

TOWARDS A NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMAN ORDER?
Contributions to the Manila Workshop*

by Johan Galtung

Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin
Wallotstr. 19
1000 Berlin 33

April 1983

1. Introductory Remarks

It is remarkable that this conference has been convened by the University of Life in the Philippines and the University for Peace in Costa Rica, and is concerned with the most basic perspective that could ever be introduced on the international order: not the economy, nor the technology, nor communication - simply the human perspective, whatever that may mean in concrete terms. The conference has not been convened by any institution in what refers to itself as the "First World", nor from the socialist "Second World". It comes out of institutions in the South and is already based on an axis of cooperation that nobody would easily have guessed in advance, between a country in Southeast Asia and a country in Central America. In this there is already a strong, positive, first message, a message of structural change, of countries in the South seeking together in cooperative patterns, inviting others to join, not waiting for countries in the North to take the initiative. May the North get this message!

And there is also a second message, more negative in this connection. Nowhere that I know of in the North is there anything referred to as the University for Life or the University for Peace - there have been efforts in this direction, but they have a tendency to be short-lived. On the other hand there is no scarcity of universities of death and universities for war: the Anapolis, Westpoint, Sandhurst or the Frunze Military Academies - just to mention some famous ones. As is well known at least 40% of the world stock of scientists work for the military machine, and out of them at least 95% are in the North - a strong dedication to death and war instead of to life and peace as should be the basic concerns of people who have been given the privilege of academic training.⁽¹⁾ I am afraid there is a message in this from the North, and it is not the message of vibrant optimism but rather a message of decay and death. Systems heading for their own disintegration.

This alone makes the concept of a "new international human order" a very attractive one. But the question is, of course, what the

concrete meaning beyond the formula would be. When reflecting on it I did not use the standard intellectual approach of analysing each one of the four words, starting with "new". Rather, I started with the acronym, NIHO, and tried to pronounce it. How does it sound - relative to NIO, NITO and NICO for the economic, technological and communication orders? I tried to pronounce it and it came out like Chinese, it came out very close to *ni hao* Chinese for: are you well? - how are you? And it struck me that in this there is already a hidden code expressed in the world's most spoken language, and what the code says is simply this: the key to understanding to the New International Human Order would be at the level of the individual human being, and of how "well" he and she is.

And that brings us straight to the theory of basic human needs. Exactly what these basic human needs are will and should always be a matter of dispute, it is even a basic need of human beings that those needs are his and hers, not something imposed from the outside. However, in my experience there are both universality and specificity in the basic human needs: there is something found everywhere, and there are specifications that vary in space and time, from one region and one country to the other, down to individual variations. I have found it useful to operate with four such classes of needs that seem to be relevant everywhere: the need for survival, the need for well-being, the need for identity and the need for freedom.⁽²⁾ I do not presuppose any ordering among these needs, that some of them have to be satisfied first and then the time comes for satisfaction of the others. I see them as being more on the same level, of having the same standing except under very extreme circumstances where the sheer struggle for survival and for some absolute minimum of well-being in terms of food, clothes and shelter will take priority. It should be noted that among these needs the first two, survival and well-being, may be said to be more oriented towards the human body, more material whereas the other two, for identity and freedom are more oriented towards the human mind and spirit, more non-material.

However, as always in human affairs there is no strict dividing line. Human affairs always defy neat categorizations.

In discussing these classes of needs permit me to make some references to our host country, starting with the most basic of all basic human needs: the need for survival. Obviously, if it is not satisfied we can forget about the other needs. And that very need is today threatened in the most fundamental way possible, we are all living with the danger of nuclear extinction as a reality, for us and for our children. And the old military means held to guarantee security, a strong defense, today seem to guarantee insecurity rather than security because of the strongly offensive character of the means of defense - so strongly offensive that the other side will have to try to wipe them out at the earliest possible stage in a war. The president of this country, Ferdinand Marcos, put it in the form of the basic question that today is burning in the minds of most Europeans, West and East, forcing very many of them out in the streets for the most impressive demonstrations of post Second World War Europe against the nuclear terrorism under which we live:

"Do not these bases endanger unduly the safety of the Philipinos and the Philippines not only from conventional armed attack but possibly from nuclear attack?"⁽³⁾

And on another occasion he makes the following point:

"If there is one lesson taught by Vietnam, it is that military alliances are no guarantee for survival."⁽⁴⁾

In other words, conventional wisdom leading to strong military and strong alliances is today questioned, and even fundamentally so. In this there is no change of allegiance from one world system to another, nor is there any capitulationism. There is neither neutralism nor pacifism implied. It only means that many people today feel that security can better be guaranteed without strong offensive means of retaliation, focusing more on purely defensive

defense and then possibly a strong one - based on conventional military means, guerrilla and non-military resistance, as clearly implemented in such a European country as Yugoslavia - and in a clearly non-aligned manner, outside alliances and bilateral ties to one super-power or the other.

With regard to well-being I would also like to bring in an important point made by the president of this country:

"Whom does the father take care of most? Is it not the smallest child because it cannot take care of itself? The same is true of national families."⁽⁵⁾

I see in this a very basic point relating to basic needs: First priority to those most in need! A good pattern of social development is that which lifts the bottom of the population first, letting the upper levels wait for a while till the rest of the population is catching up. This is a rather important aspect of any basic needs strategy. Rich people also have "basic" needs, they are certainly not at the minimum level but may be experienced, felt by them as equally basic: that of becoming even richer. Hence, any basic needs strategy without solid priorities being given to those most in need could easily turn into a travesty of that very concept.

Turning then to the notion of identity I think another important point has been made by the president:

"The welfare and socialist states of the West have been established not by social revolution but by imperialism: colonialism built Western socialism. But the new nationalism, even with socialism or communism as a goal, cannot pursue the development of its own society by imperialist means; it can only, if it chooses "colonize" its own."⁽⁶⁾

President Marcos is here touching on what in Latin America is known as the theory of "colonización interna". It is a very important concept: a government can compensate for its lack of colonies by

establishing colonies inside its own country, squeezing its outer provinces and its masses so that they can deliver the surplus that will go into enriching the few. Clearly no government with real respect for the survival, well-being and also identity of its own people would engage in such a policy but in line with the second quote given above give top priority to the weakest, most endangered or marginalized part of the country. This becomes particularly important in times of economic crisis where governments will try to do everything they can in order to squeeze out some extra money here and there. And it also becomes very important in the context of identity: if the country controls means of communication in general, and mass media in particular, then it may also "colonize" its own by cultural means, depriving some sectors of their cultural identity instead of enhancing it.

I come then to the fourth and last class of needs: the need for freedom. I think the most basic point here is not so much freedom of speech and thought, highly important as they are, but the freedom to translate these freedoms into organized, non-violent political action. The key link, of course, is the freedom of association, the freedom of organization of like-minded people to promote their interests, in concert with others doing the same. For most people this freedom is only a reality if it exists at the local level because it is at the local level that most **people** live. In this country that would correspond to the barangay level, a small although not the smallest administrative cell. Self-reliance at that level, real autonomy in the sense of having some command over local resources, including the economic ones will make freedom a reality, not only a beautiful word.

Thus, I have tried to point out some basic aspects of what to me would represent a New International Human Order and if somebody feels that my quotations and perspectives are politically inspired

that is absolutely correct. Nothing could be more political than the search for a new human order, intranational as well as international. Moreover, it is so fundamental, so basic that it cannot be left to others than to human beings themselves, trying to find their ways through history, guided by important ideas and inspiring examples. And here the formulation itself, a "human order" is terribly challenging: on the one hand there is an admonition to keep a very human perspective, even of the individual human-being; on the other hand there is the necessity to try to work it out in some kind of concrete detail without loosing hold of that perspective.

I permit myself to extend my congratulations and my best wishes to the conveners of this meeting, the University of Life and the University for Peace. I think a timely and important step has already been made. I hope that in proceeding further you will keep your axis of cooperation as the main-stay of this venture, and my only advice would be that you should not take advice from people from the First World too seriously - of course with the exception of people coming from small countries in Northern Europe--

2. Concluding Remarks

It is indeed a great honour and a great pleasure for me to try to summarize the discussions we have had on the New International Human Order. It is an honour because it is such an important topic on which to apply whatever one might have of intellectual craftsmanship; it is a pleasure because the discussions have been so excellent.

I think the New International Human Order has three key aspects, and you will permit me to mention them first, and then to comment on them.

First: the New International Human Order has to take in the whole human being, body, mind and spirit, be concerned with human development in its entirety; it is holistic.

Second, the New International Human Order is also concerned with spiritual values and dimensions of human development as a part of the holistic orientation, but this has to be emphasized because it is left out of all other conceptualizations we have seen in recent years.

Third, the New International Human Order, because it is holistic, may serve as a systematic basis for the identification of gaps in other conceptualizations and efforts to bring about human and social development.

That NIHO is holistic implies more than a catalogue with the three elements body, mind and spirit. It is not merely a checklist but also an encouragement to try to look for those patterns of development that would permit human beings to behave as integrated wholes with body, mind and spirit not only, so to speak, in the right proportions but functioning together, woven into true human personalities. There are many answers in human history to the question of how

this can be done, some of them may serve as inspirations today, some of them may sound out of date. But whatever the answers are the approach is important, and this seems to me to be the basic perspective in the New International Human Order.

A missing element in all the important efforts to restructure the world that we have been witnessing in recent decades is the spiritual one. In a sense this is not so strange since it is the basis for the oldest international orders, the oldest non-governmental organizations in the world: those brought about by the world religions, particularly those with claim to universality, the Occidental religions and among them particularly Christianity. But precisely because these attempts are so old some new approaches may be tried. One may even express it this way: religion is too important to be left to religions alone, for clearly this spiritual dimension also has something to do with religion - with the effort to "relink" with "that out there", re-ligio.

Permit me some reflections on the spiritual dimension, with the warning that this is the kind of thing of which Norwegians may have great difficulties talking, not being very spiritual as people. I might even go so far as to say that I think we Norwegians have rather small souls, perhaps the size of a pea at most - particularly when compared with Southern peoples more richly endowed along this dimension. (And when saying this applies to Norwegians, you can imagine what my comment about Swedes would be like--). Nevertheless, I should try to articulate three points about the spiritual dimension that seem to me rather important.

First, the human spirit is the place where we can reflect on ourselves. I think it is what distinguishes us from animals: animals certainly also have minds with cognitive and emotional functions, where memories are stored, where passions positive and negative can build up. But we can reflect on it, and through language even communicate our reflections to others, not only to ourselves. And that reflection

is a condition for the most important aspect of the spiritual dimension from the point of view of the individual alone: the reflection may lead to transformation. We may change ourselves. We may, although this possibly only happens during and after severe personal crises change our own code - the pattern of behaviour also often known as personality. Human beings are poor in instincts but rich in codes, which gives us a certain flexibility. But only a very small proportion of that flexibility is ever made use of. In social crisis of some severity we may even be able to reach down together into the collective sub-conscious, after reflection and dialogue, and change codes we have in common, such as civilizational codes. But that would only take place in the most dramatic periods of history, the real transformations such as in Europe after the decline of the Western Roman Empire and after the decline of the High Middle Ages.

Second, it is through the spiritual dimension that we can also reach out to others. In fact, the best definition of love that I can think of would be intimacy of body, mind and spirit. We all know that only rarely do we achieve all three and let no one speak badly about those moments when we achieve "only" one or two of them. It may also be that our concept of love has been too much tied to that which passes between man and woman alone. But the notion of love as closeness involving the totality of human beings remains as one of the most precious possibilities on earth, one of the goals steering us through life and giving us the peak experiences of our existence. The very fact that this is possible from one corner of the world to the other - and perhaps you will excuse me for mentioning that this is a very basic experience of my wife and myself coming from opposite parts of the world - gives testimony to the enormous human capacity for love as well as evidence of how little of it is made use of.

Third, in addition to the spiritual dimension enabling us to reach into ourselves, reach out to others we may also say that

it enables us to reach up, or as it is commonly said: spiritual uplift. We all know that strange feeling, perhaps also not coming too often, when certainly we feel a kind of nearness to something much beyond ourselves, something transpersonal, something cosmic. The late Arthur Koestler referred to it as the oceanic feeling, a feeling of floating in the universe. In the Occidental religion this feeling is identified with closeness to the Creator, to Yahve, God, Allah. In the Oriental religions of Hinduism and Buddhism gods are metaphorical, the feeling is there but it is seen as a link to something transpersonal that is not expressed in the form of a personal God. In other words, the feeling is universally human; the verbal expressions we attach to it when we try to describe it may be different. Under some circumstances we feel it more strongly than under other, and under those circumstances we may feel a contact with generations past and future not normally enjoyed. In the Occident this contact is often attempted achieved through prayer, in the Orient more through meditation. The forms of religious experience are many.

Permit me at this point some reflections on the world religions since they are crucial to our effort to come to grips with what a New International Human Order might possibly mean. Actually there are only a couple of aspects of them that are important in this connection, but they are on the other hand extremely important. Thus, I think it should be emphasized that the Occidental religions in addition to the teaching of the existence of a personal God who is attentive to our prayers have two rather strongly held tenets of faith with sometimes disastrous implications: universalism and singularism. Both Christianity and Islam perceive of themselves as valid for the whole world, as universal. Moreover, they also conceive of themselves as the only valid ones, nobody or nothing else is equally valid. But this means that the personal gods of these religions become rather jealous characters, protected by a class of high priests zealously guarding the principles of universalism and singularism through often very violent missionary activities and attempts to eradicate

whatever competitive systems of belief might arise.

One does not find these two ideas in Oriental religions. They are much less concerned with the compulsion to disseminate the gospel to the very end of the world; they are much more able to see themselves as a component in the system of faith an individual, a group, a nation may build up rather than as the only component. As a consequence the Occidental religions become concerned with global architectonics, with making the world safe for their religion, thereby pitting Christianity and Islam that are so similar in their ambitions against each other in battles of terrible hostility, of which we have hardly seen the last. Oriental religions become more inward oriented, less concerned with global constructions. One might even go so far as to say that the Occidental religions become too outward oriented at the expense of neglecting the inner life of human beings whereas Oriental religions become very inner oriented at the expense of a certain lack of concern for what happens in the outer world. A better balance is certainly called for. A task for NIHO?

This is also clearly seen in the secular off-springs of the Occidental religions: liberalism/capitalism which is the legitimate child of Christianity and Marxism/Socialism which is the illegitimate child - illegitimate in the sense of parenthood not being recognized. They are both universalist and singularist, claiming that the whole world would be better if their system was predominant. As a consequence they are pitted against each other in wars of a kind we know only too well in Occidental history, and with the universalist aspirations the Occident is trying to export this dichotomous, combative perspective on human affairs to the rest of the world. The consequences are disastrous, in all fields: economically, politically, militarily, culturally, socially - and spiritually, reducing us to hostages of that nuclear terrorism engaged in by some right and left wing extremists.

It is reflections such as these that I think would have to be taken into account in our effort to work for a New International

Human Order. We simply cannot tolerate that the human quest for a spiritual life is monopolized by any particular faith which in addition also has universalist aspirations. We cannot tolerate it for the simple reason that the means of coercion at our disposal today, including weapons of mass destruction, are of such a kind that any such orientation becomes a luxury we can badly afford. Nor can we tolerate that the spiritual dimension is cut off from concerns with economic, political, military, social and cultural aspects of the human order - nothing against individuals or great magnitudes of people living in monasteries devoting themselves mainly to a spiritual life, but such a world would also have economic, political etc. problems and it would be the task of the NIHO to look for solutions and not ignore such problems.

Then, there is the identification of gaps. No international order can be human if some humans are excluded from it. The world in which we live gives much too much power to the middle-aged at the expense of the old and the young, to males at the expense of females, to the university educated at the expense of the less educated. We live in a World of MAMU's (Middle-Aged Males With University Education) and one could add of WASP's (White Anglo Saxon Protestants). And one could add: able-bodied, or at least so they/we conceive of themselves/ourselves. The quest for that precious quality referred to in Latin America as dignidad, dignity is impossible if some groups are excluded - not only for those groups, but also for the others, the so-called privileged, that are deprived of association with those whom they marginalize. All are included, as pointed out by Ambassador Shahani.

And one could think of so many other aspects of contemporary life that would be lifted out and up and into the public eye through the focus brought upon it by a New International Human Order. Thus, today we talk very much about "unemployment", but that is usually in the narrow sense of people not having jobs, ways of converting human power into money. But job is not the same as work. Work is the possibility of self-realization through own efforts - creative activity that has not been alienated through social structures. And that

touches the spiritual dimension, hence it is the concern of the New International Human Order, that of constituting economic life in such a way that at the same time it could become spiritual life. Humankind knew better how to do this kind of thing in earlier ages than today. There is much to learn from history, yet even more room for creative activity for the future.

No doubt the New International Human Order would also have moral, perhaps even moralistic dimensions. Implicit in it would be a negative view of consumerism and materialism, not only because it is too much - more than human beings can stomach and more than nature can yield - but mainly because it is too little. It gives satisfaction only to the body and to some domains of the mind; not to the spirit. And one could go one step further and also say that there is a need for new commandments in the world; that the precepts found in Christianity, Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism and other systems of faith may be excellent but not addressing themselves sufficiently to the realities of the world today. Thus, there is not enough about exploitation of nature, exploitation of other human-beings and peoples, of threats and use of weapons of mass destruction and other contemporary evils. Of course there are expressions given to these problems in the languages of contemporary international politics, of UN resolutions, proposals for human rights and so on. But the old form of moral commandments might also be tempting. What could be a more fitting task for a meeting of people from the world's leading religions, including various types of humanisms, under the aegis of the New International Human Order?

Permit me then, going back to the discussions, some more specific comments relating to our topic of concern.

It has been mentioned repeatedly that the New International Human Order calls for generalists. Human being should be seen as a totality, and also as a totality beyond individuals, in a social

setting and a context of nature. But in order to come to grips with that the narrowness of the specialist will be counter-productive. One needs more people, as many as possible that try to comprehend these totalities, sufficiently trained also to see the short-comings of their own insights, to be knowledgeable of where more specialized knowledge is indispensable. These would be people who would relate to specialists trained within more narrow disciplines the same way as the general medical practitioner relates to specialized physicians. In recent years, in the social sciences, there have been three clear efforts in this direction: peace studies, development studies and future studies. Strongly related to each other they are all efforts to come to grips with the totality of the human condition - more or less successful, always in need of criticism from within and without, always evolving, dying if they become dogmatic. In this particular conference I can think of no better example than the First Lady herself with her highly commendable, holistic approach to human affairs as presented in her book The New Human Order.

In a similar vein it is quite clear that we need optimism in order to get anywhere. A realistic perception of what is going on in the world is indispensable. But to give in to it, with all the negative tendencies we can see today, sinking into the comforts of pessimism, converting it into inaction through modish cynicism, is too cheap. I could also add, as an intellectual: it is too intellectually easy, it is second rate. Anybody can be an empiricist and derive good arguments for the pessimistic outlook; it takes considerably more to build on empiricism and criticism and develop a constructivist approach with visions of viable alternatives and feasible strategies. In this particular conference I can think of no better example than Robert Muller, the UN Assistant secretary general who after 35 years of service in the United Nations still manages to keep smiling - a remarkable feat that makes one believe in the strength of the human spirit, almost in a life after death. An inspiration for us all!

Then, everything we try to say about a New International Human Order may become dangerous, even reactionary if the realities of the present world are not taken into account and taken seriously. A search for the spiritual dimension should not become an excuse to pay workers lower salaries, compensating by sending them to church instead. The flagrant inequalities found in the world of today, the absence of peace and dignity, the need to build autonomy through self-reliance; all this has been brilliantly pointed out by Don Rodrigo Carazo; a perspective never to be lost sight of. As a matter of fact I think the major danger implicit in the quest for a New International Human Order is exactly that one does the opposite mistake of the one made by all others: an over-emphasis on the spiritual at the expense of everything else. That would make NIHO reactionary.

Then, the word "international" has been criticised, particularly by Dr. Pedro Nicken. It has been pointed out that if this should mean "inter-governmental" then it would become very narrow indeed. Governments will handle that which they think they can handle, and that means generally matters that can be solved in such a way that governments come out on top. But just to take one example in another direction: a New International Human Order would be unthinkable unless there is a high level of freedom of travel. Human beings should have a right to meet each other, and the means of communication and transportation should be affordable for all - as in the tradition of the hadj, Muslim pilgrimage to Mecca. But not only individual humans and countries should have relations to each other, also cities, municipalities, communes all over the world as today is happening more and more. And one day in the future relations spun among sub-national territorial units, as today among the member organizations of international non-governmental organizations, become more and more important and will make our world still richer in its structural possibilities. Governments are not to be excluded, but not to be taken too seriously either.

Then, it has been pointed out by many that the quest for a New International Human Order in no way should be seen as antithetical

to the work done by the United Nations in this and many fields. It should be seen as complementary, as informed by the various UN approaches, as pointed out by Dr. Perinbam. In fact, through the work made by the Philippine government the UN has already given its endorsement of the concept, just as it has endorsed the University for Peace.

So, NIHO becomes one more effort to push us a little bit forward, or at least to stem the tide towards destruction. By doing such efforts it will also be profoundly political; politics in itself being neither clean nor dirty, although there certainly are clean and dirty ways of doing politics. I have tried to indicate that in the four classes of basic human needs some entry points can be found for a New International Human Order; some of them are also firmly entrenched in the rhetoric of contemporary politics at the national and the international levels. I have also tried to point out how there is a connecting formula in all of this, the formula of self-reliance, at the individual, local, national and regional levels. Self-reliance means simply relying on one's own forces and resources and economic factors first; then, when they have fully made use of relating to others in an equitable manner, through exchange. It is often seen as a sign of maturity since it is the opposite both of being dependent and of making others dependent on oneself - among individuals, among local communities, among nations, among regions.

But even if basic needs and self-reliance today may sound like good guiding lights they are certainly open to criticism, and they may be superseded tomorrow by something much better. Hence the importance of seeing NIHO as open, open as a concept, open in terms of membership. It calls for both teaching and learning, and for dialogues all over the world about what it might possibly mean in concrete terms, how it can be promoted, how it can become what we all hope it might become: precisely a more human international order.

And like all orders it has to have a symbol. There has to be some short expression understood by everybody that embodies that something above the ordinary struggle and competitions among individuals and groups and nations and regions of which we have more than enough. And here I can think of no better symbol than one that is used and understood by everybody around the world, particularly among young people, found on benches in parks, on trees in the fields, on stones and on houses:



Appendix: An Ever More Difficult World - by Johan Galtung

Dividing the world in North and South, in West and East, gives the four worlds on which the analysis is based; North-West, North-East, South-West, South-East:

	WEST	EAST
	<u>First world:</u>	<u>Second world:</u>
	Private capitalism	State socialism
NORTH	OECD countries	CMEA countries
	<u>Third world:</u>	<u>Fourth world:</u>
	NIEO	Ichi-ban
	South America	China, Japan
	Caribbean	Korea, Taiwan, HK, Singapore
	Africa, Arab World	ASEAN in general, Indo-China
	West, South Asia	Australia, NZ, Oceania

To get at some of the dynamics of this scheme let us for a moment try to capture the world situation from the US point of view. The general thesis is that the US is deeply involved in four conflicts, of different nature, each of them deep and extensive and intractable. To wit:

- with the Second world: a military-political conflict with the Soviet Union, over basic values and basic interests, with an accompanying arms race that absorbs more than 30% of the domestic capital formation - presumably much more - with no success in curbing the race and the probability of a major nuclear confrontation far from zero. With 97% of the targets in the North and 3% in the South it is easily seen that that means.

- with the Third world: an economic-political conflict of liberation from networks of neo-colonialism, some of it fought in an institutionalized form in UN fora, some of it in open international defiance, much of it as guerrilla movements fighting both the US and a government linked to the US.

- with the Fourth world: an economic competition that, by and large, the Fourth world has won ^[1] - not yet in the sense of topping the world statistics but in the sense of having dynamism, initiative, growth. ^[2] If Japan fails, the mini-Japans may take over; if they fail, the People's Republic of China may take over - all of them using the rest of the Fourth world as a reserve for capital, labor, raw materials and markets. ^[3] As a next wave of challenge there are the ASEAN countries.

SECRET

- with the First world: as a result of the other three conflicts a certain estrangement between the US and her allies in the First world is increasingly visible - the US being seen as less overpowering in her strength (relative to the Second world), less straight in her international morality (relative to the Third world), less unbeatably rich in her capital accumulation (relative to the Fourth world). The strong, rich and moral is in the process of transformation towards its own negation - in First world eyes. No other country in the world is exposed to a process of status erosion so profound, and so dangerous.

Economically this cannot but lead to the prediction of continuing decline in the relative position of the First world. The question, however, is how this decline is absorbed inside the society: by elites pushing it on the people through unemployment and decreasing purchasing power, or by going down that difficult and unexplored road called economic decline together? Obviously these are the conservative and social democratic approaches respectively, but we are badly prepared in the First world for this, not even having a theory of economic decline, much less a management of decline.

In the Second world it is hard to imagine big economic changes to the better given the international situation and the static nature of the economic structures - it is also difficult to imagine major differences in the distribution between elites and people in the years immediately ahead, particularly after the defeat - at least so far - of the Solidarity approach in Poland. Political changes might be more likely than major economic ones.

In the Third world the NIEO gives such advantages to the elites that they should be able to capture most of the growth of the country as a whole, leaving the people (75-95%) in a period of stagnation or decline. This will lead to ever-increasing gaps, to be filled with military and police to keep the masses at bay.

In the Fourth world the ability to distribute is an important asset. There will be growth, less spectacular for Japan, more so for the next in line, and parallel for elites and peoples, at least for the countries inspired by Buddhism - less for the Christian ones.

With what kind of world does this leave us? A very problematic and dangerous one, to say the least. The economic point of gravity changes, from the NW to the SE corner of the world. The political point of gravity slides towards the Third world to the extent that UN votes are important. The military points of gravity, in an old-fashioned and badly working balance of power formula, remains in the North, divided between West and East. This is not to say that the old formula, with all three types of power firmly anchored in the world North-West was better: it conferred much to little power on the rest of the world, much too much on the few who used it badly, to exploit and repress and fight among themselves and are now suffering some of the consequences of their maladapted behavior in a world increasingly becoming a world-system. Being very far from a world government with sufficient power over these forms of power a much better formula would have been a balance of power along all three dimensions, not the type of division of labor in power specialization we are now getting.

As it now stands three already discernible patterns may become much more pronounced:

The First world will react with the power it has in excess and abundance, military power, eg in the form of rapid deployment forces, against the militarily weak, ie the Third and [less] the Fourth worlds. The condition for concerted action is that there is a general dependence in the First world on commodities, particularly oil and gas. Efforts to become independent, or dependent on the Second world, will be frowned upon as it leaves less reason for wielding military power. By and large efforts to use military power will be accepted, even applauded, by a population in general economic decline (as in the Falkland/Malvinas exercise). And it will use economic embargoes against the Fourth world when Fourth world superiority really starts hitting. [4]

The Second world may engage in something similar but more regionally, towards border countries only (as in Afghanistan) and with more of a military motivation and out of fear of threat to party political monopoly.

The Third world will continue to decry all of this, and the elites will

use strong anti-imperialist rhetoric to make people believe that the old enemy is still the major force responsible for the cleavages inside the country. There being neither force, nor money behind the [strong] words, they will tend to pass largely unnoticed.

The Fourth world will continue to push forward economically, and being composed of countries with highly uneven level and type of development there are many surprises still to come, particularly for the First and Second worlds who, steeped in their racism and white supremacy thinking, will always be late in understanding how they are overtaken by other parts of the world. The general world economic decline will, of course, also affect the Fourth world - but it is assumed that even if the First world closes itself to much of the trade, there are sufficient markets in the Second world, the Third world elites and the Fourth world itself still for some time to come. But it will take much time before this leap forward is accompanied by the usual panoply of global political manipulation and military pressure tactics.

Too much change, too soon, for a world badly adjusted to the change it has already undergone. And yet the drive of private capitalism for profit, of state socialism for control, of the NIEO for a fair share in the world capitalist system and of the world South-East to beat them all at their own games are strong; they will tend to continue unabated, at least at the elite levels in all ^{four} worlds. But what about the people level? They will probably be more interested in the other two possibilities, state capitalism and private socialism, demand the former through elections and/or in elite efforts to imitate Japan and the japoncitos, and take refuge in collectives, communes inter-family cooperation etc., as people will do under crisis. The governments will decry the latter as withdrawal from the formal [and controllable] sectors; but it is hard to deny people the right to defend themselves. And yet those acts of self-defense, local, self-reliant, may well become models and presursors of what elites will have to do at the more national levels: increasing self-reliance, in an increasingly problematic world.

[1] The U.S. and Japanese Council, an advisory body to the prime minister, predicts that the Japanese GNP per capita will be far ahead of the US GNP per capita by the year 2000 - \$ 21,200 as against \$ 17,000.

[2] The picture given by world trade statistics is relatively clear. The share of the US in world exports of manufactured products decreased from 22.6% in 1955 to 12.3% in 1977; that of the EC remained rather stable - from 46.4% to 45.0% in the same period; Japan increased from 4.0% to 11.9% and the four mini-Japans from almost nothing to 4.5%. If we focus on the developing countries alone and look at the share countries and groups of countries in that category have, then the four mini-Japans stand out with an increase from around 20% in 1955 to 59.2% in 1977 - with 17.1% for South Korea, 16.0% for Taiwan, 19.0% for Hong Kong and 7.1% for Singapore - all in 1977. Next in line are India with 6.7% (for 1976, less than tiny Singapore with 6.0% the same year) and Brazil with 6.1%.

[3] So, the general thesis about the Fourth world is that of a three-wave pattern, or maybe four. First, of course, there is Japan. Then, the "4 'New Japans' Waiting in Wings to Pose a Fresh Economic Challenge to West" (International Herald Tribune, 25 August 1982): "During the 1970s the economies of rapidly industrializing Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong and Singapore grew at an average annual rate of more than 9 percent, while Japan posted a yearly growth rate of 6 percent. For the United States, the rate was just 3 percent. To be sure, growth has slowed for the East Asian economies during the current worldwide recession. But most economists expect that once the world picture brightens a bit, the East Asian economies will bounce back with a vengeance. They predict that in the 1980s, Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong and Singapore will increase the size of their economies by 7 percent to 9 percent a year while Japan's more mature economy shows annual gains of 4 percent".

Then there is the third grouping, the ASEAN countries (with Singapore as an overlap): "'Follow Japan' Campaign Being Pursued in SE Asia", The Daily Yomiuri, 29 April 1982): "Singapore Prime Minister, Lee Kuan Yew started the Seek-Inspiration-From-Japan campaign several years ago. Malaysia adopted a "Look East" policy, which includes South Korea as well as Japan, after Dr Mahathir Mohamad became prime minister nine months ago. Vice president Adam Malik of Indonesia says his country has much to learn from Japan's giant trading firms". And the article has an interesting sidelight on Dr M in Malaysia: "The first Malaysian prime minister not educated in Britain coupled his Look East campaign with the deliberate deemphasizing of relations with Britain".

And then there is China, in a different phase: "China's post-Mao movement toward a mixed economy already permits Special Economic Zones where foreign businessmen can set up factories, hire and fire workers and earn profits. Now leaders of the People's Republic have made yet another concession to capitalist ways - - individuals who are in business for themselves will be allowed to hire up to seven employees" (TIME, 7/12/81)

(4) The best example of efforts to block Japanese car import is probably from France where the French minister for industries, André Giraud, declared in February 1981 that for each five Japanese cars imported one French car industry worker becomes unemployed. Japanese cars were blocked in the ten hours (Dagbladet, Oslo, 6 February 1981). But penetration has gone far.

It is a telling sign of the superiority of the Fourth world, in this case and so far of Japan, that trade unions insist on Japanese investment. "The Northern Region TUC /trade union council/ has offered total breakdown of traditional job demarcation in an attempt to lure the new Datsun car factory to the region. - - An end to restrictive trade union practices was thought to be the best offer which the TUC could make to ensure that Datsun came to one of three possible North-east sites" - The Guardian, 16 June 1981. And a corresponding story from Italy although it refers to England, again: "O rientra lo sciope-ro o Leyland ai giapponesi", Corriere della sera, 20 October 1981 - referring to Sunday Express of 18 October according to which the president of British Leyland threatened British workers with suspension of a strike or else the whole firm would be up to sale - to the Japanese. In view of the above it is an open question whether that constitutes anything like a credible threat.

One of the clearest symbols of Japanese industrial supremacy was reported in Daily Mail 11 November 1981, witnessed by millions before that: " -- the installation of a 25-ton, 36,600 square foot advertisement containing 10 miles of wiring, for Fuji film, has consolidated the Japanese dominance of the neon in New York Times Square. By the end of the year, 22 of the Square's 30 incandescent ads will promote Japanese goods. The Fuji hoarding is the most elaborate since the Winston cigarette maker used to halo the square with smoke rings".

(5) Thus, Japan won the important competition for the production of "the third car" in India - in addition to the Morris Oxford and the Fiat 1100. "Suzuki clinched the deal with Maruti after months of patient negotiation beating better-known competitors such as Nissan, Renault, Fiat, 8L and Volkswagen. The 800 cc subcompact offered by Suzuki scored over its rivals in fuel consumption (about 65 mpg) and price [\$5,500 inclusive of taxes, which at the moment constitute 40 percent of vehicle prices in India" (The Daily Yomiuri, April 30, 1982).

x presentations given at the Workshop on the New International Human Order, April 7-9, 1983, Manila, Philippines.

[1] For an exploration of a code of ethics for research, see Johan Galtung, "Science Assistance and Neo-Colonialism: Some Ethical Problems", chapter 7 in Papers on Methodology, Ejlers, Copenhagen, 1979.

[2] For an exploration of the theory of human needs, see Johan Galtung, "The Basic Needs Approach", chapter 3 in Katrin Lederer, ed., Human Needs, A Contribution to the Current Debate, Hain, KBNigstein, 1980.

[3] Times Journal, April 21, 1975

[4] From "The Revolt of the Poor", Notes on the New Society of the Philippines, II, Manila 1971, p. 47.

[5] Quoted by O.D. Coronel in an article, "The State, the Church and Political Maturity", Manila Times, 4 April 1983 - the quote from Marcos is given as being from 1972.

[6] From "The New Society", in Today's Revolutionary Democracy, Manila 1971, p. 105.