

PEACE AND BUDDHISM

by Johan Galtung

Université Nouvelle Transnationale
154 Rue de Tolbiac,
Paris 75013

February 1985

1. Introduction: Some comments on "peace".

In order to explore the topic "peace and buddhism" there is a general methodology which is certainly not very original, but very useful. Whenever there is a question of relating X and Y, it may be a good idea to present some thinking about X, then some thinking about Y, and then some ideas about compatibility or conflict, harmony or disharmony or simply irrelevance, between X and Y.

I shall follow that format, and take them in the order of the title, starting with Peace, then Buddhism. And this I shall do at a fairly high level of abstraction, the present paper being in the field of social philosophy rather than concrete contemporary politics.

Thus, I do not intend to discuss balance of power policies, particularly prevalent in the Occident, or the power centre theories, particularly prevalent in the Orient.⁽¹⁾ To a large extent these are peace theories of the elite, obviously in the interest of the elites' monopolising and wielding their power - but ^{they are} not necessarily peace theories. Rather, I shall have as a point of departure one very simple insight: that peace has something to do with entropy, here simply taken in the sense of "disorder".⁽²⁾ However, that term does not quite connote the idea. Disorder sounds like something messy. The basic point is not messiness in any pejorative sense, but high complexity of the system: many and diverse components, and many and diverse ties of interaction between them.⁽³⁾ The underlying thinking would be that the moment the system tends to crystallise, the number of types becomes smaller, the concentration on one point more pronounced, and the links of interaction no longer fill the total space or possibilities but tend to connect certain types only and often mainly in a negative way. At that point the system may look very orderly, but is in fact poised for battle. In conflict theory this state of affairs is known as polarisation, as when two alliances are pitted against each other, most of the interaction takes place between the leading powers (super-powers) and within them only between the leaders (super-leaders). A "summit meeting" is the typical example.

Against that image of unpeace or peacelessness, I would like to sketch, very briefly, an alternative image. This image presupposes immediately that one is willing to consider that peace has to be discussed and understood not only as peace among nations, but also as peace within societies, within human beings and with nature. It has to be understood in the space of nature, humans, society and the world. In all four spaces there seem to be two common factors that are necessary conditions for peace: diversity (between the types mentioned above) and symbiosis (the interactive links mentioned above). In nature this would lead to ecological balance. In humans this would lead to rich, mature human beings, capable of developing several inclinations within themselves and letting them play together. At the social level it leads to pluralistic, even fascinating societies, not fragmented into different parts but with the parts interacting with each other, constantly evolving. And at the world level this would lead to active peaceful coexistence between several systems, not only between two as Soviet theory has it (and they, in addition, do not practise that excellent theory inside their own society; they gamble on only one social type, "socialism").

It is easily seen how different this image of peace is from current reality. Even at the level of theory, both East and West today think about peace as if it were compatible with war with nature, destroying the ecological balance which has as its basis diversity and symbiosis; at the same time bringing forth, simple-minded, often dogmatic and materialistic human beings; at the same time trying to have one system dominate the whole world. There is no sense of the value of diversity, that it is not only unnecessary but even harmful when one social type dominates society, and world, alone. Both spaces can evolve through symbiosis between diverse parts, e.g. "socialism" and "capitalism" together.⁽⁴⁾

With significant diversity and symbiosis / ^{deficits our} world becomes a warlike system, with efforts to control ^{violence} / through balance of power policies. However, when ^{such} / policies are based on offensive arms, (arms that can be used to destroy the other side, not only to defend one's own country), the outcome seems always to be arms races because the other

side cannot possibly know for certain whether the assurances that the arms are for "defensive purposes only" are true.⁽⁵⁾ And arms races almost invariably lead to war.⁽⁶⁾ And that is our situation, our predicament - as briefly told as possible. We all know that a nuclear war of any proportion is something that simply must not take place.⁽⁷⁾ Hence, our prospects are not too bright, to put it mildly.: we are building war structures, not peace structures.

2. Buddhism: Twenty strong points for peace

I then move on to the second part: buddhism. In the world as a whole, buddhism is the major system of belief that, to my mind, comes closest in its way of looking at the world to the type of dynamic, highly complex peace theory just indicated. I shall try to explore this point by dividing it into two parts: twenty strong points in buddhism in the sense that they are highly compatible with active pursuits of peace, and six weaker points, in the next section. At the end, then, I shall try to draw a balance, relating the images of peace and of buddhism presented.

- (1) Very basic in buddhism is the anatta doctrine of no individual soul. It should be pointed out that this does not rule out something that might correspond to an occidental soul concept at a collective level. What is ruled out is the strong, occidental emphasis on individualism, and the individual as something unique, specific, detachable and particular. The anatta doctrine certainly does not rule out unity in a transpersonal "soul" - in short unity with all humans, wherever they are, transnationally, across any kind of borders (by age, gender and race; by nation and class) and with nature, and not necessarily only the biosphere, or only animals. One might perhaps say that where in christianity identification points up from individuals here and now, via Jesus Christ to God (more or less mediated by the Church, depending on the type of christianity), in buddhism identity extends in space to everybody, downwards (if one may use that expression at all) to non-human nature, and backwards and forwards in time through the principle of karma and re-birth (as distinguished from the Hindu concept of transmigration where an individual soul is involved). Thus, the anatta doctrine makes for a very high level of identification with everything alive in past, present and future, even unity. Anatta should in principle

counteract fragmentation - even uniting individuals that otherwise /^{may} be pitted against each other in a fight for God as each individual sees him, translated into more secular causes if God starts waning. A phenomenon only too well known in the Christian world.

- (2) A consequence of the anatta doctrine is the ahimsa doctrine, non-violence towards all forms of life, certainly including animals (a reason why buddhists ^{tend to be} vegetarians). Ahimsa should not be seen in terms of egoism or altruism; these are concepts that presuppose individualism with the egoist being the individual only trying to maximise his own benefits, even at the expense of others and the altruist being the individual trying to (9) maximise the benefits of others, even at the expense of himself. Within the anatta doctrine the ahimsa doctrine should be understood as a simple norm not to hurt others because hurting others is the same as hurting oneself. For Gandhi this was absolutely essential, his unity-of-man doctrine being the pillar on which his construction rested. (10) Needless to say, a strong non-violent doctrine is highly peace-building, but problematic if some parts of the world are non-violent and others are not. Hence a concept of defensive defence! (11)
- (3) Ahimsa, non-violence, is nevertheless a negative formulation - it means a (not) himsa (violence). This formulation is taken from the pancha-shila, with five precepts, all of them negative (in addition to abstention from taking life, one should also abstain from stealing, from adultery or sexual misconduct in general, from lying, and from intoxicating drinks). The pancha-shila should be seen in conjunction with the pancha-dhamma the five deeds that are formulated positively. One of them is metta-karuna, translatable as "compassion". In other words, one should not only abstain from violence but also feel compassion towards all beings, everywhere. (The other four deeds are "good vocatioⁿ", which would exclude the sale and making of weapons and liquor, "positive control of sexual life and passions", "telling the truth" and "mindfulness, carefulness" - in the sense of abstaining from negligence, carelessness). From the point of view of peace theory, this is important: in the very entry buddhism there is a basis not only for negative peace, but also for positive peace, not only for absence of war, but also for positive relations. (12)

- (4) A basic idea of buddhism is what one might call the collective ethical budget, the idea that buddhahood is something we reach together; not the same as self-realization of the individual, but Self-realization of all. I see no reason why this thinking could not also be applied to the world space: the well-being, development and security of other countries is also well-being, development and security for my country. If I hurt and harm the other party at the individual or collective level we can no longer develop together, ^{not even} reach each other. I may triumph alone, but that is also all. In principle this type of thinking should lead to a new kind of trade theory where I build up the other party through cooperative arrangements,⁽¹³⁾ and to a theory of not only common security (the Palme Commission) but cooperative security.⁽¹⁴⁾ Some of this might take the form of world institutions such as the United Nations peace-keeping forces; more important today is perhaps efforts to build one's own security without reducing that of the others, for instance through defensive rather than offensive weapons.⁽¹⁵⁾ In short, the collective nature of this thinking would take the form of "my security is your security and vice versa", leading to a concept of additive rather than subtractive security.⁽¹⁶⁾
- (5) Basic in buddhism is tolerance, first within buddhism with the famous dictum of 84,000 sects, a history practically speaking with no holy office to protect doctrine, no inquisition and no intra-religious wars. But there is also tolerance of other systems of belief, making it possible to combine them with buddhism to a large extent, or to coexist with buddhism. There is pluralism rather than singularism, there is unity in diversity, and there is also a symbiotic use of the diversity as witnessed by the ability of buddhists to integrate other types of thinking in their own approach.⁽¹⁷⁾ In peace theory this means that the condition of diversity of types of attitudes and behaviour is highly compatible not only with buddhist thought but also with buddhist practice. Sharp lines of confrontation are avoided; there is a search for compatible ideas and actions as an expression of unity.
- (6) The doctrine of the middle road is a philosophy, expressed as a concrete approach to life. The basic point is "neither too much nor too little", an approach that will tend to make buddhists

non-fanatic. In the field of attitudes and belief this would imply a tendency to stay away from extreme positions. This could, in turn, make buddhists, like quakers, useful as bridge-builders, as contacts between the extremes, perhaps pulling the extremes towards a more "pragmatic" buddhist position.

- (7) The middle of the road policy is a concrete manifestation of the point above. In material life this means neither too little - the basic needs have to be satisfied - nor too much - accumulation of riches should be avoided. The implication would be relatively egalitarian societies, less concerned with materialism, and great care in economic life so that others are not deprived of the possibility of a middle of the road life (the unity of man principle would play a role in this connection). What is here seen as a social doctrine could also be a world doctrine among countries: no country should ^{consume} too little, no country should ^{consume} too much. More particularly, no country should ^{consume} too little because others ^{consume} too much; no country should ^{consume} too much because it is taken from others that consequently ^{consume} too little. Again, from the point of view of peace theory this obviously gives a strong basis for positive peace policies based on equality, equitable forms of exchange, cooperative behaviour.
- (8) Small is beautiful: for the simple reason that the type of cooperation needed to move forward towards buddhahood, with human beings constantly interacting, ^{helping} each other, can only be meaningful in smaller units.⁽¹⁸⁾ Even a buddhist mass movement like the soka gakkai, with its mega-manifestations, seems to be at its best in the small, in face to face groups.⁽¹⁹⁾ But in general this type of thinking would be more typical of hinayana buddhism than of mahayana (of which soka gakkai may be said to be an example). From the point of view of peace theory, small social units seem to be more peaceful in all four spaces (nature, human, social, world), among other reasons because there will be more steering mechanisms, people telling each other when something goes wrong than in mass societies of mutually fragmented individuals, kept at a considerable distance from the power elite.⁽²⁰⁾ In general, buddhism will tend to favor small units of social organisation, and smaller units - by and large - are less belligerent than the larger ones, if for no other reasons than having less resources for destructive activity.⁽²¹⁾

- (9) Holism: buddhism will have no difficulty thinking and acting in terms of all four spaces, not accepting divisions, man-made, artificial, of the great unity of sentient life. However, of all the four spaces it should be pointed out that buddhism is at its strongest, as a philosophy and as a practice, in human space, and then, also, in its relation with nature. Buddhism is less developed as a canon of thought and practice for social space and world space. There is a certain lack of social doctrine in buddhism, including a certain lack of peace doctrine in a more specific sense - a point that could easily be overcome (I feel) with more active contributions from contemporary buddhist philosophers. The basic condition is there, however: buddhism is non-metaphysical. It is a moral philosophy, to be tested empirically, with no special sphere for the divine as something separated from human beings. Where occidental religions would develop a theology as a science of the divine, buddhist philosophy ("buddhist theology" being a contradictio in adjecto) is freer to focus on this world and as holistically as the problem would require.
- (10) Historically, buddhism tends to be a religion, or system of belief, for the people, or the great masses, rather than for the upper classes and the power elite.⁽²²⁾ Thus, it was expelled from India for being incompatible with Brahminist aspects of Hinduism. In Japan the leading elites adapted the much more nationalist and regressive (state) shintō as their basic orientation, in addition to christianity. In Korea, and to some extent also China, the power elite embraced christianity, and its secular offsprings, liberalism/conservatism and marxism. Thus, in Korea today, one finds aggressive christianity in the South and aggressive marxism in the North, among the elites, on top of widespread buddhism in the people - presumably also in the North - and hence a great peace potential if only the leaders could either step back or reconcile themselves with the general Korean urge for unification. From a peace theoretical point of view, this would mean a great potential for peace politics. With buddhism as guidance, a joint Korean peace policy based on buddhist thinking would have a solid foundation in terms of the masses of the countries involved. But it was too weak to withstand the Japanese (shintō) conquest of Korea; one possible reason why the elites embraced Western thinking as a response. Western thinking tends to be more self-, less self-oriented - more self-assertive on behalf of the believers (Christianity), the nation(s) (liberalism) and/or the class (marxism).

- (11) In buddhism there is no division between creator and created - an essential point in the buddhist unity of all (and not only unity of man) concepts. From a peace theoretical point of view this means that we have only ourselves to rely upon. We cannot hope to get peace in return for obedience to a transcendental God, as part of His grace. It has to be of our own making, as a part of the ongoing creation of the world as made by all sentient beings past, present and future. We have to strive, just as peace is not a gift, but the possible result of conscious, deep, action.
- (12) Closely related: In buddhism there is less of a subject-object distinction. There is not only we watching the world - the world is also watching us; we are in it, but also of it. Concretely this means that there is an ongoing dialectic where we influence the world and the world influences us. Peace is not something we make by shaping the world; it is also something shaped in us in the process. It is our task to turn that dialectic positively. And this is not done by asking occidental questions like "Where do we start, by changing the world or by changing ourselves?" but by promoting those processes whereby positive changes in nature, human, social and world spaces can go hand in hand.
- (13) According to buddhist thinking, there is impermanence in everything, the anicca doctrine. The world is ebbing and flowing, not a rigid structure of global architectonics - but precisely a process based on diversity in symbiotic interaction. It does not make any sense to try to freeze the world in a form or a structure once and for ever. Whatever plan one might make for peace, it has to be a process plan, not a structure plan. From a peace theoretical point of view this is much more realistic than any structural blueprint that lays down for eternity what peace should look like but does not take into consideration the evolving nature of the four spaces in general and the interaction, within and between them, in particular.
- (14) According to buddhist thought, this interaction is always two-way; my consciousness working on the world, the world shaping my consciousness, and so on. To achieve anything one should never try to proceed in a linear manner, pushing a lever forgetting that there is a reactio to every actio. And not try to find one

lever that can be used to move the rest of the system, but trying to work from all corners at the same time. Much better than a major one-dimensional push are many small, but coordinated efforts along several dimensions at the same time, starting in all kinds of corners of material and spiritual reality remembering that the system will hit back in a complex web of interrelations. (23)

- (15) According to buddhist philosophy, the world is filled with contradictions, the whole approach being highly dialectic. Thus, the current Chinese thinking in terms of "one country, two systems" ⁽²⁴⁾ meaning that there can be both socialism and capitalism within one country, the People's Republic of China - is fundamentally buddhist and daoist, certainly not marxist which is a much more linear, one-sided, occidental system of belief. From a peace theoretical point of view one possible implication of this is that one should not try to get rid of contradictions, trying to make systems pure. Rather, a diversity with contradictions is both possible and even desirable. And to strive for a contradiction-free reality is meaningless.
- (16) Buddhist thought is organised like a buddhist wheel, it is not pyramidal and deductive from first principles. Of the various ideas mentioned above none should be seen as more fundamental than the others. Rather, they could be seen as organised around a wheel where all possible lines are drawn between the points as connections to be explored (with the danger that this would lead to bilateralism, always looking at only two points at the time, rather than three, four, many). One important implication of this is that there is no unbroken core of fundamental and final articles of faith; and that the system as a whole is open to new points, meaning new approaches. As the wheel rolls through time, new points come up on top and demand more attention; as the wheel spins the relationships between the points are spun into an ever tighter web of thought and action. Ultimately, it is the totality of all of this that matters, the whole approach being fundamentally holistic, and dynamic - as opposed to a deductive pyramid tying together atomistic insights or "findings". (25)
- (17) Buddhist thought is profoundly optimistic: there is buddha nature in us all if we only realise it. But there is a difference between the hinayana approach perhaps more emphasising

how to avoid dukkha (suffering) and the mahayana approach more emphasising how to obtain sukkha (bliss, happiness). Thus, it stands to reason that from the hinayana school more might be expected in terms of negative peace, and from the mahayana school more in terms of positive peace. Since both are parts of a dynamic peace concept, a buddhist gift to the world would be to combine the hinayana and mahayana approaches, see them as examples of diversity, and let them interact symbiotically with each other. A challenge to buddhism! (26)

(18) The buddhist view of processes tends to be cyclical, not linear. There is neither any definite guarantee that things are going well, nor that they are going badly. There are ups and downs in all four spaces, and that which has come up may come down again just as that which has come down may come up (as opposed to heaven and hell in christian theology these are seen as end states in human evolution, as points of no return). From a peace theoretical point of view the cyclical view may inoculate buddhists against being too optimistic when things go well or too pessimistic when things go badly, thus permitting them a middle of the road position also in this regard. On the other hand, there is also - particularly in the mahayana school - a basic optimism which would imbue the cyclical perspective with an element of linearity, somewhat like a spiral moving forward and upward. (27)

(19) In buddhist philosophy the focus is on continued striving, self-improvement and Self-improvement being not only indispensable but also possible. Neither acts of faith, of submissiveness or acts of Grace from divine quarters (except in amida buddhism) are to be expected, to be hoped for or would in any sense be useful. Much and hard work is needed - a type of thinking entirely compatible with peace theory.

(20) And finally, there is the goal of the whole exercise in human space: nirvana, which can be seen as some type of maximum entropy. It should not be translated as "extinction" or similar metaphors used in western presentations.⁽²⁸⁾ It might

rather be seen as some kind of realisation of the unity of man doctrine, a Self-realisation where the anatta doctrine is fully realised, in a state of constant sukkha. This would be highly compatible with the idea of peace as expounded above, in the mini-peace theory already indicated at the outset. Nirvana is entropy, peace is entropy - hence, in a certain sense peace is nirvana and nirvana is peace And the preceding nineteen points concretizations of this point number 20.

3. Buddhism : Six weak points for peace

But buddhism also has weak points that contribute to explaining why today it does not play the great role as a peace-building factor. That buddhism certainly has the potential for doing. Six such points will be briefly touched upon: those living in buddhist countries may see many more.

- (1) Tolerance is good, but buddhism may also have been led to become too tolerant, for instance of highly violent systems of militarism - like in the case of Japan where buddhists too easily also embraced shintoism and combined the two with confucianism in a highly dangerous way which was most useful for Japanese militarism (the kamikaze suicide expeditions, being a good example). Another case in mind may be buddhist support for military regimes, like in Thailand.
- (2) Tolerance is good, but buddhism may also have been too tolerant of systems practising structural violence, for instance in their economic policies, so that the middle way doctrine becomes a structural impossibility. The result is extreme misery on the one hand and extreme wealth on the other, without buddhists necessarily standing up, fighting the system, in an effort to practise middle way policy. Again Japan is an example of such economic policies, internationally speaking, itself accumulating riches and periphery countries in the Japanese economic sphere experiencing extreme poverty, even misery. But then, at the same time, it should also be mentioned that the income distribution of Japan is among the most egalitarian in the world. ⁽²⁸⁾ And the index of equality varies little over time, meaning that rises and declines come in a parallel fashion for the elite and for the people - both facts to some extent, in all

probability, attributable to the influence of buddhist thought and practice within the country. In a sense this might be taken to indicate that there is more of a social doctrine than a world doctrine in buddhism, but above all buddhism operates as an extremely important doctrine structuring behaviour in the nature and human spaces, at the micro rather than macro levels. As mentioned above, these are the strongest points where the spaces are concerned.

- (3) The idea of working among ourselves in small groups, next to the temple and the tank, in the village, under the guidance of the bhikkhu (monk), is beautiful. But it may also lead to retreatism, to withdrawal. Of the Triple Gem, the Buddha and the Dhamma (the teachings of the Buddha) are available to all. But the Sangha (the order of the monks) becomes marginalised from the rest of society, having its own existence in splendid, micro society isolation (meaning by that both that it is isolated and that it is splendid, practising ahimsa and metta-karuna among themselves). Buddhism becomes privatised, not in the sense of being individualised, but in the sense of belonging, collectively, to small groups on their cooperatively engineered road to buddhahood. The impact on macro society is negligible, or even negative by placing individuals far on the road to buddhahood outside ^{circulation.} social /
- (4) Buddhism may too easily accept that the leadership of a country practises the opposite of buddhism as long as it gives in return freedom of worship. In other words, buddhists like others may too easily accept a concordat with the powers that be, and are of course not immune to the fringe benefits, the emoluments that such a concordat might carry in its wake. Where buddhism becomes a State religion, this danger is very apparent, Thailand being a possible example.
- (5) In the idea of cyclical processes, as opposed to linear processes, a high amount of fatalism may easily enter, accepting defeat too easily even if there is no inner capitulation. According to the cycle, decline is inevitable; however, it is not too dangerous since according to the cycle there will also be an upswing in due time. But since this will come anyhow no real effort is needed. In short, there is some truth to occidental prejudices about the Orient and vice versa, of course. (30)

- (6) Given the five conditions just mentioned, buddhism may easily become ritualistic, ornate, embroidered and very beautiful like in the countless temples in South East and Eastern Asia. ~~But~~ this may also be all there is to it. The focus may be on the buddha as an object of idolatry and on the gasho, pressing the hands together, bowing lightly to the image of the buddha in any position. The focus may be on the dharma, on his teachings as something to be learnt by heart, even in quaint languages (pali, which is the same to sinhalese as sanskrit to hindi, or in very classical chinese and other languages). And the sangha may be something admired but at a distance, not to be imitated. In other words, buddhism may become an object rather than something subjective entering the life of the person as an almost inexhaustible reservoir of insight into human life; a psychophilosophy sans pareil. And that is the recipe for stagnation - which is another way of saying that a religion is dying.

4. Conclusion

Looking through all / ^{the} points just made, the balance sheet is obvious: Buddhism has a tremendous potential^{as a source} for active peace politics, to a large extent untapped. But buddhism has to be revived and kept alive in order to escape the corruptive influences of a world replete with direct and structural violence. Incidentally, I think there are such peace potentials in all religions, but buddhism differs from so many of the other religions (for instance christianity) because by no stretch of imagination can buddhism be used to justify direct and structural violence, war and exploitation. When christianity turns its ugly side up, it spells war; when buddhism turns its ugly side up, it spells retreatism, ritualism. It is our task to have both of them turn their beautiful sides up, and they may actually be quite similar in their action consequences. (32)

It might be useful to remember that the Lord Buddha practised his doctrine, and for all of society. His was not only a religious doctrine, but also a social and political doctrine for the social and inter-social formations of his time. So maybe that is what we are missing: a higher level of consciousness as to what buddhism could mean in practice, with more exercise of inspired leadership to implement the insights.

Of course, there are such inspiring and important examples of buddhist leadership as the former U.N. ~~Sec~~retary-general, the Burmese U Thant or the Soka Gakkai International leader, Japanese Daisaku Ikeda, or the Sarvodaya Shramadama International leader, the/ the Sri Lankan Ariyaratne. The challenge is certainly there. All over the world there are efforts to build more peace-like structures - but they are often missing in ethos. Buddhism is such an ethos, perhaps in search of a concrete structure. Maybe the two could meet, and maybe this could also be a very concrete example of a meeting of East and West, very much overdue?

N O T E S

- * Talk given at the International House of Japan, December 1984 in connection with the conference "Buddhism and leadership for peace", organised by the Peace Research Institute of the Soka University in Japan and Professor Glenn Paige of the Department of Political Science, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii. The talk was also given in Seoul, Republic of Korea, December 1984, in a meeting organised by the Dae Won Pagoda. I am grateful to discussants in both places, particularly to the very lively discussion stimulated by buddhist monks in Seoul.
- 1) Japan emerged with one power centre, Europe with at least two after the Catholic-Protestant split; one tended to develop power monopoly theories, the other balance of power theories. Japan was isolated for a large part of her history and hence not in need of an interactionist power theory, European countries certainly were not. But that does not explain why Japanese gardens tend to have one centre, not necessarily located inside a garden, as usually conceived of, whereas European gardens, particularly the French ones, tend to be based on symmetry. So, maybe there are deeper forces at work, more at the level of cosmology than ideology?
 - 2) For an exploration of this, see Johan Galtung, "Entropy and a general theory of peace", Essays in Peace Research, Vol. I, Copenhagen, Ejlers, 1974, Chapter 5.
 - 3) This perspective, derived from general thinking in ecology on "system maturity" is basic to my own understanding not only of alternative peace theory but also alternative development theory as explored in Development: goals, concepts and theories (forthcoming)
 - 4) Three obvious ways of combining capitalism and socialism would be (a) to have them in different parts of the country, for instance in a federal structure permitting high levels of autonomy, also in basic economic policy, (b) to have the country go through capitalist and socialist phases in succession, more or less planned, and (c) to have a functional mix, some

sectors of society run in a capitalist/market manner, other sectors in a socialist/plan manner. The latter is also known as the social democratic approach, option (b) is perhaps what China has been and possibly still is undergoing whereas option (a) may be a fascinating possibility for the future, although there are some approximations already in the German Federal Republic, within a capitalist framework.

- 5) See my There are alternatives! Spokesman, Nottingham, 1984, Chapter 3.2.
- 6) Op.cit. p. 100
- 7) For one description of the consequences for the nuclear war, emphasizing and exploring the sociological and psychological aspects more than is usually done, see my Environment, Development and Military Activity, Norwegian Universities Press, Oslo, 1982, Chapter 3.
- 8) I am using the words "occidental", "oriental", not geographically in the rather ludicrous "West of Suez"/"East of Suez" sense, but more as a description of a religious/civilisational reality. The occidental space is dominated by the religions of the Old Testament (Judaism, Christianity, Islam) whereas oriental space, as I use these terms, is influenced by buddhist teaching. It should be noted that this would place the Philippines and Indonesia in the Occident, not in the Orient.
- 9) This is in line with the general Occidental tendency to see relations as competitive, as "I win, you lose" or vice versa. In buddhism there is a strong emphasis on the possibility of growing together, and also of declining together because of the linkages of individuals with each other. It is the network of individuals rather than these individuals themselves that matters; the relations rather than the elements that are related.

- 10) See my Gandhi Today, Bertelsman, München 1985 - other translations forthcoming, Chapter 3.
- 11) And this is the basic thesis of There are alternatives!, as developed in Chapter 5.2 in some detail.
- 12) See "An editorial", Journal of Peace Research, Vol. I, N° 1, 1964.
- 13) See Johan Galtung, "Self-reliance: Towards alternative economic theory", Keynote speech given at The Other Economic Summit (TOES) Longon, May 1985.
- 14) The Report of the Palme Commission is called Common Security London, 1983. My critique of that report is found in There are alternatives!, Chapter 4.3. pp. 138-45.
- 15) For a further explanation of this see the excellent book by Dieter Fischer, Preventing War in the Nuclear Age, Rowman & Allanheld, Totowa, New Jersey, 1984.
- 16) To this, however, it could be objected, that if there is real conflict about very basic interests or one of the countries is expansionist come what may, all such considerations would be brushed aside.
- 17) This is beautifully illustrated and documented by one of the major books of our century, Nakamura's rightly famous, The Thinking of Eastern Peoples, Honolulu, the University of Hawaii Press, 1964.
- 18) I will forever remain grateful to my buddhist friends in the Malaysian Buddhist Meditation Centre, Green Lane, Penang, Malaysia for showing me so gently how this works in practice, starting with charts in Pali, continuing with exchanges of merits and demerits experiences, and then with short talks on buddhist topics followed by discussions. The point was not only that the size of the groups doing this was small, but also that it was a group in the sense of not being an organisation with a hierarchy, meaning a priest officiating on top. The role of the monk, the brother, was more like a brother.

- 19) I must relate my own personal experience in this connection which I found so touching. Being a Visiting Professor at the Universiti Sains Malaysia in Penang, I happened to live close by the Pagoda described in the preceding footnote. One Sunday I ventured over, across the Green Lane, and asked whether I might be present at the ceremony. I was most cordially welcomed, and after this had been repeated a couple of Sundays, I was asked whether I could imagine giving next Sunday's talk on a buddhist topic. I immediately objected that I was not a buddhist, only somebody from the protestant north of Europe, not that I was a Christian in general or a protestant in particular, but I was simply interested in buddhism, trying to understand better what it was about. "But that means that you are a buddhist", they exclaimed, adding that buddhism is not a question of sudden conversion, of being something one was not before, but of a process, of becoming. I can testify to this: there is an endless road to walk both ethically and cognitively; buddhism being easy to enter, demanding in the process, endless in its prospects.
- 20) It is interesting to relate this to the theory of indirect democracy. When the system is based on political parties the struggle among them is horizontal, people deciding through their votes which party or combination of parties should rule. But the distance between ruler and ruled may still be considerable; there may be rulers and ruled in all parties, and what changes when the parties change is the group of rulers. When the system is based on referenda and public votes in general over issues, chances are that the distance between ruler and ruled may become less. The rulers will have to rule more in accordance with the concrete and specific wishes of the ruled because the votes are over real issues, not over those issue bundles referred to as parties, permitting the rulers to interpret an election victory almost any way they want. However, what is missing in that type of system is the horizontal struggle among political parties over interests and values. And thus it is that this struggle comes to the forefront in systems based on parties, retaining considerable distrust for the ruled and distance between ruler and ruled, whereas that

distance is decreased in systems (like the Swiss system) based on referendum, at the expense of considerable lack of dynamism inspired by party struggles.

- 21) This is a major finding of the Correlates of War project directed by J. David Singer of the University of Michigan. It is also a rather important argument underlying the "Small is beautiful" thesis.
- 22) One reason for this populist character : buddhism is simply too egalitarian for the tastes of the upper classes, and the ascetic lifestyle of the bhikkhu too modest - for instance in comparison with the upper rungs of the ladder of the Christian hierarchy - to be promising from the point of view of the upper classes.
- 23) This is a major point in hindu, and for that matter also in buddhist philosophy: if one pursues only one goal or value single-mindedly at the expense of all others, chances are that one will not even obtain that one, precisely because of this "complex web of inter-relations".
- 24) The Chinese expression for this, transliterated, is "I guo, lieng zi"
- 25) For further explanation of this theme, see Johan Galtung Methodology and Development, Ejlers, Copenhagen, 1986, Chapter 1.
- 26) To quote the Mongolian buddhist Ochirbal, at the "Buddhism and leadership for peace" conference in Tokyo, December 1984: "What matters is not hinayana or mahayana, but buddhayana!
- 27) And this, of course, would relate to Chinese and Japanese time perspectives in general, less linear, more cyclic than what is found in the occident.
- 28) I often wonder whether this dissolution-into-nothing interpretation so often found in the West is something made by Christian priests in order to make buddhism appear less attractive! Clearly, Christianity derives much of its strength from its promise of eternal life. What buddhism promises is release from the cycles of rebirth, just as hinduism promises release from the cycles of transmigration. Rather than dissolution nirvana is seen as a state of maximum entropy, a state of union where the individual is no longer discernible.

- 29) The Japanese income distribution seems to have three major characteristics: the statistical indices of dispersion are very low; they are relatively constant over time meaning that there are few fluctuations with diverging and converging patterns and, of course, not all benefits can be expressed in monetary terms thus escaping such measures. The latter point should be kept in mind before one becomes too lyrical about the Japanese system.
- 30) To the West "freedom is insight in necessity," although promulgated by leading Western philosophers, has always been seen as the philosophy of the Knecht; the Herr living according to the maxim: "freedom is insight in sufficiency", meaning his own sufficiency, his self-sufficiency. The result is tremendous occidental elite expansionism. To the orient "freedom is insight in necessity" seems to have been much more acceptable, leading to a fatalism passing as wisdom as a cloak for conservatism. As a result oriental elites have been threats to their own, occidental elites not only to their own but also to elites and people everywhere else in the world.
- 31) I think Christianity like other ideologies in the occident come in two versions: one made for expansion and one for protection, in order to be adaptable to the changing phases of occidental history.
- 32) See the last chapter of the book by the Swiss theologian Hans Küng, Christ Sein. Also, read the beautiful preghiera semplice by Francisco d'Assisi. Where is the christological aspect of Christianity in those two? Where is the grace of God? Is it not rather "wer immer strebend sich bemüht...?"

In this paper I have been inspired by buddhist writing and buddhist practice, and particularly by my numerous discussions with plain, ordinary buddhists. I have, however found the following two books quite useful:

Alexandra David-Neel, Buddhism, its doctrines and its methods
New York, 1979

David J. Kaluapahana Buddhist philosophy. A historical analysis
Honolulu, 1976.