INTER culture

exploring the frontiers of cross-cultural understanding

PEACE and Cultural Disarmament

FALL/OCTOBER '85

89

published by the monchanin cross-cultural center

english edition

CONTENTS

PEACE AND CULTURAL DISARMAMENT

No culture, tradition or community, no matter how evolved, traditional or intercultural it may claim to be, can, by itself, establish the nature of criteria of human growth for the whole of mankind.

1986, «INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF PEACE»

FORTY YEARS AFTER THE END OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR AND AFTER ITS OWN FOUNDATION, THE UNITED NATIONS HAVE PROCLAIMED THE YEAR 1986 «INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF PEACE».

WHAT KIND OF PEACE THEY ARE PROPOSING? THE NATIONS WHO HAVE A SEAT AT THE UNITED NATIONS IN NEW YORK ARE PROPOSING IT TO THE WORLD AS A SYMBOL OF TOGETHERNESS AND UNITY.

BUT MORE DEEPLY AND UNDERLYING THIS NETWORK OF ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL INTERESTS, THERE ARE THE PEOPLES AND THE CULTURES THAT THE ARTIFICIAL BOUNDARIES IMPOSED BY WARS AND SO-CALLED PEACE TREATIES HAVE NOT SUCCEEDED IN FRAGMENTING. THESE PEOPLES AND CULTURES HAVE THEIR OWN WAY OF SEEING AND LIVING THEIR NON-VIOLENT AND HARMONIOUS RELATIONSHIP TO BEINGS AND HUMANS.

AS LONG AS A CULTURE INTENDS TO IMPOSE ITS WAYS ON OTHERS, AND UNTIL IT TAPES THE ROAD OF CULTURAL DISARMAMENT, IS IT POSSIBLE FOR PEACE TO EMERGE? OR WHAT SORT OF PEACE SHALL WE GET?

IN THIS ISSUE, RAIMUNDO PANIKKAR AND ROBERT VACHON REFLECT ON CULTURAL DISARMAMENT. AS FOR GREGORY SCHAAF, HE PRESENTS AN HISTORICAL REMINDER OF THE PEACE TREATY OF 1776 BETWEEN WHAT HE CALLS THE FIRST UNITED NATIONS OF THE NORTH-AMERICAN CONTINENT.

THE EDITOR

The American Indian Peace Movement: Past and Present

by Gregory SCHAAF, Ph.D.[1]

One of the most important contributions to the world American Indians wish to offer is their long tradition of peace. Although most books, articles and Hollywood movies have focused only on American Indian warrior societies, an ancient peacemaking tradition existed since the dawn of history and is still being practiced today. The present work for peace involves current issues, including human rights, land rights, treaty rights and the future of seven generations to come. One of the strongest bodies of evidence for the existence of a peace movement among Indian societies during the American Revolution is preserved in the *Morgan Papers*, a collection of mostly unpublished documents focused around the first American Indian Peace Treaty in 1776 (1). This article will search back to the origins of peace, span the historic highlights of efforts to preserve peace and report on recent achievements

by Indian leaders who promote peace. At a time when Mother Earth is threatened by man's capacity for global destruction, perhaps we could all benefit by pausing for a moment to focus on the timeless message of the "American Indian Peace Movement".

In the beginning, according to many Indian creation stories, the cosmos was at peace. Some say the Great Creator began with a song or divine breath to form this land and life. Most agree that everything was created for a purpose. The cycles of the animals, plants, and insects, the changing of the seasons, the ebb and flow of the tides - all were created to exist in harmony with human beings in accordance with the laws of nature. Life was not created for man to destroy life through greed, violence, or war. As time passed, a dark period began

when many forgot the original purpose of life. After a series of disasters, people began to desire a return to peace as a way of life. Peace means more than life without war. Principles of peace were woven into a way of life intended to honor the laws of nature by practicing a spiritual philosophy which teaches respect for all life. These principles of peace are often referred to by traditional elders as the "Original Divine Instructions".

My search for the ancient roots of peace have led me from distant archives to the circles of wise elders who are still holding onto the Original Divine Instructions received by their ancestors from the Great Spirit of the Great Peacemaker. Among the Haudenausaunee (Iroquois Six Nations Confederacy), these instructions are called Kaianerekowa or "Great Law of Peace". By comparing this standard with the principles of Native People from coast to coast, as well as among the oldest writings of societies on earth, a global perspective is emerging

as a foundation for the world peace and environmental movements (2).

Although these universal teachings may seem foreign at first to non-Indians, Hopi Grandfather David Monongye explained that we are all related (3). If everyone could trace their ancestry back far enough, our distant ancestors were organized as tribal people. There were Germanic tribes, Celtic tribes, Viking tribes, Siberian tribes, African tribes, the tribes of Israel and many more. Tribal legends describe how the people received the Original Divine Instructions which are universal and eternal. The Lenni Lenape, Grandfathers of the Algonquin family of nations, preserved accounts of creation, the Great Flood and a hundred generations before the coming of Europeans. Their record tablets are called the *Wallam Olum* or "Radiant Record". The Hopis still have their stone tablets which serve as a foundation for their societies in some of the oldest continuously occupied communities in North America (4).

When I asked Grandfather David the meaning of Hopi, he responded: "Hopi means a person of peace. You may be red. You may be white. You may be black. You may be yellow. If you are a person of peace, you are Hopi" (5). Thus the Hopi divide the world not simply by race (which often results in racism), but rather between Hopi and Ko-Hopi, a violent and destructive person who is out of balance with the natural order. When this concept is extended to a society which is out of balance, the term is Koyanaskaatsi, the title of a recent award winning film. The message is to look more closely at our present life, and to ponder the rhythm of life echoing through the Grand Canyon, the point of emergence into the fourth world for the Hopi, the "Peaceful Ones" (6).

Their friends to the west, the Chumash Nation of Southern California also shared a similar philosophy based on respect for the laws of peace. Chumash elder Grandfather Victor "Sky Eagle" Lopez explains: "We were given four Great Principles for peace: *Justice* - preserve a fair and equal system of justice; *Kindness* - treat people, animals, plants, and even a tiny insect with kindness for all were created for a purpose; *Understanding* - listen and think carefully to gain a clear understanding; and the most difficult of all? *Tolerance* to be tolerant of people who have a different color of skin or speak a different language or have different shaped eyes"(7). These four principles have guided the Chumash, who painted on the rocks, like the Hopi, a design of a circle with a balanced cross pointing to the four directions. This symbol has been found in ancient art and writings around the world. One translation explains: "Together with all nations, we hold the world in peace and harmony" (8).

One law is recognized almost univer-

sally from the native people of the Americas to Europe, Asia, Africa and Australia - to kill another human being is against the Great Laws. For example, the Old Testament relates how Moses received the Ten Commandments on the top of a mountain which includes a divine law: "Thou shall not kill". The Haudenausaunee Great Law of Peace states regarding killing: "You have committed a grave crime in the eyes of the Creator" (9).) A fundamental law of almost every society on earth is that killing is a crime. However, international wars and interracial conflicts have continued throughout history, because people have failed to honor justice, kindness, understanding and tolerance.

History is not only the annals of war. One must look deeper for the records of peace. Among the oldest legends and writings found in the annals of human history are stories about peacemakers who combined diplomacy and spiritual guidance to help societies emerge from the "dark ages".

Onondaga Chief Leon Shenandoah and Mohawk Chief Jake Swamp and others have related accounts of the Great Peacemaker who appeared during a dark age in the history of the Haudenausaunee. Over 1000 years ago, some people became violent and destructive. The desire for revenge led to bloodshed. Warfare threatened their very survival. The Peacemaker then arrived from the Great Lakes, and risked his life to urge people to stop abusing one another. He stated that human beings are capable of reason, and through the power of reason everyone desires peace. (10). Therefore, people must organize to make peace possible and to prevent the abuse of other human beings. Through logical and spiritual reasoning, the Peacemaker inspired the warriors to bury their weapons (the origin of the saying "to bury the hatchet") and planted atop a

sacred "Tree of Peace". Dr. Robert Muller, the Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations, contends: "This profound action stands as perhaps the oldest effort for disarmament in world history". The continuation of this peacemaking tradition was witnessed in the Summer of 1982 at the Second Session on Disarmament for the United Nations. Almost 500,000 people of peace marched to the UN led by Hopi Grandfather David Monongye, Onondaga Tatodaho Leon Shenandoah and a Japanese Buddhist the late Most Venerable Nichidatsu Fujii. Mohawk Chief Jake Swamp recently conducted a "Tree of Peace" ceremony with these Buddhists to bless the site of the first North American Peace Pagoda at Leverett, Massachusetts. Closer relations between East and West are growing through peaceful exchanges of ideas and cultural exchanges of our heritage" (11).

The theme of the "Tree of Peace" is universal. According to Dr. Robert Muller: "One of the most important symbols of our ancestral heritage was the image of a Tree of Peace or Tree of Life"(12). Accounts of the Tree of Peace have been found on hieroghyphic papyrus rolls in the pyramids of Egypt, cuneiform tablets from ancient Sumeria, as well as the oldest writings of India, China and Africa. Most cultures have traditions - like the Christmas Tree, May Pole, the Sundance Pole and many more - which symbolize peace, rebirth and renewal. Nathalie Novik of the Society of Inter-Celtic Arts and Culture remarked: "... the oak, the sacred tree of the Druids, is still considered the king of trees... and the presence of mistletoe on an oak showed the tree had been elected by the gods..." (13) (If you've ever been kissed under the mistletoe, now you know the reason why!).

The Chumash of Southern California

also respect the oak as a sacred tree. Grandfather Victor "Sky Eagle" Lopez explained to a group of school children at a recent "Tree of Peace" planting: "May the Creator bless each and everyone of you. He will see these beautiful trees grow up and bear fruit for all of us. See this beautiful soil that the Creator has given us, so that we can plant and live in peace with all the people of the world' (14).

Many peacemakers throughout history have shared a similar vision of a sacred "Tree of Peace", as the Oglala holy man Black Elk dreamed: "I heard the white wind blowing gently through the tree... and from the east a sacred pipe came flying on its eagle wings... beneath the tree, spreading deep peace... we camped in the sacred circle... and in the center stood the holy tree. And I say the sacred hoop of my people was one of many hoops that made one circle, wide as daylight and as starlight, and in the center grew one mightily flowering tree to shelter all the children of one mother and one father. And I saw that it was holy". (15). When entering a Lakota sweat lodge, one says: "For all my relations". Their elders explain that this means not only human beings, but includes all land and life, for the past, present and future generations.

Chief Jake Swamp shares a similar concern for the preservation of world peace and the future of our children: "We must have respect for what the Creator has given us, for the Mother Earth, and everything she holds for our benefit... our teachings state that we must make a place for our children seven generations into the future"(16). The Haudenosaunee chiefs and clan mothers encourage everyone to assume a responsibility to help promote a more peaceful world for the future.

I first met the Haudenosaunee chiefs and clan mothers two years ago at a meeting of the Grand Council in Onondaga. I was invited to confer with them on two matters: first, to share the knowledge preserved in the *Morgan Papers*, a collection of rare letters and manuscripts which prove the Iroquois took a stand for peace and neutrality early in the Revolutionary War, and that the United States made certain promises related to the sovereign rights of the Indian nations; and secondly, to seek the counsel and advice of the Haudenosaunee regarding an invitation to speak in the United Nations.

By retracing the "White Roots of Peace" I found my way to Onondaga where the Peacemaker buried the hatchet's beneath the Tree of Peace. Since the United Nations stands near their homeland, it seemed appropriate that I should come here to the center of the first United Nations. Upon entering the Longhouse, I was greeted warmly by the Onondagas – the firekeepers who are like the executive branch, the Mohawks and Senecas – the elder brothers who are like the Senate, the Oneidas, Cayugas and Tuscaroras – the younger brothers who are like the House of Representatives, and the Clan Mothers who are like the Supreme Court. The meeting began in a traditional way with prayers for peace and greetings being offered by each speaker who held up strings of shell beads called wampum – one of the gifts originally delivered by the Great Peacemaker (17).

I was first introduced to the art of wampum diplomacy in 1976, when I discovered the *Morgan Papers*, a collection of Revolutionary War documents including letters written by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Hancock and the private journal of George Morgan, the first U.S. Indian agent. Morgan's journal contains profound statements seeking

peace on earth expressed by the head chiefs, tribal ambassadors, medicine people and women leaders from over thirty Indian nations. For more than two centuries the *Morgan Papers* were kept secret. I shared these papers with the Lenni Lenape and Hodenosaunee, because much of the material related to the original promises made by the United States to their ancestors.

I first presented a copy of the John Hancock letter which directed Morgan to take a "Great Peace Belt with 13 diamonds and 2,500 Wampum beads" to the sachems and warriors of the western Indian nations. The purpose was to "convince them of the good wishes and good intentions of the Congress... and to inspire them with sentiments of Justice and humanity..." (18). Morgan's journal contained evidence this action by the Continental Congress marked a major turning point which signaled the inevitable break with England. Only 76 days before the "Declaration of Independence", Congress ordered Morgan westward on a mission of peace, because the Indian nations potentially held the balance of power which could support or crush the Revolution.

Morgan sent the 13 diamonds peace belt, symbolizing the 13 United Colonies, to the Grand Council at Onondaga with the following message:

Brothers,
When we met around our Council Fires at Albany and Pittsburgh last year we buried all evil thoughts, smok'd the Pipe of Peace & renewed the Covenant Chain of Friendship which your Forefathers & ours had made... (19)

Morgan opened the oration in a traditional way by recalling past relations. Both governments vowed in 1775 to preserve the peace between their nations, and the

agreements were sanctified by prayers communicated through the sacred pipe. The "Covenant Chain of Friendship" represented the original peace agreement sealed through the smoke of a pipe with a silver chain linked to the stem, symbolizing the prayers for everlasting peace between Indians and Europeans. Morgan then made certain "no rust" had formed on their "Chain of Peace":

We hope nothing has happen'd to change your Hearts, for our's remain strong & we are determined to keep fast hold of the Covenant Chain of Peace... (20)

Morgan may have spoken sincerely from his heart, but the fact remained that some of his superiors were not determined to preserve the peace.

General George Washington needed strong fighting men, and he stated that he thought the Indians would not remain neutral and would either side with the British or the American Revolutionaries. Washington and other generals lobbied Congress to offer the Indians bounties up to $100 for British officers. British Governor Henry Hamilton also was reported to have offered the Indians bounties for scalps.

Indian Agent George Morgan unleashed a fervent verbal attack against those who tried to destroy the peace:

But Brothers we are told there is a bad Wind blowing your way & that the Evil Spirit is striving to blind your Eyes & shut your ears from all Good & to make Mischief between you & your Brethen of the United Colonies... (21)

Who was the "Evil Spirit"? Morgan was referring to the British who were trying to incite the Indians to fight against the Americans in the Revolutionary War.

However, now that Congress approved Washington's request to enlist the Indians, the parents of the Six Nations would soon become concerned for the well being of their older boys and young men.

Morgan advocated cooperation between the Indians and the American Revolutionaries, and promoted peace by pointing out the fact they were both born in the same country:

Now as we esteem you just like our own Flesh & Blood being all the Children of this Continent, & want to live in Peace with you upon it forever (22).

If more people shared these harmonious sentiments and worked for peace with dedication, the course of American history could have changed dramatically. Although the rich North American continent provided enough for everyone's needs, apparently even this bountiful land could not fulfill everyone's greeds.

Morgan then explained the purpose of the Great Belt of Peace:

We send this Belt of Wampum to enquire the Truth of what we have heard and desire you will open your minds to us by a Deputation of your Wisest Men that we may know if you have any just cause of Complaint against us, for if you have you may rely on our Endeavours to satisfy you immediately on your application, and if you have none we hope you will tell us so that the sorrow may be removed from our Hearts... (23)

The Belt of Peace was meant to dispel from their hearts any thought of war and to promote peace as a foundation for future American Indian relations. This wampum belt was to form an alliance of peace, not war. Morgan warned them

against anyone who spread negative rumors about the Americans and threatened to disrupt their mutual happiness:

> In the mean time Brethren we desire you to be cautious how you listen to bad Birds who no doubt will endeavor to sing evil stories into your Ears - The happiness of you and your Women & Children as well as that of many other Nations inhabiting this Country depends upon your Prudence at this time - Therefore be strong Brethren in preserving peace... (24)

Morgan hinted that the "bad birds", such as British officers at the upcoming meeting near Niagara Falls, would "sing evil stories in their ears". Morgan warned the Six Nations that the safety of their women and children would be endangered, if they jumped into the Revolutionary War. The Grand Council soon sent two chiefs to bring back any of their young men involved in the war.

Morgan had no way of knowing his work for peace was being undermined by special interest groups, as he directed his words to the head chiefs:

> ... if you have not heard before from us through our Agent to the Northward, We desire this Belt & message may be delivered to the Big Cinder and other Chiefs of the Onondaga Council without delay... 25

The Big Cinder or Keeper of the Fire served as the Tadodaho, who opens the meetings of the Grand Council.

The Tatodaho was nominated by the clan mothers and appointed for life, as long as he did not jeopardize the welfare of his people. He could not dictate, but rather governed by wisdom, humility and implementing the wishes of his people.

In Iroquois society a good leader must never place himself above his people. The Tatodaho was said to have "skin the thickness of seven layers of bark", meaning that people could speak sharply to him, but he would not be permanently harmed. In contrast, a chief must speak with soft words, guiding people through logic and spiritual means.

Iroquois chiefs were (and are) both political and religious leaders. They did not separate, as the Europeans would say, church and state. The Americans adamantly demanded such a division, because the institutionalized churches in Europe had usurped their power during the Inquisition and other periods of persecution. If an Iroquois chief wantonly abused his power, the clan mothers would have a subchief warn him that his actions were against the wishes of the people. If he did not heed this warning or a second, then the third time the clan mothers would strip him of his power, and overnight he would no longer be a chief.

The American Revolution placed tremendous pressure on the chiefs of many Indian nations, including the Hodenosaunee, who were responsible for advising their people on the best course to survive the war. Morgan warned them not to get involved physically in the war, but rather to choose the path of peace:

> We wish our Brothers the Six Nations may deliberate well upon the measures they will pursue, and consider it is Peace we recommend to them. We hope they will not blow the unhappy Coal nor interfere in the Quarrel which now subsists between your American Brethren and the English (26).

Morgan and the leaders of the American Indian Peace Movement tried to prevent the Revolutionary War from spreading across the frontier like wildfire. However, the act of Congress to enlist Indians would inevitably "blow the unhappy coal", sparking some of the Indians to violence and inflaming Indian country in the bloody war.

The Six Nations were not strangers to war. They had survived over 250 years of intermittent warfare since first contact with the Europeans. Wars over the fur trade were especially divisive, pitting tribe against tribe. Morgan contended that most White People were not corrupt and warlike, as evidenced by the efforts of some White peacemakers:

> If they will recollect the Great progress we took a few years ago in accomplishing the happy Peace between the Northern & Southern Indians, they must undoubtedly think it their duty as well as Interest now to promote Peace between us (27).

Morgan concluded on a religious tone by appealing to the spiritual nature of the traditional Hodenosaunee people. He acknowledged that both the Iroquois and people around the world prayed to the same Creator. If the peacemakers were to survive and to ease the threat of war, divine help would be needed to guide them through this time of peril:

> We pray that the Great & good Spirit who governs everything in this World may look down with Pity on the Six Nations & grant them his Aid in this good Work.
> A Belt of Wampum with
> 13 Diamonds united 10 Rows 250 long is 2500---- (28)

This belt of wampum was six feet long and half a foot wide. It also represented an invitation to attend the first American Indian Peace Treaty scheduled for September.

In June of 1776, Iroquois ambassadors took bold steps by voicing their position personally before the Continental Congress. They made an appeal for the American Revolutionaries to recognize the Six Nations Confederacy and expressed their dedication to promote peace and friendship. Beyond opening diplomatic relations with the Revolutionary Council, the Iroquois also sought to open free trade and commerce, as well as requesting for Americans to recognize the Indians' territorial sovereignty.

Led by an Onondaga Chief, the delegation was invited into Independence Hall to meet President John Hancock, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams and the other delegates of Congress. After some ceremony, Hancock spoke from a prepared speech:

> Brathers,
> We hope the friendship that is between us and you will be firm, and continue as long as the sun shall shine, and the waters run; that we and you may be as one people, and have but one heart, and be kind to one another like brethren (29).

In the classic style of Indian oratory, Hancock voiced the original promise to the Indians. If these vows would have been honored, the future relationship between the Americans and the Indians might have been founded on the Great Law of Peace. The Hodenosaunee gave John Hancock an honorary name which means "The Great Tree of Liberty".

They named George Morgan the "Council House". The Shawnee called him the "White Deer". The Lenni Lenape (Delaware Indians) called him "Brother Tamanend, the Affable One", the title of perhaps the greatest Peacemaker in their history. In 1682 at Philadelphia, Tamanend joined hands with Quaker Governor William Penn

beneath the Tree of Peace called the "Shackamaxon Elm" at the "Place Where Chiefs Are Made". In 1982 a delegation of Lenape leaders, including Chief Henry Secondine, Linda Poolaw and the late "Touching Leaves" Nora Thomson Dean, met with the Pennsylvanians to reestablish the peace for the Tricentennial of this early peace treaty.

In October of 1776, John Hancock sent a delegation of congressmen as Indian Commissioners to join George Morgan in negotiating the first American Indian Peace Treaty at Fort Pitt (present day Pittsburg). Lenape Grandfather Netawatwees, at the age of almost 100, insisted that the treaty convene outdoors beneath the Tree of Peace, a massive elm at the Forks of the Ohio. They joined the Shawnee, Wyandot, Ottawa and Six Nations in the "Friendship Song" and the "Dance of Peace" which symbolized the Covenant Chain of Friendship.

The peace talks around the council fire continued from October 15 to November 6, 1776. To preserve the peace, a joint system of justice was proposed where both Indians and Americans would be represented. The Senecas, "Keepers of the Western Door", agreed to supervise a peacekeeping force in the Ohio River Valley. The Shawnee Clan Mother Coitcheleh expressed concerns for the safety of the children. Shawnee Chief Cornstalk eloquently voiced the call for justice regarding political sovereignty, religious freedom and land rights:

When God created this World he gave this island to the red people and placed your younger Brethren the Shawnees here in the Center - Now we and they see your people seated on our Lands which all Nations esteem as their and our heart - all our Lands are covered by the white people and we

are jealous that you still intend to make larger strides. We never sold you our Kentucky Lands which you now possess on the Ohio between the great Kenhawa and the Cherokee (Tennesse) River... This is what sits heavy (on our) hearts & on the hearts of all Nations... Now I stretch my Arm to you my (Brothers) of the United States.
(30)

The Kentucky lands were part of a 25,000,000 acre "International Indian Hunting Preserve" shared equally by the Shawnee, Lenni Lenape, Iroquois, Wyandots, Miami, Cherokee and other Indian nations.

The United States Commissioners, led by Doctor Thomas Walker, Colonel John Montgomery, John Harvie and Jasper Yeates, presented each Indian nation with a belt of wampum and promised on October 29th:

We by this Belt give you the most solemn assurance that while the Red People continue to hold fast the old Chain of Friendship with the white people, their Lands shall not be touched or intruded on, but they & their Children shall enjoy the same unmolested, while the Sun shines, or the Rivers run   (31).

This was the beginning of a "Trail of Treaties".

The commissioners also promised each nation that the United States would never draft Indian men:

... we know that you are well acquainted with fighting in the Woods & can undergo like men every hardship & difficulty when you go to War; but we would not deceive you, we would not ask you to fight our Battles, wherein you may loose many of your young men;

we think we are able to meet our enemies in the Fields & Woods without involving our Indian Allies in a War...
(32)

However, today young Indian men have been receiving notices to register for the draft in violation of this first American Indian Treaty. Many vows were made beneath the Tree of Peace. Perhaps the time has come to dust off the original Promises and to listen to the message of the American Indian Peace Movement.

When I spoke before the United Nations I made two proposals: first, may the traditional elders - these wise people of peace - speak directly before the United Nations; and second, may the UN call for all people of peace on earth to begin planting Trees of Peace. Both proposals were applauded. These ideas were shared by many people for both environmental and humanitarian reasons. 100 nations and 100 world organizations have now united to plant one billion trees around the world. The "International Tree Project" has been adopted as part of the UN's "International Year of Youth" for 1985. Trees of Peace will continue to be planted through 1986 to symbolize

the world-wide cease-fire proclaimed for "International Year of Peace".

Mohawk Chief Jake Swamp has been one of the most dedicated ambassadors, travelling from coast to coast to help explain the principles of the Great Law of Peace at Tree of Peace plantings. He and his wife, Judy, recently met with Dr. Robert Muller and his wife, Margarita, at the United Nations. They spoke with hope that the dream of the Peacemaker - a world without war - may one day come true.

Everyone is invited to join us in planting Trees of Peace to breathe life into the body of Mother Earth. Start planning to plant Trees of Peace in your community. If you would like to help in this global effort, please feel free to write:

Chief Jake Swamp
Mohawk Nation
via 188C Cook Rd.
Hogansburg, NY 13644

Dr. Gregory Schaaf
511 Ixoria Ave.
Fort Pierce, FL 33482

NOTES

[1] The *Papers of George Morgan* (hereafter cited *Morgan Papers*) were passed down for generations through the Morgan family and were discovered by the author in 1976 at a meeting with Ms Susannah Morgan of Santa Barbara, Ca. A doctoral dissertation was written by the author under the supervision of Dr. Wilbur R. Jacobs, Professor of History at the University of California in Santa Barbara. An historical narrative soon will be published under the title *The Morgan Papers : The American Indian Peace Movement during the Outbreak of the Revolutionary War*. The present article is based on the research for this book and a second manuscript in process entitled, *The Tree of Peace : A Universal Tradition*.

[2] A vast literature exists on creation stories and the development of international law. For an Iroquois account see, Mohawk Nation, *The Great Law of Peace of the People of the Longhouse* (White Roots of Peace, Mohawk Nation, via Rooseveltown, N.Y.), illustrated by John Fadden (Kahonhes).

[3] David Monongy, Hopi Independent Nation, personal interview (Third Mesa, Az., June 1982).

[4] *Ibid.* Information on the *Wallam Olum* was provided by the late Lenape Grandmother Winnie Poolaw. A new translation of the text is being refined by David McCutchen, a fine linguist and artist from Sagus, California.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] Translation explained by Thomas Banyacya, Jr., Hopi Independent Nation (Spring, 1985).

[7] Grandfather Victor "Sky Eagle" Lopez, Chumash Nation, personal interview (Montecito, Ca., October, 1983).

[8] The Chumash Symbol may be found at Painted Cave Road off San Marcos Pass near Santa Barbara, California. The Hopi Symbol may be found on the rock ledges around Third Mesa.

[9] *The Great Law of Peace,* Law 20.

[10] For an explanation of the significance of the Tree of Peace see, Mohawk Nation, *A Basic Call to Consciousness* (Akwesasne, New York, 1977) and Paul A. W. Wallace, *White Roots of Peace* (Philadelphia, 1946); a new edition will soon be released by Chanacy Press.

[11] Dr. Robert Muller, "A Vision of Peace", foreword in a book soon to be published, Gregory Schaaf, *The Morgan Papers.*

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] Nathalie Novik, "Trees of the Celts", article to be included in an upcoming book, *The Tree of Peace* by Gregory Schaaf.

[14] "Tree of Peace Planting Ceremony", *Transcript* (Crane School, Montecito, Ca., January 14, 1985), Tape 1, Side A.

[15] John Neihardt, ed., *Black Elk Speaks* (New York, 1975).

[16] Jake Swamp to Gregory Schaaf, personal correspondance (Mohawk Nation, April, 1984).

[17] This interpretation of the structure of the Six Nations was explained to the author by Lee Lyons, Onondaga historian.

[18] John Hancock to George Morgan (Philadelphia, April 19, 1776), *Morgan Papers,* doc. #2, p. 1.

[19] United Colonies to the Six Nations (Pittsburgh, May 19, 1776), *Morgan's Journal,* p. 13.

[20] *Ibid.* The meaning of the "Covenant Chain of Friendship" was explained to the author by Leon Shenandoah and Oren Lyons, chiefs of the Onondaga Nation.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 13-14. The role of the chieftaincy in Iroquois society was explained to the author by Chief Leon Shenandoah, Chief Oren and Lee Lyons from Onondaga, and Chief Jake Swamp from the Mahawk Nation.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] John Hancock to Iroquois Ambassadors (Philadelphia, June 11, 1976), National Archives, M 247, r 37, i 30, pp. 350-51.

[30] Cornstalk to the United States (Fort Pitts, November 7, 1776), *Morgan's Journal,* p. 73.

[31] U.S. Commissioners to the Western Indian Nations (Fort Pitts, October 29, 1776), *Transcript of the Treaty Proceedings,* Jasper Yeaters Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, accepted by the Indian Claims Commission, Docket No. 13 E et al., exhibit A-193, p. 20.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

ERRATA

I N T E R C U L T U R E 88 English Edition (ISSN 0828-797x)

Page,	line,	Correction	Page,	line,	Correction
1	4	A ground-breaking	27	15	Guerry, Vincent, etc. to be moved to p. 34
1	13	He presently spends most of his time writing at Tavertet	30	29	Trudel, Marcel, etc. to be moved to p. 34
1	15	at the University of Santa Barbara	31	19	Bureau, René, etc. to be moved to p. 34
25	23	Bertley, Leo, etc. to be moved to p. 34	35	9	West (instead of Occidentals)

Cultural Disarmament *

by Roger RAPP

The pages that follow represent a condensed version of some of the ideas developed in my Courses RS 143, *Religion, Revolution and Peace* and RS 181, *Technological Employment, Scientific Responsibility and the Arms Race*, plus some data from my graduate Seminar RS 261A, *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Peace*. Roger Rapp was the Teaching Assistant for the two courses. He has put some of those ideas together. I hope that this effort will constitute another step towards elucidating some of the connections between Peace, Academia and our lives.

Due to the technological feats of the last decades, the human race is becoming increasingly aware that its destiny lies not so much in the whims of Fate, the will of God(s), the laws of History, or even in the dynamism of Evolution, as in the hands of humans themselves, represented by those who control the sources of power. Human fear is shifting from the sphere of the Divine or the realm of Nature to the very technological systems humans themselves have created. A punishing God or a menacing Nature are less awesome than a technocratic complex that is theoretically at our service, but which can easily destroy itself and the planet.

The modern predicament has something to do with the awareness that the very future of the planet is not so much a theological or a geological as it is an anthropological affair. History escapes the strict limitations of human relationships and quarrels and acquires cosmic proportions. The old categories of war and peace need to be rethought anew. The question of peace is not just political or technological; it is an ultimate issue - and thus a top priority of Religious Studies.

R. Panikkar

I. RELIGION, REVOLUTION AND PEACE

"Two men who wish to watch the sunrise would be very foolish indeed to argue over the place where it will appear and on the proper ways to look at it, then to cause their dispute to degenerate into a quarrel, to come to blows and, in the heat of the brawl, tear each other's eyes out. It would then be far from simply a question of contemplating the dawn."

St. Augustine, Sermon 23, 18

A. The Triple Challenge

Hardly anyone would dispute that we live in disturbing and troubled times. The human project for the 20th Century barrels down the three-lane freeway of the magamachine, the technocratic complex and the pan-economic ideology, scarcely able to imagine that such a magnificent construct could be a blind alley. But the wall looms up ahead. Change direction we must, or perish; and the change must embrace both our ways of thinking and our styles of living. Hence, the human race now suffers the throes of a burgeoning mutation in consciousness which amounts to no less than a revolution in human consciousness. For those of us in the _____ ___ld, a triple challenge shapes that mutation. The challenge comes to us individually, collectively and academically.

The challenge to us individually demands that we begin to take responsibility. All too often one shrugs the shoulders and asks, "What can I do alone?". There exists a kind of duplicity in our age in which, on the one hand, we raise the individual to a pedestal above all else, and on the other, the individual is trodden underfoot as nothing. For example, think of the countless, faceless people in the entertainment industries behind the media superstars. Or again, consider the great corporations who advertise the "personal touch" in order to build a mass market. We are generally unaware of this schism until we fall in a crack in the system and our own position becomes threatened. Sometimes responsibility entails going against the grain, standing alone, even being ground up under the wheels of the megamachine - if in so doing you gain your humanity.

In this pan-economic consumer age, our collective throw-away syndrome has normalized waste and made a virtue of profligacy. Perhaps, like an old razor, it is the whole system that must be thrown out. The challenge to us collectively is to face the possibility that the system itself has fallen beyond repair or reform. But the very idea of junking the corporate ideology counters our conservative instinct. How can we discard the megamachine? Sub-consciously

we are still trying to repair. The mega-machine has broken down - the oppressed and the hungry cry out in the grinding its gears - but we do not know how to throw it out.

The third challenge confronts us intellectually and academically. It demands that we break down some of our self-imposed limitations in order to gain a new perspective on the issue. This requires that we rid ourselves of the comfortable, but deceitful thought that every problem can be cut down into small manageable pieces. This approach works on some problems, but not on all. We have grown accustomed to analytic thought, and as a result, the meaning of education has dwindled to the mere dissemination of specialized information concerning isolated, self-enclosed spheres of inquiry. We feel, however, that the main function of education does not rest in the brokerage of information, but rather in living and struggling along together to tackle a problem of mutual interest and import. There are no pre-packaged answers in life; no a priori right or wrong, no totally objectifiable issues. Authentic academic inquiry never ends, but like all living things, has its peaks and valleys and continues on.

B. Humankind Contemplates Suicide

As reflected in the story from St. Augustine quoted at the beginning of Part I, there seems to be an internal dialectic of civilization that leads it to destroy itself. More than one civilization has come to an end, and it seems that Western Civilization now stands at that cross-roads which marks an end to a period of human history. Those on the left and those on the right, the Russians and the Americans, first worlds and third worlds, most would agree that this is the case.

One could cite innumerable interpre-tations regarding the meaning and content of this mutation in human consciousness that is occurring. For our concerns here, however, this radical transformation in human awareness could be characterized as a revolutionary "end of history". "History" marks a way of being human, as did "pre-history". Our basic assumption here states that the 20th Century is now witnessing a new form of being human taking shape within the tumult of our times. Such a new way of being human arises because of the radical malaise endemic to our current situation.

The sickening of human consciousness manifests itself as the possibility of humanity committing suicide. This has been made possible by the advance of nuclear technology. Never before has humankind contemplated committing suicide, such an idea remained unthought. We thought to go to the moon, to dive to the bottom of the ocean, to become God, but never did we think to wipe out humanity as such. You can think the unthinkable, qua unthinkable, but you cannot think the unthought. The crossroads at which we collectively stand has brought into consciousness the idea of a total human-induced cultural holocaust.

Certainly numerous traditional peoples have considered the idea that the world would come to an end. The Kali Yuga, Mo Fa, or the Iron Age would mark the end of time. Nonetheless, these notions marked the close of a cycle of time, which would be renewed. They represent something quite different from suicide per se.

Suicide reveals two contradictory elements at play within the psyche. With the first, one desires mastery over oneself. Only then can one claim, "I am truly master over my own life". The ritualized suicide of *Hara Kiri*, for example, requires an extreme courage to achieve power over one's destiny. The second factor, however, exposes an incapacity to go on. A leering impotency overwhelms the one contemplating suicide, and destiny rolls on in its own course.

This nuclear suicide which we are considering here stands as a collective act. It is not that we as individuals are making a decision. The whole nuclear dilemma reveals a collective act of our culture. We exist as a part of the *macro-anthropos*, the *purusa*. This holds true even though we may indeed be that part of the collective consciousness trying to convince the rest that life, however imperfect, has its value. A thorough awareness of our collectivity lends much clarity to the issue, for we must convince - not resist or fight - that part of our collective self bent on self-destruction.

We could distinguish two kinds of reasons that lead one into the temptation of suicide. First come the immediate reasons - the terminal cancer, the lack of money, the unfaithful spouse, the tyrannical boss, our personal treachery, unworthiness or failure. Sometimes these reasons can be dealt with simply by positive thinking. However, not all obstacles can be overcome. If the decision to take one's own life rests solely on the immediate reasons, then there is little likelihood of humankind seeing the 21st Century.

Then, there are also internal, subjective and deeper factors at play in suicide. Under the same set of circumstances, one person may end it all and another will walk back to life. One finds other reasons to live which until now were unrealized. New dimensions of life are discovered that outweigh the immediate reasons for death.

In a certain sense one of the prin-cipal tasks of peace studies is to help discover that dimension of life which is worth living, which transcends all the reasons we can evoke for ending it all. Scholars now begin to speak of positive peace, and grope for some idea of what that would mean. All the peace research that goes on - the models of war, the psychology of arms races, the flood of information on the destructive potency of the weaponry - all of this must be balanced with some kind of positive understanding. But how? Somehow we need peace on earth as much as we need a revolution in our ways of being and doing. Somehow we must begin to speak of these things on the level of ultimate questions, on the level of religion.

C. The Revolutionary Spirit

As the world situation worsens, the human psyche deteriorates and the Earth itself sickens, we discover more and more that the problems of peace have entered the sphere of Religious Studies. If Religious Studies means something more than archeology, and peace something more fundamental than "politics", then we must face the intellectual and existential issues of peace with all the courage and strength, wisdom and insight that our discipline lends us. Accordingly, let us set out a few working hypotheses about the relationship between religion, revolution and peace.

1. Religion is a way to peace

What does Religious Studes have to do with the issues of peace? We tend to have a frozen and provincial notion of what is meant by "religion", a word that does not appear in the Old Testament and only once in the New. Religion means much more than ethics. What, then, is religion?

Human beings have always wanted to

lead a happy existence, to live life to the fullest. There are many expressions for this happiness: liberation, salvation, etc. All religions seek to save Man, to lead us to the fullness of life. Theologies or philosophies may discuss what this salvation is. Religion consists in the set of symbols, practices and doctrines which conduct humans toward salvation.

Although there have been many definitions given to "religion", the most useful one here would be the following: "Religion is the way to salvation". Salvation here can be variously interpreted to be: Heaven, God, the *Dharma*, the *Tao*, Happiness, Fulfillment, the Classless Society, etc. One legitimate and timely interpretation is this: Religion is the way to Peace. Peace in this context cannot mean the simple absence of war, but rather it must encompass the full harmonious blossoming of the human experience: both the internal and the external, the personal and the social, the political and the cosmic, the human and the divine.

Another way of putting the same idea would be to say that peace constitutes a religious question. Peace cannot be reduced to simple political, social or diplomatic parameters. Peace appears to be an all-embracing and wholistic symbol. Moreover, we should have to emphasize that the way to peace must be revolutionary. Peace does not consist in a simple passive state relative to conflict. Nor does Peace issue as the automatic outcome of something, be it a set of actions or beliefs. It cannot be taken for granted and still retain its vitality and efficacy. Peace upsets the status quo. It resists destructive forces. Peace implies a revolutionary process. It requires that the unjust routine be broken, that business cannot go on as usual.

2. *Religions are revolutionary*

Every new religion introduces a new awareness which upsets the established order. A prime example of such a revolutionary break-through in awareness would be the Sermon on the Mount. Controversy and persecution almost always follow religions. They overturn the normal flow of life. As Buddhism puts it, *sarva dukkha*, all that we normally see, think and experience is suffering, and we must get rid of it. The center of life must be displaced and a new one found. Or from the Christian perspective, in order to enter the Kingdom, a conversion, a *metanoia* must be achieved.

3. *Peace and revolution resist institutionalization*

Generally speaking, at a certain point, human institutions begin to suppress that which they were instituted to promote. Religions certainly do not escape this generalization. We can note a tendency of established religions to stifle the very spirit which has given birth to them. Similarly, an inbuilt paradox can be found in the attempt to institutionalize either revolution or peace.

Revolution institutionalized, or taken as a means to something else, destroys the essence and beauty of revolution. Movement and change form the pulse of revolution. The establishment of revolution kills it as revolution.

Likewise, peace taken as a victory erodes any possibility of a peaceful outcome. Victory contradicts Peace. Peace on the terms of the victor will never amount to peace. The defeated may accept, but their grandchildren will remember. Victory of any sort - spiritual, intellectual, military - will not achieve peace.

4. *Peace and Revolution stand in dialectical polarity*

Peace and revolution exist within a dialectical tension or polarity. More than one revolution has ended in great bloodshed. More than one has accepted the sword as its proper means. More than one has perpetrated more violence than the regime it has overthrown. Religion holds within its breast these two opposing tendencies - to seek peace and harmony while demanding revolutionary change. This tension between peace and revolution can only be resolved with a dialogical non-dualistic conception of reality.

Revolution consists in more than just social change or social reform. It requires a change in the very fabric of society. It demands that the very under-structures of human life be transformed. Revolution does not entail a simple changing of the guard, but much more fundamentally, it questions the very roots of the system. In North America, most people feel very little need for revolution because they are comfortable with the system. Revolutions do not merely make the system work better. They lay the axe to the sub-structures. The status quo of our current pan-economic system has its basis on a deeper structure or archetype which will re-emerge even if it witnesses some disruption of the system.

As the Russian and East German *Philosophische Wörterbuch* puts it, two ideas define revolution: 1) Revolution entails the transformation of society as a whole; 2) Revolution remains one of the most important phases in the evolution of a society.

The idea of revolution is based on a spacial metaphor. It implies a change of situation.

The seasons, the clocks, the moon

all revolve, but their temporal movement does not reflect true revolutions. Revolution breaks the natural rhythms by which things change. It produces a quantitative change that leads to a qualitative change. Revolution entails a mutation in the order of things, not just a changing of the guard.

The concept of historical revolution appears to be relatively new. In it, the course of history is conceived to begin anew due to human intervention. The very fabric of society transforms and breaks into an entirely new mode. The revolutionary spirit assumes that the present system has deteriorated beyond repair.

There exist, however, manifold tactics to implement the revolution. These include both non-violent and counter-violent means.

Violence has many and oftentimes subtle forms. It is linked with human intentions and self-understanding. There can be unintended violence, just as there can be a recipient of physical force (e.g. a surgical patient) who feels no violence has been committed. The perpetrators of oppression can be totally blind to their violence.

One important definition of violence comes from McAffee Brown, who calls it "a violation of the person". Violence occurs with the rising consciousness of the victim. Gustavo Guttierez, one of the leaders in Liberation Theology, analyzes the current Latin American situation in terms of a cycle of violence, with institutional violence at the root. Three kinds of violence can be distinguished: institutionalized violence, counter-violence and repressive violence.

At this point, let us look closer at the problem of human violence in its relation to religion, revolution and peace.

II. THE ROOTS OF VIOLENCE

"Yield and overcome."
Tao Te Ching, 22

A. *The "Global Village" Syndrome*

We often hear optimistic prophecies of how the earth is being turned into a "global village" via the world-wide spread of electronic means of communication, rapid transportation and the like. This great optimism, however, generally comes from one camp, namely, the rich minority of the human family. Not everyone shares this vision.

In order to put the global village into perspective, let us suppose that this planetary village consists of 100 people. Now, of these one hundred people, seventy cannot read. Only one has a college education. Seventy do not have safe drinking water. Eighty live in sub-standard housing, and this is considered the "normal" condition of things. Six have one half the entire village income, including both resources and money. Therefore, ninety-four exist on the other half.

It is also very revealing to look at the trends of the privileged six people. Three of them are in the work force. A hundred years ago, two were in agriculture (70%) and the other engaged in manufacture and other work. Today, however, two are in services: bankers, brokers, lawyers, etc.; and the other one in the work force does all the rest. 4.5 "people" watch the TV networks for news; 5.3 see TV every week on an average of three and a half hours a day. Five of these people see, i.e. are exposed, to 40,000 commercials a year which renders them more conditioned than the rats of B. F. Skinner.

After World War II, leaders of the Western world touted the slogan "World peace through world trade". But after the 1960's they began to acknowledge that it was simply world trade for profit. Until the Bretton-Woods Agreement (1944) world trade was still largely barter. But now marketization and the profit incentive dominates so thoroughly that if labor is cheaper in Hong Kong, the factory moves out of Vermont. As a result, the trend of the rich getting richer as the poor get poorer has accelerated. In 1900 the poor earned half that of the rich. But in 1970, what one third of the world earns in one week, it takes the other two-thirds one year.

The arms race is patently criminal. It solves nothing, not even the problem of defense. In the so-called developing countries, there is one soldier for every 250 people, where there is only one physician for every 3750 people. That is, there are 12 times more soldiers than physicians. In 1979 the world spent $350 billion on defense, somewhere in the order of a million dollars a minute. The arms sales by the super-powers have gone to support the systems of slavery in so many developing nations. In the last five years, 67% of the arms sold by the industrial nations went to the third world. In the period from 1977 to 1981, the USA controlled 52.5% of the arms export industry; the USSR, 28.7%, meaning that 71% of arms sales came from these two countries. We should couple this with the fact that over 130 wars have taken place since 1945. 45-50 million people have died in battle. Today there are at least 45 nations involved in war.

We must admit to ourselves that either World War III has in fact already begun or World War II has not yet ended. The world has an army of 20 million people, without counting the police. Another thousand people die in every conflict, of which 600 are civilians.

We tend to be unaware of how the present-day system itself perpetrates injustice. We privileged few are culpable of accumulated injustice.

B. *The Anthropological Factor*

C.C. Smuts has said, "When I look at history, I am a pessimist, but when I look at pre-history, I am an optimist". Only in human beings does fighting become disruptive of existing balances. Only the human animal massacres its own kind and others. Only Man wages war. Yet, as Smuts' statement implies, not all of human experience has been marred by institutional violence. If we are to speak about either peace or violence, then we must include all of the last 6,000 years of human experience. Otherwise, we run the risk of being narrow-sighted.

When trying to fathom the roots of violence, however, it does not appear to be a simple matter of something having gone wrong along the way. From the very beginning there seems to have been a flaw. There are three philosophical schemes or metaphysical options to explain the origin of violence and war: the monistic, the dualistic and the advaitic. The deepest way to go back is to look into ourselves.

1) The monistic view sees Man as basically good. Man descends from God, and ultimately His goodness will prevail, if not in this world, then in the next. In this scheme of things we find an inbuilt transcendental optimism. In all the monistic schemes, there is some sort of Fall from which the evil unfolds. What is needed, then, is to rise up from the fall, either by oneself (as in Buddhism), with the help of others (as in Marxism) or with Superior help (as with the Abrahamic monotheisms). Whether the Fall is interpreted historically, anthropologically or socially, all these possibilities belong to the same metaphysical option.

2) The second option could be characterized as dualism. Academia has tended to mishandle this interpretation of reality, but recently dualism has steadily gained more credibility. This view does not minimize the power of evil. It puts evil on an equal footing with the good. Together they act out a cosmic drama in which our destinies are determined. The good may not triumph, and darkness may indeed reign. Dualism polarizes and quickens the spirit to be decisive and committed.

3) The third option could be called the non-dualistic or advaitic option. Here, good and evil are not placed in a dialectical either/or situation. In its depth, reality becomes opaque, no longer appears as good; Evil which becomes intelligible ceases to be evil. A radical ambivalence lurks in the very existence of things. This third option does not rely on mechanical or technical solutions. The scientific methods of modern times preclude this vision of things.

There seems to be something like a Fall in all three options. Man and creation have an innate goodness, but somewhere along the way, Man has committed an error. Where is the fault? Where did we go wrong?

Many of the traditional religions locate the Fall in a historical fact, in the deeper sense of history which finds its origin in a cosmogonic event. The

fault occurs in the beginning, with the original Man, with the ancestors.

Other understandings locate the Fall in an anthropological fact. Here again, we could speak of three attitudes.

a) What could be characterized as the gnostic attitude would claim that knowledge contaminates the human project. Somewhat like photographic film, once exposed to light, it is spoiled. Once you have eaten of the fruit of good and evil, you lose pure awareness, spontaneity fades away, you discover yourself naked and must cover yourself.

b) A second attitude would be that epitomized by Rousseau. Man is good, but society makes him evil. The human being is receptive and moldable. The environment can alter its very nature. Lead to forsake the artificial world of the city and return to a more natural mode of existence, Man's original goodness would shine forth.

c) A third class of anthropological answers would be the scientific, based on observation and experiment. Let us consider some of the current theories now circulating.

A very intriguing analysis comes from René Girard as outlined in his "Violence and the Sacred". Girard locates the source of violence within the functioning of the human psyche itself. He identifies a triangular structure in which there is the desiring subject, the desired object and a model through which the two interact. The model acts as a kind of "scapegoat mechanism" which actually transforms the object in the process. Taking examples from both literature and anthropology, Girard sees the scapegoat painted as either victim or savior. In both cases, the scapegoat functions to re-establish the order of

the world. The object of desire is clothed in its desirability. It is the desirability that takes hold of the subject and alters the perception of the desired object. According to Girard, rituals represent the institutionalization of that structure. He claims that you never desire the subject of desire, but only the object of desire.

A second set of scientific answers to the roots of human violence would be all the psychological theories of aggression based on the discharge model. Here it is assumed that the human being is phylogenically programmed with an instinct for self-preservation and aggression. Built somewhat like a hydraulic theory, the adherents to the discharge model claim that frustrations pile up and accumulate in the human psyche. Then, when a certain threshold is reached a critical mass is achieved and aggression explodes out: in sexual activity, it bursts out as orgasm; in other physical expressions, it comes as violent action. The adherents of this theory tend to reduce all violent acts to this structure — be it crime, quarrels, wars, torture or what have you.

Freud, Konrad Lorenz and B. F. Skinner could be cited as examples of theorists who would fit into this category. Each in his own way would positively accept the darwinian hypothesis of natural selection and survival of the fittest. They all presuppose that aggression works to the service of life. Therefore, they would submit that aggression is vital and necessary to survive. Aggression itself stamps and shapes the biological law of life in all its modes even so far as the human and cultural spheres of politics, economics, etc.

All of these theories are open to critique on many levels. As a general comment, we could say that they commit at

least two fundamental errors. First, they unduly extrapolate from the animal world to the human, and perhaps even interpret that animal world via an aggressive anthropocentric bias. Second, they argue in a circle, concluding that: "Man is aggressive because he has been aggressive".

The most thorough-going critique has been offered by Eric Fromm. Upon examining physiological, neurological and sociological data, he has concluded that wars and aggression are neither natural nor normal. Rather they spring from the cultural sphere. Moreover, he asserts that they are not present in every culture, but only in the cultures of scarcity, that is, in the cultures of accumulation and of power.

Nor do the assumptions about the aggressive nature of man uncritically forwarded by the adherents of the discharge model stand up to historical purview. War consists in an institutionalized form of violence. The standing army, a labor force specialized in violence, begins in Babylonia with the change from the matriarchal to the patriarchal form of society. Pre-history knew no wars, although there may have been violence. It is around 3000 BC that civilizations built on power began. Since then, the number of wars has increased geometrically throughout the centuries. Yet even in the so-called Dark Ages in Europe, four days a week were God's peace and warfare was forbidden. No people have ever conceived of war and power on the same destructive magnitude as 20th Century Man.

Perhaps it would be helpful here to distinguish power from authority. Power, "potestas", energy, "Macht" requires the sheer capacity of doing something. In contrast, authority requires people recognizing and accepting that doing. Power is enacted by one who can make decisions, but authority must come from one who can

"let grow", as the very etymology suggests. This "letting things grow" is not the same as anarchy or anomy. Suicides are created by anomy in which one loses the sense of belonging and connection. The *augur* is he who gives the consecration of the divine. The criticism of power by authority defines the role of the prophet.

Eric Fromm distinguishes two kinds of aggression. a) Defensive or reactive aggression could be called benign. This aggression is biologically adaptive and amounts to the instinct for self-defense and self-preservation. Perhaps it should not even be labeled aggression. b) Malignant aggression, on the other hand, makes for aggression proper. It provides the basis for destructiveness, sadism, masochism, etc. No other mammal displays this trait. Malignant aggression is not biologically adaptive, nor is it innate, nor is it a reaction pattern. Animals trained to be aggressive can be untrained. The most powerful chimpanzees do not necessarily become the leaders of a herd, nor do the strongest elephants. As for the predatory nature of animals, intra-specific killing does not occur, and inter-specific killing is rare.

As for the problem of vital space, crowding does not make Man violent, but rather violence comes from the destruction of mores. In Vietnam, the US soldiers "wasted the gooks". From World War I on, one of the main tasks of officers has been to kill those who do not advance. We must challenge the cliché that the predatory instinct is the origin of war.

In the human case, we should speak of "instrumental" aggression. This form of aggression stems from greed, and comprises one of our strongest non-instinctive traits. Animals do not exhibit greed. The technocratic complex has its

roots in greed, not in freedom.

Therefore we must say that war is not natural, nor normal, but cultural. Not every culture has practiced war. Even in linear time, 95% of the time, Man has been a hunter, and not engaged in war. The urban transformation, which accompanied the neolithic revolution, was marked by the shift from a matriarchal to a patriarchal civilization. Kingdom and bureaucracy found their rise around 3000 BC and resulted in the objective conditions that made war useful. Perhaps now war is no longer useful.

The mono-cultural approach to peace has not overcome the Roman archetype of the *pax romana*. *Pax* suggests a juridical "pact". It amounts to the necessary condition for the development of one particular civilization or conception of the world. It provides the condition for an order imposed by the victor or the civilized. We need this so-called peace for the establishment of our religion, our economy or our democracy. For example, the article on "Peace Research" in Ritter's *Wörterbuch* claims that "peace research starts with the fundamental assumption that World Peace has become a vital condition for the scientific technological epoch". The intended meaning, of course, is that without World Peace the benefits of the technological world could not be sustained. It is assumed that the scientific technological epoch is a universal good, and that everyone would want it to continue. Read another way, however, it says that we must impose our peace so that we can have the world we want.

Rather, we would submit that peace comprises the very goal of human life. It cannot be equated with the external order. It cannot work simply to the benefit of one and not all others. It is an anthropological reality, not a political

one. No longer should we consider peace to be the fruit of one civilization or of a technological development. Violence stems from an inequity of power. Civilizations have been built upon power and the discharge of their violence has come as war and upheaval. So far, the system has indeed worked in this way. However, now that we have reached the limits of this arrangement in the post-Hiroshima world, this system will no longer work. The situation leads us back to question the very nature of Man and civilization. Peace cannot be based on the values of the victors. The problem of peace shakes the foundations of Man, society and reality itself.

C. The Technocratic Complex

In previous eras first Nature and then God(s) were the great challenges. Blessings and threats issued from them. Nature embodied the untapped potential, the unfolding mystery of growth and life, the powerful and fearful face of reality. The Gods worked in mysterious, supernatural, divine and inscrutable ways. The most important condition to a secure life was the proper appeasement of the natural and the supernatural.

In the modern age, however, the great confrontation in life has shifted to the realm of humankind. We now recognize ourselves and the artificial world we have created to be the unknown, the unexpected, the fateful. We have triggered forces which we cannot steer. We have created a new way, a way in which our own existence totters precariously in the balance.

No longer can we point to the devil, to evil or to immorality and feel that we have laid hold of the culprit. We can no longer pinpoint the enemy. It has gained an anonymity because it has become us - our parents, our siblings, our cousins,

our citizens, our comrades - and we can no longer recognize ourselves for it. The system itself has corroded. Once again we are confronted with a life and death issue, but it has no face.

Once we overcome the two-storied notion of reality which sees the real thing as always coming later, we can get a new perspective on the issue of peace. We are drowned in a daily flood of information for which we have neither the skills nor even the capacity to fully assimilate. When genuine problems arise, we have no vision to discriminate the truly vital from the superficial; we have no means to separate the wheat from the chaff. Another committee is formed and meanwhile business goes on as usual.

The artificial world we have built has reversed the order of things. In nature many seeds are produced but few germinate, grow and mature. With the technological world, when something is technically possible, then it becomes imperative to do it. Any scientific possibility will become real, but this is not so with the realm of nature.

We confront the Man-made world. So few of the modern Western generation has experienced even the most fundamental human acts, such as childbirth or growing food. Those in the third world ask, "In what world do they live? How can you call existence in such a world of concrete and machines, life?" The Man-made world we live in has gone amuck. Westerners pride themselves on being rational, civilized and honest, but they cannot find the time to enjoy life. The purpose of culture has always been the fulfillment and enjoyment of life. Culture does not mean to be either overworked or bored, either consumer or consumed, either employed or entertained. The third human confrontation meets head on with the featureless Man-made world.

No one controls this world. It falls under the sway of the technocratic complex that grinds on with its own accelerated rhythms and appetites.

If it is Man today who is most problematic, we may properly ask, "Which Man?" What is the nature of this Man? If we are to distinguish contemporary Man from traditional human beings, then we must point to the technocratic complex which represents a *novum* in history. The technocratic complex emerges from a mixture of *techne*, *logos* and pan-economism.

Techne means art, human creativity. It requires inspiration; the *pneuma* is needed. It indicates human skill.

The *logos* refers to the rational element in the human being. This *logos* has a certain veto power. But it was not meant to direct. Technology substitutes one particular type of the *logos* for the *pneuma*.

The primary feature of pan-economism is that quantity becomes the most universal element. Money allows for the quantification of everything. Money allows for unlimited growth. All you need do is add another zero. With all other goods, there is a limit. The last offspring of scientism is the quantification of everything.

The technocratic complex makes the tyrant anonymous. We cannot pinpoint a person at the center pulling all the strings. The system itself, the collective being we have become, chugs on without stop.

To clarify our position, we should perhaps distinguish between tools and machines; then, for lack of a better word, between machines of first and second degree.

A tool functions with the direct or indirect use of human energy. The hammer depends on the arm. With the tool, the human wit excogitates the process and human energy is employed. Quite often the tool represents an extension of the human body itself: the hammer as a harder, bonier fist; the saw as sharper, tougher teeth, etc.

The machine of first degree represents an instrument which uses naturally available energy: animals, wood, water, wind. These energies are bent to the human will. These machines can be unhitched, turned on and off.

The machine of second degree is qualitatively different from that of first degree. With this machine, there is a transformation in the very source of energy. It has its own regularities, its own laws, independent of the makers and the operators. It has its own form. It is not something that can simply be unplugged. The US has 3,000 airplanes and over 147,000,000 cars. We must use them or society as it is now lived would collapse. The machines themselves have their own function, and they condition the humans who use them. They are unforgiving of idiosyncracies and mistakes. People have to obey the needs of the system. People must follow its regularities. The greatest example is the modern city.

Some people dream of beating atom bombs into plowshares, but how is that possible? And further, what would we do with so many plowshares? How can we deal with all the waste we make? Los Angeles is 70% concrete roads. How can we do away with all these ways of incommunication? How can we dismantle the cities – and yet how can we go on as we are? There is no real escape, and escapism into drugs, crime, violence or whatever will only exacerbate the problem. In the

past we could localize the culprit, but now that is not possible.

Today we stand in a technological trance. When we study Africa we speak of the totem. Perhaps we should look at ourselves with the same categories. Technology represents the new totem. We sometimes brag about the vast number of discoveries made during the last 50 years. But what is the quality of these discoveries? We have fabricated some 25,000 metal alloys. The Navahos have 324,000 ways of using the verb "to go". There are 700 words in Arabic for camel. We do not question our own assumptions.

The technological society was implemented to make humans free and happy, but this simply has not been fulfilled. We have lost sight of the goal and have become entranced by the means, the mediator, the intermediary.

Technological society cannot be generalized. It does not provide the model for the rest of the world. Six percent of the world population consumes 40% of the available resources and controls a total of 60%. Its possibilities and energies are limited. Before World War II the system was relatively open. Now, the system has closed, and in a closed system any increase in one area implies a decrease in another. We are experiencing an arithmetic increase of entropy. Our life style cannot be sustained on a world scale. In the technocratic complex any progress implies regress in another area. Whether we ignore the world as maya, throw bombs or preach reform, we all share in this quandary.

We must delve further and deeper into this issue than the Arms Race. The West suffers from a set of syndromes that create an air of myopia: the postponement syndrome which treats the current moment as mere preparation for the real thing

coming later; the intermediary syndrome which imposes an instrument or a technician between us and our experiences; individualism which takes the insular as autonomous; fragmentation and specialization which prevents anyone or any body of people from controlling the controller.

We are experiencing a radical mutation, a qualitative transformation, in the human being, in the nature of society and in history. This has been symbolized by the split of the atom. But we must delve deeper into the meaning of this mutation. The major characteristic of this mutation is the technocratic society.

Let us offer several intra-cultural reflections on this new world.

1. There is an essential difference between traditional technique and contemporary technology.

In English we can speak of technique and technology. Both derive from the Greek *techne*, which means "art", "skill", "making", "shaping", "giving form". It implies poetic creation. Human consciousness gives shape to matter, and this occurs first and primarily through language. Technique is the craft of the artist. The spirit of Man incarnates itself in matter and continues. This life-giving creator pours life into matter in order to produce an artifact. To do it, the artist has to be inspired. Without the spirit, he or she cannot produce.

With technology, the ratio replaces the spirit. Each product of *techne* is unique; mass production belongs to technology. To produce one automobile is impossible. Technology needs the second degree machine. Technology itself becomes an instrument, and in so doing transforms itself into an end. *Techne* occurs the world over as a cultural invariant. All cultures have artifacts,

arts, skill, beauty. Not all cultures, however, have experienced technology. The computer and the airplane come from Western civilization alone.

2. Technology is more than applied science.

Technology certainly encompasses applied science, but the entire pan-economic ideology is added. The technocratic complex and civilization as a whole back it up. The computer implies that thinking be tightly ordered, confined and molded. Science could be theory only, but technology always has an element of praxis as well as theory.

3. Technology is the specific attribute of contemporary Western civilization.

Technology forms the specific, but not the dominant attribute of the West. Other cultures do not see that it is so important, and that is why they do not resist the invasion of technology. Other things are more important to them. Technology has essential links to the culture that has given birth to it.

4. Technology is not neutral.

Many self-styled prophets of the modern age have claimed that science is universal and that technology is culturally neutral. Nothing could be more patently false, and the very claim reveals a certain Western- and techno-centrism. Technology certainly does not prove to be a cultural invariant. Its spread represents the Westernization of the world. Western culture stands incompatible with other cultures on many levels. The introduction of science amounts to a Trojan horse. This will become clear as we look at some specific traits of technology.

5. The technocratic society gains an autonomy from those who created it.

Once the technocratic society gains a critical level of momentum, it becomes independent of both Man and Nature. Human beings create it, but once created, the technological complex takes over and dictates the patterns of how to live. We must submit to the megalopolis - standing in lines, banks, insurance, income tax, traffic, laws of all sort. All civilizations have had slaves, but at some level, Men were the masters and could control the slaves. But now the mechanized slave of today is more powerful than we so that the slave now exploits and enslaves us. Thus, mechanized Man becomes a slave of a master more powerful than any lord of old.

6.   Technology arises out of a mechanical and gravitational vision of the world.

The technological worldview values quantity and mechanical causality. It arises from the post-Galilean and post-Newtonian worldview. Mass, force, speed and acceleration dominate the qualitative and value-laden aspects of culture. Hence it could be characterized as a gravitational vision of the world.

7. The technological outlook presupposes that Man is different from and superior to Nature.

The technocratic society is tinged with a myopic strain of anthropocentrism peculiar to Western culture. The rise of humanisms of all sorts characterizes the tendency to see the individual as an autonomous source of truth and reality.

8.   The method proper to technology is experimentation and interventionism.

Perhaps the best example for this point would be to compare Western medicine with the traditional arts of healing in India and China. In Western medicine,

in order to know, you change and intervene, you isolate and probe. But this is not the only way to know. It is not a complete form of knowing. Until the 16th Century the dissection of corpses was simply not done anywhere in the world. This was not because it could not be done, but because the body was considered a holy temple whose essential spirit would be lost if violated by the scalpel. Now the modern world routinely demands an autopsy in order to "certify" a death. Moreover, all the Western psychologies - be it that of Freud, Jung, Adler, Rogers - all take the same approach. They try to bring out clarity and distinction. This again cuts the whole of experience into pieces. But this approach is far from being universal. Other cultures try to know by seeing. Traditional skills of meditation and contemplation, which form a homeomorphic equivalent to Western psychology, consist of a faith in the harmony, health and order of the universe. The technological society has no room for that.

9.   Technology presupposes that reality is objectifiable and thus subject to thought.

Technological thinking splits reality in two: subject and object. It always locates the reality of things over there. Things are seen as dead and constant. Hence, they can be manipulated, controlled, calculated. Technological causality has its basis in probability and logic. Due to this emphasis on calculability, we have lost the experience of being surprised by reality.

10.   The space and time of technology differ from that of human time and space.

Here the watchword would be interchangeability. In mass production, a certain homogeneity of time and space is assumed which differs markedly from the

human experience of qualitative, value-laden time and space. Christianity, Marxism and technology claim a universality that many other cultures cannot accept. The latter do not want to lose identity.

11.   The techno-scientific world assumes that matter is inert.

The material world is considered dead and lifeless. In contrast, the animistic worldview experiences matter as a living source of reality.

12.   There is an epistemological nominalism in the technocratic world.

Scientism tends to be ontologically and epistemologically nominalistic. It distrusts words, metaphors and symbols,

and prefers signs, graphs and equations. Words are reduced to being mere labels. What does it mean? Science cannot explain. Technology assumes a split between being and thinking. Hence it cannot enter the heart of reality.

Without this vast set of assumptions, the technological world could not function. For other cultures to enter that world, their traditional ways of being and thinking must step aside and disappear.

Techne is transformed into technology by acceleration and the machine of second degree. With acceleration, the very rhythms of nature are interrupted. It does not allow for the recycling of time. To accelerate these rhythms means to become a consumer of energy and resources.

III.   CULTURAL DISARMAMENT

"You cannot simultaneously plan for war and peace."
                  Albert Einstein, *New York Times Magazine*, June 23, 1946

A.   A Phenomenology of Peace

Peace appears to be emerging as a symbol for our times. No other symbol seems to have the power and universality of peace. What then are symbols? It is through symbols that we construct the world of value and meaning. Symbols comprise the bricks out of which myths are created. They differ considerably from concepts. While a concept confines meaning to a univocal sense, a symbol opens out into many values and many meanings. A symbol embodies itself in a field of relationships. It involves a cluster of subjects as much as objects.

Let us outline a genetic approach to the problem. As we have discussed earlier, Peace consists in a set of relation-

ships. It is not an ontological state, but relates genetically to the consciousness of conflict. Conflict and peace arise together. The greater the conflict the more pressing the need for peace. In conflict-free times peace is taken for granted. The adolescent discovers peace while dealing with the conflicts of growth and maturity. The mystic finds peace by passing through the dark night.

Peace has a somewhat feminine quality. Warriors and the founders of empires have always tended to be male.

Peace appears in three forms: a) the resolution, b) the solution or c) the dissolution of conflict. Let us look at

each one separately.

a)   A conflict is resolved when the one who has created the trouble has been eliminated. The resolution occurs when we go to the past, to the *status quo ante*, to the *ante bellum*.

b)   The solution to conflict entails going forward to the future. It is not found in eliminating the cause of the conflict, but rather in victory over the enemy. Peace comes at the end. One strives for the *status ad quem*.

c)   The dissolution of conflict is found in the present, in the *status quo*. It entails a transcendence of the situation. It is found in the *status in quo* or the *status transcendens*.

A sharp division of means exists with these three attitudes to conflict. The first seeks to eradicate evil and hence morals have a priority. Tradition is held most important. The second seeks victory through action. The historical process becomes the most highly esteemed aspect of reality. The third consists in a way of gnosis, and with it truth takes primacy. The problem is dissolved when one sees or realizes the truth. It speaks of the path of interiority, mysticism and spirituality.

We could say that Peace is "meta-natural". This does not mean that it is anti-natural, supra-natural or a-natural. It comes neither from the human nor the divine. Meta-natural implies that it comes naturally, but without being the automatic or even the normal state of affairs. It has to be achieved, conquered, merited, accepted. It is given to you, but you must be worthy of it. It is not inborn and innate. It thrives in the process of becoming, which implies activity, movement, dynamism.

B.   *Peace and the Cosmic Order*

In previous eras, God, Empire, *Dharmaraja* and the like were the symbols of an uncontested unifying myth. So too were Democracy, Civilization, the Classless Society. No longer, however, do these symbols ring so convincing; they have lost their unifying efficacy. Peace, as a concept or a doctrine or a worldview, likewise lacks such unifying power. But as a symbol, as a polyvalent and poly-semic reality, peace may become such a symbol for our times.

When we look at all the various cultural expressions of the idea of peace, what emerges as the underlying assumption or conception behind all the words for peace? What comes out as the root metaphor? On what does peace rest?

The most common denominator seems to be the basic belief that there is a cosmic order: *rta, ordo, dharma, armonia, sat, being, pratityasamutpada*.

The idea of order etymologically comes from the root *or* or *ar*. *Ordior* means to weave, to put order in the threads. *Ar* means to join or put together. The arm, *arete* (virtue) and *ars* (art) all derive from the root *ar*.

St. Augustine defined peace as *"tranquilitas ordinis"*, the tranquility of order. Peace has variously been identified with Brahma, Yahveh, Christ – all representing the fullness and order of the cosmos. With conflict, war and violence, however, this order has been disrupted. Again, disruption and disorder have been variously conceived as sin, *duhkha, Sünde*, a schism, a rent in the cosmic fabric. The fundamental question then arises: How can we make the cosmos whole and well again? How can we bring order back to it? Peace is that which

recovers the original order.

Once disrupted, there are two ways to correct the order: inner and outer. The inner path is like that of the archer in Oriental martial arts. The heart of things has been disrupted and that is what must be righted by discipline and interior struggle.

The outer path looks to the practical, exterior workings. It sees the machine that does not work, locates the problem, and replaces the part. It situates the disruption in the outer world. If it is cold, use a heating furnace.

Peace requires a correlation of inner and outer, of sacred and profane. An intimacy and enclosure must exist between the two.

The problem arises when the two realms fall away from each other and become separated, when one is developed at the expense of the other. As it is said in the Gospel of Thomas, the Kingdom comes when the inner is like the outer. *Ecclesia* and *Imperium* meet. The link between the two consists neither in an inner nor an outer relation. Space, time, destiny and order all belong to both. Contemplation leads to action. It is not the case that we simply need to change consciousness or merely change the structures and all the rest will follow. Both sides require radical reworking. The relationship is neither heteronomous, nor autonomous. Rather it is an intrinsic or ontonomic relationship. Peace comprises the propriety of things, not the private property of one privileged side. It does not fall within a private/collective framework. We need to change reality, which includes both consciousness and social structures. We must begin with ourselves, but we must end with others. The vicious circle must be transformed into a vital cycle.

In order to discover the deeper meaning of peace, dialectical thought must be overcome. Peace is a mystery that surpasses the human intellect. It will not come with some kind of manipulation of consciousness designed to change the social structure. We must have a foretaste of that inner peace. One begins with oneself – the soul, body and the intellect. These are not just a window out of which to look from a safe vantage point, but a bridge which interacts as a part of the reality.

Although not exhaustively so, there is a passive aspect to peace. Peace cannot be imposed. It must be found. It comes as the fruit of a revelation, and implies an acceptance and assimilation, like Siva drinking the poison, or like Christ bearing the sin of the world. Peace means acceptance of the world and of others.

To build a positive notion of peace, we must begin by identifying the blind alleys. As in negative theology, the first step is to recognize what we should not do or say. As we have already outlined, the arms race stands as the foremost blind alley.

A second blind alley takes the shape of the pan-economic ideology. In this worldview, everything depends on economic competition. It entails the monetization of life. One is as valuable as one's purse. There is a great link here with technology, as we have already indicated. Related here as well is the scientific outlook. As important as it is, it has been extrapolated far beyond its proper realm and has come to dominate our entire view of reality. Common to both is the quantification of life. Money allows for this. Excessive quantity is not cumbersome in money, and this is true of money alone.

Positive suggestions to continue and

further the human pilgrimage would begin with the correction of how we see the human being. We have been operating on an improper idea of what Man is. We have no space here to go into details. We could begin with Parmenides' identification of thinking and being, or even with René Descartes' "Cogito ergo sum". In this style of thinking, Man is understood to be a thinking machine. Sentiments belong to passion and should be overcome. The idea of Man as a rational animal began with Aristotle. The Latin interpretation of what Aristotle said came out as "animal rationale". But what Aristotle actually said was, "the animal through which the logos passes". The ratio means the total faculty of becoming aware. Logos means the word, the faculty of making sense of life. It means to converse, to have intercourse. It is the deepest exchange of love and thought.

We need a new anthropology. There is no word if there is no speaker, spoken to, spoken about and spoken with. These are the four dimensions of reality. If I am a speaking being I am not alone. I need you. And this exhibits a power which reveals something above us. Word can be put into dance, song, and gesture.

A new unifying myth seems to be emerging, one centering around Peace, but we cannot artificially create a myth. Cosmic and human harmony may be possible; but we cannot force such a union. The urge for Peace must transcend utopic whims and steer clear of the platonic dream. Reality is not stacked two stories high, the shadowy cave here and the real thing outside, above and later. Peace does not require paradise - all it takes to start the momentum of peace is people willing to listen and work with each other.

C. Cultural Disarmament

To come to some final conclusion we may add that the process of disarmament will never even begin, or if started it will soon be jeopardized by some third party arming itself, unless we seriously entertain a concomitant cultural disarmament. Only true cultural disarmament can guarantee that the move is not a merely strategic one. For any human group, especially a nation, to claim it shall disarm is not only utopian but also irresponsible unless this move is accompanied by a parallel cultural disarmament. What is this cultural disarmament? It is the insight into the inherent flaws of "our" culture and the vision that the Way of Life which has led us to the present day predicament needs a radical revolution, a total metanoia. Here is the place for cross-cultural studies, learning from other cultures how they have envisaged life and the dynamics of common human living with one another, the rest of the living beings, the earth and the divine beings.

Since the 19th Century, there has been many thinkers in the West to indict the present-day Western civilization in unambiguous terms. We do not need to enter into this argument now. We may simply become more and more aware of the growing consensus on the fact that the Western technological civilization is running down an avenue with no exit. Now, our suggestion is not that we should change direction, but that we should not run at all. We should walk, to begin with. More and more people in all parts of the world are awakening from the technological trance by recognizing that technology does not "deliver the goods" which it has itself promised - to speak with its own language. This process is a global one. It has to begin somewhere and a gesture towards military disarmament may be a move in the right direction, but it will not last unless followed by a vision of reality congruent with the first move. This will also imply an emancipation from the grips of technology by overcoming the technological attitude towards reality: as objects, means, etc.

Cultural disarmament also implies giving up the generally subconscious claim that the present day culture is superior to any other culture of the world, that it represents the end product of an evolutionistic progression, that it is universal and thus adaptable to any people on the planet. We should recognize the achievements of Western culture and the feats of the scientific era, but we must become aware at the same time of its internal contradictions, its totalitarian tendencies and its superiority complex - without entering now into the origins of such an ideology or offering a further analysis of it.

Further, if we follow this line we shall discover the pattern for another type of disarmament, namely the non-violent and intrinsic one. There is no point in imposing such a disarmament. It would not even be understood or meaningful, besides that it would not last long. It has to come out of a new vision, new experiences and a positive overcoming of the disenchantment with the dreams of the techniculture. It is a process of conviction, of growth, of error and trial, of dialogue and learning, tasting, groping, questioning and experiencing where the true values of personal life lie. It is not a disarmament by force. It is the discovery of a new land. Although we see only from a distance and our vision is still blurred by the vapors of the machines, we may begin to sense that firm land and new green pastures await us.

P U B L I C A T I O N S

Cultural Disarmament and Peace

by Robert VACHON

1) The Need for Cultural Disarmament

Were we to achieve nuclear or military disarmament, would we have Peace? I think not. For, as I said in 1972 at the North American Consultation of the World Conference on Religions for Peace (1), to approach the peace issue in terms of Disarmament, Development and Human Rights, is a Western and monocultural enterprise, even if there are also people from different cultures and religions who partake in this approach. Of course it is a valid perspective, but it is not the only one in existence, nor is it necessarily the most important. There are others that have not yet reached the heart and soul of Western man and which are provided by Native American, African, Hindu, Buddhist, Chinese or Arab civilizations.

For instance, the Oriental world of Hindu and Buddhist persuasion is less concerned with Disarmament than it is with *Aparigraha* (2), less with Develop-

ment and Evolution than with *Karman* and *Yajna* (3), or what could be called Cosmic Solidarity, less by Democracy and Human Rights than by *Dharma* and what I like to term Dharmacracy (4). Other similar instances could be drawn from other cultures - African, Native American, etc.

That is why I submit that, in order to have Peace, a nuclear or military disarmament is not enough. We also need a cultural disarmament. I would even go further and submit that there can be no nuclear nor military disarmament without a cultural disarmament. For one of the deepest causes not only of the arms race but of conflicts and finally of the lack of peace, is not first and foremost the abuse of power on the part of a given culture, but the conviction that one's culture is superior to everybody else's and that it should become the universal norm for everyone.

The deepest reason for the lack of

Peace stems from the belief that Reality, and hence Peace, can be reduced to the understanding or consciousness we have or can have of it.

Hence the need for a twofold cultural disarmament.

HORIZONTAL

On the one hand, a horizontal one, which consists in a radical de-absolutizing and relativizing of our respective cultures, in the light of other cultures across the globe. This applies to all cultures, whether modern-western or other. The focus of the process should be, however, on the best dimensions of one's own culture and with the utmost faithfulness to the latter's unique and irreducible character. The issue therefore is not whether we should deny one's culture, affirm it or not affirm it. It is rather that of relativizing it in all its dimensions; not only in its socio-economic, legal-political and religious aspects, but also in its premises, whether epistemological, anthropological or cosmological. I shall exemplify this later with regard to the modern-western culture. It is strange indeed that, living in such a pluralistic world, we are so little concerned with reflecting on the intercultural foundations of Peace. By that I do not mean simply calling on people from different cultures to study the different ways of achieving Peace. But rather that we should equally make sure that the very question itself of Peace be not exclusively posited and defined according to the criteria of one culture, but also of all the cultures existing in the world at the present time.

No one culture or religion, however modern, traditional or cross-cultural it may be, is self-sufficient enough on the one hand to provide adequate solutions to

the world's problems or to those of any human being, and on the other to even posit the question of Peace properly. It is necessary to penetrate as deeply as possible into the various cultures of the human tradition. But even that is not enough.

Vertical

There is also a need for a vertical cultural disarmament. It consists in liberating Life (and hence one's own life) from the exclusive grip of one or all cultures, but by passing through them. Obviously, everyone wants World Peace. But always one's own version of it: the Peace of the civilized, the Peace of the Primal peoples, the Peace of modern development and progress, a White Peace, a Black Peace, an Islamic Peace, an American Indian Peace, an Asian Peace, a Western Peace (capitalist or communist), a Buddhist Peace, a Confucian Peace, a Christian Peace, an African Peace, etc. Religions think they hold the key to it: religious, theocentric or spiritual Peace. The Humanists likewise: a humanistic, secular or anthropocentric Peace. The Cosmics also: the ecological, cosmocentric Peace of Nature. Others talk of Intercultural, Global or Transcultural Peace. Others, finally, speak of transhistorical and cosmotheandric Peace. One thing is obvious: any statement on the subject of Peace, however open and all-embracing we may conceive it to be, can never be other than particular and provisional. Peace itself, however, can neither be reduced to any one notion we may have of it, nor even to the sum of these notions. Peace is a notion which transcends each particular culture as well as the sum total of cultures. It is a mystery which transcends the human intellect.

Peace does not consist in merely

preserving our traditional cultures, in opening up to modernity, nor even in accepting our different ways of life and co-existing in mutual indifference or resigned tolerance. It requires a meeting, an understanding ('standing under'), a common horizon, a new vision. But this in turn requires that we acknowledge together a center which transcends the understanding we may or can have of it, at a given moment in space and time. In short, in order to have Peace, we cannot assume that we know what Peace is. Neither before, during, nor after our effort towards it.

Overcoming Our Individualisms and Sociocentrisms

Peace requires that we strive to overcome all our individualisms and sociocentrisms. We need to relativize not only the convictions, beliefs and myths that we are aware of, but also the assumptions that we are not so easily aware of, one of the most important one being often that of believing that reality and hence Peace can be reduced to the understanding we have or can have of it. Reality can neither be apprehended, planned, mastered and hence reduced to the measure of our individual (nor even our collective) consciousness. No amount of knowledge nor experience can encompass it, even if it be of the inter- or transcultural kind. For, strictly speaking, nothing can be labeled purely cultural; we are always dealing with a transcultural reality. And yet, nothing is purely transcultural either, for we are always moving within a given culture. So to speak thus of the radical relativity (horizontal and vertical) of Peace is not to fall prey to the relativism of the skeptic. What we are talking about is the wisdom of Peace, but a wisdom which is ever and constitutively in search of itself.

2) A Concrete Example : the West

Development

Thus, Peace cannot be equated even with the loftiest notions of Civilization, Westernization, Modernity! Nor with the purified notions of Progress, Evolution, Development, as most often used nowadays.   It is often said that "Development is the new name for Peace". In my view, this is a very dangerous statement. Development may be one window on "the Good Life", but it is far from being the only one. Originating in Western civilization, it is a notion which is too closely bound to a Western view of the good life. Therefore it can hardly express the radically different visions of Peace that come from Asia, Africa or Native America (notions such as *Rita*, *Dharma*, *Moksha*, *Sunyata*, Sacrifice and Cosmic Harmony).

Justice and Human Rights

In the same way, Peace should not be reduced to our purified and loftiest notions of Justice, Human Rights, Equality, Autonomy and Mastery of our destinies. They are of course all worthy and valid notions in themselves, but they all stem from a Western anthropology which does not and need not constitute the basis of Peace from the point of view of those other human traditions. There are, for instance, many cultures - African, Asian, Native American - in whose original traditions there is no word for "Right", because their relationships are conceived in terms of "duty-of-infinite-gratitude" towards one's ancestors, one's community, the cosmos, etc. This is the case, for example, with the notion of *Dharma* among the Hindus, of Thanksgiving among the Mohawks, of Community among Africans, etc.

Another example is that of ownership and equality. Two notions that are considered by the West as universal, but which, in fact, are completely foreign to cultures who see their relationship to land as being one of belongingness to it and as one of duty and stewardship. Relationships between humans on the one hand and other life forms on the other, are perceived as hierarchical but in a circle where there is no concept of superior and inferior, each one playing a different but important role within the whole.

Democracy and Nation-State

It must be understood that I am not here opposing the western notion of democracy. But I do contest the totalitarian claim that there can be no other choice except between democracy and totalitarianism. As if there were no decent political society possible outside of the one that is based on this particular form of political anthropology and as if we had a duty to export it throughout the world.

I would also draw your attention here to the fact that not only is democracy incompatible with mass democracy, but that the notions of majority-minority, as well as those of voting, giving orders, sovereign Nation-State and even those of political parties and distinct governments, need not always be the constituents of social organization. Such is the case, for example, with the Native Indian societies. They are not only based on consensus, but are generally stateless and without someone who gives orders. Furthermore, their notion of democracy is radically different from that of the anthropocentric West at its best, since, for them, "the People" does not mean humans only but also every living creature. It is a cosmocentric notion.

We can therefore say that the West does not have the monopoly of the notion of democracy; furthermore that democracy per se, even ideally, offers no more than one view on political society; and it is neither the only one, nor necessarily the best.

Were we to follow through with such a cultural disarmament, we might be less prone to export and impose our democratic notions of political peace to those who live on the basis of different systems that are not necessarily inferior to our own. We might be less inclined to be violently judgmental of peoples who, we believe, enter into the 20th Century and into the realm of peace and freedom, only when they become sovereign Nation-States along the lines of our so-called 'universal' democratic principles . We might be less prone to erode and destroy their traditional political systems in the name of democracy. We might also be less prompt to equate western democracy with its historical forms, the more recent one being that of the sovereign Nation-State in its double identity of market-democracy and bureaucratic-democracy. This might allow us an in-depth renewal of democracy. It might then be possible to sort out our basic organic political identity from the secondary functional identity of the modern Nation-State. We could, in other words, recognize that, in order to be "of this country", we need not necessarily be a citizen of the sovereign Nation-State which calls itself Canada (or Quebec).

Schooling

A number of other illustrations could be given (5). I shall limit myself to stressing the importance of not reducing education to schooling and literacy. To say that Peace requires education does not mean that everyone should go to

school. We know how the confusion between academic culture and educative culture has destroyed traditional educative cultures throughout the world. Again, we are not opposed to schooling, but to compulsory schooling for everyone and everywhere, to this literacy-schooling-which-feels-it-must-replace-the-oral-traditions-and-their-traditional-educative-cultures. Cultural disarmament implies a sort of de-schooling, not in the sense of rejecting all schooling, but in the sense of relativizing its importance, its necessity and its ideological foundations of scientific objectivity. We need to rediscover the organic dimensions of education, which is more philosophy (love of wisdom and wisdom of love) than technology and systemic-bureaucratic planning. Functional thought is not to be discarded, but subordinated to substantial thought and ultimately to Life. Ultimately, it means refusing to believe that the Good Life is merely an outcome of our rational projects, management and engineering. It means accepting the belief that Mind is more than reason, that Man is more than his Mind and that Reality is more than Man.

Anthropology

Western anthropology is homocentric, i.e. it sets Man at the center of the universe. Modern anthropology goes further and sets the individual person and his autonomous decision at the center of human living. Peace thus becomes primarily a human and personal, i.e. individual, question. But for two-thirds of humanity, things are seen differently; their anthropology is cosmocentric. Man is but one of the dimensions of the Great Cosmic Circle. He also must sacrifice himself with and for the Whole. He also must harmonize to the Whole. Peace then becomes a cosmic issue; the person grows to the extent that the " individual" disappears.

And what if Peace were also an anthropocosmic or even a cosmotheandric issue?

3) Emancipation from the Megamachine

The cross-cultural foundations of Peace cannot be sought "in abstracto". While avoiding the pitfall of interpreting all technology as the devil's work and of falling prey to reactionary technophobia, and while carrying out the struggle to improve and humanize technology, harnessing it to the service of all cultures, we yet have to become aware of something which our modern mind fails to understand. We need to realize the unique character of today's technology and techno-science, namely, that it is no longer a mere instrument or neutral tool which can be used for good or bad, but that, by its very nature, it cannot be humanized. It has become a megamachine which cannot be used in the service of Peace. Cultures cannot co-exist with it.

If we seem condemned to deal with it, we need not embrace it. We need rather to learn how to emancipate ourselves from it, without however trying to destroy it directly. Were we to try to do the latter, we would be imitating it and finally we would become its victims. To emancipate ourselves from it consists in leaving it to its own self-destruction.

Conclusion

In short, real Peace can only come about where there is neither victor nor vanquished. No military, intellectual nor even spiritual victory can bring about Peace. How is this possible in a world where balance of power and abuse of power are the rule? That is the challenge! Peace through cultural disarmament and emancipation from the technocratic complex. The question of Peace

indeed shakes the very foundations of Man, of Society and of Reality itself. It is a sword which pierces through the marrow of our souls and calls for *metanoia*, a mutation. It is founded upon the knowledge which is blessed ignorance, that wisdom which is constitutively in search of itself. It is born when we really begin to believe in the impossible, for true freedom does not lie within the realm of a choice between various initiatives, but... beyond. Its realm is that of Hope against hope, of the impossible, the non-manipulable, the incomprehensible.

NOTES

[1] R. Vachon, "The Urgent Issues of Religion and Peace", *Revue Monchanin*, Sept.-Oct. 1972, no. 36, pp. 19-26.

[2] Non-appropriation, non-thesaurisation, non-possession.

[3] *Karman*: selfless action; *Yajna*: sacrificial action, i.e. forgetting of self. Both are actions that are constitutive of the Cosmic Order.

[4] *Dharma*: natural social order and duty; *Dharmacracy*: a government stemming from Cosmic Order, as opposed to *Democracy*: a government born of human decisions; human governments.

[5] C.f. R. Pannikar, "Alternatives to Modern Culture", *Interculture*, Oct.-Dec. 1982, no. 77, pp. 2-69.
- "Alternative à la culture moderne", *Interculture*, oct.-déc. 1982, Cahier 77, pp. 2-69.
- "Emancipation de la technologie", *Interculture*, oct.-déc. 1984, Cahier 85 on *"Le développement, un requis universel?"*, pp. 22-37. English edition to be published in *Interculture*, 1986.
- " Is the Notion of Human Rights a Western Concept?", *Interculture*, Jan.-March 1984, no. 82, pp. 28-47.
R. Vachon, "Quelle coopération internationale? D'une coopération intégrationiste à une coopération interculturelle", *Interculture*, avril-juin 1983, pp. 18-35.
- "Pour une réorientation radicale des ONG", *Interculture*, oct.-déc. 1984, pp. 38-63. English edition to be published in *Interculture*, 1986.
- "Intercultural Education and Attitude Towards the Two-Thirds World", *Interculture*, April-June 1985, no. 87, pp. 20-35.
- "Système politique intégrationiste et identité culturelle", *Revue internationale d'action sociale et communautaire* (to be published, December 1985).
- "Autogestion et développement : la tradition autochtone contemporaine", *Recherches amérindiennes au Québec*, vol. XIII, no 1, 1983, pp. 35-43.
- "Autodétermination politique et culture politique autochtone traditionnelle", in N'tsukw and Vachon, *Nations autochtones en Amérique du Nord*, Montréal, Fides, 1983, pp. 282-306.
Tremblay, Jacques et al., "Relations de l'homme à la nature dans les sagesses orientales traditionnelles", in *Ecologie et environnement* (Cahiers de recherche éthique, 9, Montréal, Fides, 1983, pp. 151-167.

Articles

Annual Index

INTERCULTURAL HORIZONS, published by Monchanin Cross-Cultural center, $4.00 per year (including program of activities).

A quaterly bulletin published separately in French and in English which offers, in a critical and journalistic manner, to inform you about serious intercultural questions that touch the peoples of Quebec and elsewhere. It includes columns covering diverse intercultural exchanges, activities within the cultural communities and publications touching upon intercultural areas.

THE MONCHANIN CROSS-CULTURAL CENTER / LE CENTRE INTERCULTUREL MONCHANIN is a center for education and research on cultures of the world and on intercultural relations. Founded in 1963 and incorporated (Quebec) in 1968.

SERVICES

o Resource persons   o Consultations

o Library   o Counseling

o Publications   o Cross-cultural training for professionals

ACTIVITIES

o Friday intercultural forum o Sensitization workshops

o Total immersion seminars   o Colloquia

o Symposia   o Research