Blair were carrying out their duty to defend the Western civilization and the interests of Mass Destruction (apparently) being developed by the Iraqi President Saddam Hussein.

The dispute over storylines associated with the invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2003 is "saturated," which makes it particularly appropriate for analysis through positioning theory. New reports based on "new evidence" are regularly being published, influencing the competing storylines about the Iraq war. These storylines continue to be developed, in an open-ended process that seems to have no end in sight. For example, famous memoirs suggest Prime Minister Blair had a larger role in the "macho" to war than had earlier been reported (http://www. thinkprogress.org/2010/10/21/hillary-blackhat-warpath-from-early-2002-colin-powell-memo/what-inquiry-invading-iraq/). Further revisions could again change the storyline in the coming months, as Canadian storylines and weaknesses are forth. Positioning theory is particularly suitable for analyzing these kinds of dynamic, fluid, open-ended disputes over storylines, rights, and duties.

Concluding Comment

We used this opportunity to review positioning theory's origins, basic assumptions, and major components and to apply positioning theory in a context of intergroup contact and conflict. We showed through positioning analysis that rights and duties are adopted and applied fluidly, in relation to group goals and positions. Using narrative research, we present new findings regarding the major international event that galvanized different groups, in support of different storylines. The Iraq War narrative circulated widely in the United States and United Kingdom governments, in particular, at least hundreds of billions of dollars. Critics vehemently argue that the government of US President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom had not only violated the rights of the Iraqi people, but also the rights of American and British peoples. The enormous sums of money wasted on wars in the Near East "enriched" private companies such as those of Halliburton and Blackwater, besides being used to improve education, health, and social services for the masses in the United States and the United Kingdom. From this perspective, these wars were not only rights violations against American and British taxpayers and showed that Bush and Blair were not carrying out their duties toward their own nations. In response to the critics, some argue that by invading Iraq, Presidents Bush and Prime Minister Blair were carrying out their duty to defend the Western civilization and the interests of Mass Destruction (apparently) being developed by the Iraqi President Saddam Hussein.

The dispute over storylines associated with the invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2003 is "saturated," which makes it particularly appropriate for analysis through positioning theory. New reports based on "new evidence" are regularly being published, influencing the competing storylines about the Iraq war. These storylines continue to be developed, in an open-ended process that seems to have no end in sight. For example, famous memoirs suggest Prime Minister Blair had a larger role in the "macho" to war than had earlier been reported (http://www. thinkprogress.org/2010/10/21/hillary-blackhat-warpath-from-early-2002-colin-powell-memo/what-inquiry-invading-iraq/). Further revisions could again change the storyline in the coming months, as Canadian storylines and weaknesses are forth. Positioning theory is particularly suitable for analyzing these kinds of dynamic, fluid, open-ended disputes over storylines, rights, and duties.
"In the Minds of Men...": Social Representations of War and Military Intervention
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Abstract

This chapter reviews research on representations of war and military intervention, primarily situated in two different social psychological research traditions: individual attitudes and social representations. The former has approached the object of investigation by studying the cognitive and affective correlates, more general predictors, and behavioral consequences of individuals’ support (vs. rejection) of war or military intervention. The latter focuses on a greater extent on contextual and historical processes that influence the social meanings attached to war and military intervention. In this approach, attitudes are just one (evaluative) component of social representations—and differences between individuals and groups may be attributed to the various functions social representations fulfill. We thus adopt the broader social representations approach. Based on this, the chapter closes by drawing implications for strategies to change individual attitudes, as well as representations of war and military interventions, and by offering questions for future research.
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"Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be conceived"—so says the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the preamble to its constitution (1945). The statement raises various questions. How are wars represented in the minds of men (and women)? How can these representations be changed to construct the defences of peace? And to what extent can peace be brought about by changes in representations at the individual level? Accordingly, psychologists have a long tradition of engaging with war and peace (though too often against war and for peace, for an overview see Christie & Mould, 2013). In light of today’s widespread militarization and occurrence of wars and warfare, the conflicts, the discourse’s engagement with such questions is more important than ever. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (2010) reported that worldwide military expenditure increased from US$1.223 trillion in 1992 to US$1.760 billion in 2015. And the Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research (2016) found that there were 43 wars or limited wars taking place globally in 2015, with an additional 180 serious conflicts. Memory plays on militarization fuels wars and military interventions, and thus contributes to direct violence. However, the research on how to address other pressing social issues also contributes to structural violence: the presence of structural and institutional conditions that prevent humans from meeting their basic needs and fulfilling their physical and mental potentials (Galtung, 1969). With social justice defined as the absence of structural violence, research on representations of war and military interventions is of great relevance to the focus and priorities of this handbook.