

RESEARCH ON IMPERIALISM:
Inter-disciplinary Approaches To
International Relations

by Johan Galtung

Center of International Studies
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08544

September 1986

The Zimbabwe I knew from my first two visits here, in January 1966 and July 1967, was still in the throes of imperialism, and was, of course, named after that first and rather major imperialist in these lands, Cecil Rhodes. I was here to study how sanctions would not work, having as a basic assumption that they constituted a minimum effort to show the world that something was being done about the run-away colony after UDI of November 1965, without intervening with more effective means. That intervention in the workings of imperialism essentially had to be done by the Zimbabweans themselves, violently, non-violently, or (as I would think would be the best) both. Running across one of the regimes security bosses in July 1967 I was asked how much time I thought they had left, and my answer was "ten years, absolutely maximum twenty years". He was of the opinion that they could manage most problems except one: a big, comprehensive, general non-violent march on what was then called Salisbury by the 10,000, perhaps even 100,000, not having the nerves to shoot, to make a massacre--I, of course, immediately brought this piece of information to people in the liberation struggle .

In 1980 the liberation came, and one of my many dreams as an outsider, a dream you very well know, to see not only blacks and whites working together, but black and white children playing together, has certainly been realized--you will permit me my sentimentality in giving expression to this since I saw it with my own eyes yesterday. That there still are bigotted racists among the whites living in Zimbabwe we all know. More interesting from a political point of view is how it has been possible for the blacks,

the real Africans, to overcome so much of hatred, Fancor that they had all reasons to develop during generations of oppression and years of liberation struggle. All of this leads to one conclusion: the experts of imperialism and liberation are here, not we from the outsiders. But a person like I myself can contribute some insight on how it works on the sender side, granted that you are the experts on the receiving end.

Our concern is research and teaching in international relations, focussing in an interdisciplinary manner on the workings of imperialism in Southern Africa. My point of departure, given that although being a Norwegian for the time being I live in the United States of America and do research there, could be to look into the phenomenon known as reaganism. It has been defined by some people as based on two major factors: corporate greed and right wing populism. There is no way of making fast profits in the USA today that can compete with the military industry where practically speaking unlimited funds are at their disposal. Hence, it is in the interest of corporate capitalism in the US to conceive of the world as a stage where its major and most advanced (according to them) actor, the US itself, is threatened in her security at practically speaking all places, at all times, and in all possible ways--transforming each single threat into the construction of some means of violence with a suitable profit margin. At the same time, of course, this permits maintaining the system so that less violence oriented corporations can continue drawing their profits from around the world. I accept this perspective, I think it is a very correct one and a major way

of understanding what happens on the receiving end. In other words, I would certainly have no quarrels with marxism-leninism.

But the picture is not complete, there is more to it. Given the income distribution in the United States it is quite clear that there is not that much of a trickle-down effect. The masses of the US population do not necessarily share in this reaping of profits around the world. There is a limit to how much they share the spoils, in other words. Thus, only five percent of the US population have any income above US dollar 50,000, only one percent above US dollar 100,000--and below US dollar 50,000 life is not that glorious, particularly given the forty million of the population living below what is declared as the poverty line (right now around US dollar 11,000). What is there for them in this view of the world, which is considerably more than just an image, it is also a very well known recipe for action?

This is where right wing populism enters. It has been described by some as the secular religion of the United States, and in my version it runs approximately as follows.

On top of the universe is God, white, male by definition christian. The rather plebeian Puritans who came to the continent of North America, populated by the indigenous in the early sixteenth century saw themselves as His Chosen People, and the lands as the Promised Land. Theirs was the idea of a pact entered into with the Almighty and the pact ran approximately as follows. If

the population kept their side of the promise, meaning the Ten Commandments God would keep his side, meaning helping His Chosen People.

The rest of the world would enter the fold, through the process that now is known as Americanization, for which the Manifest Destiny of last century was a very outspoken articulation. In other words, the fate of US foreign policy adventures would depend on the level of christian morality of the US population. And the most important of the Commandments, for several reasons, was the sixth, certainly not the fifth--the US population having a world record in homicide. Crassly formulated the fate of US foreign policy was decided in bed, the level of adultery and other types of behavior seen from a Puritan angle as aberrations with a high moral connotation would lead to US inter-disaster as exemplified by the debacle in Vietnam.

Below the US, in this image of the world, then are the countries in the Center also referred to as the "allies." They should share with the United States at least two of the following three characteristics: believing in the "magic of the marketplace", being christian, and being democratic in the formal sense of having institutionalized elections. In addition to this they should also be rich, measured in the standard way of a high GNP per capita. Thus, Japan would qualify, certainly relying on the world as a marketplace (although the US seems to not be aware of the very heavy level of governmental planning that goes on in order to achieve this success for Japanese capitalism). Japan cannot be said to be christian; On the other hand, there are elections, with a considerably broader range of political options presented by the parties than in the United States. And--whether

this is related to what has just been said or not--a considerably higher level of participation in that democratic institution than in the US which has the lowest level of all countries referring to themselves as democracies.

The next layer, or circle, in this image of the world would be the Periphery countries. Of course, they are poor. Worse, there is no effective magic of the marketplace working, christianity can be doubted, and so can their level of democracy. If they do not outright reject one, two or three of these basic conditions, they are still included in the Periphery. They are unstable, of course, and have to be watched. But there is hope, if they work hard.

In short, this gives us a world where at the bottom are the LDC countries or less developed countries, then come the MDC or more developed countries and then comes WDC or Washington, D.C.-- all of these neatly ordered under the center of the universe, God, the Almighty.

But this is not enough. The Puritans who came to the US also brought with them another concept. Just as there was monotheism informing them that there is only one God, there was an implicit monosatanism informing that there is only one Principle of Evil operating in the world. And this Principle of Evil captures nations and countries that can then be seen as Evil, being in the throes of that principle. Until very recently the name of that principle was communism, and the precise location of the Center of Evil, as given by Ronald Reagan himself in his famous

speech in Orlando 8 March 1983 was in Moscow, in the Kremlin.

What has happened this last year, however, is the emergence of terrorism, as construed by the US, as a rival Satan, gradually overshadowing the former Satan after a predictable interlude which is still with us where communism is seen as financing terrorism, and aiding it in other ways, if not subjectively at least objectively. In short, the Center moves, and Washington theology is now in search of its precise location. Is it Qom in Iran? Is it in the Bekaa Valley in Lebanon? Or, is it in a certain tent in Tripoli in Libya? I think the former was the real goal of the US expedition purported to liberate the captives of the so-called US embassy in Tehran Spring 1980, the Bekaa Valley was shelled by the US peace forces"; and the tent was attempted hit by the raid of Libya 15-16 April 1986. At this point it should be said very clearly that to right wing populism, which is found right in the White House in the United States, these were not acts of vengeance or belligerence in the usual sense. Ordinary nations and countries go to war; when the US does something that looks like war it is an act of punishment, punishing, even eliminating evil forces. It is a way of setting the universe straight, the way God wanted it.

Of course, the US will deal with the three layers, or circles around the center of the world, herself, in three different ways. For Center countries economic sanctions or pressures will be applicable--as can be seen in the case of New Zealand. For Periphery countries destabilization, the

consistent and energetic workings of the CIA would be appropriate. For the Evil countries intervention to the point of invasion under various pretexts would be the correct way of dealing with the country, preferably by having somebody else do it like the contras, with monetary, psycho-political and logistics support from the US. Soviet Union would certainly have merited this kind of treatment a long time ago according to this vision of the world but is a little bit too strong; to punish the Soviet Union might be too risky, they might hit back. Grenada is safer. Nicaragua is an in-between case; no doubt extremely many Americans also very highly placed are itching to invade the country, like in the past.

Epistemologically one should point out that there is no contradiction at all between this culturally/religiously inspired image of the world and the highly concrete workings of the structure of imperialism. Theology legitimizes the economy. On the other hand a successful economy also legitimizes the theology, informing Americans that they are on the right track, not only to wealth but also to christian salvation. One of these is good, both of them fantastic. I would even go further, and say the following: even if the workings of imperialism should no longer be profitable the US might still continue its aggressive pattern of foreign policy because they are the prisoners of their own world model, expect themselves to do so and expect others to expect them to.

More concretely, I do not think there was ever at the top of the US the idea of anything like parity with the Soviet Union in offensive weapons, first strike or second strike or both. Supremacy is the only pattern consistent with this overblown image of oneself. Differently put: "balance" is

interpreted as a positive balance, as being in the black, not as the balance of the engineer, of something being equal to something else. How can God ever be equal to Satan unless you have already given in to Satan?

How does South Africa enter into this? How do we view it?

I think it is very simple: the Boers fulfill all the criteria of being in the center, being market oriented (indeed), christian even to the point of feeling a calling (since 1652) as strong or stronger than that of the US Puritans, as a Chosen People finding a Promised Land, but enslaving rather than eliminating the indigenous, and having some kind of democracy among the whites. They are rich. The blacks should do the following: accept capitalism, working your way up if you can, join the churches, the struggle for democracy and human rights with peaceful means. Ultimately all will be given to you although ultimately might be rather remote! Become rich by individuals becoming richer so that the average goes up (the frequent reference to the level of living of South African blacks relative to the surrounding countries, and the efforts by many Africans to seek labor in South Africa)! However, in the eyes of WDC it looks as if the blacks are interested in socialism and planning, that they are not particularly concerned with christianity, and that the struggle for liberation in this highly articulated phase we are now witnessing will catapult more autocratic forces into power, like in a military command anywhere, certainly including the United States. In short, the US will tend to side with the whites,

It is a misunderstanding to assume that the US Congress, even when overriding Ronald Reagan's veto, think much differently. They support economic sanctions for two very simple reasons: first of all, in order to legitimize their own "sanctions", meaning intervention with the possibility of invasion lurking in the background, of Libya and Nicaragua; in order not to be caught in their own inconsistencies; and they do not think the economic sanctions will be effective anyhow knowing something about the capability of the South African white community to organize a military government, and also a relatively viable, self-sufficient economy. What is wrong with Ronald Reagan is not his way of viewing South Africa, only that he does not understand these points--much like he did not understand what was going on in the Philippines and that it could ultimately be turned very much in the interest of the US.

I am not arguing that marxism is wrong, only that it is incomplete. Many argue a certain tendency of marxism to underplay the cultural factor. It is not sufficient to say that this factor is in the super-structure. In this case the factor came on ship over the Atlantic as a cultural infra-structure or basis, to the land they were conquering from the indigenous, eliminating in various ways about nineteen million of them during the first 150 years (bringing the number down from twenty million to much below one million). These entirely racist/fascist attitudes to other human beings, to use more modern terms, cannot be seen as ways of legitimizing the workings of a capitalism still far into the future; but it was certainly enshrined in the basic tenets of

belief of a religion with a very dim view of natives and pagans unless they immediately creep to the cross. Later, the same story was then repeated again relative to Africans, legitimizing slavery as an expression of protectionism, of the Center protecting the Periphery against Evil forces--unless the slaves themselves should turn out to be Evil, in which case they would have to be "destroyed" (not killed, that is something done to fellow human beings).

Of course, one may say that these people suffer from "false consciousness", and one might strongly agree with that statement. But the category is too broad. There is no spelling out of the nature of false consciousness, its roots, its inner dynamics. Hence, I certainly would claim that culture space has a certain autonomy not easily accounted for in the marxist approach in general, and that it is in the interest of marxism to embrace this autonomy rather than to reject it, trying to reduce it to the classical framework of reasoning.

And the same goes for the other four spaces of our existence, nature, human space, social space and world space. In nature space marxism has not been able to reflect adequately the problems of ecological imbalance, whether brought about by capitalist, state capitalist, socialists economies or other economic formations. When marxism emerged as a major force nature was still regarded as unbounded, the problems of depletion and pollution and the deeper problems of decreasing diversity and symbiosis in the ecology were not

yet visible. Acknowledging this is certainly no critique of Marx, but could turn into an even important critique of marxists who refuse to acknowledge the relative autonomy of this dimension or space.

Still another reason why marxism has lost so much of its grip on people in Western Europe and North America has to do with its failure to take into account what happens in human or personal space. People are longing for meaning, for identity. Using an important marxist category they are certainly alienated, among other things by capitalist economies. That does not spell out sufficiently where we can find meaning and identity. Exactly because of this vacuum there is today a heavy retrogression to religious faiths of the past, also in the form of fundamentalism. What I have referred to above in connection with the US image of the world is certainly backed up by right wing christian fundamentalism, the theology of repression of North America, which can also be seen as countering the theology of liberation of South America. However, it should also be pointed out that many people find meaning and identity in alternative ways of life, even if conditions in the shape of socialist or the vaguely defined communist social formations are not yet available. Where this it is done is not developed by marxists nor by anti-marxists, but by others--the greens.

In social space marxism has grosso modo been unable to take sufficiently into account those rather basic factors dividing human-

kind: gender and age, race and nation. Marxism is of course excellent on class, leninism in addition on class in an international context, on imperialism. But in the words of leading feminists male supremacy, or patriarchy, takes on an autonomous character, certainly antecedent to capitalism even if today heavily related to capitalism. In short, a certain autonomy is conceded to the fact of gender. The same can be said about age, and certainly about race where the Soviet Union gives ample testimony to the significance of race in spite of the tremendous changes in economic formation that have taken place in that vast country. And the same applies to the ethnic dimensions constituting the definition of nations, best accounted for by reference to culture/religion.

There is also a second set of reasons why marxism is seen as incomplete in social space, even in explaining class relations. This has to do with the emergence of new types of class formations, particularly with the rise of intellectuals and state bureaucrats to power, whether or not it takes place inside a basically capitalist economic formation. If capitalism is still very much alive the net consequence is what I refer to as the BCI-complex (of bureaucrats, corporate capitalism and intellectuals in the sense of researchers, professionals and often also artists), constituting and integrating totality with tremendous power. Nowhere can this be seen as effectively at work as in Japan, and to some extent also in the mini-Japans (South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore).

In this perspective marxism can even become a formula for legitimizing power of intellectuals: the marxist intellectual

will proclaim that the liberation of the working class has to be the task of the working class itself. He steps discreetly into the background when the dirty job of liberation takes place, later on to emerge from his hiding place inside or outside the country as minister of this or that. I am in no way doubting his motivation and his idealism in this rather capitalist division of labor.

To conclude the picture: in world space we find the same inadequacy of marxism to account for the full working of the phenomena referred to under the headings of war and peace. Why should there be so much belligerent antagonism between socialist countries? Because they are not completely socialist yet?--in that case, what is missing? Because they have been trapped by evil powers?--in which case precisely how? Without elaborating this theme let me only say that I think world space should also be given a certain autonomy and that separate ideas complimenting the excellent insides provided by marxism-leninism in elucidating sources of war merit attention.

I could now add that much of what I have said refers to the problems of rich, capitalist countries, and that is true. True, our ecological problems are not necessarily more acute than those in the Third World in general, but they are certainly more felt in the sense that our consciousness has permitted them to penetrate. This is often used, as by the Club of Rome, to deflect attention away from capitalism in an ideology that can best be called "ecologism"--having people save electricity and recycle paper so that more raw materials are available for private and state capitalists. This

is certainly correct, but does not do away with the problem of decreasing diversity and symbiosis regardless of what kind of industrialism is at work.

I think it may also be largely true that the civil rights movement in the US was inspired by the liberation struggles on the African continent, and that the partial liberation of the blacks in the US South in turn inspired the feminist movement. But society is complex and social forces so branching out in different directions that I would not subscribe to any unidimensional, causal theory. Very much of the concrete work in this field has been done by heavily religious people, challenging their own religion. Undeniably christianity comes in at least two versions, hard and soft--and soft christianity would see the down trodden by race and gender as the equals of the top dogs where hard christianity would tend to believe in strict hierarchies enforced by such visible factors as gender and race. In social democratic countries some of the sharpness of the contradictions of capitalism has been reduced, but this may even have increased the contradictions between citizens and state bureaucrats. And that accounts for our relatively strong green movements fighting for local autonomy against the penetration both by centralized administration and centralized capitalism--a movement as legitimate as the movement in Third World countries to establish an effectively working centralized bureaucracy incapable of controlling effectively working, market forces.

Peace and war are certainly rather important for our peoples up in the North, knowing fully well that we can be obliterated by :

political or technical accident, or even by the political will of very chosen persons within the Chosen People. There is no comfort knowing that we might take much of the rest of the world with us. It is our experience that the forces of armament are not that different in capitalist and state capitalist countries, perhaps with more emphasis on naked profit in the United States and more on power in the total social formation by those in command of the military sector in the Soviet Union. I belong to those who see most of the actio in the US and most of the reactio in the Soviet Union. But there is also a certain autonomy to the Soviet side of the arms race; it is to a large extent triggered by inertia bureaucracy and intelligentsia.

Moreover, it is not our experience that the nationalization of the arms industry makes any difference at all, positively, in the sense of dampening the arms race. To this, of course, one may object that nationalization within the capitalist economy will have to be on the premises of the capitalist. But one might nevertheless at least expect some impact in the more positive direction bringing in other people than capitalists on the boards, and making the enterprise accountable to political parties at large. Nothing of this kind seems to happen.

In any marxist claim to fully comprehend all of these phenomena there is also an element of monotheism and monosatanism. The root of all evil is the same, the economic formation in general and capitalist formation in particular. I could say that this is an expression not only of christianity; but christianity itself

is an expression of occidental cosmology with its strong emphasis on peaked pyramids in world space (with the US at the top right now), in social space (with kings and presidents and general secretaries), in time (focussing on such events as the crucifixion of Christ, of the Second Coming, on the Day of Judgment), in knowledge (trying to bring knowledge on an axiomatic base which is essentially what marxism was trying to do for the whole field of social knowledge), in nature (with evolutionary charts putting Man--not woman on top) and of course in the universe in general with God the Almighty on top. Only add that it is fascinating to search for alternative cosmologies; they exist, they are important.

This more eclectic view should in no way impede effective action. It only makes you stronger, emphasizing the significance of fighting on several fronts at the same time. Imperialism has to be fought not only in its concrete economic and military/political manifestations, but also with its myths, theology. For the ordinary American what the US does around the world is not done in order to gain profit. He would rather see it in terms of sacrifice, as necessary sacrifice in order to set the world straight and give to the rest of the world some of the blessings that he sees around him in the United States, relative to the place from which he came. It should be remembered that most of these people are economic refugees, some even political refugees--and they carry in their womb, in their heart and their head the bitter memories of the past in their personal or family life, often unable to see that as particular cases.

It is not imperialism or anti-imperialism, but whether the United States should exercise her "global responsibility" more-or-less along the lines I have indicated, or retreat into "isolationism". Very many Americans would argue in favor of the latter, simply feeling that the world is not good enough for them, that it does not merit their costly and risky efforts to set the world straight. If the only thing they reap is heavy criticism then why should they do it at all? Add that these strong feelings in the undercurrents are also well articulated on top of the US society, and the genius of a Ronald Reagan consists exactly in playing on those currents, himself coming from them, knowing them very well.

Liberal intellectuals in the US are marginalized, partly because they are against unlimited corporate greed, partly because they do not share the tenets of beliefs or right wing populism. Many of them are sitting in their university campuses writing heavy books, understanding next to nothing of their own country, including its WDC center, trying to reconstruct US foreign policy as if it were some kind of cost-benefit analysis, essentially only informed by rational calculus, game theory and the like. Hence, international relations can only be studied if the domestic sources, or roots as I would call them, are taken sufficiently into account. There is no such thing as international relations sui generis, as something over and above the national actors except as an abstract game in the minds of some IR theories.

In the case of US international relations theory is illustrated in the tables in the Appendix where I have made use of the division of what I call a cosmology into the six parts of the

basic assumptions about space, time, person-nature relations, person-person relations, person-transpersonal relations and, in Table 2, the basic postulates about knowledge. On the right hand column of those tables, alternatives to the mainstream approach are pointed out. Two small words on top of the table should be noted: or-and. I myself do not entirely reject mainstream approaches, I just have the same eclectic approach as in connection with marxism: they are incomplete rather than wrong. Hence, I would stand for the "and", for the absolute need of bringing in countertrend approaches and perspectives.

This has to be done in an interdisciplinary manner. I have indicated how US behavior is incomprehensible without a minimum knowledge of history and theology. I think any marxist would agree that the world economy is incomprehensible without even a solid knowledge of history. I would add to this some of the workings of the human mind, psychology, and the human social structure in general, sociology and anthropology. And that brings up the various meanings of the term "interdisciplinary".

Interdisciplinarity is a marketplace where different academic trends meet and have a dialogue. The next step is multi-disciplinarity where teams are constituted working effectively together, but instead of the members writing separate books they now write separate chapters in the same book. The next step then is trans-disciplinarity where multi-disciplinary knowledge is found within one person, capable of writing one such book him or herself--and here I would emphasize herself because trans-disciplinary talent

in my experience is more frequently found among women than men. Men more readily accept compartmentalization since it is an expression of the way they enter the division of labor and society; women are used to a highly "trans-disciplinary" existence in any household where a high number of things from different disciplines happen at the same time through the twenty-four hours or the 365 days annual cycle. I could add, on top of this: wholistic knowledge as a further development of trans-disciplinary knowledge, with new terms, new ways of looking at things, not just an integration of existing disciplines.

In this marxism will continue to play an extremely important role. I think the social sciences should be seen in the light of marxism. To my mind social science has one major task: that of exposing the contradictions in our social formations, particularly contradictions with an exploitative character meaning that somebody gets less, even so much less that they are incapable of reproducing themselves--a fact showing up in rates of morbidity and mortality, in mental and spiritual emptiness. It is our task not only to expose the harmful contradictions, but also to construct viable alternatives, blueprints, utopias. The "liberated zone" was one such utopia, liberated zones are today spreading in Africa. Third, it is the task of social science to find out how one can participate in that liberation, designing strategies for strengthening the weak and weakening the strong. I think intellectuals can play major roles in all of these fields.

One also has to be concrete. Marx' descriptions of England at the middle of

last century are problems of the Third World today, a basic reason why marxism always comes up when oppressed people in the Third World are trying to liberate themselves. But in the Second World, the socialist countries, it is not the struggle for basic human needs, for survival in the material sense that is on top of the agenda but for more freedom, more space. Sheer liberal theory may have more to say and to contribute than marxist theory, without for that reason in any sense constituting a sell-out to capitalism. And in many countries in the First World where there is both relatively good satisfaction of human needs, after having achieved physical survival and also some political space, in other words freedom the problem is that of alienation, of lack of identity. In that case maybe rejection of both marxism and liberalism up to a certain point is relevant. Developing more anarchist, gandhian and maoist (being not the same marxist) thought would be an important task of intellectuals, and this is exactly what happens.

In so saying perhaps one should be reminded that concreteness, fighting from where you are, where you stand in itself is a marxist proposition. Or I could perhaps say that a social science focussing on contradictions and particularly the antagonistic ones, with its dynamics, trying to develop alternatives and actively engaging itself in the struggle for the realization of those alternatives is some kind of "generalized marxism", a social science approach for which marxism is one occidental branch and maoism one oriental branch. Enriched with the insights of the dialectics of daoism, much more dialectic than anything ever experienced in

western history of ideas; buddhism (more solidary than patterns of thought merging in the west) and confucianism. More complex, for that reason making China unpredictable from a narrow occidental point of view, be that liberal, conservative or marxist.

Thus, I see the role of an intellectual as much broader than simply engaging in critical analysis of his own paradigms which we would expect from any decent intellectual, data-collection, theory-formation; and informed commentary on how other intellectuals engage in an analysis of their own foundations, collect data and make theories. I see the role of the intellectual as reaching into the realms of social criticism, social constructivism, social education, and social action--in other words far outside the confines of the university. What else should be the purpose of intellectual activity if not to improve conditions of humankind? With all the social surplus that has been accumulated in the west it goes without saying that we in the northwestern corner of the world also have produced more intellectuals so our task, more than anybody else, is to try to pay back by delivering truthful and rich images of society--past, present and future.

Table II.

OCCIDENTAL EPISTEMOLOGY AND MAINSTREAM VS. COUNTERTREND
IN US INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS STUDIES

Category	MAINSTREAM	or and COUNTERTREND
I.	<p><u>Paradigms for analysis:</u></p> <p><u>atomistic</u>; fragmented, segmented <u>deductive</u> <u>empiricism</u>- "value-free" <u>tertium non-datur</u>; non-contradiction <u>dualist</u>, stable essentially</p>	<p><u>Paradigms for analysis:</u></p> <p><u>wholistic, global</u> <u>dialectic</u> <u>criticism & constructivism</u> <u>reality filled with contradictions</u> <u>yin-yang</u>, unstable, transcending</p>
II.	<p><u>Units of analysis:</u></p> <p>Actors (states) { good-evil strong-weak Actors (dec. makers) { active-passive</p> <p>Crystallized actors: motivation & capability</p> <p>World as Inter-State System Decisions carried by Elites</p> <p>--rational decision-making</p> <p>--cost-benefit analysis</p> <p>Focus on Super-Powers; Super-People</p>	<p><u>Units of analysis:</u></p> <p>Structure (cultural) { exploitative penetration Structure (world) { segmentation fragmentation Structure (social) { marginalization</p> <p>Structure (human) Structure (nature)</p> <p>Actors <u>in statu nascendi</u>: conscioueness → organization → struggle formation → mobilization</p> <p>World as Inter-People System Decisions carried ultimately by People</p> <p>--irrational { distorted cognitions distorted emotions hidden codes (cosmology)</p> <p>--absolute faiths</p> <p>Focus on People's Dreams; Images</p>
III.	<p><u>Variables of analysis:</u></p> <p>Power-over-others</p> <p>Military: <u>Realpolitik</u></p> <p>Economic: ownership of means of production comparative advantages</p> <p>Cultural: Western culture as world culture</p> <p>Political: Institution-building</p>	<p><u>Variables of analysis:</u></p> <p>Power-over-self { self-reliance non-violence</p> <p>all forms of power self-reliance; autarky</p> <p>dignity, identity, other cultures withdrawal of consent, civil disobedience "People Power"</p>

Table I-

OCCIDENTAL COSMOLOGY AND MAINSTREAM VS. COUNTERTREND
IN US INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS STUDIES

Categories	MAINSTREAM	or and	COUNTERTRENDS
SPACE	<p><u>Construction of the state systems:</u> Origin in Occident, model; Occident as Power Center; A focus on Evil outside the Center in heretic Occident and/or Periphery US with "leading role"; Chosen People</p>		<p><u>Alternative world systems (nomadic, etc.)</u> alternative origins (Middle, Far East) power potential of non-Occident No focus on Evil, or Evil in the Center, heretic Occident and/or Periphery are Good US to play normal role; like all others</p>
TIME	<p><u>Idea of Progress:</u> Crisis-catharsis-apocalypse</p> <p>Crystallization of the state system Good overcoming Evil through system superiority; deterrence Balance through retaliatory deterrence Crystallization of a balance of power sorting system; alliances Low entropy, separation</p>		<p><u>Oscillating Time/Idea of Progress:</u> Crisis and catharsis, but too much emphasis on apocalypse seen as fascist Crystallization of alternative systems Good penetrating Evil, mixing, oscillation</p> <p>Broader power concepts; defensive deterrence Crystallization of balance of exchange system High entropy, mixing</p>
ACTOR NATURE	<p><u>Emphasis on:</u> STATE-over-NATURE Nature "für mich/uns"; Interest Military insults to Nature</p>		<p><u>Emphasis on:</u> MAN-in-NATURE; common heritage Nature "an sich"; eco-balance Defense compatible with Nature</p>
ACTOR- ACTOR	<p><u>Emphasis on:</u> Verticalism/individualism, statism State sovereignty; national self- interest STATE-over-STATE conflict; competition Global darwinism; super-powers Weak will disappear unless protected Elitist foreign policy decision-making</p>		<p><u>Emphasis on:</u> Horizontalism= self-reliance; actor diversity Limited state sovereignty, non-aggressiveness</p> <p>STATE-STATE cooperation, mutual aid Inter-linkages; ties; numerous actors Weak will disappear if "protected" Democratic world policy decision-making</p>
ACTOR- TRANS- ACTOR	<p><u>Emphasis on:</u> PEACE: <u>triumph of Good over Evil</u> <u>pax americana; pax sovietica</u> peaceful co-existence super-powers as source of solutions summit meetings as ultimate authority super-powers as carriers of truth, compatible with true national, human and nature interests</p>		<p><u>Emphasis on:</u> PEACE: <u>diversity and symbiosis</u> States as good world citizens, non-aggressive Non-states as good world citizens, linking st Broadening circles of world democracy World Central Authority Globalism cum Localism Downplaying national interest; world interest Human interest & nature interest as basic: survival, well-being, identity and free- dom; eco-balance social and world space to serve human/natures</p>