# PROCEEDINGS

## Seeds of Violence or Buds of Peace? World Faiths as Resources for Peace Education

URSULA KING

SEPTEMBER 08, 2006
PULUNGANG CLARO M. RECTO, BULWAGANG RIZAL
UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
DILIMAN, QUEZON CITY

**ODINE DE GUZMAN** (DEPUTY DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR WOMEN'S STUDIES, AND ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND COMPARATIVE LITERATURE, UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES [UP]-DILIMAN)**:** Looking at world faiths as resource for education is urgent precisely because we are three days close to the anniversary of the 9/11 attacks in New York. Today, Israel finally lifted the air and sea blocking of Lebanon, which should hopefully be a step toward peace negotiations in the Middle East. With the lifting of the blockade the United Nations (UN) is also hopeful toward a wider peace process in the region, including that of the Palestinians and the Syrians. Looking at faiths as a source of peace education is also very crucial for us Filipinos, especially in view of the conflict in the South with our Islamic brothers and sisters, and our largely Catholic-Christian government.

When we talk of the peace process we also think of social justice and equality. When we talk of equality we also try to look toward more equitable distribution of resources. In this light, it would be very helpful to really look at the different world faiths to find resources for better peace building. We usually do this through dialogue. Dialogue should not, however, end with dialogue; it should proceed with practice. We

hope this afternoon's dialogue would be a major step toward achieving that end.

**URSULA KING (**Professor Emeritus of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Bristol**):** Perhaps because of the theme of my lecture, you might think that I will give a lecture on religion and gender. In fact, I wish to talk about practical activism to explore some ideas on transformative action and practices. The world contains a great deal of what social scientists call cultural and spiritual capital, which are the resources for much thinking and action. I think it is important in this war-torn world to look at these resources and how we can develop peace education and peacemaking.

Over the last ten years increasing attention has been given to the potential connection between religion and violence. In recent years, we have experienced violent incidents in different religions and cultures. With the growth of international terrorism, a new field of peace studies has emerged. A question arises as to how far religious teachings and practices fuel violent action. Some people argue that increasing global violence has nothing to do with religion. Rather, violence is the cause of political and economic factors. Others think that religion is part of the problem of violence; therefore, religion must also be part of finding the solution to counteract violence.

First, I am going to explain violence in the contemporary context. Then, I will speak about the seeds of violence in religion as resources for peacemaking. In the final portion of my lecture, I will discuss some possibilities for an integral peace education.

In 2001, I was part of the international jury in theology and philosophy, in which students have to submit articles dealing with subjects of religion and violence. Articles were submitted by postdoctoral students in theology and philosophy from different countries. The articles were written in different languages—English, German, and French. Part of the description of the theme for the essay competition reads:

> Nowadays national and international conflicts that are religious in character are happening in Northern Ireland, Algeria, Nigeria, Uganda, Afghanistan, Indonesia, and other countries. These conflicts are manifestations of a disquieting phenomenon. Do religions propose violence, rather than supposedly act as peacemakers? To what degree are religions in Asia proposing violence? Is the root problem religiosity itself, or is religion a mere instrument to achieve certain goals? What

> role do religions play in the emergence and surmounting of violence? ...
> What are the consequences of the intractable reality of violence, and what
> are the implications in doing theology or philosophy?

The issue about religion as cause of/or contributor to both violence and peace is at the very heart of my lecture today. The list of countries mentioned in my quotation is far from complete. At this point we would certainly want to include Israel on the list of countries that exemplify the intimate relationship of religion and violence.

Before I develop this idea further, I wish to briefly speak about my own religious and war experiences. I wish to relate personal reflections that arise out of a wider context, rather than merely an academic one. I grew up during World War II and in post-war Germany. I vividly remember the destructive bombing of my native city, Cologne; the fear and hatred borne of the violence of war; the evacuation to a rural village; the arrival of the American and British occupation forces. My childhood was linked to a relatively simple but fundamental experience of the religious contrast between Catholics and Protestants. There were also memories of Jews who were driven out of villages by the Nazis. Only much later, when I lived in France did I meet North African Muslims at a distance, people from Africa and Asia with very different beliefs and practices.

From 1965 to 1970 I lived in North India and travelled widely. There I met Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Jains, Tibetan Buddhists, Farsis, and Indian Jews. I experienced firsthand what has so often been said of India—that it is a true laboratory of religions. But I also witnessed the tension between different castes, ethnic and religious groups, and the low threshold of tolerance. The conflicts were very violent; for example, the Jews, being poor and small in number, were easy prey for other groups. Because of my experiences, I eventually became involved in local interfaith dialogue groups.

The complex situation of global religious pluralism presents us with new opportunities as well as new difficulties. It is important to realize that instead of simply acknowledging our diversity and plurality, we need to seriously think about the religious and spiritual meaning of pluralism for us today, to ask the deeper meaning of our social, political, and ethnic diversity. Globally speaking, we have reached a new historical moment with a new "critical corporate consciousness," with which we can discern a unity and pattern in the religious history of humankind, a closer coming together and a search for greater understanding beyond our differences. This has been discerned by several religious thinkers; for example, the

Muslim Mohammed Iqbal, the Hindu Sri Aurobindo, and the Christian Pierre Teilhard de Chardin.

Before I explore how a contemporary engagement with worlds faiths can make an important—in fact, essential—contribution to peace education, I will briefly examine first the legacy and legitimation of violence in religion, then look at some "seeds" for peace in world faiths, and the possibilities for peace education. Today, the yearning for peace is greater than ever, yet we seem to live in a permanent state of war and violence. Eric Hobsbawn wrote in the *Guardian* in 2002 a very important article on war and peace. He says that the past one hundred years have changed the nature of war, that the world as a whole has not been at peace since 1914—that is, the beginning of World War I—and the world is not in peace now, and that the prospect of peace in our society in our new century is remote. The twentieth century has been called the most murderous century in history: an estimated 187 million people have died in the numerous terrible wars since 1914. This is equivalent to more than 10 percent of the world's population in 1913. Interstate wars used to dominate in the past, but international wars have now declined whereas the number of conflicts within state frontiers has risen sharply and the burden of war has increasingly shifted from armed forces to civilians. Hobsbawm writes that only 5 percent of those who died during World War I were civilians; this figure, however, increased to 66 percent during World War II. It is estimated that 80 to 90 percent of those affected by war today are civilians—not fighting soldiers but civilians. According to another source, of the 101 conflicts that occurred between 1989 and 1996, only six were interstate wars; all the others were territorial, tribal intrastate wars, and 80 percent of the countries that are at war train children as soldiers.

How can we ever achieve peace? To quote from Brian Wicker's article on "War" in *The Oxford Companion to Christian Thought*: "The more organized society becomes the more complex its wars, which naturally follow the cultural, religious, political, and technological conditions of the time. Nowadays these conditions make war potentially suicidal for humanity. Christians in the past have only interpreted war. But today the point is to prevent it." Peace is simply no longer an option; it is an imperative. Numerous individuals, groups, and institutions are working to overcome and abolish war. Yet how often has the cry "Never again war!" been uttered without any effect. We desperately need a new peace consciousness and culture in the contemporary world. The attainment of greater peace, of conflict

resolution in nonviolent rather than violent ways, will only be possible if we put our mind and heart to it—if we really want to make it happen. And that will require tremendous effort and much work—much rethinking, in fact. A development of both new ideas and practices is required. Is it not disturbing that Christian theology knows a well-developed theory of just war but has no fully articulated theology of peace? Where do we find seeds for "making peace"?

Initially it seems that the different religions divide more than they unite, that they create more hatred, conflict, and violence than bring peace. How many battles, persecutions, and wars are due to religious factors and fanaticism, not only on September 11ᵗʰ but throughout all of history? Think of the ethnic and religious antagonisms that fuel nationalism and breed violence—antagonisms rooted in rival claims to exclusive truth and the superiority of one faith and culture over another. Think of war in modern Europe; we can think of the Crusades, the wars of religion in Europe, the pogroms, the persecutions, the teachings on holy and just war to remind ourselves of religions being part of the source of conflict and bloodshed. Not only today but throughout history, religions have helped people conceive the very idea of war in their minds and encouraged them to wage war; religious leaders go on blessing and sanctifying war even though such warring is in blatant contradiction to a universalist ethic about the sisterhood and brotherhood of all people. How many political leaders appeal even today to religious beliefs and sacred symbols to rally the support of their people and encourage them to participate in state-organized violence? Even Joseph Stalin in an atheistic communist state appealed during World War II to the Orthodox Church to rally the whole population in supporting the Soviet war effort. When you think of the paradox of France, even the atheists need the religious leaders to support war.

If we need a new peace culture, what can religions contribute to it? For many peace activists religions may seem irrelevant or more of a hindrance than a help. Yet the different faiths continue to provide spiritual explanations of human existence and a vision of what ought to be; they offer systems of beliefs and practices that nourish and strengthen life and can help build human community. The question then is: how do religions relate to the existence of violence and hatred? How do they explain the origin of violence, especially in organized forms of war? Religious explanations exist at widely varying levels and can range from myths, legends, and folklore to highly developed metaphysical speculation. By and large, religious explanations are of a different kind than those of

scientific rational discourse. We must therefore be aware of two difficulties when drawing on the sources and resources of religion: first, we often strive for different kinds of explanation than religious sources can provide, and second, we often seek answers to particular problems today, which are without exact precedents in earlier ages. We have to acknowledge these difficulties and cannot expect fully developed answers in ancient religious teaching to find solutions for our contemporary problems of global violence. Yet, we can find many seeds and resources in traditional religious teachings and worldviews that can make an important contribution to our present-day thinking about developing a peace consciousness and culture.

The religious diagnosis of the human condition includes numerous myths and stories to explain the origin of evil, suffering, conflicts, and aggression. One of the many extreme forms of violence that human beings inflict on each other is the deliberate killing of other fellow beings, especially in war. Some argue that religion is only superficially responsible for this, and that the real reason for any military aggression is the difference in political and economic power and the competitive struggle for chronically scarce resources. But there can be little doubt that religions have played a very significant role in war, and religious justifications for violent actions have been legion. Far from abolishing wars, religions have integrated them into their symbolic universe by ritualizing and even absolutizing war. The Christian pacifist John Ferguson in his insightful study, *War and Peace in the World's Religions*, came to the conclusion that while Christianity and Buddhism have been the most clearly pacifist religions in their origins and essence, both have been deeply involved with militarism from an early stage in their history. By contrast, Zoroastrianism, Islam, and Shinto have been clearly militarist in their origins and essence, and yet they have also produced figures of reconciliation and peace. He writes of Christianity: "The historical association of the Christian faith with nations of commercial enterprise, imperialistic expansion and technological advancement has meant that Christian peoples, although their faith is one of the most pacific in its origins, have a record of military activity second to none."

More recently, the Dominican Roger Ruston has argued that in a sense war itself is a religious phenomenon that feeds on the symbols of existing religions. This is due to the religious words and emotions connected with the supreme value of blood sacrifice, and there exists "a deep confusion between the goals of the nation at war and the purposes of God." He writes: "War itself has a kinship with religion in what it

demands of people and the way it heightens religious feelings. It does something to people which churches are always supposed to be trying to do: to promote selflessness and courage, to take people out of themselves and their own little designs and make them live for something greater ... It gives them an absolute, a totally demanding cause which relativizes even life itself. People experience what has been accurately called 'the false transcendence of violence." Ruston also argues that while Christian teaching originally introduced a desacralization of war into human history, the wars of the twentieth century have progressively brought about a new re-sacralization of war through the rise of nationalist passions and new absolutes.

A well-known example of the close association of religion and war is the Islamic notion of *jihad,* often identified with the idea of a holy war. However, its original meaning is "striving," and it is used to describe human effort and striving in the way of God. Eventually four types of jihad were distinguished, performed with the human heart, tongue, hands, and the sword. The first kind of jihad refers to the personal fight against evil whereas the jihad of tongue and hands can be that of preaching and persuasion, of the support of what is right and the correction of what is wrong. The fourth jihad means war against unbelievers and enemies of the faith, and this meaning has become widely dominant. It is almost universally agreed that jihad is a collective obligation and not an individual one; the Qur'an explicitly states that not all believers should actively engage in war. There is also a tradition of interpreting jihad in a spiritual sense, especially among the Sufis who understand it as the purification and conquest of the self. So there is a movement away from the lesser jihad to the greater jihad in which the inner conquest is considered to be a greater struggle than the conquest of external enemies. The Muslim Ahmadiyya movement sees the test of jihad in the willingness to suffer, not in the practice of warfare; its very essence is the active concern for the oppressed.

Among Christians there have been three different historical responses to war: radical pacifism until Christianity became a state religion; the formulation of the just-war theory, taken over from Cicero and articulated by St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Thomas of Aquinas; and the idea of the crusade, which emerged during the Middle Ages and was much influenced by the Hebrew concept of a holy war. The New Testament, so obviously more oriented toward peace than war, has been used as a justification for all three Christian responses to war: pacifism, just-war, and crusade. No major Christian church or denomination has been

consistently pacifist, and Christian pacifism has been largely confined to small groups such as the Quakers, Anabaptists, Mennonites, Brethren, and Jehovah's Witnesses. Pacifists within the churches have in times of war been barely tolerated by their fellow Christians. Conscientious objection or the refusal to give military service is treated by the larger contemporary churches as a matter of individual conscience rather than as a fundamental issue of the Christian community.

The Hebrew Bible of Judaism, which became the Old Testament for Christians, celebrates in many stories the works of a warrior God and his holy war against the enemies of his people, proclaiming God's kingship and sovereignty over the whole world. This is a world where history is a struggle and where the coming of peace is promised for messianic times. However, our contemporary experience and acts of violence are quite different in character from the violent actions of ancient Near Eastern peoples described in the Bible.

Traditionally the participation in certain religious rites has helped individuals to develop not only courage in general but also the special kind of courage needed to commit violent acts. From this point of view the religious blessings bestowed on warriors and armies through the ages have been of the greatest significance in fostering the psychological acceptance of what appears as the legitimate use of violent force in war. Equally important is the perception of the enemy as the "demonic other"—the "alien" outside the boundaries of one's own social and religious group, the enemy of God, the representative of a false doctrine, the agent of most hideous crimes. Scott Littleton speaks of the "lethal redefinition" of the victim by the killer and the community that passes judgement upon the other as something less than human—a monster, beast, animal, even rotting matter such as "garbage" and "trash." Verbal abuse regularly accompanies such redefinition, which establishes that the effecting of death of such an individual (or of whole groups of people) is a permissible, even worthy act.

But the final paradox of this pattern of violence: while one must dehumanize one's enemies in order to employ violence against them, one must at the same time dehumanize oneself to become an instrument of slaughter, eradicating such tendencies as guilt, fear, and compassion. Such perceptions of the "demonic other" had fewer implications when armed conflicts could be contained locally or nationally. Tendencies toward conflict and aggression have been seen as part of human nature, as part of the mysterious and inexplicable existence of evil; thus the use

of organized force and violence in war has been reckoned to be almost inevitable.

This brief survey shows that the different religious traditions have provided a great store of mythical and metaphysical explanations to account for the origin and existence of evil in its different forms, for the legitimization of violence and struggle. At the same time religious institutions have been implicated in aggression and conflicts through legitimizing state violence and wars, especially in societies where the religious and political elites are drawn from the same class and share identical interests. While many other ideological factors than religious ones may be important in modern warfare, certain political leaders still continue to appeal to religious beliefs and images to rally support and create a consensus among their people for a war effort. The close association of religion with war in the past and present is one of the strongest proofs of the fact that religion buttresses the existing social order. Yet there has always existed a tension in religion between giving this support and providing a prophetic critique challenging the existing order through a vision of a higher morality, a greater unity, and universal values, which transcend the boundaries of one's own group. What are some of these alternatives, which may foster greater harmony and cooperation among humankind? Where are there seeds for peace, resources drawn from religions to promote peacemaking?

Jonathan Swift said long ago, "We have just enough religion to make us hate, but not enough religion to make us love one another." And yet we can find many inspiring, empowering "seeds of and for peace" in the world faiths, present in specific religious teachings, ideals, visions, and practices. But what is peace? Too often our understanding of peace is too fragmentary, more defined by the absence of war than by a more positive content. This is too uninspiring a vision, for most religions know of the *fullness of peace* as something that permeates all of life and transforms it in a profound sense. Peace can be seen as external to the human being, as something created by socioeconomic and political conditions, by human groups and institutions, but most important, peace is also an inner state of the human spirit, which can be cultivated and nurtured, and here especially the spiritual teachings of different faiths have much to contribute. For contemporary peace work and peace education, we need a holistic vision of peace that embraces both our inner and outer life—the state we are personally in and the state of the world we live in.

In the development of peace studies and peace education, perhaps not enough attention is given to the spiritual resources of world faiths for

learning and teaching how to work for more peace. Conversely, new studies on spiritual education in a wider cultural and religious setting do not necessarily look at the burning issues of overcoming violence through learning to make peace. The religious and spiritual resources for peacemaking are so large and varied that they deserve the closest study, but much of this still remains to be undertaken. I can only give a few examples here of ideas and practices. It is undeniable that the human community is extraordinarily rich in spiritual resources, which include a rich religious heritage on peace that represents a tremendous reservoir for the art of peacemaking—if we only practice what we preach. Seeking, finding, and making peace is connected with meditation and prayer practices. For example, since ancient times, Hindu prayers have included the invocation "*om, shanti, shanti shanti*," the thrice-repeated prayer for peace, which invokes tranquillity, quiet, calmness of mind, and absence of passions. In both Hinduism and Buddhism it is important for the individual to be at peace, but the practice of peace has social implications, too. The Buddhist tradition teaches an important meditation on loving kindness (*metta*), which begins with kindness and concern for oneself, followed by developing loving kindness first toward a friend, then toward a person one is indifferent to, then toward someone one feels an antipathy against, and finally one's feelings should expand slowly to include all persons in the world and all beings throughout the whole of space and time. This practice is based on the belief in the interdependence of all sentient beings in the universe, a state of harmony, which is not simply given but has to be attained and worked for. To strive for loving kindness implies that human beings transform their hate into love, and abstain from any desire to commit acts of violence. To be truly non-violent is to adopt the mode of love over that of power and thereby live in the spirit of joy and light. There are numerous rules regulating social behavior in the Buddhist precepts and scriptures. The call for peace is nothing short of a call for the transformation of the world. Buddhism teaches that if "we desire peace to be realized in the world, we must first find it within." It is indicative that a current Thai journal published by Buddhist activists is called *Seeds of Peace.*

The striving for peace is strongly associated with the notion of non-violence, a term that only came into common English usage in the early twentieth century through its association with Mahatma Gandhi and his approach to resolving conflict. The idea of nonviolence—*ahimsa*—is primarily central to the religious traditions of India, although injunctions

against taking human life can virtually be found in every religious tradition. Like nonviolence, pacifism is a modern word and idea (the *OED Supplement* gives as one of its definitions "the advocacy of peace at any price" and lists its first usage in a French speech of 1901), but the idea of peace can be documented from ancient times. The Hebrew Bible contains many stories of wars, yet some of the great deliverances, such as that of the Israelites from Egypt, were achieved without violence, and the idea of peace runs throughout the Hebrew scriptures where the word peace—*shalom*—is found 249 times. It comes from a root meaning "wholeness" and thus is richer in meaning than our word "peace." Shalom is also very prominent in the Rabbinic tradition where it stands for truth, justice, and peace. It is said that the Torah was given to make peace in the world, and one of God's names is peace. Shalom refers to both spiritual and material conditions. Famous is the passage from the prophet Isaiah (2:2-4) describing how the Lord will gather all nations together in peace when peoples "will hammer their swords into ploughshares, their spears into sickles," and "nation will not lift sword against nation, there will be no more training for war."

Related to the Hebrew "shalom" is the Arabic "*salaam*," the greeting "peace be with you," which has been used as a salutation and blessing among Muslims since the time of the Qur'an. "Salaam" again means more than our "peace"; it extends to contentment, good health, prosperity, security, fullness of life. Contrary to the western view that associates Islam with military power, Muslims understand Islam to be the religion of peace, for the Qur'an sees peace as the will of Allah whom it describes as "the King, the Holy, the Peaceable." Peace is a transcendent gift, but it is also present in personal relations and is part of wise statesmanship.

Christians too, in spite of their violent history and theory of just war, have a strong tradition of peace grounded in the Sermon on the Mount—"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God"—and in Jesus' parting message to John, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give you, not as the world gives it." Christian pacifists have been inspired by Jesus' own example and what one might call the "bias to peace" in the Christian gospel. The church applied the title "Prince of Peace," and the Christian liturgy often repeats the phrase, "The peace of the Lord be always with you." The contemporary Christian peace movement uses the Bible as a teacher of peace, drawing particularly on Jesus' saying "love your enemies" and on the Sermon on the Mount. Its insights have been directly applied to practical matters in the discussion of military politics

by German peace campaigners whose call for peace based on a new politics of the Sermon on the Mount has raised widespread debate, and I must say that this concept of peace of the Bible was very important for the German Christian Peace Movement before the unification of Germany.

Here we have an example of using Christian religious ideas as a resource for contemporary peace thinking and action, just as Gandhi drew on the resources of the Indian tradition in developing his practice of nonviolent action in situations of conflict, or the Muslim Abdul Ghaffar Khan from Afghanistan practiced nonviolent resistance based on the Qur'an. In fact, we know of quite a few religiously inspired peacemakers: Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Desmond Tutu, Helder Camara and Oscar Romero, the Dalai Lama, and Aung San Suu Kyi of Myanmar. These pilgrims of peace draw on the religious peace heritage of their own traditions and thereby show us that peace has to be willed and aimed for, that it can be attained through the transformation of one's mind and heart as well as through initiating new actions. Other seeds of religious thought, which can foster human cooperation, are the great ideals of human unity and universal order found in different religions. But one could also undertake a study of existing religious images that express the interdependence and unity of the world as a single body—even as the body of God (as in the thought of the Hindu theologian Ramanuja)—or one might examine the root ideas of the "cosmos" and the "oikumene," pointing to an overarching sense of unity and totality embracing the entire inhabited world known to ancient thinkers. Similarly, the idea of one human family descended from a common pair of ancestors found in many myths or that of a common final goal and destiny, a "telos," for all humanity present in different soteriologies may be worth exploring. To mention the example of just one influential western religious thinker—one could cite others from both East and West—the reflections of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin on human convergence and what he calls the "noosphere" also provide rich resources for revisioning humanity as an interdependent organism patterned by the dynamics of harmony and peace rather than those of violence and strife.

All this implies that we need a change of heart. There are also a number of movements, such as the World Conference on Religion and Peace, in existence for many years; there is an annual week of Prayer for World Peace supported by people from different faiths and groups. I would like to quote the American Quaker and peacemaker Elise Boulding's works for a new culture of peace to replace the violent culture of war. She

has promoted workshops on alternative visions of the future in which participants learn to imagine a world without war or weapons, a world that is peaceful, so as to become empowered to change the situation around them. I think we ran out of women workshop on peacemaking because women sort of started peacemaking movement in the late nineteenth century. They did not go anywhere; they need much more power and much more influence. But I want to see more kinds of seeds, possibilities of movements emerging. Really we have resources of peacemaking if only we allow them to grow and flourish. So how can we see these things, how can we see them grow and reap their harvest? So I will finish with these possibilities of peace education. Slowly a global vision is emerging in every discipline and field of human activity, a more integral perspective whereby humanity is seen as intrinsically one and closely interdependent both materially and spiritually. A global perspective requires that we help and support each other rather than destructively compete against each other. To develop and strengthen such a global vision in individuals and nations we need to spend time, thought, and money on fostering global peace education. This is an urgent requirement, for so much of contemporary education is neither integral nor global; it is partial and fragmented rather than truly holistic; it is competitive, informative but not transformative of human lives. Even more than twenty years ago, thinker Ivan Illich asked how we can be freed from the prison of the "global classroom," how we can develop supportive "webs of learning," which include sharing and caring, moments of conviviality and celebration.

To sum up my argument: peace education depends on what is understood by both peace and education. The nature of war and violence has profoundly changed in the contemporary world. It is not enough to work for the abolition of war, but violence, strife, and hatred have to be addressed in all their ramifications. We have to find nonviolent conflict resolutions and peaceful, nonviolent ways of dealing with religious, ethnic, social, economic, and political differences. To create a new *peace culture* in the world we need to develop a new *peace consciousness* among the world's citizens. We need radical *civilizational change* in the contemporary world, which includes many tasks. We also need political negotiations and new peace instruments for nonviolent conflict resolutions and a stronger UN-related global authority to control and settle armed disputes.

Current levels of violence and wars of destruction might easily feed a profound pessimism, but there are also many signs of hope, encouraging

changes of direction, and new ventures that inspire a more optimistic approach and the belief that it is still possible to make our world a more peaceful place. A new vision of peace is integral to many contemporary statements and documents, and some of these draw explicitly or implicitly on religious and spiritual ideas. In 1990 Pierre Weil published for United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) "The Art of Living in Peace: Towards a New Peace Consciousness." This document refers to some of the ideas of Robert Muller, the former assistant secretary general of the United Nations who has called for a "new genesis" within humanity based on a "global spirituality" and who has suggested we develop a new set of commandments, which must include "You shall never kill a human brother or sister, not even in the name of a nation"; in fact, he speaks of "the right not to kill and not to be killed, not even in the name of a nation." Some perceptive contemporaries are wondering whether humans as a species can really evolve the capacity for true peacemaking—not the kind of peace achieved at the end of a war or as an intermittent period between wars, but peace as a *new form of life*. The Christian ecological thinker Thomas Berry is also working in this direction but I want to conclude this by mentioning few documents; otherwise it would be too long.

To mention other peace initiatives: quite a few years ago the German philosopher Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker suggested a global Peace Council of all religions, but this proved to be premature. However, out of it arose the World Council of Churches' consultation on "Peace, Justice, and the Integrity of Creation," which widely influenced members of the Christian churches around the world. In 1991, the theologian Hans Küng published his book *Global Responsibility: In Search of a New World Ethic*, which concludes with a powerful appeal to peace, often quoted since: "No human life together without a world ethic for the nations; no peace among the nations without peace among the religions; no peace among the religions without dialogue among the religions." This effort led to the Declaration Toward a Global Ethic promulgated by the Parliament of the World's Religions in Chicago 1993, with a strong commitment to a culture of nonviolence and respect for life, summed up in the categorical statement, "There is no survival for humanity without global peace!"

This commitment to a culture of nonviolence and peace is reiterated in the principles of *The Earth Charter*, developed through an international consultation process and approved at the UNESCO

headquarters in Paris in March 2000. It is a declaration of fundamental principles for building a just, sustainable, and peaceful global society in the twentieth century, drawing its inspiration among others from "the wisdom of the world's great religions and philosophical traditions." Again, its call for action includes the promotion of "a culture of tolerance, nonviolence and peace" and it underlines the need for "sustainability education" and "the importance of moral and spirituality education for sustainable living." The *Earth Charter* calls all people to "recognize that peace is the wholeness created by right relationships with oneself, other persons, other cultures, other life, earth, and the larger whole of which all are a part." This is a profoundly spiritual statement, which could provide an inspiring motto for peace education. In the same vein, the Council of Church held a declaration of the decade to overcome violence. There are many different efforts existing in the world now to overcome violence and create more peace. But these are only small buds, and we must make them bloom into large flowers.

Peace is no longer an option in our global world; it is a necessity. To create a just and peaceful coexistence beyond discrimination and violence in our world today, we need to harness the powers of love and cooperation. It also requires education, dialogue, the growth of a new awareness, and much political will for social and individual transformation. The peace imperative invites us to find and forge a new way ahead, to create a new, harmonious, and just way of living for all people on earth. This is a great and arduous task for which we need all the spiritual and practical support we can find in order to meet the greatest challenge humankind has ever met: to create peace on earth.

## OPEN FORUM

**ARNOLD AZURIN** (RESEARCH FELLOW, UP CENTER FOR INTEGRATIVE AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES)**:** Thank you very much for all the definitions of peace and new world ethics. I also share that dream, considering that there is a big slice of power in the world that makes a lot of firebombs, jet fighters, and the most expensive war-making devices, and can easily deploy their unlearned teenagers into invading any country that they would like to invade. In other words, we can keep on talking of peace— and I love that instead of talking war—but it is like in the 1960s; remember, there was the slogan "Peace Man, Make Love Not War" but

more people were doing a lot of war making. The biggest industry in the world is the war-making industry. I have also been talking about peace study and how to transcend memories in Asia... In Asia—especially in China, Korea, and Japan—they cannot even reconcile their economic interests. Meanwhile, in Cambodia, Thailand, and Laos, the people have not healed from the memories of war. The refugees are still floating in the borders. I would join you in the lecture, but I do not know whether we really are also casting a spell on their consciousness to forget that they are war makers, and they are more powerful than we are because they have big military industries. These military industries that make bombs have to sell, steal, and lead an arms race. They do not make these toys for top guns who can fly and play above the clouds, and without knowing anybody—civilian or any enemy—they will just push the button according to the computer. It is a game made by the sophisticated military industry. Maybe we should also think about the consciousness of a very religious man; President Bush—he is a fundamentalist Christian, but he uses guns. It is implied in your lecture that religion is also being used to stimulate war and hatred. Let me conclude by saying that when the Americans invaded Iraq, what do we expect the Iraqi people to do? Do we expect them to say "om ashanti ..."?

**URSULA KING:** No, but the fundamental problem you raised is militarism. Criminality lies in the people who make money from this...and the production of armaments. The British are particularly arms producing; so are the French and, of course, the Americans. I wanted to quote a piece from Miller, written in 1982:

> There is even more reason to eradicate armaments in this planet than to eradicate mortals. All conceivable parts of these armaments are ready; there have been painstaking works over the last three decades. But all depends on the will of peoples and nations, especially the big nations that bear the main responsibility on this matter.

No nation can afford to kill all its young. When you look at the statistics, how many young, talented people were killed in the last two world wars? How many women, men, and children were killed in Asia in all these different wars? This cannot go on because it will destroy not only ourselves but the total ecological balance of the planet. This is what Oxfam reported: the nature of war has qualitatively changed so much for the worst. And the power of this machine has grown so gigantically that it has outgrown our ethical standards. We must think

in terms of new ethical categories. We must have to will to start somewhere to enforce peace. The UN Peacekeeping Forces should have the power to enforce peace. We need it because otherwise we would kill ourselves forever. It is not possible to go on like this. I think it is really a very fundamental issue in the contemporary world, and people should think about it. You might say this is a vision of a utopia we cannot bring about. But it is really a question of whether we can develop a new consciousness and a new responsibility.

I remember a very inspiring lecture in India about new global humanity coming together. The speaker said,

> You know people think that this is just a dream, that this is not possible. But I tell you, in medieval times if people were told by the king, or whoever was in charge of a city-state in Europe, that they could live safely in a city without having very high city gates that are guarded and closed by night, that people could live in an open city because they would negotiate treaties and agree on certain ways of behavior, people would have thought it was utopia, that it was not possible. But this humanity with civilization grew legal relations, political consciousness, and sense of democracy.

Now we have to do this for the planet, not just for a town or city or for a country. We have come to a stage in which we are so interlinked materially and spiritually, and that it is in everybody's interest that everybody gets a good slice of a cake and flourishes as a new being because otherwise we will fall into annihilation eventually. We must promote a culture of peace. Many ideas that came out in the twentieth century are not possible in the nineteenth century; nonviolence is one of them. Feminist consciousness and the participation of women is another. Democratization of human beings is another one. These are all very new mystery, and we just have to take a step further to overcome violence. It can be worked out psychologically by counseling at individual levels— between couples, and children and their parents. Try to educate children, to share rather than to attack each other.

**TERESA S. ENCARNACION TADEM** (DIRECTOR, THIRD WORLD STUDIES CENTER, UP-DILIMAN)**:** We, from the Third World Studies Center, just came back from a workshop in Bangkok on peace dissemination, with participants from Thailand, Philippines, Cambodia, and Laos. One of the issues raised was that the role of education is very important. Another issue was whether peace education should be faith-

based or not. I wonder will there be any difference between peace education that is not faith-based and one that is faith-based? I was thinking if the Ateneo de Manila University were to have peace education, would it be different from that of UP, which is a secular school?

**URSULA KING:** I think I do not want to have this division, this dualistic vision of having either one or the other. I think it has to be both. I am really arguing for looking at world faiths: what kind of teachings and practices they have that might increase peace rather than violence. But we can look for many resources in our cultures: poets and writers and activists or politicians. I think you have to do it in secular ways. You have to do it in secular schools and universities, but faith-based schools or faith-based places also have a part to play. I do not want to play one against the other; I am more interested in seeing their peace education happen. We have in Bristol University peace studies as a kind of secular subject if you like, but many people finish doctorate or master's on aspects that has to do with religion and spirituality. And why religion? You can say religion is not so important in Europe in the public place, but religion still has got a very important influence. There are strong movements like eco-feminist spirituality, an ecological and peace movement. You get so many different kinds of spiritual meditation movements in France or Buddhist practices in Thailand and so on. But the important point is that we do not get another division. I think schools and universities play a very important role to make people aware.

**JAIME NAVAL** (ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, UP-DILIMAN)**:** I think this lecture on violence, underscoring peace coming on the eve of the September 11 commemoration, is very apt. I remember Gandhi when he was lecturing about the Ahimsa, and the first thing that comes to my mind is the quote "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth would make everyone blind and toothless in this world." My question is more policy directed and at the same time personal. I have an allergy to "peace" the moment people like politicians say it. I remember before World War II that Japan and the United States were talking about peace, and then afterward you have the war. It seems like the opposite occurs when politicians talk about peace. But at the same time we know that there are ordinary people who would like to be identified

with peace—peace advocates. There seems to be too many preachers of peace but a dearth in practitioners of peace. Many people could cry about peace, but there should be no dissonance between profession and practice. I think the trouble is not that we lack advocates but that not all advocates are credible themselves. Having reviewed the literature and examined it more intensely, what do you think are some of the ways by which we could have more peace practitioners rather than preachers of peace?

**URSULA KING:** I think you would really need to look at the conditions of particular issues. How could you find a solution to a difficult situation...without violence? Peace negotiators have negotiating skills and even debating skills in relation to situations of extreme suffering and distress. A very good example would be the Reconciliation Commission in South Africa trying to make peace while also relating to the war members in trying to help some people come to some kind of reconciliation. I think there are peacemakers in different forms and ways. We need activists in that sense and peacemakers but you also initially need the people who are willing to do this and those with the imagination that they can do it. Is it possible? All plans have lapses, and yet I think we can slowly work toward some improvements. Many think about how rapidly all the political changes have happened but we still face so many problems. You need people to push the agenda, who will say we can do things differently. I think the lack of hope consists also in the lack of imagination. I think in that sense it might be possible internationally to work some of the alternate scenarios. Sometimes I hear Tony Blair speak; I think he has a vision. Why did he go pushing this war? I do not understand it. Similarly you get all the politicians where you think they have a lot to do and then the political situation constrains them. To put them into action you need a broader movement of people that want peace and have to make peace. It is very difficult, but I do not think there are any other options. I think it is imperative really for the survival of humanity. It is not right for just a few to have comfortable positions, elites who have a wonderful and luxurious life and feel the sun is shining while the rest of the people are starving. We have to have a more just planet. And for this, we need new planetary ethics and new instruments—legal and political instruments—to make a different kind of world.

**CAROLYN SOBRITCHEA** (Director, Center for Women's Studies, UP-Diliman)**:** I would like to respond to your last reflection on how we can promote peace education. Feminist scholars in this university have really dealt with this problem, and we have participated in conferences globally to talk about peace. But my reflection on how to promote lasting peace requires a major project. All disciplines are implicated in the manner that we have privileged war or conflict. I am an anthropologist by profession, and in becoming a feminist-anthropologist I have to throw away all the books we used to teach. We have to go back to our disciplines in the way we theorize concepts of states and even our pedagogical techniques. My problem, of course, is the grading system, the way we exercise power as officials, as teachers, and we still have to learn the production of negotiated truth. I think it is a major project but possible if UP would want to take a stand in the promotion of peace education.

**URSULA KING:** I cannot give any prescriptive statement about what has to be done in UP; I know nothing about it in the first place. I visited it the first time so I do not know what is realistically possible. I think it would be splendid if others would promote peace education. I think it is a very important and really useful study to undertake. There are many ways of looking at peace. We have not given enough academic attention to this very important fundamental question because whether we live peaceful or violent lives makes a lot of difference on individuals, families, and communities or any two people in the planet.

**UNIDENTIFIED PARTICIPANT:** I came from one of the most violent provinces in the Philippines. I have been a personal witness to killings that were perpetuated not only by civilians but by people in power. For example, my cousin was killed on suspicion that he was a leftist leader. At the same time I also have a cousin who worked as a hit squad of the Philippine National Police, and was responsible for the killing of one of my colleagues—a deacon of the Roman Catholic Church. I have been listening to you, and all I can say is that there is a big difference between the real situation that I have been into and in what you are saying. If there is peace, it is not so much of a cause and effect. And peace is an effect that I cannot expect from people who are in the political or religious position but from people who are small yet honest that they could not live without peace. Peace begins not because we are in

position politically, but because we are simple people trying to achieve that. Otherwise, we simply become victims of this state violence.

**ARIES ARUGAY** (Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, UP-Diliman)**:** Our distinguished guest has given us a lecture on the role of religion in both violence and peace, and her scholarship is also very much guided by personal experience, having personally witnessed the violence of the Second World War. It seems that religion among many things could be seen as a double-edged sword. It could be used as an instrument of violence, and Professor King has documented it very much—whether you are in the Islamic religion, Christianity, or Buddhism. There are some vestiges of this religion that seem to make violence acceptable and even dehumanized—for example, enemies dividing people rather than unifying them. I cannot help but remember what George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel said, "The hands that inflict the wound is also the hand that will heal it." If religion could be used as an instrument of violence, Dr. King's thesis is that religion can also be used as an instrument of peace. And we can learn a lot not only from our own religion but also from what Dr. King is saying. We control each other's faiths in order to advance the peace imperative. As a last point, I would like to reiterate what she said on how we can advance the peace imperative—four things: education, dialogue, awareness, and political will. We are personal witnesses to Professor King's passion for peace and religion as a way of furthering peace. Dr. King has done her part, and it is up to us to do ours.

---