# Nonkilling Korea

## Six Culture Exploration

Edited by
Glenn D. Paige
and Chung-Si Ahn

Co-published by

Center *for* Global **Nonkilling**


SNUAC
Seoul National University Asia Center
서 울 대 학 교 아 시 아 연 구 소

Honolulu, Hawaii and Seoul, Korea
January 2012

First Edition: January 2012

ISBN-13 978-0-9839862-0-1

---

Cataloging in Publication Data (CIP)

Nonkilling Korea : Six Culture Exploration / Edited by
Glenn D. Paige and Chung-Si Ahn
ISBN 978-0-9839862-0-1
1. Nonkilling. 2. Peace. 3. Pacifism – Nonviolence.
I. Title. II. Paige, Glenn D., ed. lit. III. Ahn, Chung-Si, ed. lit.

CDU - 172.4 : 327.36

---

A catalogue record is also available from the Library of Congress.

Center *for* Global **Nonkilling**

Post Office Box 12232
Honolulu, Hawaii 96828
United States of America
Email: info@nonkilling.org
http://www.nonkilling.org

SNUAC
Seoul National University Asia Center
서울대학교아시아연구소

304 Lotte International Education Hall
599 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu
Seoul 151-746, Korea
Email: snuac@snu.ac.kr
http://snuac.snu.ac.kr

Put down your sword and think hard

HAM SOK HON
1901-1989

# Contents

# Foreword

# Foreword

Sung Chul Yang
*Former ROK ambassador to the United States*
*and Distinguished Professor, Korea University*

If one word can be used to describe Glenn Durland Paige, it is "maverick." Born a few months before the stock market crash of "Black Tuesday" in October 1929, he literally began his life with the Great Depression. On top of America's unprecedented economic crisis, his childhood years were marked by a series of wars and military occupations globally.

He lived through the 1931 Japanese military occupation of Manchuria, the 1937 Second Sino-Japanese War, the 1936 Italian military invasion of Ethiopia by Mussolini's Fascists, the Spanish Civil War of 1936-39, the 1936 forced annexation of Austria and the 1939 absorption of Sudetenland first and the entire Czechoslovakia later by Hitler's Nazis, all of which led to the outbreak and horror of World War II.

At 19 Glenn was a private in the U.S. Army and rose to an antiaircraft artillery communication officer attached to the First Republic of Korea Infantry Division during the Korean War. He was one of the first Korean and American soldiers to cross the 38th Parallel and briefly occupy Pyongyang, North Korea's Capital, in the short-lived rollback period of the Korean War.

At the risk of his own life in the battlefields, he has witnessed the mass carnage of "our soldiers and the enemy" as well as innocent civilians. Professor Paige's advocacy of peace by developing the concept of nonkilling is, thus, not just out of the blue egghead talk, but derived from his lifelong encounter with, and inquiry into, the fundamental questions of life and death, war and peace, and conflict and cooperation.

In a nutshell, Glenn became a soldier-turned-scholar. As a political scientist, he did not receive the spotlight from doing mainstream research topics of his time. He has been a trailblazer, exploring and searching constantly for a new niche in political science.

For the past several decades, mainstream political science has, by and large, failed to raise and appraise the aforementioned big picture questions,

including birth and death of a state and political ideology. Nor has it been successful in grasping and forecasting the epochal political changes of the last half of the 20th century and beyond.

The demise of communist regimes in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the reemerging of new Eastern Europe and Russia, the surge of democracy in the non-Western world, the rise of China, East Asia, India, Brazil and the relative political and economic decline of the United States and Japan are the cases in point.

From this vantage point, in a quiet yet relentless manner, Professor Paige has been seeking to bridge the world of ideas and the world of affairs in the discipline of political science.

His early pioneering academic endeavor was the scholarly inquiry into the Korean War decision-making from the Truman administration's top diplomatic, military and security decision-makers' perspective. The decision-making case study of the Korean War naturally evolved into the next phase in his systematic analysis of political leadership in a broader context.

In recent years, Glenn has been devoting himself to the concept of global nonkilling as a basic value for political science. His Christian upbringing notwithstanding, he has been exploring and advocating the ideas and concept of nonviolence and nonkilling from various non-Christian religious and cultural sources such as Buddhism, Hinduism and Islam.

This volume, one of his most recent global nonkilling projects, was the product of a conference on "Nonkilling Korea: Six Culture Exploratory Seminar" held in August 2010 at the Seoul National University (SNU) campus. It was co-organized by Professor Emeritus, Ahn Chung-Si of SNU Asia Center and Professor Paige's Center for Global Nonkilling.

I was honored to be a participant in this seminar last August. I would like to express my gratitude to Professors Paige and Ahn for their invitation.

It is a privilege for me to write Foreword to this book, especially because the 2010 seminar was held in conjunction with the first commemorative anniversary of the former ROK President Kim Dae-jung (1924-2009), a Nobel Peace laureate, for whom I hold a deep respect.

As Professor Paige succinctly points out in his Introduction, I believe that this volume will assist in the realization of a unified Nonkilling Korea. A free, democratic, unified Korea is not a daydream, but a collective aspiration of Koreans at home and abroad, and of peace-loving people around the world.

# Preface

# Preface

Glenn D. Paige
*Center for Global Nonkilling*

Chung-Si Ahn
*Seoul National University*

This book reports on the Nonkilling Korea: Six Culture Exploratory Seminar convened at the Hoam Faculty House of Seoul National University during August 18-19, 2010. In contrast with academic and media inquiries that concentrate on political-military-economic aspects of Korea since division and the Korean War, the Seminar sought to discover nonkilling cultural features in South and North Korea, America, China, Japan, and Russia that could contribute toward realization of a future Nonkilling Korea. That is, a Korea in which no Koreans kill other Koreans, no foreigners kill Koreans, and no Koreans are sent abroad to kill foreigners.

The Seminar was held on the first death anniversary of Nobel Peace Laureate former ROK President Kim Dae-jung. We are grateful to Professor Sung Chul Yang, former Ambassador to the United States (2000-2003) appointed by President Kim, for kindly contributing the Foreword to this book.

Deep appreciation is expressed to participants who accepted the unique invitation to introduce nonkilling aspects of their societies. Non-Korean authors were asked to write about their own societies without reference to Korea. Questions concerning nonkilling interactions of each culture with Korea and among all six cultures invite path breaking follow-up. All participants realize that this is a preliminary inquiry that hopefully will merit further exploration by all academic disciplines, leaders, vocations, the media and the public.

An invitation for scholarly participation from the North was extended by the Center for Global Nonkilling through the DPRK Committee for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. In reply it was indicated that participation might be considered if the Seminar were held outside of the South, Japan or the United States. Considering it appropriate to convene the Seminar in Korea and to include at least some impressions of nonkilling culture in the North, a substitute paper was contributed by the senior editor based upon

visits there. It is hoped that this shortcoming will be corrected in future scholarly explorations related to the theme of this book.

Special appreciation is expressed to The Korea Foundation and the Asia Center of Seoul National University for funding support that made the Seminar possible in cooperation with the Center for Global Nonkilling. The excellent support by SNU student assistants Mr. Jaeseok Myung, and Ms. Hanna Cho as well as the staff of the Hoam Faculty House is gratefully acknowledged. For editorial assistance in preparing the Seminar papers for publication appreciation is expressed to Joám Evans Pim of the Center for Global Nonkilling and Seoul National University Press staff.

It is hoped that the Seminar and this book will encourage further cultural exploration of Nonkilling Korea and similar explorations in other parts of the world.

# Introduction

# Introduction

## From Cultures of Killing

Glenn D. Paige
*Center for Global Nonkilling*

Over the past century four of the world's most dynamic and lethal societies—Japan, America, Russia and China—have impacted upon the Korean people, leaving them divided, and with all six cultures suffering from killing within and among them, perpetrated before, during and following the Korean War (1950-53). Customary scholarly and policy analyses related to Korea since 1945 have focused upon geopolitical and inter-Korean military, political and economic security concerns as each of the six societies seeks to pursue its interests by continued reliance on killing and threats to kill. By contrast, this book begins to explore nonkilling cultural aspects in each of the six societies that could be combined to reverse the legacy of lethality and assist realization of a unified Nonkilling Korea.

### Nonkilling Korea

Nonkilling Korea can be envisioned as a unified society in which Koreans do not kill each other, no foreigners kill Koreans, and no Koreans kill foreigners, including Koreans sent abroad to kill. The society is characterized by absence of weapons specifically designed to kill and absence of ideological justifications for killing. It is distinguished by a strong nonkilling ethic that pervades all aspects of national culture and contributes to decisions and processes of problem-solving to realize personal, family, community and national well-being. It is saliently practiced in relation to Korea's Asian neighbors and to all people of the world.

### Six cultures of killing

Exploration of possibilities for Nonkilling Korea requires realistic recognition of the lethal historical legacies of the six cultures that have converged to kill in Korea. Cultures like individuals can become traumatized as both perpetrators and victims of killing (Grossman, 1995; MacNair, 2002; Kawada,

1991). They inherit the violent traumas of the past, express them in the present, and project them into the future. Nonkilling discoveries must create knowledge for liberation from killing and its consequences in each culture.

While summarizing the six cultures in terms of killing it is recognized that such simplification inadequately represents intracultural variations of effects associated with such factors as regional, class, ethnic, and linguistic variations.

*Korean*

Over the centuries Koreans have suffered from killing within and from invasion by Han Chinese, Jurchens, Mongols, Manchus, Japanese, Americans, Russians and others. Koreans have killed each other in seeking to gain dominant political-military control over the peninsula from the Three Kingdoms period of Koguryo, Paekche and Paehae, through the Silla, Koryo and Yi dynasty Joseon eras, to combat since 1945 to reunify the American-Soviet divided nation following the end of Japanese colonial rule. At times Koreans have killed Koreans, reminiscent of the clan-extinguishing ferocity of court factional struggles in the Joseon era (Henthorn 1971: 190-95).

*American*

Americans inherit a lethal legacy beginning in colonial battles with indigenous peoples, through celebrated killing in the American Revolution and Civil War, to killing of indigenous peoples obstructing western expansion from Atlantic to Pacific, and to Philippine colonial expansion overseas. Killing continued in World Wars I and II followed by killing in Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and elsewhere. The culture of killing is strengthened in responses to victimization by the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 and by the Al Qaeda terrorist attacks on New York and Washington on September 11, 2001. Perpetration of atomic bomb attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and continuing combat overseas add to American traumas of killing.

Most akin to divided Korea is the lethal legacy of the American Civil War (1861-65), only two 75-year lifetimes ago, when 2.1 million soldiers from the North fought 900,000 from the South, resulting in an estimated 620,000 deaths. Harvard president historian Drew Gilpin Faust has calculated that "The Civil War's rate of death…in comparison with the size of the American population was six times that of WWII. A similar rate, about 2 percent in the United States today would mean 6 million fatalities" (Faust, 2008: xi). Americans continue to kill each other in assassinations, homicides, crime, gang violence, bombings, school shootings and other ways (Paige, 2009: 27-33). WHO reported 17,893 homicides and 30,575 suicides in 1998 (WHO, 2002: 312; 318).

*Chinese*

The Chinese people inherit the legacy of killing from the long historical process leading to establishment of political-military control over a vast territory in the ethnically diverse world's most populous country. Killing contributed to the rise of modern China from the 221 B.C. establishment of the Qin state by Qin Shi Huang to proclamation by Mao Zedong of the Chinese People's Republic on October 1, 1949 and continues beyond.

Internally Chinese experienced killing and its consequences in wars among kingdoms and warlords, dynastic succession struggles, clan feuding and revenge, ethnic conflict, religious fanaticism, and peasant rebellions culminating in large-scale revolutionary and counter-revolutionary war amid Japanese invasion claiming millions of lives. Post revolution deaths in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution have been estimated to be "in excess of one million" resulting from "beatings, torture, execution and murder….factional violence between rival Red Guards….suicide….and when the state intervened to establish order" (Thurston, 1990: 149). Externally killing and being killed have accompanied campaigns against border tribes, Mongol and Manchu invitations, establishing control over tributary states, resisting colonial dismemberment, resisting Japanese invasion during 1931-45, border wars with India and Russia, and interventions in the Korean War and Vietnam.

*Japanese*

With a "strong martial current" from ancient times (Kōdansha, 1993: Vol 1, 545) the Japanese people inherit a lethal legacy of perpetration and victimization in internal and external killing. Internally killing accompanied combat among warrior feudal clans to establish military dominance over the island nations with claim to imperial legitimacy, "family exterminations" (Kōdansha: Vol. 2, 1270), conflict among warring Buddhist sects, peasant rebellions, political assassinations and executions, slaughter of Korean scapegoats in the 1923 Tokyo earthquake, continuing in Aum Shinrikyo terrorism (Jones, 2008: Ch. 3), and Yakuza gangster crime. Internal traumatization has been amplified by feedback from perpetration and losses in combat overseas plus victimization by fire-bombing of cities and the world's first atomic bomb attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In 1997 there were 719 homicides and 23,502 suicides (WHO, 2002: 310, 316).

Externally killing accompanied repelling 13$^{th}$ century Mongol invasions, 16$^{th}$ century Japanese invasions of Korea, emulation of Western colonization after 19$^{th}$ century opening by American and other naval threats, wars against

China and Russia, colonization of Korea, and 20th century military expansion beginning in Manchuria and China to establish Japanese hegemony over countries of Asia and islands of the Pacific—as WWII ally of Germany and Italy. Killing in China alone during 1937-45, including the Rape of Nanking, resulted in uncounted civilian deaths and an estimated 1.2 Chinese military and 571,000 Japanese military dead (Kōdansha, 1993: Vol. 2, 1432). As with every other WWII combatant the total number of other people killed by Japanese remains to be calculated.

*Russian*

The Russian people inherit the legacy of killing and victimization by killing that extended political-military control over a vast territory from the Baltic Sea to the northern Pacific Ocean in the world's largest country by area. Encompassed are diverse peoples, cultures and languages. Killing brought Mongol dominance from the 13th to 15th centuries (shared by China and Korea but failed in attempts against Japan). Killing accompanied the establishment of Tsarist hegemony by Ivan the Terrible after 1480, the founding of the Russian Empire by Peter the Great (1682-1725), revolutionary overthrow of Tsarist rule in 1917 amid bloody losses of WWI, the establishment of Bolshevik Communist Party domination through Civil War (1918-22) "in which more than thirteen million people were killed, died of hunger, or emigrated" (Yakovlev, 2002: 237).

Traumatizations continued through internal purges of the 1930s and massive loss of life brought by the victimization and victorious resistance to the surprise Nazi German invasion of 1941 that engaged the Soviet Union in WWII. "Only the sacrifice of thirty million of our citizens and the heroism of the people saved the country from subjugation" (Yakovlev, 2002: 237). As calculated by former Communist Party Politburo member Alexander N. Yakovlev, the extent of perpetration and victimization in the period of Bolshevik dictatorship from 1917 until dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 was enormous. "As a result of its actions, more than sixty million were exterminated" (Yakovlev, 2002: 237).

In the post-WWII Cold War global competition with the United States, killing and losses continued in establishment of communist rule over the countries of Eastern Europe and in invasion and withdrawal from Afghanistan. In the post-Soviet period killing accompanied disputes with neighbors such as Georgia and with internal breakaway regions such as Chechnya. Internally Russians suffer from terrorist and counterterrorist killings, suicide

bombings, crime, and high rates of homicide and suicide such as 33,553 murders and 51,770 suicides in 1998 (WHO, 2002: 312; 318).

*Six Killing Cultures Convergence in the Korean War*

Contributing to and following division in 1945 the six cultures converged to produce mass killing and further traumatizations in the Korean War (1950-53). Koreans killed Koreans; Americans and Chinese killed Koreans and each other; and Koreans killed Americans, their allies, and Chinese. Japanese under American occupation did not directly participate but Japan provided bases and logistical support for the American led 17-country United Nations Command. Russians provided advice, training, and arms to the North and weapons to support intervention by the Chinese People's Volunteers but failed to provide promised air support (Chen, 1994: 204). But American pilots sometimes encountered skilled Russian fighter pilots in unpublicized defensive combat over North Korea.[1]

Estimates of soldiers and civilians killed vary widely[2] and have been cited as many as 4 million including 2 million military dead and 1 million civilians each in North and South (Kodansha, 1993: 831; Halliday and Cumings, 1988 200-1). The ROK Ministry of Defense reports 137,899 military killed and 450,742 wounded for the South; and from 508,797 to 522,000 military killed and 98,599 to 120,000 wounded for the North. UN Command killed are reported to be 40,670 with 104,280 wounded. Chinese killed are reported as 148,600 with 798,400 wounded (ROK Ministry of Defense 2011). By all measures combatants caused massive bloodshed on the small peninsula with a population then of about 30 million people.

In the absence of a Peace Settlement and withdrawal of all foreign military forces as called for in the Armistice Agreement of July 27, 1953—signed by the United States for the UN Command, the Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Volunteers—sporadic killing has continued in incidents on land, sea, in the air, and abroad. Internally killing of citizens on each side of divided Korea has occurred under conditions of protests to rule feared to favor the other.

The traumatizations of wartime perpetration and victimization continue to affect the lives of survivors, families, cultures and policy decisions in all six societies. Six culture military forces prepare to kill: North Korea (1,106,000), South Korea (687,000), American (1,580,000), China (2,285,000), Japanese

[1] Personal communication to the author in Korea in 1951.

[2] <http://necrometrics.com/20cLm.htm#KO>.

(230,000), and Russia (1,027,000).[3] Four of the six threaten to kill with nuclear weapons (America, Russia, China and North Korea). South Korea and Japan as American allies are included under the American "nuclear umbrella." All six lament victimization by enemies and celebrate their own violent victories. Internally all six maintain the death penalty and execute to varying degrees for various crimes in contrast to 96 countries that have completely abolished capital punishment for all crimes (Amnesty International, 2010).

## Is a Nonkilling Korea possible?

Given the legacy of killing by Koreans, Americans, Chinese, Japanese, and Russians in Korea, what is the basis for confidence that a killing-free Korea is ultimately possible? Basic confidence resides in a simple fact. Most Koreans, Americans, Chinese, Japanese and Russians have never killed anyone. Present populations of the six cultures testify to the dominance of nonkilling over killing within them: South Korea (48 million), North Korea (24 million), America (312 million), China (1.3 billion), Japan (127 million), and Russia (142 million).[4] The same is true for humanity as a whole, now nearing 7 billion people and increasing. If humans are killers by nature, parents and children would have killed each other and extinguished human life on the planet long ago.

Globally further grounds for confidence are found in nonkilling proscriptions in religious faiths, traditions and philosophies; nonkilling scientific advancements; nonkilling public policies such as countries without the death penalty or armies; nonkilling institutions devoted to solving salient social problems; precedents in nonkilling history; and courageous nonkilling contributions by men, women and social movements (Paige, 2009: Ch. 2). If such capabilities are discovered, developed and combined within and among the six cultures, Nonkilling Korea can be realized.

## Nonkilling Cultural Explorations

The following chapters present initial scholarly explorations of nonkilling aspects in each of the six cultures. Authors outside Korea were not asked specifically to relate discoveries to Korea. This task remains for further exploration. These studies begin to lay the groundwork for comparisons and relating discoveries to Korea. No specific guidelines were given to authors although attention was called to two earlier essays on the subject (Paige,

[3] <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_number_of_troops>.
[4] <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_population>.

1984; 2000). Authors were familiar with the nonkilling thesis of *Nonkilling Global Political Science* (Paige 2009). They were invited to respond to the open-ended question, "What are the nonkilling aspects of your culture?" Readers will appreciate the difficulty of the task posed by this open-ended question and can benefit from the discoveries shared here. Readers are invited to engage in further nonkilling explorations in these or their own cultures that can benefit Nonkilling Korea and a killing-free world.

## References


Amnesty International. 2010. http://www.amnesty.org/en/death-penalty/numbers.

Chen Jian. 1994. *China's Road to the Korean War: The Making of the Sino-American Confrontation*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Commager, Henry S. 1991. "The history of American violence: an interpretation," in Graham, Hugh D., Ed., *Violence: The Crisis of American Confidence*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, pp. 3-28

Faust, Drew Gilpin. 2009. *This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War*. New York: Vintage.

Geifman, Anna. 1993. *Thou Shalt Kill: Revolutionary Terrorism in Russia, 1884-1917*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Grossman, Dave. 1995. *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*. Boston: Little Brown.

Halliday, Jon and Cumings, Bruce. 1988. *Korea: The Unknown War*. New York: Pantheon.

Henthorn, William E. (1971). *A History of Korea*. New York: Free Press.

Jones, James W. 2008. *Blood That Cries Out From the Earth:The Psychology of Religious Terrorism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kawada, Yoichi. 1991. "The importance of the Buddhist concept of Karma for world peace," in Paige, Glenn D. and Gilliatt, Sarah, Eds., *Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving: Ulan Bator Explorations*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project, Matsunaga Institute for Peace, University of Hawai'i.

Kōdansha. 1993. *Japan: An Illustrated Encyclopedia*, 2 vols. Tokyo: Kōdansha Ltd.

MacNair, Rachel M. 2002. *Perpetration-Induced Traumatic Stress: The Psychological Consequences of Killing*. Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Paige, Glenn D. 1993. *To Nonviolent Political Science: From Seasons of Violence*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project, Matsunaga Institute for Peace, University of Hawai'i.

_____. 1984. "Nonviolent cultural resources for Korean reunification," in Sungjoo Han, Ed., *Korea and Asia*. Seoul: Korea University Press, pp. 227-250.

_____. 2000. "Nonkilling Korea: building a peace structure on the Korean peninsula," in Dae-Sung Kim, Ki-jung Kim, and Hahnkyu Park, Eds., *Fifty Years after the Korean War: From Cold-War Confrontation to Peaceful Coexistence*. Seoul: The Korean Association of International Studies, pp. 311-40.

_____. 2009 [2002]. *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Thurston, Anne F. 1990. "Urban violence during the Cultural Revolution: Who is to blame?" in Lipman, Jonathan N. and Harrell, Steven, Eds., *Violence in China: Essays in Culture and Counterculture*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

WHO. 2002. *World report on violence and death*, Krug, E.; Dahlberg, L.; Mercy, J.; Zwi, A.; Lozano, R., Eds. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Yakovlev, Alexander N. 2002. *A Century of Violence in Soviet Russia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

# Korean Culture

# Spiritual and Practical Assets of Korean Nonviolence

Jang-seok Kang
*Kookmin University*

Korea has a long history during which there were countless violent and nonviolent incidents. However, history books focus only on violent ones, such as warfare, aggressions, surrenders, violent changes in dynasty and so on. There were no such records about how nonviolence changed national history or human lives. In a word history books are full of violent actions and incidents.

But what roles did nonviolence play in the Korean history, if any? To answer this question, we need to discover nonviolent factors and resources in Korean history as well as in the Koreans' lives. This inquiry will first explore nonviolent resources from the Koreans' spiritual world, followed by exploration of contemporary and historical practical experiences and movements. Exploration of these nonviolent assets will show that they contributed positively to nonviolent problem-solving in Korean society, and that they have a great potential to transform the society into a nonviolent and peaceful one in the future.

For spiritual resources in Korea the paper will examine: the humanist spirit of *Hongik In'gan*; the peace-loving nature of Koreans and the wearing of white clothes; and the influence of Buddhism and other religious teachings. For practical resources, the focus will be on contemporary nonviolent actions, movements and trends.

## Spiritual bases of Korean nonviolence

### *Humanist spirit of* Hongik In'gan (홍익인간, 弘益人間)

The fundamental roots of the Koreans' nonviolence can be traced back to *Hongik In'gan,* which was a founding ideology of ancient Korea—Ancient Chosun founded in 2,333 BCE. *Hongik In'gan* can be translated as "benefitting broadly all the mankind."[1] Of course this concept originated from the *Dangun* (단군)[2] mythology which was contained in the Three Kingdoms his-

[1] Paige translates *Hongik In'gan* as "devotion to the well-being of humankind" (2010: 1).
[2] Dangun is the name of Ancient Chosun's founder

tory *Samkukyusa* (삼국유사) written by the Buddhist monk, Ilyoun (일연), in the 13th century. The idea has been deeply embedded in the Koreans' minds as a living philosophy as well as a national ideology (Paige, 1984).

Contemporary Korean education has been adopting this concept openly in the official documents. The Basic Act on Education, for instance, employs the idea of *Hongik In'gan* in its Article 2 which stipulates: "Education aims at realizing national development and co-prosperity of mankind…under the ideology of *Hongik In'gan*." This spirit underlies nonviolent thought and attitudes for Koreans as a whole.

*Peace-loving nature and wearing white clothes*

As is the case of many other nations, the Korean people have many nonviolence-prone attitudes. This can be proved by looking at their war history.

Historically Korea was invaded hundreds of times from neighboring countries including China, Mongolia, Russia and Japan. However there is no record that Korea voluntarily launched preemptive attacks on neighbors. There were only defenses and counter-attacks on the Korean side.

Moreover the white clothes of Koreans seem to have something to do with nonviolence. White clothes symbolize purity or peace-loving nature like a white flag in wartime. Koreans were once called a "white clothes nation" (白衣民族) by neighbors, which characterized Koreans as a peace-loving or collision-avoiding nation.

*Buddhism and other religious teachings*

In relation to nonviolence, Buddhism has had a great impact on the Korean people. As is well known, Buddhism emphasizes nonkilling, asceticism, and compassion for the creatures, similar to Jainism or Hinduism in India. Buddhist monks in Korea are vegetarians and sternly prohibit killing living beings. Since the religion first came to Korea in 392 CE it has become a spiritual mainstay for Koreans.

In fact Korea is a multi-religious nation, where all religions coexist well, a rare example in the world. The 2005 census showed that out of 47 million Koreans in the South about 25 million, accounting for 53% of the total population, professed some form of religion. Buddhists numbered 10.7 million; Christians, 8.4 million; Catholics, 5.1 million; Confucians, 100 thousand, and others. All these religions respect and love nonkilling, peace, reconciliation, forgiveness, win-win and other values. These religious teachings and lessons underlie the nonviolent Korean communities.

## The 1919 Samil Independence Movement as nonviolent resistance

In terms of nonviolent significance, one of the most important events in modern Korean history is the 1919 *Samil* (March First) Independence Movement. The uprising, called the *Mansei* (Long Live!) Movement, was a severe struggle by Koreans to escape from the yoke of Japanese colonization which began in 1910. One thing truly significant in this movement was that it was initiated nonviolently and progressed as such, although some violent factors later intervened in the process. Background of the movement is as follows.

*Increasing discontent with Japanese brutal colonial rule*

Above all else, colonization of the country was itself a great shame for Koreans because it was their first colonial historical experience. Since 1910 Japanese colonialism had accelerated oppression on the Korean peninsula. Consequently, the colonized were banned from political and social rights and most of the farmers either turned to peasantry or left the nation for Manchuria or elsewhere abroad. These realities infuriated Koreans, including intellectuals and religious people, and caused them to resist Japanese oppression.

*Overseas Independence activities of the nationalists and students*

Before and after World War I, there were organized efforts on the part of nationalists in exile to appeal to the world community. A delegation was sent to the Congress of World Socialists held in Stockholm in 1917, while another delegation went to a world weak nation's congress held in New York in the same year. Rhee Syngman (이승만) and Ahn Chang-ho (안창호) were active in America for the liberation (Han 1993: 526-28). More crucial was an incident that took place on February 8, 1919 in Tokyo by Korean students for freedom for their country. Some 600 Korean students proclaimed a declaration for immediate independence and sent it to the Japanese Diet. This became a touchstone that triggered the March First Movement.

*Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points: self-determination*

As WWI ended with Germany's defeat, in 1918 the then American President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed the so-called Fourteen Points as basic principles. Among them was the principle of self-determination. This signified that each nation had the right to determine its destiny independently without outside intervention. This greatly encouraged the oppressed Koreans as a favorable international condition.

*Sudden death of Emperor Gojong and his funeral day*

The former Emperor Gojong (고종) suddenly passed away on January 21, 1919 with a rumor that he might have been poisoned by a Japanese plot. His death provided crucial momentum for Koreans to pour out their long-standing discontents and anger against the Japanese. As a result, national leaders set the uprising for March 1, two days before the funeral planned for March 3, expecting that many people would gather in Hanyang (now Seoul) around that time.

*Action*

National leaders came to an agreement to proclaim a Declaration of Independence sharply at two o'clock in the afternoon of March 1 at the Tapgol Park, in downtown Seoul, considered easily accessibility for the people. At the final meeting, however, the plan was abruptly changed to proclaim the declaration in a different place with the only the thirty-three national leaders who signed it present. The nearby Taehwagwan Restaurant was chosen in order to prevent possible victims.

As scheduled, the national leaders[3] declared the Independence of Korea, followed by three Mansei! After this solemn action the national leaders volunteered to inform the Japanese Governor General of the declaration and accepted immediate arrest (National History Compilation Committee 1988).

In the meantime, around noon on March 1, many people began to gather at the Tapgol Park. By 2 o'clock, the park was overcrowded by a large number of people, estimated to number around 20 thousand (Han, 1993: 529). They read the Declaration of Independence and shouted Mansei! for independence without any violent actions.

At that time, however, the arrested national leaders naturally failed to show up at the Tapgol Park. Therefore Jung Jaeyong, a youth out of the crowd, jumped up on the stage and began to read the Independence Declaration.[4] This triggered the people's shouting of Daehan Dongnip Mansei! (Long Live Korean Independence!) Marches ensued, raising high national flags which had been long banned since Annexation. As many people joined the marches nationwide the number increased up to four to five hundred thousand. The independence movements quickly spread throughout the na-

[3] Out of the 33 leaders, Kil Sunchu, Kim Byungcho, Yoo Yerdai, and Jung Choonsu did not show up at the meeting (Lee Hyun-hee, 1979:136).

[4] Jung Jaeyong was arrested and sentenced to two years and six months in prison.

tion and abroad, led by diverse groups of people. The movements reached a peak during the initial two months.

The Mansei movements began with peaceful marches; but sometimes they took forms of aggressive action in the face of Japanese ruthless countermeasures. The colonial authorities used to fire on the protesters and commit massacres with their armed forces. The angry demonstrators responded sometimes violently by raiding administration offices, police, and so on.

According to a domestic statistics (Han Woo-geun, 1993: 530), over two million Koreans took part in about 1,500 independence movement actions which continued almost until the end of 1919. In addition, the movements resulted in roughly more than 7,500 killed, over 15,000 injured, and some 10,000 imprisoned out of 46,000 arrested including 186 women.[5] Also 715 houses, 47 churches and two schools were destroyed or burned by the Japanese rulers.

On the other hand, there was relatively less serious damage on the Japanese side. The angry demonstrators destroyed 47 local offices, 31 police stations and 71 other facilities, while Japanese human casualties totaled 166 persons.

## Nonviolent factors in the movement

### *Shouting "Mansei" (Long Live!) as the only method*

The 1919 Independence Movement is commonly called a Mansei movement. A Korean word, Mansei, signifies long live or hurrah! People simply raise high two empty hands and shout to celebrate national events, and so on. The most significant aspect of the March 1st Movement was that it employed the absolutely nonviolent method of Mansei shouts consistently from the outset to the last moment. On the first day of the movement, the innocent crowds who gathered at the Tapgol Park began their protests, shouting Daehan Dongnip Mansei! (Long Live Korean Independence!) without weapons or physical force. The peoples' shouts rapidly spread to every corner of the nation and abroad as well. This nonviolent method was initially recommended by the leaders in order to protect protesters from Japanese counteractions. Although there were violent responses on some occasions on the part of protesters, violence was an exception, not a regularly-adopted tool.

---

[5] On the other hand, according to a Japanese statistics, a total of 7,645 Koreans were killed during the movement; 45,562 wounded; 59 churches, 3 schools and 724 houses burned (National History Compilation Committee, 1988: 575). However, taking consideration of the fact that Japan tried to minimize the number of casualties, the victims of the Samil Movement would be much larger than reported.

*Nonviolent leadership*

The movement initially was planned and practiced by thirty-three national leaders. They all had religious backgrounds: sixteen Christianity, fifteen Cheondogyo[6], and two Buddhist. Faced with a national crisis, all the religions and leaders were firmly united to make a single voice. These religious leaders were very cautious about the choice of a proper peaceful and nonviolent method for the movement. Consequently, they chose shouting Mansei because they were really worried about the possible sacrifice of innocent people. They were wise enough to recognize that violence would bring about far more victims than nonviolence. That is why they insisted on nonviolence from the beginning. Also the movement leaders thought that a violent approach could never appeal to the then world community, whose support was believed to be a crucial element for their liberation.

The leaders also engaged in some very naïve behavior. Right after proclaiming the Declaration of Independence, twenty-eight national leaders who had attended[7] the ceremony volunteered to inform the nearby Japanese police of their meeting and accepted immediate arrest on March 1. Subsequently the movement proceeded without leadership from the very beginning, bringing about much confusion and disorder. This might be a great mistake and a reason for the failure of the movement.

*Limited incidents of violence*

As mentioned earlier, it was true that violent actions were sometimes committed by the protesters, faced with ruthless and violent Japanese countermeasures. However the degree and scale of such violence turned out to be very limited. According to a statistics, there were 166 total casualties on the Japanese side, whereas there were heavier casualties among the protesters. Over 7,500 Koreans were killed and over 15,000 were injured (Han 1993: 530). This means that the violence committed by the Korean demonstrators was much more limited than that by the colonial rulers.

At the initial stage of the movement, the marches and risings were very pure and innocent. All they did was simply raising high their empty hands, shouting hurrahs for independence. They did not resort to violent means

[6] A Korea-born religion, whose leader at that time was Son Byoung-hee (손병희).

[7] Four-signers were absent: Kil Sun-Chu, Kim Pyung-Cho, Leu Yer-Dai and Chung Choon-Su (Lee 1979: 136).

such as rocks, bricks, and farming tools. But later on, as conflicts worsened, there followed some raids and burnings by the angry resisters.

Among participants in the movement, an absolute majority were farmers, followed by students, merchants, laborers, and so on. Of course, a large number of women and children joined the demonstrations throughout the country. In particular women and young students played an important role, confidentially carrying copies of the independence declaration and national flags to all over the country. In fact large numbers of Koreans regardless of generations, classes and genders took part in the movements throughout the year of 1919. Nevertheless, the protests were esteemed to be very peaceful and nonviolent, although they were unorganized, spontaneous, and practiced entirely without leadership such as that of Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King or the Dalai Lama.

*Nonviolent expressions in the Independence Declaration*

The Samil Independence Declaration included the spiritual values and philosophy that the movement was pursuing. Basically the document was written in a very moderate tone due to the leaders' anxiety about demonstrators becoming victimized as mentioned earlier (Lee, 1979: 194). In general the declaration was oriented towards self-criticism, self-suffering and peacefulness, embracing even the opponents. As noted by Richard Devine (1997: 523), "the patriots issued a declaration in Seoul calling for Korean independence to be achieved through peaceful means," the leaders called for the absolute use of nonviolence to achieve independence. The nonviolent clauses and commitments shown on the declaration are as follows.

> We will not punish the Japanese for mistrust due to the several violations of promises since the 1876 mutual agreement.
> (丙子修好條規 以來 時時種種의 金石盟約을 食하얏다 하야 日本의 無信을 罪하려 안이 하노라.)
>
> We will not reprimand the Japanese for unrighteousness owing to their neglect of our long-standing social foundations and national sentiments.
> (我의 久遠한 社會基礎와 卓犖한 民族心理를 無視한다 하야 日本의 少義함을 責하려 안이 하노라.)
>
> Today our task is only to construct ourselves, never destroying the opponent. All we have to do is only to explore a new destiny for our nation according to the solemn orders of conscience, neither through envy nor exclusion of others due to our long-lasting grudges or momentary sentiments.

(今日 吾人의 所任은 다만 自己의 建設이 有할 뿐이오, 決코 他의 破壞에 在치 안이하도다. 嚴肅한 良心의 命令으로써 自家의 新運命을 開拓함이오, 決코 舊怨과 一時的 感情으로써 他를 嫉逐排斥함이 안이로다.)

*Three points of commitments* (공약3장)

Since today's rising is our national demand for justice, humanity, survival and prosperity, please go forward in the spirit of liberty, never ostracizing others!
(今日 吾人의 此擧는 正義, 人道, 生存, 尊榮을 爲하는 民族的 要求이니, 오즉 自由的 精神을 發揮할 것이오, 決코 排他的 感情으로 逸走하지 말라.)

To the last person and the last moment, let the nation's just opinions be expressed without hesitation!
(最後의 一人까지, 最後의 一刻까지 民族의 正當한 意思를 快히 發表하라.)

Let all of our actions be taken in the most orderly manner, so that our opinions and claims would be justly heard!
(一切의 行動은 가장 秩序를 尊重하야, 吾人의 主張과 態度로 하여금 어대까지던지 光明正大하게 하라.)

## Nonviolence significance

As analyzed above, it is clear that the Samil Movement did not call for any violent measures, but rather encouraged a nonviolent approach by Koreans. Emphasis was placed on the moral superiority of their cause. Their power did not come from guns or swords, but instead from within themselves through their righteous behaviors and motivations.

On the other hand, it is true that the Samil Movement did not bring immediate success to Koreans of that time. The reasons are many. First, the non-existence of leadership can be pointed out. All of the movement leaders volunteered to be arrested and were detained on the first day of the movement. They were the very leaders who had planned and executed the movement. Thus the ensuing movement could not progress without their leadership. In other words, the marches and protests nationwide took place spontaneously, randomly and unsystematically. Therefore they could not produce sufficient effects. But if the demonstrators for independence had had such outstanding leaders as Mohandas Gandhi or the Dalai Lama, the movements would have progressed in a very different direction.

The lack of nonviolent strategy and tactics also constituted one of the major causes of failure. It was wonderful and wise to see that both the leaders and followers chose nonviolent Mansei shouts as a major movement means. But the problem was that they lacked proper strategy and tactics

for effective nonviolent action. In fact they seemed to have no knowledge about other nonviolent methods. Otherwise very different outcomes could have been produced.

Some violent actions, albeit partial and limited, tended to hinder success of the movements. The violent actions taken are believed to have overshadowed the noble spirits and causes of the movements and to have lessened the possibility of success.

Although the Samil Movement is considered to have failed in that it did not bring immediate Independence, it might not necessarily be a just evaluation. For example, as a result of the movement, in September 1919 the Korean offices in Seoul, Pyongando, Kando, and Vladivostok were combined to establish a single Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea in Shanghai, China (Lee 1979). In 1921 the colonial government allowed publication of two national newspapers the *Chosun Ilbo* and the *Donga Ilbo.* And in 1926 they established the Gyungsung Imperial College (경성제국대학), now Seoul National University), pretending to mitigate their harsh military oppressions. More importantly the noble causes and spirits of the movement are well carved in the preamble of the current ROK constitution. In this sense the 1919 March First Movement will never be a failure on a long-term basis. Rather it will remain as an immortal nonviolent action.

## Samboilbae (三步一拜) Marches as Self-suffering Expression: The Anti-Saemangeum Project

In Buddhism bowing is the greatest show of respect to the Buddha or teachers. It lowers oneself to the lowest level by putting one's head, knees and elbows down on the ground. The bow in Buddhism varies according to the cultures where the religion was transplanted. In Tibet, for example, it is conducted with both hands and feet spread out and the body flat on the ground. In Thailand and Vietnam, one bows one's head three times while on one's knees.

The tradition of sambo (삼보, 三步), or three steps, is rooted in the idea of three poisons. Buddhist teaching is that unless one is able to shed three poisons—greed, anger and ignorance—it is of no use to believe in the religion no matter how hard one worships. So the custom of taking three steps came to signify shedding of the three poisons, while one deep bow means sincere penitence over the three poisons. The Korean word, samboilbae (삼보일배, 三步一拜), taking three steps followed by one bow, holds such significance.

Recently, the samboilbae method has been employed frequently in Korean society as an approach to problem-solving. Typical was the 2003 envi-

ronmental movement which fiercely resisted the Saemangeum Reclamation Project by this method.

The Saemangeum is the name of a vast tidal flats area which is located in the southwest of Korea. It was formed over millennia when both the Mangyung and Dongjin rivers deposited silt on the shore of the Yellow Sea. The Saemangeum tideland reclamation project started in 1991 and was completed in 2010 in order to enlarge land and control water. The project connected Gusan to Buan by constructing a 33.9 km. sea dike (or sea wall) and two sluice gates. It created 28,300 ha. of land (140 times the area of Yeoui-do island in Seoul or five times that of Manhattan in New York), a 11,800 ha. freshwater lake and the longest (33.9 km) sea dike in the world, while destroying the 208 square km. ecosystem of Korea's most important wetland. The objectives of the Samboilbae march were well expressed in the following declaration.

> We hereby sincerely supplicate for life and peace for the Saemangeum tidal flat and the whole world. We start Samboilbae (three steps walking, and one big bow) to Seoul….We now announce our request to all the people in the world, including us religious people: repent sincerely and do not fear the hardships. We must have a deep belief in life and peace to diffuse that belief around the world. We must give hope in times of despair, life in times of death, and prayers in times of violence.
>
> There has been a quite a lot of destruction and death for more than ten years, here at Saemangeum tidal flat. It is a great battlefield made of human fault and greed …. In this hard time, Catholic priest Moon Gyu-hyun, Buddhist monk Soo-gyoung, Christian and Won-Buddhism clerics are going for Samboilbae from here, Saemangeum tidal flat to Seoul. We are leaving for the 300 kilometers journey, with the most sincere and bold spirits. Along the way, there will be pain and hardships. However, we will save the Saemangeum tidal flat, in order to persuade the world to expiate its sins, and save life and peace. We will unite all the people who work for the sake of life and peace by this prayer and penance, Samboilbae. We will share the importance of even infinitesimal things, simplicity of practice, and strength of conviction. We know that all we have is our hearts that can pray and our bodies that can endure penances. We will give away all those hearts and bodies to speak about the importance of life and beauty of peace. Even when we fall on roads and our bodies start getting paralyzed, our journey to save the Saemangeum tidal flat, and moreover life and peace of the world, will continue.[8]

[8] This proclamation was made by the participants of the Samboilbae movement including the four leaders on March 28, 2003, launching their movement at the Saemangeum tidal flat towards Seoul.

*Progress*

The Samboilbae began on March 28, 2003 and was completed sixty-five days later on May 31. The four religious leaders—a Roman Catholic priest Moon Gyu-hyun (문규현신부), a Buddhist monk Soo-gyoung (수경스님), a Won-Buddhist monk Kim Gyung-il (김경일교무) and a Reverend Lee Hee-un (이희운목사) —initiated and completed their historic nonviolent Samboilbae movement, starting from the Saemangeum wetland in Buan to Seoul, even risking their lives.

Statistically, during the Samboilbae movement the leaders walked an average of 5.8 km. a day, totaling 320 km. (about 200 miles) from the Buan wetland to Seoul over sixty-five days, joined by a total of 25,000 participants, taking 360,000 steps, bowing 120,000 times (about 2,000 bows a day), wearing out 1,600 gloves. The first day of the movement, March 28, 2003, was launched simply with a silent prayer. As time went by the four religious leaders and followers had a hard time, enduring both physical pains in the daytime and severe cold at night. The Buddhist monk Soo-gyoung suffered a knee pain from the beginning. However he said nothing about it. Reverend Lee Hee-un faced a different kind of difficulty. He had to endure blind criticism from Protestant circles that bowing was not proper for a pastor. In response he changed from bowing to kneeling and praying with a wooden cross, which was more painful than the bowing. Followers increased gradually. All the activists woke up at six every morning, packed their baggage, took down their tents, and started the day's Samboilbae march at eight o'clock

They covered about 5.8 km. each day and slept in tents. Every 100 meters, they took a ten minute break. From April the activists had to suffer suffocating heat from the asphalt and fumes from vehicles. From May 4, the four religious leaders began to keep silence in order to deepen their asceticism and to deliver their messages from heart to heart. They did not utter a single word to each other. As the Samboilbae group was getting close to Seoul more people joined the silent marchers.

On the 55$^{th}$ day of the march, Buddhist monk Soo-gyoung at last fell in exhaustion. He was carried to a hospital by ambulance. The next day he came back to the march in a wheelchair. All cheered him. On May 23 they at last crossed the border of Seoul where all the activists and supporters began to converge. They continued their march towards the National Assembly building, the Catholic Myoung-dong (명동) Cathedral, the Buddhist Jogyesa Temple (조계사), the Presidential Blue House (청와대) and finally reached the central Seoul Square, completing their sixty-five day painful journey.

## Nonviolent significance

*Self-suffering walk with bows as a creative and perfect nonviolent action*

The four religious leaders adopted a perfect nonviolent method, the samboilbae, for their life and peace movement. The method was a self-suffering and extremely painful one borrowed from Buddhism. At the outset there was neither blame nor reprimand toward others. No single word was spoken between and among the activists during the latter part of the march in token of their penitence and self-reflection. They practiced this nonviolently beautiful method for sixty-five days and over the long distance of 320 kilometers (about 200 miles). It was the first such case on record in Korea.

In fact walking had been employed by many nonviolent activists. Mahatma Gandhi walked 200 miles in twenty-three days on his Salt March in 1930. Vinoba Bhave,[9] one of the Gandhi's successors, also walked 100,000 miles over 20 years in order to get donations of land from landlords in India. And Satish Kumar, another Indian nonviolent activist, conducted an 8,000-mile peace pilgrimage from India to the United States to join the Peace March by led by Martin Luther King.

*Deeply touching people's hearts*

The painful self-suffering marches deeply touched people nationwide as well as the participants, as they came close to their destination (Ma, 2005). There were some doubts about whether they could complete this long excruciating journey. But they did it despite unexpected difficulties in the process. If they had used violent means, however, the movement could not have been so touching. It seems that the more painful the method, the more touching the movement. The nonviolent significance of the Samboilbae marches was well expressed by one of the international solidarity volunteers named David:

---

[9] Vinoba Bhave, 1895-1982, an Indian religious figure, founder of the Bhoodan Movement. While studying Sanskrit in Benares (Varanasi), he joined Mohandas K. Gandhi as a disciple. At Gandhi's request, Bhave resisted British wartime regulations in 1940 and spent nearly five years in prison. After Gandhi died (1948), Bhave was widely accepted as his successor. More interested in land reform, accomplished voluntarily, than in politics, he founded in 1951 the Bhoodan Movement, or land-gift movement, and subsequently traveled thousands of miles on foot, accepting donations of land for redistribution to the landless. By 1969 the Bhoodan had collected over 4 million acres (1.6 million hectares) of land for redistribution (*Columbia Encyclopedia*).

> The more that I learned about 3 steps 1 bow, the more powerful it became to me. As I have watched the four men move closer to Seoul, at times joined by groups of supporters, the importance of the act has become clearer to me. This is an act of nature and sacred fight for something that one loves, respects, and believes in. In the case of these four men, they are making a great attempt to defend their Saemangeum peacefully and humbly, calling attention to the threats facing Saemangeum through their own suffering. This demonstration has proved to be very powerful to me, and I am sure to many others as well. It is selfless acts like these that bring about awareness, participation, and change. This goes to show that action, not merely words, is needed to bring about radical change.

*Accompanying cultural events*

There were no turbulences, violent actions or physical collisions throughout the Samboilbae movement period. Instead along the marches there were a variety of cultural events; such as songs, music, dances, exhibitions, and sharing of food. During the journey some supporters accompanying the peaceful march would hold performances with music and dance. It cheered not only themselves but also the local people who brought food and shelter to the marchers. Some people uploaded their poems on the Samboilbae website. Through these abundant cultural performances, the *Samboilbae* movement expressed its nonviolent characteristics.

## Outcomes

*Bonding among different classes of people*

The nonviolent life and peace movement provided a crucial opportunity to reunite different classes of people. It brought together religious groups, political parties, civil groups, environmentalists, women, laborers, farmers, and so on. It transcended their ideologies and beliefs in making a single voice for saving nature and lives. There was much support and encouragement from the people; over 40 million won was donated and newspapers covered the movement every day. Around ten major internet websites promptly reported the news. Three major domestic television stations—KBS, MBC and SBS—also opened debates, inviting government officials, NGOs, experts and others. The issue was the hottest one in the media for two months. Politicians also gradually responded. Out of the total of 299 National Assemblymen 150 agreed to suspend the construction of the sea wall and to find alternatives. Four major religions in Korea joined the movement, a very rare case in recent Korean history. Many local organizations also welcomed and helped the movement.

*Temporary halt to the reclamation project*

After the Samboilbae march, many fruitful discussions followed to find solutions with fundamental respect for life and peace. During this time, however, the construction authorities--the Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry (MAF) and the Korea Agricultural & Rural Infrastructure Corporation (KARIC)—opposed halting the project, because the Saemangeum reclamation project was their most lucrative business. They started to speed up construction and added more than one kilometer to the sea wall in a very short time. After hearing this news, some radical activists raced into the region, but they were soon faced with violent resistance by local people who supported the project[10]. In July 2003 the reclamation project was suspended by decision of the Seoul Administration Court. This was the first case in Korean history in which a court decided in favor of environmentalists. Later, however, the Court of Appeals reversed the initial decision and finally allowed construction to resume in 2005.

*A new civilized method beyond an environmental drive*

The Samboilbae movement, which was fundamentally oriented to love of life and peace, went far beyond simply saving a wetland or being only an environmental movement. The spirit led to grand reconciliation between man and the nature, and among all classes, north and south, inter-regional, generational, ideological, and so on. The four leaders dedicated themselves to this noble cause, risking their lives. They wanted to transform the world full of greed and arrogance into a reconciliatory and forgiving one.

*Other examples of the Samboilbae movement*

It is said that the Samboilbae method was initially employed in the education of Korean Buddhist monks in 1992. Since then the unique nonviolent method has been popularly adopted in demonstrations seeking solutions to various social problems. Examples are abundant. One was the case in which a group of local residents in Buan, Jullabuk-do Province, employed it to oppose the government's plan to install nuclear disposal facilities on their island[11]. The nonviolent march continued for ten days beginning on October

[10] The supporters of the Saemangeum project were the central and local governments, construction authorities, and local residents around the reclamation area, whereas the opponents were environmentalists, some religious people, and residents of Jeollabuk-do Province where the Saemangeum is located.

[11] The planned installation site is the isle of Wido, off Buan in Jullabuk-do Province.

1, 2003, and covered about 50 kilometers from Buan to Jeonju City. Hundreds of residents and NGOs joined the peaceful demonstration.

Among uses of the Samboilbae method have been workers' protests for guaranteed minimum living wages, reinstatement of fired workers, withdrawal of the Korean Army from Iraq, opposition to the WTO, or even for political purposes. In 2004 a National Assemblywoman, Choo Mi-Ae, practiced this method in Gwangju City in order to demonstrate her party's sincerity to the constituency, although not so successfully. But overall the Samboilbae method now seems to be established as a useful instrument in Korean society.

### Candlelight assemblies as a new civilized culture

Demonstrations in Korea used to be extremely radical and violent before the turn of the 21st century. A variety of violent means were mobilized, such as petrol bombs, iron pipes, bamboo spears, rocks, lumber, arson, teargas, and water cannons. The rationales for such radical behaviors were many; for example, to end dictatorship, to achieve democratization, and to seek settlements in labor disputes. Shamefully such violent scenes in Korea were a regular item on CNN and other world news channels.

A turning point came in Korean demonstration culture with gradual development of democratization. The tough behaviors have become far more moderate in recent years. Such violent methods as petrol bombs or iron pipes recently have nearly disappeared. Instead softer methods like candlelight vigils are replacing them. This indicates progress in demonstration culture. Candlelight rallies have taken the form of cultural festivals with art performances, music, dances and other expressions since the Law on Assembly and Demonstration prohibited other kinds of outdoor evening rallies.

This section will present candlelight rallies as one of the alternative nonviolent methods in Korea. Candlelight is said to hold three significant meanings: sacrifice in the sense that it burns itself out but lights up its surroundings; unity in that though singly weak, it can collectively fill the world; and a dream and wish since it is a flame lighting the darkness and opening the dawn. The following will introduce some notable cases in which candlelight was employed as a major demonstration means in Korea (Kwak 2009; Byun 2006).

*Candlelight demonstrations against deaths of two Korean girls by a U.S. Army tank and subsequent not-guilty verdict on American soldiers in 2002*

**Objectives**: To condemn the incident in which two teenage Korean girl students (신효순, 심미순)[12] were killed by a U.S. Forces in Korea (USFK) tank on a road in Gyunggi Province on June 13, 2002; To call for revision of the Korea-U.S. Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) in order for Korean courts to gain jurisdiction of trials over USFK soldiers.

**Development**: Following a networking citizen's call on the Internet for a candlelight rally, the rally was realized and quickly spread from downtown Seoul to nationwide. At first the rally began with pure condolences for the killed, but it later changed to demand revision of the Korea-U.S. SOFA and increased anti-American feelings. It was estimated that a total of 428 rallies and joined by five million people took place over the following two years until June, 2004 (Byun, 2006).

**Outcomes**: This demonstration seemed to be the first case in which candles were used as a major instrument for mass protests throughout modern Korean history, offering a precedent for nonviolent demonstration cultures. Although neither an official apology by the United States nor revision of SOFA were achieved, President George Bush expressed his regrets indirectly through the American embassy in Korea and in a telephone call to President Kim Dae-jung.

*Candlelight anti-Iraq War sit-ins for Korean Army withdrawal in 2003 to 2004*

**Objectives**: To oppose the U.S. unilateral invasion of Iraq in 2003; To present condolences to the late hostage Kim Sun-il (김선일) who was beheaded in Iraq by a group of Iraqi Islamic terrorists; To call for withdrawal of Korean Army units stationed in Iraq.

**Development**: Following America's unilateral invasion of Iraq in 2003, Korean troops were dispatched there at America's request. In that situation, an Islamic terrorist group took Kim Sun-il, a 34-year-old Korean employee at the Gana Trading Company (가나무역) in Baghdad, as hostage in June, 2004, demanding "withdrawal of Korean troops within 24 hours". After two days he was beheaded on June 22, 2004 as the Korean government refused their demand. Consequently the initial condolence assemblies turned into big anti-war rallies. But all these rallies were conducted in a peaceful and orderly manner, expanding from Seoul to nationwide.

**Outcomes**: Despite public pressures, the government somewhat confidentially had to dispatch 3,600 additional troops—the Zaytun Unit

[12] The two Korean girls were middle school students Shin Hyo-soon and Shim Mi-soon, both fourteen years old. They were killed by accident when walking along a road where a USFK tank under training was passing.

(자이툰부대)—in September 2004. However candles were lit and used as a silent yet strong method for demonstrations. Eventually Korean army forces and the Zaytun Unit were withdrawn from Iraq in December 2008.

*Candlelight protests against impeachment of President Roh in 2004*

**Objective**: To protest and nullify parliamentary impeachment of President Roh Moo-hyun.

**Development**: Opposition parties occupying a majority of seats in the National Assembly unilaterally passed a bill to impeach incumbent President Roh Moo-hyun on March 12, 2004. By this measure his presidency was temporarily suspended according to constitutional provisions. To protest this parliamentary decision, opponents and their supporters immediately lit candles in downtown Seoul, an action which spread throughout the nation. This soon developed into civil resistance against the impeachment forces. On the other hand, conservative impeachment supporters also held the same candlelight rallies at the same times and sites. The candlelight sit-ins continued for sixteen days until March 27, 2004, mobilizing around one and a half million participants. The parliamentary impeachment vote was finally overturned by the Constitutional Court on May 14, 2004, restoring Roh's presidency.

**Outcomes**: The candlelight vigils had a great impact on the subsequent 17th general elections held on April 15, 2004. The former majority Grand National Party became a minority in the National Assembly by gaining only 121 seats out of 299, while the former minority New Millennium Democratic Party became the majority with 152 seats. The strong anti-impeachment rallies may have had some impact on the subsequent decision of the Constitutional Court. The candlelight movement contributed a lot to changes in Korean demonstration culture and in people's political participation.

*Candlelight opposition to American beef imports in 2008*

**Objectives**: To call upon the government to renegotiate with the United States not to import American beef aged over thirty months and other products related to mad cow disease.

**Development**: Complaints began to erupt from the public in April, 2008 over the government's negotiations related to American beef imports. People blamed both President Lee Myung-bak and his government for careless negotiations with the USA, followed by candlelight demonstrations. The initial sit-downs became radical and violent as leftist groups and associations joined them, quickly turning into to anti-government slogans. All sorts of leftists and citizens—radical students, wives, children, union members, fired

laborers, environmentalists, NGOs, progressives, and radicals—turned out to voice their respective long-standing complaints. They intended to make best use of this chance for their political purposes. Consequently the initially silent candlelight sit-ins changed into violent and radical protests.

**Outcomes**: Eventually the public pressures produced reluctant renegotiations between the two governments that mitigated some of the import conditions. Consequently Korea came to win more favorable conditions including the introduction of a new Quality System Assessment program. On the other hand, there was a feeling that the pure nonviolent candlelight method had been abused for leftists' political purposes.

## Conclusion

This exploration has briefly presented some nonviolent cases in Korean history and in peoples' lives. Definitely they are the tip of an iceberg. Many more invite discovery. A major example is the April, 19, 1960 Students' Uprising which demonstrated many nonviolent features, although encountering violence in response. The 1980 Kwangju Democratization Revolution demonstrated a similar pattern of nonviolent protest followed by violent countermeasures.

In contrast, the 1987 Democratization Protest was a highlight for nonviolence. The then government finally surrendered to the demands of people power, accepting direct popular election of the president and other democratization demands. There were no serious violent attacks by protesters. It was quite similar to the February 1986 People Power Revolution in the Philippines.

Further exploration and research on nonviolent cases and assets will greatly contribute to transforming Korean society into a more nonviolent and peaceful one in the future. It is noted that softness embraces hardness, water extinguishes fire, and that nonviolence finally overcomes violence.

## References

Byon, Hee-ran. 2006. "The Expansion of Nonviolence and Candlelight Assemblies in Korea". Student paper at Inha University.

Devine, Richard. 1997. "Japanese Rule in Korea after the March First Uprising," *Monumenta Nipponica*, 52(4): 523-540.

Han, Woo-geun. 1993. *Hankuk Tongsa* (History of Korea).

Chung, Yoon-Jae (Trans.). 2007. *Bisalsaeng Jungchihak* (비살생 정치학) [Nonkilling Political Science]. Translation of Glenn D. Paige, *Nonkilling Global Political* Science, 2nd ed. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling, 2007 [2002].

Jang, Jae-hyun. 2005. "Nonviolent Factors Found in the Recent 'Samboilbae' Movement." Student paper at the Graduate Institute of Peace Studies, Kyounghee University.

Kwak, Mi-sun. 2009. "Nonviolence and Candlelight Assemblies". Student paper at Hoseo University.

Lee, Hyun-hee. 1979. *3.1 Undongsaron* (History of the March First Movement). Dongbang Books.

Ma, Yong-un. 2005. "The Samboilbae for a New Civilized Movement". NuriMedia.

National History Compilation Committee. 1988. *Hanminjok Dongnipundongsa* (History of the Korean Nation's Independence Movement).

Paige, Glenn D. 2010. "April Resolution and Nonkilling Korea: Observations and Reflections," Paper presented at the International Conference on the 50th Anniversary of the April Democratic Revolution. Organized by the Citizens Alliance for a Just Society & Clean Politics, Seoul, Lotte Hotel, October 14, 2010.

_____. 1984. "Nonviolent Cultural Resources for Korean Unification," in Han, Sung-joo, Ed. *Korea and Asia*. Seoul: Korea University Press, pp. 227-50.

Seong, Young-jo, trans. 2004. *Jeonjaengeui Yeoksa* (전쟁의 역사) [A History of Warfare]. Translation of Field Marshal Viscount Bernard Law Montgomery, *A History of Warfare*. New York: William Morrow, 1983.

Sharp, Gene. 1973. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Boston: Porter Sargent.

# Nonkilling in North Korean Culture

## Discoveries of a Former Enemy Soldier

Glenn D. Paige
*University of Hawai'i*

December 1987 was my third time in Pyongyang. The first was on October 19, 1950 as a twenty-one year old US Army assistant antiaircraft communications officer attached to the artillery headquarters of the ROK First Division. The second was following defeat of the UN forces and retreat of the First Division south through the city on December 5, 1950. Later visits that benefited discoveries were in 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1992.

The third time was as a fifty-eight year old University of Hawai'i professor of nonviolent politics. It began on November 30, 1987 on a Chosun Minhang flight from Beijing with an English-speaking flight attendant and announcements in Korean and English. Mistaken at first for a Russian, when introduced as an American friendly conversations opened up with two fellow passengers: a table tennis champion returning from a tournament in Indonesia and a traditional medicine doctor returning from an international conference in Beijing.

I was privileged to visit North Korea for two weeks, invited by the Korean Association of Social Scientists (KASS) whose president was philosophy Professor Hwang Jang Yop (1923-2010). He was also the Korean Workers Party Secretary for Foreign Affairs, a combination of scholar and political leader. As former secretary to President Kim IL Sung, former president of Kim IL Sung University and former chair of the Supreme People's Assembly, Professor Hwang had been entrusted with developing North Korea's Juche (Self Reliance) philosophy through the Academy of Juche Sciences.

I had been introduced to KASS by Professor Hiroharu Seki, a member of the Science Council of Japan, former director of the Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University, then dean of the Faculty of International Relations of Ritsumeikan University in Kyoto. As a pioneer in teaching peace by engaging students in simulated policy-making, Professor Seki had established relations with KASS that enabled him to bring Japanese students and faculty to visit North Korea. He had done the same with the American University in Washington and the University of British Columbia in Canada. We had been colleagues since political science graduate student days at Northwestern University in the 1950s.

## Nonkilling surprise

Meeting Professor Hwang for the first time, sitting opposite in the KASS conference room, I first thanked him for the invitation to visit. Then unceremoniously I asked him the scientific question that had challenged my research and teaching since 1974. "Is a nonkilling society possible?"

Since the term "nonkilling" is not in an English language dictionary nor customary in political science, the concept of a "nonkilling society" needed definition. I explained it was a society with no killing of humans and no threats to kill; no weapons specifically designed to kill humans and no justifications for using them; and no conditions of society dependent upon the threat or use of killing force for maintenance or change.

Without a moment's hesitation, Professor Hwang replied, "It is completely possible." This came as a shock and surprise since I was accustomed to the usual American political science response: "It is completely unthinkable." Professor Hwang was the first political scholar I had met in the world to answer "yes."

I then asked for his opinion on three main reasons for the impossibility of a nonkilling society that I had usually encountered in America. First, *human nature.* Humans, like animals, are killers by nature. Second, *economic scarcity*. Competition over scarce resources will always lead to conflict and killing. Third, *rape*. Males need always to be prepared to kill to prevent rape of their female family members or associates.

Professor Hwang's responses were swift and clear. First, human beings are different from animals. They are capable of "consciousness, reason, and creativity" that enable them to overcome instinctive propensities for violence. Second, economic scarcity can be overcome by "creativity, productivity, and most importantly by equitable distribution." Economic scarcity should not be used to justify violence and war. Third, "rape can be overcome by education and provision of a proper social atmosphere." This was the first time I had heard anyone say that rape could be prevented. Although rape like homicide was a death penalty offense in North Korea, the absence of prostitutes on the streets and of sexual violence in the media, gave credence to the possibility of non-rape social atmospheres.

## Discovery of the politics of love

Since the academic discipline of political science, like other social sciences, is constantly redefining its subject, it occurred to me to ask Professor Hwang, "What is your definition of politics?" He replied, "Politics means the harmonization of the interests of all members of society on the basis of love

and equality." Again, surprisingly this was the first mention of "love" as a defining characteristic of politics that I could recall in the Western tradition of political theory and philosophy from Greece and Rome to the present.

Professor Hwang gave an example of love in action. After the War orphans and delinquent youth had been committing offenses on city streets. The first response was to round them up and take them on trucks to training camps in the countryside. This did not succeed. It produced repeat offenders and a network of city gangs. Then the youth were placed individually in families throughout the country where love proved to be far superior form of rehabilitation.

Love was mentioned by several other KASS scholars in 1987. But it was only in 1989 when I asked a KASS scholar what it meant during the 4th International Conference on Buddhism and Leadership for Peace convened in Ulan Bator, Mongolia. The conference brought together Buddhists, peace leaders, and scholars from Korea (North and South), China, Japan, Russia, the United States, and other countries. To a group of these scholars sitting in a circle on an excursion in the Gobi, the KASS philosopher explained, "Parents love their children. Children love their parents. People love animals. Animals love people. People love nature. Love is the basis of human society."

The surprising discoveries of scholarly confidence in the possibility of nonkilling societies and of love in the definition of politics found in North Korea made an important contribution to the thesis of *Nonkilling Global Political Science* first published in 2002. (Paige 3rd ed. 2009). The story of their discovery is related in that book. By 2010 it had been translated into 22 languages, including Korean (Chung 2007).

An example of surprising early Korean scholarly receptivity to the nonkilling thesis of the still unwritten book occurred in 1987. After a group discussion on Juche thought and nonkilling, one KASS philosopher in 1987 said: "I am sure that if your vision is philosophically based and argued well in relation to human life and aspirations, then there will be the finest vision and the finest book in the world."

## Deep culture of Korean nonviolence

A highlight of the 1987 visit was reunion with the historian Pak Si-Hyŏng in his classical book-filled study at Kim IL Sung University. I was told that Kim IL Sung respected him and encouraged his studies. We had first met in 1960 in the Korean Section of the 25th International Congress of Orientalists held at Moscow University. He attended in a six-member delegation from North Korea. The Korean Section had mainly Russian and Eastern European specialists.

I was the only participant from a non-Soviet bloc country, having flown around the world from Seoul where I was serving as research advisor in the Graduate School of Public Administration at Seoul National University. The Moscow Congress was of special interest to me, since I had studied and published about Russian scholarship on Korea. At that time Soviet Korean studies were far more advanced than Korean studies in the United States.

Since awakening to nonkilling in 1974 I was interested in finding evidence of nonviolence in historical traditions. Thus I asked Professor Pak, "What are the roots of nonviolence in the Korean tradition?" He replied that nonviolence in Korean culture is rooted in the Tan'gun creation story of the origins of the Korean people. In this story God sends his son to earth who mates with a bear turned woman. The Korean people are born and guided by the principle of *Hongik In'gan* (welfare of all humankind). He further explained that throughout history the Korean people have not been aggressors against their neighbors, but rather have been victims of aggression.

Professor Pak's answer was profoundly interesting. Previously in Seoul I had asked exactly the same question and received exactly the same answer from the respected Quaker teacher Ham Sok Hon, known as "Korea's Gandhi," who had written a spiritual history of Korea from the Tan'gun era. (Ham 1965, 1985).

In Pyongyang I discovered the same deep culture understanding of the nonviolent essence of Korean culture as found in Seoul. The Korean people arise not out of battles of gods and sin but out of the union of Heaven and Earth producing divinely inspired humanism and respect for life.

In reflecting upon these nonkilling scholarly discoveries in North Korea, the saying "we reap what we sow" comes to mind. In seeking nonkilling cultural understanding free of lethal intent, one discovers the previously unthinkable and seemingly impossible. When scholars from North and South Korea visit each other and their neighbors, asking similar questions about nonkilling cultural capabilities, similar discoveries are probable.

## Love of children and learning

Visits to the Children's Palace, a senior middle school, and the Grand People's Study Hall in Pyongyang, evidenced love of children and learning. The Children's Palace, reflected the oft-repeated saying that "children are the kings and queens of our country." Serving 10,000 children daily aged five to sixteen, five hundred professionals in five hundred rooms supplemented regular education in various fields. Children there were studying violin, kayageum,

piano, guitar, calligraphy, painting, ballet, theater, hydroelectricity, TV repair, and auto mechanics. Now undoubtedly computers. Visiting a primary school I was told that for love of children some retired teachers had returned to teach. The Grand People's Study Hall, said to have 10,000 visitors daily, offered opportunities for adults to seek new knowledge.

## Love of mountains

In North Korea I discovered the same love of mountains experienced in South Korea during a month's stay in the Shinheungsa Buddhist temple in the Sorak Mountains in June 1972. Happily discovered in a Pyongyang bookshop was *Kŭmgangsan hansijip* [Collected Diamond Mountain Chinese Poems], Chinese texts with parallel Hangul translations written by visitors to the Diamond Mountains from the 12th to the 19th century (Ri and Pak 1989).

In 1992 together with a KASS scholar I stood on the south rim of Paektusan (Mt. Paektu) with its spectacular volcanic crater lake, looking north to China. I reflected that nonkilling collegiality can bring scholars from North and South to stand together on Paektusan and on Hallasan in Jejudo in ways that clashing armies could not do. Korean mountains have a peaceful power of their own, deeply meaningful in the heart of Korean culture.

## Love in song

As a fan of Korean folk music, I discovered audiocassettes by male and female soloists and choruses, accompanied by orchestras with mixed traditional and modern instruments. The word "love" often appeared among celebrations of nature and life.

One happy discovery was the song *Sarang, sarang, nae sarang* [Love, love, my love] in a North Korean video production of the folk opera *Chunhyang Chun* [Tale of Chunhyang]. It reminded me of when I first saw the opera performed amidst war in Taegu in 1951 with music by the National Symphony Orchestra conducted by maestro Rody Hyun. As the only non-Korean in the theater, it was a privilege to be invited backstage to meet the artists.

## Nonkilling faiths

By nonkilling faiths is meant religions and philosophies that include principled respect for human life. Although most religions have been used to kill and justify killing, the fact that they also preserve nonkilling values and motivate strong nonkilling commitments by some believers can be recognized. Also the resilience of faiths and resurgence after long repression is a fact of history.

Although it was reported abroad that absolutely no practice of religion was permitted in North Korea, I had been informed by a Soviet specialist on Korean religions that limited practice was permitted there. Therefore it was not surprising to discover in Pyongyang a Protestant church and a Catholic cathedral (with veiled women at prayer), and several Buddhist temples in the city and mountains. At a mountain temple that had survived wartime bombing that had destroyed many others, I asked the Abbot a question concerning the relation between Juche and Buddhist thought. He replied, "Juche deals with outside things. Buddhism deals with inside things."

The existence in North Korea as well as in South Korea of Christianity with its Biblical commandment "Thou shalt not kill" and of Buddhism with its first precept "Not to take the life of sentient beings" is a fact. It is also a fact that in both parts of Korea, religions have been mobilized to kill.

## Nonkilling scholarly receptivity

On a tour of monuments in central Pyongyang, a scholar pointed out the centrality and height of the scholar's writing brush in a large sculpture of the Korean Workers Party symbol. The brush is flanked by the hammer of the industrial worker and the sickle of the farmer. The figure of a soldier is absent. Respect for scholarship is one indicator of nonkilling cultural reciprocity in both North and South

Only seven years after the Korean War Armistice, six North Korean scholars agreed to meet an American professor in August 1960 at the 25th International Congress of Orientalists in Moscow. Since I had just come from Seoul, they asked me, "Who are the respected scholars in South Korea?" After expressing deep regret that South Korean scholars were not present to reply, I ventured that if as a foreigner I had to name one it would be the historian Professor Yi Pyeng Do. They responded with recognition and respect. Later I learned Professor Yi had been the master of ceremonies at the wedding of one member of the North Korean delegation, the noted archaeologist Professor To Yu Ho.

Another discovery of scholarly receptivity came in Paris in 1973 during a break in the proceedings of the 29th International Congress of Orientalists. At a sidewalk café I asked the head of the North Korean delegation if the Academy of Sciences would be interested in sending a group of scholars to visit the University of Hawaii. He expressed interest and we discussed the possibility of five scholars representing the humanities and social sciences. We thought December would be a good time to come from cold Korea to

warm Hawaii. I asked, "To whom should we send the invitation? To President Kim IL Sung?" "No," he replied, "send it to me."

As a result of this meeting, in October 1973 at the UN in New York I delivered an official letter of invitation from President Harlan Cleveland of the University of Hawaii to a member of the DPRK Observer Mission. The meeting in the Delegates' Lounge was arranged by the UN Undersecretary for Political Affairs. Unfortunately further contact was lost and the US State Department could not assure issuance of entry visas.

Sixteen years later in 1989, due to Professor Hwang's readiness to engage in nonkilling scholarly relations, four pioneering events occurred. Three KASS scholars (a linguist, philosopher, and sociologist) visited the University of Hawaii. In return the University of Hawaii president Albert J. Simone, his wife, the dean of the School of Asian and Pacific Studies, and the director of the Center for Korean Studies, Professor Dae-Sook Suh, a biographer of Kim IL Sung (Suh 1988), visited Pyongyang. This visit was condemned in editorials in the two Honolulu newspapers as lending support to a totalitarian Stalinist regime.

In November 1989, KASS facilitated acceptance of an invitation for a North Korean delegation to participate in the Fourth International Conference on Buddhism and Leadership for Peace held in Ulan Bator. The delegation consisted of an official of the Korean Federation of Buddhists, a lay Buddhist, and a KASS philosopher. The conference was organized by the Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project of the University of Hawaii. It was co-sponsored by the Asian Buddhist Conference for Peace (ABCP) in which the North Korean Buddhists Federation constituted a national section. (Paige and Gilliat 1991).

Another example of nonkilling scholarly receptivity occurred in 1990 when a KASS delegation along with South Korean futurists participated in the XIth World Congress of the World Future Studies Federation (WFSF) held in Budapest, Hungary. During an excursion to a horse farm outside Budapest, North and South Korean scholars, sitting at a table surrounded by WFSF members, sang together the nostalgic Korean folk song *Arirang*. Tears came to many eyes. There was an uplifting sense of joy of among the world futurists. The participation of Korean scholars from North and South was considered the high point of the Congress.

### Nonkilling bid to co-host the 1988 Summer Olympic Games

In December 1987 in Pyongyang I saw new sports facilities and hotels for athletes constructed in preparation for co-hosting the 1988 Summer Olympics, officially the Games of the XXIV Olympiad. The North Korean Olympic

Committee had proposed co-hosting the Games which had been awarded by the International Olympic Committee to Seoul. This bid was rejected by the IOC and Seoul. Instead they proposed that if the North would participate in the Seoul Games, then five of twenty-four Games could be held in Pyongyang. This was rejected and the North boycotted the Games. An opportunity in the tradition of the Olympic Games was lost for joint Korean and international affirmation of Korea's nonkilling cultural potential for peace.

## Nonkilling political potential

Despite the fearful and belligerent siege mentality engendered by the unconcluded Korean War, recurrent examples of North Korean peace-seeking conflict resolution with South Korea and the United States can be recognized as evidence of nonkilling political cultural potential.

In 1972 the acceptance by Kim IL Sung of secret visits to Pyongyang by ROK CIA director Lee Hu Rak produced the joint statement of July 4. It stated agreement that "unification shall be achieved through peaceful means, and not through the use of force against each other." The unprecedented Pyongyang Summit meeting in 2000 between DPRK Chairman Kim Jong IL and ROK President Kim Dae-jung produced the historic June 15 peace statement that called for "promoting mutual understanding, developing mutual Korean relations, and achieving peaceful reunification." In 2007 the Pyongyang Summit reception by Chairman Kim Jong IL of ROK President Roh Moo-hyun produced the Eight-Point Agreement of October 4. It included point four: "The two sides agree on the need to end the current armistice and establish permanent peace."

In 1980 an internationally disregarded proposal by Kim IL Sung to reduce the armed forces of the DPRK and the ROK to 100,000-150,000 men on each side offers a precedent to which political leaders of both North and South can return as a step toward truly nonkilling reconciliation and reunification.

> The confederated state [proposed form of unification] should reduce the military in order to end military confrontation between north and south and bring fratricidal strife to an end for good. At the same time it is essential to abolish the Military Demarcation Line between north and south, dismantle all militia organizations in both parts, *and prohibit military training of civilians* [emphasis added] (Kim Il Sung 1980: 77).

Since the pronouncements of founders of political regimes can legitimate and provide guidance for future generations, the peace vision that Kim IL Sung articulated in 1980 can be taken as an important contribution to nonkilling cultural potential in North Korea.

> [United Korea] should be a peace-loving nation and pursue a peaceful foreign policy. A unified Korea will not threaten aggression against neighboring countries or any other nations of the world and will not be a party to or cooperate in any international act of aggression. The [united] state should make the Korean peninsula a permanent peace zone and nuclear-free zone. To this end it should prohibit the presence of foreign troops and establishment of foreign military bases on its territory and ban the manufacture, introduction, and use of nuclear weapons (Kim Il Sung 1980: 80).

In this statement can be heard an echo of *Hongik In'gan* from the Tan'gun era. Interdisciplinary discoveries of nonkilling potentials in North Korean culture by Korean and other scholars are needed far beyond these limited observations by a former enemy soldier.

## References


Ham Sŏk Hŏn. 1965. *Ddŭitŭropon Hanguk yŏksa*. Seoul: Cheil ch'ulp'ansa. 1985.

_____. 1985. *Queen of Suffering: A Spiritual History of Korea*. John G. Sullivan, ed., trans. by E. Sang Yu. London: Friends World Committee for Consultation.

Kim IL Sung. 1980. *Report to the Sixth Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea*. Pyongyang: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

Paige, Glenn D. 2009 [2002]. *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

_____. 1993. *To Nonviolent Political Science: From Seasons of Violence*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project, Matsunaga Institute for Peace, University of Hawai'i. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

_____ and Sarah Gilliatt, eds. 1991. *Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving: Ulan Bator Explorations*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project, Matsunaga Institute for Peace, University of Hawai'i. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Ri Yong Chun and O Hui Pak, trans. 1989. *Kŭmgangsan hansijip* (Collected Diamond Mountain Chinese Poems). Pyongyang: Munye ch'ulp'ansa.

Suh, Dae-Sook. 1988. *Kim IL Sung: The North Korean Leader*. New York: Columbia University Press.

*Sarang Sarang Naesarang*. (Video, Parts 1 and 2). Pyongyang: Pyŏngyang ch'ulp'ansa. Naenarapideojejakso.

# American Culture

# From Nonkilling to Beloved Community

## Can America Help?

Michael N. Nagler
*University of California, Berkeley*

Stephanie N. Van Hook
*Metta Center for Nonviolence*

As a way into our subject we would like to say a few words about the term "nonkilling." Since the root of the Sanskrit word *hiṃsā* "violence" also means "to slay," "nonkilling" is a plausible translation of ahimsa; indeed a famous prescription in the Dhammapada of the Buddha, using a causative form of the verb, na hante, na hanyate is conventionally translated "do not kill, or cause to kill" (i.e. by participating in a system that kills, like the American judiciary or any military). However, as Nagler (2004: 44) has shown elsewhere, the literal meaning of *ahiṃsā* is probably "the absence of the desire or intention to harm or kill." In other words, the full meaning of the word that stands behind the English term "nonviolence," i.e. ahimsa, implies a much deeper commitment to the well-being of others than to refrain from killing them. Killing is merely the final and most drastic expression of violence—and what we are ultimately after is a world free from all forms of violence, indeed free of violence itself—however we understand it.

On the other hand, nonviolence and nonkilling may not be representative of the same commitment and by separating the two, the path toward a richer, more ethical society may be clearer. Nonkilling is grounded in the primordial commandment, "thou shall not kill." To kill consciously and maliciously within one's own social group (however that is defined!) is perhaps, along with incest, the greatest taboo within the human species. (See Nagler, 1988.) The military, as recently noted by French philosopher Jean-Marie Muller in an open letter to President Obama of the United States,[1] violates this logic by imposing the belief that "thou shall kill" onto our soldiers, and

[1] Available at : <http://www.mettacenter.org/blog/an-urgent-letter-to-president-obama>.

subverts itself into our cultural ethos to commit murder on morally justifiable grounds. Nonviolence is somewhat different. It is conceivably the bridge between our utopia of nonkilling to our application of that norm in the real world, which as Camus (1965: 335) suggests, is "not a world where we no longer kill anyone, but a world where murder is no longer legitimate." Furthermore, when we take away the means of the threat to kill, i.e. its legitimacy, we realize that we need a different approach to many issues, like security first of all. In our view, nonviolence is that approach.

Whether it be nonviolence or nonkilling, in the end the most important thing to recognize is that both these terms, along with almost all the vocabulary human beings have used to designate this capacity—this power, or law of nature—are negative, and that fact betrays a deep and unfortunate bias in human culture. Only one term that we know of, and that a term that has not caught on even in the country that came up with it, the Philippines, is positive, and that is the highly evocative Tagalog phrase *alay dangal*, "to offer dignity." Coined during the People Power uprising of the late eighties, one could wish that it or something equally positive would get established (cf. Zunes, Kurtz and Asher, 1999: 39-40).[2]

That said, however, the strategic value of whatever terms we use is more important than these etymological and philosophical considerations, and here we are willing to concur with Glenn D. Paige that the use of the term nonkilling may well serve as an entry point toward the acceptance of a world where, as featured in website of the Center for Global Nonkilling (<http://www.nonkilling.org>), "killing, threats to kill and conditions conducive to killing are absent," in other words where full nonviolence has been achieved. In fact we at the Metta Center have experimented with a similar concept that again is a simple prescription which, if followed, would bring a total change of outlook in its wake. We have proposed as an ethical norm to be kept in view in the design of any institution, "do nothing that degrades a human being." Without dehumanizing, i.e. degrading its recruits, "basic training" as we know it would be impossible, and war fighting would necessarily follow suit. This norm we propose has the simplicity of Hippocrates's primum non nocere, "the first rule (of medical intervention) is to do no harm," and of "nonkilling." In all cases we are dealing with what we might call "stealth" terminologies that seem perfectly reasonable to the casual hearer—who could be in favor of violence, harm, or killing in certain

[2] Another term that is at least positive is the Arabic *sabr* (صبر), "patience", which is pretty close to an essence of principled nonviolence.

circumstances—but which, when taken to heart would overthrow whole systems and force us to create far better alternatives. That means that when a person makes a commitment not to kill, including the honest commitment "not to kill, or cause to kill" she or he will be forced to find alternatives to resolve conflicts, maintain social order, defend her or his country, etc., and in a word "back into" a commitment to nonviolence which is, as Gandhi said, "all round, in every department of life."[3]

While it seems at first to be more narrow than and just as negative as the word "nonviolence" that we are mostly stuck with, it is certainly more arresting and we feel "may the best word win." In what follows, at any rate, we will use "nonkilling" and "nonviolence" just about interchangeably.

### Is nonkilling possible in America?

The question is in some ways absurdly obvious. Nonviolence as a potential is included in the evolutionary endowment of every human being (we will be discussing some new evidence for this endowment shortly). As Gandhi said, "not to believe in the possibility of peace is to disbelieve in the godliness of human nature," and we, like Gandhi, should be unwilling to commit that heresy. As there are about 300 million human beings in the geopolitical package called America (or more properly, the United States), there are 300 million possibilities for nonkilling! There is no limit to the potential within each person, i.e. of human consciousness.

But the question is absurd for another reason, and for it we may cite what peace research giant Kenneth Boulding called, somewhat tongue-in-cheek but with a very serious purpose, Boulding's First Law: "If something has happened, then it is possible." Many people declare a thorough nonkilling or nonviolent regime impossible, but nonviolence happened quite dramatically in the United States when African Americans, led by Martin Luther King, Jr. and much inspired by Gandhi's successful freedom struggle in India,[4] carried out the second major demonstration of large-scale nonviolence in the modern world: the American Civil Rights movement (1955-1968). Many less well known movements have come before and after the Civil

---

[3] "The first condition of nonviolence is justice all round in every department of life. Perhaps, it is too much to expect of human nature. I do not, however, think so. No one should dogmatize about the capacity of human nature for degradation or exaltation."

[4] For the story of the Indian satyagrahis who came to the U.S. specifically to train and otherwise assist the Civil Rights movement, and American activists who went there (Kapoor, 1992).

Rights movement, including of particular interest here the Consistent Life Ethic headed by psychologist Rachel MacNair which promotes a rigorous nonkilling ethic across all sectors of human life, including our relationship to animals—and abortion, most controversially (MacNair and Zunes, Eds., 2008). What has happened is possible, to paraphrase Boulding, and since it is possible it can happen again, in different forms.

A third reason that nonviolence is possible in America is more interesting. In his famous 1967 speech at the Riverside Church in New York City—a speech which may actually have cost him his life—Martin Luther King, Jr. called the United States "the greatest purveyor of violence in the world." That fact, for it is close enough to the truth to be called a fact, would seem to make the United States a very unlikely candidate for leadership toward a nonkilling world. However, that conclusion would be coming from the logic of violence. The logic of nonviolence—and a good deal of evidence—points in just the opposite direction. Gandhi found that he could make a satyagrahi (nonviolent actor) out of a violent person, but not out of a coward. He said that in order to be nonviolent in any meaningful sense you had to be capable of violence, and yet renounce it. No one could argue—certainly not here in Korea—that the United States is not capable of violence! Domestically, its streets are unsafe in many neighborhoods and there is violence in far too many homes. Its prisons are crowded. More Americans are behind bars or at some point in the criminal justice system than in any other industrialized country. As far as foreign policy goes, the reliance of the world's remaining superpower on violence and killing requires no comment.

Time and again, however, we have seen that the violent can undergo conversion to nonviolence by a logic that surprises the uninitiated. When Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan observed to Gandhi that the former's Pathans had remained true to nonviolence while the Hindus, who had adopted a norm of nonviolence millennia ago, did not, the Mahatma replied that this was not really surprising because the Pathans had always been brave, which was the true enabling condition for nonviolence. Likewise, school personnel have consistently found that the greatest troublemakers become the best mediators (Nagler, 2004).

## A brief history of nonviolence in America

As with all other histories, the history of the United States records and generally accepts our violent moments, but has traditionally offered little analysis or even acknowledgment of the nonviolent ones. Within our public institutions, if we are to learn about nonviolent actors, instead of sections in

our history classes, we must seek them out in special interest courses, such as religion or English literature, or turn to studies dedicated to race, gender or peace and conflict studies explicitly. The world will know peace when nonkilling is its normative history and not a "special interest." In this section, we will briefly describe a few major contributions to a nonviolent interpretation of American possibilities.

Before there was a United States of America, the earliest known experiment in the West of attempting to govern a whole society by what we would now call nonviolent principles was the "Holy Experiment" built by William Penn (1644-1718). The "Experiment" went on for seventy years, and Penn's plan is said to have influenced the Constitution itself, as did, to some degree, even the Five Nations Confederacy of the Iroquois and other native peoples who long preceded him. Nonviolence was very much alive and influencing the society of the colonies in the person of John Woolman (1720-1772), the ardent Quaker who befriended native Americans and wrote an astute essay on the connection of an acquisitive economy with war long before Gandhi (Woolman, 1961). His overriding passion, however, was to abolish slavery, at least among the Society of Friends, and even at that early period he knew intuitively that his quarrel was not with slaveholders but their views on slaves, so that he sought to persuade (where William Lloyd Garrison, a century later, would seek to force the slaveowning South to give up its ways by outright war). Given this background it is no surprise that revisionist historian Walter Conser has been able to show that the Colonies were well on their way to independence without recourse to war, which a large section felt was unnecessary and beneath the dignity of the cause (Conser, et al., 1986).

Needless to say, while these early movements had their influence, they did not prevail. The general progress of the epicenters of conflict in the United States went from (very unequal) conflict with the indigenous populations of the territory between the coasts, to slavery, to the exploitation of workers during the era of industrialization, and of course to foreign wars: since 1798, i.e. shortly after America arose as an independent nation, it has carried out nearly 300 military interventions overseas, punctuated by eleven formally declared wars, more recently the two World Wars, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, then to the Cold War to the Gulf War, to the expansion of the military machinery of the United States across the globe, and its continued involvement in wars to this date in Afghanistan, and Iraq, not to mention our "wars" on poverty, drugs, and of course against terrorism, conceived by some in the United States as the "war against our civil liberties." (Grimmett, 2009)

There have always been individuals deeply concerned to undo this vicious on-going cycle of corporate industrialization, racism and war. The United States has seen the nonviolent leadership of those within the tradition of pacifism, sects such as the Quakers, or groups such as the Abolitionists comprised of the likes of William Lloyd Garrison or Henry David Thoreau. Emma Goldman left her imprint in the United States when she explored anarchism and organized for labor rights toward the turning of the century. In the build-up to the First World War, conscientious objectorship was newly introduced and promoted during the World Wars by people such as Jane Addams and William Stafford. A. J. Muste and the Fellowship of Reconciliation were especially active in the mid-War period. Forty thousand Americans refused to fight the "good war" (WWII) on grounds that it was wrong even under such circumstances to kill another human being.

The Civil Rights Movement is widely recognized as the largest organized application of Gandhian principles the United States has seen. But we must not forget to mention the tireless work of the Women's Movement, nor the nonviolent organizing and excitement of the Free Speech Movement in the redolent 1960s, as well as the Anti-Nuclear campaigns or even the environmental movement as attempts to organize nonviolently to qualitatively improve our standard of well-being and security in our country.

Then we have the creation of organizations that provide alternatives to war-time and militaristic activity through nonviolence. The creation of the Peace Corps in 1968 by John F. Kennedy is the most prominent example, as well as international research through the federally funded Fulbright Scholarship. Yet we also have seen the creation of a U.S. branch of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the War Resisters League, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the on-going support for a nonviolent America from the American Friends Service Committee. Still others include a new face of nonviolent peacekeeping called third-party nonviolent intervention groups, including groups such as Peace Brigades International, Witness for Peace, and the Nonviolent Peaceforce. But there are also grassroots organizations, such as our own, the Metta Center for Nonviolence whose aim is to educate and consult on issues related to nonviolent change through a preservation of this rich legacy we have before us. Kathy Kelly's organization, Voices in the Wilderness, was extremely instrumental in breaking sanctions in Iraq and provides a model for nonviolence in America today. Finally, radio and TV programs such as "Democracy Now!" provide news of nonviolent movements worldwide and generate media consciousness about the issues that matter most in bringing down the war system. This is far from an all-encompassing listing of the

organizations which have arisen from a determined need to end killing and violence by the hands of the State; their exclusion from the standard study of United State's history is alarming (Lynd and Lynd, 1985).

## Global nonkilling: the "state of the art"

While the world has not come to a state of peace since the convulsions of the two World Wars, there are signs that humanity is nonetheless groping toward that desired state. New international legal institutions point in that direction, such as the International Criminal Court (ICC) and the recently adopted Responsibility to Protect (R2P) that overrides national sovereignty when that is necessary to protect life and basic rights. The spread of Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (TRC's) within states is also hopeful and even moreso the global spread of active nonviolence. This phenomenon is so little known, and so important, that it is worth quoting the findings of two researchers, Richard Deats and Walter Wink (1992), at some length:

> The two years 1989 and 1990 were years of unprecedented political change, of miracles surpassing any such concentration of political transformations in human history, even the Exodus. In 1989 alone, thirteen nations comprising 1,695,100,000 people, almost thirty percent of humanity, experienced nonviolent revolutions that succeeded beyond anyone's wildest expectations in every case but China, and were completely nonviolent (on the part of the participants) in every case but Romania and parts of the southern USSR. The nations involved were Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, Yugoslavia, Mongolia, the Soviet Union, Brazil, Chile and China.
>
> Since then Nepal and Madagascar have undergone nonviolent struggles, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia have achieved independence non-violently, the republics of the former Soviet Union are moving toward a commonwealth, and more than a dozen countries have moved toward multi-party democracy, including Mongolia, Nicaragua, Gabon, Bangladesh, Benin and Algeria.
>
> If we add all the countries touched by major nonviolent actions just since 1986 (the Philippines, South Korea, South Africa, Israel, New Caledonia, Burma and New Zealand), and the other nonviolent struggles of our century-the independence movements of India and Ghana, the struggle against authoritarian governments and landowners in Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico, and the civil rights, United Farm Worker, women's, environmental, antiwar and antinuclear movements in the U5—the figure reaches 3,300,100,000, a staggering sixty-one percent of humanity!

There are qualitative developments that may be if anything more significant and we will content ourselves here by citing three of these:

1. Since the cross-fertilization between India's freedom struggle and the American Civil Rights movement, cited above, civil-society movements, including nonviolence-based insurrections, have become more conscious of each other around the world and have begun, perhaps for the first time in history, to create institutions for systematic learning, like the Centre For Applied Nonviolent Action and Strategies (CANVAS; <http://www.canvasopedia.org>) that disseminates "best practices" from the successful Otpor (Resistance) movement in Serbia that brought down President Slobodan Milošević.
2. Peacekeeping (and the other two levels of nonkilling responses to the challenge of war) itself has developed a few new institutions, such as Unarmed Civilian Peacekeeping (UCP), an outgrowth of Gandhi's Shanti Sena (Peace Army)—in other words civil society no less than the world of supranational legal institutions is innovating.
3. Last but not least, there has been a remarkable development in science. On every level from quantum theory; in whose vision the world becomes a deep unity of which consciousness, not matter, and events, not things become the primary constituents of reality; through neuroscience to the social and behavioral sciences unity, cooperation, and empathy have been discovered as ruling principles of nature. Some day there will be a fascinating study of how this remarkable shift came about. Suffice it to say now that "science" and "history," which for so long have been carelessly thought to demonstrate the impossibility of nonviolence and the "natural" place of killing in the order of nature (duly but illegitimately projected onto human nature) are now revealing inspiring possibilities for the realization someday of the "beloved community."

It is possible to trace some stages in this regaining of confidence in the positive capacities in human nature: in reaction to the popularized "innate aggression" theorists of the 1970's more responsible scientists began to speak of "altruism," which while more open-minded still looked at whatever we might call goodness in animal and human behavior as still being based on "rational-actor," cost-benefit calculation. Now behaviorists like Frans de Waal, closely followed by social theorists like Jeremy Rifkin, speak confidently of "empathy" as the reason for prosocial behavior. Moreover,

thanks to a remarkable discovery made as recently as 1988 in Parma, Italy, they can point to a neural basis for empathy in the primate-human brain: the famous "mirror neurons," or as neuroscientist V.S. Ramachandran calls them, "Gandhi neurons" that fire in response to another's actions, emotions, and perceived intentions. One feels that we have only begun to understand the human capacity for identification with the other—for empathy—that will make killing another nearly impossible.

## The strains and strengths of the United States as a potential nonkilling regime

There are at least three ways of interpreting the movement of nonviolence thought in the United States: as a response to violence; a pre-emptive attempt to quell future violence; and more generally as an evolution of human consciousness and conscience. While the first two hermeneutics may fit a linear time model, the third really refers to a state of awareness which transcends the linear or diachronic model and accounts for the non-uniformity of nonviolent commitments in specific circumstances. Yet from their respective angles each trend informs the growing awareness that nonviolence embodies a real potential that is more potent and more satisfying than that of violence, and which gives each individual the choice and, arguably the duty to choose the former. It is therefore the belief system which gives nonviolent movements their coherence rather than an external chain of events. Given the bias of the normative versions of historiography that is only beginning to dissolve, along with the parallel development in science that we have just mentioned, it is not surprising that nonviolence in the United States has been poorly understood and even less well documented. Nonetheless, it exists at every stage of human, and national-cultural development. We Americans may well yet come to define ourselves as we really are, by our growing humanity rather than our capacity to kill.

In the first decade of the 21st century, we find the United States engaged in two overt wars; with over 1 million of its citizens in state penitentiaries where 52 were executed by the State in 2009; with a proposed military defense budget of over 600 billion dollars; with 5,113 active and inactive nuclear warheads; and the list could go on. One could argue that nonviolence has been effective for a few handfuls of individuals but has done little to change the culture. This is precisely the problem.

Few movements have readily opposed the institution of violence itself. It is too rarely recognized that structural inequity, racism, sexism, class-ism, milita-

rism, industrialism—all "hot buttons" in the public awareness—are not the problems in themselves but symptoms of a larger subversive tendency or thought process at work in the American mind (as in so many others): violence.

The modern culmination of the Women's Movement is one example of the problem. No issue may be more contentious in terms of women's rights today than freedom of choice, that is, the freedom to have a medically safe and legal abortion performed if the woman chooses to do so. And while the focus of this discussion is not whether abortion is murder or not—that is still a heated debate—it is clear that some people feel keenly that abortion does constitute killing, while others consider it a form of structural violence and oppression directed at women to deny access to abortion when desired, and in the extreme a denial that is sought after women have been dehumanized to the extent that physical violence has been committed against them. If the former are correct, the struggle to legalize abortion did not end violence against women, but simply gave us the right to perpetuate a violent system. The ongoing struggle must be to imbed women's values while legitimating women's voices in the larger culture as it progresses toward a nonviolent paradigm.

To draw from a less contentious, very basic and well-known example, take the American Civil Rights Movement. While it has been said somewhere that the greatest victory of the struggle was that it took legitimacy away from overt racism, it did little to de-legitimate violence today. Nonetheless, Martin Luther King, Jr. himself, in the midst of the Vietnam era did begin to speak out against violence, most notably in his April 4, 1967 speech at New York's famed Riverside Church.

In his own words:

> As I have walked among the desperate, rejected, and angry young men, I have told them that Molotov cocktails and rifles would not solve their problems. I have tried to offer them my deepest compassion while maintaining my conviction that social change comes most meaningfully through nonviolent action.
>
> But they ask—and rightly so—what about Vietnam? They ask if our own nation wasn't using massive doses of violence to solve its problems, to bring about the changes it wanted. Their questions hit home, and I knew that I could never again raise my voice against the violence of the oppressed in the ghettos without having first spoken clearly to the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today—my own government.

King was not only condemned by the U.S. media and lost his political backing from then President Johnson; he was shot and killed on April 4, 1968 one year later to the date. Yet, somewhat paradoxically, at the beginning of the 21st century we honor his conscience and his legacy plays a significant role in leading the way for a future without violence.

## Ending the war system

Where to begin? Perhaps the only way that the United States is going to shake off the atrocities committed in its name and against its own people is to strike it at the very root: change the culture that makes killing seem an acceptable sanction—in other words, as we have argued, to continue entertaining an image of the human being as separate from others. We must delegitimize the war system, and do so by building alternatives to the legitimate need for defense, an economy of needs and sufficiency rather than wants and scarcity. We will need a united progressive vision and a realized awareness that the war system "works" by generating ever more of artificial wants and rendering us passive consumers for the greed of another. Our passivity as consumers lends itself to our deepest fears and insecurities and the greed only increases. Arguably a reason that killing and violence have remained such potent influences in the depths of the United States is due largely to the fact that we make money at the expense of the other's suffering, and we are more afraid of poverty than we are of killing. Our material wants are literally satisfied and paid for by the blood of others.

## Conclusion

A culture built on principles of nonviolence is not an impossible ideal in America or anywhere else, but will—and must—arise from an enlightened sense of reality and possibility, based on many factors, among them the evolving American tradition of nonviolent living and activism. Drawing from the power guiding the Anabaptists or the Quakers, or the women's suffrage and civil rights movements, people throughout the country have arrived at an enlightened understanding of the higher law of conscience, where "liberty and justice for all"—and not only for the few, the white and the rich—prove the foundation for a national identity.

Nonviolence goes beyond any country, however: it is universal. Its reach extends far into the recesses of human nature and draws from our deepest need to be loved and respected as much as we have a need to give love and to give honor and respect to others. It is a special kind of model for the

transformation of society; one, which as even Gandhi maintained, is as old as the hills. Unlike models sustained through power-over methods and unquestioning compliance, nonviolent change comes from non-cooperation with oppression, cooperation with the good, and power-with others. At its best and in its principled form, it is rooted in the individual's self-realization as an agent of wisdom and change and the belief that everyone else is capable of the same transformation given the right circumstances. As E. F. Schumacher (1975: 30) said in a cult classic that stands at the beginning of the modern sufficiency movement, "no one is really working for peace unless he is working primarily for the restoration of wisdom."

Nonviolence is a human prerogative and will be the fulfillment of our lost humanity. Martin Luther King Jr. elucidated the simplicity of this truth when he stated: "I can't be what I ought to be until you are what you ought to be; and you can't be what you ought to be until I am what I ought to be." What we "ought" to be is nothing less than fully human, and we can only become fully human when we recognize the humanity of all. Nonviolence is the only path to take if we are to reclaim what we have lost, and what we have failed to give others.

Restoring humanity, also known as the process of re-humanization, is crucial to ending violence. The nature of the human mind is such that it is less willing to commit acts that harm to other human beings and violence seeks justification to the extent that violence committed does not happen against other human beings but against beings less-than-human. In order to commit violence, we must first dehumanize. This typically takes the form of establishing labels and generating a belief that people are the problem, and by eliminating them, our fellow human beings, we can cure the problem. This has been made to seem only natural; and yet, nothing is more subversive. Re-humanization allows us to accept the other as fully human, and provides us the means to oppose a person's agenda in a way that does not harm our concept of a shared humanity.

In the early 1950s, for example, there was a severe famine in China, and enormous food surpluses were being destroyed in the United States. Some genius realized that by offering our surplus food to China, we could possibly reduce tensions between us and the Chinese. A campaign was soon mounted to send miniature grain bags to the White House with the message from the Book of Isaiah, "If thine enemy hunger, feed him." 35,000 Americans complied (including the senior author of this chapter). No response. Or so it seemed. Years later the story came out: at a critical moment the Joint Chiefs of Staff tried to get President Eisenhower to start

bombing across the Yalu River into China to prevent China from supporting North Korea (an act that according to some may just have precipitated the Third World War). Casting about for a counterargument to what he rightly perceived would be an act of supreme folly, Eisenhower said, "Gentlemen: 35,000 Americans think we should be feeding the Chinese. This is hardly the time to start bombing them." It had worked in ways even the actors could not have imagined. That is nonviolence.

This story from a little over half a century ago illustrates that rehumanization and nonviolence go on beneath the level of our awareness, either individual or public—and that our most urgent task is to develop that awareness in ourselves and others, and act on it wherever the possibility affords itself. Back in our home state of California the weather is preternaturally cold—plums are setting but fall to the ground unripe because there is so little sunshine. We are experiencing the opposite side of the heat that we are all experiencing here, not to speak of what is going on in Russia, Pakistan and China. The Earth is out of balance. It is being caused—as some would irrationally deny—by a dangerous imbalance in the human psyche between a yearning for peace that can never be repressed as long as we are human and a relentless conditioning for killing and violence in the cultures of the post-industrial world. We must rid ourselves of the war system before we can solve, permanently and securely, the degradation of the planet itself, and it will take all of us.

## References

Camus, Albert. 1965. *Essais*. 2nd ed. Paris: Gallimard, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade.

Conser, Walter, Ronald M. McCarthy, David J. Toscano, and Gene Sharp. 1986. *Resistance,Politics, and the American Struggle for Independence*, 1765-1775. Boulder, CO: Rienner.

Richard Deats and Walter Wink. 1992. "Real Grounds for Hope," Fellowship, January/February.

Grimmet, Richard F. 2009. "Instances of Use of United States Armed Forces Abroad, 1798-2008." *Congressional Research Service Report*, 7-5700, February 2.

Kapoor, Sudarshan. 1992. Raising *Up a Prophet: the African-American Encounter with Gandhi*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Lynd, Staughton and Lynd, Alice. 1985. *Nonviolence in America: a Documentary History*. Maryknoll: Orbis.

MacNair, Rachel M. and Stephen Zunes. 2008. Consistently Opposing Killing: From Abortion *to Assisted Suicide, the Death Penalty, and War*. Westport: Praeger.

Muller, Jean-Marie. 2010. "An Urgent Letter to Barack Obama." Available online at: <http://mettacenter.org:8000/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/Urgent-Letter-to-Obama1.pdf>.

Nagler, Michael. 1988. "Toward a Semantics of Ancient Conflict: Eris in the Iliad," *Classical World*, 82(2): 81-90.

_____. 2004. *Search for a Nonviolent Future*. Novato, CA: New World Books.

Schumacher, E. F. 1989. *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered*. New York, London, Toronto, and Sydney: Harper Perennial.

Woolman, John. 1961. The *Journal of John Woolman and A Plea for the Poor*. New York: Corinth Books.

Zunes, Stephen, Lester Kurtz, and Sarah Beth Asher. 1999. *Nonviolent Social Movements: A Geographical Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

# Chinese Culture

# Possibilities of a Peaceful Nonkilling China

## Cultural and Political Perspectives

Dahua Tang
*Peking University*

In the pioneering book *Nonkilling Global Political Science*, Glenn Paige systematically analyzed possibilities for a future Nonkilling Global Society from the point of view of culture, psychology, technology, institutions, social movements, and other factors. Nonkilling Global Society means that each and every society in this world should be peace-oriented and nonkilling. Because of the differences between societies in cultural tradition, socio-economic development, political system and political ideology, conditions and possibilities vary for each society to become a peaceful-nonkilling one. It is so for China.

In this paper, I will analyze three problems: Why is a peaceful-nonkilling China possible in the future from the point of view of culture? Why is a peaceful-nonkilling China possible in the future from the point of view of politics? Is there any evidence for such a China?

### What does a peaceful-nonkilling China mean: four dimensions

*Externally peaceful and nonkilling China*. As a sovereign nation, in the process of dealing with its relations with other countries and international society, China will not use or threaten to use systematic violence and killing force as a means to maintain its nation-goals. On the contrary, the future China can and will wish to play an important and constructive role in building the peace-nonkilling world.

*Internally peaceful and nonkilling China*. As a social community, there is no customary and systematic hatred, violence and killing among its different classes, strata, nationalities and any other groups of people; and there is no threat or use of violent and killing force. Moreover, China as a rising power has the possibility and desire to transform itself to become a modernized country abiding by international rules.

*Technologically peaceful and nonkilling China*. In future China there are no weapons, institutions, technologies and skills used to threaten or to kill.

*Ideologically peaceful and nonkilling China.* As a spiritual and cultural entity, China will not advocate, support, and develop any ideas, theories or ideologies about use or threat to use violent and killing capabilities. On the contrary, tolerance, peace, harmony and nonkilling will be highly valued by the whole Chinese society and its people.

In my understanding, *ideologically peaceful and nonkilling* is the foundation for a peaceful and nonkilling China. *Technologically peaceful and nonkilling* is the most difficult to be achieved and maintained as a reality in peaceful and nonkilling practice, because any kind of technology, skill, means and institution could be used to kill or to cause killing. *Externally peaceful-nonkilling* and *internally peaceful-nonkilling* are different kinds or states of peace and nonkilling, and there would not be positive correlations between them. The relationship depends on the internal-external structure of interests, historical-cultural traditions and even the scale of civilization of a country. Historically internal peace and nonkilling may be based on external conquest and killing of another country's people. A country that kills its people and is full of inner violence may coexist peacefully with other countries.

## A peaceful-nonkilling China is not yet wholly a reality

According to Paige's definition of nonkilling, we can easily come to a conclusion that contemporary China is not yet so peaceful and nonkilling: There is vast killing of life (legally or illegally) in China. China keeps the death penalty. It is estimated that the number of people sentenced to death and executed in China each year is larger than that of all other countries in the world. Although without official statistics, it is imaginable that the sum of those who died of violence, torture, murder and killing in China each year is very large.[1] This is to say nothing of the sum of those who die of traffic accidents, coal explosions and natural disasters.

China possesses huge abilities and many institutions which can be used to kill. For example, the People's Liberation Army is the world's largest military force, with about 3 million members in active service. Additionaly, China is estimated to have an arsenal of approximately 240 nuclear warheads (*SIPRI Yearbook*, 2010, Chapter 8). More importantly such killing capabilities are gradually growing and being modernized.

---

[1] These two kinds of official statistics are classified as "national secrets" in China.

China has been participating in the process of economic globalization more and more deeply. Because of the more extensive overlap between national interest and the growing need for energy and outside markets with each passing day, there is the possibility of conflicts with other nations. China has disputes on territorial integrity and sovereignty with neighboring countries, such as India, Japan and some countries of ASEAN. Also due to the love–hate partnership with Japan, Vietnam, India and even Korea to some extent, there are various historical disputes and disagreements. A fact of history frequently put forward is that over the past 300 years, almost every rise of a major superpower is accompanied by large-scale conflicts between nations, mass deaths and also turmoil and/or collapse of the existing international political and economic system which maintains the peace. China's constantly growing national strength and international influence can easily arouse such memory and imagination. Some reports and comments about China Threats appear frequently on the international stage. While in China, due to events such as the NATO bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade and the collision of Chinese and American military aircraft in the South China Sea, based on historical humiliation of bullying by big foreign powers, radical racism is often stirred up.

On the other hand, after 30 years of rapid development, the per-capita GDP of China surpassed 3,000 US dollars in 2009, becoming the third largest economy in the world.[2] Meanwhile, polarization is becoming increasingly severe: the Gini coefficient has passed the safety level of 0.4 and is now approaching the crisis level of 0.5. China confronts great tension from structural adaptation of interests and also a series of challenges such as environmental degradation and aging of its population.

In a word, China is in a crucial stage of national transformation, so it faces both valuable opportunities for development and enormous risks and challenges from the domestic and outside world. China has increasing political, economic and military power, but it lacks commensurate strategic plans, experience and system to efficiently use and control such power.

Based on the above facts, it is understandable that some people are anxious about whether China could insist on the peaceful development path as a responsible power and whether it could complete orderly and peaceful

[2] According to the prediction by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in the *Blue Book of Chinese Society in 2010*, it will approach US$ 4,000 by the end of 2011. In 2000, the official plan was that the per capita GDP would surpass US$ 3,000 by 2020. China has also turned into the second largest economy in the world.

political and economic transformation. However, could that be the reason for the assertion that "it is impossible for a peaceful nonkilling China"?

The answer is related to assumptions and expectations about human nature, but it is not enough to seek evidence from human nature that people love peace. More importantly is the question whether China could turn to its cultural tradition of Peace and Nonkilling, whether it has the political foundation that could maintain and develop such a cultural tradition, and whether it is willing to transform the possibility of Peace and Nonkilling into public policy and system construction.

### Peace and nonkilling are inherent attributes of Chinese traditional culture

Peace and nonkilling can work as both cultural institutions and faith that can prevent people from violence and killing. Historically nearly all the states, nations or cultures in the world contend that they are for peace, tolerance and nonkilling. They have also developed their claims in both theory and practice. However it is still an open question, to what extent or by what means could their ideas and practices influence the modern world.

There are comprehensive and exhaustive studies on peace in Chinese traditional culture. They include Confucian theory characterized by requests for order based on family ethics; Taoism's theory of natural pacifism; Moism's theory on nonaggression; and military strategists' advice on being prudent in war. They are parts of the cultural heritage of the pre-Qin Dynasty which continues to contribute significantly to peace theory and practice in the modern world.

On the other hand, the ideal of peace has also been guiding the practice of Chinese people over centuries. For example, the ethics and regulations on war in ancient China; the peace-through-marriage (和亲) policy of the Han Dynasty and the Tang Dynasty; the tribute system of the Ming Dynasty and the Qing Dynasty; Zheng He's Seven Voyages as an envoy of Emperor Ming Chengzu with fleets armed with the most advanced navigation system and weapons of that time; and the Great Wall which was built from the Warring States Period through the Ming Dynasty.

Studies of the contents, attributes, patterns and evolution of peace theory and practice in Chinese traditional culture are important subjects for research. I also do some research on them. However it is not the focus here. The thesis here is to identify key factors which integrated Chinese traditional ideas and practice on peace into culture and history, therefore influencing the future development of China. In other words, from the perspective of Chinese culture, this thesis focuses on evidence which shows that

Chinese traditional ideas and practices on peace have been inherent attributes of modern China. Indeed, the evidence mainly lies in Chinese traditional culture and in the inherent attributes of Chinese feudal dynasties.

### Being self-contained

Chinese traditional culture which is characterized by Confucianism is self-contained. Chinese traditional culture is mainly based on the philosophy of the pre-Qin Dynasty, though it has also been challenged by alien civilizations over time. Generally it originated in a relatively enclosed geological unit, which is mainly composed of the Yellow River basin and Central Plains (中原), with Outer Mongolia on the north, the Taklimakan Desert on the northwest, World Roof of the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau on the west, the great mountains on the southwest, and oceans on the east and southeast. This is an enclosed but spacious area with abundant resources and large population, and the regions inside the area greatly differentiate from one another. In ancient times, due to the undeveloped communication and transportation, Chinese culture was developing independently.

Geographical features also made the mission of maintaining governance inside China and preventing invasion from surrounding ethnic minorities more important and challenging to emperors and imperial central governments since the Qin-dynasty than external expansion and occupation. Moreover, compared with neighboring countries, ancient Chinese culture was relatively more developed and fostered a mood of cultural superiority in China. Thus the feudal dynasties seemed to prefer realizing expansion goals by cultural means.

In sum geographical features of China and corresponding cultural attributes helped to form China's own culture and psychology, which made peace be a main policy in most of Chinese history. They continue to lead China on a peaceful path. In fact Chinese history impresses people by contrast that ancient Chinese regimes tended to govern their own people in a way far more brutal than their attitudes toward the outside world.

### Long-term continuity

From the perspective of characters, literature, regulations and other elements that constitute the world of Chinese culture and knowledge, there seems to be no other nation in the world like China which has such a long history of more than five thousand years. At present nearly 200 million people in China, approximately 15% of the total population, have earned a

high school diploma or above. They are almost capable to read and understand the Confucian literature of the pre-Qin Dynasty. From the perspective of culture, China is the only one of the Four Great Ancient Civilizations which endures till now. When it comes to studies on peace and nonkilling, the incomparably long-term continuity of Chinese culture has at least two consequences.

On one hand it made thoughts on peace and nonkilling to be common sense among Chinese. There are many ancient sayings in Chinese culture such as *Harmony Is Most Valuable* (和为贵), *Loyalty and Forgiveness* (忠恕之道), *Harmony Brings Wealth* (和气生财), *Harmony Makes a Country Prosperous* (和则兴邦), *Harmony in the Family Is the Basis for Success* (家和万事兴), and *Good Men Are Not Made into Soldiers* (好男不当兵). Just like hundreds of thousands of children in China, who will be the future of China, my seven-year old daughter was asked to spend lots of time reading and reciting Chinese traditional literature such as the *Three Character Primer* (三字经) and *Pupils' Rules and Disciplines* (弟子规) when in kindergarten and later in elementary school. These classics are on how to be a nice person who is in compliance with social etiquette. The first chapter of the *Three Character Primer* goes as *Human Being's Nature at Birth Is Good*. However about thirty years ago such literature was banned as a relic of feudalism in China. We can all understand what the change means in China and we can also imagine the prospect it will bring in future.

On the other hand, the Chinese traditional elite represented by the Confucianists take it their responsibility to preach the traditional cultural heritage (道统). Despite abandonment by some of this responsibility who chose to live a secluded life or even to kill themselves due to black despair, the majority still believe that no matter how badly the country was ravaged and deviated from the normal track, the Chinese people eventually would find the right way back. Just as Mencius said: it is a rule that a true royal sovereign should arise in the course of five hundred years (五百年必有王者兴). Some outstanding Confucianists take the following belief as the top goal of their lives: "to ordain conscience for Heaven and Earth, to secure life and fortune for the people, to continue lost teachings for past sages, and to establish peace for all future generations" (为天地立心，为生民立命，为往圣继绝学，为万世开太平). Historically this kind of belief and sense of responsibility will not change or disappear with the ups and downs of regimes. On the contrary they are capable of self-regenerating, thereby becoming the origin of China's faith in peace and nonkilling.

## Secularism and Pragmatism

Secularism and pragmatism are apparently reflected in Confucian thought. To Hegel, Confucius the founder of Confucianism is "only a pragmatic sage, obviously not relating to dialectical philosophy. He only provided some kind, experienced moral lessons." Also Hegel mentioned that "the discussion between Confucius and his followers were only common knowledge." I mostly agreed with this point of view. Although the Neo Confucians did add some extra contribution on a philosophical level, overall they did not change the fact that Confucian ideas "are a kind of emotional structure and moral teaching about how one was in the community with each other harmoniously and in countries treat the problem of world peace."

The reasons for how this kind of secular and pragmatic orientation generated and persists are complex. In my view they are mainly related to the method of agricultural production in ancient China, which began to develop in the Warring States period, continued to be highly refined up to the Opium War, and kept ahead of other surrounding regions for a very long time. Historically in those peace eras China's population consisted mainly of landowning peasants. Experiences and lessons from the elderly and family cooperation are very important to agricultural life. In Chinese peasants' view, peacefully keeping ownership of lands and staying there is their whole life ideal. They do not need philosophy, academics, and God. Their gods are land, cattle, house, parents, and Heaven which can decide good or bad weather. To the ruling elite and the imperial government, the major challenge of governance is how to keep peasants and their families staying on their lands from generation to generation. Confucius and his successors satisfy these demands and needs. They help peasants and their rulers to learn how to keep a peaceful and harmonious style of life, which depends upon love and self-constraints. This orientation has a profound impact on modern China. The chief architect of China's reform, Deng Xiaoping had a favorite sentence: "I am a farmer's son." His point of view may be related to the pragmatism of Chinese farmers and the flexibility of modern China; it still has an important impact on political life.

More importantly, in the field of comparative culture and comparative history, it is noted that in Chinese traditional culture no salvation or redemption exists. Compared with the Western world, in Confucian culture God does not exist. The West has witnessed several massacres based on religious fanaticism. Large-scale killings of Chinese mainly occur only in severe natural disasters and periods of dynastic regime change. Compared to the West's long colonial history, and the dispatch of many missionaries around the world to carry the sa-

cred religious mission, the only reason for Chinese to move abroad or leave their homelands is for livelihood. These differences indirectly reflect the nature of traditional Chinese internal and external pacifism. A widely accepted explanation is that the secular nature of traditional Chinese culture and Chinese pragmatism limits extreme religious and ideological development.

In addition we need to mention the specific conditions of the times in which the main body of traditional culture Chinese arises. Confucianism was founded by Confucius (551-479 BCE). Mencius (317-289 BCE) was the first key figure after Confucius. The main context of Confucianism and its system was initially stereotyped by him. Their period coincided with China's Warring States (770-221 BCE). In China's written history it is the first stage of war and the peak of massacre. The former social structure and existing ruling order gradually disintegrated; the scale of war and the brutality of killing increased. This can be seen in the number of people killed by the Qin army in its war of conquest with opponent states. Emperor Qin Shihuang could send 600,000 troops to destroy Chu while additional troops were sent to destroy Zhao. Based on findings of Liang Qichao and Fan Wenlan, China in the late Warring States period just had a population of 20,000,000-30,000,000.

| Year | Opposing States | No. of People Killed |
|---|---|---|
| 317 BCE | Han, Zhao | 80,000 |
| 312 BCE | Chu | 80,000 |
| 300 BCE | Chu | 30,000 |
| 293 BCE | Han, Wei | 240,000 |
| 273 BCE | Wei | 150,000 |
| 260 BCE | Zhao | 450,000 * |

* Buried alive

The above numbers show the scale and severity of war. At that time the goal of war changes. Fighting and killing are no longer just the privilege of the aristocracy. Fighting a war is no longer to defeat the enemy but to destroy and eliminate its life-sustaining ability. In order to win a war or to avoid being eliminated, all states are fully militarized. This is referred to as "combining war with farming." All states become militarized. After the Shang Yang (商鞅) Reform, Qin became one of the best militarized states and in 221 BC it unified feudal China into an imperial dynasty.

Faced with the situation of human cruelty and widespread militarization, Confucius and Mencius took a stand on the other side of war and killing. In those historical circumstances, what they were doing was to try to awaken

the feeling of life and moral conscience, and to inspire in the ruler's heart kindness-love and a gentleman's commitment to humanitarian service. As the most important thinkers of the first "axial era" of China, their thoughts and actions were recorded and became classics. Thus they have had a profound impact on Chinese culture. In a sense, we can say that Confucian ideology is the main body of traditional Chinese culture, including peace thoughts and practice, based upon the critique and reflections upon war and militarism. In view of the long-term continuity of traditional Chinese culture, today's China shows signs of reversion to tradition, built on the basis of reflection and criticism of Chinese traditional peace. This can contribute to systematic constraints and control of the phenomena of violence and killing, thus enhancing the people's future peace environment. After all it is good fortune that an ancient peace culture has had systematic and continuing relevance for large-scale war and militarism before weapons of mass destruction were invented.

## Political bases and conditions for a peaceful-nonkilling China

For a future peaceful-nonkilling China its traditional culture and historical experiences are undoubtedly important, but they do not automatically come into effect. They depend upon and need to be combined with transforming practical politics. Only in this way can they be transformed into and internalized in public policy, the legal system and political construction. For now the most crucial political condition is whether China and its ruling party (CPC) have the will and ability to adhere to the road of peaceful development, to achieve comprehensive social transition and become a country of true democracy, freedom, rule of law, and peace.

There is much evidence and examples from present China to cause worry about this kind of will and ability. For example, compared with developed countries China's political system and political operation mode is not scientific enough, the degree of democratization and the rule of law are at a low level, political corruption is seriously prevailing, and the protection of fundamental human rights of citizens is poor.

On the other hand, some evidence and examples can give us confidence. Most importantly in nearly the past three decades, the CPC and the Chinese government have been trying quietly to consolidate and reshape their ruling legitimacy, sometimes because of external pressures and challenges, sometimes because of the nation's overall strategy. For a long period, the CPC and the Chinese government have been primarily based on the legitimacy of the new historical tradition (victory in the civil war against the Kuomintang) and

the ideologies of communism and socialism. Since the 1980s, economic development and national strength play key roles in legitimacy rebuilding, and so do "socialism with Chinese characteristics," a new ideology, which claims to begin from practical conditions and independent development.

Meanwhile, China is becoming gradually aware of the importance of legalized-open-democratic rules and procedures, and has accomplished or tried to do something in this respect. For example, the implementation of the hearing system, direct democracy in grassroots elections, the development of a modern basic Code (Civil Code), and so on. But compared with the expectations of the people, there is still a great distance.

However mainly based on two factors, there is reason for cautious optimism. One is the development of Chinese education and structural changes in the population of China. Another is the development of the CPC's and the Chinese government's experience and wisdom in internal governance and international relations. For example, they learned lessons from the collapse of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and from the Kuomintang which lost its power because of corruption in 2000. They seem to come to a consensus in the top leadership that party democracy should come before organized democratic demands appear in the society, which will benefit the Chinese people and the party itself. They are also learning from Western democracies, Hong Kong and Taiwan on how to affect and guide public opinion, and how to operate in a networked world.

## Evidence for the possibility of a peaceful-nonkilling China

China has put forward and advocated the idea of a "harmonious society and world," publicly proclaimed in 2004 and 2005, consistent with the idea of harmony in traditional culture. This can be regarded as a political response and goal-setting to face challenges and pressure for reform of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese government. Also as an attempt to promote cultural influence by using traditional ideological resources. After all, as a big power China is able and willing to inject values of its own into the world value system dominated by Western countries. Today, the word "harmony" is the one of the most frequently used and seen in the public.

China insists on a protective defense and nuclear policy. China has promised the international community several times no first use of nuclear weapons, and not to use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear countries and regions. China advocates peaceful use and development of outer space and strongly opposes military competition in space.

China has joined in many international conventions and protocols on human rights. They are the system to regulate national behaviors and guarantee basic human rights. They are significant for world peace and a nonkilling society. The conventions have legal binding for the participating countries who have the obligation to make their domestic laws and governmental behavior conform to the requirements of the clauses, except for special reservations made according to certain legal procedures. In June 2006 China joined in twenty items of the International Convention on Human Rights and protocols and then four items after that. China also signed the International Convention on Citizen Rights and Political Rights in 1998. Although China has been one of the five countries among 160 signatories which have not been approved to join, it has fulfilled its promise to the international community by creative diplomatic arrangements to make effective certain parts to maintain its efficiency in such special zones as Hong Kong and Macau before their return to the motherland. This has laid the legal foundation for these two regions under Chinese sovereignty to carry out political elections before other parts of the country.

The Chinese Central Government allowed the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) to pass the 2012 constitutional reform bill in June 2010. The bill is about how to make new arrangements for the 2012 election of the Legislative Council and Chief Executive. Compared with the first proposal put forward by the HKSAR Government, the final law has accepted political preconditions set forth by the Democratic Party, the largest opposition party in Hong Kong which has the most seats among the Legislative Council opposition. The Democratic Party had proposed preconditions for support of the Government proposal. According to the Hong Kong Basic Law, such a bill should gain support of at least two-thirds of members of the Legislative Council for passage. It is regarded as a milestone when the bill was approved. It has laid the foundation for the general election of the Chief Executive in 2017 and the Legislative Council in 2020. The Chinese Central Government has the final decision for Hong Kong's political development. Approval of the bill means that the Central Government has made a compromise with the Democratic Party. It is the first time since 1949 that the Chinese Government and the Communist Party of China have compromised with an organized political opponent in its territory.

Recently there are peaceful developments across the Taiwan Straits. Indeed, there are many possibilities for a peaceful-nonkilling China in the future, but whether all of them can be realized depends upon time, opportunities and will.

# Japanese Culture

# Nonkilling in Japanese Culture

Mitsuo Okamoto
*Hiroshima Shudo University*

Tamayo Okamoto
*Hiroshima Prefectural College of Health Sciences*

One may wonder whether Japan has in its history a nonkilling tradition that could have guided Japanese people in face of killing or nonkilling decision-making. The answer is unfortunately "no". Recent history of Japanese people's aggression both in Japan and overseas is by no means unprecedented. While "nonkilling" as the first precept of Buddhist commandment can be observed in daily life without much problem, when it comes to involvement in war-making or in settlement of a conflict, an easy display of physical force is often justified and the damage often remains unredeemed. Individual soldiers' experiences of killing often leave traumatic scars on their mind long after the end of wars even when the deeds are not punished officially. The state-initiated killing, namely capital punishment, is also practiced in Japan with no prospect of abolishment. Unless both war and capital punishment are abrogated for good, nightmares of killing are repeatedly reproduced. How can we end this vicious circle? Perhaps no other way than we all learn from the past, determine the evilness of killing in war and peace and decide to take a nonkilling path.

We may need to look back on a brief history of Japan and decide which direction we could choose. Either taking a nonkilling direction as a peaceful leader of the world as the Peace Constitution of Japan promulgated in 1947 dictates, or following the path that some countries are taking for further expansion and globalization without reflecting much on the plight of the people under the oppressor country's military rule. It seems that the most reasonable path Japan could take is to realize the principles that our Peace Constitution maintains. In the following we review a short cultural history of Japan and then go over some nonkilling efforts displayed mostly after the end of World War II.

## Love and peace in ancient Japanese mentality

Whether peace-loving and nonkilling tendencies are ingrained in Japanese blood may have to be denied, but it also cannot be said that there have been no individuals who have emphasized the importance of nonkilling living without display of violence. The ancient Japanese mentality before the arrival of Buddhism and Confucianism in the 6th century can be detected from reading mythological accounts of the divine origin of the imperial family in the *Kojiki* written in the 8th century, concerning the genesis, i.e. the creation of the land, sea and humans, especially the ancestors of the Tenno (imperial) family as well as non-human creatures. Unlike the Judeo-Christian tradition, there is no concept of creation from nothing by an almighty god-figure in Japanese mythology. Human values praised in such mythology concerning the birth of the land and sea and humans and other creatures include loyalty to superiors especially to the divine rulers, as the literature was written to justify the reign of the emperor family. The mythological accounts make references to the myriad of deities, some being more important than others as they were involved in the birth of other deities (Shuichi, 1979). Episodes in the *Kojiki* (古事記) supposedly the earliest text about the beginning of the imperial house completed in 712 A.D. include the account of the divine nature of the imperial reign, such as the first emperor being the direct descendent of the ruler of the heaven. There are no clear-cut borders between the heaven, the human world and the hades. Deities in the *Kojiki* as in Greek mythology behave like humans. They fight and compete. They also love, mate, and give birth to next generation deities. A new deity is born, for example, by a deity's washing an eye or other casual acts.

Amaterasu, which literally means "heaven-illuminating great deity", enshrined to this day at Ise Shrine, was born when Izanagi (the husband of the creator couple) came back from Yomi (hades) after failing to fetch back his deceased wife Izanami (somewhat similar to the myth of Orpheus and Euridice) and washed his eye, since washing was a necessary act for cleansing of the dirt of hades. Incidentally death is still now often regarded as stain or dirt to be washed out. Then Amaterasu, supposedly a female deity, and her brother Susanoo jointly engage in bearing offspring. Susanoo wanted to prove his loyalty to his father and in triumph he did all kinds of mischief, while his sister Amaterasu was leniently watching. But when she could not bear his violence anymore, she hid herself in a cave dwelling; then the whole heavenly region became entirely dark and all the calamities arose. After various efforts were made in vain to make Amaterasu come out of the cave, a female deity

danced in front of the cave door almost naked. Other deities, assembled in front of the cave door, saw the comical dance, cheered and laughed loudly. Amaterasu in curiosity looked out by opening the door a little and was forced to come out of the door and light came back to the universe.

This small account may suggest several things about ancient Japanese cosmology and its understanding of human mentality; for example, a female figure was not necessarily subservient to a male counterpart, although one can detect some Chinese influence on human relationships such as Izanagi's remarks that blame Izanami for her initiating praise for Izanagi's beauty before their sexual encounter. "A female should not express herself first" she was rebuked, so she had to wait for his pronouncement to come first. Amaterasu, as a symbol of peace, does not counter her brother's violence by use of her own power. Instead she just hides herself behind the rock door. By contrast, Susanoo represents physical violence, thoughtless and impetuous, but it is something not to be forbidden or condemned regardless of the harm that it may bring about. This, albeit stereotypical, contrast of gentle femininity versus violent male chauvinism remains long through history to the present age. Meanwhile the male-female vertical relationship was fortified by the introduction of Confucianism. And since Susanoo exemplifies male dominance, he may be regarded as the precursor of the samurai figure in contrast to the nobility that stayed most of the time in the imperial palace creating the imperial court culture. Killing took place very often in early Japanese history. Political families in the sixth and seventh centuries were often at strife against each other. Even Prince Shotoku (574-622), who wrote commentaries to Buddhist sutras, and is said to have written in 604 the Seventeen Article Constitution based on Confucian philosophy that teaches the importance of harmony and discussion, had to end his career by being assassinated. He and his family including his son's family were all brutally murdered by his political rivals.

The political turmoil was eventually calmed down by those responsible for establishing a new government that ended up being equipped with political and legal systems including penal codes that took models from the systems of Tang Dynasty of China. The Heian period (794-1186) is said to be the only period when Japan did not practice capital punishment at least in the capital city of Kyoto, most likely attributable "to the influence of Buddhism" (Nakamura 1964).

Men and women in the court were engaged in highly refined culture exchanging letters and poems in Chinese and Japanese styles developed in the early Heian period. This was the period when *The Tale of Genji*, considered to be the first novel in the world was written by Lady Murasaki Shi-

kibu. Prince Genji the hero in this novel is not engaged in military affairs at all but always in love affairs with one noble woman after another. Military courtiers protected the emperor and other nobility and were called the "warriors facing north" as they sat facing the courtiers who sat facing south.

By its nonkilling norm Buddhism was regarded as the protector of life by noble people as well as common people but it has never worked out a powerful prohibition of killing in the Japanese culture except for the aforementioned three hundred years in the Heian period. What was valued in ancient morality reflected in mythology, as already mentioned, was the transparency of one's mind with regard to fidelity to one's superior. When Buddhism and Confucianism were introduced in Japan in the sixth century, especially Buddhism was accepted by the nobles and commoners alike and numerous temples were built in the Nara and Heian Periods. Especially popular was the esoteric type of Buddhism that was used to expel evil spirits and promise relief in the afterworld as this world was full of sufferings. Exorcists were used to harm or kill the hated person without use of weapons. To destroy someone with or without a weapon did not make much difference. It may have been the case that the recourse to underworld power or evil spirit to harm the other was to relieve blame from the actor if she or he had conscience that to harm someone was not a good thing to do.

## Military dominance in feudal and modern Japan

The rise of the warrior class to the top of social hierarchy took place in the 12th century and military rule continued until well after the mid-19th century. New sects of Buddhism were born in the Kamakura Period (1186-1336) to protect the military class and the farmers and peasants as well. *The Tale of the Heike*, a great epic of the rule and the fall of the Heike House, depicts the pride and anxiety of the military house holding power while strongly yearning for highly refined cultural life in Kyoto, the capital of Japan. They were finally expelled from Kyoto by the House of Genji troops and had to go west, ending up sinking in the sea together with their young emperor and the symbols of power. There are a number of episodes that touch readers' hearts, among which is the story about one Genji warrior who laments when he had to take his young enemy's life, as the enemy looked as young as his son and was apparently a flutist whom he had heard on the previous night as the boy wore a flute in a bag.

What are told in the epics like the *Heike* are the ups and downs of a military house and their yearnings for non-military cultural life. Later, even during the Warring States Period from 1467 until Ieyasu unified Japan in

1603, the top samurais liked to practice the tea ceremony and to perform Noh theater pieces. But strangely their cultural life and their military behavior did not influence each other.

Tokugawa Ieyasu (1543-1616) finally unified strife-torn Japan and set up the central samurai government in Edo (present Tokyo) as the first shogun in the Edo shogunate government. The government with Iyeyasu's hereditary shoguns lasted from 1603 until 1868 and was replaced by the non-military imperial government. During the Tokugawa period the feudal system was complete with four fixed social classes; namely, samurai (warriors), farmers, artisans and tradesmen after the manner of Neo-Confucianism or rather Zhu Xi ideology (朱子学) that emphasizes the unity and integrity of the whole, based upon the hierarchical structure of the world. Samurai had to wear arms (swords) and had the right to kill commoners with impunity. However the Tokugawa era was comparatively peaceful with doors closed to the outside world and the samurai did not engage in much killing. In the early Tokugawa period a samurai was allowed to kill himself when his lord died, but such act was forbidden by the central government. A book was written by a retired samurai who regretted that he had to outlive his lord, writing, "The Way of the samurai is found in death". The author, Yamamoto Tsunetomo (1659-1719), believed he could show his loyalty only by killing himself, i.e., by disembowelment (*seppuku* or *harakiri*). In a different context disembowelment was a mode of capital punishment and to receive the order of seppuku often was regarded an honor for himself and for his house. Even in the Meiji Era in 1912 it happened that at the time of the funeral of Emperor Meiji, General Nogi Maresuke and his wife killed themselves by seppuku. General Nogi is enshrined as a military deity in the Nogi Shrine in Tokyo.

### Meiji Imperialism

The change from the Tokugawa Shogunate government to the Meiji Imperial era marked the end of the military rule by recovery of imperial reign but the Meiji period was even more imperialistic and aggressive toward other countries, especially neighboring Asian countries. More importantly, emperor worship has remained strong even during the ages of samurai rule and after the Meiji Restoration of 1868. This embarrasses present-day peace activists who want to recognize the problem of war responsibility of the emperor since modern-day wars have been fought in the name of the emperor as the supreme military commander. The emperor system can be

a stigma that demands moral and financial support of the Japanese while common Japanese are still in need of substantial welfare.

Killing means taking someone's life without any discussion or argument, ignoring his or her right to life. Consent to killing, if any, would need third-party recognition in modern days. The problem was that Japanese people were sent to the battlefields without their consent with no rights to refuse or object. Japan won the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95 and the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05. In 1910 Japan annexed Korea and in 1931 established the puppet Manchukuo government. In 1932 the Manchukuo army was engaged in a war called the Nomonhan War with the Russo-Mongolian army that resulted in about 20,000 victims on each side. Japan's involvement in the First World War did not result in substantial damage on Japan's side, but during the period between the World War I and the World War II Japan became more and more imperialistic and the military power increased its strength while anti-war sentiments were suppressed and had to go underground. Sporadic anti-war expressions that include poet Yosano Akiko (1878-1942)'s *Prithee Do Not Die* was regarded as anti-nationalistic. She wrote this poem when she heard that her younger brother deployed in the Russo-Japanese war was at Lüshun (Port Arthur). Here is quoted the first stanza from the poem:

> *Prithee Do Not Die*[1]
>
> Lamenting my younger brother in combat as one
> of the troops besieged at Lüshun (Port Arthur).
>
> Oh, younger brother mine, for thee I weep,
> Prithee do not die,
> For, you were born the very last,
> And our parents loved you all the more,
> Yet they made thee grasp a blade in hand,
> Taught thee kill a man you shall,
> Kill a man, and die you too,
> Groomed you thus to age twenty-four.
> Master now of the proud old house…

Since this was meant to prevent her brother from being killed in war it could be termed an indirect anti-war poem published in 1904, although it was addressed only to her sibling much less broadly to his entire company. To think of that time of heated nationalism it was courageous of her to express

[1] <http://pw1.netcom.com/~kyamazak/lit/_Jpoet/yosano_kimishini.htm#fne5>.

herself so eloquently just for the cause of her personal or family values when all Japan was enthused in war-making against the then superpower Russia. It could be said that she was laudably able to utter the sentiment for many female family members of the soldiers who had to send husbands, sons and brothers off to the battlefields overseas. However Yosano Akiko did not remain a consistent war-resistant, so in the days of Japan's later involvement in wars with Asian neighbors, the USA and allied forces she was no longer against war. It was hard to hold on to one's anti-war stance during the warring days in the first half of the twentieth century, as the nation was fiercely struggling to make Japan a military superpower, throwing war resisters and anarchists into jail and torturing some of them to death. One of those arrested and persecuted because of their anti-government or lese majesty activities was Deguchi Onisaburo (1871-1948) a co-founder of Oomoto-kyo, a new Shinto sect. Deguchi was said to prophesy Japan's defeat in the World War II. He advocated abolition of capital punishment and the teaching of Esperanto as a common global language to communicate easily with other people in the world.

When we turn our eyes to the situation of Japan after the end of the war we see a radical change in the Japanese political and social climate. The world's first detonation of two nuclear bombs ended Japanese military rule leaving more than three hundred thousand irradiated victims in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and also air-bombed people in a number of big cities. Nuclear arms were radically different from conventional weapons in that the aftereffects of radiation left untreatable harms to all the living beings. The situation gave birth to different modes of anti-war movements. What did a former ivory tower resident do after he was seriously injured by the bomb and had to adapt himself to the new environment? Let us take up Hiroshima philosopher-turned activist Moritaki Ichiro in a somewhat detailed personal profile.

### Moritaki Ichiro (1901-94)—philosopher-activist of Hiroshima

Moritaki was teaching philosophy and ethics at Hiroshima Teacher's College (later Hiroshima University) in Hiroshima City at the time of the atomic bombing. He was born in the northern part of Hiroshima Prefecture, about 200 kilometers away from Hiroshima City, as the last child of four siblings of a farming household. He lived a happy childhood in the three generation family with grandparents, parents, two sisters and an older brother in a caring relationship. Apparently as he did not have to inherit the farming household, he went into a teaching career. After studying English literature at Hiroshima Teacher's College he taught at a secondary school and then entered the phi-

losophy department of Kyoto Imperial University. Philosophy was rather a popular subject among the sons of a relatively well-to-do family in the prewar days. In 1931 he finished the Graduate School of Kyoto Imperial University and became a professor at his alma mater, Hiroshima Teacher's College. After the war, he submitted a Ph.D. dissertation titled "The Study of British Ethics" to his alma mater (then Hiroshima University of Literature and Science) and obtained the degree in 1951. He officially retired from Hiroshima University in 1965 and became a professor emeritus there. His final lecture at the university was entitled "The Research and Practice of Peace Ethics".

While he was teaching at Hiroshima University, he began to be involved in various peace activities, starting with the collection of one million signatures to call for the ban of atomic and hydrogen bombs to be submitted to the United Nations. He was also instrumental and enthusiastic in setting up a program to offer help to children orphaned by the atomic bomb. He became the secretary general of the Hiroshima Council to Ban Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs in 1954. The split and conflicts within the anti-nuclear movements in Hiroshima worried and saddened him, as is partially described by the Nobel laureate Oe Kenzaburo's documentary account *Hiroshima Notes* (1960). But nothing stopped him from attending or sponsoring various domestic peace meetings, while he also went abroad to take part in peace conferences in various countries.

His first trip abroad was in 1957 to Britain, Germany, France and Austria. On this mission trip he went to see and had a good talk with Bertrand Russell in a cottage in Northern Wales. In 1962 he visited Albert Schweitzer in Lambarene, Gabon, Africa, and was very much impressed by Schweitzer's philosophy of life. In 1978 Moritaki participated in the United Nations First Session on Disarmament as an NGO member. In 1987 he attended the first global radiation victims conference in New York City and made a keynote speech titled "Civilization of Love—A Proposal from Hiroshima". He was also known for his tireless gesture in staging sit-ins that he started in 1957 in front of the memorial cenotaph in the Peace Park to protest the British hydrogen bomb test. His sit-ins became customary after 1973 whenever a nuclear test took place somewhere in the world. His 500$^{th}$ sit-in took place in March 1990. It was not his last, but later in the same year he was hospitalized for costal caries and stayed in the hospital for nine months. Later he was hospitalized again for stomach cancer and died in 1994 at the age of 92.

That an irradiated person could live until 92 may give a wrong message that radiation affected a human body not so badly after all. That was not the case with Moritaki and any other radiation victims. At the time of the explo-

sion he was more than 4 kilometers away from the hypocenter. Unlike conventional weapons, nuclear explosions release enormous quantities of heat, blast and radiation that can literally annihilate human beings near the hypocenter in an instant without leaving any trace of existence on earth. And those who survived the nuclear inferno are destined to live a living hell suffering from PTSD and serious physical problems including cancer. Many of the survivors end up developing cancer in multiple organs. Their suffering is multiplied when they face heavy social stigma just because they were victimized by the atomic bomb. Experiences of those who undergo such ordeals could not be shared or empathized with by others so easily. Empathic imagination could not possibly go far enough. The stigma was one of the reasons why so many Hibakusha (atomic bomb victims) hid themselves behind doors and did not want to disclose their past as Hibakusha. However, Moritaki was able to express himself well as an irradiated philosopher and decided to represent himself and other Hibakushas to the rest of the world in showing the reality and meaning of their suffering and the need to build a nuclear-free world.

Moritaki was a philosopher without much knowledge of physics or radiation at first. After the bombing the US occupation imposed a press code on the citizens and banned Japanese scientists from doing their own research about the bomb, so the nature of the bomb was not known to them until the end of the Occupation in 1952. While many health-care professionals were killed or incapacitated by the bomb and medication was scarce, the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission (ABCC) established by the US government started operation both in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1952 and conducted research and experiment on the Hibakusha. But it rarely gave them needed medical treatment under the official policy of "no treatment". Moritaki himself was hospitalized for six months in his native town to take care of his left eye. Later it was known that the real purpose of their experimentations on the Hibakusha by the ABCC was to get data on the effectiveness of nuclear bombs to serve preparations for the next nuclear war. Moritaki was indignant about the behavior of the ABCC but what he had to do first was to take care of himself as the professor of ethics and philosophy, and of more seriously injured Hibakusha and orphaned children whose parents had been killed by the bomb. At the time of the thirtieth anniversary of the Hiroshima bombing, Moritaki wrote:

> I look back the past thirty years with deep feelings that I survived somehow the atrocity. What a horrible thing happened! How many people were deprived of their life, how many children lost their parents, how many pupils had

> to be burnt to death! By only one bomb! Nobody could describe the scenes fully by saying it was just like the inferno or the end of the world. Against the background of atomic desert, only the rivers were flowing silently as ever, but they were carrying away numberless corpses. How many young women became living corpses with traces of keloid? How many people had to suffer "prolonged death" with radioactive diseases? The survivors have continued to suffer from hardships of illnesses, poverty, disfigurement, and of loneliness, while their concerns about the genetic influences of radioactive disorders continue for the second, and third generations to come.

Thus Moritaki acted for himself and other Hibakushas, and set an example for nonviolent action for peace. One of his most enthusiastic gestures was to participate in sit-ins to protest against the tests of nuclear bombs committed by the nuclear weapons states. The first sit-ins staged by a handful Hibakusha in 1957 in front of the memorial cenotaph at Hiroshima Peace Park moved the organization of Hibakushas that joined them in "the sit-in from prayer and protest" and ended up sending a group of protesters to the embassies of the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union in Tokyo. The leader of a dancing group from India that happened to visit Hiroshima witnessed the sit-ins and remarked that Gandhi had used a similar approach in India. Moritaki remarked that the casual remarks by the dancing group leader attested to the deep spirituality and universality of the sit-ins of prayer and protest that engrossed all the participants.

In one sit-in staged in the spring of 1962 against the announcements of the restart of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union and the USA after their brief suspension of testing, Moritaki determinedly started to sit and fast, after submitting a letter of resignation to Hiroshima University, for an indefinite period of time, days and nights, except for one episode of breakdown due to sunstroke. The sit-in this time was observed nation-wide. A considerable number of people reportedly participated in the event at a shopping center in Tokyo. It lasted for twelve consecutive days in Hiroshima. Now one day a small girl was walking to and fro in front of Moritaki sitting and muttered in local dialect, "How can you stop them by just sitting?" This remark pierced the heart of the activist who sat at the risk of his "entire existence". It posed serious questions about the effectiveness of sitting to stop the testing and further about the ability of peace movements to prevent wars at all. So he mulled over the questions while he was sitting. Here is one observation resulting from his contemplation:

> Even if I were able to break into a nuclear test site and destroy the testing facility, it would be only an act of violence similar to one done in war-making, and indeed an undesirable action in a peace movement. Peace movements can be carried out only by awakening and strengthening public sentiments in the form of nonviolent action.
> Sitting-in is a typical nonviolent action, a simple, even most primitive way of self-expression. It is an easily understandable, nonviolent action shared by common humankind, old and new, east and west, elderly and young.
> While I was sitting, I realized all of a sudden that I was being different from my usual self. My daily self is motivated to act only for my self, for my interests or advantages, for my own convenience, or for my preferences. But when I sit in front of the memorial cenotaph even for thirty minutes or an hour, I sit not for my self, I sit for something other than my self, if not for the entire humankind, to use a high-handed expression.
> Nothing is harder to break than the 'core of the self'. To break the core of the self and get out of it is the most difficult thing to do. Nobody knows how much human spirituality can achieve once he or she can get out of the hard core of the self. I realize I who sits in front of the cenotaph am no more the usual my self. I sit for something other than my own sake. To that extent I have been able to break open the hard core of my self. People who have been able to get out of the old self gather here immersing themselves in the atmosphere, different from the usual, of what you might call the chain reaction of human spirituality.
> It is said that a neutron thrown at an atomic nucleus splits it and gets out of the nucleus and splits another nucleus. The quick split one after another of atomic nucleus is called atomic chain reaction. It may be only an analogy, but one cannot imagine how much power a spiritual chain reaction can have, if people can get out of the nucleus of their self. When I was determined to sit discarding my usual daily self in front of the memorial cenotaph, the circle of people sitting expanded daily, and I realized a chain reaction of the human spirituality, so I told myself, "This must be it!".
> I expressed my feeling in the following words:
> "Chain reactions of spiritual atoms must overcome
> Chain reactions of material atoms." (his English)
> This was my answer to the small girl's question and at the same time it was an announcement of my perception of anti-nuclear movements to the whole world (Moritaki 1984).

Moritaki was a man of action on the street rather than a person staying in an ivory tower. Apparently he was thrown into the world of action not by his own will but by the fortuity of historical events. If it were not for the atomic bombing and his own irradiation, he might not have become a leader of the peace movement in Hiroshima. One may wonder if the man-

ner he projected himself in the peace movement was similar to that displayed by Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980) in his essay "Existentialism is a Humanism". Sartre discusses an existential self's choice of social "engagement" in which the self finds "the others", the world of intersubjectivity. This line of thinking may date back to the Hegelian conceptualization of human nature and action, but perhaps not to the thinkers of British moral philosophers such as Henry Sidgwick to whom Moritaki's post-war philosophical interest was directed at least at the time of writing his dissertation. Sartre visited Hiroshima with Simone de Beauvoir in 1960 but apparently there was no direct encounter of the philosophers, Moritaki and Sartre/ de Beauvoir.

Moritaki studied Plato in his pre-war student days at Kyoto University. His dissertation after the war dealt with British philosophers, among whom Sidgwick was his favorite, according to his former student, Yukiyasu Shigeru, ethics professor emeritus at Okayama University. Moritaki's meeting with Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) in 1957 was an important one. Moritaki recalled his visit to the cottage of the British philosopher in Northern Wales. They talked about the new morality in the nuclear age. Moritaki said to Russell that modern culture was characterized by power, and power was destined to be ruined by power, and if that was to be avoided, one had to look to the civilization of love or *agape* of Buddhism and Christianity. Russell remarked that the civilization of power was not unique to modernity. Power had ruled all through history. When Christ taught love, Rome ruled that part of the world by power. To this remark by Russell, Moritaki responded and said humanity could not live long unless based on the principle of love. Power prevailed in all periods of history, and the civilization of power was culminated by the appearance of nuclear power. Civilization of power had to be terminated at the time of its culmination. Unless civilization of power was replaced by that of love, humanity had to perish at the top of the civilization of power. After Moritaki's enthused discourse there was another exchange of conversation:

> Moritaki: This was my urgent thought derived from my atomic experience.
> Russell : Were you in Hiroshima at the time of bombing?
> Moritaki: Yes, I was. I lost my right eye.
> Russell: Sorry to hear that.
> Moritaki: But I could see now better the road to peace.

Russell concurred and then went to the bookshelf and took out a black-covered book. He showed one line on one page that said "A good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge". Moritaki was deeply moved and

almost shouted, "Doesn't the modern-day tragedy lie in that knowledge is connected with political power instead of love?" Russell responded, "Yes, indeed. In earlier days, an evil mind was not accompanied by big power but nowadays science bestows enormous power to the evil mind."

Then Moritaki further presented his observation to Russell about the genealogy of moral systems, such as individualism born from the emphasis on individuals, familism or ethnocentrism born from the emphasis on ethnicity, and globalism or cosmopolitanism based on the emphasis on human species. In the past the main axis of a moral system was that of cultural ethnicity but the advent of the atomic age expanded the perspective to that of species-wide concern. The species or the world does not anymore remain matters of ideas but now matters of reality, with all the human species being thrown into the same community sharing a common destiny. The world or the human species share the destiny of correct or erroneous use of atomic power, to the same extent that the family or ethnic group in the past shared a common destiny. The new type of dedication, wishing to protect the life and happiness of the whole of humanity, is directed to the entire human race to the same extent that past dedication was directed to one's family or one's nation. Greek or Roman cosmopolitanism was in a bad sense of the word. A new cosmopolitanism in a new and deep sense has to be established. If one calls it ethics of species, the anti-nuclear movement that wants to protect life and happiness of the entire species stands on it. Russell attentively listened to Moritaki and remarked, "We need to have a world state by any means."

Russell also asked Moritaki how Hiroshima citizens felt about the United States, and whether their hatred or hostility was strong. Moritaki replied: "Things were so horrible that people felt that such horrible things should never happen again, rather than embracing hatred or hostility." Moritaki's casual remarks seemed to have impressed Russell who then said, "I never knew the Japanese have such a noble mind." Russell, an established philosopher of mathematical logic and science, having been involved in various peace movements as a tough critic of European politics, showed here an unusual tenderness toward this visitor from Hiroshima.

One may wonder why Hiroshima citizens did not embrace the thought of retaliation. Perhaps they did, but since they were so thoroughly devastated and powerless that they could not do much even if they wanted to retaliate. Some American POWs were reported to have been tortured to death by the mob during the turmoil right after the Hiroshima bombing. There were also, however, some at the site of the torture who were critical of the conduct of the mob. Later the Hiroshima residents were just as indignant to the Japanese

government that rendered the bomb victims no help medically or economically, so that the U. S. government was no longer the only wrongdoer to them. There arose another awareness among Hiroshima residents to the effect that after all Japan had started the war as the beginning of the chain reaction of violence and had given tremendous amount of suffering to the peoples of Korea, China and south-east Asian countries. There was then some sort of a principle of love that generated a feeling consonant to what Moritaki remarked to Russell. Most of the time sufferers would not want others to suffer as much, even if they wanted their empathy. Quite often they would wish that the suffering they are experiencing should never be experienced by others at all. This may belong to a common morality, but also can be traced to the teachings of world religions such as Christianity and Buddhism.

Moritaki's discourse of love may have initially stemmed from his Buddhist experiences but he also seems to have felt affinity with Christian love and Confucian benevolence. On the other hand, his modern models of love and nonviolence were Fujii Nittatsu, Japanese leader of the Nichiren sect of Buddhism, Mahatma Gandhi, and Albert Schweitzer. In one article Moritaki writes that four common points characterize these three activists: their advocacy for nonviolence; their dedication to fellow humanity; their staunch critique of the material civilization; and their deep concern about the future of humanity after the nuclear age. In 1962 Moritaki visited Albert Schweitzer from whom he drew the powerful message of reverence for life. Schweitzer told Moritaki that Albert Einstein (1879-1955), distressed by accusations that he was responsible for the creation of the atomic bombs, hoped Schweitzer would take over his wishes to ban nuclear weapons, and so he felt responsible to carry on Einstein's anti-nuclear position.

According to Moritaki, the civilization of power is based on the subjugation of nature as the driving force of modern material civilization, whereas the civilization of love is based on conviviality with nature, realized by nonviolence as practiced by Mahatma Gandhi. The non-nuclear future is the one that does not rely on nuclear energy; instead we should be satisfied with alternative energy sources such as solar, wind, water, wave and geothermal heat.

Moritaki himself lived a simple, modest life, setting an example of a loving and caring human being. His children, former students, and friends all testify that he never spoke ill of others. He was a caring grandpa, changing diapers and giving baths to his grandchildren. He was a principled person in

deed who still guides us in our search for a peaceful, radiation-free world.[2] Let us add one word about his daughter, Moritaki Haruko (1939- ) who has been on the frontline of the movement against the use of depleted uranium (DU) weapons in Iraq, Afghanistan and on the Balkan Peninsula.

## Article 9 of the Peace Constitution and its advocates

It is often pointed out that one of the reasons why postwar Japan has been able to stay away from actual war-making, neither killing nor being killed, is that Japan has been protected by the "Peace Constitution" promulgated in 1947 but not by the "nuclear umbrella" presumably provided by the USA. The Peace Constitution is so called as it has clauses that renounce war and possession of military forces, so that Japan may not legitimately and unconditionally be engaged in war anymore. Article 9 of the Constitution states:

> ARTICLE 9. Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes. (2) To accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.

Article 9 calls for the renunciation of war and for non-possession of military power for war-making that inevitably and invariably results in taking many human lives. Nonkilling warfare may be contradictory. Since we renounce killing, we refuse to be involved in any kind of warfare.

Now that we have this Peace Constitution on the one hand, and the Japanese government's desire to orchestrate the reintroduction of militarism on the other, Japanese peace activists are forever struggling to push back the forces. In the 65 years after the end of the World War II Japan has escaped from direct involvement in wars that the USA demanded although Japan could not avoid forced participation in UN "peace-keeping" activities in conflict areas.

One success in the quagmire of national policy during the cold war period was called "three non-nuclear principles never to possess, produce nor import nuclear weapons". Apparently it was possible because of Article 9. From the outset, however, conservatives have been trying to revise the Con-

---

[2] This essay on Moritaki Ichiro was written mainly based on the following publications (all in Japanese): Moritaki (1976, 1985 and 1994); Moritaki Memorial Publication Committee (1995); Yukiyasu, ed. (1991).

stitution so as to establish full-fledged military forces in Japan. The present Self-Defense Forces are substantially military but thanks to Article 9 they cannot legitimately act as military forces. But if this article is removed, then peace activists in Japan are much concerned that Japan might accept any proposals that the USA makes to involve Japan in their war-making efforts.

Now we cannot talk about the peace activities of Hiroshima without referring to the poet Kurihara Sadako (1913-2005). Before World War II she was married to an anarchist who was conscripted and sent to Shanghai. After his return to Japan he was arrested because of talking ill in a public bus of the military's cruelty. Kurihara Sadako started to write anti-war poems in 1941. She was exposed to the atomic bomb radiation at the age of 32 at four kilometers from the hypocenter and later that night saw the devastation in the center of the city. Based on an episode she heard from someone she wrote the following poem. Here we see the total devastation on the night of the bombing that is followed by an incident of the birth of a baby.

*Bring Forth New Life*

It was a night spent in the basement of a burnt out building.
People injured by the atomic bomb took shelter in this room, filling it.
They passed the night in darkness, not even a single candle among them.
The raw smell of blood, the stench of death.
Body heat and reek of sweat, Moaning.
Miraculously, out of darkness, voice sounded;
"The baby's coming!"
In that basement room, in those lower reaches of hell,
A young woman was now going into labor.
What were they to do,
Without even a single match to light the darkness?
People forgot their own suffering to do what they could.
A seriously injured woman who had been moaning but a moment before,
Spoke out:
"I'm a midwife. Let me help with the birth."
And new life was born
There in the deep, dark depths of hell.
Her work done, the midwife did not even wait for the break of day.
She died, still covered with the blood.
Bring forth new life!
Even should it cost my own,
Bring forth new life! (Kuroko and Shimizu, eds. 2005)

In this poem one can see both death and life, despair and hope. In real life the midwife did not die in the basement but survived and later was able to see the grownup girl she helped to bring forth to birth. When Kurihara died in 2005, the Asahi Shimbun Newspapers carried its column, Tensei Jingo (天声人語), *Vox Populi, Vox Dei*, dedicated to her with comments, "With an extraordinarily staunch spirit, the poet followed an anti-war, anti-nuclear and anti-establishment path after the end of World War II. Probably what drove her was a sense of mission, symbolized by her poem, about the need to carry on life at all cost" (*Asahi Evening News* 2005.3.9).

Kurihara was not just a common anti-war activist. She emphasized the responsibility of Japanese citizens in the involvement of war-making. Before the bombing Hiroshima was not just an ordinary town but was deeply responsible for war efforts as a military city especially during the Sino-Japanese War when the Imperial Headquarters were located in Hiroshima in the compound of Hiroshima Castle (the cornerstones still remain). She blames the behavior of the USA's Atomic Bomb Casualties Commission (ABCC) that experimented on the Hibakusha but gave them no medical treatment (1978). But atomic bombs were not dropped out of the blue; Japan had engaged in fifteen years of aggression against neighboring countries. Hiroshima and Hibakusha were in a sense sanctified by the bombing while it was completely forgotten that Hibakusha and Hiroshima were both victims and victimizers.

Thus Kurihara questions the war responsibility of the Emperor, of the State and of ourselves. Another important poem of hers concerns this theme.

*When We Say Hiroshima*

When we say "Hiroshima,"
Do people answer, gently,
"Ah, Hiroshima"?
Say "Hiroshima," and hear "Pearl Harbor."
Say "Hiroshima," and hear "Rape of Nanjing,"
Say "Hiroshima," and hear of women and children in Manila
Thrown into trenches, doused with gasoline,
and burned alive.
Say "Hiroshima,"
And hear echoes of blood and fire.

Say "Hiroshima,"
and we don't hear, gently,
"Ah, Hiroshima."
In chorus, Asia's dead and her voiceless masses

Spit out the anger
of all those we made victims.
That we may say "Hiroshima,"
And hear in reply, gently,
"Ah, Hiroshima,"
we must in fact lay down
the arms we were supposed to lay down.
We must get rid of all foreign bases.
Until that day Hiroshima
will be a city of cruelty and bitter bad faith.
And we will be pariahs
burning with remnant radioactivity.

That we may say "Hiroshima"
And hear in reply, gently,
"Ah, Hiroshima,"
we first must wash the blood
off our own hands (Kurihara, 1994).

Kurihara devoted herself to various anti-war and anti-nuclear movements by writing and giving advice. In her later years she was opposed to the dispatch of the Self-Defense Forces to Iraq in the Gulf War. In 1992 she helped establish the Article 9 Society Hiroshima that still publishes a full opinion page in a national newspaper every year on Hiroshima Day with the names of the people who have donated about $10 for each entry in order to remind the people of all over Japan of the importance of Article 9.

This preceded a remarkable nationwide movement of the Article 9 Association started by nine prominent leading intellectuals; namely, novelist Oda Makoto (1932-2007), novelist Inoue Hisashi (1934-2010), social and literary critic Kato Shuichi (1919-2008), Nobel laureate novelist Ooe Kenburo (1935), professor emeritus of constitution Okudaira Yasuhiro (1929- ), philosopher Umehara Takeshi (1925-), philosopher Tsurumi Shunsuke (1922-), novelist Sawachi Hisae (1930-) and cultural exchange activist Miki Mutsuko (wife of a former prime minister of Japan, (1917-). Unfortunately the first three died in the past three years. Thanks to the initial activities of these nine people numerous local Article 9 Societies have been born all over Japan that totaled 7,400 groups in July 2010. One of the nine initial founders of Article 9 Association was Oda Makoto, who thematized nonkilling and conviviality as the principles of his philosophy and civil initiatives.

## Nonkilling and conviviality as principles for social action—Oda Makoto

The popular writer Oda Makoto (1932-2007) addressed until his death the importance of nonkilling and conviviality based on his idea of "Nan-shi" (難死) inexorable meaningless death caused by human disasters especially wars (1991). He praised the first precept of Buddhism, namely, "Thou shalt not kill" as the most powerful commandment unlike other world religions such as Christianity and Islam that fail to place the nonkilling principle in first place.

He was a junior high school student toward the end of the World War II when he experienced the US air raids on the residents of Osaka, the second-largest business city in Japan next to Tokyo. Later he studied linguistics and Greek culture at the University of Tokyo. After graduation he was granted a Fulbright scholarship to study at Harvard University and after that he made an around-the-world trip that resulted in writing a best-seller book, *Nandemo Miteyarou* [I'll go Everywhere and see Everything] 1961. Then in 1965 he helped organize "Peace for Vietnam Committee" (Beheiren) and helped American soldiers desert their military service in Vietnam (Kometani 2006). Later he was married to a second-generation Korean artist whom he used to call "the companion of my life" and had a daughter with her whom he named Nara that means mother country in Korean. He died of cancer in 2007.

His idea of "Nan-shi" included deaths caused by the Osaka/Kobe area Hanshin Earthquake of January 17, 1995 that killed more than six thousand people. From his experiences he came upon the importance of two principles, "nonkilling" and "conviviality." (1995) The "nonkilling" principle dictates that people should not be killed like worms, without their dignity being recognized. He remembers the way Osaka people were air-raided and their charcoaled bodies were abandoned here and there. While he was in the USA he visited the *New York Times* archive and saw pictures of the air-raids taken from the bomber. The pictures only showed the smoke coming from the city and not a thing about the inferno he knew actually happening on the earth that was exactly like an inferno. From this experience he felt keenly the need of having a perspective of the person being attacked. From then on he became able to imagine the plight and suffering of the people of Chongqing (重慶) City that was air-raided by Japanese bombers in 1938-1943. Also he could feel the pain of the victims of the Rape of Nanjing of 1937 and numerous other murderous incidents in China. The survivors of the Hanshin Earthquake were inadequately dealt with by the city officials who had been utterly unprepared for the disaster. People were not victimized by natural disasters but by man-made calamities. That conviction was

connected with the principles of "thou shalt not kill" and "never-get-killed-meaninglessly". But Oda believed that the "nonkilling" principle would remain a passive non-action unless it confronts the other party face to face. This may sound as if he did not preclude a possibility of the use of physical power in the act of resistance. At least he did not stand on absolute nonviolence and can be contrasted with pacifists like Moritaki Ichiro.

Still Oda's "nonkilling" principle does not end there. It is connected with his idea of "conviviality". This is also what he learned from his experiences with the earthquake. For the first few days after the earthquake, people who lost their housing were assisted neither by city officials, nor volunteers from far-away places, but by people who had also lost their own homes. They assisted one another and developed a sort of convivial relationship on their own. People are basically individuals but get united with one another when need arises. The measure of unity is democracy based on equal human rights that assure each of us freedom of expression, criticism and self-determination.

This concludes our small treatise on nonkilling culture in Japan. We just wish Oda Makoto had lived a little longer to stay in front in our united efforts to realize a real nonkilling culture in Japan.

## References

Kato Shuichi. 1979. *A History of Japanese Literature*. Volume 1, The First Thousand Years. tr. By David Chibbett. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

*Kojiki*, Tr. & notes by Donald L. Philippi. 1968. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Nakamura Hajime. 1964. *Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples*—India China Tibet Japan. Ed. by Philip P. Wiener. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

Moritaki Ichiro. 1976. *Hankaku Sanjunen*. (Thirty years of anti-nuclear movements). Tokyo: Nihon-Hyoron sha.

_____. 1985. *Hikaku Mirai ni mukete*. (Toward the non-nuclear future—Forty years of anti-uclear movements). Tokyo: Sekibundo.

_____. 1994. *Kaku zettai hitei eno ayumi* (Steps toward the absolute negation of nuclear weapons). Hiroshima: Keisuisha.

Moritaki Memorial Publication Committee. 1995. *Jinrui wa Ikinebanaranu, kakujidai wo norikoete—Moritaki Ichiro no ayumi*. (Humankind must live, overcoming the nuclear age—Moritaki Ichiro's Journey). Hiroshima: Nishiki Prints.

Yukiyasu, Shigeru, Ed. 1991. *Moritaki Ichiro Sensei no Sotsuju wo kinenshite* (In commemoration of Professor Ichiro Moritaki's 90th Birthday). Okayama: Daigaku Kyoiku Publishing Company.

Kuroko Kazuo & Shimizu Hiroyoshi, Eds. 2005 James Dorsey, Tr. *No More Hiroshima, Nagasaki*. Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Center.

Asahi Evening News. 2005. "Anti-war poet did her utmost to deliver peace", in *Vox populi, vox dei*, *Asahi Evening News*, March 9.

Kurihara Sadako. 1978. *Nukes, Emperor, Hibakusha* (in Japanese). Tokyo: San'itsu Publishing Company.

_____. 1994. *Black Eggs—Poems by Kurihara Sadako.* Tr. with an introduction and notes by Richard H. Minear. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan.

Oda Makoto. 1991. *"Nanshi" no Shiso* (Philosophy of Harsh Death). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Kometani Foumiko. 2006. "Asian Heroes – Makoto Oda," *TIMEasia.com*. Available online at: <http://www.time.com/time/asia/features/heroes/oda.html>.

Oda Makoto. 1995. "*Korosuna" to "Kyosei"* ("Thou shalt not kill" and "Conviviality"). Iwanami Junior Books.

# Russian Culture

# Evolution of the Idea of Nonkilling in Russian Culture

Tatiana Yakushkina
*Saint Petersburg State University*

This exploration should be read with regard to two things. First, I will focus mostly on one aspect of the concept of nonviolence, the one that is rendered by the English word "nonkilling". Though the concept of nonkilling is closely related to that of nonviolence and makes part of it, they are not synonymous. While nonviolence denotes the rejection of all possible forms of violence, nonkilling is limited only to killing. Second, being not a political scientist but an art and literature scholar, I will dwell upon the interpretation of nonkilling in Russian literature.

Besides Tolstoy whose name immediately recurs, other names connected with the concept of nonkilling in Russian literature and culture are not easy to find. The literature of the last two decades looks especially problematic in this respect. In the 1990s killing, from an element of the genre of suspense where it had a stable place in late Soviet literature, became nearly an obligatory component of almost every entertainment industry product. In the same decade another tendency emerged: I mean the expansion of killing into the genre of the novel where it became an inseparable part of the narration, the same as a love story once was (Varlamov, 2000). Although the literature of the 2000s looks much more "peaceful", nonviolence is not among the problems it examines.

The above-described tendencies cannot be explained by the extreme aggressiveness of the Russian people. Russians differ little from other nations whose political history abounds in wars, killings and revolutions. People have been long used to thinking in terms of violence. So it is not at all surprising that when Glenn Paige suggested I tried to study the national culture history from the perspective of nonviolence, it was not easy for me, but I am very thankful to him for this suggestion.

The year 988 CE—the date when Kiev Prince Vladimir Svyatoslavovich Christianized Russia—may be taken as a starting point for Russian national de-

velopment. To this date the genesis of the nonviolence ideal in the people's conscience also can be assigned as Christianity contributed to promoting of some ideas essential for evolution of the nonviolence ideal: that of man's soul as the arena for fighting between good and evil and the freedom of choice. The Russian people embraced Christianity so fully that, as Nikolaj Losskiy, philosopher of the turn of 19th to 20th century, wrote in his book "Character of the Russian People", "devoutness and seeking for Absolute Good related to it" became their deeply rooted main feature. It is not accidental that they called their native land "Holy Russia" (1990: 14). By this name given to their land, the Russians never meant their own exclusiveness, but the model of life behavior and ethical performance caused by a dilemma between good and evil, or between the kingdom on Earth and the kingdom of Heaven. Such a model is shown by some holy people and described in their "Lives", one of the most popular literary genres in the Ancient Rus. People read "Lives of Saints" to learn reading, they discussed them in a family circle, and they listened to them at the end of everyday church services. On the other hand, a canonization procedure was preceded by a people's long-term veneration of a righteous man. That is why the Lives of Saints can be a guide to the Russian people's ethical ideals.

The first Russian Saints were princes Boris and Glebe killed by their brother Svyatopolk in 1015. In Russian churches they were worshipped as early as 1020, though it contradicted the traditions of the Greek Church, from which the Church of Ancient Russia branched. As a rule, the Greek Church canonized confessors and sanctifiers, and the Russian princes fell victim to their brother's cruelty and desire for power, not because of their faith. But the belief of the Russian people in sanctity of the holy innocents was so strong and their veneration was so widespread that Greeks had to accept this choice.

The legend called "Sufferings and Miracles of Martyrs Boris and Glebe" describes the princes' behavior before their death. The tent is surrounded by the killers, but Boris does not intend to resist and call in the military. He does not want to insist upon his claim to reign. Instead he states his readiness to pay a dear price for the sake of God's love. Boris and Glebe's withdrawal from the sinful world and nonresistance to evil is their feat. The brothers' death is their moral victory. In Russian collective consciousness such a victory looked so significant that for many centuries Boris and Glebe have remained the main patron saints of the Russian land.

The legend was created in the period when wars were routine, and such virtues as skilful swordsmanship, bravery, and ability to kill enemies without remorse constituted the main virtues of a prince. The veneration of the two murdered princes who refused to resist evil for the sake of salvation identifies

clearly the nature of the national ideals. A century later (1174) two other holy innocents, Prince Igor Oljegovich, mauled by a crowd of Kiev people, and Prince Andrey Bogoljubsky, betrayed by his servitors, were also canonized.

The legends of other Saints reflect the same values and ideals. Thus, blessed Prince Roman of Smolensk refuses to return evil for evil, blessed Prince Mstislav does not revenge the death of his brother Izyaslav and puts an end to a great internecine war in Russia. Vsevolod-Gavriil, who became a patron-saint of Pskov, refuses his reign for the sake of reconciliation with other pretenders. The rank of blessed Russian princes consists of more than thirty saints, and none of them can be called a tyrant and a warmonger. Even in the legend about the blessed Alexander Nevsky, famous for his victories over Sweden, Germany and Lithuania, the Prince's ability to keep peace and his will to live according to God's law are emphasized as strongly as his feats of arms.

In Russian national consciousness such qualities as humility and non-resistance to evil do not indicate that the people lacked determination. The Russian blessed prince-saints are courageous, they are strangers to fear, they are ready to defend their Motherland, but the legends glorify first and foremost their readiness to sacrifice themselves for faith and for God's truth. In the consciousness of the legend-tellers the image of the Russian land is closely associated with the name of Christ. (See Pavlova, 1997.)

Chronicles, the main written documents of pre-Peter the Great Russia, represent another interesting source of research on nonkilling idea in the Russian culture. The stories about this period of Russian history abound in descriptions of local feudal wars, their numerous victims, with scenes of bloody and cruel killings. Against this background the evolution of the attitude to killing in the Ancient Russian society is of particular interest. Such research was made by historian Dr. Anton A. Gorsky (2001).

The first killings of Russian princes are recorded in the chronicles of the turn of the 11$^{th}$ to 12$^{th}$ century, i.e. about a century after the Christianization of Russia. The authors of the chronicles are Christians and their approach to killing reflects a one-century period of learning the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" in Russia. For the chronicle writers it matters a lot whether a killer or a victim is a Christian. When the chronicles describe the killings of pagans, they do not speak about such killings emotionally, they drop the circumstances and neglect the reasons; they show neither their sorrow, nor their censure of the killers. Not so for Christians. While in the relations between the pagans killing is considered a norm, for a Christian not only a killing of another Christian but killing a pagan, homager of a Russian prince, is unacceptable. According to Gorsky, while a political rival

or a pagan priest abducted in the first half of the 11th century could expect to be killed, in the second half of the century their fate could be different. A captive may be made blind and thrown in prison but not killed. The sons of Yaroslav the Wise used deceit to capture their enemy, a Cuman prince Vsyaslav, but a moral taboo for killing did not allow Izyaslav to kill him even though the risk existed that he might become the pretender for the throne of the Kiev prince. The courtiers tried to convince Isyaslav that he should have no pity for his adversary, but the Prince would not budge.[1]

In the second half of the 11th century the perception of killing changes from the moral point of view. A strong denunciation of killers is constantly accompanied by a sympathetic feeling toward victims. Thus Svyatopolk, killer of his brothers, receives a maximum condemnation, while brothers Boris and Glebe become the first Russian Saints. The canonization of Boris and Glebe is synchronous with the revocation of blood revenge as a right to kill secured in legislation. In the following two centuries the death penalty as punishment for crime was not warranted by Russian law. The only right to kill warrantable by law was that of killing a thief caught in the act.

According to Anton Gorsky, the change in the attitude to killing in the public conscience of Ancient Russia was brought by the Mongolian invasion (begun in the middle of the 13th century), when executions of captured Russian princes and unwanted vassals became common. Russian princes adopted the practice typical among the Mongolians who used killing as a prime tool in their political intrigues. It is worthy of note that the chronicles of the 14th century do not give negative assessment of killings of Russian princes in the course of local wars, and from the end of the 14th century (from the Pskov court register till the Law Code of Ivan III in 1497) the list of crimes punished by death penalty started to grow notably longer. It included horse-stealing, fire, third theft, murder, robbery, slander and treason. The list steadily grew longer till the end of Peter the Great's reign (died in 1725).

Thus thanks to the Conversion of Russia to Christianity, not only the commandment "Thou shalt not kill," but such ideas as finding piece of mind, humility and non-resistance to evil by force became national ideals. In the life of upper class representatives the Christian ideology was forever at odds with the methods they used to overcome their political opponents during the time of the Tartar Yoke. Over a period of 300 years (1243-1480) though, all Russians regardless of their social rank remained consolidated by

---

[1] *Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles*. Vol. 1, cols. 167-171; Vol. 2, cols.156-160.

the national purpose to defend their Motherland. Due to the fact that the Russians under Tartar rule experienced violence on an everyday basis and had to lead a constant struggle for survival and liberation, the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" gradually became an unattainable ideal. Nevertheless it remained a moral imperative and the absolute truth for Russians.

Starting with the formation of the Russian absolutist state and until the 19th century the idea of nonkilling was relegated to the background. Peter the Great's reforms resulted in splitting the national culture into secular and religious entities. The Russian Church became a subsidiary of the state, and the idea of nonkilling withdrew into the back of people's religious mind. The newly formed secular culture advanced the interests of the state. In the context of the strengthening Russian autocracy, the maximum it could do was to propagate a new concept of war waged in the interests of the absolutist state. In the 17-18th centuries, when Russia waged ongoing wars, representatives of the Russian literary elite were pondering over the concept of a just or defensive war and unjust or invasive war. Simeon Polotsky (1629-1680), Russian public person, preacher, publisher and poet of the second half of the 17th century, was among the first to introduce this concept into our literature.

In Simeon Polotsky's understanding, all wars are caused by human greed. In the poem *Arms* he writes that unlike animals, cattle, and birds that are born with horns, tusks, and claws, man is born weaponless, which proves that his preordination is to praise our Creator. The poet, though, has to admit with a tone of sorrow that people do not live in peace and wish to possess what is not given to them. Instead of "ours", they say "it is mine, not yours", and this is where "all warfares" come from (*The Multiflorous Garden*).

In the history of social ideas Polotsky is known for his debate with Erasmus from Rotterdam. Unlike the German humanist who denied for the Followers of Christ the possibility of waging any war, Polotsky maintained that it is an inalienable human right to defend themselves against an attack. In Polotsky's judgment, a defensive war stems from human nature or, as we would say today, from the instinct for self-preservation, and is compatible with the Christian doctrine. Pondering on the balance between war and peace, the Russian poet insists on war and peace being equally good and evil. In his understanding, an unjust war invites evil peace while a just war invites good and just peace.

The next step forward in developing such ideas was made by Michail V. Lomonosov (1711-1765), an outstanding Russian scientist, philosopher, writer and a poet. He claimed that the duty to defend and strengthen one's country is of prime importance for a head of the state. That is why in his

first *Ode on Conquering of Khotin* he called the Russian military victory a precondition for a peaceful life.

The turn from the 18th to the 19th century was a time when under the influence of the European Enlightenment the ideas of war and peace became associated with other ideas, those of emancipation from slavery and the establishment of republican rule in Russia. It is clearly articulated in the position of the Decembrists, the first Russian revolutionaries of the year of 1825, "a war becomes holy if it is launched against an oppressive rule for the sake of the liberation of slaves" (Rudnitstkaja, 1997: 123). The Decembrists also outlined a new direction in the philosophy of war and peace. In the social studies of the second half of the 19th century the question of war and revolution interdependence gradually superseded the question of war and peace. The war was interpreted as an effective instrument of a revolutionary social transformation, and the war that fosters a revolution was declared a desirable and fruitful war[2].

The 1880s mark a beginning of the surge in the revolutionary movement in Russia, which started sixty years after the Decembrists' revolt. In the history of Russian literature it covers the period from Alexander Pushkin (1799-1837), the founder of the Russian classical literature, through Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910). While 18th century literature proclaimed its objective as that of glorifying and strengthening the Russian absolutism, post-Pushkin Russian literature applied itself to criticizing the state as an institution of cruel and oppressive power. At the same time it demonstrated compassion toward the individual person as an object of the government oppression. From this perspective, Tolstoy's severe criticism of the state as a machine for totalitarian subjugation of a person can be interpreted as a summation of the development of 19th century Russian literature.

In Tolstoy's understanding, all government institutions—prisons, courts, the army, etc.—do not have any other purpose apart from violence. The Russian state "distinguished" itself by usurping the church and turning Christianity into an official religion. As Tolstoy states it, "the church hand-in-hand with the government hatched a clandestine plot against Christianity" (Tolstaya, 1928: 43). Hence it is not at all surprising that Tolstoy's doctrine of nonresistance to evil by force emerges as the negation of the existing antichristian social structure. It must be emphasized that Tolstoy's doctrine has nothing to do with passiveness and resignation to suffering. From the his perspective, it is a way to resolve the eternal conflict between the state and the individual, with the

[2] For review of the concept of peace and war in Russian journalism of the 18th-19th centuries see Rudnitskaja (1997: 103-39).

latter refusing to use violence to resist the state and finding refuge from the brutalities of the authorities in brotherly love for all humans. Tolstoy claims that the state had squashed the manifestations of authentic religiosity, which had formed in Russian national consciousness during the initial stages of Christianization. He strives to reach to the essence of the Evangelic doctrine through the cobwebs of clerical misinterpretation of the truth of Christ's word. In the article entitled "Thou shalt not kill!" written in July 1900 after the murder of Italian king Humbert I by the anarchist Bressy, Tolstoy execrated revolutionary violence as a method to change the world order.

The commandment "Thou shalt not kill" became an underlying theme of a completely new approach to war that manifested itself in Russian culture in the 80s of the 19th century. The works of the writer Vsevolod Garshin and the artist Vasily Vereschaghin did not glorify the heroic feats of war; they showed war as an instrument of mass human killing.

In 1877 when the Russian tsar Alexander II declared war on Turkey to help Serbs to throw off the Ottoman yoke, and Russian intellectuals agonized over the question of whether to "make a war or not"[3], Garshin enlisted in the army. The young writer's personal experience resounded in several of his short stories, whose emotional impact on readers makes them one of the most impressive narrations about war in world literature. Garshin, anticipating the main themes and perspective of the Lost Generation literature, focuses on the tragedy of an individual in the time of war.

In his short story "Four Days" the writer tells the story of Ivanov, a student, who being inspired by propaganda slogans, went off to war. When the story begins, we find him dying from wounds on the battlefield. The author shows what tragedies lurk behind a few pithy lines in a newspaper reporting war casualties by showing the tragedy of death of a single person. All richness of the world has narrowed for a former student to a small patch of field where he lies next to a killed Turkish soldier. "What did I kill him for?" asks the student-soldier and can't find the answer.

The main character of Garshin's short war stories is a person whose mind is deeply shocked by endless calamities that a war brings to people. It is very hard for Garshin to understand why people are used to think about a war as some inevitable but almost commonplace evil, while death caused by an accident is considered to be a terrible tragedy. People are killed on a

[3] This article was published in the influential Russian magazine *Otechestvennije zapiski*, 1876, n.° 6. The author of the article expressed his strong support for the idea of helping brother Slavs suffering under the Ottoman yoke.

battlefield deliberately; they do not die an accidental death. According to Garshin any war is absurd and is a crime against human nature.

Russian painting of the second half of the 19th century also reflected the pacifist trend, which was very pronounced in the art of Vasily Vereschaghin (1842-1904). The name of Vereschaghin became widely known all over the world. For visitors to his exhibitions in some big cities of Europe and America his paintings were a revelation. As a participant of two Russian military campaigns—that of Turkestan (1867-1873) and the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878—Vereschaghin witnessed and masterfully reproduced the ferocity and inhumanity of war. In the painter's understanding, nothing at all can justify the slaughter and savageness of war.

*Mortally Wounded* is one of the best paintings of Vereschaghin's Turkestan series. It is the first picture in the history of Russian painting where a wounded soldier on the foreground became the main character. The painter reproduces one of his wartime observations described in his notes. In a battle, Vereschaghin had seen a soldier drop his rifle, press hands to his chest and start running around, shouting "Ah, dear friends, I am killed! Ah, my death has come!" The theme of death in the war is domineering in the picture *Forgotten* which the painter destroyed due to the persecutions started against him. In the picture there was a dead Russian soldier lying in the valley with a flock of vultures flying over him. In the background one could see a freshly-made collective burial mound and a squadron leaving. The painter did not spare the feelings of his spectators and purposely intended to make them see a war in its true light. His most famous painting, *The Apotheosis of War* (1871-1872), can be called the apotheosis of the painter's art. The subject of the painting referred to the historic fact that Timur Tamerlane, a 14th century conqueror of South and Central Asia, left pyramids of sculls in the wake of his army. The painter named his picture not "The Triumph of Tamerlane" but *The Apotheosis of War*. Among the ruins of a city and dead tree trunks a huge mound of human skulls is erected, with a flock of crows circling over it. Vereschaghin dedicated his painting "To all conquerors of the past, present and future". The painter's realism in reproducing ugly scenes of war evoked revulsion to violence in the public and brought the wrath of authorities down on the painter's head. The pressure was so great that Vereschaghin had to withdraw three of his especially "antipatriotic" pictures from the Petersburg exhibition of 1874 and destroy them.

Maximilian Voloshin (1877-1932), a Russian poet, painter and active pacifist, claimed that naturalistic representation of murder in art has the same effect on spectators as a death penalty. When the death penalty is exercised, the result is

just another corpse. The only difference, according to Voloshin, is that the scene of violence, painted by a talented artist, has a long-time effect on millions of people. That was the reason why Voloshin criticized another famous Russian painter Ilya Repin (1844-1930). When in 1913 mentally impaired Abram Balashov, shouting "No more blood!" cut Repin's picture *Ivan the Terrible Kills His Son* with a knife, Voloshin was the single dissenting voice against the public chorus that sympathized with Repin and demanded that Balashov be punished. Voloshin believed that Repin himself provoked the action of Balashov by "slashing" the spectators' souls just like Balashov slashed the picture.

World War I heightened Voloshin's non-acceptance of violence. While many poets of his circle welcomed the war as a "fresh storm" and expected its "revitalizing effect" on European society, Voloshin took a strong antiwar stand. He actively argued against general conscription and refused twice to serve in the army. He also wrote some antiwar articles where he called to stop wondering who was right and who was to blame and suggested trying to understand the nature of war itself.

There was no doubt for Voloshin that the patriotic slogans of the WWI were just a cover for the economic interests of the belligerent powers. Thus unlike the former wars that had been waged because of poverty or scarcity, the current war was started due to abundance of goods, as German industry needed larger markets and more consumers. Another new feature of wars, according to Voloshin, was cynicism. Voloshin foresees that future wars, instead of soldiers, will involve mostly machines; however the reduction of human losses will not make wars more humane. The poet is sure that people will be destroyed as systematically as before. Pointlessness and cruelty of mass casualties—that is what makes the wars of all epochs similar. These ideas are reflected in Voloshin's collection of poems *Anno mundi ardentis* (In the Year of a Burning World, 1916), where the lyrical hero suffers from falseness and lies and dies of torture, as if somebody has cut part of his soul.

The October revolution of 1917 and the subsequent civil war made the question about the nature of violence especially urgent and important In Voloshin's reflections, "The idea of equality is the cruelest of all ideas that possessed people's minds. When it settles in their hearts, they… start to kill one another" (Voloshin 1991: 274). Bolshevism, being a manifestation of this idea, though, cannot be fought by violence. In the fratricidal war that began in the country Voloshin did not take sides; he considered it to be unacceptable. He calls for religious, not social revolution in Russia and sees that the only way out from the state of enmity and violence is in each person's transformation (Pavlova 1997: 244-59).

A new period in the history of Russia, that of revolutionary transformation and confrontation with fascism, made the idea of nonviolence not just irrelevant, but socially unacceptable in the country. Literature and figurative arts as forms of artistic reflection of the world have no more place for it, and the idea moves to the sphere of speculative and abstract perception of life. From this perspective the article "Do not kill" by Nikolaj Rerikh (1874-1947), an outstanding theosophist, painter and writer, is very illustrative. Reflecting on the essence and meaning of the commandment "Thou shalt not kill", Rerikh says that for centuries people have been reasoning on the cruelty of killing a body. The meaning of the commandment, though, is different. It is about opposition to killing of a human spirit. Only such interpretation of the biblical commandment will help a person to venture on a course of self-perfection, for this is where the main purpose for his being lies.

## References

Gorsky, A. A. 2001. "Evoljutsiya otnosheniya k ubijstvu v Drevnej Rysi" [The evolution of the attitude to killing in Ancient Russia], *Mir istorii*, 2.

Losskij, N. O. 1990. *Character Russkogo naroda* [Character of the Russian people]. Moscow.

Pavlova, T. A. 1997. "Vseobschij primiritel: Tjema vojni, nasilija i revoljutsii v tvorchestve M. Voloshina" [Universal conciliator: The theme of war, violence and revolution in the works of M. Voloshin], in Pavlova, T. A., Ed., *Dolgij put' rossijskoro patsifizma* [The long path of Russian pacifism]. Moscow: Institut vseobshcheĭ istorii, pp. 244-259.

Pavlova, T. A., Ed. 1997. *Dolgij put' rossijskoro patsifizma [The long path of Russian pacifism*]. Moscow: Institut vseobshcheĭ istorii.

Rudnitstkaja, H. L. 1997. "Mir bez voini: russkoje prelomlenije jevropejskoj idei" [World without war: the Russian interpretation of a Europian idea], in Pavlova, T. A., Ed., *Dolgij put' rossijskoro patsifizma* [The long path of Russian pacifism]. Moscow: Institut vseobshcheĭ istorii.

Russian Academy of Sciences. 1828-. *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisey* [Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles], Vol. 1, cols. 167-171; Vol. 2, cols.156-160.

Tolstaya, Sofia A. 1928. *Dnevniki 1860-1891* [Diaries 1860-1891]. Leningrad: M. & E. Sabashnikov.

Varlamov, A. 2000. "Ubijstvo. Zhametki o sovremennoj proze" [Killing. Notes about contemporary prose writing], *Druzhba narodov*, 11.

Voloshin, M. A. 1991. *Stikhotvorenija. Statji. Vospominanija sovremennikov* [Poems. Articles. Memories of contemporaries]. Moscow: Knisjnaja Palata.

# Nonkilling in Russian Culture

## Social Science Approach

William V. Smirnov
*Russian Academy of Sciences*

The principal source of nonviolence and nonkilling ideas in Russian culture is Christianity. Starting from 988 when Kiev Prince Vladimir baptized the population of ancient Russia the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" has been gradually socialized into Russian culture as the idea and norm of nonkilling. But this process was interrupted by the Tatar-Mongol conquest of Russia at the beginning of the 13th century. The Tatar-Mongol yoke for more than three centuries has effectively undermined the emerging culture of love and nonkilling. This yoke substantially contributed to installation of oriental despotic monarchy in Russia with its serfdom up to 1861 and to violent rule by Russian tsars.

Other obstacles to nonviolence and nonkilling culture to become firmly established in Russia are in its multiethnic and multireligion character. The traditional culture patterns of some minorities in South and East Russia produce resentment to the values of nonviolence and nonkilling. This resentment is particularly strong among Caucasian ethnic groups who were banished en masse by Stalin at the end of World War II.

Russian traditional culture patterns are more collectivistic and communal than individualistic. In this sense Russian culture is closer to Chinese and Korean Confucianism with its ethics and norms of mutual care and consideration for others as well as resistance against violence.

For most Russian and foreign scholars and observers, nonkilling as a universal value was decisively brought into Russian culture by Lev N. Tolstoy. Indeed in his world-renowned novel *War and Peace* (1869) he described war and killing in opposition to peace and love. Almost twenty years later, Tolstoy suggested in the short essay *Where Love Is, God Is* (1887) that the concept of love combined with peace should be a unifying ethic of humankind.

He openly condemned killing of another human being as immoral destruction of the divine spirit within each of us in his philosophical-religious essay *The Kingdom of God is Within You* (1894). This essay to a substantial degree convinced Gandhi to abandon violence and follow the path of non-

violent resistance. It led to an exchange of correspondence between them during 1908-10. In July 1910 Gandhi established the Tolstoy Farm in South Africa just before Tolstoy's death on November 30 of that year.

Despite Tolstoy's systemic criticism of the official Russian Orthodox Church his pacifism and nonkilling were inspired by Christian values. Relying on these values the Russian Old Believers in the time of Peter the Great at the end of 18th century refused to serve in the Russian army. Some of them even burned themselves to avoid conscription. At the end of next century militarism and killing were rejected most consistently by the Russian Doukhobors. Tolstoy and one of the Doukhobor leaders were in correspondence for almost fifteen years. Tolstoy helped the Russian Doukhobors both intellectually and financially (Tarasoff 2007: 207-14).

Contrary to suppressive Russia tsarist and Soviet policy toward pacifists of these and other Christian denominations their traditions have never been interrupted. Post-Soviet Russia has reluctantly recognized their right for alternative military service.

Another Russian writer of genius Fyodor Dostoevsky, being a deep Christian believer, condemned all kinds of killing in novels such as *The Karamazov Brothers* and *Demons as* well as in many of his personal letters and notes. Dostoevsky was the first Russian thinker to describe in literary and publicist forms the psychological and social roots of violence and killing. He condemned emerging Russian terrorism and possible violent revolution. Dostoevsky reflected endlessly upon the conditions and causes of the transition from violence to nonviolence and on ways and means of creating in Russia a nonviolent society in which all members would live in peace and love.

The socialist movements and political parties in Russia have inherited the culture of pacifism. The Russian Socialist Democratic Party was the only one in Europe that consistently rejected World War I and voted in the national parliament against the military budget. But Bolshevik beliefs in violent revolution and in the dictatorship of the proletariat undermined possible Russia transformation to a nonviolent paradigm.

At the same time, nonviolence and nonkilling did not vanish from Russian culture due to several reasons. The first is the continuity of this tradition in Soviet and Post-Soviet Russian literature and fine art. The second as noted is dedication to these values of different Russian contemporary religious denominations, primarily Christian ones. The third is the existence of peace movements and nonkilling action groups in Russia. The forth is the contribution of Russian scholars to these cultural values first of all by peace and nonkilling studies.

Nonkilling in Russian literature is the topic of Tatiana Yakushkina's chapter. I would add only the contribution to this idea of Alexander Solzhenitsyn. In *The Gulag Archipelago* and in other publications Solzhenitsyn has analyzed conditions, reasons and consequences of Stalinist and post-Stalinist repression and violence in Soviet Russia. His principal ideas for post-Soviet Russia are non-acceptance of murder and transition to nonviolence on the basis of Christianity.

Several members of the Russian fine arts community have condemned the horrors of war and war atrocities for the sake of peace and nonkilling. Evgeny Vuchetich's sculpture *Beat Swords into Ploughshares* that stands in front of the UN building in New York is one example of these fine arts works. Other painters and sculptors such as Nicolay Roerich have combined their art works with reflections on and actions for nonviolence, peace and love.

The Peace Movement in Soviet Russia that was founded in 1949 was often perceived inside and outside the country as chiefly a Communist Party front in the Cold War against the USA and its allies. But this perception was far from reality. Nonviolence and nonkilling action groups and individuals courageously came forward against the Soviet military invasion into the Czechoslovak Republic in 1968 and into Afghanistan in 1986-89. They were inspired by the UNESCO Constitution, November 16, 1945[1] and by the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, December 10, 1948, Article 3.[2]

In 1991 when all public financing of the official peace movement was canceled, the Soviet Peace Committee was transformed into the Russia Federation for Peace and Conciliation (RFPC) with voluntary financial support from peace, nonviolence and nonkilling advocates in Russia. In recognition of the RFPC's efforts to promote these core values the Council of Europe granted the RFPC status as an international non-governmental organization within the Council of Europe. In 2009 also in recognition of its contribution to these values, Secretary-General of the United Nations Ban Ki-moon and Secretary-General of the Council of Europe Terry Davis sent congratulatory messages on the 60th anniversary of the peace movement and establishment of the Soviet Peace Committee - Federation for Peace and Conciliation (Kamyshanov et al. 1999: 14-7).

---

[1] Namely, "That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed."

[2] Namely, "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person."

The first Russian scholar who contributed to Russian nonkilling culture was one of the founders of Russian and American sociology Pitirim A. Sorokin. In his *Leaves from a Russian Diary* he wrote:

> Come whatever may in the future, I do know that it has three lessons ... Living, even if it is difficult, is the most beautiful, ravishing and delightful treasure of the world. Follow the debt as well delightful for life gets better, unqualified because the soul is to uphold the ideals—here's my second lesson. And violence, hatred and injustice will never be able to create any mental or moral or even tangible Kingdom on Earth (Sorokin 1924:197).

In 1950 Sorokin in three books developed the concept of love as the means to overcome violence and hatred. He argued that scientifically supported creative love could stop wars and bring peace (1950a, 1950b, 1950c).

The Nobel Peace Prize laureate physicist Andrei Sakharov, as one of the fathers of the Russian A-bomb, knew the threat of annihilation of tens of millions of people in the event of a nuclear war. Like Pitirim Sorokin he believed that love and moral values could create a new Planet Earth in which wars are immoral and outdated.

It is difficult to exaggerate the influence of the ideas of "nonviolent political alternatives" and "nonviolent political science" on the then existing social sciences and even on politics[3] in the former Soviet Union. They were expressed in a paper, "Nonviolent Political Science," presented by Glenn Paige at the 11th World Congress of the International Political Science Association held in 1979 in Moscow. It was the first contact between Western political scientists, who then held predominantly positivist theoretical-methodological views, and Soviet Russia social scientists with mainly ideological or even ideologically determinist orientations.

Paige's ideas surprised Russian scholars, for the Russian past and contemporary history provide countless and seemingly irrefutable evidence of violent human nature. The violence-accepting political and other social sciences in Russia are beginning to change more rapidly after publication in the Russian language in 2005 of Paige's book *Nonkilling Global Political Science* (*Obshshyestvo byez Oobiystva: Vozmozhno li eto?*). Subsequently historical-factual, philosophical and strictly scientific arguments for human nonkilling capabilities are becoming more and more acceptable in the Russian academic community.

---

[3] We in Russia are in need of analysis of the idea of a nonviolent society's influence on Gorbachev's "New Political Thinking" and on its current offsprings.

To summarize the history and social sciences studies of nonkilling in Russian culture it can be said:

- The main root of the nonkilling idea in Russian culture is Christianity.
- For various negative historical reasons nonkilling has been marginal in Russian culture.
- For the same reasons the oppressive Tsarist and Soviet regimes converted nonkilling into a counterculture and have inspired Russian intellectuals to develop and fight for nonkilling.
- Publications and activities of Glenn Paige and other members of the Center for Global Nonkilling have made a substantial impact on nonkilling reflections and studies in Russia.[4]
- Academic and civic nonkilling subcultures in Russia are becoming more mature and influential.

## References

Evans Pim, Joám, Ed. 2009. *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Kamyshanov, V. I., et al. 1999. *Mir v sobstvennom dome i vo vsem mire* [Peace at Home and All Over the World]. Moscow: Federation for Peace and Con-ciliation.

Paige, Glenn D. 2005. *Obshshyestvo byez Oobiystva: Vozmozhno li eto?* [Society Without Killing: Is it Possible?]. Trans. G. A. Startsova of *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press. Both available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Sorokin, Pitirim A. 1924. *Leaves from a Russian Diary*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. Revised English edition *Leaves from A Russian Diary—and Thirty Years After*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1950.

_____. 1950a. *The Ways and Power of Love: Types, Factors, and Techniques of Moral Transformation*. Boston: Beacon Press.

_____. 1950b. *Altruistic Love: A Study of American Good Neighbors and 122 Christian Saints*. Boston: Beacon Press.

_____. 1950c. *Exploration in Altruistic Love and Behavior: A Symposium*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Tarasoff, Koozma J. 2008. "Tolstoy and the Doukhobors," in Paige, Glenn D. and Evans Pim, Joám, Eds., *Global Nonkilling Leadership: First Forum Proceedings*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonviolence and University of Hawai'i at Manoa, pp. 207-14. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

[4] One of the latest publications by this Center is *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*, edited by Joám Evans Pim (2009) is at the center of current academic discussions in Russia.

# Conclusion

# Conclusion

## Toward Nonkilling Korea

Glenn D. Paige
*Center for Global Nonkilling*

Chung-Si Ahn
*Seoul National University*

In Seminar discussion and comparison of discoveries, five topics emerged for special consideration: the prevalent mention of the concept of "love"; the role of nonkilling in religious faiths and philosophies; the role of women in nonkilling change; the importance of arts and literature; and the need to broaden and combine interdisciplinary explorations in all six cultures to provide knowledge essential to realize Nonkilling Korea.

### Love

The surprising finding of the concept of love in the definition of politics as "the harmonization of the interests of all members of society on the basis of love and equality" by philosopher Hwang Jang Yop (p. 74) reinforces the importance of Harvard sociologist Pitirim A. Sorokin's call for the scientific study of love as imperative for human survival and well-being (Sorokin 1954: viii).

> Only the power of unbounded love practiced in regard to all human beings can defeat the forces of interhuman strife, and can prevent the extermination of man by man on this planet. Without love, no armament, no war, no diplomatic machinations, no coercive police force, no school education, no economic or political measure, not even hydrogen bombs can prevent the pending catastrophe. Only love can accomplish this miracle, providing, however, we know well the nature of love and the efficient ways of its production accumulation and use….Unfortunately, we know much less about "love energy" than we know about light, heat, electricity, and other forms of physical energy.

This calls for inquiry into the presence and power of love in the six cultures related to Nonkilling Korea. As biographer Louis Fisher writes of Gandhi, "Since Gandhi regarded nations not as abstract legal entities but as agglomerations of human beings with names, noses, aches, and smiles, he believed that international relationships should be founded on interdependence and love" (Fisher 1950: 285).

## Nonkilling in religious faiths and philosophies

Seminar explorations noted the presence of proscriptions against killing in the religions and philosophies of all six cultures. These include Confucianism's humane reciprocity, Buddhism's precept "not to take the life of sentient beings," Christianity's command "Thou shalt not kill?", and similar proscriptions in other faiths.

While these proscriptions may have mitigated somewhat killing in the past such as in temporary abolition of the death penalty in Japan (p. 93) or in Russia (p. 182) the Seminar questioned why they have not had a more powerful effect upon killing, revolutions and war in societies that profess to honor them.

One answer to this question has been offered by historian Jonathan N. Lipman and anthropologist Steven Harrell who have analyzed violence in Chinese culture in terms of vertical (top down-bottom up) and horizontal (at top-at bottom) conflict. They explain the failure of the norms of nonviolence in terms of inadequate socialization, the existence of entities that reject them, and the ambivalence of the powerful who profess them but do not practice them (Lipman and Harrell 1983). For progress toward Nonkilling Korea this analysis implies strengthening the nonkilling ethic in all six cultures, research on segments of society that do not accept it such as religious terrorists (Jones 2008) and developing skills for nonkilling leadership in domestic and international problem-solving.

Another contribution to understanding religious killing is provided by historical studies of nine religious faiths that profess peace but divide and kill within, kill in combat against each other, ally themselves with successful violent contenders for political power, and invariably abandon peaceful principles to bless and kill in social defense against invaders while blessing killing other people abroad (Popovski et al. eds. 2009). For Nonkilling Korea this implies the need to place priority upon understanding the killing-nonkilling dynamics *within* each religious faith and to strengthen nonkilling faith, philosophical and ethical commitments in and among all six cultures.

### Role of women in nonkilling change

As needed in all aspects of modern life, the Seminar urged recognition and research on the role of women in each culture in co-gender cooperation toward Nonkilling Korea. In the admonition of nonviolent Muslim Pathan leader Abdul Ghaffar Khan, "Men and women are like two wheels of a cart. Without equality the cart cannot go forward" (Easwaran 1999; Banerjee 2000). Similarly the nonviolent Ba'ha'i leader 'Abdul' L-BAHÁ has likened men and women as the "two wings" of humanity. "So long as these two wings are not equivalent in strength, the bird will not fly" (Scholl 1986: 79-80).

### Importance of arts and literature

The importance of exploring arts and literature as contributions to nonkilling change in the six cultures is illustrated especially by the chapters on Japanese and Russian cultures. All visual, literary, plastic and performing arts, including music and song, invite inquiry. The realization of Nonkilling Korea is not only a matter of geopolitical political-military-economic studies and analysis. As the French writer Romain Rolland quotes Tolstoy: "Art must suppress violence, and only art can do so" (Rolland 1911: 203).

### Need for nonkilling interdisciplinary research

Seminar explorations show the promise and need to seek and share new interdisciplinary nonkilling knowledge among the six cultures to assist transition to Nonkilling Korea. Knowledge in each culture is needed on killing, on nonkilling, on efforts to shift from killing to nonkilling, and on creativity in all fields envisioning nonkilling future conditions of life. The task invites engagement by all the physical sciences, biological sciences, social sciences, humanities and professions. It invites inquiry into bio-neurological, socio-economic, cultural, social learning and problem-solving potentials for transition to nonkilling conditions within and among the six cultures. Studies of individuals, groups and movements seeking nonkilling change are needed. So are applied studies of means to ensure internal and external nonkilling security.

### Intercultural cooperation for study of Nonkilling Korea

To facilitate advancement and sharing of needed knowledge, scholarly cooperation in the form of an institute, center or program for intercultural study of Nonkilling Korea merits consideration. To be established in Korea

in a place accessible to six-culture scholarly participation. It might be independently endowed or as part of an existing scholarly institution.

An example of an independent institution is the nonprofit Center for Global Nonkilling in Hawaii (www.nonkilling.org). An example in an existing institution is the Institute for Nonkilling Philippines in Kalayaan College in Manila (www.kalayaan.edu.ph). An example of a consortium of university and civil society organizations is the Nonkilling India Universities Forum in Delhi initiated by vice-chancellor Anoop Swarup of Shobhit University (www.shobhituniversity.ac.in) and professor N. Radhakrishnan, chairman of the Indian Council of Gandhian Studies (www.profnradhakrishnan.com).

The institute, center or program would seek and share knowledge to assist transition to measurable nonkilling conditions of life in a unified Korea. It would make contributions to nonkilling change in all six cultures. Five areas of inquiry invite exploration. Discovery of grounds for a strong nonkilling ethic that can be expressed in relations among the six cultures. Discovery of knowledge to support the nonkilling ethic. Discovery of skills that can effectively apply the nonkilling ethic and supporting knowledge in individual and social decisions. Discovery of ways to introduce the nonkilling ethic, knowledge, and skills at all levels of formal and informal education and training—and through the media. Discovery and encouragement of nonkilling creative expressions in all the arts.

Some recent publications provide support for scholarly shifts from acceptance of the inevitability of killing to discover new nonkilling possibilities. These include *Towards a Nonkilling Filipino Society: Developing an Agenda for Research, Policy and Action* (Abueva ed. 2004); *Nonkilling Global Political Science* (Paige 2009 [2002]); *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm* (Evans Pim ed. 2009); *Engineering Nonkilling: Scientific Responsibility and the Advancement of Killing-Free Societies* (Evans Pim ed. 2011); *Nonkilling Geography* (Tyner and Inwood eds. 2011); *Nonkilling Societies* (Evans Pim ed. 2010); *Nonkilling History: Shaping Policies with Lessons from the Past* (Adolf ed. 2010), and *Global Nonkilling Leadership: First Forum Proceedings* (Paige and Evans Pim eds. 2009). Examples in the arts are *Nurturing Nonkilling: A Poetic Plantation* (Gomes de Matos 2009) and a song "No More Killing," (Hamadeh 2009). Forthcoming are *Nonkilling Psychology* (Christie and Evans Pim eds.) and *Nonkilling Futures* (Dator ed.).

Scholars engaged in intercultural studies on Nonkilling Korea can be assured of collegial support by 580 scholars in 400 universities in 70 countries who are participating in 19 nonkilling disciplinary research committees associated with the Center for Global Nonkilling.

## Conclusion

If scholars and people of now-divided Korea can discover, develop and share their nonkilling cultural capabilities, and encourage similar discoveries by scholars and people among the four cultures that have so violently impacted upon them, their combined nonkilling actions can achieve without bloodshed a reunified Nonkilling Korea and can make a transforming leadership contribution to a killing-free world. This book begins to invite serious exploration of this capability.

## References


Abueva, Jose V. ed. 2004. *Towards a Nonkilling Filipino Society: Developing an Agenda for Research, Policy and Action*. Marikina City: The Aurora Aragon Peace Foundation and Kalayaan College. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Adolf, Antony, ed. 2010. *Nonkilling History*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Banerjee, Mukulika. 2000. *The Pathan Unarmed*. Karachi & New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Easwaran, Ecknath. 1999. *Nonviolent Soldier of Islam*. Tomales, CA: Nilgiri Press.

Evans Pim, Joám, ed. 2009. *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

_____. 2010. *Nonkilling Societies*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

_____. 2011. *Engineering Nonkilling: Scientific Responsibility and the Advancement of Killing-Free Societies.* Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Fischer, Louis. 1983 [1950]. *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi*. New York: Harper & Row.

Gomes de Matos, Francisco. 2009. *Nurturing Nonkilling: A Poetic Plantation*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Hamadeh, Anis. 2009. "No More Killing." Music online at: http://www.nonkilling.org.

Jones, James W. 2008. *Blood That Cries Out From the Earth: The Psychology of Religious Terrorism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Johnston, Barry V. 1995. *Pitirim A. Sorokin: An Intellectual Biography*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Kim Dae-jung. 1997. *"Three-Stage" Approach to Korean Reunification: Focusing on the South-North Confederal Stage*. Los Angeles: The Center for Multiethnic and Transnational Studies, University of Southern California.

Lipman, Jonathan N. and Stevan Harrell, eds. 1983. *Violence in China: Essays in Culture and Counterculture*. Albany: New York University Press.

Muller, Jean-Marie. 1995. Le *principe de non-violence: parcours philosophique*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.

Paige, Glenn D. 2009 [2002]. *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

_____. 2006. "Korean Leadership for Nonkilling East Asian Common Security." *Korea Observer*, 37(3): 547-63.

_____ and Joám Evans Pim. 2009. *Global Nonkilling Leadership: First Forum Proceedings*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Popovski, Vesselin, Gregory M. Reichberg and Nicholas Turner, eds. 2009. *World Religions and Norms of War*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Rolland, Romain. 1911. *Tolstoy*. Trans. Bernard Miall. New York: E.P. Dutton.

Scholl, Steven. 1986. *The Peace Book: Words From the Great Traditions*. Los Angeles: Kalimát Press.

Sorokin, Pitirim A. 1950. *Leaves From a Russian Diary—and Thirty Years After*. Boston: Beacon Press.

_____. 1954. *The Ways and Power of Love*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Tolstoy, Leo. 1983. *The Law of Violence and the Law of Love*. London, Santa Barbara, New York: Concord Grove Press.

Tyner, James and Joshua Inwood, eds. 2011. *Nonkilling Geography*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Wright, Henry Clarke. 1841. *Man-Killing by Individuals and Nations, Wrong—Dangerous in All Cases*. Ithaca: Cornell University Library. Available online at: <http://www.library.cornell.edu>.

Yang Sung Chul 1999. *The North and South Korean Political Systems: A Comparative Analysis*. Elizabeth NJ & Seoul: HOLLYM.

# Appendix

# Appendix

## March First 1919 Nonviolent Declaration of Korean Independence

### The Proclamation of Korean Independence

We herewith proclaim the independence of Korea and the liberty of the Korean people. We tell it to the world in witness of the equality of all nations and we pass it on to our posterity as their inherent right.

We make this proclamation, having behind us 5,000 years of history, and 20,000,000 of a united loyal people. We take this step to insure to our children for all time to come, personal liberty in accord with the awakening consciousness of this new era. This is the clear leading of God, the moving principle of the present age, the whole human race's just claim. It is something that cannot be stamped out, or stifled, or gagged, or suppressed by any means.

Victims of an older age, when brute force and the spirit of plunder ruled, we have come after these long thousands of years to experience the agony of ten years of foreign expression, with every loss to the right to live, every restriction of the freedom of thought, every damage done to the dignity of life, every opportunity lost for a share in the intelligent advance of the age in which we live.

Assuredly, if the defects of the past are to be rectified, if the agony of the present is to be unloosed, if the future oppression is to be avoided, if thought is to be set free, if right of action is to be given a place, if we are to attain to any way of progress, if we are to deliver our children from the painful, shameful heritage, if we are to leave blessing and happiness intact for those who succeed us, the first of all necessary things is the clear cut independence of our people. What cannot our twenty million do, every man with sword in heart, in this day when human nature and conscience are making a stand for truth and right? What barrier can we not break, what purpose can we not accomplish?

We have no desire to accuse Japan of breaking many solemn treaties since 1876, nor to single out specially the teachers in the schools or government officials who treat the heritage of our ancestors as a colony of their own, and our people and their civilization as a nation of savages, finding delight only in beating us down and bringing us under their heel.

We have no wish to find special fault with Japan's lack of fairness or her contempt of our civilization and the principles on which her state rests; we, who have greater cause to reprimand ourselves, need not spend precious time in finding fault with others; neither need we, who require so urgently to build for the future, spend useless hours over what is past and gone. Our urgent need to-day is the setting up of this house of ours and not a discussion of who has broken it down, or what has caused its ruin. Our work is to clear the future of defects in accord with the earnest dictates of conscience. Let us not be filled with bitterness or resentment over past agonies or past occasions for anger.

Our part is to influence the Japanese government, dominated as it is by the old idea of brute force which thinks to run counter to reason and universal law, so that it will change, act honestly and in accord with the principles of right and truth.

The result of annexation, brought about without any conference with the Korean people, is that the Japanese, indifferent to us, use every kind of partiality for their own, and by false set of figures show a profit and loss account between us two peoples most untrue, digging a trench of everlasting resentment deeper and deeper the farther they go.

Ought not the way of enlightened courage to be to correct the evils of the past by ways that are sincere, and by true sympathy and friendly feeling make a new world in which the two peoples will be equally blessed?

To bind by force twenty millions of resentful Koreans will mean not only loss of peace forever for this part of the Far East, but also will increase the ever growing suspicion of four hundred millions of Chinese—upon whom depends the danger or safety of the Far East—besides strengthening the hatred of Japan. From this all the rest of the East will suffer. Today Korean independence will mean not only daily life and happiness for us, but also it would mean Japan's departure from an evil way and exaltation to the place of true protector of the East, so that China, too, even in her dreams, would put all fear of Japan aside. This thought comes from no minor resentment, but from a large hope for the future welfare and blessing of mankind.

A new era wakes before our eyes, the old world of force is gone, and the new world of righteousness and truth is here. Out of the experience and avail of the old world arises this light on life's affairs. The insects stifled by the foe and snow of winter awake at this same time with the breezes of spring and the soft light of the sun upon them.

It is the day of the restoration of all things on the full tide of which we set forth, without delay or fear. We desire a full measure of satisfaction in

the way of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and an opportunity to develop what is in us for the glory of our people.

We awake now from the old world with its darkened conditions in full determination and one heart and one mind, with right on our side, along with the forces of nature, to a new life. May all the ancestors to the thousands and ten thousand generations aid us from within and all the force of the world aid us from without, and let the day we take hold be the day of our attainment. In this hope we go forward.

Three Items of Agreement

1. This work of ours is in belief of truth, religion and life, undertaken at the request of our people, in order to make known their desire for liberty. Let no violence be done to any one.
2. Let those who follow us, every man, all the time, every hour, show forthwith gladness this same mind.
3. Let all things be done decently and in order, so that our behavior to the very end may be honorable and upright.

The 4,252nd year of the Kingdom of Korea, 3rd Month.

Representatives of the people.

The signatures attached to the document are:

Son Pyung-Hi, Kil Sun-Chu, Yi Pil-Chu, Paik Yong-Sung, Kim Won-Kyu, Kim Pyung-Cho, Kim Chang-Choon, Kwon Dong-Chin, Kwon Byung-Duk, Na Yong-Whan, Na In-Hup, Yang Chun-Paik, Yang Han-Mook, Lew Yer-Dai, Yi Kop-Sung, Yi Mung-Yong, Yi Seung-Hoon, Yi Chong-Hoon, Yi Chong-Il, Lim Yei-Whan, Pak Choon-Seung, Pak Hi-Do, Pak Tong-Wan, Sin Hong-Sik, Sin Suk-Ku, Oh Sei-Chang, Oh Wha-Young, Chung Choon-Su, Choi Sung-Mo, Choi In, Han Yong-Woon, Hong Byung-Ki, Hong Ki-Cho.

## Source

McKenzie, F. A. 1969. *Korea's Fight for Freedom*. 2nd ed. Seoul: Yonsei University Press, pp. 247-58.

# Contributors

# Contributors

**Chung-Si Ahn** is professor emeritus of political science, Seoul National University, fellow of Seoul National University's Asia Center, director of the Asia Center's publications programs, and chair of the editorial board of its journal *Asia Review*.

**Dahua Tang** is associate professor in the School of Government, Peking University, Beijing. He graduated from the Peking University's department of international relations in 1987 and has been lecturing there since 1992.

**Jang-seok Kang** is professor and associate dean of the Graduate School of Politics & Leadership, Kookmin University, Seoul, former chief of staff of the Committee on Unification, Foreign Affairs & Trade, National Assembly, and author of *The Institutional Reforms of the Korean National Legislature*.

**Michael N. Nagler** is professor emeritus of classical and comparative literature at the University of California, Berkeley, founder and president of the Metta Center for Nonviolence, Petaluma, California, and author of *The Search for a Nonviolent Future*.

**Mitsuo Okamoto** is professor emeritus of peace studies, Hiroshima Shudo University, former member of the Science Council of Japan, 1995-2004, founder and director of the Hiroshima Center for Nonviolence and Peace, president of the Article Nine Society Hiroshima, and author of *Principles of Peace Studies* in Japanese.

**Tamayo Okamoto** is former professor of bioethics at Hiroshima Prefectural College of Health Sciences, former lecturer of Japanese thoughts at Shikoku Christian College, active in the Article Nine Society Hiroshima and citizens' initiatives against nuclear power plants and depleted uranium weapons, and author of "Means and Ends" in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Peace Research*.

**Glenn D. Paige** is professor emeritus of Political Science, University of Hawai'i, founder and chair of the Center for Global Nonkilling, Honolulu, and author of *Nonkilling Global Political Science*.

**William V. Smirnov** is head of the department of political science, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, professor in the department of political science and public administration, Russian Academy of Civil Service, vice-president of the Russian Political Science Association, and former vice-president of the International Political Science Association.

**Stephanie Van Hook** is the executive director of the Metta Center for Nonviolence in Petaluma, California.

**Tatiana Yakushkina** is associate professor of foreign languages and literatures at Saint Petersburg State University, St. Petersburg, specialist on Italian literature of the Renaissance, former teacher of European and American literatures at Omsk State Pedagogical University, Omsk (Siberia), and author of *Italian Petrarchism of the 15-16th Centuries: Tradition and Canon*.

**Sung Chul Yang** is distinguished professor at Korea University, Seoul, former member of the ROK National Assembly, ambassador to the United States, 2000-2003, and author of *The North and South Korean Political Systems: A Comparative Analysis*.