

VISIONING A PEACEFUL WORLD

Johan Galtung

Introduction: Peace, Power and the State

I start with two basic assumptions. First, *any peaceful world order has to take into account all four types of power: military, economic, cultural and political*. One cannot build peace on only one or two of them. Any power type can be transformed, even softened--but not disregarded. Power is with us forever. Second, *states, even nation-states, will be around for a long time*. There is something stabilizing in territorial contiguity and temporal continuity, combined with a minimum of human similarity. In addition there is the simple fact that nation-states *do* provide; the state often is *l'etat-providence*.

World space may be anarchic and risky as an interstate system. But states have also been capable of providing internal security, alleviating misery, guaranteeing a minimum of freedom and equipping people with at least one source of identity: faith in that nation-state itself--all of this within its own borders, even if so far mainly for first world countries. *War* as an institution is an increasing failure; the *nation-state* is not; however related the two may be. The nation-state is simply too successful. This also applies to lower levels of territorial administration such as provinces, cantons and communes, and to states within the larger

federations. There are major reasons why they are still around, have been for centuries, even millennia, and will be so for the foreseeable future--but not forever.

Hence the argument here is in favor of modifying aggressive states and world space. The short term problem is not how to abolish states but how to weaken them, soften them, and then weave them together by interlinking them in an equitable manner so that it becomes structurally difficult for them to engage in war or warlike processes. The question is how this rather general formula can be concretized into something both viable and attainable for peace in the interstate system. Many of the points to be made also apply to peace between sub-state and non-state actors, but that will not be spelled out.

Table 1 [pp. 59-60] is designed in such a way as to accommodate, relatively comfortably, much of the thinking in this important arena. A peaceful world presupposes regulation of power so as to obtain peace. War is power abuse. The study of power coincides with the study of politics: politics is power and power is politics. But the focus here is on politics for peace, and "peace" is seen as coming in two major varieties, negative peace and positive peace. As we assume the key building blocks in a peaceful world order to be nation-states for the foreseeable future, negative peace can be obtained by softening them, restraining their power exercise, and having them reduce their aggressiveness. And positive peace can be obtained by linking them together in harmonious, cooperative relations through the cement provided by inter-governmental and inter-people organizations. With four types of power that gives us the eight cells in the matrix of Table 1. An eightfold approach.

Before proceeding from one cell to the other with concrete answers to the question "what should be done?" the following prefatory remark is important. There is no assumption about any linear order in the Table. None of the eight cells is more

Visioning a Peaceful World

important than another. There is no single point where one should start, proceeding from one to the other, until a peaceful world has been obtained. Nor is there any one cell whereby the other seven cells automatically become easier. Just to the contrary: the assumption would rather be that there is a certain, albeit crazy, consistency in the world today and that any progress would have to be on all eight cells at the same time. Any focus on only one of them in all likelihood proves elusive because of the inner logic of the present world order. Hence, many incremental changes on all eight points/cells in the right direction are better than a single-minded push on one of them--an oriental, wholistic approach rather than an occidental unidimensional display of efficiency that may quickly turn out to be counter-productive.

The Occident is more concerned with efficient use of means than with efficacy. The military budget is tested for cost-effectiveness, not whether security is really obtained. Occidental peace movements, focussing on disarmament only, for instance, often share that mentality. Single factor and single issue movements and politics are as incompatible with the politics of peace as with the politics of health.

The Military Power Dimension

The abolition of war as an institution is put at the bottom of the top left-hand cell. I am not going to say more about it except this: what is in the rest of the table is supposed to provide the context within which wars, not states, might simply wither away. Random wars will remain, just as random slavery still exists. Like most random phenomena they will turn out to have some kind of structure upon closer examination. But that is not the same as institutionalizing and legitimizing, even internalizing such evils.

Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving

In a peaceful world deterrence would be based on the capacity to defend oneself, not on an offensive capacity to retaliate, indistinguishable--for all practical purposes--from the capacity to launch an attack. The consequences of the latter are very clear: offensive capability targeted on the adversary will tend to stimulate offensive capabilities in the adversary, in other words an offensive arms race; and an arms race will tend, sooner or later, to lead to war. It may be objected that if neither party wants war the possession of that offensive capability is only a necessary, but not sufficient condition for a war. But the problem is not only the aggressive war but also the pre-emptive war launched to prevent the other side from launching aggressive war, and the displaced war in less dangerous theaters.

When defensive defense is discussed a key problem, and a very important one, is the borderline, very far from sharp, between offensive and defensive weapons systems. Moreover, systems designed as defensive may, often through minor changes, be converted into highly offensive systems. The angle of anti-aircraft guns mounted on ships can be lowered considerably and the guns can be used to strafe the coasts of rebellious islands. This is true. There is a gray zone between the clearly defensive and the clearly offensive, not a sharp line.

More productive in the debate about defensive defense and transarmament in general is a positive image of the content of defensive defense. There are three types: short range conventional military defense, paramilitary defense, and nonmilitary defense. Typically they will all operate in relatively egalitarian ways, based on much solidarity among the participants. They would operate within the national territory, not outside, except for an interdiction capability which should be minimum in order not to provoke the adversary. And yet something might be needed to prevent an adversary from long distance destruction of the country. Another key problem defensive defense poses for the aggressive state is that it cannot

Visioning a Peaceful World

be used to protect economic and political interests abroad. The answer is simple: if those interests have to be "protected" militarily there must be something wrong with them. National interest located abroad is an anachronism, a good example of residual imperialism.

In this connection some words about nonviolence in general, and nonmilitary defense in particular. How does nonviolence fit into the four power dimensions? The answer is simple: nonviolence has to be based on strength. But the strength would not derive from having means of destruction of equal or greater magnitude than the adversary, since not only the use of force but also the threat of use of force is ruled out in nonviolent struggles. Deterrence based on mutual retaliation may occasionally work; but a state of perennial fear is not peace, not even negative peace. Strength would be based on invulnerability rather than destructive capability; from being strong, rather than having destructive strength. How?

One concrete formula to counter military power is a high level of fearlessness. Force moves people only when mediated by fear. And correspondingly for economic power: exchange only moves people when mediated by interest, or, even more strongly, if people are dependent on the goods and services offered in exchange for their labor and money, goods and services. Disinterest, or a minimum of self-sufficiency, is the obvious answer to that problem. And similarly for cultural power: only the submissive person is moved by values not in his own interest; the obvious answer being identity, dignity. Finally, political power: the nonviolent person will refuse to participate in illegitimate power configurations, used for the wrong purpose. That person will empty such institutions, making noncooperation in politics a part of noncooperation in general. The answer lies in autonomy, in doing one's own politics. Strengthened by faith in one's own values, disinterested in what the adversary has to offer because of one's own level of economic self-sufficiency at least

Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving

where basic needs are concerned, and armed with fearlessness, the nonviolent person becomes not only invulnerable but also invincible.

Basic to the whole notion of transarmament is gradual unilateralism. Steps toward transarmament can be taken by one country alone. Classical balance of power applies less since defensive arms are not pitted against each other. Late-comers to this change in military doctrine may find themselves like the last countries practicing slavery: as international outlaws

There are dangers, but also rewards for the first to enter this new stage in military history. One of them is considerably decreased military expenditure; another is considerable decrease in the risk of total destruction in case of a mutual nuclear/laser holocaust. One major obstacle to transarmament will be the constraints put upon a member of a military alliance wanting to transarm. There will be sanctions not only exercised by the superpower, but also by other members seeing their position threatened if somebody obtains higher security through a new military posture.

What would be the positive peace counterpart of transarmament processes? If transarmament is something a nation can do itself in order to institutionalize military nonaggression, thereby engaging in an exercise of softening itself, what would be the cooperative counterpart, since we also want to interlink nation-states? One answer will obviously be world peacekeeping. In spite of its enormous shortcomings, humankind as a whole has gained significant experience with this institution under the auspices of the United Nations. The destructive capabilities of such operations should never exceed what one would expect a transarmed nation-state to have; in other words, they should not possess offensive capabilities, but typically operate on the basis of hand weapons.

Visioning a Peaceful World

However, these weapons should not only be for self-defense in an individual sense. One of the more useful concepts for world peacekeeping forces would be as a buffer zone, as territory located between two contending parties, on the land of both of them, who would then agree on a contiguous zone populated by a dense grid, even a human wall, of world peacekeeping forces. Added to this comes the nonaligned countries already interposed between NATO and WTO countries (concretely this means Finland and Sweden, Austria and Switzerland, Yugoslavia and Albania). They would guarantee not to grant free transit of war material, and could back up that guarantee with the stationing of inspectors from world peacekeeping forces from other nations on their territory.

However, even conventional war is not necessarily a land war. Buffer zones are easily negated by aircraft, in some cases by naval forces. Consequently there should also be deep stationing of world peacekeeping forces. Any potential aggressor should know that an offensive will not only have to contend with land based buffer zones, but also with land based hostages, from all kinds of nations, possibly even from his own. The target would not be so clean and clear, pure and well-sorted as one would expect in the nation-state, but multinational, ambiguous, problematic. Whether stationed as buffers or hostages, world peacekeeping forces could at the same time do useful jobs beyond simply being there, as a part of a world service for a better environment, and for social development.

Another important positive peace task, also a counterpart to the negative peace agenda item of developing defensive, nonprovocative defense, is world cooperation in transarmament. If a country has developed deep and extensive experience making the country indigestible to an adversary the security will not decrease if the country shares doctrine, strategy, even some of its tactics with others.

Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving

Transarmed nations already exist, based on defensive defense and non-alignment. International peace-keeping forces already exist. There is considerable political will and experience in the field; and yet no strong world government. Some permanent members of the United Nations Security Council may have a dim view of either initiative, clearly directed against them by proclaiming non-aligned countries as healthy, far from suffering from some strange disease known as "neutralism." World peacekeeping forces might be resented by the superpowers because they would draw on a higher level of moral legitimacy than the superpowers are able to mobilize themselves. Superpowers see themselves as peacekeepers, in need of nobody to watch them.

In fact world peacekeeping forces would even serve as a link between superpowers and that strange, non-tangible but nevertheless real reality to which Kant and others have referred--the moral law inside us and the cosmos above us. In a generation or two (or three) "national military service" may even be as strange and illegitimate as "municipal military service" today. World Service would be the answer. And even today young persons all over the world demand a choice between different forms of service. This demand is resisted by authorities who know very well that to many national military service would be the last choice.

Is a World Transarmament Association a step also on the road to disarmament and war abolition? Theoretically, yes. A world of Switzerlands, Yugoslavias and Finlands would make war considerably less likely. In a world of that type purely defensive armies might also be reduced. But the first priority should always be given to the reduction of offensive capability, such as long range nuclear missiles and tanks, since that is where a basic source of fear and arms races is located. They provoke. To discuss disarmament as if withdrawal of nuclear landmines (defensive, but counterproductive by being too destructive) and

long range nuclear missiles should count the same is intellectually flawed. But one may also proceed with both offensive and defensive reduction at the same time. And some countries might even follow Costa Rica's bold example and abolish the military as a social institution all together.

The Economic Power Dimension

Much of the same reasoning holds for what will now be developed in connection with economic power. Does it not stand to reason that economic activity has to respect the sometimes sturdy, sometimes very fragile tissues of nature space, human space, social space and world space? That there is something basically wrong with economic activity if it produces ecological imbalance; dissatisfaction of human needs rather than the opposite for substantial portions of humankind; less rather than more real democracy and development in general in the social spaces around the world; and war rather than peace in world space? The task of economic activity, like other activity, must be to maintain and enhance ecological balance; protect and build human beings by satisfying reasonable needs; and to do all of this in ways reasonably compatible with the values of democracy, development and peace in the social and world spaces.

Of course, what is said in the preceding paragraph is rather moralistic. What is called for are concrete proposals for economic nonaggression and for building a world economy. But such proposals for economic activity within as well as between nations have to be consistent with two guidelines: production and distribution. Primacy should be given to basic human needs and to ecological balance, while also enhancing social development and world peace. But this is not the point of departure chosen in economics. Therefore, economics as a science will have to be rewritten if it wants to play a role in a peaceful world of nonaggression and cooperation. In such a

Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving

world what today passes as economics would be seen as strange emanations of a civilization with peaks of brilliance intimately related to pangs of suffering--all of it wrapped together in an apparently seamless web referred to as "modern/scientific economics"--and with the peaks in the center and the pangs in the periphery of the system. The economic system we know best produces both growth and inequality, both needs-satisfaction and needs-deprivation, both harmony and disharmony--all dependent on where you are!

Self-reliance may be one approach here. This is not the place to spell out details. Suffice it only to say that self-reliance divides into two parts, domestic and international, based on two axioms (for self-reliance I and self-reliance II respectively):

First, try to produce whatever is needed from national or even local production factors (nature, labor, capital, research and administration).

Second, when national or local production possibilities have been exhausted proceed on the basis of exchange, (trade), but on an equitable, mutually beneficial basis. There is nothing in this that presupposes a socialist economy. The two axioms can be used as guidelines for both socialist, capitalist and many other economies.

The rationale behind such principles for organizing economic activity is the effort to deal seriously with what economists cavalierly refer to as "externalities"; costs and benefits not accounted for in their ways of reckoning. That would include the costs in nature space due to ecological degradation, but also possible benefits in nature space from more positive ecological activity; the costs in human space of somatic, mental, and spiritual degradation, and also the benefits stemming from challenging tasks, new experiences, rich social networks, a feeling of being valuable and valued; the costs in social space

Visioning a Peaceful World

due to concentration of power clustered around economic decision making, and also the benefits in social space due to dense social networks spun around economic cycles, increased mobility and flexibility; costs in world space due to structural conflict engendered by economic aggression, creating penetration and dependency, and benefits in world space based on cooperation based on equitable, symbiotic economic relations.

By exploitation is meant highly unequal distribution of externalities and "internalities"; the latter being the economic values that are taken into account in the theory and practice of economics, reflected in bookkeeping. By producing for one's own consumption locally or nationally, externalities--positive as well as negative--are internalized. They stay at home, providing an incentive for economic activity that increases positive and reduces negative externalities. And when it comes to trade the rule would be this: organize the exchange in such a way that positive externalities still outweigh the negative, then share both positive and negative externalities equally. This perspective is missing from economic theory and traditional "integration" theory based on transactions of any type, equitable or not, and political institution-building.

The Cultural Power Dimension

From economic power let us move on to cultural power and ask the basic question: what do we mean by cultural non-aggression? I think there are three answers, all of them important in this connection. But first a prefatory remark: the cultural power dimension is probably more intractable than military and economic power in that it is less discussed and more deeply internalized.

First, any culture, including the macro-cultures referred to as civilizations, should be on world display, visible and available

for dialogue. There should be cultural communication, but not cultural aggression, which in the first line I would define as cultural communication backed up with military and/or economic power.

Second, there are cultures that are inherently aggressive regardless of how they are communicated. The moment a culture in general, and a religion in particular, conceives of itself not only as *universal*, valid all over world space, but also as *singularist*, meaning the only valid religion or culture in the world, there is a problem. A claim to universality combined with tolerance and with pluralism is innocuous. It is simply an admonition for everybody around the world also to take that culture into account. The same applies to singularism combined with particularism, meaning that this is the only truth for us. It is everybody's freedom to entertain such cultural fantasies. They may even stimulate cultural growth and dialogue. The problem comes when the truth is proclaimed for the *whole* world.

Third, the inherent aggressiveness in a culture provided by the religious fantasy of being a Chosen People. To be chosen by Divine Forces gives these peoples not only rights but also duties since they are His children.

I have already referred to such strongly held beliefs as fantasies. That is merely begging the question of how such people(s) can open their eyes, contemplate the vast stretches and varieties in space and time, not only at present but also in the past and in the future, and let some realism and modesty enter their fantasies. In short, is there some cure for such fantasies, some ways of exorcising these inherently aggressive aspects from cultures? At the individual level such fantasies are referred to as megalomania--in the Nazi German and South African cases as white supremacy. Given outside reactions, paranoia easily follows. A cure--short confrontation does not easily come to mind.

Visioning a Peaceful World

The net conclusion is dialogue, tolerance and mutual respect--in short, cultural relativism. But this is no invitation to unlimited, absolute cultural relativism. It is not true that all cultures (or macro-cultures, civilizations) are equally good or equally bad. And this makes us see more clearly how important culture is as the big legitimizer of military and/or economic aggression, seemingly above narrow human and national passions and interests. Such cultural elements are simple basic threats to world peace, a reason why the expression "relative cultural relativism" might be more acceptable. We simply cannot afford to lose sight of the cultural roots of aggression, using culture to legitimize military and economic aggression, however much it may hurt the true believers. The problem is obvious. We may change military hardware and doctrine. We may even change economic doctrine, even with some short-term losses. But to change culture is to change ourselves.

What is the positive peace counterpart of engaging in self-criticism in an attempt to uproot culturally aggressive elements of the types mentioned? In general terms this will hit Occident more than Orient, but in the Orient it will certainly hit Japan. It has to be done. But these are only negative pursuits. What is the corresponding positive pursuit, beyond helping each other in a searching, critical dialogue where no culture/religion is seen as entirely sacrosanct--beyond asking, in a spirit of sincerity, what is it in my culture (economic practice, military posture) that offends you most--and expecting the same question in return. In one capsule formula it is to *build world consciousness*, even a world culture, a world civilization, not instead of local, national and regional consciousness, but in addition to them, in the same way as a world economy does not presuppose doing away with local and national economies. Just to the contrary: self-reliance II is based on (local and national) self-reliance I.

As a first and simple step in that direction that could very easily be done and is already to a large extent being done: *create*

images of the world as a whole! Train people in global thinking, in thinking and talking of the world system as a total system seen from many angles. Concretely this means in social science what the geophysicists and others have been so capable of doing to the physical world: seeing the whole earth ball as one system, using concepts such as Man and the Biosphere (MAB), totally disregarding national borders, as in the International Geophysical Year (IGY). But then natural sciences draw other borders, between physics and chemistry and chemistry and the life sciences.

One very important special case is the presentation of world statistics, about the whole world and humankind as a whole. With national statistics the problem is often that the data are not sufficiently disaggregated, meaning that they do not tell us enough about the differences in living conditions (such as life expectancy, infant mortality, etc.) for different groups in society, rural versus urban, high class, middle class, low class and so on. But when it comes to world statistics there is room for the opposite complaint. There is a consistent disaggregation of the statistics into 166 or so member states of the United Nations [1991]. It is as if the point is precisely to draw attention to differences between the states, reinforcing the idea so dear to the adherents of statism as an ideology that the state is the unit of development, and development is the process whereby less developed countries (LDC) catch up with more developed countries (MDC), which may or may not catch up with the place from which much of this process is monitored and coordinated: Washington, D.C. Actually, "catching up" has to be modified as an expression. It means catching up with the position where the MDCs were located when the catching up process started. When/if the LDCs arrive the MDCs might have moved further away.

Given the significance of the state as a social organization nobody will dispute that disaggregation of world statistics in the

Visioning a Peaceful World

direction of countries is meaningful and should continue. But it is also highly meaningful to aggregate these statistics, focusing on world numbers of very rich and very poor people, very educated and very uneducated people, on how many people live in what kind of habitat (cities, towns, slums, villages and so on) and how many people are in the various professions. Statistics of this type make people think in a different way. So do statistics about raw materials, including energy raw materials, as inputs in human production processes--compared to statistics about the goods and services actually produced--so that we get a better image of how wisely or unwisely we dispose of world resources.

A small step, indeed. But under this heading of world consciousness there are colossal tasks to be undertaken. Underlying such an exercise are efforts, all over the world, to develop *positive views of humanity*, of ourselves.

A world consciousness probably has to have some underpinning in the form of a *general world cosmology*, meaning a minimum of assumptions about the world in general and humankind in particular, sufficiently shared by a sufficient portion of humankind. Using a general scheme for the analysis of the cosmologies found in the civilizations dividing humankind, I would point to six particularly important factors. Others, with other analytical schemes will come up with other lists. The basic points are the words *minimum* and *sufficient*. We do not want a world ideology with no tolerance of deviance.

First, there has to be a reasonably shared view of *world space* as multicentric, in fact with very many centers, scattered all over the world, each one of them a center in its own right, of concern rather than control. Unicentric images of the world, seeing the world as controllable and controlled from one or perhaps two command posts only, should be intensely criticized, torn apart. A polycentric view with very many centers is preferable.

Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving

Second, there has to be a reasonably shared view of *social time*. There has to be some element of an idea of progress, for instance in the direction of peace. But it should also be taken for granted that social time undulates through history, that there are ups and downs. And more particularly, there is validity to the ancient wisdom that what goes up has a tendency to come down and what goes down has a tendency to come up--with transformation occurring in the process. Thus, Oriental time conceptions as found in Buddhism and Taoism can better serve the world as a whole than Occidental time with ultimate progress at the expense of ultimate crisis at the end of time, where existence dissolves into two forking paths, apocalypse on the one hand (hell) and catharsis on the other (heaven).

Third, there has to be a reasonably shared image of the diversity of ways in which *knowledge* can be constructed. The epistemological atomism of the Occident has to be tempered with the epistemological wholism more often found in the Orient. The approach of weaving partial knowledges together in deductive theories has to be tempered by more dialectical approaches focusing on internal contradictions in everything, whether human-made or not. This is particularly important if we want to obtain a reasonable view of the world as a whole.

An optimistic position would be that we are confronted here with some kind of inevitability. The expanding world in which we live will force upon us other ways of coming to grips with that world. The only danger would be that we too easily jump from Occidental to Oriental thought, assuming that the former is completely wrong because it failed to encompass approaches developed by the latter, which then has to be totally correct. The Occident has produced enormous amounts of useful knowledge, to be tempered with Oriental and other wisdom.

Fourth, there has to be a reasonably shared image of the *person-nature* relationship as a partnership relation. There is

Visioning a Peaceful World

some world consciousness of this at this point. We know today that there is a limit to how much we can destroy of the biosphere with its animals and plants, of the lithosphere, the hydrosphere and atmosphere. We have to preserve and conserve. We also have to live from organic matter, which again links us to animals and plants, raising the question of whether we can do this without killing--more like shearing sheep, picking fruits.

Fifth, there has to be a reasonably shared image of *person-person* relations. Humankind, environment, development, peace, future and all such big things have to be seen as indivisible since in fact they are. Everybody is not only born free, but is also entitled to live and die at least without flagrant inequality.

Sixth, there has to be a reasonably shared view of *person-transpersonal* relations. There probably has to be a minimum *metaphysics* for a world consciousness to emerge. This cannot be based on any existing faith since that would make the ancient carriers of that faith inevitably the center of a world which would then become uncentric. The "oceanic feeling" of sometimes being linked, even relinked (*re-ligio*) seems to be universal. That is already a basis. Its universal recognition constitutes or reconstitutes a transpersonal reality, from one end of the world to the other. Call it God, call it *that*. The god would not have a face. The *that* would not have a name. In a coming world consciousness Islam would have certain advantages over Christianity; and Taoism over, for instance, Shinto. The more dogmatic and aggressive the religion, the less relevant. The softer aspects unite since all are chosen, the harder aspects divide since some peoples are chosen more than others. Softer aspects of world religions in general, and softer religions such as Buddhism, Quakerism, and the Baha'i faith are some of the elements by which to build, uniting rather than dividing.

Inevitably, people of different faiths to some extent feel threatened by each other, particularly if they are suffering from

the complex of universalism/singularism. But it is also inevitable that they would compare notes, so to speak, and search less for that which divides than for some common denominator, that which they have in common. The ecumenical exercise is built on this approach. Such an approach probes the borderlines among Protestant sects; between Protestantism and Catholicism; between either of these and the orthodox churches; between Christianity in any form and Judaism; between either of these and Islam; between Occidental thought and Hinduism/Buddhism; between either of these and the systems of faith entertained further to the East. And even this list does not come close to exhausting the possibilities. There are fascinating tasks ahead. And the most fascinating point is that it is already going on: there are comparisons and conferences all over the place. We have also relatively recently seen the Baha'i faith, which views all religions as manifestations of the same god, presented by the founders of that particular religion, with an endless series of manifestations still to come. Obviously the emergence of a religion of that type meets with the intense resistance of universalist/singularist religions, as evidenced by the extreme persecution of the Baha'is by the current Shiite regime in Iran. But equally obviously, a religion of that type is also a product of the changing structure of a shrinking world. World cultures have to emerge, but not as imperial impositions from the strong.

The Political Power Dimension

Let us then try to approach the problem of political power, the power to decide over the use of other forms of power. Political power is the command platform for the exercise of power, hence this is where general participation of any possible object of power or subject of power becomes crucial. The general formula for that participation is democracy. The historical problem is who constitutes the *demos*, the people.

Visioning a Peaceful World

Negative peace in connection with political power has been translated in the Table under the heading "internalize national interests." What is meant is simply this: contract, if necessary, and show some defensive quills towards the outside, but do not try a global reach with military, economic and cultural tentacles! Whenever possible give satisfaction to the national interests at home, internalize them; do not see other countries and other peoples as means of satisfying one's own interests. The primary task is to internalize national interests through policies of military, economic and cultural nonaggression and self-reliance.

The general democratic agenda should be broadened, and not only in the sense of admitting new layers of people to the *demos*. Next in line are, of course, adolescents and children, not to mention foreigners, and nature, hoping that *homo sapiens* will find ways of representing adequately the non-human inhabitants of the world. But there is also a shortcoming in the way democracy is practiced--aggregation is too heavy. The highest level of aggregation is found in the national vote, for *parties* or *presidential* candidates, depending on whether it is a parliamentary system or a presidential democracy. In either case local differences may not come sufficiently into focus, and too many issues are bundled together in an election "platform." Thus, the peace movement--highly relevant in a process of disaggregation--has managed in Europe to make people take stands on peace issues very different from the policies pursued by their governments. But the peace movement has generally not succeeded in making peace issues number one, in the sense of making party preferences on peace and war issues primary rather than economic or other issues.

Important as these problems are, the positive peace counterpart of what has just been mentioned must also be delineated. Somehow national interests have to add up to world interest; foreign policies to world domestic policy. What is called for would be *world institutions for world interests*, to

Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving

complement national institutions for (internalized) national interests. The question is whether democracy can be broader so as to include the entire world constituency, humankind. Of course it can. There is nothing particularly arcane in some additional chambers in the United Nations. So far what we have is a House of Lords (the Security Council) and a House of Commons (the General Assembly, GA, which also could mean Governmental Assembly), divided into one-vote constituencies, the famous Members that are States. In short, there is a clear overlay of British Parliamentarianism in the conceptualization of the United Nations.

So, let us imagine three changes. The House of Lords/Security Council withers away. A new, democratic, People's Assembly is added to the old, reflecting better the population. (Thus, the number of votes could equal the number of millions or the square root of the number of millions in the population); the votes are given to representatives who may then represent territorial and/or national subdivisions inside a country and no longer vote in unison. And a chamber for People's Organizations (dubbed "non-government organizations" by the governments) is also added, with similar voting formulas. Consistent steps away from statism would include giving more power to people in general and to subnational and transnational groupings in particular. If there should be an Upper House maybe it would be wiser to reserve it for the intergovernmental organizations, in consultative capacity, since many of them have been good at developing supranational perspectives. All of this would still leave out the transnational corporations, and I see no reason why they could not also be added in some kind of consultative capacity, in an additional Chamber.

The representatives in the new People's Assembly could also be chosen directly in world elections. The experiment currently going on in the European Community with twelve countries having simultaneous elections (1979, 1984, 1989) is

Visioning a Peaceful World

extremely important. The number of people involved, number of states involved and number of years of experience is of course much below a much larger democratic experiment often overlooked in the arrogant west: India. And India is also more typical of humankind as a whole than the overdeveloped, super-rich western European peninsula on the Eurasian landmass. And yet elections somehow work in that subcontinent, even with a higher level of participation than in the United States.

If that is possible, *world referenda* should also be possible, on such key divisive issues as military bases on foreign lands. How many people in the world favor that land use? But popular participation in any political process is generally divisive unless the process is permitted to go on until consensus has been obtained. And the division will probably be along lines not only decided by the geographical borders separating states.

At this point we could now make an almost endless list of *world institutions*. Many of them exist in embryonic forms in the intragovernmental organizations, and more particularly in the United Nations family. Inevitably this reduces the latitude, including that for aggression, of some countries. We have already seen one superpower, and one fallen empire withdrawing from a major member organization of the United Nations family—the UNESCO, and more of that is probably to be expected. Not all nations are equally ready for equal participation in a world institution; if that were the case the world would not have been so torn by strife and conflict as in fact it is. But instead of pursuing this argument and listing possible world institutions let me rather make a general point.

Visions of a future peaceful world as a global arena with a relatively high level of security, would have to exhibit some similarities to some of the existing countries in the world. Needless to say it would have to be more similar to confederations of states rather than to federations and unitary

constructions; otherwise a strong world government with all its dangers is there. The world has more to learn from cooperating state systems and (con)federations with a highly heterogeneous population in terms of nation (religion, languages, myths), possibly also race, than from unitary states based on homogeneity. And the world would have much more to learn from federal countries that are not based on general homology, meaning usually that the central authority of the federation has imposed on all parts the same structure. The Chinese experiments with *i guo, liang zi* (one country, two systems) may be interesting in that connection, as would cooperation between East and West Germany, North and South Korea, Hungary and Austria.

But there are other things to do in the meantime. Particularly attractive would be a *World Service* of young people from everywhere. For instance, perhaps millions of young people could be peacekeepers working for a *better environment and social development*. For a long time already it has been pointed out how much we need the "moral equivalent of war," a drafting of people similar to conscription for military service, but in the service of peace rather than war. This should not be confused with the peace corps that came into existence in the 1960s although through that many important experiences have been gained. The peace corps addresses itself to problems of the environment and development. But it is still, at least as conceived by the elites in countries that have established peace corps for their youth, designed to promote national interests rather than, or as well as, world interests. A world service, or *world peace corps* for that matter, would not be a propaganda institution to enhance the image of some countries, a purpose that might easily backfire. Like the mail service, it would function as something connecting the world rather than pitting one part against the other in what might look like cooperation, but right under the surface is an expression of narrow interests, processing the needs of others into political capital.

Visioning a Peaceful World

Basically *world service* would be voluntary and not restricted to young people. Countries with conscription, and aspiring to good world citizenship would give their youth a chance to choose between national and world service, and between military and nonmilitary service. Absolute pacifists would also object to armed world peacekeeping forces and should find their place, for instance, in nonmilitary peace brigades. Gradually national military service would fade into the oblivion it so richly deserves, retaining only a minor defensive component. To have offensive capability would simply be considered indecent, like slavery.

Table 1. VISIONING A PEACEFUL WORLD: How to weave states together, softening and interlinking them.

Military Power

Negative Peace	Positive Peace
<u>Military non-aggression</u> non-flow, non-intervention non-stock, of offensive arms	<u>World peacekeeping forces</u> nonviolent intervention stationing as buffers in crisis areas; stationing as hostages
defensive non-provocative defense transarmament	cooperation in defensive defense World Transarmament Association
disarmament	World Disarmament Association
abolition of war as an institution	World War Abolition Association

Economic Power

Negative Peace

Economic non-aggression
nature, human, social, world
production for basic needs
distribution to most needy
SELF-RELIANCE I
nationally
locally, use local factors
internalizing externalities

Positive Peace

World economy
nature, human, social, world
production for basic needs
distribution to most needy
SELF-RELIANCE II
equitable exchange
symbiosis, mutual benefit
sharing externalities equally

Cultural Power

Negative Peace

Cultural non-aggression
dialogues of civilizations
not backed by military and
economic power

criticize, internally, externally
universalism + singularism
Chosen People ideas
absolute cultural relativism

Positive Peace

World consciousness
world statistics, world images
conceptualization and foreign
policy as world domestic
politics
positive views of humanity:
multicentric space
relaxed, oscillating time
more wholistic, dialectic
nature partnership
equality, justice--inclusive
minimum metaphysics

Political Power

Negative Peace

Internalize national interests

broaden democracy
national and local elections/
party/ candidate and issue
votes
nuclear free municipalities
nuclear free professions, with
Hippocratic peace oaths
decentralize foreign policy:
to local government
to people's diplomacy

Positive Peace

World institutions for world interests

broaden democracy
chamber of governmental
organizations
chamber of people's
organizations
world elections
world referenda
world service
environment
development

An Eightfold Path

Everywhere throughout history humankind has engaged in social and world experiments on behalf of humanity--some successful, and some not. We are all doing this every day, and deep inside us the Kantian question should always be lurking: is my behavior generalizable? What would happen if everybody in my position did what I am now going to do? There are obvious shortcomings to this approach. The principle is often invoked by the establishment when they try to stop "deviant behavior": "we cannot permit this; what would happen if everybody should engage in this kind of behavior?" Moreover, the principle presupposes that different types of acts can be morally acceptable or not depending on the actor's position/situation; a principle that might be used to keep the set of positions, in other words the social and world structure, constant. There is even a

linkage between these two objections: "deviant behavior" may be precisely what is needed in order to change the social structure. "My behavior as a human being/country in general may not be generalizable, but my behavior as a moderate slave-owner/moderate imperial power is acceptable." To whom?

Nevertheless, there is something to the principle, depending on how one defines "position." And that immediately raises the question: position in what? In my family? My local community? My country? My region? Or, as in this exploration, in the world as a whole? That points forward. Many people and countries might claim that their behavior is generalizable. But others would immediately object that their action is too clearly marked, even marred by their age group or sex group, their nation or class, their citizenship or membership; by the position of the country in the world class structure. Somehow there is a need to arrive at a clearer conceptualization of what the "human position" or "world citizen" means, simply to be a human being, a member of the human race, or a country, in terms of rights and duties. The position taken here on that question is spelled out for countries in Table 1: implicitly defining world citizenship.

My conclusion is that the key to our search for a peaceful world lies in the celebration of diversity, both in the sense of heterogeneity and heterology, and of symbiosis in the relationships between those diverse parts, provided the symbiosis is reasonably equitable. Maybe our visions are impeded by our fear of diversity and by our inability to see how these very different parts can pull together. Further hindering our imagination is our dislike, sometimes intense, of different parts, simply because they are different from ourselves. A strong world *government* would tend to reduce diversity. But world *coordination* could even enhance diversity and open for much more symbiosis, in an equitable manner. And economic, cultural and political cooperation among strong, self-reliant partners might ultimately make war look totally redundant--as it looks

Visioning a Peaceful World

among the European Community countries today, the ASEAN countries, the Nordic countries--all together well above six hundred million of us.

So we are on the way. Or, rather, we are on an eightfold path, working on all eight problems--hopefully not falling into the trap of believing that solving one of them will make the others automatically follow suit. And we have the double agenda of building both more *independent actors*, in other words, *autonomy*, and more truly *interdependent actors*, meaning equity.

To many that is too contradictory: how can capacity for independence and capacity for interdependence be peace productive at the same time? The answer is simple. It takes defensive strength to live in a polycentric and highly complex world, without easy recourse to superpower "extended deterrence" and/or offensive weapons of one's own. It takes economic strength to live in a highly interdependent world without becoming dependent or making others dependent on oneself. It takes cultural strength not to depend on others for a cultural support system. And it takes political strength to participate, equally and equitably, with others that also occasionally are strong without becoming their clients and pawns, clones and clowns. The weak can be enrolled as "allies," "trade partners," "believers" and "members," concealing the aggression taking place, until the resentment building up explodes all over. The strong not.

Abolition of war is similar to what the people fighting slavery and colonialism, abject exploitation and patriarchy were and are up against. They won, or are winning. We live in their utopia, which then proved to be a realistic utopia. So is ours: a concrete utopia for peace.