

# Moon-Young Lee's Nonviolence and Transcendence Ethics in Conflict Management

Hun Myoung Park  
International University of Japan  
kucc625@iuj.ac.jp

## Abstract

*This paper examines Professor Moon-Young Lee's academic achievement that has been less highlighted than his popular image of a pro-democracy fighter. Lee employed people-work-method categorization and transcendence ethics (nonviolence, personal ethic, social ethic, and self-sacrifice) to describe and analyze public affairs. Nonviolence and personal ethic are virtues and strategies that appear in conflict management literature like Pondy (1967) and Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011), while social ethic and self-sacrifice are less discussed. Lee's nonviolence is (1) to use 'word,' (2) to tell the right things, (3) to say minimally what is really needed, (4) to use complete nonviolence and avoid enmity, and (5) to be grounded on laws, procedures, or common sense. Nonviolence will be a likely choice for those who do not have strong power and have to deal with a bad counterpart. A case of "Lieutenant's Gentle Revolt" illustrates how Lee's nonviolence and transcendence ethics can be effectively applied to a bureaucratic model of conflict. Lee's concepts of nonviolence, although sounding only theoretical and idealistic, provides practical and realistic guidance for conflict management and managerial leadership.*

## 1. Introduction

When professor Moon-Young Lee passed away in January 2014, most newspapers and mass media described him in his obituary as a "pro-democracy fighter" rather than a public administration scholar. In fact, he was forcibly dismissed and reinstated three times repeatedly and even imprisoned three times for a total of 10 years, about one third of his academic career (1959-1992) in Korea University (Lee 2008: 244-245). As a consequence, he could neither supervise many graduate students nor get many academic books and papers published before his last reinstatement in 1984. His *Autobiographic Public Administration* (1991), which provided an analytic archetype to later books (Lee 2008: 483, 525), was published just a year before his retirement.

Lee appears to be unfairly stigmatized on purpose by vested interests as a pro-democracy fighter, radical left-winger, liberal idealist, and/or just eccentric person who pursued a utopia through continuous violent struggles against autocratic

regimes and kept doing odd and useless things for his heroism and political gain. Contrary to these misbranded images, he identifies himself as *capitalist* who respect core principles of modern civil law: freedom of contract and absolute ownership of private properties (Lee 2008: 215-219, 543), *conservative* very close to moderate (in fact, conservative moderate) who believes in spiritual meditation, side with the weak, and respect traditional values (p. 500, 528, 665), and *Glorious Revolutionist* who wants to make change without bloody violence (p. 347). He rarely used violence; he hated radical actions (violence) taken by the weak as well as the strong (Lee 2008: 576-578); he always suggested using nonviolence; he just tried to get citizens' voice heard using 'word.' Thus he wants to be a realistic idealist who takes reality into account (Lee 1986: 138) and minimalist who stubbornly adheres to the unalienable minimum (Lee 2008: 150, 481, 681). His struggle is only to get back to academia by transforming the abnormal circumstance (dictatorship) that prevented him from concentrating on research in public administration (Lee 1991: 26; Lee 1996: 55-56; Lee 2008: 333). Even though Lee was offered political positions (i.e., party leader and assembly man), he never took them (Lee 1991: 362; Lee 2008: 213, 317, 379, 553). A real pro-democracy movement is to make a minimal request that even evil regimes aren't rebuff and then eagerly pay the expensive price for telling the 'word' or truth (Lee 2008: 491, 615).

Lee was a public administration scholar, of course. He served as a vice president (1969-1970) and the 9<sup>th</sup> president (1971-1972) of Korean Association for Public Administration (KAPA), although only a few remember this fact. After his retirement in 1992, he energetically published major books including *The Analects of Confucius, the Works of Mencius, and Public Administration* (1996), *Man, Religion, and State* (2001), *Cooperative Governance* (2006), and *Public Administration from the March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement perspective* (2011). In particular, Lee (1996) brought him the KAPA award for excellence in academic book in 1997. Nevertheless, his academic effort for public administration appears to be less appreciated, if not veiled or neglected, than it deserves to be.

Then what is his theory of public administration? What is the uniqueness of his framework? What is his contribution to public administration? Do his theory have conceptual rigorousness and practical

values? Which implications does his framework have for public administration? In order to answer for these questions, this paper explores Lee's major works and searches for his core concepts and their practical values in public administration. Specifically, the framework of "people-work-method" and transcendence ethics (i.e., nonviolence, personal ethic, social ethic, and self-sacrifice) is explored to draw their implications for conflict management.

The next two sections summarize his transcendence ethics and highlight his concept of nonviolence. Section 4 compares Lee's transcendence ethics with Pondy's conflict episode and Fisher, Ury, and Patton's principled negotiation. In section 5, a case of "Lieutenant's Gentle Revolt" illustrates how Lee's transcendence ethics are applied to conflict management. The implications of this case are discussed with special respect to nonviolence in section 6. Then this paper concludes that Lee's nonviolence and other transcendence ethics are not idealistic but rather realistic and practical in conflict management.

## 2. Transcendence Ethics

Lee has used two analytic lenses that are closely related each other: people-work-method categorization and transcendence ethics.

### 2.1 People-work-method categorization

Since his *Public Administration* (1962), Lee has employed the people-work-method or who-what-how categorization to define public administration and analyze social phenomena. Lee (1980: 7-8) suggests three objectives of administrative reform: (1) formation of a favorable environment where government workers in charge perform their tasks autonomously and confidently (people), (2) administrative effectiveness of performing what citizens want government to do (work), and (3) administrative efficiency to minimize labor forces and materials (method). This categorization starts from 'how' (method) and develops to 'what' (work) and then 'who' (people) (Lee 1991: 48-49).

The 'who' dimension asks how people in charge (government workers) are viewed and treated in an organization (Lee 1986: 319). Public servants should be independent, active, and social men who have their own character, discretion, and autonomy (Lee 1980: 363-364). They need to be high and noble beings with specialized knowledge and skills and refuse servile obedience to their superiors (Lee 2001: 496). A public employee is treated as means without character in bureaucratic regimes, but he or she is considered as ends with autonomy and natural rights in democratic public administration (Lee 1991: 58). Unlike yes-men who serve their autocrat, desirable public managers are willing to take risk of being

punished and make decisions favorable to citizens who suffer from dictatorship (Lee 1980: 7, 363).

'What' asks what is the meaningful work that people have to do (Lee 1986: 319). Government has to serve citizens by improving basic rights and doing what they request (e.g., social welfare, justice, and equity) (Lee 1991: 136). Government employees respond to citizens' demand (Lee 1980: 7); it is not meaningful to simply carry out tyranny's order (e.g., constructing huge bridges and buildings) and pursue unconscionable benefit in return for obedience (Lee 2001: 496).

Finally, the 'how' factor asks how efficiently people have to work (Lee 1986: 319); that is, 'how' is the method or way of doing the work. Government should be efficient in economic and social senses to save money and get agreement among stakeholders (social efficiency). And civil servants have to improve their professional knowledge and skills and serve citizens rather than subject themselves to superiors and look down on citizens (Lee 2001: 496).

In short, self-sacrifice is a value of human beings; it is meaningful to side with victims of power abuse; and nonviolence and incorrupt life are valuable ways of doing work (Lee 1986: 319-320). However, this who-what-how categorization is too general to be Lee's unique framework or theory.

### 2.2 Transcendence ethics

Lee's transcendence ethics consist of nonviolence, personal ethic, social ethic, and self-sacrifice (Lee 1980: 365; Lee 1991: 49) that originate from Four Gospels (i.e., rebirth, holiness, healing, and second coming) of Holiness Church (Lee 1991: 113-115; Lee 2001: 254-259; Lee 2008: 101-102, 269-270). The transcendence ethics are products of applying Four Gospels to secular daily life (Lee 2008: 254). He has a habit of reflecting his pro-democracy struggles from the Bible's standpoint (Lee 1986: 339). Lee argues that four ethics are found in the Epistle to the Romans 12:1-21, Epistle of James 5:7-11, and Tolstoy's *War and Peace* (Lee 1991: 113-115; Lee 2001: 255-258; Lee 2008: 270).

Why does Lee think that the four ethics are transcendent rather than evolutionary? People develop their characters in the same order to reach their maturity (Lee 2001: 149). Likewise, his struggle for democracy has also been refined in the process of transcending nonviolence toward self-sacrifice (Lee 1991: 27, 32). Ordinary citizens need to equip themselves with these moral virtues in order to transform current people-work-method (who-what-how) and thus develop an alternative to dictatorship (Lee 1980: 365; Lee 2008: 143). Lee also calls transcendence ethics *abilities* that the weak (civil servants) must have in order to confront the strong (Lee 1980: 373; Lee 1991: 27).

Table 1. People-work-method categorization and transcendence ethics

Category	Value or goal	Trans. ethics	Four Gospels	Human natures	Season
Method ('How')	Efficiency	Nonviolence	Healing (神癒)	Trust (信)	Spring
		Personal ethic	Holiness (聖潔)	Knowledge (智), propriety (禮)	Summer
Work ('What')	Effectiveness	Social ethic	Second coming (再臨)	Benevolence (仁)	Autumn
People ('Who')	Autonomy	Self-sacrifice	Rebirth (重生)	Righteousness (義)	Winter

Source: Lee (1980, 1991, 1996, 2001, 2008)

The first ethic of *nonviolence* is to give up using physical and non-physical violence and then use 'word' instead (Lee 1980: 365; Lee 1986: 294; Lee 1996: 56). Being subjected to despotic violence, the weak need to struggle with their strong counterpart with the confidence that nonviolence is the right answer to brutal violence (Lee 1980: 365).

Nonviolence is an active action to talk and only talk right things (Lee 1986: 294-295; Lee 1996: 56). Nonviolence does not, however, mean lack of authority but relevant execution of legitimate power in accordance with laws (Lee 1991: 138-139).

The second virtue is personal ethic whose concept has evolved overtime. At this stage people comply with agreements among individuals (Lee 1980: 365). Then personal ethic was refined to be obtaining specialized knowledge and skills and making and sticking with agreements (rules) (Lee 1991: 49, 140-150). In *The Analects of Confucius, the Works of Mencius, and Public Administration* (1996), Lee specifically added emphasizing self-discipline when obtaining specialized knowledge, respecting neighbors (parents) to whom you are indebted, complying with rules (laws), pursuing harmony and cooperation, being soft on colleagues and hard on himself, and building trust among superiors and subordinates (pp. 306-309, 424-431). Personal ethic needs knowledge (智) and propriety (禮) (Lee 1996: 403-404). In *Man, Religion, and State* (2001), he draws lessons from *Aesop's Fables* and describes personal ethic as (1) knowing the logic of things (格物致知) (knowing things, safe places, and his enemy), (2) having the sincerity and right mind (誠意正心) (doing it yourself, knowing yourself, and not having vain hopes), and (3) respecting agreements (pp. 150-163). He emphasizes importance of unity and solidarity of colleagues, warning the temptation of schism (Lee 2008: 381, 403-404, 521-524).

The third maturity stage is social ethic. People with nonviolence and personal ethic will side with the weak against the strong (Lee 1980: 365). Social ethic is to improve basic human rights and social values such as democracy, welfare, equity, and justice (Lee 1991: 136). Government should have responsibility for taking care of deprived people and minorities (Lee 1996: 434-435). Modern concept of benevolence (仁) is social ethic as well as the basic principle of government's work (Lee 1996: 405). Accordingly, it is not meaningful to do civil

engineering work like the tower of Babel that gives illusion to ordinary citizens (Lee 1996: 380-383).

Finally, self-sacrifice is the highest transcendence ethic at which people eagerly sacrifice themselves and save others and himself eventually (Lee 2001: 148). Although suffering from outrageous violence of the strong, prophets use nonviolence and possess personal and social ethics, however, they are not put high but are sacrificed instead (Lee 1980: 371; Lee 1991: 309). There are several steps to reach self-sacrifice. People recognize what government ought not to do; they refuse to receive improper benefit from evil government; they are alienated and even killed due to their declining the improper offer; they become delighted despite their sacrifice; and eventually the rules, which they strived to comply with, are widely perceived as principles of saving the wicked world (Lee 1996: 437-444).<sup>1</sup>

Lee illustrates how transcendence ethics are applied to public organization, policy, finance, and human resource management.<sup>2</sup> For instance, nonviolence in human resource management is to refuse spoils system and recruit with propriety (禮); government implements scientific human resource management and improves human relations (personal ethic); government with social ethic invites alienated citizens and does not discriminate against gender, race, education, disability, and others as shown in the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Act; finally, government allow civil servants' labor union to make collective agreement and have dissenting opinions (self-sacrifice) (Lee 1991: 229-255; Lee 1996: 563-601; Lee 2001: 419-431). Labor unions need to (1) avoid improper labor activities that just agitate employers (nonviolence); (2) comply with collective labor agreement (personal ethic); (3) remain as unions for employees not for employers or outsiders (social ethic); and (4) focus on labor-management instead of class struggle (self-sacrifice) (Lee 2001: 346-254; Lee 2008: 242-244).

Nonviolence and personal ethic falls in the method or 'how' category, whereas social ethics and

<sup>1</sup> Gandhi (1983) notes, "It is the reformer who is anxious for the reform, and not society, from which he should expect nothing better than opposition, abhorrence and even mortal persecution" (p.190).

<sup>2</sup> When writing his *Autobiographic Public Administration* in 1990, Lee asked his students which one among four chapters is best. It took long time for me to answer.

self-sacrifice are respectively matched to 'what' and 'who' (Lee 1991: 49; Lee 1996: 406). Like the people-work-method categorization, transcendence ethics develop from nonviolence up to self-sacrifice in order. Transcendence ethics is cumulative rather than discrete; for example, self-sacrifice is based on nonviolence, personal ethic, and social ethic (Lee 2001: 88). Hence, nonviolence and personal ethic are easier to reach than the social ethic and self-sacrifice stages. And transcendence ethics are both descriptive and normative in his work. Table 1 summarizes the relationship between the people-work-method categorization and transcendence ethics.

### 2.3 Transcendence ethics in Confucianism, *Aesop's Fables*, and Tolstoy's *War and Peace*

Lee often employed analogies of four seasons and five basic human natures (五常) in Confucianism to explain these transcendence ethics (Table 1) (Lee 1996: 325, 403-449; Lee 2008: 268-269; Lee 2011: 114-116).

In spring, buds and leaves sprouting from a tree should grow in a cautious and steady manner; otherwise, they will hardly survive, if not frozen to death, under adverse circumstances. This nature is called trust (信) that is manifested by 光名之心 (giving trust by being located at the great mean and thus glowing brightly). People with trust do not break their word and their behaviors remain same and consistent; Lee calls this human nature nonviolence (Lee 2011: 114-115). A tree grows and flourishes during summer. It needs personal ethic that is based on knowledge (智) and propriety (禮). Both human natures are respectively manifested by the feeling of approving and disapproving (是非之心) and feeling of modesty and complaisance (辭讓之心).<sup>3</sup> This propriety is equivalent to western concept of tolerance or constitutionalism (Lee 1996: 403). A tree bears its fruits in autumn. Social ethic is needed to share harvest with neighbors to whom you are indebted (those who are oppressed by a dictator). This principle is called benevolence or commiseration (仁) in Confucianism. Finally, the tree has to drop its leaves for itself and its descendants during cold winter. Lee describes this attitude as righteousness (義) or self-sacrifice. Benevolence and righteousness are manifested by the feeling of commiseration (惻隱之心) and feeling of shame and dislike (羞惡之心), respectively.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> This section employs Legge's (1970: 202-203) translation for knowledge, propriety, benevolence, and righteousness.

<sup>4</sup> Lee gave four lessons to one of his students when officiating her wedding ceremony: (1) to love your husband only and avoid committing adultery in spring, (2) to work hard to pay tax (do your duty for society) and love ardently to have many children in summer, (3) to share your

In an adverse circumstance, it is difficult to have even nonviolence and personal ethic; social ethic and self-sacrifice stages are too high to reach. Lee oftentimes cited *Aesop's Fables* and Tolstoy's *War and Peace* in connection with transcendence ethics and found that the former include only nonviolence and personal ethic, whereas the latter has all four ethics (Lee 2008: 560). *Aesop's Fables* suggest that the weak escape from the strong, obtain knowledge and wisdom, or unite themselves in order to survive under tyranny (Lee 1980: 366). These strategies appear to correspond to nonviolence and personal ethic (i.e., knowledge and agreement). Lee underlines that the democratic camp should not split itself but unite to avoid hardline reaction and thus strengthen solidarity with colleagues (Lee 2008: 385-386, 403-404). Social ethic and self-sacrifice appear to be more relevant to those who hold some power, whereas nonviolence and personal ethic are needed specifically for the weak.

The next section zooms up the concept and values of Lee's nonviolence.

## 3. Lee's Nonviolence

Nonviolence is a prior condition of other transcendence ethics (Lee 1996: 403, 419; Lee 2001: 149) and a promising alternative that the weak develop to solve problems with the strong and eventually build peace (Lee 1986: 290). Lee's nonviolence is not just the antonym of violence. Lee uses nonviolence in a unique way without defining its concept in a concrete and systematic manner.

### 3.1 What is Lee's nonviolence?

Lee's nonviolence has following important features that distinguish it from other concepts of nonviolence.

First, Lee's nonviolence is not to use any violence (e.g., actual or threatened and physical or non-physical violence) but to talk or use 'word' (Lee 1986: 290; Lee 1996: 56; Lee 2008: 95). Even when the strong use violence, the weak should not (Lee 2008: 69). 'Word' comes into play after violence stops (Lee 1996: 404). Hence, the antonym of violence is use of 'word' (Lee 1986: 290; Lee 1996: 404). Similarly, the antonym of the truth and peace is violence (Lee 1986: 298; Lee 2001: 187; Lee 2008: 580).<sup>5</sup>

Second, nonviolence is to tell right things or truth only (Lee 1986: 290; Lee 1996: 56; Lee 2008: 497). The weak should make an offer that even evil

achievement (harvest) with neighbors in fall, and (4) to give up yours eventually.

<sup>5</sup> Gandhi's *satyagraha* (truth-force) is to replace violent movement with one based entirely upon Truth (God) and nonviolence (*ahimsa*) is the only way to find Truth (Bondurant 1988: 15-18).

regimes cannot refuse since it is completely right and legitimate (Lee 2008: 66, 80, 435, 491, 497). The weak ought not to tell a lie and make an absurd request; otherwise, they will be counter-attacked and damaged by their merciless counterpart. Accordingly, nonviolence is a rational and practical strategy through which the weak can protect themselves from dictator's power misuse and violent retaliation. Accordingly, nonviolence is not submissive and passive but active and righteous action to improve the decency of the weak (Lee 2001: 149). And nonviolence is different from nonresistance or silence (doing nothing) because it is a discreet struggle to tell the truth under brutal dictatorship (Lee 1986: 294-295).

Also Lee's nonviolence should be complete nonviolence excluding even subtle verbal, emotional, psychological, and other forms of violence (Lee 2001: 149). Incomplete and half-baked nonviolence may provoke the strong to aggravate the lopsided conflict even further (Lee 2008: 59). The more the strong rely on violence, the more the weak should stay with absolute and thorough nonviolence even when they become angry over the dictator's cruelty (Lee 1986: 289; Lee 2008: 59). For example, the weak should adjust conversational tone (e.g., intonation and accentuation) and attitude properly to make 'plain speaking' as if they read a textbook to the strong. The plain speaking should be succinct and rational without any unnecessary and emotional piece. Lee suggests that ordinary people ought never to do what they ought not to in any circumstance and should endure up to the last minute (Lee 1986: 292, 298). However, it is not easy to remain patient and calm in such circumstance. Hence, nonviolence is the synonym of patience as well as core ethic that the weak under dictatorship must have (Lee 1986: 335-336). Lee (1986) states proudly that nonviolence characterizes Korean pro-democracy movement that is distinct from those in other countries (p. 344).

Fourth, Lee's nonviolence is to say minimally what is really needed (Lee 1991: 25-26; Lee 1996: 56; Lee 2008: 491). Nonviolence is the minimum that people have to adhere (Lee 2008: 65) and is associated more with not to do what they ought not to do (e.g., not to misuse power) rather than to do what they ought to (Lee 1996: 404). One day he drew a cone with a round base at the bottom ( $\Delta$ ) and another upside down ( $\nabla$ ) on the blackboard, and then asked, "Which one do you think is more painful when someone puts them on your hand?" The weak must concentrate only key words without saying or asking too much.<sup>6</sup> The minimal action of nonviolence will strengthen the weak and protect them from dictator's

<sup>6</sup> This minimalism allows the weak to minimize mistakes that the strong are waiting for retaliation and concentrate on the spirit of the times like basic human rights without unnecessary ideological conflicts over less important issues (Lee 1991: 330-331).

counter-attack. Hence, the weak should remain always patient, calm, rational, and discreet all the time.<sup>7</sup>

Finally, nonviolence is grounded on the natural law, common sense, formal laws and procedures, and the like. Rules represent common sense (Lee 1991: 351). An exemplar is Socrates who complied with even unfair laws and died (Lee 1986: 289). It will be violent, for instance, to break a word, to eat lunch too early or too late, to drink liquor too much, to commit adultery, to do unconscionable labor movement, and to employ a spoils system.<sup>8</sup> Doing what he ought not to do is worse than not doing what he ought to (Lee 1996: 420). Hence, Lee's nonviolence differs from Gandhi's civil disobedience that violates unfair laws voluntarily at the risk of being punished.

### 3.2 Why nonviolence?

Lee posits two propositions that (1) the despotic rulers collapse by themselves (Lee 1986: 289; Lee 2008: 346-347) and (2) those who can build peace are neither the strong nor radical activists, but the weak who endure hardship with nonviolence (Lee 1986: 289-290, 297).<sup>9</sup> Only people without self-interest can drive out the dictator who pursues his personal gain, armed forces, and territorial expansion (Lee 1996: 436). Then, why do the weak have to rely upon nonviolence? What are the values of Lee's nonviolence?

Most of all, it is because the weak, by definition, do not have strong power to use violence against the tyrant who has weapon and violence (Lee 2001: 88, 148).<sup>10</sup> Lee (2001) puts, "The strong disguise himself, the weak show himself as he is. The strong use cunning words, but the weak realize the correct logic of things. The strong break even promises that they made the weak, while the weak respect agreements" (p. 148). The weak in this circumstance has two approaches other than obedience: violence and nonviolence.

<sup>7</sup> "Experience has taught me that civility is the most difficult part of Satyagraha. Civility does not here mean the mere outward gentleness of speech cultivated for the occasion, but an inborn gentleness and desire to do the opponent good" (Gandhi 1983: 394).

<sup>8</sup> When Saemaul Song, written by autocratic President Chung-hee Park, blared out in an early morning in prison, Lee yelled, "Knock that Park's song off!" in protest of agent's breaking his word (Lee 1991: 352-353). "How dare you call it Park's song rather than President Park's song?" teased the intelligence agent. Lee simply replied back, "Then do you call Mr. Schubert's song rather than just Schubert's song?" He wants to stay with agreements and common sense.

<sup>9</sup> Gandhi (1983) puts, "... why it would spell victory for our side if we could maintain perfect peace in spite of any punishment that might be inflicted upon me" (p.418).

<sup>10</sup> "But sword we had none. We scarcely had the nerve and the muscle even to receive sword-cut" (Gandhi 1983: 223).

Second, the weak will be worse off from a violence strategy. Ordinary people are easy to react back to the dictator emotionally and violently. The violence of the weak is likely to simply release their emotional upset and enmity and thus calls for radical and severe reaction of the strong (Lee 1986: 297; Lee 2008: 391). Insidious rulers often induce careless ordinary people to use violence in order to get a chance to unite themselves, quell emotion-releasing violence, and thus consolidate their regimes (Lee 1986: 297).

Emphasizing nonviolence and tolerance, Lee argues that the key sentence of *The Work of Mencius* is “For them, when they cannot enjoy themselves, to condemn their superiors is wrong, but when the superiors of the people do not make enjoyment a thing common to the people and themselves, they also do wrong” (Mencius 1970: 157-158). Lee hates both power abuse of the strong and indiscrete violence of the weak (Lee 1986: 81-82; Lee 2008: 79).

Third, the weak can survive by sticking to nonviolence. This nonviolence approach, despite its conceptual and practical difficulties, will protect the weak and their neighbors from dictator’s violence. Nonviolent resistance is not to do nothing (Lee 1980: 294) but to say the right things and make their voice heard. Suppose riot policemen block the entrance of a college to discourage outsiders to participate in a scheduled demonstration. Most students of the college may get upset at such violence against themselves. But discreet students will pretend to be obedient and show their student ID cards without remonstrating with policemen because they do not have physical power to kick policemen out. Such passive behavior will lead to loose ID check and thus increase the likelihood that outsiders take part in the gathering. Violent protest and resistance, by contrast, will drive policemen to check student ID strictly although they already know that ID check is absurd. This example shows that nonviolence is not just an idealistic strategy but rational and practical one for the weak.

More importantly, nonviolence is the strong weapon of the weak to defeat the strong without legitimacy and their moral foundation and eventually to build peace after the collapse of the dictatorship (Lee 1986: 297-298). Lee differentiates Korean pro-democracy fighters from dissidents in Africa and South America in that Korean dissidents refused to use violence; they did not remain obedient to the strong who misused illegitimate power but sided with victims of the power abuse; they were incorrupt, finally while their counterpart was corrupt; while their counterparts were tantalized by desire for wealth and power, they eagerly sacrificed themselves with raging thirst for doling out all they have (Lee 1986: 318-319).

The final rationale is normative. Lee’s nonviolence appears to be deeply rooted from his

philosophical belief in human natures of Confucianism, religious life in Christianity, and experiences as a pro-democracy fighter. As shown in Table 1, four transcendence ethics are matched to five human natures in Confucianism. Lee identifies himself as a minimalist who tried to preserve the minimum for ordinary human life (Lee 2008: 150, 481). Only minimalists, who have been deprived of their minimum and experienced miserable situations, are able to have adoration for basic human natures instead of animosity toward the strong and wish that the same minimum should be given to those who robbed their minimum (Lee 1986: 96).<sup>11</sup> A prisoner could not dare catch irritating flies on the wall because he knows how painful it was to be beaten (Lee 1986: 300). Even if an intelligence agent tortures a victim, he or she sympathizes with the agent and believes that the agent also has human natures (Lee 2008:438).

Lee’s transcendence ethics appear to be useful in conflict management, since they implicitly assume a circumstance where the weak suffer from dictator’s violence. The next section explores how much the transcendence ethics are comparable to the conflict management literature.

## 4. Conflict Management

Conflict exists everywhere and everyday and is inevitable in organizations (Pondy 1967 and 1992). Conflicts have various forms (e.g., conflicts among individuals, groups, agencies, and countries) and sources (e.g., power, culture, goal, communication, and personality) (Rainey 2014: 395-396).

### 4.1 Pondy’s conflict episode

Conflict is not an event or one-shot game. Pondy (1967) argues that conflict is a dynamic process that has the history of a conflict episode with five stages (p. 299, 319). He states, “Each conflict relationship is made up of a sequence of interlocking conflict episodes; each episode exhibits a sequence or pattern of development, and the conflict relationship can be characterized by stable patterns that appear across the sequence of episodes” (pp. 298). “Each episode or encounter leaves an aftermath that affects the course of succeeding episodes. ... a conflict episode can be thought of as a gradual escalation to a state of disorder” (p.299).

A conflict episode consists of five stages (Pondy 1967). Antecedent conditions (e.g., competition for scarce resources, pursuit of autonomy, and different perceived goals) set a *latent conflict* stage before the conflict develops. People are aware of conflict (*perceived conflict*) to reach a cognitive state. A

<sup>11</sup> “I have no anger against them. I am only sorry for their ignorance and their narrowness” (Gandhi 1983: 166).

conflict in an affective state is felt to result in, for instance, discomfort, anxiety and hostility (*felt conflict*). *Manifest conflict* becomes open warfare and involves conflictful behavior that may be destructive if not managed properly. Finally, *conflict aftermath* is the stage after the outbreak. This stage may be turned into other stage or antecedent condition if the conflict is not resolved properly. However, this does not necessarily mean that a conflict episode goes through every stage one by one (p. 299). Each stage rather represents a phase of an ongoing conflict.

Pondy (1967) also emphasizes, contrary to common sense, that conflict is not necessarily bad and has a positive role (e.g., adaptability to environmental change) in an organization. "Conflict may be functional as well as dysfunctional for the individual and the organization... Conflict is intimately tied up with the stability of the organization ... conflict is a key variable in the feedback loops ..." (pp. 298). Pondy (1992: 259) even suggests the pure conflict system, as a fix of his old model of conflict, where conflict is a normal and frequent event and occasional cooperation is treated as a side-effect of conflictful activities. He puts, "Cooperation is too fragile and fleeting, purposiveness is too elusive, conflict is too frequently and too intensely directed... If conflict isn't happening, then the organization has no reason for being" (p. 259).

Accordingly, it is neither always possible nor desirable to eradicate all conflicts in an organization. Hence, manager's role is to manage (rather than resolve) conflict so that it is not destructive to organizations. A manager needs to be an orchestrator who coordinate conflicts and avoid the worst phase (Pondy 1992: 261). Citing Mencius (1970: 157-158), Lee emphasizes that violent emotional release of the weak should be avoided just as dictator's brutal violence should be stopped (Lee 1986: 297). Lee suggests that the weak have to take the minimal, but right, actions especially during a frightening period (manifest conflict stage) of dictatorship (Lee 1991: 25-26; Lee 1996: 56) just as managers manage rather than eradicate conflict to avoid the worst circumstance.

Unlike Pondy and American scholars in conflict management, Lee focuses on a specific conflict between the weak and the strong. This conflict is Pondy's (1967) *bureaucratic model* of superior-subordinate conflicts in a hierarchy. "The potential

for conflict is thus present when the superior and subordinate have different expectations about the zone of indifference. The subordinate is likely to perceive conflict when the superior attempts to exercise control over activities outside the zone of indifference..." (Pondy 1967: 314). Lee's transcendence ethics provide viable strategies to the weak who suffer from power misuse of the strong.

However, Lee's nonviolence rarely appears in American conflict management. Pondy (1992) says, "The use of raw power or of violence for redressing grievances or for altering the fundamental nature of the relationship played little or no role in the model" (p.257). Nonviolence is implicitly assumed in bargaining and negotiation. Lee's nonviolence is a prior condition or minimum requirement to avoid the worst. The weak need to give up using fists before moving on toward maturity or higher ethics (Lee 2001: 149).

Lee recognizes that the tension between democratic governance and dictatorship, like conflict episode, has changed dynamically over time. He describes five phenomena occurring under the worst circumstance: (1) a bad regime suppresses the press and prevents people from speaking out, (2) the regime removes political rivals, (3) ordinary citizens are deprived of their desire to stand by right things and their morals are debauched, (4) the regime invests in showcase projects (e.g., national wealth and arms race) rather than social welfare to transfuse legitimacy, and eventually (5) the regime is intervened by neighboring countries and its regime becomes ossified too much (Lee 1996: 368-390; Lee 2001:184-202). His time concept is comprised of past, present, future, and consolidated eternity (Table 2). People *long* for good alternatives (nonviolence) from the past, *sigh* because they struggle desperately to get away from the tough present and reach democracy (personal ethic), *dream* of participating in history together with the alienated in the future (social ethic), and eventually want to feel *ecstasy* of longing, sigh, and dream all once (self-sacrifice) (Lee 1991: 162-165; Lee 2001: 79-84). These emotions are respectively matched to the spirits of the times: nationalism (national building), democracy, egalitarianism, and then pacifism (Lee 1991: 167-169; Lee 2001: 86-88).

Thomas (1976, 1992) suggests five strategies of conflict management depending of assertiveness and cooperativeness: avoidance, accommodation,

Table 2. Time concept, feeling, and spirit of the times of transcendence ethics

Transcendence Ethics	Nonviolence	Personal ethic	Social ethic	Self-sacrifice
Time concept	Past	Present	Future	Eternity
Feeling	Longing	Sigh	Dream	Ecstasy
Time spirit (zeitgeist)	Nationalism	Democracy	Egalitarianism	Pacifism
Figures in Bible	Yacob	Joseph	Moses	Jesus Christ
Organization theory	Good individual & organization	Good organization & evil individual	Evil organization & good individual	Evil individual & organization

Source: Lee (1991: 162-170; 2001:203-224)

compromise, competing, and collaborating. March and Simon (1993) identify problem-solving, persuasion, bargaining, and politics as reactions to organizational conflict. Nonviolence among players is implicitly assumed here. Lee posits that proper transcendence ethics depend upon virtue and vice of an organization and its members (Lee 1991: 131-134). When both organization and individual members are good, nonviolence is sufficient; by contrast, self-sacrifice including nonviolence through social ethic is required when both organization and its members are evil; Good members need to have social ethic in an evil organization, whereas evil members need personal ethic in a good organization (Lee 1991: 131-134; Lee 2001: 382-394).

**4.2 ‘Getting to yes’: Principled negotiation**

More related to Lee’s transcendence ethics is Fisher, Ury, and Patton’s (2011) *Getting To Yes* that was developed from the Harvard Negotiation Project in the early 1980s. They suggest principled negotiation as opposed to positional bargaining to reach agreements among stakeholders successfully. This principled negotiation basically assumes Pondy’s (1967) *bargaining model* of conflict among individuals and/or groups. This approach also presupposes nonviolence and rational responses that are very similar to Lee’s nonviolence and personal ethic.

Positional bargaining is a common approach to negotiation where both parties stubbornly stick to their own positions. This positional bargaining, no matter whether the bargaining is soft or hard, does not produce a wise outcome efficiently and amicably (Fisher, Ury, and Patton 2011: 4). In hard bargaining, participants are viewed as adversaries who do not trust others and seek their gain or victory over their counterpart. Participants in soft bargaining trust others and pursue agreement even if they make concessions or change their position. Soft bargainers are dominated by hard bargainers (p. 10) but are rarely satisfied genuinely.

By contrast, principled negotiation on the merits views participants as problem solvers who are independent of trust and pursue wise outcome or

agreement that satisfy both parties. This alternative method of negotiation has four propositions or principles: (1) separate the people from the problem, (2) focus on and explore underlying interests, not positions, (3) invest multiple options for mutual gain, and (4) insist on using objective criteria or fair standards independent of the both parties’ will (pp. 10-15).

The first strategy is to disentangle the subjective human relationship from the objective and substantive problem (pp. 22-24). People are rational and logical on one hand, but they are emotional, illogical, and error-prone on the other hand. Participants need to understand empathetically how their counterpart views the issue (pp. 25-26) and make their proposal consistent with counterpart’s value and/or face (pp. 30-31). But they should neither speak about nor blame their counterpart for their problem (pp. 27, 38-39). Also both parties ought not to release emotions to call for emotional reaction from their counterpart (p. 34). “Attack the problem without blaming the people” (p.56). In sum, players need to protect their egos from getting involved in objective substance and face the problem rather than people in order to reframe the game into a principled negotiation (pp. 39-40).

This proposition is very close to Lee’s nonviolence in a sense that it denies the use of physical, verbal, and psychological violence. Lee emphasizes that the weak should use ‘word’ only and tell only what is right and really needed (Lee 1996: 59; Lee 2008: 491). He often cites three public pledges of the March 1<sup>st</sup> Declaration of Korean Independent one of which is “Our uprising today reflects the request of our people for justice, humanity, survival, and prosperity. Therefore, act solely in the spirit of liberty, never in the spirit of enmity.”

The second proposition is to focus on underlying interests, not positions. The fundamental of a conflicting problem lies in players’ interests such as needs, desires, concerns, and fears, not in their position (Fisher, Ury, and Patton 2011: 42). An interest is underlying force or motivation that causes to decide a position (p.43). A position tends to be concrete and explicit, while its underlying interests are likely to be intangible and implicit (p.45). There

Table 3. Principled negotiation, positional bargaining, and Lee’s transcendence ethics

Principled negotiation	Soft bargaining	Hard bargaining	Lee’s ethics
Problem solvers independent of trust	Trustful friends	Distrustful adversaries	Ordinary men
To get wise agreement amicably	To reach agreement	To get victory	To survive
Separate people from problem	Make concessions	Demand concessions	Nonviolence
Be soft on people and hard on problem	Be soft on people & problem	Be hard on people & problem	
Focus on interests, not positions	Change your position	Dig in to your position	Knowledge
Explore interests	Make offers	Make threats	
Invent options for mutual gain	Accept one-sided losses	Demand on-sided gains	Agreement
Look for multiple options	Single answer for others	Single answer you like	
Insist on using objective criteria	Insist on agreement	Insist on your position	Nonviolence
Yield to principle	Yield to pressure	Apply pressure	Agreement

Source: Lee (1991, 1996, 2001) and Fisher, Ury, Patton (2011)



exist multiple possible positions behind an interest and there exist many less conflicting interests behind opposed positions (p.44). In Egyptian-Israel peace treaty in 1978, for example, underlying interests were sovereignty for Egypt and national security for Israel both of which are satisfied by the demilitarization of Sinai Peninsula (pp. 43-44). It is necessary to identify underlying interests of both sides that are shared, compatible, and/or complementary. This diagnose activity is related to acquiring knowledge (knowing logics of things) and behaving intellectually in Lee's transcendence ethics.

Inventing many options for mutual gain is a useful skill at the planning stage. It is important to separate the process of developing or broadening possible alternatives from the process of making decision (Fisher, Ury, and Patton 2011: 62-67). Participants need to look for mutual gain or shared interest that can satisfy both players (pp. 72-75). Similarly, Corvette (2007) also suggests looking for common grounds and goals (p. 186). This strategy is similar to Lee's pursuing agreement in personal ethic.

Finally, good principled negotiators insist on using objective criteria as shown in Lee's nonviolence and personal ethic. It is necessary to develop and negotiate both fair standards and procedures. Examples of objective criteria include market price, scientific judgment, moral/professional standards, convention, tradition, and law that are legitimate, practical, and independent of players' preference and will (pp. 86-87). Fair procedures such as taking turns and flipping a coin provide effective ways of resolving conflicts (pp. 87-88). Players should be open to the reason or criteria but ought not to yield to pressure but to principle (pp.89-93). This final principle is related to nonviolence and personal ethic to pursue and respect agreements. Table 3 compare principled negotiation, positional bargaining, and transcendence ethics.

### 4.3 Negotiation under adverse conditions

Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011) argue that the principled negotiation is still applicable to adverse conditions where the counterpart is more powerful and use dirty tricks. "The stronger they appear in terms of physical or economic power, the more you benefit by negotiating on the merits" (pp. 107, 137-140). The weak have to protect themselves from accepting a bad agreement and utilize their assets fully (p.99). Principled negotiation, although depending on specific circumstance and alternatives, works for the weak even when negotiating with hard bargainers like Hitler (pp. 163-168).

Bad players may misrepresent facts, authority, or intentions (deliberative deception), make you feel uncomfortable, stressed, and threatened (psychological warfare), and/or exert positional pressures such as extreme demand, lock-in tactics, calculated delay (pp. 134-144). It is not a proper

response to put up with such tricky bargainers or play a tit-for-tat strategy in a sense that both approaches fail to reach a wise agreement. It will be foolhardy for the weak to try to retaliate against the strong with violence. Establishing the worst acceptable outcome may help the weak resist a disadvantageous deal under pressure, but at the same time the inflexibility of this bottom line makes it difficult to imagine alternatives that might satisfy both parties (pp. 99-101).

The solution is the principled negotiation on the merits and negotiation about the rule of game (procedure) on the basis of reciprocity rather than substance (132-134). Specifically, Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011) recommend the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA) approach in case of failure to reach an agreement. BATNA is the "the standard against which any proposed agreement should be measured" (p.102). The relative negotiation power depends primarily upon BATNA rather than available resources such as money and status (p.104). The weak need to overcome self-defeating attitude and self-abandonment and reframe to interests, options, objective standards, and BATNA of both parties (pp.181-194). When an agreement is not likely, the weak mobilize their knowledge, money, reputation, personal tie, and other assets fully to develop alternative actions to be taken and then choose the best option. This BATNA approach will make the weak confident in negotiation process, protect them from accepting unfavorable offer, and provide flexibility to explore more possible solutions and thus minimize the likelihood of missing the better one (pp. 102 and 106).

Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011) assume general bargaining conflicts among individuals and treat bureaucratic conflicts as special cases. Like *Aesop's Fables*, the four propositions (strategies) of principled negotiation are primarily related to Lee's nonviolence and personal ethic (i.e., knowledge and agreement) and rarely include social ethic and self-sacrifice (Table 3). The principled negotiation based on BATNA involves utilitarian or material calculation and thus provides limited explanation and solution for adverse circumstances.

By contrast, Lee seeks the best way for the weak to confront the strong under a bad circumstance. His nonviolence specifically asks to use 'word,' tell the right things only, use complete nonviolence without enmity, and rely on objective standards (e.g., law, procedure, convention, and common sense). Citing James 5:7-11, Lee (2001) recommends not to grumble to each other, to endure and wait to the end, and to be patient and patient (pp. 346-347). As shown in Table 3, the personal ethic of pursuing knowledge and agreement is comparable to the four propositions. In fact, Lee's transcendence ethics appear to be dominant strategies and BATNA that the weak have under an adverse circumstance.

## 5. A Case: Lieutenant's Gentle Revolt

This section introduces a conflict episode between a general and his subordinate lieutenant, public relations (PR) director, in a military unit. This case illustrates how the low ranked lieutenant can survive and achieve his goals successfully using Lee's nonviolence and other transcendence ethics.

The general had good personality and expertise in his field but also had excessive pride in his rank and authority. He was a good military man but not a good manager. His authoritarian leadership gave hard time to enlisted soldiers as well as officers because he always wanted to walk his own way. The general was an elder of a church but oftentimes blamed a military chaplain of the unit openly. When the general prohibited stay-over and leave of all enlisted soldiers and officers for weeks, the lieutenant strongly recommended stopping immediately the harsh punishment for joint liability. But the general ignored repeatedly his suggestion based on his expertise and empirical survey of current morale level. The oppressive order was overruled by his boss only after two soldiers committed suicide on the same day.

The general had a sort of obsession with photography. Since personal photography was not an official duty, neither a camera nor photographer was officially assigned to the unit. Nevertheless, the general usually ordered the lieutenant to take pictures of himself and events of the unit. A private soldier, despite his master of specialty (M.O.S.) in telecommunication, was unofficially assigned to the PR department because he had a professional SLR (Single Lens Reflex) camera; a compact camera was never acceptable to the obsessive general.

Unfortunately, the private suffered from serious arthritis on his back and a doctor strongly recommended that he be immediately hospitalized. Concerning about photographer's future after being discharged, the lieutenant asked the general to send him to a hospital for surgery. The general approved initially but changed his mind. He wanted to take the photographer to a party in his hometown for celebrating his promotion. Realizing this fact later, the lieutenant became furious at his egoistic decision to take advantage of the private soldier and his camera. He requested again, but the general always rebuffed nervously without explaining why.

The lieutenant ordered the private to leave his camera at his home, which is very close to general's hometown, on the way back to the unit after the party. The private understood what his boss meant and returned without his SLR camera. One day the general gave the lieutenant a call and ordered to prepare for photography at an annual meeting, where all major officers in subunits would attend and one major was scheduled to receive an army chief award. The lieutenant by intuition realized that the D-day was coming. He was confident that the general is not, although being cranky oftentimes, a brutal dictator

without any piece of ethics, and that "working to rule" is the right answer to such a peevish person.

The lieutenant pretended to prepare for photography by asking knowingly each officer if he had a good SLR camera; accordingly, all officers acknowledged that the lieutenant was trying his best to perform the mission that the general ordered. On the day of the meeting, the lieutenant ordered another private with his M.O.S. in PR to wear clean military clothing, combat boots, and photography armband as always does his senior private soldier, who was lying on his back in his room. Then the lieutenant had the junior private soldier stand by at the meeting room without a camera. Imagine a cameraman without a camera! All PR officers and soldiers, who knew lieutenant's generosity and integrity well, realized that a horrible storm was impending and became badly disturbed.

In the meeting room, the lieutenant was sitting at the last chair of the main table (only lieutenant colonel or higher officers except for him were seated there) and the junior private soldier was standing restlessly behind of the lieutenant. When all officers took their seats and came to attention, the general entered into the meeting room. As expected, he first checked the photographer and, right before taking his seat, realized a bit late that the "well-suited" cameraman was idly standing in a panic without a camera. The general immediately stared at the lieutenant, shivering slightly with anger. All officers were frozen with bloodthirsty silence for a minute. Yes, it appeared to be the longest "one minute" in their life.

The lieutenant calmly broke the choking silence, pushing himself out of his seat and putting his hip at the tip of his chair. Without turning to the general, he said (as opposed to talked to the general), in a straight face as if he was reading a textbook, that photography was not his official duty; accordingly, photography equipment (i.e., camera) was not assigned to the unit; nevertheless, he tried his best to complete his mission given by his boss; but, he could not find any good SLR camera; as a result, all he could do was to prepare a well-arranged photographer only. After finishing his "textbook reading," the lieutenant pushed himself deeply back to his seat quietly, keeping looking straight ahead. At last, the general burst with rage and eventually roared out,

"You bastard! You wanna die!"

All of sudden, the general drew out his gun and stood shuddering and grinding his teeth with anger and shame for a couple of minutes. No one dared move even a bit at that moment. The junior private confessed after the meeting that he shut his eyes firmly and thought, "I'm done for here!" Even after sitting down, the general could not assuage his madness and kept fixing his gaze at his stubborn

enemy, the lieutenant. A large portion of general's comment was fury preaching about obligation and sincerity toward boss, the general himself. However, the lieutenant kept his calm countenance "on purpose" all the time during the meeting. The general was completely defeated and badly disgraced openly by the lieutenant's "textbook reading," "zero-emotion," and "working to rules" tactics that reflects his nonviolence and personal ethic.

The aftermath of this gentle revolt includes (1) the private soldier was sent to a hospital for surgery and (2) the general decided to retaliate against the lieutenant and looked for a chance as the lieutenant expected. The lieutenant kept working to rules and trying to avoid any mistake in order not to give him a pretext for retaliation. The general put implicit pressure on the lieutenant by making the daily staff meeting even tougher. However, the lieutenant never yielded to the pressure and apologized to him. The general tried to punish the lieutenant just for not attending his party but ended up losing his face again. The general realized late that the military criminal law was not applied to the case and military prosecutors and judges in the area were lieutenant's friends. However, the lieutenant eagerly negotiated a back-door deal and received minor penalty of full-armed walking to save general's face and relieve staff officers' stress. Finally, the general realized that the lieutenant was honest and right and then changed his tyrannical leadership style somehow.

## 6. Nonviolence and Personal Ethic as Realistic and Practical Alternatives

The lieutenant showed how transcendence ethics with principled negotiation strategies combined are successfully applied to a bureaucratic model of conflict. First of all, he never used violence but said facts and rules only. He focused on problem instead of people and relied on objective criteria (i.e., field manuals and laws). The lieutenant tried his best to control his emotion and stay calm (zero-emotion) at the manifest conflict stage. The "textbook reading" was the climax of his 'gentle revolt.' Since the general had more power over his subordinates, the lieutenant knew that even a tiny mistake (e.g., violence and emotional release) could drive him into the corner immediately.

Second, the lieutenant had personal ethic and explored mutual interests and possible options. Before planning the revolt, he checked various aspects related to the conflict with his arbitrary boss. He realized, for instance, that the unit suffered from poor management and encountered a morale crisis; the general was not interested in good management but in his face-saving; but the general had at least minimal rationality and ethics not to shoot at his subordinates. He double-checked field manuals and military criminal laws in order for work-to-rule. His

ethical daily life strengthened his legitimacy and support from his subordinates and senior officers. Also he mobilized formal and informal resources (e.g., personal ties with military prosecutors) to develop a better BATNA.

Third, the lieutenant had social ethic and self-sacrifice, although not as salient as his nonviolence. Lieutenant's challenge was a conflict between a good individual and organizational or structural evil. He wanted to hospitalize the senior private who suffered from general's power abuse and transform general's management style for officers and enlisted soldiers. Accordingly, he was willing to negotiate with the general even though he did nothing wrong. And the lieutenant eagerly sacrificed himself somehow (i.e., full-armed walking) to bring peace back to the unit.

Also 'Lieutenant's Gentle Revolt' provides lessons to supplement Lee's transcendence ethics and implications for conflict management. First, the weak have to prepare a comprehensive reaction scenario (Lee 2008: 302-304). Desirable activists must have thorough and rigorous understanding of the reality (Lee 1986: 298). The lieutenant understood, for instance, what was going on in the unit, what he could do and could not, and what he had to say and how. Why do the weak have to be so cautious and well prepared? They cannot expect fairness and justice from a dictator who will take arbitrary actions at his convenience; hence, even a tiny mistake in planning and executing a scenario should be minimized. Accordingly, nonviolence and personal ethic are more important to the weak than social ethic and self-sacrifice in a worst circumstance.

Second, it is important to catch the right moment to take a minimal action. The spirit of social movements is not just idealism but rather 'realistic idealism' (Lee 1986: 138). The weak have to have prudent recognition of reality and wait patiently until a right condition becomes ripe for actions. As Mencius warns, the weak have to avoid excessive request and arbitrary emotional release. It is notable that the lieutenant waited for a D-Day without being agitated.

The weak also have to recognize the dynamics of a conflict and take proper actions depending upon changes in environment. The lieutenant decided to negotiate with the general because a second lieutenant under his control violated a military rule. The conflict episode stepped into a new phase due to unexpected event and the lieutenant searched for optimal solution for this new condition. Transcendence ethics are sequenced and cumulative, but this case suggests that the weak have to choose a proper strategy depending on specific conflict phase at that time.

Fourth, the weak have to stay with complete nonviolence and morality. As the strong exert severer violence, on the contrary, the weak should rely entirely upon nonviolence (Lee 1986: 289; Lee 2008: 59). The integrity of the weak strengthens their

legitimacy and moral power. Even a trivial violent act or fault could revitalize the strong in danger who would retaliate the weak back later. The strong know that they are doing wrong and absurd things, but they do not fear violence but do fear right 'word' and truth. Hence, it is extremely important for the weak to use 'word' only and tell the truth minimally. The 'word' should be rational enough so that even dictators can hardly refuse it (Lee 2008: 435-437).

Fifth, one indirect and unintended consequence of sticking with transcendence ethics (nonviolence) is that the strong are goaded into losing control and eventually destroy themselves. This *goaded effect* is not meant by Lee's nonviolence, in fact. But he appeared to take advantage of the similar effect (Lee 2008: 296-299). Nonviolence not only strengthens morality and legitimacy of the weak but also spotlights dictator's illegality, brutality, and injustice. As the legitimacy gap between the weak and strong widens, the weak are likely to obtain strong supports from their neighbors, whereas dictator's power will wane rapidly. The strong tends to be overconfident of their naked power and are less likely to expect nonviolent reaction from the weak. Such nonviolent strategies as "textbook reading" and "working to rules" make an arbitrary boss embarrassed and incite him to use more violence or commit more illegal acts. Nonviolence and personal ethic, unintentionally, irritates a dictator who suffers from illegitimacy and moral inferior complex. In 'Lieutenant's Gentle Revolt,' the general got totally lost at lieutenant's well-prepared nonviolence, failed to control his emotion, and made a series of false moves that eventually pushed him into a checkmate.<sup>12</sup>

Finally, nonviolence and person ethic are powerful weapons against the strong, but it is not easy to put them into practice even if the weak know their potential clearly. Theory is one thing and practice is the other. It is not because logics of transcendence ethics are too complicated to understand, but because implementation of transcendence ethics involves risk-taking and requires spiritual maturity of the weak. "Zero-emotion" before lethal threats is not as easy as it sounds. The weak have to endure suffering form violence without having animosity towards a brutal dictator, believing in his humanity (basic human natures). Hence, Lee keeps emphasizing ethical standards and patience of ordinary people (Lee 1986: 335-336; Lee 2001: 347-348).

## 7. Conclusion

Professor Moon-Young Lee dedicated himself to Korean democratization. However, his image of a pro-democracy fighter was misbranded and thus

<sup>12</sup> When a dictator cannot punish his rivals using existing laws, he will make a new arbitrary law by himself, and at last ignore even the law he made (Lee 1986: 340).

hindered people from recognizing him as a public administration scholar. He wanted to call himself a capitalist, (moderate) conservative, Glorious Revolutionary, realistic idealist, and minimalist. In fact, a puritan appears to best describe his daily life, belief in God, struggles against dictatorship, and study in public administration. The Four Gospels are reflected in his transcendence ethics that become his framework of public administration.

Lee's transcendence ethics appear to be best applied to conflict management in public administration. These ethics provide promising guidance and strategies to those who suffer from violence of the strong. This "nonviolent weapon" protected Lee from dictator's violence and political persecution.<sup>13</sup> In particular, his nonviolence and personal ethic are comparable to studies in conflict management. Lee's nonviolence provides unique and specific tactics for those who do not have strong power. The weak should use 'word' only, tell the right things minimally, have complete nonviolence without enmity, and rely entirely on objective standards like laws and common sense. Its underlying rationales show clearly why nonviolence is a dominant strategy or BATNA for the weak. Lieutenant's "textbook reading" and "working to rules" recapitalizes Lee's nonviolence and principled negotiation.

It is not easy for the weak to implement transcendence ethics in the real world. They need to have courage to tell the truth rightfully, patience to endure persecution, and morality to resist the temptation of violence (Lee 2001: 346-347). Nevertheless Lee's transcendence ethics are not idealistic but rather realistic and practical as shown in 'Lieutenant's Gentle Revolt.' In particular, Lee's nonviolence appears to provide significant implications for conflict management and managerial leadership.

## 8. References

- Bondurant, Joan V. 1988. *Conquest of violence: The Gandhian philosophy of conflict*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Corvette, Barbara A. Budjac. 2007. *Conflict management: A practical guide to developing negotiation strategies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Dalton, Dennis. 2012. *Mahatma Gandhi: Nonviolent power in action*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fisher, Roger, William Ury, and Bruce Patton. 2011. *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Penguin.

<sup>13</sup> "The idea of nonviolence as superior moral power is the key points that Gandhi sought..." (Dalton 2012: 40).

- Gandhi, Mohandas K. 1983. *Autobiography: The story of my experiments with truth* (Mahadev Desai, trans.). New York: Dover Publications
- March, James G., and Herbert A. Simon. 1993. *Conflict in organizations*. In *Organizations*, 132-156, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Mencius. 1970. *The works of Mencius*. Trans., James Legge. New York: Dover Publications.
- Pondy, Louis R. 1967. Organization conflict: Concepts and models. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 12(2): 296-320.
- Pondy, Louis R. 1992. Reflections on organizational conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13(3): 257-261.
- Rainey, Hal. 2014. *Understanding and managing public organizations*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Jossey-Bass.
- Thomas, Kenneth W. 1976. Conflict and conflict management. In *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, ed. M. D. Dunnette, 889-935. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Thomas, Kenneth W. 1992. Conflict and conflict management: Reflections and update. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13(3): 265-274.
- 이문영 [Lee, Moon-Young]. 1962. *행정학* [Public administration]. 서울, 대한민국: 일조각 [Ilchokak].
- 이문영 [Lee, Moon-Young]. 1980. *한국행정론* [Korean public administration]. 서울, 대한민국: 일조각 [Ilchokak].
- 이문영 [Lee, Moon-Young]. 1986. *겁많은 자의 용기* [Cowardly man's courage], 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 서울, 대한민국: 중원문화 [Joongwon Culture].
- 이문영 [Lee, Moon-Young]. 1991. *자전적 행정학* [Autobiographical public administration]. 서울, 대한민국: 실천문학사 [Silcheon Munhak].
- 이문영 [Lee, Moon-Young]. 1996. *논어맹자와 행정학* [The analects of Confucius, the works of Mencius, and public administration]. 서울, 대한민국: 나남출판 [Nanam Publishing House].
- 이문영 [Lee, Moon-Young]. 2001. *인간 종교 국가: 미국행정, 청교도 정신, 그리고 마르틴 루터의 95 개조* [Man, religion, and state: American public administration, Puritanism, and Martin Luther's 95 Theses]. 서울, 대한민국: 나남출판 [Nanam Publishing House].
- 이문영 [Lee, Moon-Young]. 2006. *협력형 통치: 원효, 율곡, 함석헌, 김구를 중심으로* [Cooperative governance: Wonhyo, Yulgok, Ham Seok-heon, and Kim Gu]. 경기도, 대한민국: 열린책들 [Open Books].
- 이문영 [Lee, Moon-Young]. 2008. *겁많은 자의 용기: 지켜야 할 최소에 관한 이야기* [Cowardly man's courage: A tail about the minimum to which ordinary men have to adhere]. 서울, 대한민국: 삼인 [Samin].
- 이문영 [Lee, Moon-Young]. 2011. *3.1 운동에서 본 행정학* [Public administration from the March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement Perspective]. 서울, 대한민국: 고려대학교 출판부 [Korea University Press].