NONKILLING SPIRITUAL TRADITIONS

Vol. 1

Edited by
Joám Evans Pim
and Pradeep Dhakal

Center *for* Global **Nonkilling**

Honolulu
September 2015

First Edition: September 2015

ISBN-13 978-0-9839862-6-3

Cataloging in Publication Data (CIP)

Nonkilling Spiritual Traditions / Edited by
Joám Evans Pim and Pradeep Dhakal.
ISBN 978-0-9839862-6-3

CDU - 172.4 : 327.36

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

Center *for* Global **Nonkilling**

3653 Tantalus Drive
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822-5033
United States of America
Email: info@nonkilling.org
http://www.nonkilling.org

Contents

Introduction

Affirming the Nonkilling Spirit

Joám Evans Pim
Center for Global Nonkilling

On November 4, 2007, the participants of the First Global Nonkilling Leadership Forum became the initial signatories of the *Affirmation of the Global Nonkilling Spirit*, an inspirational proclamation that "calls upon all / to work toward the measurable goal / of a killing-free world / with infinite creativity / in reverence for life." As part of the discussions of the Forum—that brought about the establishment of the current Center for Global Nonkilling— the relevance of the principle of nonkilling across a range of spiritual traditions was explored. In the proceedings (Paige and Evans Pim, eds., 2008) short personal accounts expose the connections between nonkilling and Hawaiian spirituality (Guanson), Buddhism (Ariyaratne), Christianity (Maguire), Hinduism (Bhaneja), Humanism (Simson), Jainism (Gandhi), Islam (Satha-Anand), Judaism (Tucker), Taoism (Dongshick), and Vodou (Paul).

Previously, CGNK's predecessor, the Center for Global Nonviolence, convened a number of seminars that led to the publication of a series of academic volumes that explore the deep links between nonviolence and several major spiritual traditions. The 1986 seminar on "Islam and Nonviolence" convened in Bali, Indonesia, developed into the 1993 groundbreaking book with the same title (Paige, Satha-Anand and Gilliatt, eds, 1993). The opening chapter to that book, "The Noviolent Crescent," by Chaiwat Satha-Anand, is republished here as it fully retains the power of its message.

The 1989 seminar on Buddhism and Leadership for Peace, held in Ulan Bator, Mongolia, evolved into the 1991 book *Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving* (Paige and Gilliatt, eds., 1991). A 1990 one-day gathering at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa generated the book *Nonviolence in Hawaii's Spiritual Traditions* (Paige and Gilliatt, 1991). These discoveries, all available for free download from CGNK's website, were relevant in the formulation of the nonkilling vision presented by Paige (2002) in *Nonkilling Global Political Science* that now guides the contributions brought together in this volume and the work of the Center of Global Nonkilling.

This work must also face the challenges of 'translating' and applying the important messages and learnings on nonkilling derived from all spiritual and humanistic traditions into the field of policy and action to prevent lethal violence and build killing-free societies in the present and for the future. One example is the "International Conference on Protecting Sacred Spaces and People of the Cloth" held in Bankok, Thailand, on May 28-29, 2011, co-organized by the Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research, the Peace Information Center and CGNK. As a result, a joint policy brief (also included as appendix to this volume) was presented to the ASEAN Secretary General, H.E. Dr. Surin Pitsuwan, and a collective volume published.

To continue exploring this field, the Center's Nonkilling Spiritual Traditions Research Committee, with over 30 members, envisioned a collaborative academic initiative to further understand and analyze: 1) the impact of the "Thou Shall Not Kill" / "Do not take any human being's life" imperative across world spiritual traditions and non-religious humanist ethics, but also its internal intrareligious contradictions and controversies; 2) faith-inspired nonviolent/nonkilling leaders and movements throughout history—e.g., Islam (Ahmadou Bamba and Abdul Ghaffar Khan), Christianity (Martin Luther King, Jr., Guillermo Gaviria, Leo Tolstoy), 'Indigenous' Spirituality (Te Whiti o Rongomai and Queen Liliuokalani), Hindu/Interfaith (Mahatma Gandhi), etc.; 3) spiritual practices related to nonkilling behavior and way of life, including meditation, prayers, art and spiritual guidance, with special interest in behavioral change—individual or social practices (e.g., meditation in prisons has shown to reduce violence and killings). The collection of essays compiled in this first volume represents a preliminary example of the possibilities offered by this line of inquiry, that it is hoped can be expanded.

Studying spiritual traditions through the focus of nonkilling can provide new insights. The three chapters that anthropologist Marvin Harris dedicated to the topic in his 1990 book *Our Kind* ("The Nonkilling Religions," "The Origin of Nonkilling Religions," and "How the Nonkilling Religions Spread") are a good example. Following a cultural materialist approach, Harris explains how nonkilling religions emerged, in a confluence of brutal and costly wars, environmental depletion, population growth and rise of cities, food shortages, widespread poverty and rigidified social distinctions.

As we move in the present 21st century into a scenario not very far away from that presented by Harris, the need for seriouly reconsidering the importance of a global nonkilling ethic becomes urgent. The editors hope that this book may represent a contribution to that cause.

Chapter One

The Role of Spiritual Ecology in Nonkilling

Leslie E. Sponsel
University of Hawai'i

"I need no inspiration other than Nature's. She has never failed me as yet. She mystifies me, bewilders me, sends me to ecstasies" (Gandhi quoted in Moolakkattu 2010:152-153).

"Through the wider Self, every living being is connected intimately, and from this intimacy follows the capacity of identification and, as its natural consequences, practice of nonviolence…. The rock-bottom foundation of the technique for achieving the power of nonviolence is belief in the essential oneness of all life" (Naess 2008:90).

"… nonviolence is the fundamental condition in which all the great spiritual teachers have called upon humanity to live" (Paige 1993:142).

Spiritual ecology is a complex and diverse arena of intellectual and practical activities at the interface of religions and spiritualities on the one hand, and on the other ecologies, environments, and environmentalism. The use of the plural in these terms reflects the variation and variability within each category. Some scholars prefer labels such as religion and ecology, or religion and nature, instead of spiritual ecology. However, spiritual is a more inclusive term since many individuals who do not choose to affiliate with any particular religious organization, or identify themselves with some religion in general, are nevertheless spiritual, while those who do chose to affiliate can also be spiritual. The term encompasses both the spirituality of the individual and the belief of many that there are spiritual beings and forces in nature (Harvey 2006, Sponsel 2007a, b).

The spiritual and practical aspects of spiritual ecology are very ancient, while the intellectual aspects in the modern academic sense are very recent. The earliest and still most widespread spiritual ecologists are the indigenous adherents to some manifestation of the generic label Animism such as traditional Australian Aborigines (Harvey 2006). This religion encompasses a belief in spiritual beings and forces in nature. Within Western

culture, one of the earlier outstanding examples of a spiritual ecologist is the Catholic Saint Francis of Assisi (1181/2-1226) who was ahead of his time by about a thousand years in his deep concerns for social justice and nature (E.A. Armstrong 1993, Nothwehr 2002, Sorrell 1988).

Within modern academia in America, more than anyone else Lynn White, Jr. (1907-1987) initiated scholarship in this arena of spiritual ecology. His classic article published in 1967 in the prestigious journal *Science*, "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis," is the most frequently cited article in the entire history of that periodical. It generated a discussion and debate that continues to this day, and it led to the development of ecotheology which usually focuses on Christianity and environment, often as an attempt to refute White's main thesis that the dominant interpretation of the Bible is the ultimate cause of the ecocrisis (Hargrove 1986, Nash 1989, Santmire 2003, and Spring and Spring 1974). However, the various activities associated with the Forum on Religion and Ecology[1] since the 1990s, developed largely by Mary Evelyn Tucker and John Grim, probably have done more than any other initiative to launch spiritual ecology as a contemporary field of academic and scientific research, publications, conferences, and teaching. Two other extraordinary contributors are Bron Taylor and Roger S. Gottlieb (See Gottlieb 2004, 2006a,b, 2007, Taylor 2005, 2010, Tucker 1997, Tucker and Berling 2003, Tucker and Grim 2001, 2007, 2009).

In general, each of the three primary aspects of spiritual ecology—intellectual, spiritual, and practical—can be pursued alone, but often two or all three of them reinforce one another in various degrees and ways. The intellectual aspect encompasses academic scholarship across the humanities and the natural and social sciences. This is an interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinary field of study which is growing exponentially (Kearns and Keller 2007, Narayan and Kumar 2003, Swearer 2009). Indeed, there is sufficient literature on many world religions in relation to ecology to launch an entire academic and/or activist career focused on pursuing just one religion such as Buddhist ecology and environmentalism (Kaza 2008, Kaza and Kraft 2000, Martin 1997, Sponsel and Natadecha-Sponsel 1991, 2008, Tucker and Williams 1997).

The spiritual aspect may be pursued by an individual or group in nature, or through participation in a religious organization. It may involve rituals, ceremonies, sacred places, and mysticism. This is the least studied, documented, and understood aspect of spiritual ecology so far, although ulti-

[1] See <http//www.religionandecology.org>.

mately it is often the most important one. Many environmentalists and conservationists are ultimately motivated by some kind of personal spiritual or mystical experiences in nature, although this is usually implicit in their writings at best (Kaza 2008, Taylor 2005, 2010).

The practical component of spiritual ecology refers to environmental action on behalf of nature or the environment, and some of this action is explicitly recognized as religious environmentalism (Bassett, et al., 2000, Dudley, et al., 2005, Gardner 2002, 2006, 2010a,b, Gottlieb 2004, 2006a,b, Palmer and Finlay 2003, Ramakrishnan, et al., 1998, Sponsel 2007b,c). A multitude of specific projects are well underway in this arena, such as Interfaith Power and Light in the U.S.A., and internationally the Alliance of Religions and Conservation (<http://www.arcworld.org>), to mention just two.

As noted by the American Academy of Religion (2010): "Throughout history, it [religion] has expressed the deepest questions human beings can ask, and it has taken a central place in the lives of virtually all civilizations and cultures.... Religion persists and is on the rise, even as scientific and non-religious perspectives have become prominent."[2] Humans are religious or spiritual beings in various ways and degrees, as well as biological, mental, social, cultural, economic, political, and aesthetic beings. Religion is a cross-cultural universal; no society is known that totally lacks religion, although some individuals within any society may not be religious or spiritual, or only nominally so (Smith 1992, 2001). Also, some individuals are spiritual, but not religious in the sense of belonging to some organization or institution devoted to a religious tradition. Furthermore, even some atheists may still be spiritual (Crosby 2002). However, religion is often the primary source of an individual's worldview, values, and attitudes, including elements related to nature and the environment. Religion can be an extremely powerful influence on individuals and groups, for better or worse.

Since Earth Day on April 22, 1970, the environmental crisis has not only continued, but also it has become progressively worse and more urgent (Nelson 2002). This situation has transpired in spite of many secular approaches ranging from the impressive developments in the second half of the twentieth century in the environmental components of education, natural and social sciences, humanities like history, philosophy, and ethics, and law and other professions, not to mention the establishment of numerous natural history, environmental, and conservations organizations since the nineteenth century. It should be obvious that secular approaches, although

[2] See <http://www.aarweb.org>.

certainly necessary and important, have proven insufficient in meeting the challenges of the ecocrisis. Organizations such as the Worldwatch Institute, the United Nations Millennium Ecosystem Assessment[3], and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change have been systematically documenting the worsening ecocrisis from the local to the global levels. (Also, see Leslie 1996, McKibben 1989, and Wilson 2003, 2006).

Like White (1967:28, 30-31), many individuals from diverse backgrounds and persuasions are convinced that the ecocrisis will only be resolved, or at least markedly reduced, only if there is *a fundamental rethinking, refeeling, and revisioning of the place of humans in nature*. They believe that religion and spirituality can generate such a profound transformation in many individuals and societies where secular approaches have proven inadequate (Berry and Tucker 2006, 2009, Tucker and Berling 2003, Watling 2009). For instance, The Global Forum in Moscow in January 1990 concluded: "The environmental crisis requires changes not only in public policy, but in individual behavior. The historical record makes clear that religious teaching, example, and leadership are powerfully able to influence personal conduct and commitment. As scientists, many of us have had profound experience of awe and reverence before the universe. We understand that what is regarded as sacred is more likely to be treated with care and respect. Our planetary home should be so regarded. Efforts to safeguard and cherish the environment need to be infused with a vision of the sacred" (Global Forum 1990). Likewise, Rabbi Michael Lerner (2000:138) observes: "... the upsurge of Spirit is the only plausible way to stop the ecological destruction of our planet. Even people who have no interest in a communal solution to the distortions in our lives will have to face up [to] this ecological reality. Unless we transform our relationship with nature, we will destroy the preconditions for human life on this planet."

No particular religious or spiritual path is designated as the sole solution for the ongoing and worsening ecocrisis. Instead, numerous and diverse scientists, scholars, educators, clerics, adherents, politicians, and others are each looking into their own religion and/or spirituality for elements to help them construct more viable environmental worldviews, attitudes, values, and practices for themselves and like-minded others (Gottlieb 2006a,b, Tucker and Berling 2003, Watling 2009). Individuals who are not religious or spiritual must pursue their own alternative paths.

---

[3] See <http://www.millenniumassessment.org>.

Whether or not spiritual ecology becomes a revolutionary movement and finally resolves or at least reduces the ecocrisis, it remains a most fascinating and significant arena. Religions, spiritualities, ecologies, environments, and environmentalisms are all each interesting and significant, and when one examines their interrelationships it is even more interesting and significant (Sponsel 2007a,b,c).

Spiritual ecology has already demonstrated an extraordinary capacity to facilitate constructive dialog and collaboration between disparate and sometimes antagonistic parties, including religions, religion and science, and the humanities and sciences (Barbour 2000, Carroll and Warner 1998, Clayton and Simpson 2006, Conroy and Petersen 2000, Kellert and Farnham 2002, Vittachi 1989). *It may even become a catalyst for a theoretical and practical new synthesis of human understanding of some of the most elemental, perennial, and pivotal questions: What is nature? What is human? What is the place of humans in nature? What should be the place of humans in nature?*

At the same time, there are some serious obstacles and limitations facing spiritual ecology. First, there is the powerful establishment which is seriously challenged by spiritual ecology, including hegemonic economic and political interests, individuals pursuing scientism, Marxists who ignore the significance of religion and spirituality, and so on (Haught 1990). Second, there is the discrepancy between ideals and behaviors among adherents to various religions as well as the need for going beyond rhetoric to take more practical action. Third, there are factions and tensions within any given religion or religious sect or school. Fourth, far more outreach to the grass roots or community level is sorely needed. However, in many respects while spiritual ecology is still in its infancy, it is likely to mature rapidly within coming decades. Indeed, there is certainly the substantial momentum of the exponential growth of spiritual ecology pursued in a multitude and diversity of ways in many sectors and levels of society (Sponsel 2010a, 2011).

Interfaith Harmony

In a world where the mainstream media often focus on religious or sectarian conflict and violence (Jurgensmeyer 2003, Kimball2002), it is important to consider and publicize counterexamples. Spiritual ecology is an arena of genuine nonviolent and constructive interfaith dialog and collaboration wherein individuals and organizations from diverse religious traditions and spiritual orientations can find common purpose as co-inhabitants on planet Earth (Bassett, et al., 2000, McPherson 1991, National Religious Partnership

for the Environment[4], Womersley 2005). This is in striking contrast, at least in America, to sociopolitical issues like abortion, capital punishment, euthanasia, and war where there is often heated controversy among and even within religions. Here it must suffice to mention only a few of the more prominent initiatives of interfaith dialog and collaboration in the arena of spiritual ecology.

In 1986 the World Wildlife Fund International (WWF), one of the most prominent international conservation organizations, generated an inter-faith dialogue among leaders in Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, and Judaism at Assisi, Italy. Each leader wrote a concise statement on the environmental ethics inherent in their own religion, and these were collectively published as the Assisi Declarations (WWF 1986).

The Assisi conference led to the development of the international Alliance for Religions and Conservation (ARC) based initially at the International Consultancy on Religion, Education and Culture in Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, England. ARC has been working on over a hundred conservation projects with 11 major faiths. Among these projects are the preservation of churchyards and sacred land in the United Kingdom, Huichol sacred landscapes and pilgrimage routes in Mexico, Buddhist and Daoist sacred mountains in China, and ancient pilgrimage sites of Vrindavan and Sri Jgannath Forests in India (Dudley, et al., 2005, Edwards and Palmer 1997).

The interfaith and interdisciplinary conference titled "Spirit and Nature: Why the Environment Is a Religious Issue" was held in 1990 at Middlebury College in Vermont. It yielded a wonderful documentary film televised nationally on the PBS with the distinguished journalist Bill Moyers as narrator and also an edited book of revised conference papers reflecting on the environmental relevance of the Buddhist, Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and Native American religions (Moyers 1991, Rockefeller and Elder 1992).

The Interfaith Partnership for the Environment was founded as a project of the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) in 1986. It has become a worldwide network of different religious organizations working to promote collaboration between their representatives and environmentalists (Bassett, et al., 2000). (Also see the Earth Charter[5], Lynn 2004).

By now research and dialog on the environmental relevance of each of the world's major religions has advanced to the point that some attempts have also been made to identify common denominators or at least parallels among them.

---

[4] See <http://www.nrpe.org>.

[5] See <http://www.earthcharter.org>.

For instance, in the last chapter of the first textbook on spiritual ecology author David Kinsley (1995:227-232) identifies these ten basic principles:

1. Many religions consider all of reality, or some of its components, to be an organic whole or a living being.
2. There is an emphasis on cultivating rapport with the local environment through developing intimate knowledge about it and practicing reverence for its beauty, mystery, and power through ritual celebrations of recognition and appreciation.
3. The human and nonhuman realms are directly interrelated, often in the sense of some kind of kinship, and in certain cases, even to the extent of animals being viewed as another form of humans or persons.
4. The appropriate relationship between humans and nature should be reciprocal; that is, humans do not merely recognize interdependence, but also promote mutually beneficial interactions with nature.
5. Ultimately the dichotomy between humans and their environment is nonexistent; humans are embedded in nature as an integral part of the larger whole or cosmos.
6. This non-dualistic view reflects the ultimate elemental unity of all existence; nature and spirit are inseparable, there is only one reality, and this continuity can be sensed and experienced.
7. This underlying unity is moral as well as physical; humans and nonhumans participate in a shared moral system wherein environmental issues are first and foremost ethical concerns; and nature has intrinsic as well as extrinsic values.
8. Humans should act with restraint in nature by avoiding the anthropocentric arrogance of excessive, wasteful, and destructive use of the land and other resources, and in other ways they should exercise proper behavior toward plants, animals, and other aspects of nature as sacred.
9. Harmony or balance between humans and the rest of nature must be maintained and promoted, and, if it is upset, then it should be restored.
10. Frequently the motivation, commitment, and intensity of ecological concerns are essentially religious or spiritual (cf. Pedersen 1998).

These can be a basis for further dialog and action. Many contributors to spiritual ecology tend to think that we already have the solution to the ecocrisis and how to live in balance and harmony with nature. We only need to more closely and effectively approximate the appropriate ideals and

principles of our religion in actual practice. Religions are already in place, well-established, and followed in various ways and degrees by billions of people. The pivotal task ahead is for more people to better understand the environmental as well as human and social consequences of their behaviors and institutions in both the short and long term; systematically and explicitly construct and more closely follow a viable environmental ethic; and then recognize and effectively practice the spiritual ecology in their own religion including the sacredness of all life. As Huston Smith (1992, 2000) appreciates, the world's religions are the collective wisdom of humanity and they have the potential to be channeled for enormous good.

Speciesism

In its extreme sense, speciesism refers to the anthropocentric belief that the human species *Homo sapiens* is superior to all others in every respect and that other species can be indiscriminately exploited and harmed to suit human needs and desires. Accordingly, nonhuman beings may be excluded from moral consideration (Singer 1990, Waldau 2002, Waldau and Patton 2006). *Spiritual ecology has the potential to extend nonkilling, or more broadly, non-harming, beyond humankind to all species and even to the biosphere as a whole*. The three main religions and philosophies of Buddhism, Hinduism, and Jainism share the concept and precept of *ahimsa,* which means nonkilling, or more broadly non-harming (Chapple 1993, Phillips 2008). To briefly consider one of these three, Jainism is probably the most extreme case of spiritual ecology. It is a universal belief in the sacredness of every being. Jains consider every organism to be an individual with basic needs, the capacity to feel pain, and even a soul. Thereby they extend the principle of nonviolence beyond humans to all of nature as sacred and practice universal love. Their worldview, values, attitudes, and ensuing practices are the opposite of speciesism.

Ideally, a Jain reduces the suffering of other beings by limiting his or her resource consumption to basic needs, as for example through eating only one daily meal unless fasting. Jains are not only vegetarians, avoiding eating animal foods, but also they refrain from using animal products. As vegetarians they consume only certain fruits, nuts, vegetables, and grains. Jains renounce all professions and trades that might harm animals in any way. They even visit markets to rescue animals destined to be slaughtered by others and they maintain welfare centers for old, sick, injured, and dying animals. The strictest Jains use a filter to drink water in order to minimize consuming organisms that might be in it. They walk naked and barefooted moving a

small broom like a fan to push aside any organisms they might otherwise step on. Strict Jains even practice celibacy to avoid killing sperm. In these, and many other ways, individual Jains daily maximize empathy, compassion, and reverence for all beings. Thereby they minimize their environmental impact, resource consumption, and violence. Jains pursue *aparigraha*, or nonmaterialism, limiting their acquisition of material goods and instead contributing their wealth and time to humanitarian charities and philanthropic causes (Chapple 1993, 2002, Singhvi 1997, Tobias 1991). As L. M. Singhvi (1997:93) says, "Jainism is fundamentally a religion of ecology and has turned ecology into a religion." Incidentally, Jainism is also behind the awesome work of Satish Kumar, head of Schumacher College in Devon, England, truly a great leader in spiritual ecology (Kumar 2002, 2007, 2010, *Resurgence*[6]). Nonmaterialism parallels the environmentally sensitive radical or voluntary simplicity movement in the West and beyond. One of its pioneers, Jim Merkel (2003:162-163) lists its spiritual principles as kindness, compassion, love, responsibility, limits, and fascination. (Also, see the Global Living Project[7]). For a survey of views on animals from another religion, Islam, see Foltz 2006. For Buddhist approaches to consumerism see Kaza 2005, Payne 2010).

Certainly the aim of nonkilling is most admirable. However, surely it assumes far greater admirability when it is not limited to human beings, but extended to all beings in the case of the Jain ideal of maximizing one's effort to minimize one's harm in the world. If an individual can hesitate to kill even an insect, then this magnifies manifold the goal of not killing another human being, given that most people retain some modicum of speciesism. Moreover, this realization should also make it easier for humans to empathize with fellow members of their own species and thereby extend compassion and loving-kindness toward them.

Empathy and Compassion

In his best selling book *Ethics for the New Millennium*, His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet (1999) develops the foundation for a universal ethic that transcends any particular religion or philosophy. He argues that the unconditional love of the mother for her infant generates the basic goodness of human nature, including empathy, compassion, loving kindness, and nonviolence. He notes that all humans desire to be happy and to avoid

[6] See <http://www.resurgence.org>.
[7] See <http://www.radicalsimplicity.org>.

suffering. Furthermore, since all beings are interconnected and interdependent in various ways and degrees, making others happy makes oneself happy and the converse. Accordingly, it is in everyone's interest to do whatever creates happiness and to avoid whatever generates suffering. This is the heart of his universal ethics. Moreover, genuine happiness is inner peace, and that is grounded in compassionate concern for others. Thus, the challenge is to extend empathy and thereby compassion and loving-kindness beyond one's own in-group. This requires individual restraint and good intentions including the cultivating of an ethic of virtue to mindfully shift attention away from ego to others. That can even feed social and political policies to resolve problems that ultimately stem from the way we think about and act toward other beings. Ultimately societal peace and world peace depend on the inner peace of the collectivity of the individuals involved. Furthermore, minds as well as societies need to be demilitarized (Andreas 2004).

Parallel to the above view is the work by Karen Armstrong (2010) in developing the Charter for Compassion. She argues that compassion is celebrated in all of the major religious, spiritual, and ethical traditions. The Golden Rule is our primary duty and cannot be limited to only our own political, religious, or ethnic group. The cultivation of compassion can build common ground in our divided world and thereby reduce tensions, conflicts, and violence.

Although space is not available here to provide the details, it should be noted that the role of empathy, compassion, and related phenomena in ethics and behavior is being documented through a variety of scientific research. Some of this work has been inspired by His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet (Davidson and Harrington 2002, Mind and Life Institute[8]). However, there is also independent research pursuing the biological roots of behaviors like empathy and compassion in primates and other nonhuman animals (Bekoff 2007a,b, Bekoff and Pierce 2009, de Waal 2009, Hrdy 2009). Like the nonkilling perspective developed by Glenn D. Paige and his colleagues, this is a very exciting and promising new frontier for basic and applied research. (See Paige and Gilliatt 1991, and Evans Pim 2009).

His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet asserts that a spiritual revolution is required to more effectively deal with the problems of the world created by humanity. Spiritual ecology is a vital component of such a revolution in the present author's opinion. Killing would be reduced and nonkilling increased by extending empathy beyond humankind to all species and ecosystems within the biosphere of planet Earth.

---

[8] See <http://www.mindandlife.org>.

Gandhian Ecology

In various ways and degrees the voluminous writings and awesome lifestyle of Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948) anticipated many elemental principles of ecology and environmentalism of today including holism instead of atomism; monism instead of dualism; interconnections and interdependencies in systems; ecocentrism instead of anthropocentrism or egocentrism; intrinsic value of other beings instead of merely extrinsic or utilitarian value; unity of life and species egalitarianism instead of speciesism; reverence for all life as sacred; finite resources, environmental limits, and limiting wants to satisfy basic needs; voluntary simplicity; fasting, vegetarianism, and locavorism; decentralization, local rural community self-sufficiency, and sustainable livelihood; stewardship, conservation, and waste recycling; self-discipline, self-restraint, and minimizing one's ecological footprint; ethical responsibility to future generations; and critique of technology, industrialism, urbanization, capitalism, consumerism, colonialism, and development as material progress (e.g., Dobson 1991, Drengson and Devall 2008, Lal 2000).

Gandhi recognized the relationship between nonkilling within human society and toward nature when he said: "We cannot have ecological movement designed to prevent violence against Nature, unless the principle of nonviolence becomes central to the ethics of human culture" (quoted in Moolakkattu 2010: 155). As Moolakkattu (2010:157) observes: "Gandhi's ethical and religious approach to all fellow creatures was founded on an identification with all that lives…. Ahimsa, for him, envisaged or subsumed an awareness of the interdependency of all life. Ahimsa can emerge only in a disciplined environment in which a person renounces pleasures of the body in pursuit of a higher spiritual pursuit." (For more on Gandhian ecology see Bilimoria 2001, Guha 2006, Jones 2000, Khoshoo and Moolakkattu 2009, Kumar 2008, Lal 2000, Moolakkattu 2010, Shinn 2000, and Weber 1999. For Hinduism and ecology see Chapple and Tucker 2000, Nelson 1998, and Prime 1992, 2002).

Gandhi is best known by far for his life, work, and writings on nonviolence and peace (Paige 1993:133-155). Less well known is his significant influence in the development of other pioneers in spiritual ecology, such as mountain philosopher Arne Naess (1912-2009), founder of deep ecology (1973, 1985, 1989, 2002), and economist E.F. Schumacher (1911-1977), initiator of Buddhist economics including his ideas about small is beautiful, production by the masses instead of mass production, and intermediate or appropriate technology (1973). While Gandhi has been an inspiration for many people

throughout the world, in his homeland of India he has also inspired environmentalists and others. One of the more prominent Indian personages in recent decades is Vandana Shiva. She is an internationally recognized quantum physicist, philosopher, ecofeminist, and environmental and social justice activist. For her various initiatives, including on earth democracy, seed sovereignty, and biodiversity conservation, Shiva received the Right Livelihood Award in 1993 and was identified by *Time Magazine* as a Hero for the Green Century in August 26, 2002 (London 2008, Shiva 2005, 2010).

Global Nonkilling

The rethinking and reinventing of scientific and academic disciplines from the perspective of nonkilling is necessary to promote nonkilling societies and a nonkilling world as a whole (Bhaneja 2008, Evans Pim 2009, Hellwig 1992, Kurlansky 2008, Niwano 1977, Paige 2009a). However, such changes in scientific and academic work alone are not sufficient. Other sectors of society and culture must also change, and perhaps most of all, religious thinking, discourse, and institutions. After all, religions are the primary source of the worldview, values, and attitudes for many individuals, and religions have the potential to motivate and guide their behavior and its consequences for better rather than worse. Accordingly, religions must also rethink and reinvent their capacity for nonkilling (Gopin 2008, Groff 2008, McClymond and Freedman 2008, Rouner 1988).

Spiritual ecology can also help. It has the potential to contribute toward the primary goal of the Center for Global Nonkilling in the broadest possible sense—extending nonkilling worldwide including to all beings, at least as an ideal. It can complement and extend the life work of one of the most perceptive, courageous, and noblest personalities, intellectuals, scientists, and activists the world has ever known, Glenn D. Paige (1993, 2009a,b).

References

Andreas, Joel (2004). *Addicted to War: Why the U.S. Can't Kick Militarism*. Oakland: AK Press. Available online at: <http://www.addictedtowar.com>.

Armstrong, Edward A. (1973). *Saint Francis: Nature Mystic*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Armstrong, Karen (2010). *Charter for Compassion*. Available online at: <http://www.charterforcompassion.org>.

Barbour, Ian G., Ed. (2000). *When Science Meets Religion: Enemies, Strangers, or Partners?* San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

Bassett, Libby; Brinkman, John T. and Pedersen, Kusumitra P., Eds. (2000). *Earth and Faith: A Book of Reflection and Action*. New York: United Nations Environmental Program Interfaith Partnership for the Environment.

Bekoff, Marc (2007a). *Animals Matter: A Biologist Explains Why We Should Treat Animals with Compassion and Respect*. Boston: Shambhala Publications, Inc.

Bekoff, Marc (2007b). *The Emotional Lives of Animals: A Leading Scientist Explores Animal Joy, Sorrow, and Empathy—and Why They Matter*. Novato: New World Library.

Bekoff, Marc and Pierce, Jessica (2009). *Wild Justice: The Moral Lives of Animals*. Chicago, Il: University of Chicago Press.

Berry, Thomas and Tucker, Mary Evelyn (2006). *Evening Thoughts: Reflecting on Earth as a Sacred Community*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Berry, Thomas and Tucker, Mary Evelyn (2009). *The Sacred Universe: Earth, Spirituality, and Religion in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bhaneja, Balwant (2008). "Nonkilling Political Science," in Kurtz, Lester, Ed. *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, vol. 2. San Diego: Academic Press, 1356-1362.

Bilimoria, Purushottama (2001). "Mahatma Gandhi 1869-1948," in Palmer, Joy A. Ed. *Fifty Key Thinkers on the Environment*. New York: Routledge, 160-167.

Carroll, John E. and Warner, Keith, Eds. (1998). *Ecology and Religion: Scientists Speak*. Quincy: Franciscan Press.

Chapple, Christopher Key (1993). *Nonviolence to Animals, Earth, and Self in Asian Traditions*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Chapple, Christopher Key, Ed. (2002). *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press and the Harvard Center for the Study of World Religions.

Chapple, Christopher Key and Tucker, Mary Evelyn, Eds. (2000). *Hinduism and Ecology: The Intersection of Earth, Sky, and Water*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press and the Harvard Center for the Study of World Religions.

Clayton, Philip, and Simpson, Zachary, Eds. (2006). *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Science*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Conroy, Donald B. and Petersen, Rodney L., Eds. (2000). *Earth at Risk: An Environmental Dialogue between Religion and Science*. Amherst: Humanity.

Crosby, Donald A. (2002). *A Religion of Nature*. Albany: State University of New York.

Dalai Lama, His Holiness (1999). *Ethics for the New Millennium*, New York: Riverhead Books.

Davidson, Richard J. and Harrington, Anne, Eds. (2002). *Visions of Compassion: Western Scientists and Tibetan Buddhists Examine Human Nature*. New York: Oxford University Press.

De Waal, Frans (2009). *The Age of Empathy: Nature's Lessons for a Kinder Society*. New York: Harmony Books.

Dobson, Andrew Ed. (1991). *The Green Reader: Essays Toward a Sustainable Society*. San Francisco: Mercury House.

Drengson, Alan and Devall, Bill, Eds. (2008). *The Ecology of Wisdom: Writings of Arne Naess*. Berkeley: Counterpoint.

Dudley, Nigel; Higgins-Zogib, Liza and Mansourian, Stephanie (2005). *Beyond Belief: Linking Faiths and Protected Areas to Support Biodiversity Conservation*. Gland, Switzerland: World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and Alliance of Religions and Conservation. Available online at: <http://www.arcworld.org>.

Edwards, Jo and Palmer, Martin, Eds. (1997). *Holy Ground: The Guide to Faith and Ecology*. Northamptonshire: Pilkington Press Ltd.

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

Foltz, Richard C. (2006). *Animals in Islamic Tradition and Muslim Cultures*. Oxford: OneWorld Publications.

Gardner, Gary (2002). "Invoking the Spirit: Religion and Spirituality in the Quest for a Sustainable World," *Worldwatch Paper*, 164. Available online at: <http://www.worldwatch.org/pubs/paper/164/>.

Gardner, Gary (2006). *Inspiring Progress: Religion's Contributions to Sustainable Development*, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.

Gardner, Gary (2010a). "Engaging Religions to Shape Worldviews," in Starke, Linda and Mastny, Lisa, Eds. (2010) *State of the World: Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 23-29.

Gardner, Gary (2010b). "Ritual and Taboo as Ecological Guardians," in Starke, Linda and Mastny, Lisa, Eds. (2010) *State of the World: Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability*. New Yor: W.W. Norton & Company, 30-35.

Gandhi, Mohandas K. (2010). <http://www.mkgandhi.org>.

Global Forum (1990). "Preserving and Cherishing the Earth: An Appeal for Joint Commitment in Science and Religion," Moscow: Global Forum. Available online at: <http://fore.research.yale.edu/publications/statements/preserve.html>.

Gopin, Marc (2008). "Spirituality and Peacemaking," in Kurtz, Lester, Ed. *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, vol. 3. San Diego: Academic Press, 1982-1993.

Gottlieb, Roger S., Ed. (2004 [1996]). *This Sacred Earth: Religion, Nature, Environment*, New York: Routledge.

Gottlieb, Roger S. (2006a). *A Greener Faith: Religious Environmentalism and the Our Planet's Future*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gottlieb, Roger S., Ed. (2006b). *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Ecology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gottlieb, Roger S. (2007). "Religious Environmentalism: Promises and Challenges," Lecture at Vanderbilt University. Available online at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BVpxdd1Oosg>.

Groff, Linda (2008). "Religion and Peace, Inner-Outer Dimensions of," in Kurtz, Lester, Ed. *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, vol. 3. San Diego: Academic Press, 1846-1859.

Guha, Ramachandra (2006). "Mahatma Gandhi and the Environmental Movement," in Raghuramaraju, A., Ed. *Debating Gandhi*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 223-236.

Hrdy, Sarah Blaffer (2009). *Mothers and Others: The Evolutionary Origins of Mutual Understanding*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hargrove, Eugene C., Ed. (1986). *Religion and Environmental Crisis*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Harvey, Graham (2006). *Animism: Respecting the Living World*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Haught, John F. (1990). "Critiques of Religion," in *What Is Religion? An Introduction*. Mahwah: Paulist Press, 199-250.

Hellwig, Monika K. (1992). *A Case for Peace in Reason and Faith*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.

Interfaith Power and Light Renewal Project (2007). *Renewal: Stories from America's Religious Environmental Movement*. Documentary Film. Available online at: <http://www.renewalproject.org>.

Jones, D. M. (2000). "The Greening of Gandhi: Gandhian Thought and the Environmental Movement in India," in *The Face of the Earth: Environment and World History*, New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc., 165-184.

Jurgensmeyer, Mark (2003). *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kaza, Stephanie (2005). *Hooked! Buddhist Writings on Greed, Desire, and the Urge to Consume* Boston: Shambhala Publications.

Kaza, Stephanie (2008). *Mindfully Green: A Personal and Spiritual Guide to Whole Earth Thinking*. Boston: Shambhala Publications, Inc.

Kaza, Stephanie and Kraft, Kenneth, Eds. (2000). *Dharma Rain: Sources of Buddhist Environmentalism*, Boston: Shambhala Publications, Inc.

Kearns, Laurel and Keller, Catherine, Eds. (2007). *Ecospirit: Religions and Philosophies for the Earth*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Kellert, Stephen R. and Farnham, Timothy J., Eds. (2002). *The Good in Nature and Humanity: Connecting Science, Religion, and Spirituality with the Natural World*. Washington: Island Press.

Kimball, Charles (2002). *When Religion Becomes Evil*. New York: HarperCollins.

Kinsley, David (1995). *Ecology and Religion: Ecological Spirituality in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Khoshoo, T. N. and Moolakkattu, J. S. (2009). *Gandhi and the Environment: Analyzing Gandhi's Environmental Thought*. New Delhi: Tehri Press.

Kumar, Satish (2002). "Jain Ecology," in *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press and Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions, 181-190.

Kumar, Satish (2007). *Spiritual Compass: The Three Qualities of Life*. Foxhole: Green Books.

Kumar, Satish (2008). "A Tribute to Mahatma Gandhi,". Available online at:

<http://www.YouTube.com/watch?v=lnonj8xjYnc>.

Kumar, Satish (2010). *Earth Pilgrim: Conversations with Satish Kumar*. Foxhole: Green Books.

Kurlansky, Mark (2008). *Non-Violence: The History of a Dangerous Idea*. New York: Modern Library.

Lal, Vinay (2000). "Too Deep for Deep Ecology: Gandhi and the Ecological Vision of Life," in Chapple, Christopher Key and Tucker, Mary Evelyn, *Hinduism and Ecology: The Intersection of Earth, Sky, and Water*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press and Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions, 183-212.

Lerner, Rabbi Michael (2000). *Spirit Matters*. Charlottesville: Hampton Roads Publishing Company, Inc.

Leslie, John (1996). *The End of the World: The Science and Ethics of Human Extinction*. New York: Routledge.

London, Scott (2008). "In the Footsteps of Gandhi: An Interview with Vandana Shiva". Available online at: <http://www.scottlondon.com/interviews/Shiva.html>.

Lynn, William S., Ed. (2004). "Special Issue on the Earth Charter," *Worldviews: Environment, Culture, Religion*, 8(1):1-149.

Martin, Julia, Ed. (1997). *Ecological Responsibility: A Dialogue with Buddhism*. Delhi: Tibet House.

McClymond, Michael J. and Freedman, David N. (2008). "Religious Traditions, Violence and Nonviolence," in Kurtz, Lester, Ed., *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict*, vol. 3. San Diego: Academic Press, 1860-1869.

McKibben, Bill (2006 [1989]). *The End of Nature*. New York: Random House.

McPherson, James (1991). "Ecumenical Discussion of the Environment 1966-1987," *Modern Theology,* 7(4):363-371.

Merkel, Jim (2003). *Radical Simplicity: Small Footprints on a Finite Earth*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.

Moolakkattu, John S. (2010). "Gandhi as a Human Ecologist," *Journal of Human Ecology*, 29(3):151-158. Available online at: <http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JHE/JHE-29-0-000-10-Web/JHE-29-3-000-10-Abst-PDF/JHE-2->

Moyers, Bill (1991). "Spirit and Nature," *Public Affairs Television*. New York: Mystic Fire Video.

Naess, Arne (1973). "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movements," *Inquiry,* 16:95-100.

Naess, Arne (2002). *Life's Philosophy: Reason and Feeling in a Deeper World*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Naess, Arne (2008). "Self-Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World," in Drengson, Alan and Devall, Bill, Eds., *Ecology of Wisdom: Writings of Arne Naess*. Berkeley: Counterpoint, 81-96.

Naess, Arne and Sessions, George (1985). "Platform of Deep Ecology," in Devall, Bill and Sessions, George, *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered*. Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 69-73.

Naess, Arne and Rothenberg, David (1989). *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Narayan, Rajdeva and Kumar, Janardan, Eds. (2003). *Ecology and Religion: Ecological Concepts in Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Islam, Christianity and Sikhism*. New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications (P) Ltd.

Nash, Roderick F. (1989). "The Greening of Religion," in Nash, Roderick F., *The Rights of Nature: A History of Environmental Ethics*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 87-120.

Nelson, Gaylord (2002). *Beyond Earth Day: Fulfilling the Promise*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Nelson, Lance E., Ed. (1998). *Purifying the Earth Body of God: Religion and Ecology in Hindu India*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Niwano, Nikkyo (1977). *A Buddhist Approach to Peace*. Tokyo: Kosei Publishing Co.

Nothwehr, Dawn M., Ed. (2002). *Franciscan Theology of the Environment: An Introductory Reader*. Quincy: Franciscan Press.

Paige, Glenn D. (1993). *To Nonviolent Political Science: From Seasons of Violence*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project and Matsunaga Institute for Peace. Available online at: <http://www.nonkiling.org>.

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

Paige, Glenn D. (2009b). "Nonkilling: A Better Way,". Available online at: <http://www.youtube.com/user/globalnonkilling>.

Paige, Glenn D. and Gilliatt, Sarah, Eds. (1991). *Nonviolence in Hawaii's Spiritual Traditions*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Palmer, Martin and Finlay, Victoria (2003). *Faith in Conservation: New Approaches to Religion and Environment*, Washington: World Bank.

Payne, Richard K., Ed. (2010). *How Much Is Enough? Buddhism, Consumerism, and the Human Environment*. Somerville: Wisdom Publications.

Pedersen, Kusumita P. (1998). "Environmental Ethics in Interreligious Perspective," in Twiss, Sumner B. and Grelle, Bruce, Eds., *Global Ethics: Comparative Religious Ethics and Interreligious Dialogue*. Boulder: Westview Press, 253-290.

Phillips, Stephen H. (2008). "Nonharmfulness (ahmisa) in Classical Indian Thought," in Kurtz, Lester, Ed., *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, & Conflict,* vol. 2. San Diego: Academic Press, 1347-1356.

Prime, Ranchor (1992). *Hinduism and Ecology: Seeds of Truth*. London: Cassell Publishers Limited.

Prime, Ranchor (2002). *Vedic Ecology: Practical Wisdom for Surviving the 21st Century*. San Rafael: Mandala Publishing.

Ramakrishnan, P. S., K. G. Saxena and U. M. Chandrashekara, Eds. (1998). *Conserving the Sacred for Biodiversity Management*. Enfield: Science Publishers, Inc.

Rockefeller, Steven C. and John C. Elder, Eds. (1992). *Spirit and Nature: Why the Environment Is a Religious Issue*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Rouner, Leroy S., Ed. (1988). *Human Rights and the World's Religions*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Santimire, H. Paul (2003). "Ecotheology," in van Huyssteen, J. Wentzel Vrede, Ed., *Encyclopedia of Science and Religion*, New York: Thomson Gale, 1:247-251.

Schumacher, E. F. (1973). *Small Is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered*. New York: Harper and Row.

Shinn, Larry D. (2000). "The Inner Logic of Gandhian Ecology," in Chapple, Christopher Key and Tucker, Mary Evelyn, *Hinduism and Ecology: The Intersection of Earth, Sky, and Water*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press and Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions, 213-241.

Shiva, Vandana (2005). *Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability, and Peace*. Cambridge: South End Press.

Shiva, Vandana (2010). "Navdanya International: Seeds, Food Security and Sustainability". Available at: <http://www.navdamya.org>.

Singer, P. (1990 [1976]). *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals*. New York: Avon.

Singhvi, L. M. (1997). "Jainism," in Edwards, Jo and Palmer, Martin, Eds., *Holy Ground: The Guide to Faith and Ecology*. Northhamptonshire: Pilkington Press, 91-93.

Smith, Huston (1992). *Forgotten Truth: The Common Vision of the World's Religions*. San Francisco: HarperCollins.

Smith, Huston (2001). *Why Religion Matters: The Fate of the Human Spirit in the Age of Disbelief*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

Sorrell, Roger D. (1988). *St. Francis of Assisi and Nature: Tradition and Innovation in Western Christian Attitudes toward the Environment*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sponsel, Leslie E. (1989). "An Anthropologist's Perspective on Peace and Quality of Life," in Sanders, Daniel S. and Matsuoka, Jon, Eds., *Peace and Development: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Honolulu: University of Hawai`i, 29-48.

Sponsel, Leslie E. (2006). "What are My Reasons for Involvement in the Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence". Available online at: <http://www.soc.hawaii.edu/Sponsel>.

Sponsel, Leslie E. (2007a). "Spiritual Ecology: One Anthropologist's Reflections," *Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture* 1(3):340-349.

Sponsel, Leslie E. (2007b). "Religion, Nature and Environmentalism," in Sarkar, Sahotra and Kalof, Linda, Eds., *Encyclopedia of Earth*. Washington: Environmental Information Coalition. Available online at: <http://www.eoearth.org/article/Religion,_nature_and_environmentalism>.

Sponsel, Leslie E. (2007c). "Sacred Places and Biodiversity Conservation," in Sarkar, Sahotra and Kalof, Linda, Eds., *Encyclopedia of Earth*. Washington: Environmental Information Coalition. Available online at: <http://www.eoearth.org/article/sacred_places_and_biodiversity_conservation>.

Sponsel, Leslie E. (2009). "Reflections on the Possibilities of a Nonkilling Society and a Nonkilling Anthropology," in Evans Pim, Joám, Ed., *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling, 35-70. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Sponsel, Leslie E. (2010a). Research Institute for Spiritual Ecology (RISE). Available at: <http://www.soc.hawaii.edu/Sponsel/RISE/MP_RISE.html>.

Sponsel, Leslie E. (2010b). "Into the Heart of Darkness: Rethinking the Canonical Ethnography on the Yanomamo," in Evans Pim, Joám, Ed., *Nonkilling Societies*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling, 197-240. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Sponsel, Leslie E. (2012). *Spiritual Ecology: A Quiet Revolution*. Santa Barbara: Praeger. Available online at: <http://www.spiritualecology.info>.

Sponsel, Leslie E. and Gregor, Thomas, Eds. (1994). *The Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.

Sponsel, Leslie E. and Natadecha-Sponsel, Poranee (1991). "Nonviolent Ecology: The Possibilities of Buddhism," in Paige, Glenn D. and Gilliatt, Sarah, Eds., *Buddhism and Nonviolent Global Problem-Solving*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonviolence Planning Project and Spark M. Matsunaga Institute for Peace, 139-150. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Sponsel, Leslie E. and Natadecha-Sponsel, Poranee (2008). "Buddhism: Environment and Nature," in Selin, Helaine, Ed., *Encyclopedia of the History of Science, Technology, and Medicine in Non-Western Cultures*. The Netherlands: Springer, 1:768-776.

Spring, David, and Spring, Eileen, Eds. (1974). *Ecology and Religion in History*, San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Swearer, Donald K., Ed. (2009) *Ecology and the Environment: Perspectives from the Humanities*. Cambridge: Harvard Divinity School.

Taylor, Bron, Ed. (2005). *Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*, London: Thoemmes Contiuum. Available online at: <http://www.religionandnature.com>.

Taylor, Bron (2010). *Dark Green Religion: Nature, Spirituality, and the Planetary Future*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tobias, Michael (1991). *Life Force: The World of Jainism*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.

Tucker, Mary Evelyn (1997). "The Emerging Alliance of Religion and Ecology," *Worldviews: Environment, Culture and Religion*, 1(1):3-24.

Tucker, Mary Evelyn and Berling, Judith A. (2003). *Worldly Wonder: Religions Enter Their Ecological Phase*. La Salle: Open Court.

Tucker, Mary Evelyn and Grim, John (2001). "Religion and Ecology: Can the Climate Change?," *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences,* 130(4): 1-307. Available online at: <http://www.amacad.org/publications/fall2001>.

Tucker, Mary Evelyn and Grim, John (2007). "The Greening of the World's Religions," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(23):B9-B10.

Tucker, Mary Evelyn and Grim, John (2009). "Religion and a New Environmental Ethics," Yale University interview. Available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BG0bQ3SwDI8>.

Tucker, Mary Evelyn and Williams, Duncan Ryuken, Eds. (1997). *Buddhism and Ecology: The Interconnection of Dharma and Deeds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press and Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions.

Vittachi, Anuradha (1989). *Earth Conference One: Sharing a Vision for Our Planet*. Boston: Shambhala Publications.

Waldau, Paul (2002). *The Spector of Speciesm: Buddhist and Christian Views of Animals*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Waldau, Paul and Patton, Kimberley, Eds. (2006). *A Communion of Subjects: Animals in Religion, Science and Ethics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Watling, Tony (2009). *Ecological Imaginations in the World Religions: An Ethnographic Analysis*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Weber, Thomas (1999). "Gandhi and Deep Ecology," *Journal of Peace Research*, 36(3):349-361. Available online at: <http://www.mkgandhi.org/environment/envt.htm>.

White, Lynn Jr. (1967). "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis," *Science*, 155:1203-1207.

Wilson, Edward O. (2003). *The Future of Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Wilson, Edward O. (2006). *The Creation: An Appeal to Save Life on Earth*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Womersley, Mick (2005). "National Religious Partnership for the Environment," in Taylor, Bron, Ed., *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Nature*. London: Thoemmes Continuum, 2:1158-1159.

World Wildlife Fund International (WWF) (1986). *The Assisi Declarations: Messages on Man and Nature from Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, and Judaism*. Gland, Switzerland: World Wildlife Fund International.

Chapter Two

The Spirit That Kills Not

Predrag Cicovacki
College of the Holy Cross, Worcester

Man is a spiritual being. He is not merely or exclusively a spiritual being, yet it is his spirituality that defines him the most. Or, in our time, his lack of spirituality. Perhaps even more precisely, what defines human existence in our epoch is a confusion with regard to what spirituality is, and a resulting disorientation as to who man is and what it means to be and live like a human being.[1]

To understand how we came to be so confused about our spirituality and identity, let us briefly consider the history of our understanding of spirit, all the way to the beginning of the twentieth century. Then we will pay special attention to the views of Nicolai Hartmann and Nicolas Berdyaev, the two philosophers who discussed the concept of spirit in more detail than anyone else in the century that has mostly forgotten about spirit, and who both tried to awaken us to its vital significance. At the end, following some suggestions of Hartmann and Berdyaev, I will offer a constructive suggestion as to how to come closer to living in accordance with our true, spiritual nature.

Four Stages in the Understanding of Spirit

One way in which we can present the history of our understanding of spirit is by distinguishing between its four different conceptions: 1. The early mythological and poetic tradition of ancient Greece; 2. The later Greek philosophical tradition; 3. The Christian conception; and 4. The post-medieval (or modern) conception. The development winds from conceiving spirit as something almost material, toward understanding it as almost completely mental. But let us go step by step.

If we look for the Greek term of which our word "spirit" is a translation, we find two: *pneuma* and *nous*. *Pneuma* has physical overtones, and literally means "wind" or "breath." Occasionally, it also meant "fire," or "blood," or "blowing of the wind." The concept of spirit, then, originally refered to

[1] Throughout the essay, I use "he" and "man" generically, that is, to refer to a human being and not to one gender only. The choice is based purely on the simplicity of this language, as opposed to the cumbersome "he or she" and "his/her" expressions.

something that is dynamic, always in motion and transforming, not tied to any space, nor shaped into any substantial form. *Pneuma* is what comes and goes, an animated and invisible force, whose physical manifestations we can see and need to learn to manage or control. According to this understanding, reality is comprised of two contrasting elements: the world-body and the world-spirit. The world-body consists of objects and things that fill space, while the world-soul consists of forces that shape the relationships of those objects and things, that glue them together, or keep them away from each other. Where the spirit is present, there is a force that connects, while the absence of spirit means separation and fragmentation.[2]

With the development of Greek philosophy, the shift was made from *pneuma* to *nous*. Philosophers like Plato and Aristotle do not deny the existence of *pneuma*, but they see in it a lower principle. Every living being is a body that contains in itself a breath of life (*pneuma*), but there is in the world also a structure—a law (*nomos*) that regulates the movements of even the seemingly irregular blowing of *pneuma*. Spirit thus becomes something of an ideal foundation of the world.

Greek philosophers conceive of the world as a *kosmos*, as a living organism governed by an eternal and unchangeable law. Not accidentally, the first philosophical discipline was cosmology—an attempt to uncover and explain this hidden law governing every phenomenon of the *kosmos*. The law itself is rational; it is an intellectual code that must be in principle knowable. Spirit is thus conceived as a divine revelatory principle, simultaneously operating within the natural world and the human mind. Philosophy becomes a concentrated and systematic effort to grasp, articulate, and explain the law governing the daily breathing of the *kosmos*.

Under the influence of Socrates, his successors understood "spirit" not only in a cosmological but also in an ethical sense. The *kosmos* is not just governed by the unchanging law that establishes a harmonious co-existence of worldly things. The *kosmos* is also something good. To be, to exist—as opposed to not to exist, not to be—is something good. The Greeks believed that the *kosmos* has an inalienable ethical dimension built into its core. The Socratic shift toward living a virtuous life is thus not merely an individualistic endeavor, as it later becomes in modern philosophy (decisively so with Kant). As in the Asian spiritual traditions, to be virtuous for the an-

---

[2] For more on the distinction between the world-body and the world-soul, as well as on the nature of *pneuma*, see Dudley Young, 1992. For the best history of our Western understanding of spirit, see Nicolas Berdyaev, 1939.

cient Greeks was to live in harmony with the *kosmos* as a whole. Indeed, spirituality itself is precisely manifested in that harmonious interaction of man with the world. Spiritual life is life in accordance with the cosmological and ethical *logos* governing the world.

When spirit is understood as *pneuma* in the Greek mythological and poetic tradition, the *kosmos* and our life in it is usually conceived of in a monistic way: there is *one* principle permeating and governing the entire *kosmos*. With the addition of the ethical element, this monism of some of the early Greeks becomes untenable. As it was clear to Socrates, and as elaborated by Plato and Aristotle, the dynamic balance may be interrupted; the natural world is not always overlapping with the social world. The harmony between the two is not an established fact but more like a desired goal. As Plato's *Republic* and Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Politics* show, the task becomes to realize that harmony in an individual as well as in a social life.

The Bible returns to and affirms a higher significance of *pneuma* than of *logos* (*nous*)—although *logos* is not forgotten either. In Genesis (2:7), God is depicted as animating Adam with a breath. Yet this God—Yahweh—is also the supreme law-giver and law-enforcer. In the New Testament, the transcendent Father connects with his creation through his Son. The Son becomes a historically tangible manifestation of the *logos*. As it is put in the opening sentence of the John's Gospel, "In the beginning was the Word" (*logos*; John 1:1).

This *logos* is now understood as an eternal truth that has been present from the creation of the world, with a twist that it is now being sent forth in a human form. The Son of God shows us the way toward a unification of the eternal and the temporal, the one and the many. The ethical element is strongly present in the Christian tradition as well. The mission of the Son of God is to awaken all mankind for its true and higher destiny. Thus the spirit in Christianity is manifested not only as the Holy Father and the Holy Son, but as the Holy Spirit as well.[3]

The Latin term *spiritus* means "breath," "courage," or "vigor." It preserves ties with both *pneuma* and *logos* (*nous*), and in addition has a complex relation with another key concept: that of *anima* (soul). Terminologically, there has always been a distinction between soul and spirit; a verbal distinction between them exists in all Indo-European languages. (For example, in Hebrew, they are *rauch* and *nephesh*; in Sanskrit: *prana* and *akasha*).

---

[3] See Matthew 28:19; the study of the Holy Spirit in Christian theology is called "Pneumatology." For useful discussion, see Pelikan, 1988.

Speaking metaphorically, the relationship between spirit and soul is analogous to that in which blood is related to human body. Yet the conceptual connections between them are complex and not fully possible to untangle. Besides ascribing spirit to a living person, there has also always persisted a view insisting on the continuity of spiritual life and connecting the spirit of a living person with the spirit of a deceased person—often called ghost. A ghost is usually understood as the apparition of a deceased person, similar in appearance to that person and encountered in places that the person frequented. In connection with this is also a still familiar use of the word spirit for alcohol. The reason behind the persistence of this use of spirit is to be found in the medieval superstition according to which those intoxicated by alcohol are possessed by evil spirits (and frequently visited by ghosts).

More important for our context is the Christian connection of spirit with personality. This is a truly novel element which we do not find in the Greek tradition, and which is also missing from the oriental conceptions of spirit. This novel conception is by no means sufficiently developed; for example, this conception of spirit as personality is more visible in John's Gospel than in the writings of Paul. Nevertheless, there are unmistakable hints of this conception of spirit as personality throughout the New Testament. Just as spirit (or soul, or matter, or reality) cannot be defined, neither can personality. Roughly speaking, personality is something changeless in change, the presence of the holy in the mundane. While the Greek philosophers emphasize the intellect, Christianity focuses on the heart. Instead of the Greek fascination with virtue (understood as excellence and striving toward perfection), Christianity rejects the competitive element and turns us toward the relevance of suffering and compassion, as well as toward the miracles of grace and forgiving. Spirituality thus becomes understood as a benevolent energy, a God-given gift that arrives to our corporeal world from another, divine realm. Spirit is not a rationally grounded law but a state of divine inspiration.

In Augustine, the soul is sharply separated from the body and is understood as a spiritual substance (sub-stance; what stands under). Although post-medieval philosophy turns away from much of the Christian and Scholastic tradition, the founders of modern philosophy retain the idea of mental or spiritual substance. We find it, for instance, in both Descartes and Locke. Yet the development of Newton's physics—which interprets the universe not as a living organism, but as a purely mechanical whole—requires a different approach to both reality and spirituality. This mechanical universe has no room in it for an ethical component, which can be preserved only by shifting it toward the interior of man. Similarly, the universe consisting of

atoms and the forces regulating their relations in space and time has no need—perhaps even no room—for spirits and substances. Nevertheless, man's psychic and moral life has to be explained somehow, and Locke persisted in defending the idea of mental substance; he built a conception of our indivisible soul on it. Moreover, precisely this idea of an atomic and isolated mental substance as the foundation of our identity served as an inspiration to the "Founding Fathers" of the young American Republic, which they interpreted in terms of individualism and property rights.[4]

Despite the great success of Locke's political philosophy, his conception of substance was immediately attacked and damaged beyond repair. First Bishop Berkeley demonstrated the untenability of Locke's (and Descartes's) conception of material substance. Then Hume launched an equally devastating attack against the concept of spiritual substance. With Kant, who claimed to be awoken from his "dogmatic slumber" by Hume, the concept of substance plays a very different and far less important role. As if anticipating future development in physics and cognitive science, Kant proposed that we think of reality in terms of functional rather than substantial concepts. This means, for example, that we should approach the mind not in terms of what the mind is (e.g., substance of some kind) but in terms of what the mind does—indeed, the mind is what the mind does. After demonstrating the insurmountable boundaries of our rational knowledge of the world—for example, we can neither prove nor disprove the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, or the possibility of freedom in the mechanically determined world—Kant shifted the emphasis from the theoretical toward practical reason. By revitalizing a Platonic dualism between how things are and how they appear to us, Kant also emphasized the gap between how things are and how they ought to be; he thereby made a Socratic shift toward free will and personal autonomy. Kant rarely used the word spirit, and he did not develop at all the Christian conception of personality. In Kant's philosophy, the remnants of spirit are for the most part preserved in our rational capacity to act as free agents and in accordance with our conception of the moral law.

Hegel found Kant's dualisms untenable. He saw in Kant's antinomies the struggles of a great mind unable to see a historical destiny of the ever-developing spirit, leading us toward a complete realization of freedom. Hegel's central concept was that of *Geist*, which can equally well be trans-

---

[4] For an excellent account of this development, see F.S.C. Northrop (1947), especially Chapter 3: "The Free Culture of the United States," 66-164.

lated from German as either spirit or mind. In perhaps the most ambitious attempt at a synthesis of the Greek and the Christian traditions ever undertaken, Hegel wanted to unite intellect and will, the individual and the collective, the temporal and the eternal. He distinguished between "subjective spirit" (manifested in thinking, feeling, and willing of an individual), "objective spirit" (which governs morality, society, and state), and "absolute spirit" (manifested in religion, art, and philosophy). According to Hegel, subjective spirit is a potential force, objective spirit is force in action, and absolute spirit is the aim of the force, as well as the reflection (realization) of the aim. Both nature and history are the ever-progressing dialectical movements toward that aim, toward the Absolute. Human *Geist* is an expression of the Absolute *Geist*, through the power of which all opposites could be overcome in a higher synthesis, in an ultimate monadic unity.

Hegel's grandiose conception was soon rejected as untenable. As Arthur Schopenhauer argued, this synthesis is a fiction, not grounded in material reality:

> Take, for example, the concept of "spirit," and analyze it into its attributes: "a thinking, willing, immaterial, simple, indestructible being, occupying no space." Nothing distinct is thought in connection with it, because the elements of these concepts cannot be verified by perceptions, for a thinking being without a brain is like digesting without a stomach (1966:64).

Others, like Soren Kierkegaard, objected that Hegel "sinned" in the opposite direction; Hegel ignored the nature of subjectivity and misunderstood the personal nature of religion.

In the next two sections, we will see more detailed versions of these two types of criticisms, as well as two efforts to overcome Hegel's shortcomings, by looking at the views of Nicolai Hartmann (1882-1950) and Nicolas Berdyaev (1874-1948).

Hartmann's Conception of Spirit

One fundamental mistake of the old ontology, according to Hartmann, was that it attempted to find one single grounding principle of all reality. It thus tried to ground the overall being of the world either on the principle of matter or on the principle of spirit. Yet both views are untenable: the world is irreducible either to matter or to spirit. Nor should we therefore accept some version of dualism, as it was commonly done (for example by Plato, Descartes, Locke, or Kant). Even those dualisms are not sufficient enough to account for the complexity and richness of the world. For that, we need

a genuine pluralism, and Hartmann argued that our world, as we know of it, consists of four mutually supportive yet partially independent layers: the inorganic, the organic, the psychic (conscious), and the spiritual.

There are in our world beings that are purely inorganic: chairs, rocks, and houses. There are also organic beings, like plants, but they would not be able to exist without an underlying and supporting inorganic foundation. There are furthermore organic and yet conscious beings, such as animals, whose existence would be impossible without the inorganic and organic layers. Finally, there are also human beings, who in addition to the inorganic, organic, and conscious layers, have an element of spirituality. The layer of the spirit is the highest, in comparison to all others, but it is also the weakest: we are not aware of any spirit that exists without the supporting lower layers. The material (inorganic) layer is the strongest, insofar as it provides the foundation for all others; but this layer is also the lowest.

There are numerous categories that are common to all four layers: unity and multiplicity, discretion and continuity, form and material, identity and difference… Yet each layer also has its own defining and determining categories. For example, the categories of the corporeal world are space and time, process and condition, substantiality and causality. The categories of the organic layers are, for instance: adaptation and purposiveness, metabolism and self-restoration, the constancy of the species and variation. In the psychic layer, the dominant categories are: act and content, consciousness and unconsciousness, pleasure and displeasure. In the realm of spirit, they are: thought, knowledge, freedom, will, evaluation, and personality. The categories that are the same for all four layers preserve the continuity of the various layers. The categories that are unique for each layer enable the novel elements to emerge. Thus reality is a dynamic whole, in constant tension, yet in a constant search for balance as well.[5]

Hartmann had a similar view on the nature of spirit. The spiritual layer is a unified layer, but in it we recognize three different manifestations of spirit. Somewhat similar to Hegel's distinction between subjective, objective, and absolute spirit, Hartmann drew the line between personal, objective, and objectified spirit. According to Hartmann (1933:116), "A person is that being which in ever new situations is forced to make free decisions." A person is a being that loves and hates, that can choose well or make a mistake, who has an ethos, responsibilities, and an ability to anticipate and evaluate.

---

[5] For Hartmann's detailed view, see Hartmann 1940. For a more popular presentation, see Hartmann 2012.

As in Hegel, an objective spirit exists only in collective groups of individuals (persons), and it represents the spirit of time; it has history and its modifications are the historical changes we can track and explain. The "spirit of time" consists of the goals aimed at, the general tendencies and achievements, the events and the common fate of the people living at those times. It is a worldview of one group of people—of one culture and one age. This worldview is manifested in every aspect of life: language, prevailing moral values, forms of production, artistic development, and the status of sciences. Nevertheless, claimed Hartmann (1933:209), "in no other field of experience is the close unity and wholeness of the objective spirit as powerful and as acknowledged as in the field of religion, and the closely related mythos."

Despite that, Hartmann rejected Hegel's conception of the absolute spirit. Instead, in accordance with his stratified view of reality, he spoke of the "objectified spirit," and of the manifestations of an objective spirit as captured—"objectified"—in various institutions (e.g., laws) and works (say of philosophy and art) of one age. Understood in that sense, the products of an objectified spirit are both real and *irreal*. Everything that is real, according to Hartmann, is temporal and individual (concrete). But the products of an objectified spirit have, besides a tangible (that is, temporal and individual aspect) also an aspect that transcends temporal limits. With regard to that aspect they are irreal: they belong to the realm of ideas and represent what is timeless in the historical process. Yet they always need a living spirit—a person—to recognize, interpret, or simply enliven them.

Hartmann's view contains both the elements of *nous* and the elements of *pneuma*. The world is a structured whole, governed by multiple categorial determinations and laws. Yet this world is by no means a fully determined and closed whole. It is dynamic and open-ended, without any definite goal or destination, in which the living spirit simultaneously plays a double role. On the one hand, it shapes and transforms this world, it objectifies it and gives it meaning. On the other hand, the living spirit forms and transforms itself. This *pneuma*-like quality of the spirit makes it act both as a creative force and also as a force that imposes limitations on itself and the world it attempts to objectify. As Hartmann put it:

> [I]n dominating nature, the spirit continues to be just as dependent upon the categories of nature as if it exercised no dominance at all, and its own categories continue to be the weaker categories. All its creative accomplishments in the realm of nature are limited by the laws of nature. Against them it can do nothing. With them it can accomplish marvels, and in this direction its only limits are those of its inventive power (2012:105).

Hartmann associated this creative force primarily with our discernment and subsequent realization of values. What astonished him is not that we have failed to make significant advancement in this direction. Far worse is modern man's blindness for values, which he described in terms of the narrowness of the sense of value and a lack of appreciation of the comprehensible extent of the real. For most human beings the limit of life's narrowest interests, of the most positive egoistic relations, dictated by the stress of the moment, is at the same time the limit of their moral universe. Their sprit-less existence is a cramped, diminished life, a shriveled, distorted caricature of humanity.

We usually blame our difficulties on bad luck and unfortunate social, economic, or political circumstances. According to Hartmann,

> The tragedy of man is that of one who, sitting at a well-laden table, is hungry but who will not reach out his hand, because he does not see what is before him. For the real world is inexhaustible in abundance, actual life is saturated and overflows with values, and when we lay hold of it we find it replete with wonder and grandeur (1932:39).

Berdyaev's View of Spirit

While Hartmann stayed closer to our common sense and common practice, Berdyaev turned against them. He demonized what he called the "objectification" of reality, which he believed also attempted to turn spirit into a thing (or an object). With the development of science in the post-medieval era, the measurable and quantifiable aspects of reality are taken as the criteria of what is real (and valuable). The whole world, including man's nature, is thus "objectified." In Berdyaev's (1957:60) memorable words, "Objectification is the ejection of man into the external; it is his exteriorization; it is his subjugation to the conditions of space, time, causality, and rationalization." This process includes the components of our social life as well: it leads to an unjustified glorification—Berdyaev says "sanctification"—of the state and the family, of property and society. Our ethical life becomes an adoration of such objectified and sanctified symbols, rather than a real spiritualization of living human beings.

How, then, should we understand spirit and spirituality? How should we think about the nature and the destiny of man?

According to Berdyaev, the first steps in our spiritual reorientation must involve divorcing our understanding of spirit from materialism and any concept of substance. Due to many denials of the existence of spirit, its defenders have tried to portray spirit as something objective, as an object

among other objects, as a substance of special kind. Yet spirit is not a special kind of being—neither a different kind of object, nor a unique kind of substance. Subsequently, a philosophy of spirit should not be a philosophy of being (or ontology), but a philosophy of existence. Spirit is closer to being a subject than being an object, even though the subjectivity of spirit has to be approached carefully. Hegel and other German Idealists distorted our picture of a subject, by having no affinity toward personalism and by insisting on an abstract person-less conception of spirit. Their concept of spirit was an abstraction, for they ranked an abstract idea higher than a concrete living being. They similarly twisted our understanding of dialectic and freedom. Dialectic is essentially an "unrest of being." Hegel and his followers wanted, however, to bring this unrest to an ultimate and absolute rest (e.g., "the end of history"). And just as Hegel's dialectic led to a closure, and thereby to a denial of life that can have no closure as long as it exists, so Hegel's freedom magically transformed itself into the iron laws of history that allow no choice and no exception.

Berdyaev's philosophy of spirit can be summarized in the following ways:

1. Spirit is concrete, personal, and subjective; as such, it is revealed only in personal existence.
2. Spirit must be understood in a personalistic way; personality is individually unique, unrepeatable, and different from the rest of the world.
3. Personal spirit is universal by its content, capable of embracing the whole world by its love and cognition.
4. Personal spirit is rooted in God; it is an image of God's spirit.
5. Spirit is the breath of the divine into man.
6. Spirit is freedom; spirit cannot be determined by the world.
7. The existence of spirit does not imply or require a monistic interpretation of the world (as Hegel thought). Quite the contrary, it presupposes dualism (of a Kantian kind), or even more precisely, some kind of pluralism (in the style of Hartmann).
8. The kingdom of spirit is the realm of freedom and love.
9. It is the realm of the concrete human interiority, with the experience of human destiny and human tragedy.
10. There are realities of the different orders: physical, organic, psychic and social, but there are also realities like truth, goodness, beauty, value, and creative fantasy. This last order of reality belongs to spirit. For example, truth is not real in the way that nature

or an objective thing is, but it is real as spirit and spirituality in man's existence.

11. Spirit confirms its reality through man; man is the manifestation of spirit.
12. In man, there is present a spiritual principle, which is transcendent in relation to the world; this spiritual principle is higher than the world.

Let us briefly clarify some of these points. Berdyaev found his inspiration in Christian philosophy, in the philosophy that attempts to interpret *pneuma* in a non-materialistic way. Spirit is the breath of God that permeates man's being and bestows on him—understood as a subject and a person—the highest value and dignity. Spirit is thus a reality that penetrates from within, from the inside, and not from the outside. That man is a subject means that Berdyaev wants to emphasize the relevance of act and acting; the subject is a free acting agent. This subject is far more than thinking and knowing; for Berdyaev, as for Christianity, the intellect is not the central faculty of man. The central faculty is volition, as manifested in our freedom and creativity. Man does not create the world, but he is called to creation, he is called to be creative. Through a creative act man can not only break the limitations of egocentricity and objectivity, but he can also reach out to that which is higher than himself. Creativity is the foundation of man's relationship to God.

Creativity should not be understood in a narrow aesthetic sense; it deals not primarily with the formation of works of art, but with the formation of man. Yet Berdyaev also warned us not to understand creativity in any teleological sense. In his memorable words, worth citing at length,

> Man's moral dignity and freedom are determined not by the purpose to which he subordinates his life but by the source from which his moral life and activity spring. It may actually be said that in a sense "the means" which a man uses are far more important than "the ends" which he pursues, for they express more truly what his spirit is. If a man strives for freedom by means of tyranny, for love by means of hatred, for brotherhood by means of dissension, for truth by means of falsity, his lofty aim is not likely to make our judgment of him more lenient. I actually believe that a man who worked for the cause of tyranny, hatred, falsity and dissension by means of freedom, love, truthfulness and brotherhood, would be the better man of the two. The most important thing for ethics is man's real nature, the spirit in which he acts, the presence or absence in him of inner light, of beneficent creative energy. Ethics must be based upon the conception of energy and not on the final end. It must therefore interpret freedom as the original source of action and inner creative energy and not

> as the power of fulfilling the law and realizing a set purpose. The moral good is not a goal but an inner force which lights up man's life from within. The important thing is the source from which activity springs and not the end toward which it is directed (1960:80-1).

We can now see how apparently different "strings" of Berdyaev's philosophy of spirit merge together. The impulse toward the objectification of the world and the sanctification of certain institutions encourages us to approach the rest of the world as our playground, as the raw material for the satisfaction of our goals and needs. In this process, according to Berdyaev, in this attempt to master the world and fulfill our personal ambitions, man enslaves not only the world but himself as well. In pursuit of happiness, man loses his freedom and his spiritual nature, thus the elements of the divine in him.

Berdyaev's solution is not simply to eliminate what is bad so that we can choose what is right. Our choices, according to his view, are whether to pursue happiness without freedom, or freedom with tragedy. While the former is obviously the choice of the majority, Berdyaev staked the human dignity on the latter: freedom with tragedy. Why is man's freedom tragic? Why is man's creativity tragic?

According to Berdyaev:

> Man's creative act is doomed to fail within the conditions of this world. It is a tremendous effort which is destined never to succeed. Its initial impulse is to bring forth new life, to transfigure the world and usher a new heaven and a new earth; but in the conditions of the fallen world the effort turns out to be unavailing: it comes up against the inertia, the laws and compulsions of the external world, pervaded as it is by inexorable necessities (1950:214).

And so we come a full circle: man is spirit, incarnated in a combined vehicle of soul and body. Spirit is a dynamic principle, breathed into man by God. Man can lift his eyes up, toward the divine, he can spend his life pursuing creativity and freedom, but, trapped in this world and its imperfect conditions, man seems to be destined to fail. And the vast majority of men do not even attempt to look up any more, they simply live "a life of the earth," bound to the pleasures of the body and disoriented as to what this life and man's destiny are all about. And before they can establish any sure posts in the labyrinth of this spirit-less, disorienting life, death sneaks in like a thief and takes away what is most valued.

What, then, is this life all about? And what, after all, may be so special about spirit and spirituality?

The Spirit That Enhances Life

There are two myth-like figures that in a nutshell tell the story of Western civilization, and also capture its discontents with spirit: Prometheus and Faust. Prometheus steals fire from the gods and brings it to people. Fire is one of the meanings of *pneuma*: a substance without substance, life-changing, yet also a life-endangering "thing" that allows man not only to cook food and warm himself on a cold day, but also to forge weapons and hurt others. There is a fine line—always shifting and demanding attention—between being warmed up by fire and being burned by it; finding the right distance at which to place fire has been one of the most challenging things to do. It is similar with fire-arms: they can be used for protection, but often their use also leads to unfortunate accidents and sometimes to massacres with horrifying consequences.

Faust does not steal fire but knowledge. He wants to find out how everything works, he searches for the underlying *logos* (*nous*) of the universe. As much as knowledge has always been desired and praised, as much as its applications (with the help of fire) have made man's life so much more convenient, it transpired that knowledge can also be abused, or that its applications can lead to unwanted consequences. We learn not only how to build shelters and hospitals and libraries, but also how to create most potent pollutants and destructive weapons. In the process of his history, man relies more and more on his artifacts and his power-tools, rather than on what Mother Nature (or God) provides to him. And, somehow, despite the best intentions to tame Nature and put it to the service of man, what we produce seems in the long run to have more harmful than beneficial effects. In the process of "re-creating" the creation, man has so damaged the environment and has become such an efficient murderer that there are many who speak about the sickness and even suicidal tendencies of our civilization.

We live in the world of much physical and even more spiritual pollution. Unlike chaos, which is a state of affairs (thus related to space), pollution is an event in time. Originally the word pollution referred to "a bad breath of divinity," or "blood spilled improperly or unnecessarily" (Young, 1992:232). The result of the pollution is disorder, or poisoning, or dirt (the very antithesis of energy). Thus, pollution is a contagious affliction that calls for quarantine and cleansing. The traditional means of cleansing are water and tears of lamentation. But are not all the waters at our disposal polluted? And are we still capable of shedding tears of lamentation?

Conceptually speaking, something has gone wrong with our spirituality. Instead of being creative and leading toward progressive changes, spirit got sidetracked; it got caught in a wrong conceptual net. Instead of serving the forces of life, spirit is manipulated into assisting the forces of destruction. What could be done about it?

Just as we have always experienced problems with fire and knowledge, we have analogously been uneasy about spirit; we have both welcomed it and cursed it. One of the main reasons for this is that we have always tried to capture spirit in a wrong conceptual net. Our language has perhaps obscured things more than helped us in the process. Our language—and thus our assertions about the world—consists essentially of nouns and verbs. Like life, spirit is too shifty, too "liquid," to be properly captured by either nouns or verbs. Like life, spirit is not a thing, not an object. Nor is it any kind of substance. What, then, is it?

If we try using verbs instead of nouns, we get caught in teleological thinking, that has been especially dominant since the development of modern science, technology, and industry. Our actions seem all to aim at something, they have a goal or a purpose. Many of our actions fit into that mold: they aim at something useful, at efficiency and practicality. In fact, we have become a civilization obsessed with efficiency and practicality.

As both Hartmann and Berdyaev noted, something has been obscured and missed in the process. In our goal- and result-oriented activities, we have either misunderstood or deceived ourselves about what the most important values are and whether they can be accomplished by means of our goal- and result-oriented activities. All our productivity and efficiency, all our practicality and control of nature do not seem to help us with one crucial concern: the meaning of life. We can seemingly accomplish it all, we can produce—and consume!—more than anyone else, more than ever before. Yet, after a short-lived period of satisfaction, we feel empty and disoriented.

Hartmann went as far as to argue that the meaning of life depends on "useless" values. By useless he did not mean "pointless," but those that do not seem to lead to any tangible, quantifiable utilitarian benefits. Such a useless value is, for example, love. Yet another example of it is the experience of sublimity (whether in nature or in words of art). In a way that he did not fully explain, such useless values have much to do with the development of personality and also with spirituality.[6]

---

[6] For further discussion of this issue, see Cicovacki, 2014.

Berdyaev tried to capture spirit and spirituality in terms of a subject and his acts. But that again was an attempt to impose the old noun-verb categories that just do not incorporate well something so dynamic like spirit. In a long passage from *The Destiny of Man* that I quoted earlier, he seemed to open a new path, without being fully aware of it and without following it long enough. He said there, for instance, that "the most important thing for ethics is … the spirit in which [man] acts, the presence or absence in him of inner light, of beneficent creative energy" (1960:80). Focus for a moment on the phrase "the spirit in which [man] acts." This statement is neither about a noun (what action he performs?), nor about a verb (what is it that he does and with what aim?). Rather, it is about the *way* in which he acts, about the *spirit in which* he acts. This is about "how" and not about "what." Put differently, this is about an *adverb*, rather than a noun or a verb. Berdyaev's point is something we have not sufficiently noticed or developed, despite the fact that it has been suggested to us by various phrases in which we use the word spirit. Something can be done in good spirit, or in bad spirit. Another thing can be done in a spirited way, or not so. The key may not be in what is done, or with what aim and consequences, but in what way, in what spirit.[7]

When something is done in good spirit, it enhances life. When something is done in such spirit, it directs us toward higher and eternal values, toward God. And not only are we pointed toward such values, we persist in that spirit even if our actions—more generally: our way of life—do not lead to practically the most beneficial consequences or socially appreciated results. Then the spirit in which we act is as if inspired by God and bringing us closer to God.

This, indeed, is what Berdyaev says, without expressing it that way and without perhaps noticing the most important implications of his words: "I actually believe that a man who worked for the cause of tyranny, hatred, falsity and dissension by means of freedom, love, truthfulness and brotherhood, would be the better man of the two"—than is the one who "strives for freedom by means of tyranny, for love by means of hatred, for brotherhood by means of dissension, for truth by means of falsity" (1960:80). Freedom, love, truthfulness, and brotherhood are spiritual values. They are those useless values that are incompatible with killing and destruction of humanity. They are the values that promote and enhance life.

Armed with fire and knowledge, with fire-arms and all-knowing networks, we claim to be working for noble goals, and the results of our actions are ever

---

[7] Hartmann develops this point by distinguishing between the intended value and the value of intention; only the latter is a properly moral value. See Hartmann, 1932.

more destroyed cities, ever more maimed bodies, and ever more permanently damaged souls. The results of our result-obsessed civilization are the bad breath of divinity and much blood spilled improperly and unnecessarily.

It does not have to be that way. It can change if we stop imposing our schemes on the world, chasing ever more profit, and wrenching from life as many pleasures as possible. It can change if we learn to let go and trust the spirit, if we let our lives be guided by the spirit we can neither completely grasp nor fully control. Hartmann and Berdyaev suspected that this road will lead us toward understanding and developing spirit in terms of personality. An ancient idea that it is, it lurks us toward a still uncharted territory. We cannot anticipate what is awaiting us there, expect for one thing: the spirit we will find and develop there is the spirit that kills not.

References

Berdyaev, Nicolas (1939). *Spirit and Reality*. London: Geoffrey Bles.

Berdyaev, Nicolas (1950). *Dream and Reality: An Essay in Autobiography*. London: Geoffrey Bles.

Berdyaev, Nicolas (1957). *The Beginning and the End*. New York: Harper Torchbook.

Berdyaev, Nicolas (1960). *The Destiny of Man*. New York: Harper & Row.

Cicovacki, Predrag (2014, forthcoming). *The Analysis of Wonder*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Hartmann, Nicolai (1932). *Ethics*, Vol. I. New York: Macmillan.

Hartmann, Nicolai (1933). *Das Problem des geistigen Seins. Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung der Geschichtsphilosophie und der Geisteswissenschaften*. Berlin: Walter de Gryter.

Hartmann, Nicolai (1940). *Der Aufbau der realen Welt. Grundriss der allgemeinen Kategorienlehre*. Berlin: Walter de Gryter.

Hartmann, Nicolai (2012). *New Ways of Ontology*. New Brunswick: Transactions Publishers.

Northrop, F.S.C. (1947). *The Meeting of East and West*. New York: Macmillan.

Pelikan, Jaroslav (1988). *The Melody of Theology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Schopenhauer, Arthur (1966). *The World as Will and Representation*, Vol. II. New York: Dover.

Young, Dudley (1992). *Origins of the Sacred: The Ecstasies of Love and War*. New York: HarperPerennial.

Chapter Three

A Phenomenological Approach to Spirituality and its Relation to Nonkilling and Nonviolence

Douglas Allen
University of Maine, Orono

Introduction

In his influential book, *Nonkilling Global Political Science*, Glenn Paige insightfully analyzes the nature of our dominant assumptions, principles, ideologies, and ways of being in a world of killing societies. He convincingly demonstrates the need for us to dedicate ourselves to the goals of a human community, from the smallest to the global, that is characterized by life in a nonkilling society. Such a nonkilling society exposes, challenges, and resists the assumptions, values, power relations, and ideological justifications found throughout history in killing societies, including violent and lethal views of human nature and of political reality. No killing of humans and no threats to kill characterize a qualitatively different nonkilling society.

The integrally related means and ends of working cooperatively to realize a nonkilling society are essential for transforming our world of killing societies. This is necessary if humans are to realize their moral and spiritual potential for self-development and for community and global development. However, on even more narrow pragmatic grounds, it is imperative that we dedicate ourselves to working for nonkilling societies, since the present values and priorities of killing societies are economically, militarily, politically, culturally, socially, religiously, and environmentally unsustainable. The present dominant values and structural relations of killing societies are not only morally and spiritually bankrupt, but are threatening human survival on this planet, even for those not concerned with human flourishing.

"Nonkilling" is a term less familiar and much less frequently used than nonviolence. Indeed, while killing is a frequently used term, nonkilling is not. What is the relationship between nonkilling and the more familiar nonvio-

lence? In very general terms, we may propose that killing always entails violence, and that nonkilling always entails nonviolence. The reverse is not always the case. Not all violence involves killing. For example, specific acts of psychological violence involving hatred, economic violence involving exploitation, and religious violence involving intolerance may not result in killing. And not all nonviolence involves nonkilling or at least does not place primary emphasis on nonkilling. For example, specific acts of nonviolence emphasizing compassion and loving kindness or economic egalitarian relations of justice may acknowledge but not emphasize the centrality of nonkilling.

Nonkilling would seem to be more narrow and more focused than the more general and diverse meanings of nonviolence. This commitment to principles and ways of being in the world expressing nonkilling, while challenging and confronting the dominant power relations and forces of killing societies, has the advantage of allowing for more focused formulations and practical applications than many of the moral and spiritual approaches to nonviolence. Whether M. K. Gandhi's philosophy and practices of nonviolence and other profound nonviolent approaches have strengths lacking in the more focused emphasis on nonkilling is another significant consideration for those committed to nonkilling societies.

While accepting that the absolute universal commitment to a culture of nonkilling commits one to working toward a much more nonviolent world, the question arises whether an acceptance of absolute and universal ideals, principles, and values of nonviolence ever allows, in exceptional situations, for killing. This challenge to an absolute of nonkilling, as contextualized in the most challenging and difficult situations, is whether one can in practice reject all killing as unjustifiable or at least as unnecessary violence. We'll end this essay by considering such a well-intentioned challenge to a universal culture of nonkilling in which the principle *thou shalt not kill* is never violated.

Glenn Paige and others who accept his work as the key foundational approach to working for a nonkilling society have emphasized a nonkilling political science, while granting that nonkilling can be applied to other disciplines and contextualized ways of living. Since political science is not my discipline, it has not been my major concern. In fact, in ways that nonkilling political science could easily grant, I have found that political science, with notable exceptions, has been a very violent and killing discipline. Even within the dominant educational status quo of our killing society, there are other disciplinary approaches that have been more open to nonviolent and nonkilling alternatives.

Why has political science been such a killing discipline? Why has political science been so reactionary and violent in assuming and justifying killing and

killing societies? I would submit that we can account for much of this killing approach because the discipline of political science tends to emphasize that it is an "objective," "scientific," "value-free" approach in which it is presenting and analyzing the political assumptions, values, power relations, dynamics, models, and justifications of political "reality." In rather uncritically assuming and not challenging the political approaches and frameworks of the dominant killing political realities, as its disciplinary perspective, political science, of course, is far from value-neutral or value-free and usually reflects and is frequently complicit with immoral and dangerous realities of killing societies. In my experiences, while granting that a nonkilling political science is welcome and urgently needed, other disciplinary approaches in philosophy, ethics, sociology, ecological studies, women's studies, religious studies, alternative economics, and other fields have often had less of an integral relation with killing societies than has political science.

My phenomenological approach to spirituality greatly depends on my attempt to formulate, revise, reformulate, and reapply my interpretations of profound contributions made by Mircea Eliade and M. K. Gandhi. In exploring fundamental issues of spirituality and their relations with a culture of nonkilling, my phenomenological interpretation of spirituality will be greatly informed by the writings of Eliade and my interpretation of his phenomenology of religion with his universal structural account of the dialectical relation of the sacred and the profane.[1] My formulations of spirituality and nonkilling will be greatly informed by the writings of Gandhi and my interpretation of his philosophy and practice of nonviolence with his universal affirmation of the value of *ahimsa* and its significance for contemporary issues of killing and violence.[2]

In my approach and interpretations, there are no simple, adequate, essentialized answers or solutions to the most difficult questions and issues with regard to spirituality and nonkilling today. The universal values and structural relations of nonkilling, essential for our understanding of and re-

---

[1] For Eliade's phenomenological approach to the sacred and the dialectic of the sacred and the profane, see Eliade (1963, 1954, 1959 and 1961). I first developed my detailed account of Eliade's phenomenological approach to religious phenomena in Allen (1978), and I greatly developed my formulation of Eliade's universal structural account of the dialectic of the sacred and the profane in Allen (2002).

[2] The best resource for Gandhi's writings is the 100 volumes of *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* (1958-1994). There are many excellent collections of Gandhi's writings, including Iyer (1986, 1987 and 1993). I've developed my interpretations of Gandhi's philosophy and practice of nonviolence and how to relate *ahimsa* to killing and violence in numerous publications, including Allen (2006, 2008 and 2011a).

sponding to contemporary killing societies and killing disciplinary approaches, always need to be contextualized dialectically in all kinds of nuanced, complex, often ambiguous and contradictory ways. This requires an open-ended dynamic approach; deepened and broadened insights and analysis with the upholding of our fundamental unity as human beings with a respect for the diversity of multiple paths to nonkilling societies; active engagement with the development of practical skills in the problem-solving experiments with killing and nonkilling cultures and societies; the nurturing of moral character, courageous and highly motivated authentic living, mutual support, perseverance and hope in the real possibility of a nonkilling society; and a commitment to reformulate and reappropriate our interpretations and practices in new, creative, contextually relevant ways.

A Phenomenological Model of Spirituality

Mircea Eliade, with whom I worked closely and upon whose phenomenology of religion I wrote extensively, was often described, especially in the 1960s and 1970s, as the world's foremost theorist of religion, myth, and symbolism. Although he boldly claims that his disciplinary subject matter is the entire spiritual history of humankind, he tends to use the terms religion and religious phenomena much more than spirituality and spiritual phenomena. Nevertheless, it is possible to reformulate and develop his phenomenology of religion as a phenomenology of spirituality.

Indeed, Eliade's phenomenology may lend itself more adequately to an account of spirituality since he does not want to focus on any specific religious beliefs, rituals, or institutions. Instead, his phenomenology is based on the description and interpretation of meaning of the foundational experience of the sacred which gives rise to diverse symbolic, mythic, and other expressions of the spiritual history of humankind.

The essential, universal, foundational dichotomy in the phenomenology of spiritualty is between spirituality and nonspirituality, including identification with forms of antispirituality. Spirituality involves the experience of the sacred. Nonspirituality involves the rejection of the sacred and spiritual realities. The nonspiritual is used interchangeably with "the secular" and "the modern." The spiritual (experience of sacred) and nonspiritual (modern, secular) are two qualitatively different ways of being in the world, two experiential ways that human beings relate to self and other, and two universal structures of human consciousness.

In the phenomenology of spirituality, the spiritual and the modern, secular, nonspiritual are not formulated as adequate accounts of complex, historical, temporal, economic, political, and social life in any highly contextualized human existence. They are formulated at a very high level of universal essentialized abstraction. Phenomenologically, they may be related to Edmund Husserl's philosophical ideal for the phenomenological movement, especially in later diverse formulations of existential and hermeneutical phenomenology. Reflecting on the diverse expressions of spirituality and nonspirituality, they can be related to the process of abstraction and idealization of phenomenological eidetic reduction with the intuition of universal spiritual and nonspiritual essences. The spiritual and the nonspiritual are presented as two paradigmatic formulations, two exemplary types, of our human modes of being in the world with their qualitatively different presuppositions, values, and views of human nature and of reality. Whether a largely descriptive and interpretive phenomenological account of spirituality entails a commitment to nonkilling remains to be seen.

My phenomenological account is necessarily oversimplified in its attempt to formulate an exemplary, universal, structural model of spirituality that is useful for distinguishing spiritual from nonspiritual approaches and views. From this phenomenological perspective of spirituality, nonspiritual human beings live in a one-dimensional world. Consistent with many dominant, post-Enlightenment, modern, scientific, technological, economic, and political theories and approaches, they tend to define themselves as spatial, temporal, historical, natural, finite, conditioned, limited, imperfect human beings. This is usually the case even when such nonspiritual human beings act as if they have some absolute universal truths justifying killing and killing societies.

Spiritual people, by contrast, recognize another, qualitatively different, sacred dimension of reality that they distinguish from that secular nonspiritual world. Religious and other spiritual people recognize a transcendent dimension of reality that is described in terms of God, soul, heaven, immortality, the Infinite, the Eternal, and in numerous other ways. This sacred transcendent dimension of reality is usually viewed in perspectives expressing the spiritual reality as supernatural not natural, eternal not temporal, infinite not finite, and absolute not relative. Sociologically, all traditional religions embracing a phenomenology of spirituality have taboos and other prohibitions and punishments to separate and keep pure the sacred transcendent dimension of reality.

The key point here in this universal phenomenological account of spirituality is that the spiritual perspective always has this two-dimensional view in which it affirms the qualitatively different, sacred, transcendent dimension of

ultimate reality. To avoid a common misconception, it's important to clarify that such traditional religious terms as the devil, Satan, and evil are not secular terms. Phenomenologically, they express sacred realities. Sacred does not necessarily mean good, nonviolent, or nonkilling. There are negative, violent, killing, sacred forces that transcend our normal spatial, temporal, empirical, natural, historical categories; they may express supernatural evil power beyond the ordinary natural and human phenomena of nonspiritual reality.

In this phenomenological approach to spirituality, there is a central focus on spiritual transcendence: on the intentional relationality of a spiritual mode of being in the world and structures of consciousness allowing for transcendence of the one-dimensional enclosures of secular, temporal, historical, natural existence and reality. This intentional spiritual aim of gaining access to the transcendent sacred is meant to be phenomenologically descriptive and not to endorse some theological or metaphysical claim about the nature of worldly existence and ultimate reality. Religious and other spiritual believers, of course, do have such normative views; otherwise they would not identify with spiritual perspectives. However, in this section formulating a phenomenological model of spirituality, I am attempting to suspend, as much as possible, all such value judgments about the truth and falsity of spiritual claims. The phenomenological account is formulated consistent with the philosophical sense of a phenomenological description of the essential, general, defining structures of diverse spiritual experiences and spiritual phenomena.

In this phenomenological model of spirituality, the sacred always transcends the nonsacred world of phenomena, but the two dimensions have to be brought into some integral dialectical relation in order to have spiritual experience and spirituality. In other words, the spiritual sacred has to be made accessible to our finite, empirical, cultural world; otherwise it's just an irrelevant abstraction with no existential relation to our worldly needs, crises, and economic, political, psychological, and cultural modes of being. That is what religion is. *Religio* points to this way of relating, of relating the transcendent sacred to our ordinarily finite, natural, limited, secular world. On descriptive phenomenological grounds, this is true whether the spiritual is experienced as an absolute, transcendent reality of nonkilling or whether it expresses sacred killing. Formulating some abstract ideal of "thou shalt not kill" or some other transcendent nonkilling sacred reality may be necessary, but it is not sufficient for an adequate phenomenological approach to spiritualty. In any spiritual mode of existing in the world and structure of consciousness, the transcendent sacred must always be mediated, made imminent, brought into an integral existential relation with our everyday contextualized world. In this re-

gard, the rich language of spirituality, as seen in its symbolisms and mythic constructions, provides such a mediating function, serving as a bridge between the transcendent sacred and imminent secular phenomenal world.

This universal sacred-secular, dichotomous, mediated structure expresses a kind of paradoxical relationship true of any spiritual orientation. It is paradoxical and rationally incomprehensible to the ordinary, secular, spatial, temporal, historical, natural, logical mind. Consider the familiar model of Jesus as the Christ: How can we understand God becoming man, i.e., how can we understand eternal and infinite God as the absolute taking a human form that suffers, appears in time and history, etc.? But this is structurally true of every transcendent sacred manifestation. Structurally, it is just as paradoxical, mysterious, irrational, or illogical to the nonspiritual mind to try to comprehend how the transcendent supernatural sacred reality could appear in a stone or tree or other limited natural phenomenon, in a human vision or dream, or in finite limited human language. How could something eternal take temporal form? How could something transcendent become imminent and assume a limited incarnational form? Or, how can a limited, finite, spatial, temporal, natural, relative, historical phenomenon reveal that which is infinite, supernatural, eternal, and absolute? In sum, the transcendent sacred, the supernatural, the divine, etc., have to be brought into some existential meaningful paradoxical relation with our finite world as an essential structure in all spiritual experience and in all forms of spirituality.

I'll just add one of several other structures of this universal phenomenological model. If you're a religious person, you not only recognize the distinction between these two dimensions of experience that are paradoxically mediated. There's also a built in evaluation. The really real, the ultimate reality, is the sacred, whether this is God, Allah, Brahman, Soul, Nirvana, or some other description. The sacred and the profane are not symmetrical structures that exist on the same level of reality. The sacred provides religious people with the ultimate truths about transcendent reality. This can be revealed through the Bible, the Koran, the Vedas, the Pali Canon, cosmological and eschatological myths, or other scriptures; through a founder, prophet, mystic, or other transmitter of sacred truths; through miracles, through nature, and in numerous other ways. In all cases, that sacred dimension for the religious believer is something special, transcendent, revealing the nature of ultimate reality. Therefore, in this phenomenology of spirituality, there is an evaluation of the sacred as what's most really real and as providing the standards for how you should live your spiritual life in this world of imperfection, suffering, evil, killing, and violence.

What makes this account of a phenomenological approach to spirituality and its relation to nonkilling and nonviolence so complex, ambiguous, contradictory, and challenging is the insight that the experience of the sacred and its dialectical, dynamic, contextualized process of spiritualization function and are expressed on all levels of human experience and consciousness. The sacred and diverse spiritual phenomena are expressed on levels of the prereflective, the nonrational, the irrational, the conceptual and rational. They are expressed through the emotions and the imagination. They are expressed in ways that are overt and manifest and in ways that are hidden and camouflaged. They are expressed on different levels of consciousness, including claims to unifying, mystical, transhuman, paranormal, and other states of "higher" conscious realization.

What this means for a complex and contextually-aware phenomenological approach to spirituality is that experiences of the sacred and spiritual phenomena may be disclosed, usually in limited and unfulfilled ways, even in some of the key modes of consciousness and formulations of consciously, even avowedly, nonspiritual, modern, secular human beings, often identified with killing societies. For example, the transcendent sacred and spiritual consciousness may be identified, often in hidden and camouflaged expressions, and deciphered on levels of symbolic and mythic constructions, dreams, nostalgias, fantasies, films and literature, and ideologies. Dominant contemporary values, commitments, and justifications of seemingly nonspiritual, nonsacred, modern, secular, killing societies, with their focus on the economic, the political, the military, war, nationalism, science and technology, materialistic consumption, exploitation and control of nature, and human progress, often go far beyond what can be analyzed and justified in terms of empirical, historical, economic, political, and other purely secular phenomena.

Informed by this phenomenological model of spirituality, how can we understand the nature and extent of killing and violence in our contemporary world? In the next section, I'll restrict my brief formulations to religion and religious phenomena.

The Phenomenological Approach to Spirituality and Killing Societies

As is sometimes done, it is tempting to use our phenomenological model of spirituality in order to submit that when human beings are truly spiritual, and especially when they live at the highest levels of spiritual development, then they are against all killing, war, violence, and humanly caused suffering. One can find considerable evidence justifying such a nonkilling perspective

and commitment in the history of religions, including the exemplary lives of some of the most revered spiritual figures and their teachings and in scriptural and other passages expressed at the highest levels of spirituality. Even today, in a world of such religious killing and violence, one frequently encounters the strong unqualified assertion that if one is a "true Muslim," a "true Christian," or a true devotee of any other religious faith or spiritual position, then one is almost by definition against all killing, war, terrorism, and violence.

If religion and spiritually are essentially against killing and for love, compassion, tolerance, peace, and justice, why is there so much killing, war, hatred, intolerance, injustice, and violence in our killing cultures, societies, and world today caused by, justified by, and done in the name of religion? Can our descriptive phenomenological account help us to make sense of this troubling question? (See Allen, 2011b.)

Using the phenomenology of spirituality, how would Mircea Eliade interpret the nature, meaning, and significance of such killing religious cultures and societies? Does his descriptive phenomenology of religion, with its universal structure of the dialectic of the sacred, assist us in the necessary transformation from killing to nonkilling?

When examining Eliade's insightful interpretations of the deeper religious and spiritual meanings of the experiences of the sacred, nonkilling and nonviolence are not essential or universal values. Often they are not even central values. In his descriptions and interpretations of the symbolic structures, essential nature, and function of the cosmogonic, eschatological, and other mythic narratives, of rites of initiation and other sacralized rituals, and of other religious phenomena, killing, violence, and even the emphasis on the violent shedding of blood are often transformative and of the deepest spiritual meaning and significance. For example, Eliade frequently uncovers the essential mythic structure of the need to destroy the old, sometimes involving killing, in order to realize spiritual rebirth and regeneration.

When one examines the integral relations between religions and killing in the Middle East, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, and other parts of the contemporary world, including the fastest growing fundamentalist and other religious groups in the United States, it seems evident that religion is more of a negative and destructive force when it comes to killing, war, violence, sexism, homophobia, and other humanly caused suffering. Religion today is overwhelmingly more of the problem than the solution in creating nonkilling societies. How can our descriptive phenomenology of spirituality assist us in making sense of this troubling phenomenon and the aforementioned contradictions between killing-nonkilling, war-peace, and love-hatred found within religions?

As was previously formulated, in the universal, structural, phenomenological model of spirituality, religion always reveals some specific religious structure of transcendence. To summarize, in the two-dimensional spiritual perspective and mode of being in the world, this qualitatively transcendent sacred is distinguished from the normal, everyday, spatial, temporal, natural, historical, finite, limited, relative, secular dimension of our worldly experience and consciousness. In all religious experience and all religious phenomena, there is the existential human need to connect these two dimensions of the sacred transcendent reality and our worldly secular phenomena. This dichotomy and this connection, necessary for religious phenomena to become humanly accessible and relevant, are expressed through complex, paradoxical relations. In these dichotomous, paradoxical, spiritual relations, religious believers evaluate the sacred transcendent as their ultimate reality and as providing the exemplary models and norms for how to live and assess their worldly existence.

In such a phenomenological framework, in creating and maintaining killing and nonkilling cultures, all religions and all religious believers encounter the following key questions: What is the nature and status of the transcendent sacred? What is the nature and status of the human, natural, secular phenomenal world with its religious views of human nature and often dominated by killing, violence, and humanly caused suffering? What is the nature and status of the "bridges" or structural symbolic connections between the sacred and the imperfect phenomenal world as expressed through foundational teachings, scriptures, myths, rituals, institutionalized arrangements, moral codes, social structures, and dreams, visions, ecstatic and other religious experiences? Put in different terms, what are the acceptable means, whether involving killing or nonkilling, allowing religious believers to approach and realize the desired ends, and how do religious beings formulate the dynamic means-ends relations?

When we examine the thousands of years of the history of religions and especially the presence of religion in the world today, we find a tremendous variation in how traditional religions and individual religious believers answer these questions. This is insightful when trying to unpack the endless patterns, complexities, and contradictions in religious responses revealing different ideals, attitudes, intentions, and practices with regard to killing and killing societies.

With such variations in the descriptive phenomenological approach to spirituality, I cannot overemphasize the following conclusion focusing on the relations in religious phenomena of killing-nonkilling, hatred-love, violence-

nonviolence, and other key dichotomies: There is nothing inherent in or entailed by our universal phenomenological model of religion that would allow us to claim that religions must necessarily uphold theories and practices of nonkilling or killing. This applies to all of the major structures and patterns in our phenomenological model. This means that instead of prejudging whether religion is essentially killing and violent or essentially nonkilling and nonviolent, one must always contextualize the general phenomenological structures and patterns and analyze their complex, dynamic interactions and relations with the numerous, particular, economic, social, cultural, religious, and other contextualized variables.

Consider the transcendent sacred. Religions and religious individuals can embrace a view of the sacred transcendent reality as expressing absolute nonkilling, nonviolence, peace, love, compassion, tolerance, and inclusiveness, or they can embrace a view of the sacred transcendent as expressing considerable killing, violence, war-like virtues, destructive power, anger, jealousy, and intolerant exclusivism. One can find numerous variations of these views of sacred transcendent reality, as well as mixtures of them, as contextualized in all kinds of ways in scriptures, myths, rituals, and institutionalized constructions throughout the history of religions and the contemporary world.

Consider our human, natural, temporal, and historical mode of existence in the world. In various religious conceptions, human nature, as reflected in human existence, may be formulated as inherently or essentially evil, as expressed in killing, or as basically good and opposed to killing, or as a mixture of good and evil. We cannot prejudge this in some essentialized a priori manner based on a universal phenomenological model. Different religions and religious believers will provide different answers, and their real religious beliefs and practices are integrated within and shaped by their specific contextualized variables. For example, if a religion views human beings as essentially sinful and evil, then it will be more likely to uphold the widespread prevalence, necessity, and even legitimacy of killing and violence. Killing and other forms of violence will often be viewed as legitimate religious responses, both internally toward the evil temptations and transgressions of a religion's own sinful members and also externally with aggression and defense against the threats of nonbelieving evil others.

Consider the paradoxical connections or bridges relating the sacred transcendent and the worldly natural phenomena. Based on the phenomenological model of spirituality, one cannot prejudge whether such religious connections, necessary for rendering the transcendent sacred accessible and relevant in responding to our existential crises and human needs, will be killing and

violent or nonkilling and nonviolent. In some religious traditions such as Jainism and contemporary illustrations as found in the teaching of the current Dalai Lama, the connecting language, symbolism, myths, rituals, rites of passages, initiations, and economic and social practices may be strongly shaped by a religious commitment to nonkilling, peace, love, kindness, and compassion. They tend to emphasize the need for nonkilling and nonviolent relations and societies. In other religious traditions and contemporary illustrations, these connecting bridges and relations may allow or even glorify killing and violence, reflecting the structural violence of the status quo, expressing multidimensional violence, and often expressing admiration for overwhelming displays of overt supernatural and natural killing and violence.

Using such an approach for interpreting and applying the descriptive phenomenological framework for spirituality is helpful for addressing many of the major issues and debates regarding religion, philosophy of religion, sociology of religion, and religious killing and violence. For example, if a religious tradition conceives of God, the transcendent sacred, as the absolute, perfect, omniscient, omnipotent, omnibenevolent reality and if it also conceives of our limited, finite, worldly existence as largely defined by killing and evil, how do we reconcile these two religious claims in a coherent and plausible way? This is the traditional Problem of Evil, with a long history of religious and spiritual attempts to provide connections or relational bridges between these two conceptions of the sacred and the human, between God and killing and other forms of evil in the world. If a religious tradition conceives of the transcendent sacred as an absolute, perfect, all-knowing, all-powerful, and all-good God—a God who knows humans will cause the genocidal Holocaust, a God who could prevent the Holocaust, and a God who as perfectly good would want to prevent the Holocaust—then how can such a view of God as transcendent sacred be connected consistently and convincingly with the existence of so much killing and other destructive, religious and nonreligious violence in the world?

As seen in this section, it seems that a phenomenological account that attempts to be largely descriptive must acknowledge, even if with great reluctance and sadness, that the history of the dialectic of the sacred and expressions of religion have often been characterized by killing. One finds acceptance and frequent emphasis upon our human nature and mode of existence as evil, tragic, and very violent, with essentialized killing and killing cultures, myths, rituals, theologies, and ideologies revealed and constructed as necessary for religious transformation and spiritual realization. Where does this

leave us with regard to the central topic of a phenomenological approach to spirituality and killing societies throughout history and especially today?

A Normative Phenomenological Approach to Nonkilling Societies

At the beginning of the previous section, we presented a religious and spiritual response that maintains that the overwhelming majority of religious phenomena offered by a history and phenomenology of religion, often including killing, can be completely rejected as expressing false religion and false spirituality. It is sometimes asserted that true religion, the beliefs of any true devotee, and the position of any truly spiritual person always involve the rejection of all killing, killing cultures and societies, and other forms of humanly caused violence.

Such responses are illustrated by contemporary apologetic and defensive reactions by some Muslims to violent Islamophobic attacks. Such Muslim and other reactions to a virulent Islamophobia, which stereotypes and then rejects the entire religion of Islam as a killing and false religion, are understandable. However, they are not convincing. On descriptive phenomenological grounds, they and similar defenders of other religions seem to claim that 90 per cent of those claiming to identify with almost all religions that allow for killing can be dismissed as not religious.

Some have granted this descriptive phenomenological account of such pervasive killing and violence in religion and have then presented a sharp dichotomy of religion as sometimes a killing culture versus spirituality as always a nonkilling culture. Such a religion-spirituality dichotomy is often useful, but it does not completely remove the disturbing conclusions about the descriptive phenomenological account of killing and killing cultures.

From personal experiences, when I first lived in the sacred city of Banaras (Kashi, Varanasi) on the Ganges during 1963-1964, I came to know some remarkable and revered spiritual beings, who did not identify explicitly with organized, institutionalized, mass Hinduism or any other, traditional, mass religion. What gradually troubled me was the realization that these spiritually developed teachers and practitioners were largely irrelevant to the killing societies, humanly caused suffering, and violence all around them. And what was even more troubling was my frequent observation that these spiritual masters often related to the starving and the impoverished, untouchables (*dalits*), those of lower castes, women, and those of other religions with language, attitudes, values, and practices that expressed violent and even killing spiritual orientations. One can give numerous illustrations of revered spiritual teachers

today who do not have a central commitment to nonkilling and who often accept and even glorify certain kinds of killing of certain kinds of others and violent deaths of true believers as of the highest spiritual value.

The question is whether we can go beyond a general descriptive phenomenological account of religion and spirituality and provide some normative basis to the claim that religion and spirituality, at least on levels of higher spiritual development, require a commitment to nonkilling and a transformation to nonkilling societies. My proposal is to examine an open-ended, dynamic, creative approach that is consistent with how I have attempted to interpret, reinterpret, reformulate, and reapply what have struck many readers as naïve, often bizarre, and demonstrably false claims about nonkilling and nonviolence in the writings of M. K. Gandhi.

My approach, focusing on the history of killing religions and cultures, may be illustrated by well-known and extremely controversial claims by Gandhi with regard to his favorite text, the *Bhagavad Gita*.[3] Gandhi reads and interprets the moral and spiritual message of the Gita as emphasizing the *karma yoga* path of selfless action with no ego attachment to the results of one's action and as essentially a gospel of nonviolence. This approach has astonished scholars, and some have claimed that his formulations are a hermeneutical disaster. Scholars grant that Gandhi's readings and interpretations may be filtered through and reflect his own personal needs and commitment to the methods and goals of *ahimsa*, and they may express his flights of the imagination and his alternative idiosyncratic formulations, but they are completely at odds with the actual textual requirements of a serious, objective, hermeneutical interpretation.

The *Bhagavad Gita* has been a major Hindu scripture for over 2,000 years, with hundreds of millions of Hindu devotees embracing it as their sacred text and with numerous scholarly and other influential interpretations. How could it possibly be a nonviolent and nonkilling spiritual text? It is immediately obvi-

---

[3] Gandhi's commentaries on the *Bhagavad Gita* can be found in various pamphlets, edited volumes of his writings, and in the *Collected Works*, especially vol. 32 ("Discourses on the Gita"), 94-376, and vol. 41 ("Anasaktiyoga," published in English under the title *The Gita According to Gandhi*), 90-133. One recent edition, including Gandhi's Gita text and commentary, is Gandhi (2009). I've attempted to make sense of some of Gandhi's most controverial interpretations regarding *ahimsa*, nonviolence, and nonkilling, especially in his reading of *Hind Swaraj* and the Gita, in several publications, including Allen (2009).

ous to any reader that the dramatic setting of the Gita is the battlefield and that Krishna instructs the warrior Arjuna to fulfill his *dharma* or duty by fighting, even if this inevitably involves killing. He must do this in a selfless manner without any ego-attachment to the results of his action. In several passages, Krishna allows and even justifies the killing in battle by teaching Arjuna that he should free himself from his focus on results of his actions including duty-based killing actions; that he can free himself from the karmic results of the killing through the spiritual attitude of nonattached action; and that he should realize that killing of the body and the illusory ego self has nothing to do with the higher spiritual realities. For several thousand years, including the influential commentaries of Shankara and other Hindu philosophers and spiritual teachers through the nineteenth-century and more recent nationalistic political and other cultural and spiritual interpretations, it did not seem to occur to Indian interpreters or the millions of believers that the Gita could or should be read as a gospel of nonkilling and nonviolence.

The usual attempt by those sympathetic to Gandhi, in their efforts to make sense of Gandhi's approach that seems to misread and misinterpret the text, is the well-known claim that Gandhi is offering a symbolically charged, allegorical interpretation. The dramatic setting should not be taken literally or at face value as portraying an actual battlefield and war. Krishna's teachings on duty-based, nonattached action should not be taken literally as justifying war and killing. Thus, the Gita should be read and understood as a moral and spiritual narrative, a mythic and allegorical construction, that includes the symbolic expression of the war that goes on within each of us as we struggle with forces of good and evil. To fulfill our duties, to follow what Lord Krishna has revealed to us, to make moral and spiritual progress, and finally to realize *moksha* or the complete freedom from the cycles of rebirth with the realization of the ultimate spiritual reality, we must "kill" our ego-desires and our attachments to the worldly results of our actions.

There is certainly great value in the very varied symbolic, mythic, and allegorical interpretations of Gandhi's reading and understanding of the moral and spiritual message of the *Bhagavad Gita*. These interpretations are often insightful and consistent with Gandhi's approach to language, texts, contexts, killing and violence, religion and spirituality. My own view is that even after the development of insightful allegorical and other symbolic readings and interpretations, there remain troubling killing passages in the Gita and serious hermeneutical challenges to the complete adequacy of Gandhi's readings and claims.

In addition, to claim that a text must be read as symbolic narrative, on the deeper level of mythic and allegorical meaning, does not automatically

remove all concerns about violent and killing textual expressions. After all, we have thousands of years of profound religious and cultural myths and allegories that express and are used to justify killing societies.

I would like to propose a different hermeneutical approach, which can make use of and complement necessary symbolic readings and interpretations of violent and killing textual expressions as expressing deeper nonviolent and nonkilling messages, but which also addresses the violent and killing texts, contexts, and societies in a radically different manner. In such an approach, consistent with our earlier descriptive phenomenology of religion and spirituality, we acknowledge the widespread history and contemporary expressions of religious and cultural killing.

In ways that are consistent with some of Gandhi's assertions, my approach contradicts the understandings of both nonkilling Gandhi followers embracing his absolute message of nonviolence and Gandhi critics who dismiss him as muddleheaded in his textual misinterpretations of nonkilling nonviolence. We acknowledge that the Bible, the Koran, other religious scriptures, and other textual formulations often do not endorse absolute nonkilling. Using our illustration of the *Bhagavad Gita*, we acknowledge that the original formulators, even if we appreciate their remarkable ethical and spiritual insights and truths, did not regard the Gita as a scripture of nonviolence. Their spiritual experiences and understandings gave rise to the textual expressions that have to be contextually situated. These were remarkable, inspired, but also limited human beings, as are all human beings, who lived in violent times, used violent language, and incorporated political, economic, social, and other violent relations of their experienced world. These defining features of their contextual world shaped some of their textual formulations in ways that could communicate basic truths and realities. This is also true of the influential interpreters and millions of followers who embraced the scriptural formulations with their textual readings, interpretations, and applications at least partially filtered through and shaped by their own contextual values, priorities, and situations.

Therefore, Gandhi and we can regard the Gita as a gospel of nonkilling nonviolence not because it was originally formulated or understood that way, but because it is a dynamic open-ended text, which can be reread, reinterpreted, purified, and developed, so that it can be experienced and interpreted at a higher and deeper ethical and spiritual level of realization. In other words, the Gita and other spiritual texts can now be selectively read and selectively interpreted, so that they can become contextually relevant, nonkilling resources for us, living in the contemporary killing world with our evolu-

tionary human developments and modern variables and crises. This is because we can develop and interpret the spiritual teaching and meanings in ways essential for constituting the means and goals of nonkilling societies. This is not an arbitrary or subjective hermeneutical flight of the imagination. We must remain consistent with and true to the Gita's basic foundational spiritual principles and truths, and skillfully and creatively integrate them with other complementary economic, political, psychological, and cultural insights and truths, but we can and must do this in a more ethically and spiritually developed manner. Only then can the Gita, other texts, and other contextually significant resources provide us the values and relevant exemplary models or theories and practices for more developed nonviolent human beings and nonkilling societies.

In ways that are bold and desperately needed today in our killing world and consistent with my proposed hermeneutical approach, we are challenged to develop and improve the textual formulations of the Gita and other scriptures and the interpretations of remarkable spiritual teachers and practitioners, including Gandhi. This applies not only to religious texts and traditions, but also equally to the textual formulations and later interpretations and applications found in the writings of Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Marx, and other economic, political, social, and cultural traditions found throughout human history and influential in the contemporary world. Through our rereading, rethinking, reinterpreting, and reapplying, contextually influenced by new information and insights and developments, our nonkilling hermeneutical and transformative project is to raise critical questions, purify and improve our own nonkilling perspectives and practices, challenge and resist killing religious and secular cultures and societies, and provide constructive, contextually-significant, nonkilling values, methods, and goals for transforming our killing world.

Because of limitations of length for this essay, I won't attempt to provide a detailed phenomenological account of spirituality that could offer some grounding and hermeneutical framework for analyzing and justifying such a nonkilling and nonviolent normative position. In other writings, I've attempted to provide a detailed analysis of the presuppositions, principles, methodological framework, and moral, philosophical, and spiritual view of reality justifying nonviolent perspectives.

At this point, it will suffice simply to suggest a phenomenological approach to spirituality structured by a human experiential orientation, presuppositions, principles, and a view of reality emphasizing the fundamental unity and interconnectedness of reality. What unites us as human beings is more fundamental than what divides us. This is not a hegemonic violent

oneness or unity that erases and destroys any respect for differences. This is an experiential, dynamic, open-ended, essential unity with a respect for perspectival and contextual differences.

With such an experiential orientation, methodological approach, and ontological view of human beings and reality, we can analyze killing societies, religions, and cultures as emphasizing the primordial and essentialized differences of "the other." The essentialized religious, economic, cultural, political, racial, gendered, and ideological "others" are fundamentally and essentially different from my religious, economic, cultural, political, racial, gendered, and ideological identities. Throughout the history and phenomenology of killing societies and continuing today, we find that such an approach is easily transformed into perspectives of reality in which the essentially different other is then viewed as inferior, uncivilized, irrational, immoral, evil, and threatening, thus justifying killing and other forms of violence directed at the other. Such a violent and killing approach today not only justifies immoral means and ends and has led to widespread killing, genocide, war, humanly caused suffering, environmental destruction, and crises of unsustainability and survival on this planet. Such an approach also contradicts the normative ontological phenomenology of spirituality, in rejecting the essential unity and interconnectedness of life, and hence it constructs human perspectives that are extremely partial and limited, are illusory, and reject essential truths about human beings and reality.

By way of contrast, a phenomenological approach to spirituality, that provides a normative approach and methodological framework of interpretation, can justify nonkilling societies as emphasizing the fundamental interconnectedness and unity of human beings and all of reality. Not only does a nonkilling phenomenological approach to spirituality expose and resist the presuppositions, principles, and perspectives of killing societies as expressing immoral means and ends and as economically, politically, militarily, religiously, educationally, and environmentally unsustainable and threatening future life on this planet. Such a nonkilling phenomenological approach to spirituality, embracing the normative view of the unity and interconnectedness of human relations and reality, is more truthful, more cognizant of and integrally related to reality, and hence allows for real human and planetary development and flourishing.

A Nonviolent Challenge to the Phenomenological Approach to Spirituality and Nonkilling Societies

Almost all challenges to any phenomenological approach to spirituality that critiques, resists, and proposes alternatives to killing societies obviously come from those upholding the need for and adequacy of killing approaches, values, cultures, and disciplines. In terms of dominant hierarchical structures of power, money, and influence, status quo education and socialization, the corporate media, and Hobbesian and other secular and religious views of human nature, this is to be expected.

What is more surprising is a challenge from some well-intentioned, admirable proponents of nonviolence. Perhaps most surprising, even to most Indians, are hundreds of pages of writings by M. K. Gandhi, the best known and most influential modern proponent of the philosophy and practices of nonviolence. While upholding the absolute value of nonviolence and an exceptional commitment to avoiding killing, even when it comes to his extreme vegetarian diet and his willingness to be killed rather than to inflict harmful suffering on others, Gandhi often struggles with the most difficult moral and spiritual situations in which it is difficult to find a nonviolent, moral, and spiritual response.

Gandhi and some other proponents of the absolute ideals and ends, means, and values of nonviolence, which would seem to encompass the more specific cases of nonkilling and the absolute rejection of killing societies, sometimes struggle with real life, contextualized situations in which there seem to be no viable nonviolent alternatives.

How does one committed to nonkilling and nonviolence respond to a situation in which a psychologically insane or extremely mentally unbalanced individual is in the act of killing children in a school? How does one respond to a situation in which a rapist is in the act of committing the rape? How does one respond to a situation of explosive ongoing terrorism? How does one respond to a situation in which human life is threatened by malaria-carrying mosquitoes or attacking animals? In other words, how does a nonviolent and nonkilling human being and society respond to real life, violent, killing situations in which there are no opportunities for nonkilling dialogue and nonviolent conflict resolution; no short-term nonviolent responses that can prevent the ongoing killing; and no long-term nonviolent responses that can focus on the root causes and basic determinants of the killing society and the need for the transformation from killing to nonkilling?

Surprising to most readers, Gandhi very reluctantly concedes that in the most difficult moral and spiritual situations, killing may be allowed. In many writings, he analyzes how Indians should respond to the life-threatening attacks by "menacing monkeys," and he submits that they should sometimes kill them. He even analyzes the inevitability of killing life in terms of his vegetarian diet, measures to improve hygiene, and other necessities of a nonviolent society. In most cases, he discusses the unavoidability of some involuntary killing and violence as part of our human mode of being in the world, but he also includes exceptional cases of voluntary killing. And this extends beyond the killing of nonhuman sentient life to situations that may involve the killing of other human beings. He even writes of when killing may count as *ahimsa*? How is this possible?

In a nonkilling phenomenological approach, it is important to emphasize that over 99 percent of the time, when we intentionally or unintentionally act as part of killing and violent societies, there are nonkilling and nonviolent alternatives. We may not be aware of or act on these nonkilling alternatives for all kinds of reasons: We are socialized, rewarded, and punished as part of killing societies; we are socialized to accept violent and killing stereotypes about human nature, the nature of others, and our incapacity to transform killing to nonkilling societies; we experience understandable insecurity and fear when considering challenging and resisting those with power over our lives in killing societies; and we lack the knowledge, skills, creativity, and training to develop nonkilling values and commitments.

But how do we respond to those killing situations in which there are no viable nonkilling and nonviolent alternatives? In other writings, I develop some analysis of how a nonviolent approach might have been used by Jews and others in responding to Hitler and the Nazis; how a nonviolent approach might have responded just before the terrorist attacks occurred on 9/11/2001; and how a nonviolent approach might have responded while the terrorist killings were taking place in Mumbai from the 26/11 to 29/11/2008. I'll briefly refer to the Mumbai terrorism for my response to a killing situation in which there are no nonviolent options.[4]

---

[4] Among writings in which I focus on Gandhi's approach to these and other killing situations in which there are no nonviolent options are Allen (2006: 19-39), and several chapters in Allen (2011a). In such interpretations, I often revise, reformulate, and even reject Gandhi's views, as in his advice to Jews in the 1930s and, in at least some writings, in his advice to rape victims. This is consistent with Gandhi's own open-ended approach as his "experiments with truth," with hundreds of pages in

In my analysis of nonviolence, that maintains the absolute ideals and values of nonkilling and is contextually informed by real violent and killing relative situations, nonkilling human beings who were in the Chatrapati Shivaji Terminus (CST) on 26 November, as innocent civilians were being killed, needed to stop the terrorist killings. This may have required violent force and possibly killing. The terrorists, who were doing the killing, had no interest in engaging in nonkilling dialogue. Even if one intervenes courageously and says "kill me," the terrorist would simply kill you and then continue killing the others in the railway terminus. To do nothing to stop the killing, or to intervene nonviolently in a way that has no possibility for transforming the killing situation, is not only ineffective but also makes you complicit with the perpetuation of the ongoing killings. In short, such a violent action, even if it involves necessary killing, may be justified by the moral and spiritual ideals and values of a nonviolent society since such killing may be the most nonviolent option available.

Such a phenomenological approach to nonviolent spirituality, which allows for killings in exceptional situations, opens the door to all kinds of dangers from dominant killing societies. After all, we easily recall the endless justifications for killing and other forms of violence, that repeatedly use the same kind of language, including war and violence as necessary for peace and nonviolence. Once we grant killing exceptions, how do we avoid the slippery slope of killing? How do we distinguish our nonkilling approach from just war theories, religious teachings, political theories, and other justifications found for thousands of years to the present in killing societies? Granting exceptions clearly poses a challenge and danger to a nonkilling spirituality, but not granting any relative contextualized exceptions poses an even greater danger to creating a relevant nonkilling world.

Let me only briefly suggest how we may distinguish our phenomenological approach to spirituality from the justifications for killing in killing societies. In those exceptional situations, with extreme violence and killing taking place and with no nonkilling and nonviolent options available, violent

---

which he acknowledges his own failed experiments, miscalculations, and even "Himalayan blunders"; with a recognition that some of Gandhi's interpretations and views were of little value during his lifetime or have become inadequate and irrelevant today; and especially with an approach that affirms the necessity for innovative, creative, contextually significant interpretations and applications focusing on killing societies today and the need for nonkilling transformation that integrate Gandhian insights with other complimentary nonviolent contributions.

and sometimes even killing actions are allowed and may be necessary to stop the killing. However, we never give up the ideals and values of creating nonkilling societies. When we engage in such necessary killing, what we do is not glorious. It is not even good or moral. It is something tragic and terrible. We should be saddened by what we have had to do in responding to situations that express human failure in creating killing societies that sometimes offer no nonkilling effective means of actions.

Since we always uphold the ideals and values of nonkilling, even when such exceptional violence and killing is necessary, we engage in killing that is of the most limited duration and intensity necessary to stop the ongoing killing. We restrict to a minimum the violence and loss of life, and we refuse all contemporary justifications for "collateral damage." Most importantly, we do everything in our power to transform the economic, political, cultural, educational, religious, and other causes and conditions that led to our killing societies and such tragic failures in which we have no immediate nonkilling alternatives. We expose and resist all attempts to use the killing to justify more killing, terror and terrorism to justify our responses of terror and terrorism, violence to justify more violence, so that we do not become entrapped in the cycles defining violent and killing societies.

Only by raising qualitatively different, nonkilling and nonviolent alternative values, while educating, resisting, and transforming, can we break through the vicious cycles of the phenomenology of killing and violence. Only then can we create nonkilling societies expressing nonkilling life-affirming and sustainable relations between human beings, other beings, and nature. Only then can we embrace a contextually meaningful and effective phenomenological approach to spirituality expressing the presuppositions, values, principles, policies, and paradigms of nonkilling and nonviolent societies.

References

Allen, Douglas (1978). *Structure and Creativity in Religion: Hermeneutics in Mircea Eliade's Phenomenology and New Directions*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Allen, Douglas (2002). *Myth and Religion in Mircea Eliade*. London and New York: Routledge.

Allen, Douglas (2009). "*Hind Swaraj*: Hermeneutical Questions of Interpretation, Mythic Construction, and Contemporary Relevance," *Journal of Contemporary Thought*, 30: 5-32.

Allen, Douglas (2011a). *Mahatma Gandhi*. London: Reaktion Books.

Allen, Douglas (2011b). "Religion and Violence in the Contemporary Word: Is religion more of the problem or the solution?" in *Patterns in Philosophy and Sociol-*

ogy of Religions, Gligor, Mihaela, Ed. and Sabbarwal, Sherry. Jaipur, India: Rawat Publications, 14-41.

Allen, Douglas, Ed. (2006). *Comparative Philosophy and Religion in Times of Terror.* Lanham: Lexington Books.

Allen, Douglas, Ed. (2008). *The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi for the Twenty-First Century*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Eliade, Mircea (1954). *The Myth of the Eternal Return*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Eliade, Mircea (1959). *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return*. New York: Harper & Row, Torchbooks.

Eliade, Mircea (1961). *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. New York: Harper & Row, Torchbooks.

Eliade, Mircea (1963). *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. New York: World Publishing Co., Meridian Books.

Gandhi, Mahatma (1958-1994). *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*. New Delhi: Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.

Gandhi, Mahatma (2009). *The Bhagavad Gita According to Gandhi*, John Strohmeier, Ed. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books.

Iyer, Raghavan, Ed. (1993). *The Essential Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iyer, Raghavan, Ed.(1986-1987). *The Moral and Political Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chapter Four

Spirituality and Nonkilling

Theoretical Basis and Practical Evidence

Piero P. Giorgi
National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies
University of Otago, Dunedin (New Zealand)

Nonkilling is a relatively new concept (Paige, 2009 [202]) but it has been explored in relation to many social aspects and from the point of view of several academic disciplines.[1] The topic of spirituality is perhaps the most difficult one. In this work we will analyse first the theoretical aspects of spirituality and nonkilling. Then we will review some practical examples of the relationship between these two practises.

In the literature about religion(s) the terms spirituality and religion are generally used as synonymous. In a number of occasions (see, for example, Giorgi, 2008, chapter 5) we have, on the contrary, emphasised the different origins of these two phenomena and their diversity. Establishing such difference is very important in the present discussion.

Definitions always carry personal biases, but they are necessary for the reader to know what the author means when using a certain word. Regardless of whether one agrees or not with his/her definition, it will help understanding the author's reasoning. I define *spirituality* as the human potentiality of asking metaphysical questions[2] and attempting some answers. I define *religion* as the original human spirituality framed inside later acquired concepts of divinity, priesthood, moral rules and rituals. Let us explore this difference.

Spirituality is a natural potentiality of human beings

Human beings emerged as a species (*Homo sapiens*) about 150,000 years ago in Eastern Africa and about 70,000 years later began moving

[1] See <www.nonkilling.org>

[2] In this case metaphysical questions concern aspects of life other than physical sustenance, avoiding physical pain and seeking physical pleasure. They concern, for example, thinking and discussing about the meaning of life and death, our origins, the origin of nature, how we should relate to nature, and how we should relate to other human beings. This is a restricted view of spirituality, but it can suit the context of our discussion.

gradually into all five continents. About 40,000 years ago human beings started producing art (Palaeolithic rock art) in the form of painted cave walls and mobile art (carved bones and stone figurines) (Anati, 2000). Several millions of rock art images from five continents have already been described and classified by palaeo-anthropologists. The interpretation of these images strongly suggests two aspects that are central in our discussion: Palaeolithic humans did not use violence against each other (Giorgi, 2001, Giorgi and Anati, 2004, Giorgi, 2008, chapter 3)[3] and had a relevant level of spirituality. Importantly, these two human traits have also been found in the last century in contemporary hunter-gathering cultures, which were the best available models of a possible prehistoric life style. They have been studied by cultural anthropologists, but now they have practically been eliminated through forced re-location and cultural genocide.

In rock art we can find several pictorial symbols that meant infinity and movement, or represented mythological beings associated with the origin of natural structures and human beings (Anati, 2000). Interestingly, these metaphysical symbols seem to have had a general use in different continents, when comparing cultures that could not have had any form of contact (Von Petzinger, Nowell, 2010).

Contemporary hunter-gatherers verbally reported similar metaphysical concepts to enquiring anthropologists (Evans Pim, 2010). They proved to have an interest in the origins of human beings and nature, in particular rivers, the sea, mountains, plants and animals. Of course, they were concerned with the type of behaviour they should adopt towards other human beings, not in terms of moral rules (religion) but as a practical application of their nonviolent culture.

A very different type of evidence supporting the congenital nature of human spirituality is the presence in our brain of a functional region that specifically mediates metaphysical and spiritual thoughts. This was tested

---

[3] The present work is not meant to discuss the evidence of nonviolence in Palaeolithic humans, as already presented in Giorgi (2001, 2008). Here it is enough to remind that human beings emerged through a process of biocultural (not just biological) evolution; that violence and nonviolence are complex social behaviours; and that social behaviour cannot be defined by genes. As a consequence we are neither violent nor nonviolent by nature (or genes). A nonviolent culture would offer children nonviolent social models (hunter-gatherers); a violent culture would offer children violent social models (last 7,000 years in food-producing culture). A nonviolent transformation of our culture is therefore possible as the emergence of violence in the late Neolithic was a purely cultural change. Here we concentrate on the evidence of spirituality among hunter-gatherers.

with functional magnetic resonance imaging (Aletti, 2006). But, as for most human cognitive functions, a well-developed spirituality must be acquired (not learned; for terminology, see Giorgi 2008, section 2.3.3) after birth through specific experience, just as we must develop after birth the functional potentialities of bipedal gate, speech and hand dexterity, which are not congenital functions (instincts). If children do not experience enough spirituality in their cultural environment, they cannot express their own spiritual potentialities and remain prisoners in a material world without being able to fly higher as human beings should. The spiritual poverty of modern life in part explains the general acceptance of daily human killing in both the civilian (assassinations and death penalty) and military world (war).

Religion is a "recent" cultural acquisition

As indicated above, we consider religion as the world of spirituality framed inside new practices introduced in the Neolithic by the cultures that produced food. The chain of events that inevitably followed food production (as opposed to hunter-gathering) has already been discussed elsewhere (see Giorgi, 2001: 152-161 and Giorgi, 2008, section 4.3). Among these events, we must consider the importantance of the process of social stratification and the position of power of astronomers, who introduced the concept of the divine associated with moving stars and the commanding role of the chief priest, as the intermediate between human beings and gods. The chief priests also introduced a moral code of behaviour and the rituals to be performed to appease the gods. The addition to spirituality of these new ideas and practices (priesthood, gods, moral codes and rituals) corresponded to the birth of polytheistic religions, which became a necessary system of power in communities that had become too large to self manage themselves and also suffered of the social malaise introduced by a new relation of fear with nature.

The anthropological and archaeological literature generally does not make a clear distinction between spirituality and religion, and often attributes to pre-historical human beings religious concepts, such as the veneration of gods and the practice of rituals. A "religious spirit" in prehistory has been mentioned by Facchini and Magnani (2000), a term that does not contribute to clarify issues. We hold, instead, that religion, as described here, did not exist before the Neolithic (Giorgi, 2007, 2008). The distinction between spirituality and religion is important for the analysis of the relationships between spirituality and killing (see below).

Power systems and religion

The egalitarian cultures of hunter-gatherers did not know those post-agricultural institutions we refer to as power systems. These institutions did not emerge from an innate human desire for power; they became gradually necessary when the size of human settlements became too large for collective decision-making. We suggest that the evolution of religions followed the same cultural trend and religious authorities joined civil powers in the new effort of controlling a large, stratified population. The different forms of power enjoyed by religious authorities changed according to different cultures, from the coincidence of kings and great priests in antiquity, to the assignment of the same land benefits of counts to bishops and abbots in the Middle Ages, and to the title of prince of the Church later assigned to cardinals. In the past, religious authorities acted as ministers of the king and prelates were part of His Majesty's court.

In the occasion of wars, religious authorities have blessed troops and weapons assuring everybody that God was on their side, while the clergy of the enemy were stating the opposite. This ambiguous situation nurtured the idea that religion could be the cause of many wars. In reality religion was only part of a convincing propaganda: the enemy wants to take our land, rape our women and destroy our gods. That was enough to convince poor peasants to kill other poor peasants, while they would have preferred to stay home and continue working the land. Wars are decided and wanted by high authorities for a variety of reasons other than religion.

Gandhi, nonviolence and spirituality

Although Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869-1948) is considered the father of nonviolence, this behavioural trait was the normal result of human biocultural evolution (see above) and, as a strategy to resolve conflicts of interest, was also practised in antique and modern times before him (Sibley, 1963). Moreover, Gandhi lacked current anthropological and neurobiological information and believed that we are violent by nature (Pontara, 2006; Manara, 2006). His philosophy of *ahimsa* (nonkilling, nonviolence) was, therefore, based on moral principles (without a scientific support) and on the belief that a person can be converted to the idea of not causing pain to others. Interestingly, this position is the one that now motivates most people engaged in the peace movement and in peace studies. It is a worthy position from the ethical point of view, but very ineffective for the purpose of a nonviolent transformation of society: it would be much better *stopping the current violent education of small children*

and adolescents, rather than trying to convert people to nonviolence after having educated them to violence.

Regardless the intellectual source of Gandhi's nonviolent teaching, he has been very clear in stating that *one cannot be really nonviolent without having a good level of spirituality* (Pontara, 2006; Manara, 2006). He insisted on the spiritual, not religious, qualities of a person practising nonviolence. In fact Gandhi, although of Hinduism upbringing, avoided being associated with one particular religious faith and probably paid with his life the determination of maintaining good relationships with the Muslims of the Indian subcontinent.

Unavoidable violence, still a very popular belief

We have become aware only recently of the rich humanity that characterised the Palaeolithic cultures (see above) and of the need to include that period as part of our human adventure, in order to understand who we are. As long as we limited our interest to the so called "history", that is, the shorter period beginning when we started producing written records (about 6-7,000 years ago), we obviously believed in congenital violence: direct violence and war also started at the beginning of that "history". Two additional factors contribute to uphold this wrong but popular belief. The first one is a psychological trap. The hypothetical unavoidable occurrence of violence produces a soothing feeling in both citizens and authorities: we don't need to do anything to prevent and eliminate violence, a process that would involve radical and unpopular changes in people's life style and political programs.

The second factor maintaining the *status quo* is the vested interest of several businesses that a strongly competitive life style and overt violent social interactions continue in society. An oppressive commercial-media system effectively promotes egoism and individualism among people, thus discouraging grass-root initiatives aiming at social promotion. Just a few examples of what works against the prevention of violence: the weapon industry, powerful movements promoting intolerance and nationalism, associations exploiting the ambiguity of legal rights such as the National Rifle Association, the industry of passive entertainment (violent films and sport events), the industry of unhealthy food, the industry of competitive physical appearance, etc.

While we have grown accustomed to think that an increasing rate of chronic depression, drug dependence, diseased people, corruption and poverty are unavoidable aspects of modern life, we also have the emergent proposals and experimentation of a nonviolent economy, a nonviolent civilian defence, a nonviolent education, etc. The future non-competitive, nonk-

illing, nonviolent society with true democracy—an unavoidable transformation in order to avoid extinction—would be composed of happy, healthy and spiritual people with enough material resources.

The unhappy, sick and poor soldiers

The postmodern war machine has removed all the attractive aspects of being a soldier. The glorious service of noble ancient worriers, the honourable obligation of medieval citizens and the professionalism of modern armies have gone. Now a young man joins the army to learn a job, to obtain a degree, or to pay the house loan during a dangerous assignment abroad. But the price to pay is often too high. In Russia one can see return soldiers begging in the street; in the Unites States a proportion of Vietnam veterans and other former "heroes" are guests of psychiatric clinics or members of outlaw gangs.

A strong evidence denying congenital violence in humans is the many cases of mentally disturbed soldiers, especially those returning from "dirty" wars, where armies of industrialised countries fight against irregular troops in Third World countries, operations often called "peace missions". Chronic depression, violent behaviour, drug addiction and other syndromes are becoming a serious health problem among war veterans. If it was true, as most people believe, that violence is a natural human characteristic (see above), soldiers returning home should be happy, satisfied, well balanced people, while quiet post office clerks should be mentally disturbed. This obviously nonsensical suggestion is based on the conclusions reached by Sigmund Freud when he discussed this very topic in a very reputed book at the age of 74, ten years before his death (Freud, 1930; Giorgi 2009: 103-107).

Religious training

Most readers must have attended, to a certain extent, Sunday school or a similar program within a certain religious creed. The aim of most types of religious training is to inspire (or inculcate, depending on the teacher's style) the love of God, the foundations of specific beliefs, formal rituals, and moral rules. These rules are very important, but they should be demonstrated since birth by the parents with their life style, non instructed verbally and too late by a religious authority. For our discussion it is interesting comparing the religious training of a child with the training of a soldier.

Military training involves, besides specific strategies to kill, the numbing of critical thinking, of unfettered human empathy (*agape*), and of a general spiritual view of life (see above). The training of a soldier involve, therefore, the

suppression of the main functions that make us human, let alone the concept of uncritical obedience, the biggest insult to that freedom of deciding for ourselves that was granted to us by our Creator. But these terrible features of military training are necessary for the profession of war; so it is the idea of war that is wrong, not the preparation of a diligent soldier for the killing. There is a rich literature on the theory and practice of the nonviolent defence of a country (Sharp, 2005), but the public is accurately prevented from knowing about it. Military personnel are encouraged, indeed, to embrace a given religious faith, but with the added attitude of intolerance toward other forms of belief. This does not justify, however, the idea that religions are the cause of war.

The spirituality of nonkilling animals

The ancient nutritional choice of vegetarianism is becoming increasingly popular and is inspired by various motivations. The purely nutritional approach holds that plants can provide the whole requirement of proteins we need and that eating meat causes a number of health problems. The environmental approach holds that feeding animals to feed humans is inefficient and damages natural resources. The ethical approach is inspired by the discomfort of causing pain to animals.

Interestingly, the last two approaches belong to the domain of spirituality. Being concerned about the environment involves asking metaphysical questions on our relationship with nature and about the future of humanity. Being concerned with animal suffering involves metaphysical questions about our relationship with other living beings on earth. One could object to this interpretation by noting that the choice of answers to those metaphysical questions depends on ethical principles, not so much on spirituality. Two comments. One should not automatically assume that the only source of ethical principles is religion; we have a rich history of secular ethics. In fact spirituality is a natural faculty of human beings (see above) long before the emergence of religion and it has always inspired the collective mind as part of a healthy social culture, especially in small communities. Furthermore, the teaching (formal catechism) of most Christian denominations contains little or nothing about protecting nature and animals.

The relationship between spirituality and nonkilling

Cultural anthropologists have reported that surviving hunter-gathering cultures did not have a moral code as such, one like the Ten Commandments for example. Children acquired an ethical behaviour growing up in a

community where people displayed solidarity and did not lie, steal and kill, apart from occasional extra-marital breaches (Evans Pim, 2010). Adolescents also received information about mysteries and taboos from the elders during initiation. The whole community had sophisticated methods to prevent the rare possibilities of violence and injustice.

Hunter-gathering cultures had essentially a high level of spirituality. This means that they were asking questions about the origins of natural features and of human beings, and about their relationship with nature; these were answered with mythological explanations. They were interested in how one should relate to other human beings: this had been culturally selected to be nonviolent relationships.[4] Interestingly, contemporary hunter-gatherers did not engage in war, they were unlikely to use man-to-man violence (Fry, 2013) and were wounding in a leg somebody guilty of a bad crime, while capital punishment was unknown. This view of hunter-gathering cultures has nothing to do with the idea of the "noble savage" of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who had no notion of anthropology and imagined that "savage" as a lone idiot not doing any harm because too stupid for doing so (see Giorgi, 2001, note 7).

If we compare the above model with the opposite social situation, a large city of an industrialised country, we find essentially a severe lack of spirituality. The origins of the physical world and the wonders of living creatures are unwillingly learned at school and soon forgotten. The origins of human beings are badly described at school and soon forgotten or misunderstood or substituted with the catechism of creationism. How we should behave toward each other—cooperation, solidarity and nonviolence—is not taught at school, is hopelessly advocated at religious classes, is denied in history classes, and negatively displayed in the family and the general public —individualism, competition and egoism, if not worst.

Moreover, people are not told about the emergence of inhuman behaviour, violence and killing in the periods of the Late Neolithic and the Bronze Age, which are still recorded only for the achievements of food production and technological advances. Who has a vested interest in perpetuating this ignorance?

---

[4] Like other social species, *Homo sapiens* emerged after a bio-cultural (not just biological) evolutionary process, with social behaviour not being defined by genes. This means that we are neither violent nor nonviolent by nature, and nonviolence was selected and maintained by cultural transfer from one generation to the next because it was the most suitable behaviour for the advantage of the community (adaptive).

Specific case studies

One may ask the question of whether there is a relationship between the practice of killing and the level of spirituality of a nation.

There are three cases when the State authorises killing human beings: death penalty sentenced by the judiciary, striking in self-defence carried out by police officers and citizens, killing people who are considered a danger to the country (enemies) carried out by soldiers or special services. Death penalty is the most interesting one.

All countries of the European Union, Canada, Russia, Australia, New Zealand and ten others have abolished death penalty for all crimes. The United States, Indonesia and many countries of East Africa and Southern Asia retain death penalty. The rest have intermediate or unclear situations. The case of USA is particularly interesting because this country is so much represented by media and fiction to become internalised by the public, like in the advertising strategy, as the social model to imitate. Well, of the 50 States composing the USA, only 18 have no death penalty statute, while most of the remaining 32 have performed executions since 1976 (after a suspension by the Supreme Court between 1972 and 1976). While in Europe one is currently discussing about the illegality of life imprisonment because the main aim of imprisonment should be attempting the redemption of the inmate, the USA is still allowing death penalty as it was in Europe 100 years ago. Moreover, the unique percentage of US citizens owing a gun is well known, as well as the unique frequency of shooting in schools and public places.

Interestingly, the US has a level of religiosity (people attending church) much higher than Europe (41% vs. 15% in France or 10% in UK, according to Gallup International). It is difficult to determine the level of spirituality of a person and, worse, of a country, but this human trait surely requires the ability of deep thinking, abstract reasoning and metaphysical interests. After having lived long periods in several different countries, it is the impression of this author that, apart a culturally privileged minority, US citizens are generally more materialistic and superficial than European citizens. I present this personal impression with due caution, because it should be supported by proper evidence-based data, but I would doubt that the US is on the way of becoming the spiritual leader of the world. On the contrary, the US is currently the country fighting more official wars than any other one, besides being involved in many covered operations without Congressional oversight. A program of research should be undertaken on the relationship between high levels of killing and low levels of spirituality.

The causes of our low level of spirituality

In this work the idea has been defended that spirituality and religion are different human traits, one being innate and the other recently added by purely cultural evolution. As mentioned above, it is relatively easy to assess the level of religiosity of a society, but that of spirituality seems to escape quantitative methods. From the psychological and behavioural traits mentioned above, one could, however, select the quality of interpersonal relations and perhaps direct violence as a measurable parameter, although the concept of spirituality is a much more complex than that. In this case it would be easy to assess the displays of individualism, egoism, greed and wild competition to determine, by default, the level of spirituality. Unfortunately, these attitudes and behavioural traits are those considered as winning strategies by the current neo-liberal trends, which would explain the difficulties we face in expressing our spiritual potentialities. If this reasoning is correct, we could follow the same line of thinking to elucidate the cause(s) of the current low level of spirituality in industrialised countries.

One cannot blame certain philosophical ideas, such as positivism or Marxism or existentialism, because they are intellectually dead or survive in a small minority of learned people. In any case, these outmoded ideas were associated with anti-religion positions and do not concern spirituality. In fact, one can meet self-declared "atheists" or "agnostics" who display high levels of spirituality.

In the majority of people, human and spiritual poverty is cunningly promoted by *economic power systems that need both vulnerable workers and uncritical consumers*. Workers have won many battles in the past to have their rights recognised by employers, but they are gradually losing their achievements through the strategy of guided "economic crises" (during which very rich people are doing even better) that force them to lower down their demands. Added to this is a new, and so far unknown, form of oppression of citizens as consumers perpetrated by the commerce-media system (a form of structural violence). Its overt selling mantra is freedom and liberty … to buy much more than what one need.

Greed, corruption, habituation to killing, need of violent entertainment, and psychiatric conditions are the intended outcome of the above mentioned hidden power system that aims at obedient and gullible citizens, who become even more vulnerable if somehow depressed and not fully healthy. One can well imagine how these new weapons of behavioural control may impede the expression of people's natural potentiality for spirituality. Con-

versely, one can imagine how a population with a good level of spirituality would be protected from such effective attempt of oppressing them. Within the commercial-media oppression system, the military industry needs citizens that are drugged with violent entertainment and habituated with both home and international violence as a normal human affair. Here the selling mantra is "security", aiming at having all police and army interventions justified, while hiding the fact that violent military solutions enjoy a very low rate of success when compared with the excellent record of nonviolent movements (Zunes et al., 2007; Drago, 2010).

Conclusion

It is clear that the culture of violence we are experiencing today gradually emerged 6-7,000 years ago and was perpetrated from generation to generation by cultural transfer through unconscious repetition. The expression of the innate human spiritual potentiality was at the same time inhibited for thousands of years by the new social context of large food producing cultures and, perhaps, also by the dry, ritualistic practice of religion. In recent times, especially after World War II, new economic strategies have consciously been put into place to enhance the alienation of people and to oppress them both as workers and consumers. Now we are surrounded by violence, corruption, and killing in fictional entertainments and in our real daily life; this makes us worried, unsecure and poor enough to be easily manipulated.

The recovery of human dignity and peace will need a spiritual and a Political transformation—the capital letter distinguishes the future service Politics from the current power politics. In our opinion, this will occur with what we (see <www.neotopia.it>) call a *nonviolent, slow, legal and local revolution* (in a sense of radical change). "Nonviolent" refers to the theory and practice of Gandhi, Galtung, and Sharp; "slow" means a probable duration of two or three generations, because the final targets will be children; "legal" means that the methods adopted will be in line with local laws; "local" means that spiritual and Political actions will come from the bottom (active citizenship) in small towns and will be adapted to local resources. A good strategy for the type of "revolution" mentioned above is to distinguish short-term projects from medium-term projects and long-term projects, which should all be started at the same time. The first type would deal with simple remedial actions that do not resolve the basic problem (as they does not deal with its cause) but make people (especially adult) aware of the situation of oppression (structural violence) in which we find our-

selves. The second would be destined mainly to adolescents by appealing to their residual capacity of idealism and rebellion and proposing nonviolent methods, such as simply saying "no" to the many chimeras of the commercial-media oppression, to start with. The third one would be destined to small children and their parents, who would provide a very different social environment for them, one offering the same advantages of babies born in a hunter-gathering band.

The aim of this ambitious, but inevitable, project is to begin a nonviolent transformation of local communities first and wider social entities later. This model of a nonviolent, slow transformation of society is meeting with a powerful opposition from the commerce-media interests that favour religious sermons to active spiritual and nonviolent solutions.

References

Aletti, M. (2006). "Tra dati neurobiologici, contesti culturali e attribuzioni personali – La specificità dell'approccio psicologico alla religione," in Aletti, M. et al., Eds., *Religione – Cultura mente e cervello.* Torino: Centro Scientifico Editore, 138-197.

Anati, E., Ed. (2000). *40,000 ans d'art contemporain* (40,000 years of contemporary art). Capo di Ponte: Edizioni del Centro.

Drago, A. (2010). *Le rivoluzione nonviolente dell'ultimo secolo – I fatti e le interpretazioni*. Milano: Edizioni Nuova Cultura.

Evans Pim, J., Ed. (2010). *Nonkilling Societies*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at <www.nonkilling.org>

Facchini, F. and Magnani, P., Eds. (2000). *MIti e riti della preistoria* (Myths and Rites of Prehistory). Milano: Jaca Book.

Freud, S. (1961). *Civilisation and Its Discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Fry, D. P., Ed. (2013). *War, Peace and Human nature – The convergence of Evolutionary and Cultural Views*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Giorgi, P. P. (2001). The Origins of Violence by Cultural Evolution. Brisbane: Minerva Education & Science. Available online at <www.pierogiorgi.org>

Giorgi, P. P. (2007). "A new interpretation of female symbols and figurines produced in prehistoric Europe – The hypothesis of the centrality of women" in Bloom, M.; Giorgi P. P. and Pietroboni, G., Eds. *Rock art in the framework of the cultural heritage of humankind*. Capo di Ponte (Italy): Edizioni del Centro, 185-191.

Giorgi, P. P. (2008). La violenza inevitabile – Una menzogna moderna. Milano: Jaca.

Giorgi, P. P. (2009). "Nonkilling human biology", in Evans Pim, J. Ed., *Toward a nonkilling paradigm*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling, 95-122. Available online at <www.nonkilling.org>

Giorgi P. P. and Anati, E. (2004). "Violence and Its Evidence in Prehistoric art – A comparison of ideas". In Anati, E., Ed. *Prehistoric and Tribal Art. New Discover-*

ies, Interpretations and Methods. Capo di Ponte (Italy): Edizioni del Centro, 263-269.

Manara, F. C. (2006). *Una forza che dà vita – Ricominciare con Gandhi in un'età di terrorismi*. Milano: Edizioni Unicopli.

Paige, G. (2009). *Nonkilling Global Political Sciences*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at <www.nonkilling.org>

Pontara, G. (2006). *L'antibarbarie – La concezione etico-politica di Gandhi e il XXI secolo*. Torino: Ega Editore.

Sharp, G. (2005). *Waging Nonviolent Struggle – 20th century practice and 21st century potential*. Manchester: Porter Sargent.

Sibley, M. Q. (1963). *The quiet battle – Writings on the theory and practice of nonviolence resistence*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Von Petzinger, G. and Nowell, A. (2010). Article published by *New Scientist*, 21 February 2010, 31-34.

Zunes, S.; Kurtz, L. R. and Asher, S. B., Eds. (2007). *Nonviolent social movements*. New York: Backwell Publishing.

Chapter Five

Kāore Whakaheke Toto (Do Not Shed Blood)

Looking Into the Past for Messages to Create a Peace Based Future

Kelli Te Maihāroa
University of Otago

This chapter explores the indigenous spiritual tradition of Te Maihāroa, my *tīpuna* (ancestor), highlighting the peaceful struggle against the British colonial forces during in the mid-nineteenth century. It is a history written collaboratively by the Te Maihāroa *whānau* (family) under the *korowai* (chiefly cloak) of *Waitaha*, First Nations people of Aotearoa (New Zealand). Te Maihāroa was a prophet led his people on a peace march for justice called *Te-Heke-Te Ao Mārama in 1877* (The Migration to Enlightenment) to re-claim the 'Promised Land'. This work outlines the challenges of being displaced from ancestral homelands whilst maintaining the traditional spiritual and cultural values of *Waitaha*. It concludes by highlighting how the past can help transform our behaviour to a 'non-hurting' future. These indigenous spiritual teachings remain a critical signpost, not only for *mokopuna* (grandchildren) of tomorrow, but to demand urgent attention today, to find peace based alternatives to ensure the survival of humankind (Kim, 2011).

In ancient times, *Waitaha,* the oldest New Zealand *Māori* tribe set out from their Pacific homeland Te Patu-nui-o-Aio (also known as Hawaiki) to Aotearoa New Zealand, where *Māori* (indigenous peoples) have continued to live for over a millennium. Rākaihautū was the captain of *Te Waka Uruao* (canoe) and is one of the founding ancestors of *Waitaha*. He explored the South Island's interior lakes and our history reminds us of how he shaped the great mountains with his magical *ko* (digging stick), establishing occupational rights through *ahi kā* (ancestral fires), the ignition and maintenance of sacred fire lighting ceremonies. Rākaihautū departed from his ancient homeland Te-Patu-nui-o-Aio in the Pacific Ocean approximately 67 generations ago.

The tribal people of *Waitaha* are characterised by our peaceful ways of 'being' and rejection of warfare (although other *Māori* tribes did engage in tribal warfare). The fact that there are no known war artifacts for this period of original inhabitance stands testament to the peaceful existence and legacy of *Waitaha*. *Waitaha* has been described as *"wai"*—the *Māori* word for water, and "*taha*" as a vessel of container, and also as the "carriers of ancient *wairua*" (spirit) (Interview with author. Rangimarie Te Maihāroa. Ōmārama, April 4th, 2013). *Waitaha* are '*kaitiaki o Roko*', the 'caretakers of the god of peace: *Rokomaraeroa*. Te Maihāroa was the *ariki* (high chief) of *Waitaha*, following his ancient *whakapapa* (genealogy) links to the chiefs of our tribal history Rākaihatū and his son Rakihouia, founding ancestors of *Waitaha*.

A deeply spiritual man, Te Maihāroa was steeped in the ancient *Waitaha* teachings following his mothers' sacred *ariki* (high born) ancestry. Te Maihāroa was born towards the later part of the eighteenth century and raised in a small village called Te Waiateruati, near Arowhenua in South Canterbury. As an adult he practiced ancient *Māori tikaka* (*Māori* customs and protocols), specialist in adapting old *Māori* religion as a tool for reform in the face of European colonization. He was the last *tohuka* (specialist expert priest) in the South Island (Mikaere, 1988).

Te Maihāroa was an expert in two worlds. Knowledgeable as an expert in ancient *Māori tikaka*, he also possessed literacy skills through his acquisition of reading and writing in both *Māori* and English (biliteracy was an invaluable skill in the early 1800s). He possessed the gift of *matakite* (prophecy), which enabled him to predict the future. His visionary leadership of 'peace' attracted followers of the *Waitaha*, *Kāti Mamoe* and *Kāi Tahu* tribes. He was regarded as an icon of hope for *Māori*, who were battling to come to terms with massive land and cultural loss, as well as the dire prediction by *Pākehā*, that the *Māori* race would disappear forever; due to the ongoing loss of life from newly introduced diseases (Mikaere, 1988).

Similar losses were also experienced in North Island tribal areas such as the settlement of Parihaka in Taranaki, where the prophets Te Whiti-o-Rongomai and Tohu Kākahi lived, had lost one third of their people to illness (Riseborough, 1989). In stark contrast *Māori* viewed the flourishing *Pākehā* population as almost 'supernaturally' immune to the diseases and therefore rationalised that they (Māori) were being punished because they had relinquished their knowledge of *wāhi tapu* (sacred places) and traditional ways of life (Mikaere, 1988; Elsmore, 1999). Traditionally the *tohuka* (specialist priest) were responsible for the spiritual wellbeing of their people and keeping them safe from harm. One way to achieve this was the lift-

ing of *wāhi tapu* (sacred ground) where *tohuka* visited ancient sites to "lift" dangerous spells and ghosts. *Māori* believed that by lifting the *wāhi tapu* this would help prevent the spread of diseases (Elsmore, 1999).

Spiritual teachings

Historically the *Māori* worldview consisted of a universal spiritual understanding of *mauri* (spiritual life forces) organically interconnected. *Māori* believed that interactions with other people, objects or experiences could be life giving or life draining. Traditional *Māori* customs are based on two founding and complementary concepts: *tapu* (sacred, restricted) and *noa* (non-sacred, common). For *Māori* these two concepts categorise and separate the natural and supernatural world. For example, *tapu* can help to avoid hazardous contact, enforcing restrictions surrounding religious rites, sacred fire sites, burial caves or to protect natural resources. To transgress across these boundaries could result in serious illness or death (Ibid, 1999).

Te Maihāroa engaged regularly in ancient '*tapu*' lifting ceremonies to help remove restrictions, resulting in a 'normal' or cleansed state of *noa* (free from *tapu*). He viewed interactions with *Pākehā* as *tapu* and wanted to distance himself and his supporters from the pressures of colonisation. He espoused that *Māori* should maintain strong *whakapapa* bloodlines and live in isolation from *Pākehā* so that they would be protected from the terrible diseases that the early settlers bought with them. Despite his reluctance to interact with *Pākehā*, Te Maihāroa attracted public attention due to his spiritual authority and the miracles that he regularly performed (Mikaere, 1988). Witnessed by both *Māori* and *Pākehā*, these spiritual phenomenons were also made public, published in local newspapers and recorded by several historians, cementing his supernatural authority (Beattie Collection 1939-1945; Te Maiharoa, 1957).

As a prophet, the spiritual teachings of Te Maihāroa and his reinterpretation of ancient beliefs was imperative as a counter balance to the *Pākehā* God, which could be construed as to showering *Pākehā* with gifts of wealth, health and prosperity, whilst *Māori* were on the brink of survival as a race. He emerged as a new political hope for his people, based on their continued dissatisfaction over land issues and rejection of the newly imposed systems (Elsmore, 1999). The spiritual assurance of Te Maihāroa empowered *Māori* to further reject both *Pākehā* missionary interference and intermarriage with *Pākehā* as a means to maintain *tino rakatirataka* (absolute sovereignty).

Political

In 1840 the political relationships between *Māori* and representatives of the British Crown was formalized through the signing of *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* (the Treaty of Waitangi) in 1840. In 1848 the Crown imprinted their ownership rights on the South Island by persuading Southern *Māori* to sell over eight million hectares of their land for $ 2,000 (pounds), less than one farthing a hectare (Mikaere, 1988). This sale, known as the 'Kemp Deed' land purchase possessed a condition of the bargaining claim in which *Māori* reserves were to be set aside to enable *Māori* to access traditional food sources.

Within a few short years the spirit of the Treaty was broken. Te Maihāroa become a nationally known political figure advocating for the plight of Southern *Māori*: the two main issues that were impacting significantly on the lives of his people were the lack of land reserves set aside for *Māori,* and the encroachment of *Pākehā* farmers on *Māori* land. For example, the land reserves set aside for a whole village of *Māori* people often equated to the same amount of land owned by one *Pākehā* farmer, there were often barren wasteland, limiting the possibility to enjoy traditional hunting and fishing activities essential for cultural preservation (Beattie Collection, 1939-1945). *Pākehā* also adopted a "Western" perspective, regarding natural *Māori* land as non-developed wasteland and viewed it as their 'god given' right to 'work the land'.

Te Maihāroa advocated vehemently for *Māori* rights through frequent communication with the newly established New Zealand Government, including letters to the Queen as representative of the British Crown. From the 1860s onwards he reminded the Crown that *Māori* had been left with insufficient land and resources to sustain his people, their traditional way of life, and that they had become alienated from their own *whenua* (land). The determination to retain *Māori* land and his growing distrust of the Government led Te Maihāroa to believe that ultimately separation was required for cultural and moral regeneration of his people.

Juxtaposed to the *Pākehā* view of land ownership, Te Maihāroa maintained that *Papatūānuku* (Earth Mother) did not belong to anyone and that *Waitaha* were simply the spiritual kaitiaki (caretakers/ guardians) of the *whenua* (land). He rejected the sale of land and disapprovingly labeled the proceeds of such sales as receiving 'black penny' (Interview by author. Rangimarie Te Maihāroa. Ōmārama. April 4th 2013). The conversion to newly introduced land tenure rules, which were foreign to *Māori*, resulted in on-going confusion about the status of land owned by Pākeha (either as a

result of either land sales or confiscation), especially when large tracts of land remained uninhabited (King, 1996).

Although Te Maihāroa recognized that a large portion of *Te Waipounamu* had been sold by others to the Crown, as *Upoko Ariki* (Head Spiritual Leader) of *Waitaha* in the South Island he firmly believed that he still retained ancestral and personal title to all of the "land", including the "the hole in the middle of the South Island" and all other lands that make up the Southern Island (Written communication, Peter Ruka, Dunedin, December 15th, 2012). Despite the lack of goodwill and limited resources set aside for them by their Treaty counterparts, Te Maihāroa had a vision for a new future. His prophecy of journeying to the 'Promised Land' called him to lead 150 tribesmen and women, who gathered to his call to action, leaving from the village of Temuka in June 1877.

The vision that Te Maihāroa had for his people was to establish a new home in the interior hinterland of the South Island where they could conserve *Māori* values and be completely independent of *Pākehā* influence (King, 1996). He believed that they had agreed only to sell the land from the eastern coast to the base of the nearest mountains to the Government in the Keep Deed Purchase (Mikaere, 1988). This perspective was contradictory to the position of the Crown, who viewed the Kemp Deed as extending beyond the Southern Alps. Te Maihāroa firmly believed that *Māori* were the rightful owners of all of the land beyond the Eastern foothills of the Southern mountains, which still remained *Māori* land and that physical occupation would enforce moral ownership. The place that Te Maihāroa led his pilgrimage to was Te Ao Mārama, (the World of Light) in the centre of the South Island, known today as Ōmārama. Another name given to Ōmārama is Ōmāharama which means sacred thoughts (Interview by author. Rangimarie Te Maihāroa. Ōmārama. April 4th 2013).

Te-Heke-Te Ao Mārama (the Migration to Enlightenment)

The migration of the 150 *tūpuna* (ancestors) was called *Te-Heke Te Ao Mārama*, commonly known as '*Te Heke*' and was viewed with great interest and understanding by all *Māori* communities throughout *Aotearoa*, knowing and understanding the '*take*' (topic) of *ahi kā roa* (eternal sacred fires); and was also discussed in the Parliament of the day (Mikaere, 1988). *Te Heke* followed a vision Te Maihāroa had that he would lead his followers to their heartland, known as the 'Promised Land'; using the metaphor of Judaic Laws of returning to Zion the land of the ancient ancestors (Written com-

munication, Peter Ruka. Dunedin, December 15th 2013). The intention of Te Maihāroa was to relight the sacred fires of *Waitaha,* establishing ownership along the *Waitaki* Valley from the mouth of the great river to the foothills of great mountains of the Southern Alps.

They travelled under the veil of *tapu,* and were only allowed to eat when they had halted their daily journey and the *tapu* was lifted. *Te Maihāroa* often travelled ahead, to kill *taipo* (evil spirits) and to ensure the *wahi tapu* had been lifted to ensure a safe passage (Mikaere, 1988). Te Maihāroa was reported to have had great spiritual powers, which were demonstrated on numerous occasions. One of these momentous occasions was when *Te Heke* party was approaching the *Waitaki* Bridge, which was closed for an approaching train. Te Maihāroa recited *karakia* (prayer) and the gates at either end of the bridge opened for the party. Before all of the carts and people could get off the bridge, the train came from the south. Te Maihāroa continued reciting *karakia* (prayers) to protect his people, and the train stayed stationary although the wheels were still going around with steam continuing to come out of the locomotive's chimney. When all of the carts and people were off the bridge, Te Maihāroa completed his *karakia*, and the train continued on its journey, leaving both the tribal members, the train driver and passengers safe from possible injury. This event was witnessed by both *Māori* and *Pākehā* and reported in the local newspapers, subsequently creating interest and admiration in some sections of the community (Ibid, 1988).

Te Maihāroa firmly believed that the first line of mountains marked the limits of the land sold to the Government and beyond them remained *Māori* land. Local historian Herries Beattie recorded *Māori* as having a legitimate grievance (Beattie Collection, 1939-1945). But when *Te Heke* reached beyond the mountains to Ōmārama, the 'Promised Land' that they had envisioned as a home away from the tensions and bitterness, it had already been settled by some Europeans. As they journeyed into the interior they realized that the colonists had established themselves throughout the island. On identifying that these settlers were grazing the hinterland, *Māori* wondered why they were not receiving rentals for grazing rights on their property. *Māori* wrongly assumed that the Crown would protect and look after their interests as the indigenous people under the Treaty of Waitangi 1840.

Te Maihāroa and his people believed that the hinterland and interior lakes had had never been sold and that *Māori* had established ownership rights through the *whakapapa* of his people, deeds of their *tūpuna*, and continuous occupation through *ahi kā roa* over one thousand years. Despite these established traditional boundary markers and connections with the

whenua for a millennium, large parcels of the South Island were quickly sold off (often without *Māori* knowledge or consent), to settlers eager to grab a stake in the land. Te Maihāroa maintained that the land left outside of the sale should all be returned to *Māori* ownership. The efforts of Te Maihāroa to seek justice were largely ignored by the Crown who adopted the view that *Māori* held an illegitimate and unfounded claim (Mikaere, 1988).

Despite the disappointment of finding their envisioned 'Promised Land' had also become a home to many settlers, Te Maihāroa and his people established a new life for themselves beside the *Ahuriri* River (now part of Lake Benmore). They created a village of compact and comfortable housing, planting gardens and seeking employment opportunities on the neighboring sheep stations. *Māori* and *Pākehā* co-existed in relative harmony for over a year, until *Pākehā* started to complain to their local Member of Parliament about weapons being seen in the village. Despite *Māori* establishing a peaceful new life and finding work on nearby farms, the tangled ownership situation refused to dissipate (Mikaere, 1988).

The newly erected *Māori* village consisted of approximately 150 people and around one hundred dogs, kept for mustering stock and as pets (Beattie Collection, 1939-1945). The *Pākehā* farmers insisting that the *Māori* dogs were troubling their sheep and that their freehold land was being ploughed for crops, sent for the police. Te Maihāroa had previously nominated Horomona Pohio as Native Assessor in 1859 to liaise with the Crown over *Māori* land ownership. Two decades later, with ongoing conflict between *Māori* and *Pākehā,* Pohio went to Wellington in October 1878 to report that the land dispute at Ōmārama were incorrect and that no weapons were being brandished or sheep being killed. Pohio asserted *Māori* rights to the interior of the island and that the squatting settlers had no Crown grant to it (Mikaere, 1988). The Native Minister Mr. John Sheenan firmly rejected the claim for the return of the interior land to *Māori,* stating that it was an illegitimate claim. *Māori* had little or no experienced in fighting political battles in a cultural domain that was completely foreign to them (Elsmore, 1999).

The news of the dispute now engaged national attention, largely captured in newspapers and political domains, both spaces were predominately controlled and dominated by *Pākehā*. A buildup of arms and military training by *Pākehā* was recorded in the local *Ōamaru Mail* newspaper (1879) caught the attention of Jim Rickus, a man of mixed *Māori* and *Pākehā* descent who had *whānau* in the *Māori* village at Ōmārama (Mikaere, 1988). Rickus suspected that if the militia were attempting to take the *Māori* village by surprise, there may be bloodshed, so he made his way to Waimate by train and then rode

through the night on horseback to warn Te Maihāroa of the impending police arrival (a journey of 160 kilometers). Rickus warned the people to waste no time and to leave with speed to save their lives (Ibid. 111-115.)

Around the same time, government officials became aware of a similar situation building at Parihaka, in the North Island, where tribal leaders Te Whiti-o-Rongomai and Tohu Kākahi had instructed their people to plough the fields to assert ownership and as a peaceful protest against illegally confiscated ancestral lands (Binney, 1997; Elsmore, 1999; Riseborough, 1989). One official view showing the concurrence was reported as follows:

> In August 1879 some natives in the north island trespassed on and ploughed some land in the North Island, proceedings were taken against them and they were evicted and I was instructed to deal similarly with those at *Omarama*, a force of forty constables from Canterbury and twenty from Otago in addition to those of my own district" (Beattie Collection, 1939-1945, E-21:17).

Despite assurances by Pohio, the Native Minister Mr. John Sheenan and Hori Kerei Taiaroa, Southern *Māori* M.P. visited the village. Sheenan refused to discuss the *Māori* claim and delivered them an ultimatum to vacate the land by the end of the year. On the morning of the 11th of August 1879, Inspector Thompson ordered the armed militia to deliver the order to the *Māori* village that they were trespassing and were subsequently to be evicted. The village people were huddled inside their community hall. Although one or two of the tribesmen had a gun to defend themselves if they were attacked, the people were given clear instructions by Te Maihāroa to preserve peace at all cost (Mikaere, 1988; Beattie Collection, 1939-1945).

The Crown, eager to stamp their authority over Te Maihāroa and his people, ordered them to leave without resistance or else suffer the consequences of prison or an armed confrontation. Outside of the hall, the elders tried to use persuasion instead of force, stating that they had never sold or parted possession with the land. Because Te Maihāroa was ill, Thompson spoke with Rawiri Te Maire and told them that they would be allowed two days to prepare for departure. Armed troopers threatened Te Mairie, a close friend and relative of the leader, who subsequently gave himself over for arrest to ensure that peace was maintained. Realizing that the situation was on the brink of fighting, Te Maihāroa sent out another message to his people:

> *Kāore i au pera ki whakaheke toto (I do not wish to shed blood)*
> (Beattie Collection, 1939-1945, E-21:11).

Reluctantly, Te Maihāroa instructed his people to leave their home rather than shed blood. He had already received a further vision of his people returning to live at a place called Korotuaheka, an ancient village (near the mouth of the *Waitaki* River). The next day several *Māori* asked for reprieve as Te Maihāroa was too ill to travel, but this request was declined and the constables and Inspector Thompson returned the following day to ensure that the people would leave. As they departed, the Crown destroyed their houses and crops, using the scorched earth tactic. There were about 150 people, 50 men and the remainder being women and children. The *whānau* were accompanied by 30 dray, 100 horses and around 100 dogs (Mikaere, 1988). The weather was bitterly cold, being the middle of winter, with snow was falling as they left their 'Promised Land'. This was land that, according to their custom had been gifted to them from the *Atua* (Gods), handed down by the ancient ancestors to *Waitaha*, direct to *Upoko Ariki* Te Maihāroa, Priest and Prophet of *Waitaha* (Interview by author. Rangimarie Te Maihāroa. Ōmārama. April 4th 2013; Written communication. Peter Ruka. Dunedin. December 15th 2012).

The journey down to the mouth of the *Waitaki* River was slow, largely because they had to hunt and gather food as they travelled. This Crown exercise was more than confiscation over a piece of land: it was an extinguishment of their *tino rakatirataka* (absolute sovereignty). A local Waimate bookseller and historian, Herries Beatties, recorded the following account;

> The Government sent down one McKay, to tell them to remain at Omarama, but that this emissary arrived too late… He asked them to return, but they knew that they would be returning to a desolate and ravaged heritage, for before they were out of sight of the place, the troopers had burnt or destroyed every building (Beattie Collection, 1939-1945, E-21:14).

Te Maihāroa and his people reached the south side of the *Waitaki* River in late August 1879, where they again re-established a village with a hall, church, school and burial ground. At the time there was the view that "if we had returned we would have been there yet" (Beattie Collection, 1939-1945, E-21:11) but the *mauri* (life essence) of the *whenua* had been scorched by the torches of the colonizers. Te Maihāroa passed away in 1886 and the settlement of Korotuaheka diminished in numbers, with the land eventually being farmed by a *Pākehā* farmer. Descendants of Te Maihāroa still live in Ōmārama and at Glenavy, near the *Waitaki* River, where they have been dedicated to keeping the lore and law of their ancestor alive and well, helping

to heal the breaches between new tribal groups and people from European nations who have since come into the South Island (Written communication. Peter Ruka. Dunedin. December 15th 2013).

Retracing Te Heke

In December 2013, the Te Maihāroa *whānau* and friends along with descendants of the 150 original trekkers re-traced the footsteps of *Poua* (Grandfather) Te Maihāroa, along much of the route that he had led them all, 135 years ago. The re-tracing of the sacred footsteps of our *Poua* Te Maihāroa (1800-1886) to celebrate 135 years since he led his people on a migration for peace from Temuka to Ōmārama in 1877. Te Maihāroa (1879), remains our *Ariki* leader (highborn), prophet of our people of *Waitaha*, our ancient tribal groupings from our past lands and oceans. *Tuku tōu kākau, tōu wairua, tou ihi mauri, kia rere pure rehua ai, mai te moana ki kā mauka tu tonu*, release the heart, the wairua, the essence of life, flying like a butterfly, from the sea to the mountains again (Written communication. Peter Ruka. Dunedin. December 15th 2013). *Te Heke Ōmāramataka* 2013 rekindled '*ahi kā'*, re-igniting the traditional ancestral fires that Te Maihāroa maintained during *Te Heke* 1877, one hundred and thirty five years ago.

The retracing of Te Heke in 2013 ensured that the peaceful spiritual traditions of Poua Te Maihāroa and *Waitaha* First Nations Peoples' continue to be cultural, spiritual and ethical markers for our whānau. For over a century in *Aotearoa, Waitaha* have held tightly to the vision of peace, welcoming into their own *whānau Māori* from northern tribes who fled south for safety. *Waitaha* are more than peaceful people living peacefully with the skills to be peacekeepers. *Waitaha* are peace-livers: that is, the essence of *Waitaha* identity is steeped in peace. Living and maintaining this *kaupapa* (theme) under the *korowai* of peace is the central *pou* (pillar) of the *Waitaha* Nation.

This message is a living message, one of peace and harmony. Peace and harmony occur when our '*wai*' (water) or spirit is calm. Nonviolence is a central message that is spoken of and demonstrated by our elders and through the memories of our ancestors, who remind us to engage fully in life to promote a peaceful way of living. The ability to remain calm within oneself, despite the ongoing disruptions and distractions of life, is the grace of peace. The ability to transform our lives within *whānau*, and *iwi* (tribes) is within our grasp. To transform our lives and have a positive impact on the wider world can be termed 'tino *rakatirataka* (absolute sovereignty), reminding ourselves that we hold the knowledge and the wisdom to make the

changes that are required of us. We can no longer bury our head in the sand and expect the challenges to just go away, for our very survival as humans depends on our actions today, tomorrow and the near future.

Traditions of peace often start at the grassroots level where peace is demonstrated daily and recognized locally through inter-relationships with everyday life (Tam Wai Lun, 2000). World peace has become the current 'buzz word', often seeming too idealistic, unreachable and unachievable (Kim, 2011). The utopian dream can be realized when we make changes at a *whānau* and *iwi* level (family and relatives, micro and meso level), which will permeate the collective. Below are some peace-making suggestions which synthesis *Waitaha* beliefs with other peaceful traditions about taking responsibility for making this world better (Kim, 2011).

My home, my sanctuary: universally we know when things are going well or when there is chaos being created either by us, through our actions or around us. Often as adults trying to do the best for our children, it is easy to overlook the big picture. What kind of home are we providing them with? Are they provided with enough food, warmth, shelter and love to help them to flourish? What role models do we have around our families to support our wellbeing? Who can we go to for spiritual, cultural and economic guidance? What changes do we need to make in our own lives to improve the quality of relationships within our home? Kinship connectedness diminishes where there is a lack of intimacy. A peaceful home-life that affirms strong values and beliefs, where people are intricately connected, grows strong stable young people as our future generation.

My community, my heartbeat: too often the modern world pulls us away from what really matters, the people that we live with and live for. Our communities are crying out for us to do things differently, to work together more harmoniously for the greater good. Instead of focusing on all of the negative things that are happening around us, we can spend our time and energy involved in a range of peace-building action in the pursuit of peace. This can encompass a range of activities from exercising political participation by voting in democratic elections, regional and nationally. Communities can be mobilized by sharing our voices, views and perspectives. Become involved in community building activities or developing unique localized peace-building efforts from the grassroots to include citizens in a bottom-up peace process (Richmond, 2001).

The power of collective vision and prayer: there is beauty and value in our rights to freedom of worship to each *Atua* / Higher Being, for each *karakia* is a mortal surrendering for help and guidance. As the peace activist

Marianne Williams once stated "it is our light, not our darkness that most frightens us" (Williams, 1993: 190). If we can now think of an object, draw it on a computer and have a computer programme manifest our thought into an actual object, are we not truly capable of creating a "heaven on earth?" Why would we want to create a computer-generated machine gun, which can materialize in front of us? Is there not a higher calling for us as humans to pray for and create a world that can nourish our bodies and soul? Our own faiths can remain distinct, and yet as a collective, if we have a 'global one nation' view, our own faith continues to be a powerful resource for global peacemaking (Valentine, 2000).

Develop common approaches: identify the synergies between people, groups of people, look for commonalities. When we are able to view perspectives and experiences through 'another lens' this develops tolerance and builds rapport and empathy between people / groups. There are advantages in shared 'viewpoints' on the health and wellbeing of all people, which leads to integrated strategies spread across diverse communities (Valentine, 2000). The 'potential' needs a long-term profile and commitment. Change does not happen overnight, but it can happen. These requires an 'unpacking' of what changes may need to be developed within your community, who are the people that will drive this *kaupapa*, who are the people that you want to recruit as allies to support you. In the past, academic research has concentrated on the violence produced (Richmond, 2001). This approach needs to be rejected, stressing the focus and energy on what to do, not what not to do.

Build culture of inclusiveness: our people descend from a culture of tolerance and acceptance. We have in the past and continue to experience cultural differences today, and yet we are able to withstand and embrace such differences, honoring the richness and diversity that comes with such challenges. We are not too dissimilar to other indigenous people who have become displaced through colonization. But we are sustained as a people by coming together and sharing our language, hers and histories, identity and culture. These shared experiences help strengthen our children, so that they know who they are and where they come from, for it is only when you know yourself that you can know 'others'. Shared experiences help to build and maintain positive relationships with others. Agreeing to and honoring 'Memorandum of Understandings' or formal 'Relationship Agreements' can further enhance these relationships. Such symbols of goodwill and friendship can be handed down to future generations as a foundation for healthy, inclusive and respectful relationships (Valentine, 2000).

Right of Return: The right of indigenous people to return to their ancestral lands from which they were displaced is an on-going debate (Murphy, 2010-2012). It is recognized that indigenous people are strengthen by returning to live in peace within their homelands (Ibid, 2010-2012). The rights of indigenous peoples' to claim their rights as *tino rakatirataka* is intricately tied within their rights of land reclamation. In Aotearoa, we are progressing towards shared understandings between the Crown and *Māori* with regards to *Māori* being alienated and displaced from ancestral lands through the Treaty of Waitangi Settlement negotiations and claims. For us as a whānau, small steps were made and acknowledged 135 years after Te Heke 1877 with an apology from a local farmer and the mayor of Ōmārama. It can at times be an uncomfortable exercise for both parties, but a necessary and legitimate part of re-writing injustices of the past. Indigenous people have a birthright to take advantage of conventional and customary international laws to support their struggle for autonomy and to look towards the United Nations for international leadership on this issue (The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948, Article 13 (2) & Article 17).

There is a well-known *Māori whakatuakī* (proverb), which guides our thoughts "looking backwards into the future". Messages from our *Tūpuna* are maps for finding ourselves, left for us in our past to guide us in our present and future. Our belief as *Waitaha* First Nation People is that our *Poua* Te Maihāroa left us with a very clear message as to how he expects us to live under the *korowai o Waitaha* (the chiefly cloak of the *Waitaha* Nation): *kāore i au pera ki whakaheke toto* (I do not wish to shed blood). It is more than a dream; it is a philosophy that Te Maihāroa (1879) and his people, my *tīpuna*, lived by. This clear message, if adopted by our global citizens, has the capacity to change the world and embrace a new way of 'thinking' and 'being'. This is not a difficult cloak to bear, for following the 'peace *kaupapa*' (theme of peace) is contained within. This is not to say that we do not get upset and feel emotions running through us that we would want to soothe and rest. The difference is realizing that there is an alternative view, choice of thinking and doing things, ways of being.

We may be viewed as dispossessed people who have suffered at the hands of colonialists. But we view ourselves as active participants shaping our experiences with the 'other' to be harmonious and beneficial to both Treaty partners. We may have been temporarily marginalized, but do not consider ourselves to be oppressed. We continue to exercise our rights to walk our ancestral lands, keeping the *ahi kā roa* burning. We continue to offer ancient *karakia* asking for healing of our land and waters. Our elders

continue to take their chosen mokopuna (grandchildren) into the mountains to teach them the old ways. We dare to dream of a future that benefits all of our children, no matter what colour of the rainbow we/ they are. We dream of a future where individuals and communities live under the *korowai* (chiefly cloak) of the message gifted to us by Te Maihāroa (1879):

Kāore i au pera ki whakaheke toto (I do not wish to shed blood).

References

Binney, Judith (1995). *Redemption Songs: The Life of Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki*. Auckland: Auckland University Press and Bridget Williams Books.

Beattie, Herries (1939-1945). The Heke to Omarama 1878: A Celebrated Migration which nearly led to fighting. *Beatties Collection* (1939-1945) E-21: 1-19.

Elsmore, Bronwyn (1999). *Mana from heaven: a century of Māori prophets in New Zealand*. Reed.

Kim, Min-Sun (2012). "World peace through intercultural research: From a research culture of war to a culture of peace". *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 36: 3-13.

King, Elisabeth and Matthews, Robert O (2013). "A new agenda for peace: 20 years later". *International Journal*. 2012: 275.

King, Michael (1996) *Maori: a Photographic and Social History*. Reed. Hong Kong

Mikaere, Buddy (1988). *Te Maiharoa and the Promised Land.* Auckland: Heinemann.

Murphy, Tammy (2010-2012). "'Courses and Recourses' Exploring Indigenous Peoples' Land Reclamation in Search of Fresh Solutions for Israelis and Palestinians." *Journal for the Study of Peace and Conflict,* 54-69.

Riseborough, Hazel (1989). *Days of Darkness: The Government and Parihaka Taranaki 1878-1884*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.

Richmond, Oliver P. (2001-2013). "A genealogy of peacemaking: the creation and re-creation of order." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 26.3: 317.

Williamson, Marianne (1992). *Return to Love: Reflections on the Principles of A Course in Miracles*. New York: HarperCollins.

Valentine, Lonnie (2000). "Subverting Hatred: The Challenge of Nonviolence in Religious Traditions." *Buddhist-Christian Studies*, 292.

Chapter Six

Buddhism and Nonkilling

Exploring a Buddhist philosophy of human mind for the promotion of the principle of nonkilling and peaceful world

Juichiro Tanabe
Kumamoto University

Introduction

Since its beginning, the principle of nonkilling and nonviolence has been one of the foundational pillars of Buddhism. This paper examines how Buddhism can contribute to promoting the principle of nonkilling and peaceful relationships in contemporary world.

As widely acknowledged, Buddhism, since the Buddha, Gautama, has developed a comprehensive analysis of mind both as a root cause of human suffering including killing and violence and as a key to addressing it. Stated otherwise, on Buddhist view, the dynamics of killing and violence and that of nonkilling and culture of peace are closely connected to our own mind-states. So this chapter investigates how the Buddhist analysis of mind enables us to broaden our understanding of psychological dynamics of the rise of killing and its overcoming.

To this end, four sections form the argument. First section argues killing has mainly two dimensions, that is, direct killing and indirect killing. Embracing Johan Galtung's three types of violence—direct violence, structural violence, and cultural violence—this part claims that people can lose their lives in direct and indirect manners. Second section expounds the basic features of Buddhism. Here, the Four Noble Truth doctrine, which is the foundation for all Buddhist schools, will be examined. Following that, third section delves into a Buddhist view of the dynamics of human mind and killing. The upshot of this analysis is the proposition of the concept of the conditioned mind and its relation to the dynamics of killing. Fourth section explores how the principle of nonkilling and peaceful and harmonious world can be developed. Here we will examine how the conditioned mind that drives us toward killing or violence can be addressed. The thrusts of the analysis are the proposition of the contemplative mind as one of the practical methods to overcome killing and the promotion of the two levels of dialogue to develop harmonious human relationship.

Methodological considerations

Buddhism is categorized into three major schools—Theravada, Mahayana, and Vajrayana. Each of these schools further has sub-schools that have respectively developed distinct teachings and traditions or customs along with the shared objective, that is, uprooting suffering. It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine all of those schools in detail and to take up all their teachings to analyze their contributions to the development of the dynamics of killing and promotion of the principle of nonkilling and peaceful world.

Therefore, the paper employs the following texts and teachings to develop the research: Dhamapada,[1] Surangama-Sutra,[2] Nagarjuna[3]'s Seventy Stanzas on Emptiness, Catustava or Four Hymns to Absolute Reality, Asvagosha's[4] Awakening of Faith, and Lankavatara Sutra.[5] However, it must be also emphatically noticed that although it embraces those texts and teachings to unfold the argument on killing and explore the principle of nonkilling and promote culture of peace, what is examined in this chapter is merely one of the possible examples of Buddhist approaches to killing and nonkilling as other texts and teachings would lead us to advance distinct understandings of the dynamics of killing and the principle of nonkilling.

---

[1] The Dhammapada is a collection of Buddha's sayings. Fronsdal's (2005) work presents a detailed analysis of the Dhammapada.

[2] Surangama Sutra is a Mahayana Buddhist sutra and has been influential and important especially to Zen Buddhism. Regarding the details, see Luk (2001).

[3] Nagarjuna is one of the most important Buddhist philosophers, who lived between the second and third century. Chang (1971) states Nagarjuna is a founder and exponent of Madhyamaka philosophy that centers on sunyata (emptiness) doctrine to achieve liberation from suffering. Regarding the details of Nagarjuna's works and Madhyamaka philosophy, Murti's (1955) study would be helpful.

[4] Asvagosha is the philosopher of Buddhism. Suzuki (2001) assesses Asvagosha is the first expounder of the Mahayana Buddhism and one of the deepest thinkers among the Buddhist patriarchs who engaged in a thorough analysis of human mind both as the root cause of suffering and as the source to overcome it.

[5] Suzuki (2003) states Lankavatara Sutra is one of the main texts of Mahayana Buddhism and central to Zen school that is one of the important wings of Buddhism. He also argues that the teachings presented in the text examine the nature or quality of mind, self-realization and the process for its attainment to achieve liberation from suffering. Put differently, Lankavatara Sutra engages in critical and constructive analysis of human mind that seeks to break through an erroneous understanding of mind and unveil its true nature so that we can achieve liberation from suffering and inner peace.

Meanings of killing in this chapter

This chapter understands killing on two dimensions—direct killing and indirect killing. In line with Galtung's three types of violence, direct killing can be seen as direct violence while the latter can be considered as structural violence and cultural violence. Direct violence literally means hurting somebody directly: war, deadly armed conflict, mass killing, massacre, etc.

Structural violence can be defined as "the cause of the disparity between the potential and actual, between what could have been and what is" (Galtung, 1969: 168). The potential level of realization is what is possible with a given level of insight and resources (Ibid). Therefore, if insight and resources are dominated by a group or class or used for other objectives, the actual level fails to below the potential level and violence is present in the system (Ibid). In both direct violence and structural violence, individuals can be killed or hurt, but while the former is caused by specific individual actors or groups of people, in the latter case the violence is built into unequal power relations in the social structure, which results in uneven life opportunities (Lawler, 1995). Further cultural violence is characterized as any kind of symbols such as religious dogma, ideology, language, art, science, law, media, education and so on that provides self-serving justification for direct and structural violence (Galtung, 1996).

Reality as a manifestation of human mind

Though two levels of killing—direct killing and indirect killing—have been discussed, what must be known before delving into the dynamics of killing is that at the core of Buddhist teaching lies human mind. For instance, the Dhammapada states, "All experience is preceded by mind, led by mind, made by mind" (Fronsdal, 2005: 1). The Surangama Sutra also states, "The Tathagata has always said that all phenomena are manifestations of mind and that all causes and effects including (all things from) the world to its dust, take shape because of the mind" (Luk, 2001: 16).

These statements do not mean there are no objects outside our minds. Rather, they signify that "the qualities of the things come into existence after the mind, are dependent upon mind and are made up of mind" (Lai, 1977: 66). Stated otherwise, the state of the world around us, which believe exists external to us, is actually a reflection of the condition of our mind (Ramanan, 1978). The content of reality is invariably mediated by the knowing mind and its perceptual and conceptual apparatus (Burton, 2001). So critically examining the nature of one's mind or the principles of epis-

temic function is a central theme of Buddhism: knowing, first of all, reality as a construct of the mind-base or mind-structure, critically reflecting how mind becomes the root cause of suffering including killing and exploring how it can be addressed constitute the core of Buddhism (Matsuo, 1981). And the Four Noble Truths doctrine assumes the central role in analyzing and addressing human suffering in line with the dynamics of human mind.

Analysis of the Four Noble Truths doctrine

The Four Noble Truths doctrine is the Buddha's first and most essential teaching (Geshe Tashi, 2005) and the core doctrinal framework of every school of Buddhism (Yun, 2002). The Four Noble Truths are "truths of pain, origin of pain, suppression of pain and the way to suppress pain" (Pereira and Tiso, 1988: 172).

The first noble truth states that on a Buddhist view, our life is basically filled with suffering and trouble (Rahula, 1974). However, this statement does not refer to a pessimistic or a nihilistic view of reality. Rather, recognizing our reality being full of suffering leads us to a deeper and more profound question of "What is the root cause of suffering facing us?" and this is the core of the second noble truth.

The second noble truth proposes the cause of suffering (Rubin, 2003). Suffering derives from craving, that is, a mental state that leads to attachment characterized as the tendency of mind to cling to certain specific objects or views (Burton, 2002). Besides craving, ignorance is understood as a fundamental cause of suffering (Cho, 2002). Ignorance is our basic misapprehension of the nature of reality (Geshe Tashi, 2005) or lack of self-awareness and correct knowledge of reality (Cho, 2002). The basic feature of ignorance is that we tend to see things including human beings as having permanent, unchanging, or fixed nature and cling to anything that reinforces our concept of permanence, pushing away or denying that threatens it (Geshe Tashi, 2005). Further, craving and ignorance give rise to three mental defilements: greed, anger, and delusion (Olendzki, 2003). Thus, human mind itself is the locus wherein the gap between reality and the human hermeneutical reality represented in conceptual or linguistic rendering accompanied by desire takes place, which results in suffering (Park, 2008).

The third truth claims that by knowing the root cause of suffering, human beings will be inspired and empowered to overcome its cause (Yun, 2002). Suffering is neither everlasting nor beyond human reach; rather, since it derives from our own craving and ignorance, it can be overcome if

they are understood and coped with properly. As both the causes of suffering—ignorance and craving—and liberation from suffering are two different states but are created by our minds (Park, 2008), the solution is within us.

The fourth truth provides the way to address suffering and achieve mental well-being and serenity, which is generally called the noble eightfold path (Rubin, 2003). It is: right view, right thought, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, and right concentration (Rahula, 1974). The gist of the fourth truth is that we need to resolve our suffering from three angles—ethical conduct (right speech, right action, right livelihood, and right effort), mental discipline (right mindfulness and right concentration), and wisdom (right view and right thought). When wisdom—an insight into how things and events exist, that is, impermanence, interdependence, and empty nature or lack of fixed or unchanging nature, mental discipline—the ability to focus our minds on whatever object, view, standpoint we choose or build and keep that concentration clearly and with intensity for an expanded duration, which heightens the level of awareness of our own internal dynamics, and ethical conduct—practicing a moral life with compassion that empowers us to take into accounts others' feelings, perspectives, rights, and well-being as well as our own are well integrated together (Geshe Tashi, 2005), we can overcome suffering and construct a positive and harmonious relationship.

Dynamics of human mind and killing

Proposition of the conditioned mind and dynamics of killing

The implication of the analysis of the Four Noble Truths doctrine would be that the main cause of suffering or more generally problems facing us is internal (Geshe Tashi, 2008). In other words, killing or more broadly violence of any kind begins with our own mind or our thinking (Park, 2008). Therefore, this section delves into the dynamics of human mind and killing.

Firstly, the concept of 'the conditioned mind' is proposed. The conditioned mind is the mind framed by "the entire corpus of ideas, values and customs that come to be presupposed or regarded as truth by the common sense of a community" (Wright, 1986: 21). From time immemorial, human beings have developed conceptual thought as the main tool to make sense of the world of experiences in abstraction and to communicate them with fellow human beings (Ichimura, 1997). As social beings, our mind is shaped by the beliefs and forms of truth that are conventionally accepted as valid and effective in the practical matters of social or cultural life-world (Wright,

1986). It is the mind framed by socially embedded assumptions, worldviews, and habitual ways of interpretation that we hold in response to a given life-world (Gunnlaugson, 2007).

Through socially or culturally embedded habits of mind, we project certain pattern of conceptual categories upon reality and make experience conform to our systems of thought (McEvilley, 1982). Any kind of collective circumstance molds our minds to conform to certain norms and determines the appropriateness or acceptability of a given state of awareness or communication in the social or cultural settings (Goleman, 1993). By getting our minds socially conditioned, we build and accept frames of reference—certain patterns of cultural values, political orientations, and ideologies, religious doctrine, moral-ethical norms, and so on—to construct conceptually framed reality to lead a meaningful life (Mezirow, 2003). As collective beings, it is inevitable our minds become conditioned by certain patterns of conceptual thought. However, on a Buddhist view, the conditioned mind can turn into a root cause of killing.

The root cause of violence lies in our propensity to absolutize any particular frame of reference as absolute (Gomez, 1976). Once we cling to certain conceptual or discursive thoughts socially or culturally conditioning us as universal, it leads us to fixate the real—objects, persons, groups of people, events and so on—with some supposedly fixed attributes or qualities (Chang, 1971). Formations of sedimented and habitual ways of seeing the real with fixed perspectives on what and how things are and are not bring about restricted patterns of awareness and limit our intentional range and capacity for meaning-making commitments (Hershock, 2006).

The absolutization of our conditioned state of mind with fixed view of reality is connected to our eagerness for the establishment of sense of security and stable identity. Loy explains security refers to "the conditions where we can live without care, where our life is not preoccupied with worrying about our life" (2002: 8) and that involves stabilizing ourselves by fixating the real with putatively immutable attributes: in our anxiety and quest for reassurance and security, we reify situations and things and stick to and manipulate those solidified conditions (Mipham, 2002). Put differently, the fragility of constructed views and identification is to be seen as a threat to security and so, at first glance, establishing fixed perspectives on reality and projecting supposedly immutable or permanent attributes upon objects and entities including human beings achieve stable sense of identity and security.

However, once we construct our world with fixed attributes and keep strong hold of those qualities as absolute or complete, we come to have greed, anger, or obsession over them (Suzuki, 1999). Especially, when ac-

tual conditions in the real world do not accord with our projected views, perspectives, and with our intentions, that causes anger, hatred, or bewilderment (Murti, 1955). Although those feelings are our responsibility, we tend to blame others or those external objects upon which we project fixed views or attributes (Geshe Tashi, 2005).

Further, when we build some particular thoughts or standpoints and claim completeness for the perspectives we have established, that causes us to be dogmatic, exclusive or other views or thoughts (Ramanan, 1978). As fixed idea of identity becomes strong and extreme, it tends to be imagined to be absolute and exclusive of other identities or views of identity and drive us toward extreme behaviors against those with distinct attributes of identity (Der-lan, 2006). The extreme attachment to our own views can elapse into polarity or negation of other views, values, and ultimately of people who are different from us. Once the views or perspectives socially or culturally conditioning us has come to be clung to as complete, we are prone to feel threat, fear, anger or hatred to those with distinct frames of reference, which can provide us with self-serving justification for violence of any kind.

What should be mentioned further is the basic mode of thinking in social or cultural conditioned state. Though becoming conditioned by social or cultural conceptual thought is natural and essential to us, as Wade insightfully argues, it is fundamentally of dualistic nature of thought (right/wrong, good/bad, black/white, to name a few) and divides the world into 'in-group' and 'out-group' (1996). Further those in dualistic thought are informed by the principle of the excluded middle (Fenner, 1994) or 'either-or' logical stance (Nagatomo, 2000). This logical stance in nature prioritizes one over the other by enhancing dichotomous relationship between in-group and out-group, whereby an imbalanced attitude invested by extreme in-group self-interest and desire is favored and promoted (Ibid). Consequently, the subject, relying on the strong in-group consciousness, becomes the generative factor for creating the discriminatory and oppositional relationship (Ibid).

Once we see the other as something disconnected from us, it becomes easier to propagate violence upon the other outside the boundary (Hart et al, 2000). In dualistic logical and epistemological structure, we are inclined to project negative qualities upon the outside and see them objectively belonging to them (Wilber, 1993), which promotes self-righteousness to take discriminatory attitude and commit violence of any kind to them. Further, the mind in dualistic state "swings from extreme to extreme: in its swinging to extremes, it clings to dead-ends" (Ramanan, 1978), whereby the values, ideas of one's

group are not viewed as one of many alternatives, but the only right ones: other possibilities are dimly conceived or denied as wrong (Wade, 1996).

The upshot of a Buddhist view of dynamics on killing is not the rejection of the social or cultural conditionedness or conceptual thought or frame of reference conditioning us. Rather, the main target to be critiqued is our tendency to become enmeshed in a specific conceptual position or particular frame of reference conditioning us as absolute or complete (Muller, 1998). Social or cultural conditionedness through the establishment of certain conceptual thought or system of thought, though essential to our lives, in its dualistic nature, can cause us exaggerate differences between peoples, create supposedly firm boundaries between 'in-group' and 'out-group' and reify those into fixed and independent entities segregating from one another by impudedly intrinsic and insurmountable differences (Waldron, 2003), which leads us to commit violence and impedes us from constructing a harmonious and constructive human relationship.

Addressing the dynamics of killing and exploring a peaceful world

A Buddhist dialectical contemplation

On a Buddhist view, the propensity of our minds to become conditioned by socially or culturally constructed frame of reference or conceptual thought and to cling to it as absolute or complete, which is accompanied by dualistic, either-or thinking, becomes the root cause of killing or violence, the methods to break the attachment based on dichotomous logical and epistemological framework need to be sought. And dialectical contemplation on an insight into conceptual thought, which has been developed in Buddhism, is to be seen as one of the practical methods.

The core of a Buddhist dialectical contemplation is the realization of the inherent interdependent nature of conceptual thought of any kind conditioning us. The inherent contradictory and interdependent nature of conceptual thought or symbolic knowledge is expounded by Buddhist masters. For instance, Nagarjuna, in his Seventy Stanzas on Emptiness, states, "Without one there cannot be many and without many it is not possible to refer to one. Therefore, one and many arise dependently and such phenomena do not have sign of inherent existence" (Komito, 1987: 80). He also states in the Catustava, or Four Hymns to Absolute Reality, "If there is existence, then is non-existence; if there is something long, similarly (there is) something short; and if there is non-existence, (there is) existence; there both (existence and non-existence) are not existent (Tola and Dragonetti, 1995: 128). He also states,

"Unity and multiplicity and past and future,etc., defilement and purification, correct and false—how can they exist per se?" (Ibid).

These statements demonstrate that "no concepts are immune from the dynamics process of interdependence in the sense that they refer to an absolute stratum of reality presupposed by all other concepts" (Waldo, 1975: 288). Put differently, "all views, when analyzed, imply their own negation, which means that they are logically dependent on opposing views that contradict them" (Kakol, 2002: 212). Any concept or viewpoint, while claiming its own absolute or complete validity, inherently possesses a contradictory nature and establish itself as the absolute or ultimate truth.

Further, the central approach of the Buddhist dialectical contemplation to realize and experience the ultimate unreality of any form of conceptual thought-construction is to expose all views to "bi-negation" (Ibid). Views are negated by the function of "reductio ad absurdum" and then the opposing viewpoints or standpoints that have arisen by the negation are also nullified in the same manner (Ibid). This bi-negation approach implies the fundamental contradiction or inconsistency of any form of conceptual thought or symbolic knowledge socially or culturally conditioning us: while one concept or frame of reference needs the other that opposes it, the latter needs the former to make sense. However, the former itself needs the latter, and eventually infinite regress continues without end, which leads us to experience the ultimate unreality to absolutize any form of conceptual thought or frame of reference conditioning us as the independent and complete truth.

Some might understand Buddhist dialectical contemplation aims to abandon or cease thinking or conditioned state. However, it is explicitly denied. For example, Asvagosha's Awakening of Faith states, "We understand by the annihilation (of mind), not that of the mind itself, but its modes (only)" (Suzuki, 2001: 83). The Lankavatara-Sutra claims, "The goal of tranquilization (of mind) is to be reached not by suppressing all mind activity but getting rid of discrimination and attachments" (Suzuki, 2003: 73). These show that Buddhist contemplative dialectic seeks to achieve mind or mind-state that does not adhere to a certain habit or pattern of thought as the absolute truth or knowledge (Muller, 1998). The ultimate purpose is to make our own minds free from attachment to any form of thought even when we are engaged in it (Loy, 1985). Transcendence of an attachment to any particular view or pattern of thought while perceiving its practical value in certain situation empowers our conceptualizing faculty to function well or even better than before as it no longer has to operate in a rigid, constricted and clinging mode in approaching our reality including addressing killing (Muller, 1998).

Based on dialectical contemplation, one of the core elements to overcome killing or violence is the realization of the essential dependent-originated nature of any conceptual or linguistic framework: any form of symbolic knowledge or conceptual thought that shapes dichotomous human relations cannot be seen as existing outside the purview of interdependency (Ibid). It does not mean total erasure of difference or collapse of all distinctions into an all-frozen sameness, but advocates a reformulation of dualistic thinking. Realization of interdependent nature of symbolic knowledge or conceptual thought-construction that builds dichotomy or boundary empowers us to transcend 'either-or' thought. What needs to be known is that dualistic 'either-or' thinking, though important and useful in some circumstances, is "only one product of the total functioning of the mind" (Tart, 2000: 28). The awakening to the inherent interdependent and interpenetrating nature of symbolic knowledge enables us to effect a perspectival shift from the dualistic stance to nondualistic stance (Nagatomo, 2000), wherein prima facie opposing or antithetical views are not seen as fixed pair of opposites, but as inter-relational constructs. Going beyond dualistic stance calls us to transcend any strongly ingrained habits of our thinking and participate in and play with opposing or even contradictory views or standpoints.

As Vaughan claims, when we are liberated from the attachment to a particular fixed view, it becomes possible to have multiple perspectives in viewing and approaching the real including human relationships (2002). The transcendence of fixed perspectives can enable us to overcome a particular limited horizon of attitude and open up the infinite network of meaning that are not tied to any specific self-centered standpoint (Blass, 1996).

Contemplative mind for peaceful relationship

Based upon the Buddhist dialectical contemplation, the contemplative mind is proposed as one of the practical methods to overcome killing or mind-state that drives us to commit violence of any kind that blights people's lives.

Normally, once we become conditioned by certain thoughts, we tend to remain identified with those thoughts, beliefs and kept imprisoned in the conditioned state (Welwood, 2000), which constricts the purview of our thought. So the first step is to disidentify ourselves from the conditionedness to make it conscious and reflect on it (Ibid). The practice of contemplative mind means the practice of detachment from the contents of our consciousness, the thoughts, feelings and reactions flowing from our minds (Hart, 2001). Put differently, promotion of contemplative mind cultivates our first-hand experience

of the nature of social or cultural conditionedness of our thinking and knowing within a collective context, which helps us become less identified with our habits of mind and standpoint (Gunnlaugson, 2007). In short, the aim of practice of contemplative disengagement is to create a space in our own minds for the development of an enlarged awareness, attentiveness to broader dimensions of how mind can work by pushing beyond collectively built presuppositions and sedimented habits of thinking and knowing (Hart, 2001).

Contemplative mind practice, which leads us to be aware of inherent interdependent and interpenetrating nature of different or opposing conceptual thoughts and liberates us from an attachment to any particular viewpoint, sharpens our capacity to simultaneously hold multiple perspectives and patterns of thought that embraces various perspectives without adhering to any one of them (Hart et al, 2000) to approach the real. The transcendence of dualistic thinking empowers us to hold multiplex, complementary both/and dialectical thinking, which enables us to appreciate the opposite of a deep truth is another deep truth (Braud and Anderson, 1998). Consequently, capacity for synthetic or integrative thinking, conceptual flexibility or appreciation for a variety of values and standpoints according to distinct situations can be enhanced (Apffel-Marglin and Bush, 2005).

The integrative expansion of experiential range as a result of the practice of contemplative self-critique enables us to engage the world in a more extensive and inclusive manner (Firman and Gila, 2002). Recognizing interdependent and interpenetrating nature of reality including human relationship makes us aware that we need to approach the phenomenon of conflict from a perspective distinctive from conventional dualistic or dichotomous logic. It is impossible to draw a complete line or picture that judges which party in the conflict is absolutely right or wrong: rather, what must be acknowledged is those in conflict are interdependent and interconnected with each other (Park, 2008). They are closely interwoven on a profound dimension despite their conflictual relationship on a visible level (Ibid). With dualistic view of conflict transcended, it comes to be realized that violence against the other becomes an act of violence against ourselves and is understood as an undesirable and unrealistic option or course of action in the transformation of a conflictual situation (Brantmeier, 2007).

Further, an understanding of the inherent and fundamental interdependent and interconnected nature of reality serves as a rock bottom foundation for peace (Ibid). Understanding interdependence and interpenetration makes us recognize that our happiness comes through others' happiness (Luisi, 2008). Awakening to inherent interdependent and interpenetrating nature of

reality enables us to appreciate that our own well-being and others' are inseparable: without considering and acting to promote others' peace, our own peace would be impossible (Vaughan, 2000).

As is widely recognized, identity assumes one of the critical roles in peace and conflict studies. A key to lasting peace is to be beyond ego or identity (Ibid). It does not mean the denial of identity: rather, it refers to a qualitative transformation of our viewing the nature of identity. Rather than seeing our identity or independent and fixed existence, we need to understand it as the interdependent web of life with no any fixed nature (Loy, 1993). Realizing identity as an open and dynamic living system existing within a larger interdependent ecosystem can awaken us to an ultimate nondualistic relationship between in-group and out-group (Rothberg, 1992), which enables us to recognize we cannot discriminate ourselves from the inter-relational web of life without damaging both others and ourselves (Loy, 1993). When an all-embracing or holistic view or perspective free from an extreme attachment to every vestige of self-centeredness as a consequence of knowing an inherent interdependent and interpenetrating nature of distinct symbolic knowledge or conceptual thought that builds boundaries between in-group and out-group is appreciated and practiced somehow, the path to ultimate nondualistic nature of peaceful relationship can be opened.

Two dimensions of dialogue for harmonious relationship

Arguably, dialogue, the need for which arises from the emerging acknowledgement that our changing reality demands a new global ethic and a new perception of one another (Said et al, 2006) has become one of the core methods to transform violent and antagonistic relationship into harmonious and constructive one. The central aim of dialogue is not just share information: rather, it is to uncover the processes that are shaping us and the struggles we are having, which, it is assumed, will lead us to mutual respect and a sense of solidarity (Chappell, 1999). Dialogue seeks to go beyond dichotomous debate or discussion and to achieve mutual understanding and transformation (Ibid).

However, what must be recognized is the intimate connection between dialogue with others and dialogue with oneself: only those who are capable of a sincere encounter with themselves are capable of a genuine encounter with others (Hadot, 1995). The practice of authentic dialogue requires the openness to be challenged and transformed by encountering others' viewpoints or values as well as the willingness and ability to engage in active listening and

understanding of them (Ferrer, 2002). Through dialogue, we need to let ourselves be changed in our point of view, attitudes, values, frame or mode of thinking and this means we must dialogue with ourselves as well as with others (Hadot, 1995). In short, two dialogues—contemplative internal dialogue with ourselves and external dialogue with others—need to be practiced.

A Buddhist contemplative inner dialogue consists of mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom: the cultivation of mindfulness or moment-to-moment awareness of internal states such as feelings, thoughts, attitudes, etc., concentration for steadying the mind, and an insight into the nature of reality and conceptual thought or symbolic knowledge shaping our reality as well as dichotomous in-group and out-group boundary (Brantmeier, 2007). Calming and focusing on our own mind states enable us temporarily mute external factors so that we can see the role of our mental and emotional habits in framing our perception of reality (Chappell, 1999).

Besides, contemplation upon realty with an insight into it, that is, inherent interdependent and interpenetrating nature of conceptual thought or symbolic knowledge that divides and categorizes the real and consequent interdependent, interconnected, and impermanent nature of all things empowers us to transcend an attachment to any form of particular standpoint or viewpoint as absolute, which creates a space within our minds to explore alternative ways of thinking (Ibid).

Engagement in internal observation enables us expose and deconstruct socially or culturally embedded positions of belief, values, thoughts and so on, freeing our minds to notice and appreciate multiple perspectives and unexpected insights (Hart, 2004). Learning to be less embedded or reified in the perspectives or thoughts, we can develop a deeply different basis of relationship to our own modes of thinking and emotional processes (Gunnlaugson, 2007), which serves as a foundation for self-transformation.

As the expanded awareness as a result of the development of contemplative inner dialogue, which awakens us to wider range of possibilities in interpersonal, intergroup or inter-communal relationships, is experienced and practiced, integrative and synthetic human relationship in the midst of diversity can be achieved. Touching diversity and difference marks the rise of complex and coordination-enriching interdependence (Hershock, 2012) since diversity can only be enhanced by realizing and enacting patterns of complexly meaningful interdependence and interpenetration so that each participant in dialogue is not only capable of, but committed to contributing to the welfare of others (Hershock, 2006).

Truly, the practice of contemplative inner dialogue is not easy. However, since how we act and how we speak are derived from our own minds or mind-states, we should monitor and control our minds to act and speak constructively and harmoniously (Kosan Sumim, 1999). Peaceful world beyond killing should be based on the practice of mindfulness of our thoughts and feelings and of contemplation on an insight into and understanding of reality. Practice and development of deep reflection—looking deeply into each act and each thought of our daily lives empowers us to be capable of observing and controlling our behaviors, attitudes and thoughts and having multiple ways of thinking and knowing, and developing dialectically constructed synthetic views and ideas in approaching peaceful world (Thich Nhat Hanh, 1999). Stated otherwise, the dynamics of nondualistic peace arises from the interior transformation of ourselves, transcending an attachment to a particular frame of thought, moving towards understanding diversity and difference as a mutual interdependence and interpenetration to find sympathy and compassion with each other (Coleman, 2006).

Conclusion

This chapter has examined a Buddhist understanding of the dynamics of killing and explored how the principle of nonkilling and peaceful relationships in contemporary world can be achieved. Peaceful human relationship beyond killing entails "continuous, relationally-expanding and interdependent improvision," (Hershock, 2012: 368) which allows us to experience difference as an opportunity to mutual insight and inspiration to explore something new to us. Improvising, the ethos of which is "the lived, enacted performance of being different in the world" (Ibid: 374) is the ongoing development of new visions and meanings from within things as they have to be. Improvision is not the denial or abandonment of distinct values, worldviews, or norms that have been socially or culturally constructed and nurtured. It is their meaningful revision and reorientation so that we can add new understandings or views to them according to dynamic and interdependent human interaction.

As both killing and nonkilling are complex and multi-faceted phenomena, it would be absurd to assert that the study of human mind is the only key to achieve peaceful world. However, at the same time, Francis argues that "in human societies, minds and hearts are the main arena." (2010: 129). The problems of killing or violence of any kind that claims peoples' lives are not merely economic, political or technological in nature: they are also reflections of the emotional, moral, and spiritual state of human beings

(Grof and Grof, 1993). Though they are important and must be implemented, political, economic, and military approaches alone are insufficient: exploring a psychological understanding and response adequate to our global crises has become one of our most urgent challenges (Walsh and Vaughan, 1993). Thought it might be a hard and challenging task, we must not shun deepening our understanding of the nature of human mind simply as it is difficult, and confine our focus to the easier examination of overt behavior since it has become the global necessity (Tart, 2000).

As Rothberg suggests, engagement in constant mindfulness and contemplative practice is an important tool to help to prevent a separation between the experiences of the participants in social action and the desired changes, and between the process of change and the intended results (1992). Peaceful world depends not so much on what happens to us, but on what attitude, understanding and reaction we give to those events or phenomena including human relationships: the discovery that peace in part depends on our choices about interpretation and attitude toward external events empowers us to see reality is our responsibility in its contents and to promote qualitative thinking to get out of quagmire (Chappell, 1999). Engagement in mindfulness and contemplative practices make us reconsider a belief, perspective, or value which we may have previously accepted without question or without serious interrogation, the experience of which enables us to realize that attention can be redirected by our own effort from external world to internal world to undo old habits of thoughts and to explore new ones (Vaughan, 2000).

Though it is crucial to keep balance between outer approaches and inner ones, at the center of the process of any form of peaceful relationship should lie human mind that can employ various ways of thinking and knowing such as rational consideration, mindfulness, reflection, intuitive induction, creative imagination and so on to make a positive change. Since every day we are creating our own subjective realities (Vaughan, 1979), every moment of our daily life can be an opportunity to know the value of contemplative practice and the power of mind.

References

Apffel-Marglin, Frederique and Bush, Michael (2005). *Healing the Breach of Faith Toward Everything That Is: Integration in Academia*. Available at: http://www.contemplativemind.org/programs/academic/summer05/Apffel-Marglin_Bush.pdf

Blass, Rachel (1996). "On the Possibility of Self-Transcendence: Philosophical Counseling, Zen, and the Psychological Perspective." *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 23: 277-297.

Brantmeier, Edward J. (2007). "Connecting Inner and Outer Peace: Buddhist Meditation Integrated with Peace Education." *Journal of peace education and social justice,* 1: 120-157.

Braud, William and Anderson, Rosemarie (1998). *Transpersonal Research Methods for the Social Sciences: Honoring Human Experience.* London: SAGE.

Burton, David (2012). *Is Madhyamaka Buddhism Really the Middle Way?* 2001. Available at: http://www.westernbuddhistreview.com/vol3/madhyamaka.html

Burton, David (2002). "Knowledge and Liberation: Philosophical Ruminations on a Buddhist Conundrum." *Philosophy East and West* 52. 3: 326-345.

Chang, C. C. Garma (1971). *The Buddhist Teaching of Totality: The Philosophy of Hwa Yen Buddhism.* University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Chappell, David W. (1999). "Buddhist Peace Principles." In Chappell, David W., Ed., *Buddhist Peacework: Creating Cultures of Peace*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 199-231.

Cho, Sungtaek (2002). "The Rationalist Tendency in Modern Buddhist Scholarship: A Revaluation." *Philosophy East and West* 52.4: 426-440.

Coleman, David L. (2012). "Buddhist Peace Practice: Sunyata, Wisdom and Compassion." *Journal of Globalization for the Common Good* 2006. Available at: http://lass.purduecal.edu/cca/jgcg/2006/fa06/jgcg-fa06-coleman.htm

Der-lan Yeh, Theresa (2006). "The Way to Peace: A Buddhist perspective." *International Journal of Peace Studies* 11.1: 91-112.

Fenner, Peter (1994). "Spiritual Inquiry in Buddhism." *ReVision* 17.2: 13-25.

Ferrer, Jorge (2002). *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory: A Participatory Vision of Human Spirituality.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Firman, John and Gila, Ann (2002). *A Psychology of the Spirit*. Albany: University of New York Press.

Francis, Diana (2010). *From Pacification to Peacebuilding: A Call to Global Transformation*. London: Pluto Press.

Fronsdal, Gil (2005). *The Dhammapada: A New Translation of the Buddhist Classic with Annotations*. Boston: Shambala.

Galtung, Johan (1969). "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6.3: 167-191.

Galtung, Johan (1996). *Peace By Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization.* London: SAGE.

Tashi Tsering, Geshe (2005). *The Four Noble Truths: The Foundation of Buddhist Thought volume 1*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Goleman, Daniel. "Psychology, Reality, and Consciousness." In Walsh, Roger and Vaughan, Francis Eds., *Path Beyond Ego: The Transpersonal Vision*. New York: Penguin Putnam, 18-21.

Gomez, Louis (1976). "Proto-Madhyamika in the Pali Canon." *Philosophy East and West* 26.2: 137-165.

Grof, Stanislav and Grof, Christina (1993). "Transpersonal Experiences and the Global Crisis." In Walsh, Roger and Vaughan, Francis Eds., *Paths Beyond Ego: The Transpersonal Vision*. New York: Penguin Putnam, 251-252.

Gunnlaugson, Olen (2007). "Shedding Lights on the Underlying Forms of Transformative Learning Theory: Introducing Three Distinct Categories of Consciousness." *Journal of Transformative Education* 5.2: 134-151.

Hadot, Peter (1995). *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hart, Tobin (2001). "Teaching for wisdom." *Encounter; Education for Meaning and Social Justice* 14.2: 3-16.

Hart, Tobin (2004). "Opening the Contemplative Mind in the Classroom." *Journal of Transformative Education* 2.1: 28-46.

Hart, Tobin; Nelson, Peter L. and Puhakka, Kaisa (2000). "Introductio." In Hart, Tobin; Nelson, Peter L. and Puhakka, Kaisa, Eds., *Transpersonal Knowing: Exploring the horizon of consciousness*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1-9.

Hershock, Peter D. (2006). *Buddhism in the Public Sphere: Reorienting Global Interdependence*. London: Routledge.

Hershock, Peter D. (2012). *Valuing Diversity: Buddhist Reflection on Realizing a More Equitable Global Future*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ichimura, Shohei (1997). "Contemporary Significance of Chinese Buddhist Philosophy." *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 24: 75-106.

Kakol, Peter (2002). "A general theory of worldviews based on Madhyamika and process philosophies." *Philosophy East and West* 52(2): 207-223.

Komito, David R. (1987). *Nagarjuna's "Seventy Stanzas": A Buddhist Psychology of Emptiness*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion.

Kosan Sunim (1999). "My Way of Pilgrimage to Peace." In *Buddhist Peacework: Creating Cultures of Peace*, edited by Chappell David. Boston: Wisdom, pp. 121-8.

Lai, Whalen (1977). "The Meaning of "Mind-Only" (Wei-Hsin): An Analysis of a Sinitic Mahayana Phenomenon." *Philosophy East and West* 27(1): 65-83.

Lawler, Peter (1995). *A Question of Values: Johan Galtung's Peace Research*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Loy, David (1985). "Mu and Its Implications," *Zen Buddhism Today*, 3: 108-124.

Loy, David (1993). "Indra's Postmodern Net," *Philosophy East and West*, 43(3): 481-510.

Loy, David (2002). *On the Nonduality of Good and Evil: Buddhist Reflections on the New Holy War*. Available at: http://thezensite.com/ZenEssays/Mescellaneous/NonDuality _Good_amd_Evil.htm

Luisi, Luigi Pier (2008). "The Two Pillars of Buddhism – Consciousness and Ethics." *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 15(1): 84-107.

Luk, Charles (2001). *The Surangama Sutra*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
Matsuo, Hosaku (1981). *The Logic of Unity: The Discovery of Zero and Emptiness in Prajnaparamita Thought*. Tokyo: Hokuju Shuppan.
McEvilley, Thomas (1982). "Early Greek philosophy and Madhyamika." *Philosophy East and West*, 31(2): 141-164.
Mezirow, Jack (2003). "Transformative Learning as Discourse," *Journal of Transformative Education* 1(1): 58-63.
Mipham, Jamgon (2002). *Introduction to the Middle Way: Candrakirti's Mahdyamakavatara with Commentary by Jamgon Mipham*. Boston: Shambhala.
Muller, Charles (1998). "Innate Enlightenment and No-thought: A Response to the Critical Buddhist Position on Zen," Paper presented at the International Conference on Son, Paekyang-sa, Kwangju, Korea, August 18-22.
Murti. T. R. V. (1955). *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism: A Study of Madhyamika System*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
Nagatomo, Shigenori (2000). "The Logic of the Diamond Sutra: A is not A, therefore it is A," *Asian Philosophy* 10(3): 213-244.
Olendzki, Alexander (2003). "Buddhist Psychology," In *Encountering Buddhism: Western Psychology and Buddhist Teachings*, edited by Segall, Seth R. Albany: State University of New York Press, 9-30.
Park, Jin Y. (2008). *Buddhism and Postmodernity: Zen, Huayan, and the Possibility of Buddhist Postmodern Ethics*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.
Pereira, José and Tiso, Francis (1988). "The evolution of Buddhist systematics from the Buddha to Vasubandhu," *Philosophy East and West* 38(2): 172-186.
Rahula, W. S. (1974). *What the Buddha Taught*. New York: Grove.
Ramanan, Vekanta (1978). *Nagarjuna's Philosophy As Presented in the Maha-Prajnaparamita-Sutra*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Rothberg, Donald (1992). "Buddhist responses to violence and war: Resources for a Socially Engaged Spiritality," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 32(4): 41-75.
Rubin, Jeffrey B. (2003). "Close Encounters of a New Kind: Toward an Integration of Psychoanalysis and Buddhism." In *Encountering Buddhism: Western Psychology and Buddhist Teachings*, edited Segall, Seth R. Albany: State University of New York Press, 31-60.
Said, Abdu'l-Aziz, Lerche, Charles and Funk, Nathan (2006). "For the need for new thinking," *International Journal of Peace Studies* 11(2): 105-120.
Suzuki, Daisetsu Teitaro (1999). *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Suzuki, Daisetsu Teitaro (2001). *Asvaghosha's Discourse on the Awakening of Faith In the Mahayana*. Fremont: Asian Humanities Press.
Suzuki, Daisetsu Teitaro (2003). *The Lankavatara Sutra: An Epitomized Version*. Rhinebeck: Monkfish Book Publishing Company.
Tart, Charles (2000). *States of Consciousness*. Lincoln: iUniverse.

Thich Nhat Hahn (1999). "Ahimsa: The Path of Harmlessness." In *Buddhist Peacework: Creating Cultures of Peace*, edited by Chappell, David. W. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 155-164.

Tola, Fernando and Dragonetti, Carmen (1995). *On Voidness: A Study on Buddhist Nihilism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Vaughan, Francis (1979). *Awakening Intuition*. New York: Doubleday.

Vaughan, Francis (2000). *The Inward Arc: Healing in Psychotherapy and Spirituality*. Lincoln: iUniverse.com.

Vaughan, F. (2002). "What is Spiritual Intelligence?" *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 42(2): 16-33.

Wade, Jenny (1996). *Changing of Mind: A Holonomic Theory of the Evolution of Consciousness*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Waldo, Ives (1975). "Nagarjuna and Analytic Philosophy (1)," *Philosophy East and West* 25(3): 281-290.

Waldron, William S. (2003). "Common Ground, Common Cause: Buddhism and Science on the Afflictions of Identity," In *Buddhism and Science: Breaking new ground*, ed. by Wallace, Allan. New York: Columbia University Press, 145-191.

Walsh, Roger and Vaughan, Francis (1993). "Minding our world: Service and Sustainability." In *Path Beyond Ego: The Transpersonal Vision*, edited by Walsh, Roger and Vaughan, Francis. New York: Penguin Putnam, 227-231.

Welwood, John (2000). "Reflection and Presence," In *Transpersonal Knowing: Exploring the horizon of consciousness*, edited by Hart, Tobin, Nelson, Peter and Puhakka, Kaisa. Albany: State University of New York Press, 85-111.

Wilber, Ken (1993). *The Spectrum of Consciousness*. Wheaton: Quest Books.

Wright, Dale. (1986) "Language And Truth In Hua-Yen Buddhism," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 13: 21-47.

Yun, Hsin (2002). *From the Four Noble Truths to the Four Universal Vow*. Hacienda Heights: Buddha's Light Publishing.

Chapter Seven

Dawn of Awareness: Buddhist Antidotes to Killing

Karma Lekshe Tsomo
University of San Diego

Teaching meditation on compassion in U.S. prisons over the years has taught me many things, particularly the value of Buddhist practices for counteracting the impulse to act on violent thoughts and emotions. Inmates in high security prisons, who are generally incarcerated for violent crimes, seem to be especially responsive to meditations on loving kindness and compassion. Initially, some inmates tell me that they have no compassion, while others say that they find it easy to generate compassion for some and difficult to generate compassion for others. For instance, one inmate told me that he feels compassion for the insects that he shares his cell with, but finds it very difficult to feel compassion for human beings. For those who profess to feel no compassion, it is important to introduce the practice of compassion gradually, starting with generating compassion for oneself.

Loving kindness and compassion can be practiced by all human beings, regardless of nationality, cultural background, religion, or philosophical orientation. These qualities transcend all the boundaries that people tend to construct to separate themselves from one another. The qualities of love and compassion have many practical applications and benefits, both for creating inner peace and peace beyond our own personal sphere. These qualities do not always arise naturally for everyone, especially those who have been neglected or abused during their formative years, but they can be cultivated by everyone and can be a powerful force in transforming destructive habits and emotions. According to the Buddha, even the most hardened criminal and serial killer is capable of developing loving kindness and compassion. Buddha Sakyamuni was able to transform the notorious murderer Angulimala through the power of his loving kindness and set him on the path to liberation (see Kumar and Badiner 2005; Stede, 1957). It has been documented that allowing prison inmates to keep pets reduces conflicts, violence, and recidivism (Strimple, 2003; Deaton, 2005; Ormerod, 2008). Caring for a pet arouses loving kindness not only toward that one animal, but also to other living beings. This example of positive behavioral change is

instructive because it shows that, like prison inmates, all human beings are capable of transforming destructive habits and emotions.

Buddhist texts and traditions provide abundant resources for creating peace in the mind and peace in the world. A multitude of spiritual practices are taught that serve as antidotes to destructive emotions and deterrents to harmful behaviors such as killing. Primary among them are the virtues of loving kindness and compassion. Loving kindness and compassion are both ideals to aspire to and also ethical guidelines for human beings to live by. These virtues are not simply concepts to believe in, but are qualities to be cultivated in every moment of everyday life. The effective practice of loving kindness and compassion requires wisdom, a quality that develops both intentionally, through conscientious study of the Buddha's teachings, and spontaneously, through practicing the Noble Eightfold Path: right view, right intention, right speech, right action, right effort, right livelihood, right mindfulness, and right concentration. Living according to these guidelines brings about peace, happiness, and liberation from suffering, both immediate and ultimate, for oneself and others.[1]

To transform destructive patterns of thinking and behaving is possible, but it does not happen automatically. All ordinary human beings are prone to desire, ill will, jealousy, and confusion, because of habitual patterns that have developed over a long period of time. The effects of unwholesome actions of body, speech, and mind are like imprints on our stream of consciousness that, when provoked, cause us to instinctively act in unskillful or even violent ways. These habitual tendencies manifest as emotional impulses that trigger and reinforce unskillful patterns of reaction. When a person's desires are unfulfilled or thwarted, the person can easily become angered and lash out with harmful words or actions. Even harboring angry, negative thoughts is problematic, because when a challenging situation arises, tempers flare and the situation may easily lead to violence. To become kind, peaceful, and compassionate requires that we transform our habitual patterns of emotional response, thinking, and reactive behavior. For this reason, the Buddha taught numerous practices for learning to control destructive emotions. These practices do not require belief

[1] The Noble Eightfold Path is one of many of the Buddha's teachings for guiding human conduct. Another schema explains the ten unwholesome actions: to refrain from taking life, taking what is not given, sexual misconduct, harsh speech, divisive speech, untruthful speech, idle gossip, wrong views, covetousness, and malice. Other guidelines for ethical conduct include the five precepts for laypeople: to refrain from taking life, taking what is not given, sexual misconduct, untruthful speech, and intoxicants.

in anything beyond our own capacity for transformation and are freely available to anyone who wishes to create peace of mind and peace in the world.

The Ethics of Harm and Harmlessness

For Buddhists, the practice of loving kindness and compassion is integral to an ethical framework founded on nonharm (*ahimsa*). Two assumptions underlie this ethical framework: first, that no living creature wishes to suffer and second, that all actions have consequences. The first assumption is easily observable: not only human beings, but also animals, birds, and insects, including ants and mosquitos, clearly wish to avoid suffering and death. The second assumption is the law of cause and effect. Actions (*karma*) have consequences. Wholesome actions have pleasant consequences; unwholesome actions, such as harming living creatures, result in suffering both to the victim, who experiences the harm and pain immediately, and to the perpetrator, who will experience pain and misfortune as a as a natural consequence of harmful actions.

As the Buddhists see it, sentient beings cannot avoid the sufferings entailed in birth, sickness, old age, and death. In addition, we cannot avoid the sufferings of not getting what we want, getting what we do not want, and myriad other sorrows, anxieties, and frustrations. To heap additional sufferings onto ourselves in addition to the innumerable sufferings we already face is the height of foolishness but, out of ignorance, we continue to work against our best interests. As a result, we continue to experience rebirth, suffering, and death time and again.

Human beings enjoy a distinct advantage over other forms of life, because we are capable of understanding the causes of suffering and can figure out ways to avoid them. The Buddha offered sage advice about how to extricate ourselves from the cycle of suffering. But putting this advice into practice requires that we overcome our ignorance, laziness, and the destructive emotions that keep us spinning around in the cycle of frustration and pain. Through introspection, we can easily understand the disadvantages of harming living beings: violence serves no useful purpose, but only causes harm to ourselves as well as others. Through introspection, we can also understand the benefits of being kind and compassionate to living beings; loving kindness and compassion bring happiness to ourselves as well as others. As we progress along the path of nonharm, we train not only in avoiding harm to living beings directly, but also in preventing harm and providing conducive conditions for living beings' happiness. As idealistic as this may sound, it is possible to directly experience real peace and happiness as a result of living a harm-

free life, in both our own minds and in our relationships with others. Experiencing these results reinforces our conviction and our instinctive tendencies toward the virtues of non-harm, compassion, and loving kindness.

A system of ethics premised on the principle of not harming others or ourselves is the logical key to escaping the cycle of violence. To refrain from harming sentient beings is not just a moral dictum; from a karmic perspective and the practical perspective of global awareness, it is also a matter of great urgency. Because pain and suffering result from unskillful actions, especially acts of harming living creatures, logically, all kinds of actions that cause harm and suffering to other living creatures must be abandoned in order to avoid the unfortunate consequences. The action of killing is regarded as especially unwholesome, both for the victim and the perpetrator. Killing is believed to lead to unfortunate, even hellish rebirths. This explains the Buddhist tendency toward passivism; even in the unlikely kill-or-be-killed scenario, Buddhists may believe that it is better to let go of this one short life rather than spend countless lifetimes in the hell realms as the consequence of killing a sentient being.

Refraining from killing alone is not enough, however. One might abstain from killing sentient beings as far as possible throughout one's lifetime, but still do incalculable harm to living beings in myriad ways without ever taking a life, through verbal and sexual abuse, theft, treachery, and many other misdeeds. Buddhist scriptures make it clear that to live an ethical life, it is necessary to avoid harming sentient beings by any means, whether by physical, verbal, or mental actions (*karma*). The injunction to refrain from harming beings can therefore be understood in broad terms as encompassing all manner of actions that cause harm. To be killed might be less painful that being raped or tortured, for example. Still, from a Buddhist perspective, the most serious harm is to take the life of a sentient being and to take the life of a human being is especially serious, because it is primarily human beings who have the intelligence to achieve enlightenment, if they put their minds to it.

The Vietnamese Buddhist poet and activist monk Thich Nhat Hanh interprets the Buddhist precept "to refrain from taking life" in the broadest possible terms. His interpretation of the first precept is not entirely unique, however; precedents occur in the codes of discipline for monastics (*vinaya*). Examples include the prohibition against drinking water that has not been strained, an oversight which could inadvertently take the lives of tiny insects, and also the action of cutting living trees and plants, which could destroy the habitats of sentient beings and displace them, causing them to suffer. Thich Nhat Hahn's interpretation of the first precept, to refrain from taking the life of a sentient being, includes not eating animal flesh, since eat-

ing meat not only causes animals a painful death, but also causes animals to be raised for slaughter, often in excruciating conditions. A spacious mind will be able to imagine the sufferings experienced by myriad beings and also able to generate loving kindness toward them and devise ways to relieve their suffering. Contemplating the sufferings of sentient beings and generating loving kindness toward them are key Buddhist meditation practices.

Another Buddhist leader who is a strong proponent of peace and the precept "to refrain from taking life" is His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama. In 1950, at the age of 16, he assumed political leadership of Tibet, which was under threat of invasion by Chinese communist forces. He made every effort to resolve the crisis peaceably until 1959, but was forced to flee to India that year after more that 87,000 Tibetans were killed. Even in the face of overwhelming aggression, he championed the practice of nonviolence. He continues to advocate peaceful solutions to world problems guided by the principles of tolerance, mutual respect, and universal responsibility.

Wisdom: Cultivating Insight and Understanding

Love and compassion are universal qualities that unite people of all traditions and perspectives, whereas wisdom has vastly different interpretations. In the Buddhist traditions, wisdom means insight and understanding. Human beings are not born always born with wisdom, but all can develop wisdom through mental cultivation. Actions are typically preceded by the intention to act and, for Buddhists, the intention behind an action is crucial. Because we lack mindfulness and awareness, of our thoughts, emotions, and intentions, we often commit actions carelessly, without wisdom. Lacking wisdom, we often misunderstand situations and over-react, lashing out in thoughtless ways and causing harm to others and ourselves. One way to prevent this is to bring ourselves fully into the present moment and assess the situation with clarity. What are the facts of the case and what is the most beneficial response? Once we are fully present, we can understand the true nature of the situation and the best solution. Upon reflection, with full awareness, we often realize that we have misunderstood the situation and decide that there is no cause for offense. We may find that we have misunderstood others' intentions. By bringing mindful awareness to the situation, focused completely on the present moment, we can understand the situation in a new light. Instead of seeing a vicious aggressor, we may see an unmindful, unwise human being in pain who needs our compassion and understanding. Mindfulness and insight can prevent sticky situations from erupting into violence.

Being raised in India, the Buddha had no doubt heard about the concept of karma. He accepted the concept in principle, but rejected the conventional, somewhat deterministic or even fatalistic interpretation of the concept. Rather than emphasizing the ritual efficacy of actions, he emphasized their ethical import. He explained that karma refers to all actions (virtuous, nonvirtuous, and neutral), that these actions give rise to consequences (either pleasant, unpleasant, or neutral) both for ourselves and others, and further that the consequences of actions may be experienced either in this lifetime or future lifetimes. It is therefore in the best interests of individuals to make skillful decisions. As we gain understanding and personal experience of the workings of cause and effect, and become more skilled at controlling the destructive tendencies of our minds, we naturally begin making more skillful decisions, until eventually we are able to avoid destructive actions and liberate ourselves from the suffering consequences of destructive actions altogether and achieve liberation—the goal of the Buddhist path.

With mindfulness, it is easy to avoid harm, because we can be aware of the intention behind our actions and be careful performing them. Harm is often caused by acting instinctually, as a result of habitual tendencies accumulated over a long period of time, perhaps lifetimes. Unlearning anger and hatred and transforming habitual patterns of reaction may require a long time. When we put our mind to it, however, it is possible to eradicate the habitual tendencies that incline us toward creating harmful, unwholesome actions. The reason is that the mind is not a fixed entity, but rather a stream of conscious moments that are mutable, constantly changing. To transform our mind in an instant, especially in the heat of passion or a spasm of hatred, is very difficult. We can, however, transform our mind gradually and methodically. The process of mental cultivation or transformation requires diligent and persistent practice, but the effort is very worthwhile. All human beings have the potential to become kinder, wiser, and more compassionate, regardless of the traumas we may have suffered or inflicted on others. Just as intention is integral to an action of harming, similarly intention is an integral aspect of reversing harmful habits and habits of harming.

The intention to reverse harmful habits and habits of harming derives from wisdom and understanding. To develop wisdom and understanding requires contemplation, especially contemplation on suffering. Rather than avoiding thoughts of pain and suffering, it is necessary to look directly at suffering, both our own suffering and the suffering of others.

The intention to harm often arises from fear. The Buddhists look for the cause of the fear and find that we usually fear harm to ourselves, our loved

ones, or our possessions—the preoccupation with "I, me, mine." The antidote is to question: What is the "I?" From where does the notion of an "I" arise? Where does the "I" exist? What color is it? What shape is it? How is my "I" different from another person's "I?" In meditation, the Buddhist practitioner will investigate the body, feelings, perceptions, mental constituents, and consciousness in search of the entity that we are so afraid of losing. After conscientiously searching for an "I" or a "self," the practitioner eventually comes up empty handed. Among the components of the person, no such entity can be found. To understand the self as simply a construct is to become liberated from the constraints of that construct and thereby understand the true nature of reality. This contemplation or investigation goes hand in hand with other meditations to strengthen our power of compassion by cutting through the attachment to ourselves and others. The practitioner begins by understanding the concept intellectually; through practice, this insight becomes spontaneous.

The conclusion that the Buddhists draw is that the "I" or "self" is a simply a label attached to the component parts of a person for conventional purposes. This realization eventually dawns as a result of contemplation on the nature of the self. Just as human beings are given a name or label at birth for easy identification, so the "I" or "self" is a convenient label given to the physical and psychological components of a person, even though no fixed self exists. When we realize that one's "self" and one's name are simply convenient labels with no ultimate essence, we realize that taking offense when someone abuses or accuses us is senseless. Why spend our lives defending a convenient fiction? Understanding the self as empty of ultimate reality helps cut through our attachment to a substantially existing self and thereby weakens the instinctive reaction to harm those who try to harm us. By realizing the provisional nature of the self, we cut through our instinctive impulse to defend ourselves and create space to negotiate. The wisdom to see the true nature of the self can prevent us from feeling offended and fighting to defend our "self," or at least buy time to devise a strategy to escape a potentially dangerous situation.

The practice of patience is not only fundamental for fostering diligence in our practice of mindfulness and awareness, but is also a primary antidote to hatred and anger, so cultivating patience is essential for preventing killing. There are many Buddhist practices for developing patience. One Buddhist practice of patience involves reflecting on the fact that, as human beings, most of us do not wish to harm our loved ones or ourselves. Even if we get annoyed, our feelings of love outweigh the irritation and anger that may arise when something annoys or provokes us. In this practice, we then imagine ex-

tending our sphere of concern to include all sentient beings and simulate regarding all of them as our loved ones. The ideal is to regard all sentient beings with loving kindness equal to the love we feel for our nearest and dearest. By logic extension, then, we will not want to harm any of them. Although the practice of extending loving kindness to all sentient beings may not come easily, the practice of extending our sphere of concern does gradually increase our ability to feel love for others, to practice patience with them, and to control the emotions of anger and hatred toward them.

The normal human tendency, however, is to feel warm, caring feelings toward those we love and feel annoyance or anger toward those that we hate. Hatred and aversion are the emotions that induce us to do harm. If we can rid ourselves of hatred, ill will, and frustration, we can protect ourselves from the danger of wishing to harm others. Eliminating anger and hatred is a process and takes practice. Every unpleasant encounter is therefore an opportunity to practice patience and thereby decrease our resentment. Our practice of patience and loving kindness must be genuine, however, not superficial or grudging; otherwise, these emotions will arise again at the least provocation. Eradicating hateful thoughts and destructive emotions requires patience and effort, but rather than let them simmer and fester, ultimately we need to eliminate them altogether. Suppressing emotions is ineffective; that is why it is so important to transform anger and hatred through the power of love and compassion. Every time we recognize even the smallest seed of anger or hatred, we can apply these practices as antidotes.

Rather than trying to suppress destructive thoughts and feelings, Buddhist practitioners actively train in transforming harmful thoughts and feelings into their polar opposites: transforming hatred to love, anger to patience, jealousy to rejoicing, stinginess to generosity, greed to contentment, and so forth. Instead of repressing violent emotions, steeling our hearts against those who harm us and our loved ones, we endeavor to actively apply appropriate antidotes. There are many methods to transform hatred and become more loving. One method is to recognize the anger, hatred, and ill will we harbor in our mind. Thich Nhat Hanh (1999: 72) expresses this poetically in "Call Me by My True Names": "I am the twelve-year-old girl, refugee on a small boat, who throws herself into the ocean after being raped by a sea pirate, and I am the pirate, my heart not yet capable of seeing and loving." Although it may seem inconceivable that we have committed acts of such horror, it is not impossible that we have committed such atrocities in the past, either in this lifetime or in some previous lifetime. The harms we commit create imprints on our stream of consciousness. These

imprints are like seeds that ripen when the conditions are right. These impressions may be subtle or vivid, distant or fresh, but they can affect the way we see the world and the way we respond to particular situations and people. As a consequence, we may instinctively react with feeling of closeness to some people and distance from others, depending on our relationships in the past. Instinctual violent response patterns and fears based on experiences from the past can only be transformed through concerted efforts to cultivate mindfulness, wisdom, loving kindness, and compassion.

Mediation on Compassion and Loving Kindness

In the Buddhist texts, compassion is defined as the wish to remove the sufferings of all sentient beings. To develop compassion therefore involves meditation on the myriad sufferings that living beings experience. The point is not to cause distress or depression, but to awaken us to the painful realities of life that afflict ourselves and other beings alike. Even if we are currently very content and prosperous, unfortunately our situation can change at any moment. More importantly, creatures not as fortunate as we may be are undergoing unimaginable sufferings. In meditation, we visualize all the different sufferings that sentient beings undergo, which causes genuine compassion to arise in our mind. Gradually, by contemplating the sufferings of living beings in this way, our hearts become filled with compassion and feelings of compassion become our natural response when we see a being in pain. The practice of compassion involves both contemplating the countless varieties of suffering that beings undergo and also generating a genuine wish that all beings be free from those sufferings for once and for all.

Loving kindness is defined as the wish to bring happiness to all beings. On the conventional level, this means providing whatever sentient beings need that we may be capable of offering, whether it be food, water, clothing, shelter, medicine, protection, or whatever. On the ultimate level, loving kindness means taking responsibility to establish all sentient beings in a state of happiness and well-being. Beings in different situations have different needs, so the practice of loving kindness involves wishing that all living beings be provided with whatever goods and services they require to make them happy. In meditation, we visualize living beings in all the different forms they take, as human beings, animals, ghosts, and so on. As we actively generate the wish that all these beings receive whatever they need to make them happy, our hearts become filled with loving kindness. Gradually, loving kindness becomes a natural state of mind for us and our responses to situations naturally become

kind and loving. As we visualize all living beings receiving whatever they need, we imagine their happiness at having their needs fulfilled. In the process, our own minds naturally become happier and more content. We, after all, are also sentient beings. As our minds become happier and more content, this frees up enormous amounts of energy that we ordinarily expend in useless or negative thoughts and actions. This energy can now be used for benefitting sentient beings instead, bringing boundless happiness to ourselves and others.

At the heart of the Buddhist understandings of loving kindness and compassion, then, is the awareness that, to be genuine, loving kindness and compassion must extend beyond one's own circle. Feeling love for our own family, friends, and loved ones is not so difficult, since we enjoy their companionship and receive love, gifts, and other benefits from them. When they suffer from illness and other tribulations, we automatically sympathize and wish them well. Feeling love toward beings who are lovable—adorable little children and animals, for example—is also not so difficult. It is natural to have feelings of love and compassion for cute and helpless creatures, especially when we don't have to care for them on a daily basis or deal with their tantrums and mess. What is difficult is generating thoughts of loving kindness and compassion for an extended circle of beings, beyond our own familiar family, friends, and those we already love. It is easy to feel love for those who are lovable; what is difficult is feeling love toward those who are mean, nasty, different, or indifferent to us.

Expanding our feelings of love and compassion to a larger circle, especially toward those toward whom we may have conflicted or negative feelings, is what helps us expand our capacity for loving kindness and compassion. To consciously visualize extending these positive emotions toward those who are vilified by the media as evil, members of despised groups, and followers of different political, religious, and philosophical persuasions from our own is a way to stretch our capacity for love and compassion beyond its accustomed boundaries. Like flexing and strengthening rarely used muscles in our arms or legs, the process of generating positive thoughts and emotions in our heart and sending them in new directions makes us more flexible and helps to strengthen our capacity to love deeply and unconditionally. Some years ago, at the time of the 2004 election, a group of Buddhists on Maui started a campaign to send loving kindness to George W. Bush. Their reasoning was that generating negative thoughts about him was only creating more negativity in the world, whereas generating loving thoughts toward him would help create more loving kindness in the world, which would be a positive contribution. Along these lines, Buddhist prac-

tices entail making a conscientious effort to imagine the sufferings of those who annoy, torment, and disagree with us. In meditation and at random times throughout the day, we generate the wish that our "adversaries" or "enemies" be free from all their sufferings and actively send thoughts of loving kindness toward them. In this way, we are able to soften our hearts and develop feelings of loving kindness and compassion even to those who pose the most serious challenges to our equanimity and peaceful aspirations.

These practices are not limited by time and space. As a mental exercise or thought experiment, we can extend of loving kindness and compassion to people in different places and historical contexts. By expanding our awareness and the scope of our concern, we can increase our capacity for loving kindness and compassion beyond space and time. In this way, our minds become more flexible, more subtle, and more adaptable—qualities that can be useful in meeting new and unexpected situations and challenges on an everyday level. Imagining the sufferings of those we fear or hate and generating love for them may be a stretch, but that is the whole point of the exercise. If our love and compassion are circumscribed, they are limited. Then there is always a danger that someone beyond our comfort zone may trigger anger in our mind and cause us to react in a less than peaceful way or even kill them. Through contemplation and meditation on loving kindness and compassion, we can remove the accustomed boundaries of our concern and expand them infinitely.

These practices cannot simply be intermittent, however. Sometimes our pride causes us to think, "Oh, I know that already. I'm not a violent person. There's no chance that I would react violently even toward someone I don't like." This intellectual arrogance could result in our downfall. Even those who are strongly committed to peace, nonviolence, and other positive values can trip up and experience moments of anger. As Thich Nhat Hahn reminds us in "Call Me By My True Names," until we become perfectly enlightened, all of us have the seeds of hatred within us. Under provocation, the seeds of anger and hatred could erupt and we could unexpectedly react in a violent manner. In a situation of threat or danger, we could even potentially kill a living being. In just one moment of anger, all our good intentions and peaceful commitments could fly out the window and we could potentially belie all that we stand for. To be effective, therefore, we need to nurture loving kindness and compassion on a daily basis. The more seriously we meditate, the more skillful we will become in applying these practices in everyday life. Meditation on loving kindness and compassion will be the best protection for our peaceful intentions to avoid killing and other nonvirtuous actions.

Extending Loving Kindness and Compassion

How far does our compassion extend? If it extends only to our own family members, it is very limited and may be mixed with attachment. If it extends only to our own ethnic, national, or religious group, it is also very limited and may be mixed with feelings of attachment to people of our own groups and aversion toward those who belong to different ethnic, national, or religious groups. Ideally from a Buddhist perspective, loving kindness and compassion should extend to all sentient beings equally. The term "sentient beings" refers to beings with consciousness, who therefore have the capacity to feel suffering. If we include all these beings within the scope of our love and compassion, then we will be aware of their capacity to feel pain and suffering and their vulnerability and will therefore be more careful to avoid harming any living creature. If we include all living beings including plant life in the scope of our compassion, that is also excellent. From a Buddhist point of view, plant life itself does not have consciousness and therefore does not have the capacity to feel suffering or to achieve liberation from suffering, but because sentient beings depend on plants for their sustenance and because plant life is the habitat of sentient beings, Buddhists also place great importance on protecting plant life.

A key meditation practice for extending loving kindness and compassion for all sentient beings, found in the Mahayana Buddhist tradition, is the Seven Steps for Developing the Awakening Mind (*bodhicitta*). On begins by sitting quietly and contemplating the equal value of all sentient beings. From the humblest insect to the most powerful being on earth, all are equal in having the potential to become perfectly enlightened. The first step is to reflect on the fact that all sentient beings have been our mothers. In the beginningless process of cyclic existence, we have been related to all sentient beings in all possible relationships. These sentient beings have been our mothers, fathers, daughters, sons, sisters, brothers, wives, husbands, teachers, students, friends, enemies, and colleagues. The second step is to remember the kindness of all sentient beings. In our many relationships, sentient beings have been extremely kind to us. When we eat even a mouthful of food, we should remember the kindness of all the sentient beings who have helped to bring us this food: the farmers, truckers, distributors, shopkeepers, cooks, and others. All those who have been instrumental in providing us with the food have been incredibly kind. But of all these relationships, the greatest kindness comes from our mothers.

The third step in the practice is repaying the kindness of sentient beings. After remembering the tremendous kindness we have received from sentient beings, we reflect that it would be extremely rude not to repay that kindness. Therefore, we should generate the wish to repay the many kindnesses that we have received from sentient beings. The fourth step is compassion, the wish to free all beings from suffering. After generating the wish to repay the kindnesses of sentient beings, we generate the pure wish, "May all beings be free from suffering." The fifth step is loving kindness, the wish that all sentient beings be established in a state of happiness. After generating the wish to free all sentient beings from suffering, we also generate the pure wish, "May all beings be happy."

The sixth step is called "the special thought." It is not difficult to generate the thought to free sentient beings from suffering and the wish that they be happy, but then we must ask "Who will take responsibility to liberate sentient beings from suffering?" It is easy to produce this generous thought, wish, or hope, but translating it into practice entails taking on an enormous responsibility to effect change. Upon sustained reflection, one comes to a profound realization and generates the special thought: "I will take the responsibility to lead all beings from suffering. I will bring them to a state of happiness." Although this thought may appear to be incredibly arrogant—the delusion of a naive idealist or the raving of a potential tyrant—it is at the heart of the Mahayana Buddhist aspiration to enlightenment. Far from being perceived as an extreme ego-projection, it is instead viewed as the very mechanism for dismantling self-interest by placing the welfare of all other beings before one's own. Generating the strong determination to put into action one's grand aspiration is regarded as a necessary stage in the process of achieving ultimate realization.

The seventh and final step is generating *bodhicitta*, the altruistic aspiration to achieve perfect awakening in order to liberate all sentient beings from suffering. Although we may sincerely wish to take the responsibility of liberating all beings from suffering and bringing them to a state of perfect happiness, at present we do not have the capability to do that. As long as we ourselves are trapped within cyclic existence (*samsara*), we do not have the capacity to free others. Reflecting carefully, we realize that only a perfectly awakened being has the capacity to liberate all beings. Therefore, we aspire to become a perfectly awakened Buddha ourselves. This aspiration is called *bodhicitta* and generating this altruistic attitude must be implemented in action. There are said to be two types of *bodhicitta*: first, the aspiring *bodhicitta*, which is the wish to become a Buddha and liberate beings; and second, the engaging *bodhicitta*, which is the actual practice of engaging in the *bodhisattva*'s way of life that will lead to Buddhahood and ulti-

mately to the liberation of all beings. Generating the precious *bodhicitta* even once in a lifetime is said to make one's entire life worthwhile.

Natural Antidotes to Killing

Love and compassion naturally exist in the hearts of human beings; they are our true nature. The qualities of love and compassion are at the core of all the world's religions and value systems. The essence of love is to bring happiness to all beings and the essence of compassion is to relieve their sufferings. With these heartfelt concerns, we can work actively to promote our mutual well-being and to prevent harm. The practice of loving kindness and compassion is therefore the natural antidote to killing, the most severe harm sentient beings can experience. To be ultimately effective, the practice of loving kindness and compassion must be tempered by wisdom. "Idiot compassion" can sometimes cause more harm than good. Dedicated and sustained practice of any of these meditations will create a mind so patient and strong that eventually it will be impossible to harm any living creature. If we genuinely send forth thoughts of loving kindness and compassion, such as "May all be happy! May all beings be free from suffering!" then the killing of living beings will be unthinkable. Simple, meaningful practices like these will not only create happier, healthier human beings, but will help ensure the continuation of life on Earth.

References

Deaton, Christiane (2005). "Humanizing with Animals: A Closer Look at 'Cell Dogs' and Horse Programs in Correctional Institutions," *Journal of Correctional Education*, 56(1): 46-62.

Hanh, Thich Nhat (1999). *Call Me by My True Names: The Collected Poems* Berkeley: Parallax Press.

Kumar, Satish and Badiner, Allan Hunt (2005). *The Buddha and the Terrorist: The Story Of Angulimala*. Cambridge: Green Books.

Ormerod, Elizabeth (2008). "Companion Animals and Offender Rehabilitation–Experiences from a Prison Therapeutic Community in Scotland," *Therapeutic communities*, 29(3): 286-96.

Stede, W. (1957). "Angulimala and Liberation," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 20: 533-535.

Strimple, Earl O. (2003). "A History of Prison Inmate-Animal Interaction Programs," *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(1): 70-78.

Chapter Eight

Hindu Vision of Nonkilling

Realizing Truth for Creating a Nonkilling World

Pradeep Dhakal
Chetanalaya, Institute for Humanity, Peace and Spirituality

Introduction

Hinduism is the oldest of all living religions. It is not founded by any particular prophets and has no beginning date either. Its foundation is laid by many sages of Indian subcontinent who experienced religious life and expressed their views in different time periods in Indian-subcontinent. So, no date or founder can be noted as the beginner of Hinduism. That is why this religion is traditionally designated by several names, such as *Sanatana-Dharma*, *Vaidika-Dharma* and *Manava-Dharma*. The religion that is based on the eternal values and truth of life is called *Sanatana Dharma*. *Vaidika-Dharma* means the religion of the *Vedas*. *Manava Dharma* means the religion of Man. Thus, Hindu religion is rich in its essence.

The Vedic literature is full of knowledge, which is the outcome of experience and experiment of ancient sages. The four collections of the *Vedic* literature are the *Rigveda, Samaveda*, *Yajurveda* and *Atharvaveda*. The *Rigveda* is the oldest *Veda.* The history of Hinduism practically begins with the composition of the hymns recorded in the *Rigveda* in the past.

The *mantras* or hymns are created by the poets, elaborated ritualistic treaties, or the *Brahmanas*, are the works of priests and the *Upanishads* are the revelations of mysteries. The *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* are the most influential epics in Indian society. The stories of these epics have influenced the human mind to form a society that is morally, culturally and ethically strong.

The *Ramayana* has beautifully presented relationships, such as individual, family, social and universal. It teaches us to practice a life that is beyond a materialistic life. Like the *Ramayana, the Mahabharata* is also the story of a battle between righteous versus unjust people. Furthermore, the story is also a cultural base of Indian civilization. The *Mahabharata* focuses on *tyaga* (Sacrifice). In order to maintain peace of mind and peace of world, one should sacrifice one's ego. The overall teaching of the *Mahabharata* is *ahimsa paramo dharma* (*Mahabharata*, 12.257.6.): "Nonviolence is the supreme religion". The *Ma-*

habharata teaches four values which are essential for peace: Nonviolence (*ahimsa*), Sacrifice (*tyaga*), Forgiveness (*kshama*) and Truthfulness (*satyam*).

The culmination part of the *Mahabharata* is the *Bhagavad Gita*, which is the basis of religious-spiritual development of Hindu civilization. It is a symbol of peace in Hinduism. It has a great influence on the Hindu mind. It shows the path of self-realization for every individual. It also shows the different *marga* (paths): *karma*, *bhakti* and *jnana* for peace in life.

Peace is possible if duties are performed without self-expectation. These duties and tasks should be carried out only for the benefit of people, society and world. One should see other creatures as the part of this Mother Nature and respect their life. This feeling brings up a sense of nonkilling. "Endued with self-restraint, and possessed of righteous behaviour one should look upon all creatures as one's own self" (*Mahabharata*, 12.292). Moral virtue is given high preferences in the *Mahabharata*.

The *Smritis* also has an important place in Hindu society. The most important *smriti* is the *Manusmriti*. Manu has described the annihilation of killing propensities (The *Manusmriti*, 10.63.) "A killer of animal lives is punished with many diseases in this life" (The *Manusmriti,* 11.52). This shows that the concept of nonkilling was known and understood in *Smriti* period.

The *Puranas* contain the important social thoughts of Hindu society. The *Puranas* stand on the pillars of Vedic and Upanisadic framework of thinking. The early *Puranas* were written in the Gupta period and the later *Puranas* were written after 500 AD, and were recast and enlarged later. The Puranas elaborate the philosophical aspects of Hinduism, such as the nature of *Brahma*, *Prakriti, Purusa*, creation and dissolution of the world, bondage, liberation, virtues, vices, and the means to liberation. The aim of the *Puranas* is to evoke the religious devotion in human beings through stories, myths, *yajnas* and legends of great personalities. The *Puranas* try to teach in a very simple way by adding fairy and imaginary tales to deep philosophies. However, this simple idea made a wrong impact in later period. So, animal sacrifice aggravated in Hindu society. There are eighteen main *Puranas* and an equal number of subsidiary ones (*Upa-puranas*). The religion of the learned classes began to be systematized into the philosophical sutras of the six schools of Hindu thought: *Nyaya, Vaiseshika, Samkhya, Yoga, Mimamsa*, and *Vedanta*. These thoughts are called *Darsana*, a view of life. In the history of Hinduism, the establishment of Sankara's *Advaita* system of philosophy is a great landmark. A large body of literature has grown around it and the majority of Hindus are Sankara's followers. The *Advaita* system also influenced some of the sectarian theologies of Sankara's time (Sarma, 1966: 40).

By the time of *Smriti* and *Puranas,* Hinduism was developed in all spheres—rituals, customs, knowledge and philosophy. Social institutions were established firmly. Hinduism has developed almost all the main features:

1. The conception of the impersonal Absolute (*Brahman*) and the personal God (*Isvara*),
2. The supreme authority of the *Vedas,*
3. The law of *Karma* and Rebirth,
4. The systems of caste, the four stages of life and the four ends of life,
5. The three-fold path of *karma*, *bhakti* and the *Jnana yoga*,
6. The doctrines of the Hindu Trinity and the sectarian beliefs and practices of the *Vaishnavas*, *Saivas*, and *Saktas*,
7. Incarnations of the Supreme (*avataras*),
8. The rituals of image worship,
9. Faith in pilgrimages to holy shrines, rivers, and mountains.

During the medieval period, Hinduism continued with these features. In modern era, Arya Samaj movement, Krishna Consciousness and other movements are trying to make Hinduism pure religion to handle the whole humanity with the vision of nonkilling, nonviolence and peace. Mahatma Gandhi has laid the foundation of nonviolence in the world.

Emergence of the Concept of Nonkilling as the Opposition in Hinduism

When the practice of sacrifice was growing and ritualism was taking the place of religion, the seed of opposition was germinated against the sacrifice and sacrificial *yajna*. The reaction against the sacrifice is reflected in the *Upanishads*. The *Upanishads* took the strongest leadership in the revolution of sacrifice and replaced it with knowledge. Upanishadic view discourages the slaughter of animals on the sacrificial ground. This view gave the base for the concept of nonkilling in Hindu society.

The ideas of *karma* and rebirth profoundly influenced men's thoughts of the Universe and the different orders of beings existing in it and made sacrifice irrelevant to the moral and spiritual situation of man. Alongside of this intellectual trend, developed the social and economic situations. In the social sphere, the increasing importance of the priestly class was bound to lead to a reaction against it and its theories, which were also economically wasteful to the classes involved in the production of wealth. These intellectual, social and economic causes combined to produce the movement against sacrifice with which began the development of the concept of noviolence (Gokhale, 1961: 178-179.)

The concept of nonviolence in the *Upanishad* was being accepted by individuals. However, there was no indication that it could be apparent on the political level. So, there was still scope for the acceptance of nonkilling thought at social and political level, which could not happen due to the continued warfare of the Aryans and other groups in Indian-subcontinent.

In the meantime, Buddhism and Jainism were developed for opposing the existing tendency of violence in the society. Buddha emphasized the importance of the qualities of nonhatred and compassion (*karuna*) which became the philosophical foundations of the concept of nonviolence and nonkilling. Jainism also emphasized complete nonkilling in the world.

Fundamentals of nonkilling in Hinduism

Understanding truth or realizing God is the basic element of the Hindu notion of nonkilling. Here we will discuss the fundamental concepts for the development of human conscience for developing the idea of nonkilling.

Atman

According to Hindus, the energy that lies in the core of one's self is known as *Atman*. *Atman* is eternal, immortal and spiritual. It is the essence of the individual. "The soul is neither male nor female nor neuter, whatever the body it acquires, it becomes identified with that" (*Svetasvatara Upanishad,* V.10). "The soul is never born, nor it ever dies; nor does become after being born. For, it is unborn, eternal, everlasting and primeval; even though the body is slain, the soul is not" (The *Bhagavad Gita,* 2.20). As a man shedding worn-out garments, takes other new ones, likewise, the embodied soul, casting off worn-out bodies, enters into others that are new (The *Bhagavad Gita,* 2. 22). The *Bhagavad Gita,* (2.19) further says that both of them are ignorant, he who considers the soul to be capable of killing and he who takes it as killed; for verily the soul neither kills, nor is killed.

The Universal element *atman* is eternal and it is manifested in every creature. If it is realized by an individual, he/she will not kill any creature.

The Self is Brahman

The self is not born, nor does it die. It has not come into being from anything, nor does anything come into being from it. This unborn, eternal, everlasting and ancient one suffers no destruction with the destruction of the body (*Katha Upanishad*, II.18). Smaller than the smallest and greater than the greatest, the self dwells in the hearts of all creatures. Those who are without

worldly desires realise the glory of the self, free from grief, through the purification of the senses and the mind (*Katha Upanishad*, II.20).

The human race, birds, animals and vegetation all have a life with the property of growth and death. They must belong to the *Brahman* within them. Consciousness is therefore an all-pervading reality with which each one of us is blessed. The concept of *Brahman* being the seed of consciousness lies within the meaning of the consciousness itself. The consciousness and the *Brahman* are, therefore, clearly differentiated. One is the seed, the other is what sprouts out of it (Bhasin, 2005).

The man who knows this soul to be imperishable; eternal and free from birth and decay—how and whom will he cause to be killed, how and whom will he kill? (*The Bhagavad Gita,* 2.21) This shows that there is soul in every part and parcel on the Universe. If this truth is realized, one does not kill any creatures on earth. And, we can expect a nonkilling human world.

Realization of the Self

To understand the truth of life, one starts with understanding one's self. When every individual understands self, nonkilling arises in the world. *Atman* is the element which is the life force in every element of the universe. Realising this fact leads one to the understanding of truth, which ultimately results in the feeling of nonkilling.

The *Upanishads* say, "In Him the heaven, the earth, the sky, the mind with the senses are centred. Know Him alone as the *atman* of all and leave off all other speech" (*Mundak Upanishad,* II. ii. 5). This *atman* cannot be obtained by much study of *Vedas* or intelligence or much learning. He whom the Self chooses, by him the Self can be gained. To him this *atman* reveals its true nature (*Mundak Upanishad,* III. ii. 3). He alone is all that was and all that will be. Knowing Him, the Eternal, one transcends death; there is no other way to freedom. Seeing the Self in all beings and all beings in the Self, one attains the highest existence, and not by any other means (*Kaivalyopanishad*, I.9-10). This shows that feeling of equanimity leads one's life towards nonkilling. After realizing the self, one is acquainted with the truth, i.e. one sees self in all beings and all beings in the self. When there is self in all beings he cannot kill self. This is the strongest view of nonkilling in Hinduism.

The *Upanishads* point out that one reaches to the stage of self-realization only after eradicating the desires from mind. After attaining self-realization, one sees the divine element everywhere and in every particle of the world. The *Upanishads* say, "He who is without desires, who is free from desires,

the objects of whose desires have been attained, and to whom all objects of desire are but Self—he is free from birth and death, and having realised the infinite Self, becomes merged in it" (*Brihadaranyak Upanishad,* IV. iv.6).

The *Upanishads* emphasize the self-realization. It describes Self-realization as the basis of truth. It can be attained after understanding the nature of *atman*. "This *atman* is hidden in all beings and does not shine forth, but it is seen by subtle seers through their sharp and subtle intellect. Let the wise sink his speech into the mind, the mind into the intellect and the intellect into the Great *atman* and the Great *atman* into the Peaceful *atman*" (*Katha Upanishad,* I.iii.12-13). One can attain highest state of mind when one realizes self and practices nonkilling.

Truth: Harmony of Life

After understanding and realising one's self, one discovers the underlying truth. The realisation leads one to ultimate peace and gets harmony to his life and life of everyone around him. Eventually, the whole society is set in the process of peace-building. There is an interesting discussion in the *Chhandogya Upanishad*, which describes the truth of life.

> "The infinite is the source of joy. There is no joy in the finite. Only in the infinite is there joy. Ask to know of the infinite."
> "Sir, I wish to know of it."
> "Where one sees nothing but the One, hears nothing but the One, knows nothing but the One—there is infinite. Where one sees another, hears another, knows another—there is the finite. The infinite is immortal, the finite is mortal."
> "In what does the infinite rest?"
> "In its own glory, nay, not even in that. In the world it is said that cows and horses, elephants and gold, slaves, wives, fields and houses are man's glory—but these are poor and finite things. How shall the infinite rest anywhere but in itself?" "The infinite is below, above, behind, before, to the right, to the left. I am all this. This infinite is the Self. The Self is below, above, behind, before, to the right, to the left. I am all this. One who knows, meditates upon, and realizes the truth of the Self—such as one delights in the Self, reveals in the Self, rejoices in the Self. He becomes master of himself, and master of all the worlds. Slaves are they who know not this truth"(*Chhandogya Upanishad,* VII.23-25).

Krishna says in the *Bhagavad Gita,* "I am the universal Self seated in the hearts of all beings; so, I alone am the beginning, the middle and also the end of all beings" (The *Bhagavad Gita,* 10.20). This truth leads one to the path of harmony in life where one practices truth, nonviolence and nonkilling.

The Vision of God

The concept of God is deep-rooted in Hinduism. It is believed that God is eternal, unborn, immortal and everlasting. God does not appear in the human form. He is not human being, nor can the man be God. He is the source of all the elements on the universe. This is the overall concept of God in Hinduism. The *Vedas* are the early sources that describe God.

God, the all-pervasive pervades all beings within and without (*YV*, 32.8). *Yajurveda* (*YV*, 40.1) further mentions that the whole universe is permeated by the supreme God. God is immortal and resides in every element of the Universe. *Svetasvatara Upanishad* says: "This whole universe is filled by the all-pervading Being, to whom there is nothing superior, and than whom there is nothing smaller or larger. Rooted in His own glory, He—the One without a second—stands immovable like a mighty tree" (*Svetasvatara Upanishad*, III.9).

He is the one Deity hidden in all beings, the all-pervading Self abiding in all beings, the controller of all activities, the indwelling Self of all, the witness, the enlightener, the absolute beyond all attributes (*Svetasvatara Upanishad*, VI. 11). He transcends the whole world, and also manifests himself as the whole world. He is the eternal being, the support of all, remover of evil. The existence of the whole world depends on Him. He is the master of the world, the supreme self, the eternal, the permanent good, the changeless, the cosmic being, the great goal of knowledge, the self of the universe and the supreme refuge (*Taittiriyaranyaka*, X.11).

God is known as the supreme creator (*YV*, 30.3) of the universe who dispels the evil impulses. He is the main source of strength, vigour and vitality that endows all the powers physical, moral and spiritual to all the creatures on universe. *Atharvaveda* (10.8.32) describes that the God is beyond decay and death. *Yajurveda* (40.8) says that the God is omnipresent and effulgent, formless and flawless, faultness and sinless, devoid of lapses, free from pulsation, pure and pious, holy and hallowed. He is divine poet and genius, self-existent and all-pervasive. He sustains the creation perfectly for eternal peace and harmony. Understanding God or realizing the truth is interrelated in one's life. Realizing the truth of God cleanses one's mind of all evil and leads one to sentiments of nonkilling.

Ahimsa *(Nonviolence)*

Nonviolence means no killing of any creatures in the world knowingly. Nonviolence restricts the consumption of meat and use of creatures, plants for the bodily pleasures. There should be respect towards the natural ele-

ments. Nonviolence is not only about harming others but also not supporting others for doing harm. The practice of nonviolence leads to the emergence of nonkilling. If one sees the self in all beings and all beings in the elf, one cannot wish to harm others. This realization is the foundation of nonkilling. *Ishavasya Upanishad* says, "When a person sees the Self in all people and all people in the Self, then he hates no one."

*Vegetarianism (*Shakahar*)*

Vegetarianism promotes a deeper meaning and sensitivity in life. Hinduism has accepted the eating of meat; it is just for those persons who have not realized the truth and who are not fit for the spiritual life. Such persons have to practice human behaviour and also they have to develop truthfulness in their life in order to realize the truth of life.

While offering food to friends, teachers, government officers, guests, parents and children vegetarian meals are given more importance in *Yajurveda*. (*Yajurveda*, 12.72.) It shows that the idea of nonkilling in relation to animals was deep-rooted in Vedic period.

Pythagoras said that as long as men massacre animals, they will kill each other. Indeed, he who sows the seeds of murder and pain cannot reap joy and love. Even in a deeper sense, Indian philosopher, Sri Aurobindo, has put his view that vegetarianism is a will not to do harm to the more conscious forms of life for the satisfaction of the belly. As Frawley (1995: 118-9) states:

> Hinduism respects the Divine presence in animals. It recognizes that animals project certain cosmic energies through the Divine Self present within them. Animal images appear in Hinduism for their archetypal and poetic value, not as a mere worship of lower forms of life. Respect for the God in animals, which includes picturing the God in animals, is part of any universal teaching. It is not a sign of lack of spirituality but of a greater sensitivity to the sacred nature of all life. If we refuse to recognize God in animals, it only shows that we have not yet come in contact with the real Divinity, that our God is a human prejudice, not a universal Truth. It indicates that we will abuse and exploit animals for our own personal pleasure, which is exactly the case in the world today. Animals too have soul, mind and personalities. Unless we see the Conscious Being in all creations, we do not really 'see'. We do not know ourselves, nor will we function as a humane and compassionate presence in the universe.

Realization of Self and Emergence of Nonkilling

He who sees all beings in the Self (*Atman*) and the Self in all beings, shrinks not from anything thereafter. When, to the knower, all beings become one with his own *Atman*, how shall he be deluded, what grief is there when he sees everywhere oneness? (*Ishavasya Upanishad*, 6-7). The sage who has realised his Self (*Atman*) beholds that all objects and all beings are not distant from his own Self and that his *Atman* is the *Atman* of all. When this truth is taught to people on earth, they start respecting life and stop killing any creature on earth and practice nonkilling. The inner freedom and equanimity that evolve out of this integral cosmic vision make one's life at peace with all beings in nature. One is then "passionately concerned about the well-being of all things" (The *Bhagavad Gita*, 12.4).

Yatiswarananda examines that when the Godman comes down from the heights of divine realization, he brings with him a new vision and sees the supreme Spirit in himself and in all things. His mind is at peace, unshaken by misery or success. Free from fear, attachment, or anger, his heart remains filled with love and compassion for all beings. He has realized a new peace based on the unfailing foundation of divine Consciousness, and is not touched by anything in the world, but longs to share this peace and bliss with others (Yatiswarananda, 1979: 190).

In the *Upanishadic* vision the inner experience of the self blossoms forth into an integral world-view that renders peace with all beings. The *atman* that one intuits within oneself is the *atman* that pervades all beings. The enlightened person sees "all beings in the Self and the Self in all beings" (*Ishavasya Upanishad*, 6); the entire world is seen as "permeated by the divine Lord". The effect of such a universal divinity on the life of humans is harmony and peace with all beings.

A man of self-realization, becomes universal in his inner consciousness. He experiences himself as inwardly identical with all other beings—with the entire universe. He finds himself in all and all in himself. The *Bhagavad Gita* (13.27-30) declares:

> He sees, who sees the supreme Lord existing equally in all beings, deathless in the dying. As he sees the Lord equally existent everywhere, he does not injure the Self by the self, and so goes to the highest goal. And he truly sees, who sees that Nature alone does all actions, and that the Self is actionless. When he sees the separate existence of all beings inherent in the One and their expansion from that One alone, he then becomes *Brahman*—the infinite and the absolute.

Mahabharata says, "We should not do to others what will be offensive to us. We must look upon others as ourselves. He who, by his action, mind and speech is continually engrossed in the welfare of others and who is always a friend of others, knows the meaning of *dharma*." (*Mahabharata:* Shantiparva, 261.9.) This is the overall essence of a true religion.

Every religion accepts the moral factors for nonviolence, peace and nonkilling. The moral law sustains the individual and the entire world. Moral principles are concerned with man. We should aim nonkilling both for the human beings and all other creatures to the utmost extent.

Conclusion

Hinduism desires peace not only for an individual or human society or world but for the whole Universe. So, Hindu approach of nonkilling is Universal in nature. It visualizes the whole humanity as a single unit.

There is only one truth in the human world that all human beings are from the same elements—or created by the same life element of the Universe. So, they belong to the same family—humankind. Every religion declares that truth is one. So, people should study their scriptures deeply so that they understand the true meanings of their religion and feel that the different ways of expressing their religion and declaration of the truth—that man is one. When all people on earth will be able to understand the truth of human existence and come toward a sense of oneness, there will be no killing in this world.

The religions of the world have different natures and ideologies, however; they can come to the same ground regarding the nonviolence and nonkilling. They can make a single network for helping the needy and troubled human areas and they can protect animals which are in danger and in pain. The Hindu concept of *Basudhaib Kutumbakam* is essential in this regard. This concept does not define or proclaim any religion. It is a humanistic approach for world peace and human welfare.

References

Bhasin, R. V. (2005). *The Essence of Hinduism*. Mumbai: Jaico Publishing House.
Frawley, David (1995). *Hinduism: The Eternal Tradition*. New Delhi: Voice of India.
Gokhale, B. G. (1961). *Indian Thought Through the Ages.* Bombay: Asia Publishing House.
Sarma, D. S. (1966). *Renascent Hinduism*. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan
Yatiswarananda, S. (1979). *Meditation and Spiritual Life*. Bangalore: Ramakrishna Math.

Chapter Nine

Peace Movements in Light of Pan-Indic Spiritual Traditions

A Case Study of The Anuvrat Movement and Sarvodaya Shramdana Movement

Shivani Bothra
Victoria University of Wellington

A frequently cited verse from Rig Veda is *ekam sat viprahbahudhavadanti,* (1.64.46) translated as "Truth is one and the wise call it by many names." Alternatively, like Philip Goldberg states "One truth many paths"(Goldberg, 2010: 10). In a similar vein, it can be said that violence is complexly one, manifested in divergent ways and there is no singular ideal approach to reduce or deter from violence. Today there is a growing awareness of the broad spectrum of nonviolent ways for a futuristic peaceful world society. However, if we look back at the historical records, we find a myriad of nonviolent methods employed by world leaders—political, social, and religious; leading activists and civilians from diverse cultures and backgrounds with the singular objective of creating a nonkilling society. In the present section, I will discuss some of the distinguished Pan-Indic peace movements from the postcolonial period, initiated to create socially just, economically viable and ecologically sustainable nonviolent societies. I have addressed the subject, on the one hand, by presenting a brief account of the Anuvrat Movement while, on the other hand, comparing it with other concurrent movements.

The Anuvrat Movement was the brainchild of the late ascetic Acharya Tulsi (1914-1997), a socio-religious reformer and the ninth religious leader of the Jain Svetambara Terapanth sect. It was built upon the traditional Jain practice of *anuvrat* (vows for laity) that had evolved from the original teachings of Mahavira, the 24th Jain preceptor. The eleven *anuvrat*vows i.e. 'small vows' were modified version of the five *mahavrat,* or 'great vows' taken by Jain mendicants. In order to understand Tulsi's movement, I will examine how Tulsi's movement compared in its origins and philosophy to several other contemporary movements that were either continuations of the efforts of Gandhi's followers or inspired by Gandhi's efforts.

Gandhian Heritage

Mahatma Gandhi was the first to popularize the term *Sarvodaya*, meaning 'Welfare of All,' by using as the title of his translation of John Ruskin's work, *Unto This Last.* By way of choosing this word, he wanted "to translate Ruskin's message [his vision of a future society], and later, [...] to symbolize the spiritual revolution prescribed by Gandhian utopia" (Fox, 1989: 42). Many of later pan-Indic movements focused and shared the ideals of nonviolence, truth and self-reliance. How these ideals formed the foundation of peace movements, both spiritual and secular in nature will be further discussed in this section. I will examine four such movements that aspired for a better society and shared Gandhi's heritage—either in his philosophy or in his legacy. They are the Anuvrat Movement (1949); the Bhoodan Movement (1951); the Sri Lankan Sarvodaya Movement (1958) and the Chipko Movement (1971). The prime objective of these post-colonial movements was to regain social stability by reconstituting the social life. Furthermore, in this section, I will delve deeply into the Sri Lankan Sarvodaya Movement, which is rooted in Buddhist philosophy and inspired by Gandhi's *Sarvodaya*. Both movements—Anuvrat and Sarvodaya—had innovatively added spiritual ideals like vows, meditation and non-attachment as cornerstones to their movements. A close examination of both these models will illuminate the significance and need of spiritual values in contemporary times for creating a nonkilling society.

The Anuvrat Movement

Acharya Tulsi was a pioneer of these reconstituting movements, beginning his movement as early as 1949. As said earlier, his platform evolved out of traditional Jain values and he was also able to demonstrate a well-fortified Gandhian paradigm. The Indologist Peter Flugel observes: "Tulsi created the nonreligious Anuvrat Movement for the implementation of nonviolence and morality in social life" (Flugel, 2002). A point to be noted here is that Gandhi singled out nonviolence from the scriptures and applied it effectively as a technique for political change, whereas Tulsi carved out nonviolence from the scriptures for fostering social change.

The Bhoodan Movement

Vinoba Bhave, the spiritual heir of Gandhi, launched the Bhoodan Movement in 1951 in the Pochampalli village in the Telengana region of Andhra Pradesh (Singh, 2001: 263-64). The movement's mission was to persuade wealthy landowners to voluntarily give a portion of their land to poor

peasants, a concept strongly tied to the Eastern religious practice of *dana* (charity). Raghavendra Nath Misra, in his book, *An Economic Assessment of the Bhoodan Movement in India*, notes that Vinoba derived his philosophy for the movement from the classic Hindu text the *Gita*. Vinoba, a layman demonstrated great asceticism, and like Tulsi, he walked on foot across the Indian sub-continent in order to persuade landowners to gift their land to the landless. Even though both the movements were action-oriented, the main difference between the two was that: Vinoba focused on 'gifting land,' and Tulsi focused on 'small vows' for self-restraint. Vinoba Bhave, through his movement attempted a social-economic development of post-independence India whereas Acharya Tulsi's purpose was the regeneration of humans on spiritual and ethical grounds.

The Sarvodaya Shramdana Movement

A. T. Ariyaratne, a Buddhist layman, launched the Sarvodaya Shramdana Movement in Sri Lanka in 1958. He notes: "We in Sri Lanka were inspired by this Sarvodaya thought of Gandhi and the Bhoodan-Gramdan action of Acharya Vinoba Bhave" (Ariyaratne, 1996: 3). In forming the ideology of the movement, Ariyaratne believed that the Buddhist *Dhamma* teachings would provide a blueprint for a new social order and a nonviolent revolution (Bond, 2004: 243). Interestingly, he redefined Gandhi's Sarvodaya "Welfare of All" as "Awakening of All" (id., 2). As noted by a human development theorist Dennis Goulet (1981: xviii): "Sarvodaya reinterprets the Middle Path for the technological age". Goulet's assessment implies that Ariyaratne adopted appropriate technology in his developmental projects, while remaining true to his Buddhist tradition.

The Chipko Movement

By 1970, the Chipko Movement, which had a great impact in Northern India, was led by two followers of Gandhi–Sunderlal Bhauguna and Chandi Prasad Bhatt. "*Chipko,*" loosely translates as *hug,* was a movement that originated in the Indian Himalayas and was dedicated to saving trees by hugging them, if necessary, when loggers came to cut them down (Weber 1988: 11). It was yet another example from the post-independence India of how the nonviolent resistance and struggle of thousands of ordinary people without the presence of an especially charismatic leader could succeed under certain circumstances (Haynes, 2002: 230). The Chipko movement explored nonviolence for the protection of the environment.

Ecumenical Spirituality

The aforementioned movements demonstrated the need for a new model of collective action, a fresh vision for the society and a regenerated human consciousness. They all resemble Gandhi's example in their practices and their actions, yet each of them is unique in the way they cultivate their respective movements in light of their own traditions. An element that distinguishes each of the above movements is their relationship to different scriptural texts of Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism. The Hindu text the *Bhagvada Gita* inspires the Gandhian movements, the Jain scripture *Acharanga* inspires the Anuvrat Movement and the Sri Lankan Sarvodaya Movement draws inspiration from the Buddhist scriptures of the *Tipitaka* (Nithl, 2005: 116).

To further develop the understanding of the Anuvrat Movement, I will now compare it with the Sri Lankan Sarvodaya Movement. Both of these movements are drawn from two distinct *sramanic* (ascetic) traditions and have many similarities in their nature. To explore how these *sramanic* movements have been able to sustain members for more than five decades, and steadily working in the direction of maintaining a nonkilling society, I will examine the practice of meditation, which was believed to have developed the integrity of the movements.

Meditation in Anuvrat and Sarvodaya

Ariyaratne, the founder of the Sri Lankan Sarvodaya, maintains that in classical Sri Lankan culture, the awakening of the personality was based on four principles: Sarvodaya interprets the first principle, *metta,* as respect for all life, cultivating love for all beings. This principle leads to second, *karuna*or compassion, which Sarvodaya understands as compassionate action. The third principle, *mudita*or sympathetic joy, results from acting on the first two principles. As well as, the fourth principle, *upekha*or equanimity becomes important for developing a personality, which is unshaken by praise or blame, by gain or loss. With Sarvodaya's psychological connections to these traditional *Brahma Viharas* (observances), it leaves me to ask what place meditation holds in the movement. In view of Ariyaratne (1996: 56): "Meditation helps to purify one's mind and generate an energy of love".

In a similar way, Tulsi laid stress on incorporating meditation in the movement when the Anuvrat Movement was at its pinnacle. According to an Anuvrati—one who accepts anuvrat vows: "Preksha Meditation, a Jain form of meditation, was introduced in the Anuvrat program to develop will power among the Anuvratis that would allow them to smoothly follow the

vows. A method of inner purification was needed that could give them the requisite strength." In terms of the Sarvodaya movement, Joanna Macy contends that, "Sarvodaya has brought another innovation to Sri Lankan Buddhism by wedding meditation and social action" (Nithl, 2006: 85). However, on many occasions both the movements have claimed in different tones that the constitution of meditation is only to support the social ethical actions of the movement's philosophy. Does Anuvrat or Sarvodaya require meditation to reach its goal? Is meditation merely a means to the end or an end in itself? I will further discuss how the mendicant Tulsi merges his movement with meditation and how Ariyaratne, the layman, integrates the Buddhist practice of *metta* meditation in social activity.

The Anuvrat Movement and Preksha Meditation

Some of the questions that Tulsi encountered regarding the Preksha Meditation (Insight meditation) were: "How did it originate and why? What values do you wish to establish through it in society? Is this also an extensive movement like Anuvrat" (Tulsi, 1994: 1). Tulsi (1994: 3) stated that Preksha Meditation was the next logical step following the Anuvrat Movement:

> Anuvrat and Prekshadhyana (meditation) originated almost together. Though, at that time, I had no conception of *'preksha'* in my mind. But, for the creation of the kind of ground I required for Anuvrat, it was not possible to ignore the inevitable requirement of *dhyana-sadhana*. The sapling of Anuvrat bloomed earlier because it was connected with the gross world and the behavioral aspect of life. But, *preksha* is concerned with the subtle world, the inner aspect of life, and it took a long time to develop. As the conception of moral values took root among the people, the spiritual thirst increased.

In order to comprehend Tulsi's response, the next query was about Preksha Meditation and how its practice (*sadhna*) assists the Anuvratis in realizing the goals of the movement. As I gathered from the responses, the technique called Preksha Meditation was developed by the monk Mahapragya (who later became Tulsi's successor in 1995) in 1970 to provide a holistic aspect to the growing Anuvrat Movement. Mahapragya, in an article, gives the reason for incorporating meditation in the movement. He writes: "Mental tension has emerged as a dreadful disease of the age of industrial progress. To remedy it, the Anuvrat Movement has added a new chapter to itself in the form of Preksha Meditation." Elaborating on the benefit of his

new experiment Tulsi stated: "Meditation affects the secretion of the endocrine glands and this in turn brings about an inner transformation of the individual." Another monk (who has been guiding the movement's activities since few decades), sheds light on the position meditation holds in the movement: "The practice of meditation helps in the purification of emotions and a transformation from negative thinking to positive thinking. Unless these are purified, people are not able to maintain vows." Mental disturbance is becoming an increasingly significant cause of growing violence in any society today. Moreover, meditation as a remedy is not only accepted but also recommended by the medical sciences in the present times.

Interestingly, if meditation holds such a central, transformative role in the movement, then what was the need for the vows? In the view of another Anuvrati, "Anuvrat vow means self-control and meditation is the technique for strengthening these vows." Several of my informants also said bothAnuvrat and Preksha complement each other. However, what is more intriguing here is to see that when the Anuvrat Movement was growing rapidly during the first two decades, Preksha Meditation was still an undeveloped concept. Twenty years later as Preksha developed, it came to be understood as a part of the Anuvrat Movement. From the various responses collected with regard to meditation's role in the movement, it seems that it has largely over-ridden the focus from the vows. Keeping the vows of minimizing violence, limiting material possessions, optimum use of resources and leading a truthful life seems to be more challenging than meditation. On the other hand, if meditation assists in developing secular spiritual goals, then irrespective of which path one follows if it leads to the same destination of creating a nonviolent society. Having seen the gradual shift in the Anuvrat Movement from vows to Preksha Meditation, let us now look at how Ariyaratne blends his Sarvodaya movement with *metta* meditation.

Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement and Metta Meditation

The Sarvodaya movement started with the aim of building a Buddhist centered society in postcolonial Ceylon (Nithl, 2005: 110). The founder of the movement, Ariyaratne, annotates his movement as: "The Sarvodaya *Shramadana* Movement drew abundantly from the wealth of Buddhist thought which we have attempted to apply to the realization of socio-economic ideals in harmony with moral and spiritual ends" (Nithl, 2005: 112). Unlike Tulsi's Anuvrat Movement, Sarvodaya is a layman's movement promoting meditation for social reform. Ariyaratne reinterpreted the Buddhist virtue of *dana* for his

social movement. *Dana,* traditionally referred to almsgiving for the Buddha or to the *sangha* (community of monks) as a merit-making practice. The reinterpretation of this virtue in the movement is: "*Dana* becomes the social ideal of sharing; sharing one's wealth and one's labor, as in *shramadana*, for the welfare of all (Nithl, 2005: 124). Here a reflection of Vinoba Bhave's Bhoodan movement is observed as concurrent to Ariyaratne's movement. Furthermore, an element of comparison with Tulsi's movement is that Anuvrat laid emphasis on non-possessiveness by cultivating *sanyami*—self restraint—and Sarvodaya focuses on non-possessiveness by integrating the virtue of *danai*—charity—within their movement.

Ariyaratne laid emphasis on *mettabhavana* (meditation) and regarded it "an energy of love that counteracts the negative thoughts in our psychosphere" (Bond, 2004: 277). He emphasized the pragmatic role of meditation and stated: "The short periods of meditation at *shramdana* camps are intended only as reminders to the people that this movement has a spiritual base and is not like just any other rat race" (Nithl, 2005: 86). Yet another point Ariyaratne made is that meditation is as an activity for its own sake leading to higher consciousness and does not constitute a central pursuit in Sarvodaya. Thus, Sarvodaya's approach is in contrast with the primary role of meditation for the Anuvratis. The Anuvrati laid a greater emphasis on the practice of Preksha Meditation for advancing the movement's philosophy of human regeneration through individual transformation. For Ariyaratne and other Sarvodaya leaders meditation plays a secondary, but a useful, role in the movement.

Even though the two movements uphold different propositions and significance to meditation, albeit agree upon the fact that the component of meditation complements their movement. Both social reformers, Tulsi and Ariyaratne, were optimistic in recognizing what Mary Douglas has called "the human potential for sustaining great spiritual achievements." As analyzed from the various viewpoints, the addition of meditation to their social-ethical movements was in accord with the spiritual goals of Tulsi and Ariyaratne. Both the *sramanic* traditions engaged ascetics within their movements as the 'agents of change.'

Conclusion

These peace movements are operating in different parts of Asia, central to these movements echoes a compelling need to foster values like compassion, charity, non-possessiveness and equanimity. Are these ethical considerations outdated in the present technologized global society or can we

build upon them as pillars of constructing a nonkilling society? A nonkilling society is not only a society free from weapons but a loving society as well. It is a society, which holds nonviolence as infinitely superior to violence. A society, in which environment of love and peace is nurtured by optimum utilization of resources available in the environment; a society that maintains a balance between need and greed; a society that respects humanity irrespective of any caste, color or creed and a society that recognizes the sanctity of every living being in every aspect of the environment. The two crucial tools which foster in the development of such a nonkilling society is the practice of self-restrain and meditation by global citizens.

References

Ariyaratne, A. T. (1996). *Buddhism and Sarvodaya: Sri Lankan Experience*. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

Ariyaratne, A. T. (1980). *Collected Works Volume II*. Moratuwa: Sarvodaya Research Institute.

Bond, George D. (1992). *Buddhist Revival in Sri Lanka: Religious Tradition, Re-Interpretation and Responses*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Bond, George D. (2004). *Buddhism at Work: Community Development, Social Empowerment and the Sarvodaya Movement*. Bloomfield: Kumarian Press.

Flugel, Peter (2002). "Terapanth Svetambara Jain Tradition," in Melton, J. G. and Baumann, M., Eds., *Religions of the World: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia of Beliefs and Practices*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

Fox, Richard Gabriel (1989). *Gandhian Utopia: Experiments with Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Goldberg, Philip (2010). *American Veda: From Emerson and the Beatles to Yoga and Meditation How Indian Spirituality Changed the West*. New York: Harmony.

Goulet, Denis (1981). *Survival With Integrity: Sarvodaya at the Crossroads*. Colombo: Marga Institute.

Haynes, Jeffrey (2002). *Politics in the Developing World: A Concise Introduction*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Nithl, Yanandam V. (2005). *Buddhist Philosophy of Social Activism*. Global Vision Publishing House.

Singh, Rajendra (2001). *Social Movements, Old and New: A Post-Modernist Critique*. New Delhi: Thousand Oaks.

Tulsi, Acharya (1994). *Transmutation of Personality Through Preksha Meditation*. Ladnun: Jain Vishva Bharati. Print.

Weber, Thomas (1988). *Hugging the Trees: The Story of the Chipko Movement*. New York: Viking.

Chapter Ten

Nonkilling and Necessity in the Christian Tradition

Robert Emmet Meagher
Hampshire College

Introduction

Is Christianity, we may well ask, a nonkilling spiritual tradition? There is no single, much less simple, answer to our question. Traditions, like all things temporal, live and die, unfold and change. What is true one moment may not be the next. In this light, it might be safest to answer our question this way: sometimes "yes" and sometimes "no." That said, I would argue that the full truth lies still deeper, in a more complex, conflicted space where conscience, that judge whom Philo called our "cross-examiner," holds court. Cross-examined by conscience, the Christian tradition, I will argue here, yields a third, contradictory, answer to our question: "yes" and "no" in the same moment. In other words, when the Christian tradition is true to itself, to its roots and its calling, it is at the same time both pacifist and murderous.

As we set out pursuing this argument, I must admit that I am not altogether convinced of its cogency. I present it as a thought-experiment, a theory to counter the Just War Theory of Augustine, a theory of unjustified war that conscience nevertheless demands. Having begun this experiment with the question "Is Christianity a nonkilling spiritual tradition?" I will divide my response, then, into three parts: YES—NO—YES and NO.

YES

The Jesus Tradition

Mahatma Gandhi, whose nonkilling credentials are beyond question, is said to have once remarked that "I like your Christ, I do not like your Christians. Your Christians are so unlike your Christ." Gandhi, of course, was not the first mindful critic to point out the less than perfect fit between Christ and the tradition that took his name but not all that came with it.

We needn't wonder nor search long to discover why Gandhi liked Christ. Jesus was, after all, a reformer—some would say a revolutionary—

in an occupied land, a traditionalist in a homespun robe, a man of peace. The earliest evidence we have of this man and his teachings has survived in a document known as "Q", short for *"Quelle"* or "Source," a proto-evangelical collection of the sayings (*logia*) of Jesus, many of which found their way eventually into the Christian gospels. "Q is our earliest source of authentic Jesus tradition" (Joseph, 2014: 8). Quite simply, Q brings us "nearer to Jesus than anywhere else on the pages of history." (Robinson, 1992: 180, 183). And here, at the very roots of the Christian tradition, we find a Christ unequivocally committed to nonviolence. The Jesus that emerges from this seminal text is a teacher whose lessons are all about love of enemies, non-judgment, forgiveness, peace, and fearlessness in the face of death. The Jesus remembered in Q is, in a word, a pacifist.

Later, in the Gospel narratives, when we witness the life, the deeds (*praxeis*), of Jesus, we find his essential pacifism confirmed, most convincingly on the night of his arrest, when he offers no resistance to his captors. On the contrary, when one of his disciples (identified by John (Jn 18:10) as Simon Peter) draws his sword and cuts off the ear of Malchus, the high priest's slave, Jesus restores the ear (Lk 22:50–51) and reprimands his volatile disciple, saying that those who take up the sword die by the sword. Though he claimed to have legions of warrior angels at his command, Jesus went to his death as a lamb, not a lion.

The Christian Tradition

Despite a handful of contrary passages in Q and the four canonical gospels later invoked to argue that Jesus was not as meek as he had been made out to be, the early Christian Church took to heart and imitated his nonviolence. This was demonstrated in the outspoken pacifism of the most vocal Christians and the fact that there is no evidence of Christians' serving in the military until the late 2nd century. Virtually all of the major early Church Fathers, East and West, repudiated military service. Tertullian (c.155–c.240 C.E.), the reputed "Father of Latin or Western Theology," put it this way: "How will a Christian go to war or for that matter how will he serve even in peace, without a sword that the Lord has taken away? … In disarming Peter, the Lord disarmed every future soldier. No uniform is lawful among us, if it stands for sinful action" (Tertullian, *On Idolatry*, 19.318, 321). The "sinful action" in question was the act of taking human life, always sinful, always to be condemned and eschewed by Christians, whether in battle or in the courts. Judges, magistrates, execu-

tioners, just like soldiers, all too often had blood on their hands. In time, as men in these positions converted to Christianity and as Christians enlisted in military or civil service, Hippolytus of Rome, made it clear that the Christian Church could not, would not, tolerate killing.

> A soldier of the civil authority must be taught not to kill men and to refuse to do so if he is commanded, and to refuse to take an oath; if he is unwilling to comply, he must be rejected [by the Christian church]. A military commander or civic magistrate that wears the purple must resign or be rejected [by the church]. If a catechumen or a believer seeks to become a soldier, they must be rejected, for they have despised God (Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*, II.16.17–19).

Killing up close and appreciating it from afar, however, are not the same thing. Apart from relatively exceptional periods of fierce persecution, early Christians were grateful for the civil order, rule of law, and security provided by Rome, all of which allowed their Church to propagate and prosper. From a fearful few gathered in an upper room in Jerusalem awaiting the Holy Spirit, it is estimated that the followers of Jesus by the end of the 2nd century may have grown in number to as many as five million. This surely would have been unthinkable without Rome's cities, roads, common tongue, and admittedly its legions. Consequently, near the end of the 2nd century, the same Tertullian who condemned killing and, to be sure, any Christian involvement in it wrote to the reigning Emperor, Septimius Severus, to assure him that Christians were upstanding citizens, loyal to the state. He then went even further to add that "Without ceasing, for all our emperors we offer prayer. We pray for life prolonged; for security to the empire; for protection to the imperial house; for brave armies, a faithful senate, a virtuous people, the world at rest, whatever, as man or Caesar, an emperor would wish" (Tertullian, *Apology*, 30.4). Tertullian saw in the empire, as in the Creation itself, the hand of God, the handiwork of divine largesse and providence.

Christians—pacifists in a warrior state—gratefully acknowledged all that the *gladius*, the signature sword of the Roman legions, daily defended, without their having to stain their hands and souls with the blood of others. Walking in the footsteps of their Lord, Christians were *in* the world, but not *of* it (Jn 17:16). While lethal force, within and without the empire, was admittedly necessary to maintain the peace they enjoyed, they saw killing as the work of others, fellow Romans but not fellow Christians. "A state of faith admits no plea of necessity," wrote Tertullian in *De Corona* (11:421). "They [Christians] are under no necessity to sin, whose one necessity is that they do not sin."

This and other exemptions claimed by Christians, however, sat less well with those Romans who were very much *of* the world. One of these was Celsus, an outspoken opponent of Christianity, who complained that Christians simply weren't pitching in, as it were. They were in his eyes parasites, not patriots. Peace comes at a price, and Celsus argued that it was time for Christians to pay their fair share. It was Origen, arguably the most sage and scintillating Christian thinker of the first three centuries, who responded to Celsus, conceding that security was the concern of all Romans and that lethal force was necessary to its maintenance, but arguing that what Christians had to offer Rome was far more essential and effectual than bearing arms. The holiness of Christians' lives and the efficacy of their prayers on behalf of Rome represented their fair share and then some. After all, Rome does not expect its priests to take up arms. Their service to the state lies in their advocacy to the gods, whose favor they secure by the holiness of their lives and the power of their prayers and sacrifices. The same, claimed Origen, is true for all Christians, who share in the priesthood of Christ, and call down their God's blessings on Rome and its endeavors. The fact is, wrote Origen, "the holier a man is, the more effective help does he render to emperors, even more than is given by soldiers, who go forth to fight and kill as many of the enemy as they can" (Origen, *Against Celsus*, 8.73).

In retrospect, Origen's rebuttal to Celsus was as prophetic as it was canny. To the stinging accusation that Christians, so far from being responsible Romans, were bystanders and ingrates, Origen countered that Christians had, in fact, opted *in* not *out* of the empire, and they were a force to be reckoned with. Their holy lives and their prayers to their God on Rome's behalf defined their unique service to the state, their pledge of lasting loyalty. What's more, their God was the one true God, in whose hands lay the fate and welfare of Rome; and they were God's people. In this sense, they were the future of Rome, though not even the prescient Origen could have imagined how true that would be in the years and centuries ahead.

NO

Christendom

No one saw it coming. The conversion of Constantine the Great, like the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, turned not only heads but the course of history. Three centuries earlier, at the Council of Jerusalem (c.50 C.E.), Paul—Roman citizen and Christian convert—had won the day, convincing a new Jewish sect to open its arms to the Gentiles, the wide world, in other

words Rome. Now, resplendent in victory on the Milvian Bridge (312 C.E.), the ascendant Emperor opened Rome's arms to Christians, who understandably saw the providential hand of God at work in Constantine's rise to power and sudden conversion. Indeed, Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea spoke for most Christians of the time when he celebrated Constantine as "the servant of God and the Conqueror of Nations" (Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, I.6), God's friend and earthly regent.

No one could claim now that Christians were bystanders. They were suddenly stakeholders. No longer and never again on the margins, they held the center. They *were* Rome. That meant that more was expected of them now than to pursue holiness and pray for the empire. The rule of law was not just for Christians to observe but theirs to enforce; likewise, the empire's borders were theirs to defend, rather than to hide behind. Rome's enemies were their enemies, and they had to confront them. For centuries Christians had witnessed and enjoyed the benefits of the *Pax Romana*, the Roman Peace, a peace bought with blood. Waging war and punishing criminals, however, had been the work of others. In a Christian empire, however, there were no convenient "others." This much became clear: a pacifist Church was one thing. A pacifist empire was another. Christian baptism, formerly an impediment to military service, became a prerequisite. As the established religion, Roman Christianity shed its wings and walked the corridors of power, borne down by an unfamiliar gravity.

Beginning with Constantine and culminating in the reign of Theodosius I (379–395 C.E.), not only did Rome become Christian, but the Christian Church, or more precisely the Western Christian Church, became Roman, through and through. Theirs was no natural embrace. Rome was violent, root and branch, to its core, unapologetically so. Christianity, on the other hand, was all about love and forgiveness, turning the other cheek and showing mercy. Or at least had been. Now, under a new sky, Christians took up arms and the Church changed its mind about killing. Nearly overnight, the case for pacifism was forgotten. But why? Fear of barbarians, messianic fervor, a new Christian jingoism? Or had the roots of Christian nonviolence never run all that deep in the first place? For most Christians in the West, it seems, the nonviolent Jesus had become an awkward anachronism. Enter the Church Militant, the Church Triumphant. Enter Christendom.

However fated and fortunate the Christian Church's "coming of age" might have seemed at the time, it must also have provoked wide debate and ignited some deep scruples. So long as killing was understood as sinful, Christians could have nothing to do with it, which is to say that they could

have nothing to do with war or civil execution, except as their victims. After centuries of leaving the killing to others, Christians must have been reluctant to take up the sword; yet this was exactly what the times and the Church "in its wisdom" called for. To answer the call, Christian conscience clearly required a reset, and this was work best suited to moral philosophers and theologians, men who deal in ideas, in "think tanks," far from where other men kill and die. The greatest of these was Augustine, a Roman through and through, having served for a time in the imperial court, but now saving himself and his talents to serve his God and his Church. Augustine was a philosopher, theologian, and biblical exegete of unparalleled learning and genius. Not surprisingly he proved equal to the task.

What Augustine came up with was a new take on killing and the profession of arms that came to be known as Just War Theory, but he did so quite piecemeal. The truth is that Augustine never systematically addressed killing and war. What he had to say on these topics must be gleaned from the vast corpus of writings he left behind: treatises, commentaries, dialogues, sermons, and letters, as well as his landmark autobiography, The *Confessions.* When anyone refers to Augustine's seminal Just War teachings they can mean no more than a collage of relevant passages cut and pasted together from the profusion of texts he left to posterity. Augustine's foundational contribution to what we know today as Just War Doctrine, amounted to no more than the first seed planted in what, as it were, became a civic garden. Each new generation of Just War proponents, from the 4th to the 21st century, have amended and expanded its provisions and arguments to accommodate and address new wars, new weapons, new enemies, and new objections to all of the above.

So what was the seed that Augustine planted? Put most simply, it was the claim that war could be justified, i.e. that there can be such a thing as just war. "Just war," however, was and remains a euphemism. War, after all, is all about killing. Otherwise, it would be called an argument, and neither Christ nor Christians had a moral problem with arguing. What concerned Augustine was "just killing," not only on the battlefield but also in the courts. Another source of confusion can be removed if we realize that by "just" he meant sinless or innocent, not legitimate, defensible, urgent, or necessary. Augustine's concerns, unlike the preoccupations of most later Just War proponents, were theological and moral, not legal, much less psychological. He was probably aware of and surely would have agreed with Tertullian's assertion that Christians' "one necessity is that they do not sin." Consequently, the one exercise of lethal force that he, and his mentor

Ambrose, ruled out from the start as never justifiable, never sinless, was killing in self-defense. Far better to die in that case than to kill. The kind of killing that Augustine was concerned to justify was selfless killing, killing on behalf of others, on behalf of the state, killing for the common good.

The core of Augustine's theory is that there are two morally distinct kinds of killing, one sinful and the other not, one that violates God's will and one that doesn't. Presumably, once this founding principle were accepted, there would need to be rules, criteria, reservations, limits… and these followed soon enough and have proliferated every since. But the first principle, the make-or-break claim, of Just War Theory has remained intact, unaltered, and rarely challenged from Augustine to the present day: that it is possible to kill without sin, without stain, without guilt, without shame, without pollution, without being haunted by the souls of the dead, without (in today's currency) "moral injury."

The challenge facing Augustine, in simplest terms, was to reconcile the Jesus Tradition, the words and deeds of the Son of God, with the needs of Christendom, which meant to transform a nonkilling tradition into a killing tradition. There were hurdles. The first and most formidable was to find a way around or through the commandment of love, the center and sum of the Christian life. The next was to devise a way of reading the New Testament that would enable rather derail the agenda of what was already on its way to becoming an imperial Church. And lastly, even if the act of killing were rendered morally harmless, there remained the likelihood of collateral moral damage. That is to say that even if killing were sinless, it could be the occasion of other kindred sins such as hatred, rage, vengeance, bloodlust, and a perverse delight in the pain of others. To this too he suggested a solution.

Augustine, in constructing his theory of justified killing, charted a course that cannot be detailed here. In short, he avoided whenever possible the New Testament, preferring the Old Testament, whose Lord of Hosts was more amenable to killing than was the Prince of Peace. And so, as might be expected, Moses and David figured far more prominently in Augustine's deliberations on war and killing than did Jesus. When there was no avoiding the Christian scriptures and their inevitable veto on violence, however, Augustine employed the subtle knife of allegory to neutralize their threat. Most decisively, Augustine reduced Christian love to an intention, a state of soul, explaining how killing and even torture can be conducted with love. "Once and for all, then, a precept is given to thee," wrote Augustine, "love and do what you will" (Augustine, *Ten Homilies*, 10.7.7). God looks to the heart not to the hands. If the killer's heart is pure and filled with love, then

the blood on his hands can be washed away with soap. This revised reading of the gospel of love provided all the license Christendom needed to embark on a new, imperial course.

Imperial Christianity

As Old Rome and its empire moldered into irrelevance, the Christian Church, or perhaps more accurately the Papal Church, rose to take its place. The *Ecclesia Catholica* emerged as an empire in its own right, defining the center of Christendom, and claiming imperial powers. These included what had come to be known as the "two swords," an allusion to the two swords presented to Jesus on the night of his arrest (Lk 22:38), and eventually interpreted as absolute spiritual authority, on the one hand, and total secular dominance, on the other. The privileges and powers claimed by the Roman Pope, a shepherd in theory and an emperor in fact—were without limit or shame. Summarized in the infamous proclamation *Dictatus Papae*, the "Dictates of the Pope," attributed to Gregory VII, they included such claims as these: that the Pope alone can depose emperors; that all princes shall kiss his feet; that he may be judged by no one; that he alone may use the imperial insignia; that he is beyond error and that, in death, he will be numbered among the saints (cf. Henderson, 1910: 366-367).

On the martial front, it was the same Pope Gregory the VIIth who removed the last moral stigma from the act of killing, provided the killer follow the rules laid down by the church. The profession of arms, as a result, could be pursued without scruple and deserved respect and merit, in this life and the next. There can be no question here of tracing the course of Christendom and just war through the Middle Ages when killing became the pastime of princes, and war rose to new theological heights in the Crusades. Instead, a few "highlights" or reminders may suffice. Once war became just, it was only a matter of time before it became holy; and killing, once sinful, could—in a just cause and with pure intention—bring spiritual rewards, even salvation, to the killer. Not all Christians, however, accepted Just War and sinless killing. Eastern Orthodox Christianity, never did and still doesn't accept just war, in theory or practice. And even in the Western Church, there were doubters and deniers, like Saints Martin and Francis, and the great humanist scholar Desiderius Erasmus, who was fierce and eloquent in his condemnation of the dark pact Christendom had made with war and killing.

Even so, for most but not all Christians Just War worked like a dream and has ever since—at least in this one sense: it enabled Christianity to

move from the margins to the center of power, to declare wars, and to enlist Christians to fight those wars, risking their lives but not their souls in the bargain. I say it "worked like a dream"; but for the killers, the veterans, then and now, that dream is often a nightmare. The line that Augustine and his successors drew between sinless and sinful killing, and the line we still draw between killing in wartime and murder in peacetime is open to challenge. In fact, it is under challenge today and every day by combat veterans, who know better than did Augustine the dark consequences of killing. Augustine was confident that the care of souls lay within the power of the Church, including the power to bind and loose, to forgive, to purify, to restore, to resurrect. The Roman papacy, in effect, claimed the authority and power to define truth—physical, legal, moral, and theological. *Rome locuta est, casa finita est.* When Rome had spoken, the case, any case, was closed. Truth was what the Church said it was.

The assurances of religions and states, however, regarding the righteousness of their wars and of all the bloodshed and destruction they cause, then and now, offer no light or consolation to those who wage them, much less to those who endure their ravages. These sorrier souls have different "seats," as it were, in the theater of war; and what they see and suffer there must be allowed to inform and, at least in part, guide us as our discussion takes another, possibly more truthful, turn.

YES and NO

The Good Samaritan and the City of Man

When the Roman Catholic Church made its peace with war, what it called "just war," endorsing "righteous" violence and issuing waivers to kill, it would seem that only two divergent paths presented themselves to faithful Christians: either nonkilling or killing, either pacifism or Just War. What we haven't considered as yet is the fact that the "pacifist" option was not confined to a radical few "conscientious objectors." Instead, it was the road taken by all priests, monks, and nuns, who by virtue of their calling disavowed both the marriage bed and the battlefield, the act of making life and the act of taking it. These acts belonged to what theologians like Eusebius called the "*kosmikoi*," the worldly ones, the laity, the Church's "second estate," neither holy nor sinful, or perhaps both: "sort of" holy and "sort of" sinful. What this divide surely reveals is that the Church was still uneasy with its arguably necessary and admittedly convenient justification of war and killing. Someone had to do it, but that didn't make it right. In other

words, someone "else" had to do it, not those following the "counsels of perfection," not those following Jesus all the way to Golgotha. This same unease with the path taken likely explains why the Church, in "just" wars, and even in its "holy" wars, where men won remission for their sins and the promise of eternal salvation, warriors with blood on their hands were required to do penance for every life they took. Soap and absolution were not enough, it seems, to cleanse the hands and souls of killers.[1]

We may well question whether the Church ever enjoyed a clear and untroubled conscience in its embrace of killing. And if not, why not? After all, until the Reformation, laity and clergy alike expressed little doubt that the Church possessed the power to "bind and loose" (Mt 16:19), the "keys to the kingdom" bequeathed by Jesus to Peter and to his successors. This meant that decisions taken and judgments made by the Pope here on earth would be honored in high heaven. What it didn't guarantee was that they would be observed down here on earth. The Church, in other words, possessed the power to forgive violations of divine commands, sins against God. And killing was undeniably one of those. But was killing *only* a violation of a divine commandment? Was it *only* a sin against God? Was it not also a sin against humanity, a violation of the humanity not only of the one killed but also of the killer? In his *Literal Commentary on Genesis* Augustine had commented that the archetypal sin, the killing of Adam by Cain, meant that all homicide amounted to fratricide. All murderers, therefore, would bear the mark of Cain on their foreheads. Was this, we may ask, a mark that the Church was or is empowered to wipe away, not in the heavenly kingdom, but here, in what Augustine labeled the "City of Man"?

In the City of Man—unlit by divine Revelation and unconvinced by papal authority—matters of life and death, killing and nonkilling, fear and forgiveness— are rarely certain or simple. Consider the gospel parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:35–37). A wayfarer is beaten, robbed, stripped, and left in a ditch, half dead. A priest and later a Levite, when they see him, cross over to the far side of the road, and walk past. Then a Samaritan, an outcast, comes upon the naked, beaten man. Tenderly and generously he sees to his wounds and his needs. In case there were doubt, Jesus instructs his interlocutor that it is the Samaritan, not the priest or the Levite, who is to be imitated. The parable's lesson is clear, but the context is also impor-

[1] It is interesting and important to note here that, in the Greek Orthodox tradition, priests were then and are still permitted to marry but not to wage war; for war, though at times thought necessary, was and is never regarded as anything but sinful.

tant. Jesus was being cross-examined regarding eternal life and how to be sure to inherit it. The law was clear: love God above all else and love your neighbor as yourself. Then came inevitable follow-up: who is my neighbor? And Jesus answered, as he so often did, with a story. But does it take Judaic law, divine revelation, or Jesus to tell us this? Here in the City of Man there is, after all, such a thing as common decency, common human decency—not always observed, but still no secret.

One slight hypothetical alteration in this parable, however, may be enough to cloud over our moral clarity and make common decency less common. What if the Samaritan had come upon the scene earlier, when the robbery and beating of his human "neighbor" were still in progress? What would love have called for then? Thugs who rob and beat their prey, leaving them for dead, are not likely to scatter when confronted by a man of conscience who does no more than point out their evil. To speak truth to power, in this case, may amount to doing nothing, which is precisely what the priest and the Levite did in the canonical version of this story. So what does love of neighbor mean, when the neighbor is under threat, or under fire? Here and now, in the City of Man this is a real and urgent question, demanding an answer. Complicating the matter for Christians, East and West, are these venerated words spoken by Jesus to his most intimate disciples at their Last Supper:

> This is my commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you. No one has greater love than this, to lay down one's life for one's friends. You are my friends if you do what I command you (Jn 15:12–14 NRSV).

These are words that we must allow to challenge us, even haunt us. The unsettling fact is that, *in extremis*, many Christians (and many others)—convinced of the evil of war, the sin of killing, and the primacy of pacifism—take up arms, not in their own defense, but in the defense of otherwise defenseless others, their "neighbors," which may mean their children or may mean total strangers, in any case their fellow human beings. This is the extreme third option announced above: the YES *and* NO, nonkilling *and* killing, pacifism and violence, hand in hand. A logical contradiction, yes, at least in Aristotelian terms. "A is B" and "A is not B" cannot both be true. They mutually exclude each other, just as it seems do nonkilling and killing. But do they represent a moral contradiction? Do they morally exclude each other? There is a dialectic, pursued in both Western and Eastern mysticism, that embraces contradiction so as to transcend it and reach a higher plane

of truth. Doing so mostly means leaving clear, coherent discourse behind and becoming wordless or talking what to others sounds like nonsense. This was precisely what Capt. Timothy Kudo, USMC confronted when he returned home after serving in both Iraq and Afghanistan and submitted a piece to the *Washington Post* in January 2013, entitled "I killed people in Afghanistan. Was I right or wrong?" To many Americans, who saw him as a hero and thanked him for his service, Kudo's question made no sense, and his own response to it made even less sense: "killing is always wrong, but in war it is necessary." The media, confused and on occasion hostile, descended on Kudo (2013). How can something be both necessary and wrong? They wanted to know and he couldn't tell them. It just is. An equally troubling but perhaps more promising question would be: how can something morally wrong be morally necessary?

This is a question to which it is all but impossible to give a definitive or even convincing answer. It is a question with which Eastern Orthodox Christianity has struggled for centuries. As stated earlier, Eastern Christianity has never accepted the West's justification of war and, instead, has maintained that all war and killing are evil and sinful. At the same time, *in extremis,* i.e. in the no-man's-land between good and evil, when the moral sky darkens and innocent lives are at risk, killing can and has been understood and accepted as the lesser of two evils. Sometimes, in other words, the exercise of violence, even lethal violence, may be less of a sin against humanity, less of a betrayal, than standing by and doing nothing. In the original parable of the Good Samaritan, the priest and Levite merit the condemnation of Jesus, as well as our own, by walking past and doing nothing. But what about our revised version of the same parable? Might it not be equally contemptible to walk past the atrocity-in-progress and do nothing to stop it? This is a question with which pacifists, within and without the Christian Tradition, have long wrestled, for millennia, and which they carry forward in our own day.

Militant Pacifism

Pacifists raising their fists and bearing arms? Just who do I have in mind? I will give a few brief examples, from the trenches, as it were. In World War II, although a priest and a long committed, outspoken pacifist, Dietrich Bonhoeffer slowly and painfully came to the realization that he was morally obligated, even "called" as a Christian, to participate in the plot to assassinate Adolph Hitler. At the same time he never justified his complicity in all the deceptions and betrayals that the scheme entailed. Still less did he re-

gard the killing of Hitler as anything but murder and, as such, a grave sin that he would carry to his death when he would meet his Maker and fall upon his mercy. Bonhoeffer, to his own torment, came to believe that "innocence" is not the only or highest calling of a Christian and that to be "sinless" in a sinful world can be irresponsible. Thomas Merton too, until his untimely death, struggled with pacifism and responsibility, concerned not to be a "guilty bystander." Both men, in their last years, grew to understand more and more deeply the "this-worldliness" of Christianity and what it meant to follow an incarnate God.

It may be that absolutes are too brittle to withstand real life; and abstractions, put into practice, seem to cast little light when we most need it. Pacifism, as an absolute and in the abstract, proved so to the young, New Zealand missionary monk, Rev. Michael Lapsley, when he witnessed first-hand the demonic, systemic evil of Apartheid South Africa. In his own words:

> I had come to South Africa overflowing with eagerness and youthful idealism to preach the gospel of love and peace. The Bible says we are required to love god with our heart, our mind, our soul, and our strength and our neighbors as ourselves. But in South Africa I couldn't be a neighbor to a black person. We were locked into an oppressor-oppressed relationship. Over the course of the three years I lived there, my conviction about what it meant to be a Christian gradually eroded and finally collapsed in the face of the shooting of innocent children. I began to realize that my understanding of the gospel did not take into account the full magnitude of evil… As a result I began more and more to question my pacifism.… I knew that the answer to my spiritual crisis was somehow to be found in my commitment to the liberation struggle (Lapsley, 2012: 62).

At first, Father Michael, however much he affirmed the ANC (African National Congress), parted ways with them over the armed struggle. He persisted in preaching nonviolence to black and white, but eventually became convinced that Apartheid would not be brought down without the violence he still saw as evil. Consequently, embracing a more militant theology of liberation, he joined the ANC and served as its chaplain. Now an enemy of the State, he was exiled and eventually sent a letter bomb that exploded in his hands. He narrowly—some would say miraculously—survived, but not without sustaining devastating permanent injuries. When Apartheid fell and he was free to return to his adopted country, Father Michael did so and to this day works tirelessly for reconciliation and healing, in South Africa and widely throughout the world in numerous post-conflict zones.

Lastly, we consider another pacifist monk-turned-freedom-fighter. Ernesto Cardenal—poet, liberation theologian, revolutionary—left his native Nicaragua and traveled to the Trappist Abbey of Gethsemane in 1957 to place himself under the tutelage of the already luminary Thomas Merton, the abbey's Novice Master. Both men, who soon became fast friends and life-long confidants, were ardent Catholic pacifists and shared a calling to the contemplative life. Serious illness, however, necessitated Cardenal's return to Nicaragua and his adoption of a less austere form of monasticism, one that his fragile health could endure. In fact, Merton had planned to join Cardenal there in order to co-found with him a Trappist-inspired contemplative community without the formal rules, strictures, rigors and routines of the Trappists. This plan dissolved, however, when Merton's superiors refused to release him from his vow of stability and permit his going off to Niacaragua. Cardenal, for his part, fulfilled his dream and founded a contemplative community on the island of Mancarrón, the largest in the Solentiname archipelago, a community that opened its arms to local *campesinos* as well as to anyone—man, woman, child—who sought sanctuary and devout fellowship. As the violence and oppression of the Somoza regime became ever more ruthless, however, and more pointedly when Cardenal's own community was savagely attacked and razed by Somoza's National Guard, Cardenal became convinced that nonviolent struggle was not practical in Nicaragua, not when even innocent children were being slaughtered. Like Bonhoeffer and Lapsley, Cardenal came to accept violence as a necessary evil. He even found support for this in his reading of the gospels.[2] Take his comments on Jesus' prescription to "turn the other cheek" (Mt 5:39; Lk 6:29), a virtual "proof text" of pacifist Christians:

> This doesn't mean not to fight. It means not to fight for yourself but for others. And Christ says to turn the other cheek, but it's *your* other cheek, not the other cheek of other people. Christians who don't fight for the revolution aren't turning either one of their cheeks. They're turning the

[2] Thomas Merton had died by the time that Cardenal embraced violence; so there is no way to be certain what he would have said to this turn in Cardenal's thought and life. But another virulent pacifist and mutual friend of Merton, Daniel Berrigan, S.J., was later outspoken in his rejection of Cardenal's militant convictions: "Thou shalt not kill. Love one another as I have loved you. If your enemy strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other…. We really are stuck. Christians are stuck with this Christ, the impossible, unteachable, irreformable loser" (Berrigan, 1978).

> cheeks of undernourished children, of the hopelessly ill, of abandoned widows, of workers robbed of their work (Cardenal, 1978: 113).

A line in the sand. Pacifism at others' expense becomes a tool in the hand of oppressors and murderers. If nonviolence is to be a moral choice, it is a choice for the victim to make, not the bystander, not the mere witness.

A Philosophy of Limits

So where has our thought experiment brought us? If we return to the question with which we began—is Christianity a killing or a nonkilling spiritual tradition?—it appears we have reached a 3-way draw. Some say "yes"; some say "no"; and some say both. Perhaps the only way out from this impasse is with the mutually compromising admission that Christianity is in principle nonviolent though not always in practice. Christian ethics, after all, is riddled with compromise. Lying and stealing, for example, are considered natural evils, whose gravity is nevertheless diminished when their commission is necessary to prevent greater evils. Necessity is indeed a spoiler that rears its head regularly when dogma meets daily life. One could argue that it keeps us honest. In ancient Greek mythology and literature, "Necessity" (*ananke*) was a deity and a natural force that we mortals ignore at our peril. Necessity, wrote Camus, is all about limits and the goddess who enforces them: "Nemesis—the goddess of measure. All those who have overstepped the limit will be pitilessly destroyed" (Camus, 1965: 156).

It may seem odd and arbitrary, at this point, to draft Albert Camus to help us reflect on necessity and limits in the Christian tradition, a man widely (and mistakenly as I see it) labeled an atheist. Supposedly he was also an existentialist, despite the fact that he insisted that all of his writings had as their aim to attack existentialism, which he saw as wrongheaded and pernicious. Regarding his formal Christian credentials, Camus was baptized and confirmed, and made his First Communion as a Catholic, though after that he was consistently and conscientiously at odds with the Church and its God, which hardly distinguishes him from legions of estranged, excommunicated, and hostile Catholics and Christians throughout history. The more relevant and important fact is that he carried on a brilliantly fierce lifelong engagement and dialogue with the Christian tradition and its adherents, from his youthful thesis "Christian Metaphysics and Neoplatonism," focused on the thought of Augustine and Plotinus, to his satirical musings on the essence of evil in *The Fall*. I see no point, however, in claiming that Camus was a Christian, a "would-be" or "crypto-" Christian as some have called

him, only that Gandhi, who "liked" Christ, would most probably have liked Camus, as well. If not *in* the Christian tradition, then, Camus at least wrote *to* or *at* the tradition, mostly in adamant opposition, though on occasion admiringly; but never with indifference.

Camus—like Bonhoeffer, Cardenal, and Lapsley—was a committed pacifist who struggled with that commitment in the face of demonic, institutionalized violence and who, like them, came to a limited and troubled acceptance of armed resistance. His, like theirs, was a reluctant decision not to renounce nonviolence but to conscientiously violate it, within limits, as an exception that proves rather than rejects the rule. What makes Camus uniquely helpful here is that he examined this decision in great depth, wrestled with it, and wrote about it extensively, across multiple genres (fiction, nonfiction, and drama). In truth, he obsessed over it, as it represented the most deeply troubling moral conundrum and personal challenge that he faced as a pacifist freedom fighter, committed to justice in a dark world.

"We shall know nothing," wrote Camus in the opening pages of his masterwork *The Rebel*, "until we know whether we have the right to kill our fellow men, or the right to let them be killed" (Camus, 1956: 4). As Camus surveyed his world and his times, he was convinced that murder or killing (synonymous in his view) was the greatest moral problem we face. From the outset, however, Camus made it clear that his concern was not with "crimes of passion"—unpremeditated, impulsive murders that belong to a specific tumultuous moment and are unlikely to be repeated or to spread. Instead, what concerned him to his core was what he called "crimes of logic" or reason—calculated murders that have been "justified" in advance by judges, generals, politicians, philosophers, revolutionaries, anyone with an idea, an ideology, a belief or a strategy that "legitimizes" and thereby "decriminalizes" killing, and robes the killer in innocence. Camus knew well that he lived in a murderous age. He said that the Resistance had taught him this much—that violence was unavoidable. He never expected to live in a world without murder, but refused to accept a world in which murder is justified, a world of easy kills and innocent, righteous killers. Killing, for Camus, can be nothing but criminal, and just war is an oxymoron, a convenient, bureaucratic lie.

Already, in the *Myth of Sisyphus*, Camus had argued: "There is but one truly philosophical problem, and that is suicide. Judging whether life is worth or is not worth living amounts to answering the fundamental question of philosophy" (Camus, 1955: 3). In the *Myth* and in each of the works grouped together in what he referred to as the Sisyphus Cycle, Camus answered that question with a defiant "yes" to life. In *The Rebel* that "yes"

transcends the self and resonates throughout the ranks of humanity. "From the moment that life is recognized as good, it becomes good for all men," (Camus, 1956: 6), "human solidary is metaphysical" (Camus, 1956: 17), and the essential human community is made manifest. At this point suicide and murder become inseparable, and murder becomes "the definitive crime against man" (Camus. 1956: 126). Human solidarity is a sacred bond. I cannot say "yes" to my life without extending that same "yes" to every other human; and I cannot say "no" another's life without saying "no" to my own.

We must not forget, however, that there is another part to what Camus insisted we must know: whether we have the right to let our fellow men be killed. Camus is unequivocal regarding the criminality of killing, but what of the crime of the bystander, the one who blinks or turns a blind eye to the murder of others? If the Resistance taught Camus that violence was inevitable, it also taught him that he must stand up to it, not only with the pen but also with the sword. "Contrary to what we sometimes used to think," wrote Camus in July, 1943, "the spirit is of no avail against the sword, but that the spirit together with the sword will always win out over the sword itself" (Camus, 1960: 7). Camus saw his years of involvement in armed resistance to Nazi aggression and atrocity as "a long detour" and explained that: "It took us all that time to find out if we had the right to kill men, if we were allowed to add to the frightful misery of this world" (Camus, 1960: 6).

What "right" came down to, however, was necessity. Was it necessary, and how necessary was it, to take human life in order to save it, to kill in order to stop the killing? Camus saw this as something to be decided one murder and one murderer at a time, not in the abstract, never once for all, never from a distance. His fullest and most compelling response to this question came in the form of a play entitled "*Les Justes*," "The Just Assassins," first performed in Paris in 1949. It focused on the tortured resolve of one real-life assassin, Ivan Kaliayev, who together with his fellow revolutionary terrorists, had plotted and carried out the assassination of the Grand Duke Sergei on the morning of February 17, 1905. In his portrayal of their heated debates with each other and with their own troubled consciences, Camus as playwright cast as much light as he ever did on the limits to be observed in the taking of human life. He expressed the belief that these young idealists, whom he greatly esteemed, "while recognizing the inevitability of violence, nevertheless admitted to themselves that it is unjustifiable. Necessary and inexcusable—that is how murder appeared to them" (Camus, 1960: 169). The final word, however, on the necessity and limits of killing for the sake of life goes to the killer, Kaliayev:

> When we kill. We're killing so as to build up a world in which there will be no more killing. We consent to being criminals so that at last the innocent, and only they, will inherit the earth (Camus, 1958: 245).

Camus later explained his admiration for Kaliayev and the Russian "fanatics" of 1905 in these terms:

> The greatest homage we can pay them is to say that we would not be able, in 1905 (or even now perhaps in 2015), to ask them one question that they themselves had not already asked and that, in their life or by their death, they had not partially answered (Camus, 1956: 167).

After hurling his bomb into the Grand Duke's face, Kaliayev threw himself under the Duke's carriage to be trampled by his horses. As it happens he survived and was hanged. In retrospect, what mattered to Camus and should matter to us is that this killer refused to disregard or even discount his enemy's life, refused to consider it of less worth than his own. He refused to take another life and continue to live his own. His crime stops where it began. It won't spread like a plague, as justified murder so easily does.

So, do we or do we not have the right to kill our fellow men, or the right to let them be killed? It appears the answer we have come to in our experiment with truth in the Christian tradition is a resounding "no" to both. No such "right," ever. But where, in a still murderous world, does that leave us? We can never kill enough to bring killing to an end, and yet there may be darkly cursed moments when we can no longer live with ourselves if we don't die trying. In such moments it seems that the best that anyone can do is to weigh his or her own life in the same scale as the life to be taken. Life for life, death for death. In *The Rebel*, Camus called Kaliayev and his fellows "the Fastidious Assassins," scrupulous to a fault, nearly to the point of paralysis. The murderous option Kaliayev took must always be "a desperate exception or nothing… He kills and dies so that it shall be clear that murder is impossible" (Camus, 1956: 282). Murder is the option we can't rule out but must, to our core, dread taking.

References

Augustine. *Ten Homilies on the First Epistle of John*. Translated by H. Browne. In vol. 7 of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 1.

Berrigan, S.J., Daniel (1978). "Killing for the Love of the Kingdom: Open Letter from Daniel Berrigan". Available online at: <http://www3.nd.edu/~theo/jhy/writings/otherauthors/EXCHANGE.htm>.

Camus, Albert (1955). *The Myth of Sisyphus*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Camus, Albert (1956). *The Rebel*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Camus, Albert (1956). *Caligula and 3 Other Plays*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Camus, Albert (1960). *Resistance, Rebellion, and Death*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Camus, Albert (1965). *Notebooks 1942–1951*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Cardenal, Ernesto. (1978) *The Gospel in Solentiname, vol. 2.* Maryknoll: Orbis.
Eusebius. *The Life of Constantine*. Translated by Arthur C. McGiffert and Ernest C. Richardson. In vol. 1 of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 2.
Henderson, Ernest F. (1919). *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*. London: George Bell and Sons.
Hippolytus. *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*. Translated by Burton Scott Easton (1962). Hamden: Archon.
Joseph, Simon J. (2014). *The Nonviolent Messiah: Jesus, Q, and the Enochic Tradition.* Minneapolis: Fortress.
Konstan, David (1962). *Before Forgiveness: The Origins of a Moral Idea.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kudo, Timothy (2013). "I Killed People in Afghanistan. Was I Right or Wrong?" *Washington Post*, January 25. Available at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/2013/01/25/c0b0d5a6-60ff-11e2-b05a-605528f6b712_story.html>.
Lapsley, Michael (2012). *Redeeming the Past: My Journey from Freedom Fighter to Healer.* Maryknoll: Orbis.
Origen. *Against Celsus*, 8.73. Adapted from the 1885 translation by Frederick Crombie.
Robinson, James M. (1992). "The Sayings Gospel Q." REL 484. Unpublished Instructor's Class Notes. Claremont Graduate School..
Tertullian. *Apology.* Translated by S. Thelwall. In vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*.
Tertullian. *On Idolatry*. Translated by S. Thelwall. In vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*.
Tertullian. *De Corona (The Chaplet).* Translated by S. Thelwall. In vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*.

Chapter Eleven

Mennonite Peacebuilding

Transforming Conflict as a Spiritual Practice[1]

Julianne Funk
University of Zurich

Introduction

The Mennonite Church is a Christian group of approximately a million worldwide. The Mennonites come from the sixteenth century Anabaptist renewal movement on the European continent that took its name from Menno Simons, a leader in the movement. As one of the three historic peace churches alongside Quakers/Friends and the Church of the Brethren, the Mennonite Church has had a commitment to Christian pacifism since its foundation, often including nonviolent resistance. This chapter considers historic Mennonite nonviolence as one spiritual practice of nonkilling[2] behavior and it proceeds through four parts.

First, the Mennonite faith tradition is presented as discipleship to Jesus, the founder and model of nonviolent practice. Mennonites understand embodied faith as 'following Jesus', or behaving as he taught through his words and actions. They believe that grace will come to the Christian via God's spirit, the church, scripture, and prayer, to provide her with the capacity to follow this path of discipleship. The contemporary Mennonite Confession of Faith states: "Jesus is our example, especially in his suffering for the right without retaliation, in his love for enemies, and in his forgiveness of those who persecuted him" (Confession of Faith 1995, Article 17). They should pursue peace and justice through: gentleness, willingness to be persecuted

[1] The author has drawn parts of this chapter from: "Lessons from the Mennonite Peace Church Tradition", a presentation given at St. Michielskerk 'Peace Pulpit' in Leuven, Belgium on 31 May 2009, and her doctoral dissertation (Funk, 2012).

[2] As Glenn Paige explains, "the term [nonkilling] is not in customary use. It seeks to direct attention beyond 'peace' and even 'nonviolence' to focus sharply upon the taking of human life" (2009: 9). While this chapter considers Mennonites' generally more positive approach, one can easily see how a "concentration upon liberation from killing as source and sustainer of other forms of violence could be a significant step forward" (ibid.) in this direction.

for goodness, not preparing for or participating in war, not serving in the military, loving enemies, forgiving rather than revenging, pursuing just relationships, settling disputes within the faith community, and resisting evil without violence. As Roth (2005: 90) explains:

> For Mennonites, Christian discipleship …is not primarily a private spiritual transaction … [but] a commitment to participate in God's transforming, redemptive work in the world. … At the heart of this … is a surprising and paradoxical understanding of power. …The power that Jesus lived and taught was the paradoxical power of human vulnerability, in which human weakness allowed the presence of God to be fully revealed.

Second, the chapter will provide a brief background of the nonviolent foundations of Anabaptist Mennonites arising during the European Radical Reformation of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The most notable movements arose in Switzerland and the Netherlands, and their ideas are recorded in the Schleitheim Confession (1527) and the Dordrecht Confession of Faith (1632), respectively, about not taking up the sword even against evil or as an 'act of love.' This concept of nonviolence, or nonresistance, practiced by the Anabaptists arises from Jesus' instruction: "You have heard how it was said: Eye for eye and tooth for tooth. But I say this to you: offer no resistance to the wicked. On the contrary, if anyone hits you on the right cheek, offer him the other as well" (Matthew 5:38-39).

Third, the chapter explores Mennonite practices of peacebuilding as conflict transformation, which have contributed significantly to the global field of peace research. Through providing 'social relief' alongside humanitarian aid, Mennonites early on noted the presumptuousness and limits of many approaches to peacemaking. Therefore, Mennonite peace practitioners (e.g. John Paul Lederach) sought first to understand and respond to the complexity of each unique conflict and the patterns of destructive violence particular to the context, actively listening in order to empower the insiders. As such, Mennonite peacemakers have pioneered this 'elicitive' approach, seeking appropriate, constructive responses to conflict from the very people engaged in it. And rather than short-term 'solutions' such as a cease-fire, Mennonite-initiated 'conflict transformation' aims at reconciled relationships and seeks to "introduce a new way of living and being in the world" (Kraybill, 2000: 38), to initiate new systems and processes for dealing with conflict nonviolently, so that cycles of violence end. Well received by academicians and policy-makers for its sustainability, this Mennonite approach has become a standard in the field.

Fourth and lastly, the chapter will give the author's own story of growing up as a Mennonite, drifting away from that religious community, and later rediscovering this heritage through her peace and conflict studies. This rediscovery brought a unique methodology to her doctoral research and provided her with personal vocational guidance to become a peace scholar-practitioner. She now works in the region of the former Yugoslavia, using the elicitive approach to assist local peacebuilding and reconciliation NGOs and to conduct research on local faith-based peace practices. As such, this chapter takes a doctrinal, historical, methodological and personal narrative look at Mennonite nonkilling spiritual practice which, in this community of faith, is called nonviolence, nonresistance, peacebuilding and conflict transformation.

Mennonite faith as discipleship to Jesus, a founder of nonviolent practice

Faith as discipleship

Mennonites will most commonly characterize what it means to them to be a Christian with the word 'discipleship,' explains Mennonite historian John D. Roth. In plain language, the website of the Mennonite Church USA expresses "Mennonite beliefs and practices vary widely, but *following Jesus in daily life* is a central value, along with peacemaking" ("Who are the Mennonites"). The idea of discipleship comes directly from the gospels in the Bible which describe the men Jesus invited to follow him. These men, Jesus' disciples, responded to this invitation by dropping their work and leaving the comforts of family and home to step onto an unknown path with a man who appeared to be a prophet. Discipleship for a Mennonite Christian today means making a similar decision to follow in the footsteps of, or emulate, Jesus Christ. Naturally this is done without the material person of Jesus, but instead with the Holy Spirit, scripture, prayer and the church as guides for discipleship. Nevertheless, the path of discipleship as it unfolds for 21st century Mennonite Christians remains unknown, as it was for the original disciples, and, perhaps most important for this consideration of Mennonite nonkilling faith, alternative to the norm. Mennonites tend to picture Jesus as a radical of his time, introducing ideas and behaviors that didn't fit culture or common sense, such as a new kingdom based on love and compassion and a power based on vulnerability.

The *Confession of Faith in a Mennonite Perspective* (1995)[3] describes the basic Mennonite tenant that Jesus called Christians to follow him, including being vulnerable, weak and living sacrificially (being willing to suffer for a greater good). So discipleship is firstly a decision to follow Jesus, and not simply ascribing to a set of beliefs or attending a ritual weekly. "A Mennonite understanding of faith... is always embodied; faith always finds expression in the world of flesh and blood" (Roth, 2005: 91). Following Jesus means participating actively in God's transformation of the world as taught by Jesus through word and example. This means personal transformation and an outward commitment to ushering in the 'new creation' of the world that Jesus initiated. This concept comes from the New Testament letter of Paul to the Corinthians which states: "From now on we regard no one from a human point of view…. If anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new!" (2 Corinthians 5:16-17, New Revised Standard Version).

This activity of discipleship therefore requires a new perspective, what Jesus called the kingdom of God or the kingdom of heaven—a reality not governed by sin but by love. In this kingdom reality, many things are quite different, even paradoxical to our usual norms. The principle of power, for example, is not force or violence, but vulnerability, love and compassion. The ideal role is that of servant, not a lord or leader, because 'the first shall be last and the last, first.' The logic of this kingdom is that only in human weakness can God be fully present, revealed and powerful—the human being makes space for God's power when he/she sets her ego aside. If disciples live into this new creation power, they essentially become channels for the power of God rather than human power. As Roth (2005: 90) explains, in comparison to other Christian traditions:

> For Mennonites… following Jesus is not primarily a private spiritual transaction (to accept Jesus in my heart), an emotion-filled charismatic experience, or the practice of taking communion on a regular basis—valuable though all of these may be. Rather, following Jesus is a commitment to participate in God's transforming, redemptive work in the world, bearing witness to a 'new creation' made possible by Christ, so that God's will is indeed made evident 'on earth as it is in heaven.'

[3] This confession contains articles referring to foundational beliefs about God and Jesus that motivate practices of discipleship including nonviolence.

Naturally this high standard of Christian discipleship is not an easy lifestyle. In the past only those in monastic orders pursued such a life. Mennonites believe that they are indeed capable to do this but only with God's help (through 'grace'), which is mediated through God's spirit, the church, the scriptures (the Bible) and prayer (Confession of Faith 1995, Article 17).

According to Article 18 of the Confession of Faith, Mennonites "draw the life of the Spirit from Jesus Christ, just as a branch draws life from the vine. … When we are in the presence of the Spirit,… [o]ur outer behavior matches our inner life" (1995). Further regarding the important relationship with God's spirit, the Confession expresses: "We believe that to be a disciple of Jesus is to know life in the Spirit. … leading us deeper into the wisdom of God. … We yield ourselves to God, letting the Holy Spirit mold us into the image of Christ" (1995, Article 18).

This 'we' spoken of so often in the Confession is the second crucial element of discipleship from the Mennonite perspective. Discipleship "cannot be pursued alone" (Roth, 2005: 91) and is done in the context of the church, meaning the group of believers. The vision of Jesus' kingdom was a community of his followers, a group with a new vision for a transformed world. Alone one can transform only oneself. Together, we are capable of much more (see more on this below).

Third, the scriptures are a source for Mennonites (as all Christians) to learn about this path of discipleship from the stories of faithful people of the past, explicit instructions, the life of Jesus himself, and the history and teachings from the early church. The more one knows this text and internalizes its guidance, the greater one's resources of knowledge and wisdom in challenging moments.

Prayer is the fourth way of pursuing this difficult call to discipleship. Prayer is essentially the communing of the human heart with her maker. The believer expresses her sorrows, joys, pains, gratefulness and needs and, in the opposite direction, attends to the voice of God's spirit's which can flow through the open heart of one who listens. Prayer is akin to meditation and can be done individually or with others. It tends to provide focus, inner strength, hope and peace to a Christian disciple.

Discipleship as following Jesus' example of nonviolence

Central to being a Christian disciple for Mennonites is Jesus' teachings, again through word and deed, about love and service. This can be found as a golden thread throughout Jesus' life, as told in the biblical gospels. Jesus'

teachings from The Sermon on the Mount may be the most concise and striking call "to a pattern of morality that transcends mere justice or common sense or even the golden rule" (Roth, 2005: 104). Here, speaking to his disciples in front of a crowd of people, he turns human logic on its head:

> Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth. Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they will be filled. Blessed are the merciful, for they will be shown mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God. Blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.
> Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you and falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me. Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven, for in the same way they persecuted the prophets who were before you (Matthew 5:3-12, New International Version).

This is nothing other than a reorientation towards power. Blessed—or empowered—are those who are poor, meek, sorrowful, hungry and thirsty for goodness, the merciful, pure hearted, peacemakers, the insulted, persecuted and slandered. The logic of humankind is usually that the rich, happy, bold, assertive (even aggressive), those who successfully pursue their interests and rise to the top (no matter who one must step on to get there) – these are the powerful and 'blessed.' Jesus doesn't say these poor blessed folk will have the kind of human power or 'blessing' that we idolize in the rich and famous Instead, this the power of transformation with a capacity to change hearts and minds as well as structures and systems of violence that have no place in his kingdom. Opposite to human power, this nonviolent power is not self-seeking, but kingdom-seeking.

Like all principles of nonviolence, however, it can be critiqued as inherently passive, and therefore non-powerful even in this transformative, vulnerable way. This is a valid point. In response, however, Mennonites might refer to perhaps the most alternative of Jesus' teachings, which, if truly followed, is anything but passive; Jesus famously taught his disciples to love their enemies and to pray for those who persecuted them. In action, Jesus healed the man who came to arrest him and later prayed that God forgive the Roman soldiers who had nailed him to the cross where he died. He consistently taught with words all who gathered to listen, including the Jewish priests who were there to taunt and debunk him, who openly conspired

against him, answering questions that they posed as traps, to make him look like a fool. From a Mennonite perspective, Jesus' life and teachings can be understood as active nonviolent resistance to the injustice of both the Roman state and the Jewish religious institution of his time. As stated by the Mennonite Confession of Faith, Article 17: "Jesus is our example, especially in his suffering for the right without retaliation, in his love for enemies, and in his forgiveness of those who persecuted him" (1995).

Nonviolence is therefore a product of Christian discipleship according to the Mennonite Church. Discipleship to Jesus is the foundation for contemporary expressions of nonviolence and peace-making within the Mennonite understanding. Today, the Mennonite commitment to nonviolence is essentially to love—both neighbor and enemy. Jesus taught that anyone can love the one who loves back—this is not a virtue. However, to love one's neighbor as oneself is a challenge and to love one's enemy is an exceptional, radical act. This kind of nonviolence is itself a whole new orientation and faith commitment. The Mennonite Confession of faith vocalizes this, latter, commitment in its Statement of Nonviolent Behavior:

> As followers of Jesus, we participate in his ministry of peace and justice. He has called us to find our blessing in making peace and seeking justice. We do so in a spirit of gentleness, willing to be persecuted for righteousness' sake. As disciples of Christ, we do not prepare for war, or participate in war or military service. The same Spirit that empowered Jesus also empowers us to love enemies, to forgive rather than to seek revenge, to practice right relationships, to rely on the community of faith to settle disputes, and to resist evil without violence. (1995, Article 22)

Voicing its nonviolent orientation, or philosophy, the Confession goes on to express:

> We believe that peace is the will of God. God created the world in peace, and God's peace is most fully revealed in Jesus Christ, who is our peace and the peace of the whole world. Led by the Holy Spirit, we follow Christ in the way of peace, doing justice, bringing reconciliation, and practicing nonresistance even in the face of violence and warfare. (ibid.)

The kingdom logic according to the Mennonites is that violence and death are not the final winners in our world. Jesus' death and suffering could be seen as the end of his story, but Christians believe he was resurrected to new life after his death, which is a tribute to the victory of God

and his overpowering love for (undeserving) human beings; Mennonites would add to this the victory of nonviolence as love par excellence. As Roth (2005: 110) reminds his readers,

> Christians, after all, are post-resurrection followers of Christ. We have been redeemed by Christ, transformed by the power of God's love, and are called to walk in the power of the resurrection. Precisely because of the resurrection, we bear witness to a different reality than the logic of force that led to Christ's death.

Roth explains nonviolent action as the witness of Christians to the world that darkness and violence will not have final victory because "history is ultimately shaped 'not by [human] might nor by power,' but by the Spirit of the living God (Zech 4:6)" (ibid.).

The church as a community living according to a nonviolent standard

As stated above, the church—the faith community—is the context in which the discipleship life of faith is possible. "Mennonites envision the church as a community of voluntary Christian believers…. This gathered community, at least in its ideal form, provides a communal context for… sustaining, challenging, and disciplining the disciple in the high calling of following the way of Christ" (Roth, 2005: 142). Together, the individuals are strengthened to follow this alternative lifestyle and it is also as a group that the justice of the kingdom of God becomes realizable. One person can follow this calling but will make less impact than a collective.

The church is called as a body to continue Jesus' work of bringing peace into the world. This peace that Jesus gave his disciples is not just a (negative) lack of physical violence, but a positive wholeness (like the Jewish concept of peace, *shalom*, which includes well-being). Jesus' disciple, Peter, who founded the church, learned through a vision that this kingdom reality is inclusive and characterized by just relationships. The church brings together "different tribes and nations" into a new community with a shared life (Kreider et al., 2005: 10). The church is therefore a model of the peace she strives to bring into the world. Committed to bringing just peace, this is an active challenge to nonviolence, again, not 'passive pacifism.' Kreider et al. state this bluntly: "Without conflict, injustice is fixed and unchallenged, and there is no hope" (Kreider et al., 2005: 35). So the church as a community of those who have voluntarily and "publicly offered their primary allegiance to Christ" (Roth, 2005: 127) seek to live into the kingdom of God he initiated.

The Mennonite Confession of Faith puts it this way:

> We believe that the church is called to live now according to the model of the future reign of God… [where] the people of God will reign with Christ in justice, righteousness, and peace…. …The church is to be a spiritual, social, and economic reality, demonstrating now the justice, righteousness, love, and peace of the age to come (1995, Article 24).

Origins of the Mennonite church: Historical foundations of nonviolence as a faith tradition

The Mennonites as a historic peace church

Mennonites trace their roots to the Radical Reformation of the 1520s in Switzerland when their ancestors, the Anabaptists, broke with the reformer Zwingli. The name 'Mennonite' comes from its founder, the Dutch Catholic priest Menno Simons (1496-1561), who joined the movement in the early 16th century and organized congregations in Holland. Two central tenants of this new faith were: rebaptism (which is now the principle of adult believer baptism) and the significance of Christ's death on a cross as not only that which makes reconciliation with God possible, but also that which requires personal discipleship from Christ's followers. Jesus called his disciples to love as he loved, and he "loved them to the end" (John 13:1). The ultimate test of his love, Christians claim, was to lay down his own life. Anabaptist disciples and were therefore willing to lay down their lives both literally and in service to others.

Baptism as an adult (in addition to one's infant baptism which was the standard at that time) was important because it was the public demonstration of the believer's conscious intention to live a life of discipleship to Jesus, something considered impossible for an infant. Because of their rebaptizing, which broke with the official, state-endorsed church practice, these 'Anabapists' as they were labeled, were persecuted, tortured and killed by both the established church and the state. As such, they determined their response of nonviolence (even refusing self-defense), as they saw modeled and taught by Jesus himself. Due to persecution, the Mennonites have typically migrated to places tolerant of their faith, including the US, Canada, and Paraguay. From these beginnings, the Mennonites have become known as one of the historic 'peace churches' (those committed to pacifism from their origins).

Today, Mennonites are well known in the fields of peace and conflict studies and peace practice. Their active involvement in these activities is primarily a result of the challenges presented by World War II, which initi-

ated a new phase of the Mennonite peace tradition. While the Mennonites hold a deep commitment to peace and justice, the American way of fighting injustice and violence during WWII was mainly with military force, which was unacceptable to the American Mennonites. Their non-engagement in military service prompted conscientious objection and alternative service, which led to a wide array of peace activism that continues today.

The earliest Anabaptist confessions of faith

Doctrinally, we can see the foundations of Mennonite beliefs in two documents, or public confessions, explored in this section. "The Mennonite Church, organized in North America in 1898 by several regional conferences of Swiss-South German background" (Confession of Faith 1995, Introduction), has recognized these two as the earliest of essential value to today's believers. Both consider the use of violence—labeled 'the sword'—to be "outside the perfection of Christ" and therefore "both confessions call for laying down the sword and praying for enemies" as taught by Jesus himself (Harbuck 2010). The Schleitheim Confession, or Seven Articles, of 1527, was drawn up in the Swiss canton of Schaffhausen by the Swiss Brethren, "the oldest and most influential body of German-speaking Anabaptists" ("Swiss Brethren" 2013). The document was quickly copied and extensively circulated among Swiss and South German Anabaptists. "[W]ritten… in the face of biblical interpretive error and persecution" [4] (Harbuck, 2010), both of the famous Swiss Protestant leaders Zwingli and Calvin refuted it. The Dordrecht Confession of Faith, on the other hand, was written in Holland in 1632 to unite the Flemish and Frisian Mennonites (the Dutch Mennonites). It was later adopted by Alsatian, Palatine (from the Palatinate, or Rheinland-Pfalz, Germany) and Northern German Mennonites (Dordrecht Confession 2013). As such, these documents are historic bases for the Mennonite Church today.

[4] Harbuck explains further: "The Schleitheim Confession was not meant to be a full systematic theology, but was intended rather as a foundation of truth at a time when heresy and persecution were rampant. [The confession's author, Former Benedictine monk, Michael] Sattler sought to both comfort the distraught victims of persecution in his fold and to explain the specific convictions that set these victims of persecution apart from both the Catholics and the Protestants alike. The Schleitheim confession is important to Christian history as it is the first theological confession to be written after the Reformation, and is one of the most fundamental sources concerning the teachings of the Anabaptists directly after their formation in 1525."

The Schleitheim Confession has seven articles, two of which are relevant to the nonviolent fundamentals of Mennonites. The fourth article "concerning the separation that shall take place from the evil and the wickedness which the devil has planted in the world" states:

> that we have no fellowship with them…. Thereby shall also fall away from us the diabolical weapons of violence—such as sword, armor, and the like, and all of their use to protect friends or against enemies—by virtue of the word of Christ: "you shall not resist evil." (Schleitheim Confession 2013)

Following this, Article six delves more deeply into the subject, "concerning the sword," in four parts. Each asks a question and produce an answer based upon an example from Jesus' life. The first concern is "whether a Christian may or should use the sword against the wicked for the protection and defense of the good, or for the sake of love." The article answers with an example from Jesus' life, which is the model for any Christian: "Now Christ says to the woman who was taken in adultery, not that she should be stoned according to the law of His Father… but with mercy and forgiveness and the warning to sin no more, says: "Go, sin no more." Exactly thus should we also proceed" (Schleitheim Confession 2013). The article claims, secondly, that it is not for Christians to judge in cases of conflict or dispute. Thirdly, because Christ fled from being crowned king and taught his disciples to deny their very selves in following him, so the Swiss Anabaptists agreed that the Christian should refuse accepting any governing position even if he is chosen for the post. The article concludes with the explanation:

> the rule of the government is according to the flesh, that of the Christians according to the Spirit…. The weapons of their battle and warfare are carnal and only against the flesh, but the weapons of Christians are spiritual, against the fortification of the devil. The worldly are armed with steel and iron, but Christians are armed with the armor of God, with truth, righteousness, peace, faith, salvation, and with the Word of God. (Schleitheim Confession 2013)

A century later, the Dortrecht Confession of Faith expands upon the Schleitheim Confession and consists of eighteen articles adopted by the Dutch Mennonite Conference. It "represents the mature development of Anabaptist thought and… is not only a more comprehensive statement of faith than the Schleitheim Confession; it also addresses the distinct order and practices of the Mennonite Church" (Harbuck, 2010). The fourteenth

article of the confession is relevant to this chapter, addressing the topic of revenge, essentially in agreement with the Schleitheim Confession:

> As regards revenge, that is, to oppose an enemy with the sword, we believe and confess that the Lord Christ has forbidden and set aside to His disciples and followers all revenge and retaliation, and commanded them to render to no one evil for evil, or cursing for cursing, but to put the sword into the sheath, or, as the prophets have predicted, to beat the swords into ploughshares. From this we understand that therefore, and according to His example, we must not inflict pain, harm, or sorrow upon any one, but seek the highest welfare and salvation of all men, and even, if necessity require it, flee for the Lord's sake from one city or country into another, and suffer the spoiling of our goods; that we must not harm any one, and, when we are smitten, rather turn the other cheek also, than take revenge or retaliate. And, moreover, that we must pray for our enemies, feed and refresh them whenever they are hungry or thirsty, and thus convince them by well-doing, and overcome all ignorance. Finally, that we must do good and commend ourselves to every man's conscience; and, according to the law of Christ, do unto no one that which we would not have done to us. (Dordrecht Confession 2013)

Notably we read in the Dordrecht Confession some important elements not in the previous document which are significant for Mennonites today. First is the phrase 'beat the swords into ploughshares' which arises from the Old Testament prophesy of Isaiah: "They will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation will not take up sword against nation, nor will they train for war anymore" (Isaiah 2:4, New International Version). This is one of the most frequently cited scriptures by Mennonites in reference to their commitment to nonviolence as part of the new kingdom of God. They interpret the time of this prophesy's realization as both today—something the church works for in the present—and future, when it will be complete.

Of note secondly is the reference to fleeing rather than harming another person. We see this practice as a significant determinant of Mennonite history, in which Mennonites have moved great distances in the face of persecution for their radical beliefs and rather than be forcibly enlisted in armies, as we will see in the next section.

Practice of peacebuilding as conflict transformation: contributions to the field of peace research

From isolation to involvement[5]

The Mennonites have been known throughout history for "doggedly refus[ing] to use sword or gun in their own or their neighbors' protection" (Miller, 2000a: 4). Their reason for this comes from the life example and words of Jesus who loved his enemies, would not resist the violence of others towards him but instead turned the other cheek, overcoming evil with good. Consequently, thousands of Anabaptists were tortured and killed without giving any resistance.

At the very start of the Anabaptist movement, during the Reformation, their break with the state church on the issue of baptism and other standard religious beliefs and practices prompted persecution from religious and civil authorities who sought to crush the radical movement. The Anabaptists' way of life was extremely incongruous to its feudal context. Anabaptists denied the authorities if their laws were inconsistent with their faith which said "[t]here were… no holy people, places, or things... [except] God, the Bible and the community of faith" (Miller, 2000b: 276). Throughout history thereafter, nonviolently opposing injustice in such cases but without any physical defense (what became called nonresistance) in the face of persecution, they fled to lands where their faith practices would be tolerated.

Fleeing persecution took Mennonites to North America under King George III's rule in the late 17th century and Russia (what is now Ukraine) in the late 18th century under Catherine II, where they could live essentially separate lives from their non-Mennonite neighbors. The extreme violence exacted against them, not surprisingly, prompted Mennonites to withdraw, self-protectively, into their own communities with little contact with their social surroundings. This was extensively the case until the twentieth century. One story cited by Miller recalls Armistice Day, 1918—victory and the end of World War I—when a Mennonite farmer in a small Kansas town was nearly lynched for his pacifist stance and perceived lack of patriotism (e.g. not joining the army, refusing to buy war bonds). Such incidences drove the Mennonites to isolate themselves as a group. In Canada, however, Mennonites increasingly engaged in the political realm. On the one hand, waves of migrations resulted in municipalities and electoral districts where Mennon-

[5] This subsection draws from Miller's history of Mennonite peacemaking (2000a and 2000b) unless otherwise noted.

ite majorities were concerned with issues such as educational autonomy (Epp, 2007). Later, the children of refugees from Stalinist Russia felt the need to shape political decisions for greater justice in the public sphere.

However, facing World War II brought a change of perspective for some North American Mennonites and altered the expression of this faith group radically once again. On the one hand, a couple key Mennonite theologians voiced the need to get involved in the world as peacemakers. On the other hand, many American Mennonite men were drafted and, as conscientious objectors,[6] engaged in alternative service[7] around the country rather than joining the military; this took them out of their rural enclaves and into mainstream society. More Mennonites also began pursuing higher education and professions other than traditional farming and here they interacted with society at large. There was a trend with conscientious objectors in particular to seek 'meaningful work;' something that made an evident, constructive contribution to meeting human needs. An important role for the evolution of the Mennonite Church was mental health nursing because the Mennonites engaged witnessed horrid conditions and began to demand justice for their voiceless patients.

---

[6] The United Nations Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights recently published a report outlining the legal basis for conscientious objection which says the right to object to military service based on conscious can be derived from" the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights" (2012: 7). The common practice of conscientious objection developed from "the introduction of a military system based on universal conscription into a standing national army, which spread across Europe following the French Revolution. As conscription was introduced in places or groups that had not previously been subject to any military obligations, it led to major debates and the developments which form the basis of the current recognition of the right of conscientious objection as an individual right as distinct from an exemption for certain groups" (2012: 23). The Office's report refers, however, to the Mennonites' exemption from the Dutch armed guard already in 1575 during their wars of independence. "At least since the middle of the nineteenth century the words 'conscientious objection' have been applied intermittently to an unwillingness based on conscience to perform military service…. The first self-identified 'conscientious objectors' appeared during the First World War" (Conscientious Objection, 2012: 4).

[7] "States may, if they so desire, establish alternative service in place of compulsory military service… [however,] there is no requirement under international law for States to establish such a system. They can, if they so wish, excuse conscientious objectors from military service with no further action" (Conscientious Objection, 2012: 37).

In 1920, Mennonite Central Committee (MCC), the outreach arm of the Mennonite Churches, was born from the intention of the churches to feed starving people under Stalin's regime in the USSR, including their Mennonite brothers and sisters in Russia and Ukraine. Referring to Jesus' plea to his disciples, the MCC website recounts that "[t]hrough the years, MCC has worked to follow the call of Matthew 25:35-36 to reach out to those who are hungry, thirsty, ill or in prison and to welcome strangers" (MCC History). Via MCC, the Mennonites since that time became known for their quick reactions in natural disasters, sending teams to clean up and rebuild after devastation, distributing goods such as quilts and toiletries which had been collected and assembled by church communities.[8] Armed with their 'new mobility,' education and experiences of service and relief, North American Mennonites after World War II began to look abroad for ways to serve and bring justice.

Mennonite contributions: just peacemaking, peacebuilding and conflict transformation

Mennonites have a history of providing humanitarian aid and doing relief work (reconstruction and assistance) after natural disasters. In a similar vein, Mennonites began offering peacemaking services after 'social disasters.' "There was [however] an increasing realization that cleaning up and rebuilding after a war, riot, or tornado was important, but a Christian was also called to address systemic conditions that created injustice and violence" (Miller, 2000a: 7). In addition to giving material assistance after wars or natural disasters, Mennonites were encouraged by those they served to help them transform the very systems and institutions which cause violence. This goal brought together peace *and* justice; two ends that may seem in tension, but according to those Mennonite peace activists, "the Bible demand[s] a creative synthesis" (ibid.). Because Mennonites consider peacemaking and active nonviolence a way of life, Mennonite leaders and peace workers saw the need for all Mennonites to have training in conciliation skills.

After training and embarking on Mennonite missions to 'social disaster' areas, these peacemakers were faced with ineffectiveness and frustration.

---

[8] Miller recounts that "The relief and service work done under MCC auspices was enormous considering the size of the church. After World War II, nearly every North American Mennonite extended family had at least one member who had spent several years as an MCC volunteer" (2000a: 6).

The variety of cultures and their local approaches to conflict quickly revealed the presumptuousness and limits of the North American approach to conciliation. Instead, Mennonite peace workers recognized the need for 'elicitive' approaches to peacemaking. Such an approach seeks to understand and respond to the complexity of each unique conflict and the patterns of destructive violence particular to the context. Since only those involved in the conflict can truly understand it, the elicitive model relies upon the local peace constituency (those within the population who continue to resist violence). The conciliation process must therefore actively listen to and empower the insiders who know what is sustainable, positive peace and what is just a façade of good relations or an unacceptable compromise, motivating them to remain nonviolent in the face of overt destructive conflict, Then, rather than use the standard external interventionist approach, the external facilitator helps to cultivate cultures and even structures of peace, thus participating in the transformation of violent conflict (Ramsbotham et al*.,* 2005: 218-219). The Mennonite peacemaker now seeks to 'elicit' appropriate, constructive responses to conflict from the people engaged in it.

The Mennonite tradition of peacebuilding predates the term coined and defined by Johan Galtung[9] (1976) and made common by the United Nations (Boutros-Ghali 1992) [10] and is also distinctive from secular and other religious forms of conflict resolution,[11] reconciliation and peacemaking. Peacebuilding, in the Mennonite view, "consists of making connections or building relationships among people who are antagonistic and working to replace this hostility with trust" (Engle Merry, 2000: 205). As Mennonite theologian John Howard Yoder has influentially argued,[12] "the responsibility of Christians," and not

---

[9] Galtung wrote in the 1970s: "The mechanisms that peace is based on should be built into the structure… As such, peace building would create, structures "that remove causes of wars and offer alternatives to war in situations where wars might occur" (1976: 297-298).

[10] *An Agenda for Peace* explained peacebuilding as those acts which solidify peace and prevent a relapse into conflict.

[11] Conflict resolution is the term most commonly used for the field related to dealing with conflict in a positive way to bring peace. However, with John Paul Lederach and others, I have chosen the term conflict transformation instead because it lacks the inherent connotation of solving problems, allows the idea of conflict to remain neutral rather than negative and providing space for sustainable and needed long-term change rather than a quick-fix. Conflict transformation is also the most commonly used reference to this field of Mennonite peacemakers.

[12] His most famous text being *The Politics of Jesus* (1972) in which he argues that

only Mennonite peacebuilders, is to "be the church," by which he means "refusing to return evil for evil, by living in peace, sharing goods, and doing deeds of charity as opportunities arise" (Yoder, 2012). In this way, according to Yoder's theology, "the church witnesses … to the fact that an alternative to a society based on violence or the threat of violence is possible" (ibid.).

Mennonite peace scholar and practitioner John Paul Lederach has expanded the standard notion of peacebuilding to be "a comprehensive concept that encompasses, generates, and sustains the full array of processes, approaches, and stages needed to transform conflict toward more sustainable, peaceful relationships. The term thus involves a wide range of activities that both precede and follow formal peace accords. Metaphorically, peace is seen not merely as a stage in time or a condition. It is a dynamic social construct" (1997: 20). Peacebuilding therefore is better characterized by the term conflict transformation, which refers to a process of change (and not only the goal) from negative to positive or constructive structures, relations, attitudes and behaviors.

Conflict transformation or transformative peacebuilding seeks to bring reconciliation or a deep and lasting peace not only between individuals, but also across society as a whole (Lederach, 1997). Reconciliation is essentially healed relationships. Lederach says that perhaps the most important goal for deep-rooted conflict is developing the recognition of relational interdependence (2000: 55). All conflicts and their transformations are embedded in relationships. How we perceive and deal with this relatedness is an essential aspect of conflict transformation. Relational reconciliation should be the peacemaker's orientation. Conflict transformation also seeks to "introduce a new way of living and being in the world" (Kraybill, 2000: 38), to initiate new systems and processes for dealing with conflict nonviolently, so that the cycle of violence ends. Violence creates more violence. If peace is to be sustainable, it must therefore break out of this cycle. Once the cycle is broken, the construction of peace can truly begin.

Key attributes of Mennonite peace practice

Engle Merry and Mitchell (2000), two non-Mennonite, external analysts each studied Mennonite contributions to the field of peacebuilding for a volume on the subject (Sampson and Lederach, 2000). They located within

---

Jesus had a nonconformist and nonviolent social ethic that he initiated for his people (the church) to follow.

Mennonite peacebuilding the Mennonite philosophy of first "connecti[ng] with the poor, the vulnerable, and the powerless and [second] desir[ing] to allow local leaders to emerge rather than exporting North American experts and conflict resolution skills" (Engle Merry, 2000: 216). This 'localism' springs from an assumption that "broader peace can be developed from the ground up" (Mitchell, 2000: 225). The socially unimportant and weak are the focus of support and service, because they tend to be the recipients of greater violence than their adversaries (be it the system, the government, the majority, etc.), but have less capacity or opportunity for changing the system. Standing with the oppressed actually aims to bring justice, which is a crucial element of sustainable peace. Mennonite peace practices, according to Mitchell (2000), are distinctively focused on service and support. Engle Merry (2000) has assembled six key attributes of Mennonite peace practices which give further insight into this facet and are thus explained below.

1. The time frame for peacebuilding is long-term because conflict escalation and resolution can take decades, and because peacebuilding can require years of engagement for understanding the situation (in my case, nearly a decade) and connecting with locals so as to partner effectively with their work.
2. Careful listening is the second attribute, which is essential because it fosters understanding in the peacebuilder who may then discover how to complement rather than invade or impede local peacebuilding efforts. True listening also builds trust, which strengthens the relationship between external and local peacebuilders. This was crucial for my work of hearing true stories of religious experience and delving into the complex relationship of religion and faith as it has developed over history and between groups in Bosnia-Herzegovina.
3. Mennonite peacebuilders "move between insider and outsider roles" (Engle Merry, 2000: 216), simultaneously taking on roles of belonging (e.g. through long-term relationships with locals) and non-belonging as a foreigner. As Mitchell puts it, "Mennonite peacebuilding works because those involved strive to become as near to insiders as [possible]… while maintaining a relevant deterrent role as outsiders" (225). Anthropologist Maček (2009) describes this as being both friend and stranger.
4. Particularly distinctive from other styles of peacebuilding is the Mennonite tendency to intentionally not taking charge of the conflict transformation process. In my doctoral peace research, I focused on religious peacebuilders who exhibited this 'withinness' (Mitchell, 2000) or an abil-

ity to value the significance of the contextual particularities and tap into them. According to this approach, healing happens as a result of (individual or group) inner work and therefore requires "a deliberate effort to avoid power, to resist taking it when it is offered, to sidestep the role of the educated professional" and instead 'accompany discovery' with those who need transformation (Engle Merry, 2000: 209). This is very unlike most mediation practices that emphasize the heroism of the successful intervener who 'masters' a conflict transformation process.

5. Standing with the weak and suffering rather than directing things from a position of power. It means the peacebuilder herself becomes vulnerable and disenfranchised with those who are so, even standing in between the oppressed and the oppressor. This demonstrates a philosophy of nonviolence and relatedness as ultimate truths about peace and power.
6. Lastly, based on peacebuilding as a spiritual act of faith and witness, Mennonite peacebuilders are less concerned with particular results than simply being faithful to act in accordance with their commitment and beliefs. It is a view that often one does not see the results or understand events that happen, but trusts that if I have been responsible in my little role, God will oversee the big picture. It is a position focused on human hope and a divine picture of meaning in the world, rather than measurable effectiveness 'now.'

The lessons learned by Mennonite peacemakers in the second half of the 20th century are applicable to all peacemakers and have been adopted by many within the fields of peace research and practice. However, the practice of peace through the nonviolent way of life runs counter to the established systems for dealing with conflict and violence today and therefore, while lauded in peace and conflict studies as well as theoretically ascribed in many development and peacebuilding projects, it is not as commonly applied. As such, religious people, like the Mennonites, who have a faith commitment to nonviolent peacemaking are often pioneers in actualizing this alternative way.

The author's story: melding 'Mennonite' and 'peacebuilding' into myself

Mennonite meets Mennonite

I grew up a Mennonite, which, when I was very young, seemed synonymous with tightly knit family ties (including innumerable cousins), our little church with old hymns and simple pews, a certain set of family names

that seemed to keep getting recycled and special, Germanic-sounding foods baked by grandma on Saturday mornings. This upbringing was a certain mix of isolation from mainstream society and an educated collective concern for global affairs and needs. Donation cards with pictures of bloated, starving children in Ethiopia seem somehow to fit alongside church potluck dinners of my childhood. My community had specific, alternative ways of looking at and behaving in the world, which I experienced tangibly through the embarrassment of taking my school lunch out of re-washed-until-no-longer-transparent plastic ziplock baggies or the strange discomfort I felt on days when people waved American flags or heartily sang patriotic songs.

Moving three thousand miles away from my home in California when I was nine meant leaving much of this behind, however, and the new 'Midwestern Mennonite' was hardly recognizable and not especially desirable. As a result, my siblings and I gravitated to a non-denominational evangelical Protestant church with lots of youth activities and my parents followed. Thus I spent the second decade of my life largely without my ethnic group and its religious beliefs or the faith practices I have enunciated in this chapter. Instead, I was surrounded by what I would now call generic, conservative American Christians who were committed to attending church on Sundays and learning about the Bible. As a teenager, my involvement deepened much beyond this, however, as I became a core member of my youth group, participating in all sorts of outreach events for or with other kids my age as well as homeless people and residents of the 'inner city' of different races and economic status. While the goal of my church in these events was clearly proselytism, the concern to be of service to those less fortunate remained a thread that appealed to me, however untrained I was for service or deaf to the patronizing tone of our words and actions.

As a young adult revisiting my Mennonite relatives and family friends, I associated this part of my identity as related to an in-group with a name game of who's who and Mennonite meals with the 'best' sausages from Kansas, but little more substantial that I wished to hold onto personally. However, years later, on another continent, studying peace and conflict for my Master's degree, I re-encountered 'my people' through the eyes of my academic colleagues and was stunned. Not only had my European professors heard about this tiny faith group, but they esteemed the Mennonites as experts in peace and conflict scholarship and models of peace practice. Later, doing my field research in Bosnia-Herzegovina, I was again astounded to hear local peace workers praising Mennonite Central Committee as the most effective and credible international organization amongst dozens ac-

tive in their country postwar. But perhaps most beautiful to my ears was the story of one activist about how Mennonites had taught her to incorporate her faith, Islam, into her peace practice. This respectful and elicitive approach was something substantial and desirable something I wished to learn and embody myself. In this way I was re-introduced to the Mennonites (as both known and unknown) and found an impetus to own these best practices and teachings from my own tradition.

Becoming a peace scholar-practitioner: conflict transformation as spiritual practice

I have come to adopt Mennonite philosophy of peace in my approach to being a peace scholar-practitioner. In addition to my methodology, I am characteristically Mennonite (according to Engle Merry, 2000) in that this accords with my spiritual commitment to nonviolence. In my own research about other faith-based practitioners of peace or 'religious peacebuilders,'[13] I have called this vocation or spiritual motivation, which Roth explains well:

When Mennonites advocate on behalf of reconciliation and peace-making, we do so not because we think this is the most politically expedient way of getting to a particular outcome. In fact, there are no guarantees that responding nonviolently in the face of an aggressive person or nation will stop the aggressors in their tracks.... But Mennonites affirm a spiritual reality at work that is deeper and truer and more real than the aggression presenting itself at the moment. And we participate with Christ in the path of discipleship when we respond to hatred with love, or when we resist evil doers without taking on the tactics of the evildoers we are resisting. This is a deeply spiritual claim. The martyrs died, not chanting political slogans, but singing hymns, preaching the good news and confessing their faith (2005: 107).

Mennonites understand the peacebuilding process "as walking with those who are making peace a reality, while others sign the peace accords in the capital city" (Engle Merry, 2000: 211). This practical method is made possible by the spiritual commitment to people, such that the importance of personal fame or visibility is diminished. While such recognition is of course a temptation, I am strengthened in my resolve by my faith and simply grounded in this way from my religious upbringing to value the former over the latter.

---

[13] I qualified religious peacebuilding according to the following variables: (1) the actors who identify themselves as religious persons or 'believers', (2) the motivation from faith (or religious worldview) driving the peace actions and (3) the inclusion of issues related to religion/faith in the peace-enhancing efforts and activities.

Generally, I have been keen to engage 'ordinary' residents as both informants (those who provide me with data) and those who are the potential actors in building peace in their contexts. Studying 'normal' people is typical for anthropologists, but was unusual for the international relations, political and social science advisors of my doctoral work who usually value elite actor contributions. As a Mennonite peacebuilder, I carry certain normative assumptions from within this tradition—such as the significance of the weak and powerless—and do not carry others that are common, such as physical power as most significant, the focus on elite decision-making for change to occur, military force as necessary to creating peace, and quick solutions as the prime measure of success. 'Top down' peacebuilding is only one part of sustainable peacebuilding, while my approach seeks to move from within the local context, 'eliciting' positive approaches that build trust and confidence that can support and entrench institutional and infrastructural improvements. For example, in my research on religious peacebuilding in Bosnia-Herzegovina, I considered how this context is beset with obstacles at the top level. The religious institutional elites are, in general, morally compromised because of their involvement with ethno-national wartime activities and their current support for nationalist political agendas. Therefore, I looked for those faith-based peace efforts that were functioning well—highlighting 'positive approaches'—and these I found at the grassroots level where ordinary believers were active.

However, beyond simply studying local, ordinary subjects for my PhD research in Bosnia-Herzegovina, I carried with me a commitment to their ends; I wished also through my research to advance their goals of peacebuilding postwar in a nonviolent way. This is equally unusual as, at best, it would be considered beyond the scope of research or, more likely, critiqued for influencing the subject studied. On this point, however, I agree with Adam Curle, a respected Quaker peace practitioner and social scientist who expresses the significance of such personal involvement in one's research well when he states:

> If we consider ourselves separate from what we do, we distort our understanding, both of what we do and what we are. … the observer is part of the scene that they observe, and so contributes to shaping it. … I would find it distasteful and dishonest, let alone inaccurate to pretend that I was not personally involved in, and therefore to some extent altered by, those situations I describe. By studying situations we become part of them, interacting constantly with the other actors. This cannot be dismissed as merely subjective, nor is it unscientific to draw tentative conclusions. No,

> to recognise the reality is to be properly scientific. When we grasp the constant interplay of the observer and the observed we understand the inherent impermanence of things; all the actors … are constantly responding to all the other actors and to the totality they comprise (1995: 140).

Curle's view on involved or participant research resonates with my research methodology. Such a method has deepened my understanding of my topic significantly, but I was told my presence also had a positive effect upon my 'subjects'. War and postwar zones are often loci of intense international intervention and interference. As such, I was concerned that my presence and research 'do no harm' (Anderson, 1999). However, I have been told that my research and interest in this work have encouraged and even strengthened faith-based peacebuilding in Bosnia-Herzegovina (my research topic). My interest and engagement reminds these religious peacebuilders that their work is important and even raises their awareness of their seemingly small role in the big picture of peacebuilding in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

My elicitive strategy of considering ordinary, often powerless people is inspired by a Mennonite belief that peace cannot be imposed, top down, and it does not only take place as a result of elite decisions. In this way I try also to conceptualize peace from within a local vision (Mitchell, 2000: 222) and adapt my models and methods of analysis to the particular context. Consistent with the Mennonite tradition of peacebuilding, seeking to transform conflict rather than 'only' reduce direct violence, I am most interested to engage and empower local leaders. This has very often included supporting peacebuilding work as a volunteer.[14] As a participant observer (e.g., a volunteer and researcher at the same time), I gain valuable insights and I attempt to give back through supporting these local leaders; through sharing my time, efforts, skills, network, etc.

Conclusion

The Mennonite faith tradition of nonviolence is long and rich. The church's development of nonkilling practices has been based on radical convictions to pacifism originating at the time of the European Reformation and evolving with the dynamics of their contexts, from Europe to the American continents over the last five centuries. This chapter catches only a glimpse of the history and doctrines shaping these changes, choosing to focus in the

[14] Currently (2011-2013) I do so with the support of Brethern Volunteer Service, a program of the Church of the Brethren.

second half on the practical outputs from this vibrant experience. We see that the Mennonites, while relatively small as a global community (1.5 million), have had an extraordinary impact in the fields of peace practice and scholarship. They are considered models and ground-breakers in these realms, bringing nonviolent ethics into greater mainstream acceptance and challenging the policies of international organizations and national leaders. The last section of the chapter brings the personal story of the author to bear on these historical, doctrinal and practical inputs. It is just one Mennonite narrative of ethnic belonging, religious upbringing and later re-awakening to, and reclaiming her own tradition through changed lenses As such, the chapter has sought to provide a single yet hopefully profound understanding of Mennonite nonkilling practice to stand alongside the many others worldwide and those presented in this volume.

References

Anderson, Mary B. (1999). *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace – Or War*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros (1992). *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping*. Report of the Secretary-General, United Nations GA.

Confession of Faith in a Mennonite Perspective (1995). Scottdale: Herald Press, 1995. Available at: <http://www.mennolink.org/doc/cof/>.

Conscientious Objection to Military Service (2012). Geneva: United Nations Office of the High Representative of Human Rights.

Curle, Adam (1995). *Another Way: Positive Response to Contemporary Violence*. Chipping Norton: Jon Carpenter Publishing.

Dordrecht Confession of Faith (2013). *Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online.* Available at: <http://gameo.org>

Engle Merry, Sally (2000). "Mennonite Peacebuilding and Conflict Transformation: A Cultural Analysis," in Sampson, Cynthia and Lederach, John Paul, eds. *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*. Oxford University Press, pp. 203-217.

Epp, Marlene (2007). "Mennonites and Politics: From the Quiet to the Loud in the Land," *H-Canada*, April.

Funk, Julianne (2012). *'Invisible' Believers for Peace. Religion and Peace-building in Postwar Bosnia-Herzegovina*. Doctoral dissertation. Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

Galtung, Johan (1976). "Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking, and Peacebuilding," in Galtung, Johan, ed., *Peace, War and Defense: Essays in Peace Research, Vol. II*. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers.

Harbuck, Michael (2010). "A Comparison of the Schleitheim and Mennonite Dordrecht Confessions." *The Berean Blog*. Available at: <http://mharbuck.wordpress.com/2010/06/10/a-comparison-of-the-schleitheim-and-mennonite-dordrecht-confessions/>.

Kraybill, Ron (2000). "Reflections on Twenty Years in Peacebuilding," in Sampson, Cynthia and Lederach, John Paul, eds. *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*. Oxford University Press, pp. 30-44.

Kreider, Alan, Elenor Kreider and Paulus Widjaja (2005). *A Culture of Peace: God's Vision for the Church*. Intercourse: Good Books.

Lederach, John Paul (1997). *Building Peace. Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Lederach, John Paul (1997). "From Resolution to Transformative Peacebuilding," in Sampson, Cynthia and Lederach, John Paul, eds. *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*. Oxford University Press, pp. 45-55.

Maček, Ivana (2009). *Sarajevo Under Seige. Anthropology in Wartime*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Miller, Joseph S. (2000a). "A History of the Mennonite Conciliation Service, International Conciliation Service, and Christian Peacemaker Teams," in Sampson, Cynthia and Lederach, John Paul, eds. *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*. Oxford University Press, pp. 3-29.

Miller, Joseph S. (2000b). "Appendix A. Who Are the Mennonites?" in Sampson, Cynthia and Lederach, John Paul, eds. *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*. Oxford University Press, pp. 275-280.

Mitchell, Christopher (2000). "Mennonite Approaches to Peace and Conflict Resolution," in Sampson, Cynthia and Lederach, John Paul, eds. *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*. Oxford University Press, pp. 218-232.

Paige, Glenn D. (2009). *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. Honolulu, Center for Global Nonkilling.

Ramsbotham, Oliver, Tom Woodhouse and Hugh Miall (2005). *Contemporary Conflict Resolution. The Prevention, Management and Transformation of Deadly Conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Roth, John D. (2005). *Beliefs: Mennonite Faith and Practice*. Scottdale: Herald Press.

Sampson, Cynthia and Lederach, John Paul (2000). *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schleitheim Confession. *Global Anabaptist Wiki*. Available at: <http://www.anabaptistwiki.org/mediawiki/index.php/Schleitheim_Confession>.

Yoder, John Howard (1972). *The Politics of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Chapter Twelve

An Alternative to Anzac: White poppies at the Peace Pole

Katerina Standish
University of Otago

Introduction

War memorials are permanent markers of violent conflict. Memorials (and ceremonies of remembrance) are tied to both victory and defeat in battle and many modern countries tie their national identity to the service of men and women in armed combat. Memorials to war are "ubiquitous" and speak to a common, though increasingly criticized, understanding of past conflicts—that war is necessary, and, to question the project of 'going to war' is to belittle the sacrifice of those who have fought and lost their lives (Buffton, 2005: 25).

> Memorials and ceremonies that celebrate war as victorious as well as those that frame it as a defeat encourage us to go to war again, either to claim greater glory and honor or to expurgate failure. In this way, war memorials and the commemoration of war anniversaries often become justifications for both past and future wars. They validate the deaths of soldiers as necessary sacrifices to preserve the nation (ibid, 26).

New Zealand is a former colony of the British Empire. On the 25th of April, New Zealand celebrates Anzac (Australian and New Zealand Army Corp) Day. This national day of memory is experienced through acts of military remembrance; through dawn marches, parades, wreath laying and church services, where, grandchildren proudly wear the service medals of their deceased military ancestors. The day is a national holiday, shops close, families gather and the civic populace remembers the sacrifice of soldiers killed while doing their duty (as well as those whose served and survived). Poppy Day, the Friday before the 25th, precedes Anzac—red poppies, supplied by the RSA (Returned Soldiers Association) go on sale so Kiwis (native New Zealanders) can show their support.

Anzac Day is one of multiple 'days of remembrance' throughout the commonwealth. In Canada, November 11th holds a similar form of "public mem-

ory" where war is turned into a glorious and heroic exemplification of national solidarity (Gray and Kendrick, 2001: 12). While most 'official' state commemorations were created in the wake of World War I (WWI), they continue to this day, absorbing each new wave of veterans or servicemen or women into their community of duty. For countries like New Zealand, Australia and Canada, there is a symbolic sense that in the war efforts of Vimy Ridge and Gallipoli, these former imperial colonies became nations of their own—as if the century prior to World War I produced no 'national' contributions, and, as if nothing of cultural notice or worth has occurred since 1918 (Reynolds, 2010).

On Anzac Day, citizens wear the red poppy as a "universally respected national symbol of remembrance" (Iles, 2008). Refrains, such as, "it is our duty… to honor the memory of our deceased veterans," (Hammer, 2005: 88) "wear your poppy with pride…honour the dead [and] serve the living," (Iles, 2008: 206) the red poppy is a "debt we owe" (ibid, 208) to veterans, and "a way of saying thank you" (ibid, 209) are conjoined with military, religious and civic commemorations that make noncompliance—not wearing the red poppy—akin to a form of treason, "equated with being unpatriotic" (Thorsteinsson, 2009).

Conversely, post-war peace commemoration, or, memorials to peace, is viewed as rare, "fragile and temporary" (Buffton, 2005: 25). This speaks to an apparent, and under scrutinized cultural position—that peace cannot coexist within a system of war.

War systems are civic and national structures that "organize themselves to participate in potential and actual war" (Goldstein, 2006: 3). Countering the *war system* means challenging many tenets of the modern nation-state because in most states, "war is less a series of events than a system…[that includes] military spending and attitudes about war" (ibid, 3). Countering violence may mean, in the *war system*, countering the state—a position that puts one in the position of 'enemy.'

This chapter seeks to engage with the 'narrative of remembrance,' in New Zealand—the role of social memory, the transmission of the memorialization of war, the juxtaposition of military service with the sacred and how war support is manufactured or resisted though the wearing of the red or the white poppy. This chapter describes an 'Alternative Anzac,' the April 25th Peace Pole ceremony guided by the students and faculty of Otago University's National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies. Finally, this work will explore how the alternative Anzac comprises a spiritual nonkilling tradition, an act of nonviolence that seeks to challenge war society without doing harm—countering violence and the role of war in social cohesion.

Collective memory and its transmission

Groups have myriad ways of formulating and transmitting the past. Cultural narratives are transmitted through books, TV, movies, the media, stories and national processes and practices of citizenship (Ryan, 2007: 139). National identity, similar to other forms of identity, is an assumption of some form of *sameness*, something shared by a social collectivity that contains an historical element and that is largely "formed in childhood" (Volkan, 2006: 15). While an *ethnie* is a group of people who share more (culturally) with one another than with others, nations are ethnic groups (or settler populations from ethnic groups) who seek political power in some way (Oberschall, 2007). In addition to a number of other qualities, a nation shares a "mass public culture" (Smith, 2008: 12) that contributes to the cultural cohesiveness of a country and includes "a system of public rites, symbols and ceremonies" (ibid, 36).

Cultural symbols of belonging include forms of social memory. While collective memories can be seen as a form of social consciousness—when many individuals share similar memories (Olick, 1999), they are distinct from social memory—which is the outcome of negotiated choices between interest groups (Baddeley, 1999). While persons or groups hold individual and collective memory, social memory selects particular stories and 'forgets' others. In the case of WWI, "social memory was formed primarily from the perspective of the victorious nations—France, the British Empire and her 'dominions', Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Canada" (Winter, 2009: 609-10). The communication of the social memory of war is done through public memorialization (such as Anzac Day) and are designed to "open up spaces for grieving and honoring the dead [to] provide spaces for individuals and communities to find meaning in a particular war [but also] close off the individual and particular experiences of war in favor of a larger narrative …[by providing only] a single narrative" of war (Buffton, 2005: 26.)

Because the formation of social memory has created a national benefit in New Zealand the 'selection' process whereby the true dimensions of war are "sanitized" continues—'war' is repackaged for public consumption (Winter, 2009: 614). And, as "not all memories are remembered," many memories are simply forgotten, left outside of the national narrative of war, sacrifice, obligation and gratitude (ibid, 614). What is remembered is the sacrifice, the glory, the duty, what is forgotten is the suffering, the killing, and the destruction of lives. The single narrative of the war system does not include all of the stories of war; neither does it enter into a discourse of

what it really means to serve, to object to serve, and to suffer from the action of war. If "death in combat is the soldiers' highest duty, the civilians duty is to remember and celebrate that sacrifice" (Buffton, 2005: 28). If the war system requires these reinforcing forms of national obligation in order to cohere, can nations exist without war?

The role of social memory in nation building

We have seen that in order to form a cohesive cultural bond, nations utilize collective *memories*—narratives of the past—as social memory "knowledge that is passed on [that forms a] keystone of national identity" (Bar-Tal and Rosen, 2009: 358). Nationalism, a common, modern, narrative, encodes certain attitudes and behaviors with significance: supporting the memorialization of war is one such attitude and, in New Zealand, one such behavior, is wearing the red poppy, on Anzac Day. The relevance of Anzac Day to Kiwis (and the role of the red poppy) is tied to her status as a dominion of the British Empire.

While there are many kinds of nations—New Zealand, similar to other commonwealth countries (Australia, Canada, South Africa), was created by settlers— "migrant communities of settlers…split of from the 'motherland'" of England—becoming ethnic fragments of the home culture (Smith, 2009: 52). And, despite a large body of research that recognizes the role of the indigenous Maori in the cultural and political development of New Zealand, Kiwis inherited the rites of military remembrance from their British 'motherland.' In New Zealand, Anzac Day, like Remembrance Day elsewhere, links the nation, to war, by conjoining the service of Kiwis in World War I to both commonwealth loyalty and nascent national independence.

De-colonization did not completely occur in New Zealand until well into the mid-twentieth century. In 1914, New Zealand was a Dominion of the United Kingdom. After WWI, New Zealand joined the League of Nations as an *independent* signatory (Chaudron, 2012). The contribution of Kiwi forces in the First World War may have occurred because of the British declaration of war—Britain declared war on Germany, then New Zealand (despite her remote location and small population) followed suit, but the Allies only won because of the 'colonial' recruits—like the soldiers from New Zealand. Although the contribution of the 'dominion' armies from Canada, Australia and New Zealand was part volunteerism and part conscription, thousands in the Kiwi forces went willingly:

> About 120,000 New Zealanders enlisted during the First World War, of whom 103,000 served overseas. When the war broke out in 1914 men

> flocked in their thousands to answer the call to arms. By the end of the first week of the war 14,000 had enlisted. Despite confident claims that it would be 'over by Christmas', by 1916, the war appeared no closer to a conclusion. The seemingly endless toll in lives and maimed men began to impact on public sentiment. As the Census and Statistics Office was tasked with the compilation of manpower registers, newspaper editorials urged the public to accept the necessity of greater sacrifices if the war was to be won. Intensive campaigns to encourage enlistment failed to meet their targets, with only 30 percent of men eligible for military service volunteering. In 1916 conscription for military service was introduced to maintain New Zealand's supply of reinforcements. Only four MPs opposed its introduction. The Military Service Act 1916 initially imposed conscription on Pakeha only, but this was extended to Maori in June 1917 (New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage ,2012).

New Zealand's expeditionary forces had the highest casualty and death rate of any commonwealth nation in WWI and thousands of families were impacted by the loss of husbands, fathers, brothers and sons (Summers, Wilson and Baker, 2011: 465-466). The significance of New Zealand's military contribution in WWI created the first national war narrative of New Zealand (New Zealand would go on to commit troops in World War II, the Cold War, Korean War, Vietnam, Malaya and Borneo and currently in the global 'war on terror') (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2013). 'War' work, in the context of the New Zealand Nation, is a century old specialty and war memorialization has been an ongoing project since 1921.

Memorialization as sacred space

Sacred space is a place where people sense a relationship with the divine (Hughes and Swan, 1986). It can be a place of honor, worship or ritual and in many indigenous cultures, the whole world can be considered sacred (Oakes *et al.*, 2004). Sacred spaces are intersections where the corporeal and spiritual intersect and, "there, in some special way, spirit is present to them" (Hughes and Swan, 1986: 247). Sacred Space can include a holy place "a well-structured, clearly delimited space," it can include a sanctified area, "a more extensive geographical area...usually consisting of the territory covered by a pilgrim," or an entire country can be determined sacred (Clancy-Smith, 2006; Grapard, 1982: 196). Sacred space can be disputed; places where the sacred and the secular meet and can become sites of struggle that result in forms of intercultural discord, civil unrest and religious hostility (Kong, 1993). And finally, expressions of the profane exist in parallel to sacred settings—

maintaining that one's own concept of the sacred is unquestionable while treating the sacred spaces of others as dubious (Stirrat, 1984).

Contemporary war commemoration can be seen as an amalgamation of social memory and sacred space. War Tourism—pilgrimage to places of national battles from WWI (e.g. Gallipoli, Ypres, Vimy Ridge) create pilgrims of site-seers—linking history, patriotism and mourning (Scates, 2002) "Through their participation in commemorative rituals, visiting battlefields, reading names on graves and monuments and seeking information, tourists can participate in the selection and rehearsal of the Great War's social memories" (Winter, 2009: 620).

As with all war memorials, what is *presented* represents something quite different from the experience of most soldiers, families and victims—war memorials present only certain identities, connecting the soldiers death to duty, patriotism "the sacrifice of Jesus" or "an ideal of freedom, liberty, democracy, or justice" (Buffton, 2005: 29-30; Cooke, 2000). Memorials to WWI—the Great War—do not make comment on the destruction of war or, in any way encapsulate the astronomical loss of life and livelihood because of it,

> Nine million men died [in the conflict]…there were a further twenty-eight million wounded and millions too who had experienced captivity. The dead left three million widows, not including women they might have married, and, on one calculation, six million fatherless children, not to speak of the tens of millions of grieving parents and grandparents, for the war burned its way up and down the generations with heedless ferocity. Total war also struck directly at civilians, whether in the form of burned villages, reprisal shootings and the sinking of merchant ships, or as naval blockades gradually decimated entire populations through calculated starvation (Burleigh, 2007: 1-2).

War monuments, (over 30,000 in France erected between 1919-1924) are representations of social memory that determine who should be remembered and which 'we' " should remember 'them,'" the dutiful we, the grateful we, the patriotic we. Indeed, war monuments connect the death of soldiers to conceptualizations of holiness and fertility, grasping (somehow) from the 'work' of soldiers, divinity and productivity (Gray and Kendrick, 2001: 12). In St. Rémy-la-Calonne, a monument depicts a dying soldier in the arms of a woman echoing the *pieta*—the dying Jesus in the arms of the Virgin Mary. In Terre de France "we see a peasant woman at the grave of a soldier marked by a cross and a helmet, but sprouting from the grave come abundant sheaves of wheat. The message is that the blood of the dead soldiers brings forth new life to reinvigorate the country" (Buffton, 2005: 27-

28). This connection to the notion of soldier, sacrifice and reanimation continues in the modern day practice of wearing the red Flanders poppy.

The Red Poppy: symbolism, history and remembrance

The red Flanders poppy has come to symbolize the war sacrifice of soldiers; it's called the Flanders poppy because of a poem written by a Canadian Medical Officer in 1915 called 'In Flanders Fields,'

> In Flanders fields the poppies blow,
> Between the crosses row on row,
> That mark our place; and in the sky
> The larks, still bravely singing, fly
> Scarce heard amid the guns below.
> We are the Dead.
> Short days ago
> We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
> Loved and were loved, and now we lie
> In Flanders fields.
> Take up our quarrel with the foe:
> To you from failing hands we throw
> The torch; be yours to hold it high.
> If ye break faith with us who die
> We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
> In Flanders fields (Col. John McCrae).

Selected as the official emblem of war in 1921, the Flanders poppy, worn on the lapel or uniform, has become a part of war remembrance in all commonwealth countries. It symbolizes blood, death, sacrifice and renewal, "while poppies represent the shed blood of dead soldiers, they also denote nature's constant cycle of regeneration and renewal…the rituals surrounding death are permeated by the symbolisms of rebirth and fertility" (Iles, 2008: 212). This rebirth applies to the British dominions, whose national identities were founded in the sacrifice of their citizens and soldiers in WWI (and every battle fought since) (Gray and Kendrick, 2001). In an inversion of coherent reasoning, the sacrifice of soldiers, the death of men (most of whom did not choose to be there) is transformed into fertilizer—cannon fodder to compost, "men's bodies, planted like seeds as they fell on the soil of the battlefields, could also represent hope for the future" (Iles, 2008, 212).

The White Poppy: nonviolence, inclusivity and remembrance

The White Poppy has become an international symbol of peace. It was originally used in Britain by the Cooperative Women's Guild, an organization started in the late 1800's that sought to support the social, educational and recreational development of women (Gaffen, 1983). The Cooperative Women's Guild campaigned for minimum wages for women; maternity benefits and, at the 1914 Women's Conference, at The Hague, called for an end to war.

The Peace Pledge Union, a pacifist group started in 1934, also adopted the antiwar stance and embraced the white poppy as a symbol of peace, nonviolence and remembrance. The white poppy challenges the militarization of society and provides an alternative form of remembrance of war.

> The white poppy began as a message from women—many of whom were mothers, sisters, widows and sweethearts of men killed in the First World War. They, like many others, began to feel with the rising domestic and international tensions that the war to end all wars, in which their men had been maimed, killed or languished in prison for refusing to fight, would be followed by an even worse war. The white poppy was born out of this fear as a symbol of our inability to settle conflicts without resorting to killing but also of hope and commitment to work for a world where conflicts will be resolved without violence and with justice (PPU 2011, ¶3-4).

The white poppy, similar to the red Flanders poppy, is a symbol of war remembrance but one that seeks to have a more holistic image of war and further, presents the message that true remembrance, means an end to war. "The white poppy was not intended as an insult to those who died in the First World War—a war in which many of the white poppy supporters lost husbands, brothers, sons and lovers—but a challenge to the continuing drive to war" (PPU n.d. ¶3). While there are other symbols of peace—the laurel wreath, the dove, the peace sign—the white poppy, though created prior to the Great War, has come to been seen as a secondary and oppositional symbol to the red poppy—the white poppy connects the remembrance of war to the goal of peace (Iles, 2008).

The Role of Anzac in Australia and New Zealand

"Because of Gallipoli, New Zealand and Australia became nations" (Young, *The Nelson Mail*, August 26, 2011). The participation of Australia and New Zealand in the Imperial battle of WWI cemented the histories of these two nations to *world* history. The British dominions in the southern

hemisphere walked upon the global stage of war in WWI and acted admirably and for their contribution, they earned places on the world stage, the League of Nations, the Paris Peace Talks and later, the United Nations.

The sacrifices of the generation of the first decades of the 20th century are becoming more popular as time goes by. Why? Scholar Mark McKenna thinks the Anzac resurgence is part of the new "civil religion," the certainties of Christianity being replaced by modern forms of worship and ritual interrelated with an increased curiosity in ancestry and history (McKenna, 2010: 112). There are more forms of nationalist media, films, TV shows and political figures, harnessing the uniquely Aussie and Kiwi experiences in the Great War and wars that came after and the increasing patriotism means that Anzac Day has become more important in Australia and New Zealand than Christmas (ibid, 112).

The realities of why the Aussies and Kiwi forces went to war are largely missing from the Anzac story, "like all national myths, the myth of the Anzac simplifies the past" (ibid, 111). The narrative, now, does not mention that Australia and New Zealand were not fighting for their own liberty, freedom or defense but were "attacking and invading the Ottoman Empire" for England (Lake, 2010: 10). The Anzac narrative, linked to the national identity of Australia and New Zealand, has been "militarized" local military history conflated with the 'myth' of a nation united against something threatening (ibid, 12). In fact, almost every military action carried out by Australia and New Zealand has occurred overseas, meaning that for most local people, war is something remote and contingent upon the experiences and perceptions of others (Reynolds, 2010: 43).

The inaccessible 'truths' of war make possible the repackaging of Anzac to mean the fight for freedom, security and the Australian and New Zealand way. The 'myth of Anzac' easily replaces the lived reality of those who have fought in distant theatres of war and also, the relative moral certitude of the first wars (WWI and WWII) erase the later, more morally murky battles in Vietnam and Iraq (ibid, 43). The 'Anzac myth' means that since the 1990s, the "merging of military and family history" has created a rapport with the past that makes personal identity 'nationalized' and because of our lack of complexity in understanding the past; Anzac Day acts to 'simplify' history and generate solidary in the present (Damousi, 2010: 103).

Critical engagement of war memory

War, as a subject of inquiry, is often contemplated from disciplinary vantage points; sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists, security strategists etc.

all investigate the ontology of war through their particular academic lens. Because of such 'disciplinarity' the capacity to critique 'war memorialization' may mean that there needs to be a critical engagement of 'war' as a transcendent phenomenon of cultural/social/political civilizations, first (Howard, 2006).

> War's fundamental properties are in part revealed by its disordering and reordering of knowledge. War's powers work through connections between war and knowledge and through political investments in truths about war…much needed critical engagement of …war, then, is in the situation of being both taken for granted in its meaning and radically underdeveloped as an object of inquiry…in a manner adequate to its social powers as a destroyer and maker of truths (Barkawi and Brighton, 2011: 127).

In order to critically engage with the role of war in human life (and the memorialization of war by nation-states since 1918), there needs to be a fundamental questioning of war, an inquiry into what is considered (when war is considered at all) and an investigation into what opportunities remain in the spaces around nationalist war memory to look for other meanings. Professor Richard Jackson challenges the conformity of war memorialization averring "it is not just about only remembering soldiers but also only remembering them in one way" (pers. comm). This commodification of the act of war is a practice that is made visible in war memorialization, a "reordering of knowledge" that leads to sanitation of the violence of war (ibid, 127) leaving room for only "particular" understandings of it (Aradau, 2012: 116).

Because war memorials choose for us what we are to remember (heroism, duty, sacrifice) the narrative they create around war is simple and easily adopted. The 'work' of war memorials is to entertain only certain rituals of remembrance, ones that both celebrate war in the past and accommodate the notion of going 'back to war' in the future. If the nation-state is considered a perpetual and preventive mechanism in contest with possible revolutionary movements (Balibar, 1994) then war memorializations, by signifying militant power and might, are symbols of the "ever present possibility of combat" and serve to remind us that 'never forget' does not mean 'never again' (Schmitt, 1996: 32).

Alternative forms of war memorialization

This chapter is not an exhaustive exploration of how people celebrate war and peace in different ways—instead, the goal of this chapter has been to tease out relevant discourses around war memorialization, the role of

war memorialization in New Zealand (in particular, Anzac Day) and to provide evidence and exposure of an alternative remembrance created in Dunedin that represents a new spiritual tradition of nonkilling. To ground the 'Alternative Anzac' ceremony in the global nonkilling tradition two other alternative forms of war memorialization will be briefly mentioned: the Quaker Memorial for Conscientious Objectors and the International Conscientious Objectors Day.

Quaker Memorial for Conscientious Objectors

The National Memorial Arboretum in Staffordshire, England, is a military burial ground filled with men and women who died as a result of their armed service. In addition, this Arboretum houses memorials to military deserters and civilians who died in WWI. As of April 2013, four stone benches in a stone alcove border this space of National commemoration. The Quaker Memorial is an articulation—a linking—between pacifism, war service, the death of innocence and the price paid by those who would rather face death than kill another person (Wainwright, 2013).

International Conscientious Objectors Day (May 15)

Armistice Day (November 11, 1918) was a day that originally celebrated the end of war. It was later renamed Remembrance Day (and Veterans Day) and came to stand for the role of the military in war—not the peace that resulted from the original armistice that ended WWI. Similar to other national holidays that are co-opted by the politics of the day—e.g. Mother's Day was started by Julia Ward Howe, in 1870, as a day "to encourage women to stand up against war, vowing not to send their sons, husbands, fathers, and sweethearts to be killed" and has now become a flower and greeting card holiday for homemakers (Buffton, 2005: 30). The act of remembering a true cost of war was practiced in Tacistock Square (London, England) on the 15th of May, 2011. In this alternative war remembrance the names of those who *refused* to serve in combat during WWI are read aloud as white flowers for peace are laid on the Conscientious Objectors Memorial Stone

> We chose this place of peace to remember those who resist war, all over the world, many of whom have been imprisoned, suffered and died as a result. The themes for our ceremony were that remembrance must involve working against war to make sure it never happens again, and that

> remembrance must be inclusive of all the victims of war including the millions of civilians whose lives are rarely commemorated (Beck, 2011: ¶1).

In a killing-free world people whose spiritual and moral traditions precluded them from the participation in military operations deserve to be recognized and remembered because they set an example for others as people who objected to violence, and frequently, suffered for their beliefs and actions to that end. The great contribution of conscientious objectors and nonviolence proponents is that they epitomize alternatives to violence, alternatives to war and voices for peace. The next section of this chapter will present an additional 'alternative' to the killing traditions of war, the 'Alternative Anzac Ceremony at the Peace Pole.'

The 'Alternative Anzac' Ceremony at the Peace Pole

On April 24, 2013, in conjunction with the University of Otago's Department of History and Art History and Preventive and Social Medicine, The National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (NCPACS) hosted a public forum, asking the question: How should we remember War? The public forum investigated the way that war remembrance practices had changed over time and asked two important questions: what alternative forms and practices of remembrance are possible and should peaceful futures play a greater role in war remembrance? The forum was a philosophical and intellectual opportunity to identify how war remembrance is supported by ideologies of aggression, militarization, hegemonic masculinity and nationalism. Importantly, the forum recognized the relevance of 'voice' in remembrance and the selective nature of war remembrance—giving voice to military and state organs of war and silencing the voice of war victims and activists for peace.

On April 25, 2013 (Anzac Day), a space of peaceful encounter, nonviolent participation and remembrance was created for people to recognize the full cost of war. Participants were invited to commemorate war by acting for peace. In the ceremony, NCPACS students lay a white poppy wreath at the base of the peace pole, the song 'Let Peace Begin With Me' was sung, the poem 'The Cure for Troy" was read, the *peace pledge* was taken and the attendees were led in a yogic peace meditation. During the ceremony, space was provided for any and all in attendance to speak about peace from a personal perspective and voices rose to share practices of peace from a variety of spiritual traditions.

The Alternative Anzac was uplifting, inclusive, and participatory and enacted a tradition of nonkilling by uplifting our shared human spirits with song and poetry (Urbain, 2009) and then manifesting a spatial incarnation of peace (Tyner, 2009). The lyrics of 'Let peace begin with me' were sung by vocalist Michelle Jackson. The song says:

> Let there be peace on earth and let it begin with me
> Let There Be Peace on Earth the peace that was meant to be
> With God as our Creator Family all are we
> With God as our Creator we are one family
> Let me walk with my brother in perfect harmony.
> Let peace begin with me. Let this be my solemn vow
> To take each moment and live each moment in peace eternally
> Let there be peace on earth. And let it begin with me (Miller and Miller, 1955).

Those in attendance were given the words to this song. After the group rendition of this moving song, Professor Kevin Clements read 'The Cure for Troy.' It reads:

> Human beings suffer, they torture one another,
> They get hurt and get hard. No poem or play or song
> Can fully right a wrong inflicted or endured.
> The innocent in gaols beat on their bars together.
> A hunger-striker's father stands in the graveyard dumb.
> The police widow in veils faints at the funeral home.
> History says, don't hope on this side of the grave.
> But then, once in a lifetime the longed for tidal wave
> Of justice can rise up, and hope and history rhyme.
> So hope for a great sea change on the far side of revenge.
> Believe that a further shore is reachable from here.
> Believe in miracles and cures and healing wells.
> Call the miracle self-healing: The utter self-revealing
> Double take of feeling. If there's fire on the mountain or lightning and storm,
> And a god speaks from the sky.
> That means someone is hearing the outcry
> And the birth-cry of new life at its term (Heaney, 1991).

Following the poem, participants were invited to approach the peace pole and lift up a left hand to grasp it (the left hand is the closest to the human heart). When no more people could touch the pole, they were asked to place their left hands upon the left shoulder of the person in front of them. They were then asked to close their eyes, stand softly on the earth,

and focus their minds' eye on the space just inside of their belly buttons. They were then requested to warm their bellies, as if on a small candle flame and to brighten and fill their chests in order to warm their hearts. When the heat in their bellies infused their hearts with a sense of comfort and warm-heartedness they were asked to remember this moment and share this feeling of wellness and care with others—a feeling that they had readily manifested in their own personal bodies. They were then requested to let the warm feeling rise further in their bodies until the corners of their mouths curled up in a restful smile. Attendees were asked to breath deeply the feeling of peace that they had achieved together and to move forward, from this moment on, with kindness and integrity.

After the group meditation, attendees were invited to say the peace pledge and then tie a white ribbon of peace to the peace pole. The peace pledge avows: "I renounce war, and am therefore determined not to support any kind of war. I am also determined to work for the removal of all causes of war."

At 5:30 pm, in the reserve green space in front of the Otago Museum, Dunedin, New Zealand, almost 100 strangers met to act for peace. This venue was chosen because the space is a crossroads, at the centre of which, stands a pole dedicated to world peace. The peace pole contains a message of universal peace in the two official languages of New Zealand (English and Maori) and is one of thousands of peace poles around the globe that symbolize peace, and nonviolence in the human family. The Dunedin peace pole is a site of pilgrimage, vigil, nonviolent protest and commemoration and has been a meeting place for peacemakers in Dunedin since November 2005 (http://www.peacepoleproject.org). Professor Kevin Clements, the director of NCPACS was one such peacemaker on April 25th. When asked about why he participated in the 'Alternative Anzac' Clements said the following:

> I think its really important to have a more inclusive ceremony which is respectful of all those who have lost their lives in war—very often for reasons that they had no control over. If you were conscripted you were really placed in an invidious position. You had no choice but to fight. There were many others who resisted for conscientious reasons. Many of these people also lost their lives. We need to acknowledge perpetrators and victims. The white poppy is a more explicit acknowledgement of the *never again* idea…[the] white poppy ceremony around the peace pole was more inclusive, more respectful of diversity, more respectful of the enemy, more respectful of the tragic nature of war. I think it provided an opportunity for slightly deeper reflection…alternative ceremonies are an important way of affirming future possibility (pers. comm.).

Jean-Paul Lederach, a major peace and conflict studies scholar, considers that a fundamental part of affecting change stems from the way a society imagines itself—in order to manifest a peaceful future we need to first imagine one (2005). The 'Alternative Anzac' is such a manifestation of change because it is a ritual of new understandings, "we are trying to highlight the fact that nobody gets out of war unscathed—heroes to cowards…[and that] war generates mutual tragedy for the victor and the vanquished" (Kevin Clements, pers. comm.). Speaking 'truth' to the past will help us make different choices in the future.

Transforming collective memory and creating sacred space

Collective memories are group narratives that are created and transmitted from one generation to the next. In order to transform our relationship with a violent history we need to recognize that the presence of something in the past does not mean that it needs to exist in our future. The sacred spaces created by war memorials concretize certain ways of remembering war, and in doing so; make possible the 'next' possibility of combat.

By creating new spaces of remembrance the monolithic hold of war memory begins to loosen, is challenged and can therefore be transformed. Creating new sacred spaces, spaces that celebrate life, human rights and killing-free traditions can begin with something as simple as laying a peace wreath on a stone, sitting in quiet contemplation of 'other' paths taken or tying a white ribbon to a peace pole.

Alternative Anzac as a spiritual nonkilling tradition in New Zealand

Creating a positive relationship with the past can contribute to nonviolent behaviors in the future. The goal of the 'Alternative Anzac' is to provide an alternative form of war remembrance—one that is committed to nonkilling and one that sensitizes us to national forms of commemoration as sacred/secular rituals of violence (in the past and the future). Preventing violence means recognizing aggression in many forms and taking *alternative*, nonviolent countermeasures. Making the connection between collective 'war' memory and sacred space can result in a new form of practice and a novel kind of understanding—that a killing-free world can begin with a pledge against an insidious and prevalent form of collective violence: war.

References

Aradau, Claudia (2012). "Security, War, Violence-The Politics of Critique: A reply to Barkawi," *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 41:112-23.

Baddeley, Alan, D. (1999). *Essentials of Human Memory*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Balibar, Étienne (1994). *Masses, Classes, and Ideas: Studies on Politics and Philosophy Before and After Marx*. London: Routledge.

Barkawi, Tarak and Brighton, Shane (2011). "Powers of War: Fighting, Knowledge and Critique," *International Political Sociology*, 5: 126-43.

Bar-Tal, Daniel and Rosen, Yigal (2009). "Peace Education in Societies Involved in Intractable Conflicts: Direct and Indirect Models," *Review of Educational Research*, 79:557-75.

Beck, Lucy (2011). "Remembrance Day 2011at the Conscientious Memorial Stone, London." Accessed June 2, 2013. Available online at: <http://www.ppu.org.uk/whitepoppy/a_remdays/rem2011a.html>.

Buffton, Deborah, D. (2005). "Memorialization and the Selling of War," *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, 17:25-31.

Burleigh, Michael (2006). *Sacred Causes: The Clash of Religion and Politics, from the Great War to the War on Terror*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Chaudron, Gerald (2012). "New Zealand's International Initiation: Sir James Allen at the League of Nations 1920–1926," *Political Science*, 64(1): 62-80.

Clancy-Smith, Julia (2006). *Exemplary Women and Sacred Journeys*. Washington: American Historical Association.

Clements, Kevin (2013). Interview with author, May 17, 2013.

Cooke, Steven (2000). "Negotiating memory and identity: The Hyde Park holocaust memorial, London," *Journal of Historical Geography*, 26(3): 449-465.

Damousi, Joy (2010). "Why do we get so emotional about Anzac?" In Lake, Marilyn and Reynolds, Henry, Eds., *What's Wrong with Anzac?* Sydney: University of New South Wales, pp. 94-119

Gaffin, Jean (1983). *Caring & Sharing: The Centenary History of the Co-operative Women's Guild*. Nottingham: Nottingham Printers.

Goldstein, Joshua, S. (2001). *War and Gender.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grapard, Allan, G. (1982). "Flying Mountains and Walkers of Emptiness: Toward a Definition of Sacred Space in Japanese Religions," *History of Religions,* 21(3): 195-221.

Gray, Peter and Kendrick, Oliver (2001). "The Memory of Catastrophe," *History Today*, 51(2): 9-15.

Hackett, Claire and Rolston, Bill (2009). "The burden of memory: Victims, storytelling and resistance in Northern Ireland," *Memory Studies*, 2:355-76.

Hammer, Betty, D. (2005). "Memorial Day: A Tribute to our Veterans," *The Officer*, 81(4): 88.

Heaney, Seamus (1991). "The Cure for Troy." Accessed June 2, 2013. Available at: <http://writtenencounters.blogspot.co.nz/2008/01/cure-at-troy-seamus-heaney.html>

Howard, Michael (2006). *Captain Professor*. London: Continuum.

Hughes, Donald, J. and Swan, Jim (1986). "How Much of the Earth is Sacred Space?" *Environmental Review*, 10(4): 247-259.

Iles, Jennifer (2008). "In Remembrance: the Flanders poppy," *Mortality*, 13(3): 201-22.

Jackson, Richard (2013). Interview with author, May 31, 2013.

Kong, Lily (1993). "Negotiating Conceptions of 'Sacred Space': A Case Study of Religious Buildings in Singapore," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 18(3): 342-58.

Lake, Marilyn (2010). "Introduction: What have you done for your country?" In *What's Wrong with Anzac?* Edited by Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, 1-23. Sydney: University of New South Wales Ltd.

Lederach, John Paul. 2005. *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McKenna, Mark. 2010. "Anzac Day: How did it become Australia's national day?" In Lake, Marilyn and Reynolds, Henry, Eds., *What's Wrong with Anzac?* Sydney: University of New South Wales, pp. 110-34.

Miller, Sy and Miller, Jill (1955). "Let Peace Begin with Me." Accessed June 2, 2013. Available at: <http://www.jan-leemusic.com/Site/History.html>.

N.a. (n.d.). "Anzac Poppy Image." Accessed June 1, 2013. Available online at: <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/war/anzac-day/poppies>.

New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage (2012). War-census-and-conscription. Accessed May 29, 2013. Available online at: <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/media/photo/war-census-and-conscription>.

Oakes, Jill, Riewe, Rick, Belanger, Yale, Blady, Sharon, Legge, Kelly and Wiebe, Patsy, Eds. (2004). *Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes*. Winnipeg: Aboriginal Issues Press.

Oberschall, Anthony (2007). *Conflict and Peace Building in Divided Societies: Responses to Ethnic Violence*. London: Routledge.

Olick, Jeffrey, K. (1999). "Collective Memory: The Two Cultures," *Sociological Theory*, 17: 333-48.

Peace Pledge Union (PPU) (N.d.). "White Poppies are for peace." Accessed June 2, 2013. Available online at: <http://www.ppu.org.uk/whitepoppy/index.html>.

Peace Pledge Union (PPU) (2011). "PPU Promo." Accessed June 2, 2012. Available online at: <http://www.ppu.org.uk/down/ppupromo2011.pdf>.

Reynolds, Henry (2010). "Are nations really made in war?" In Lake, Marilyn and Reynolds, Henry, Eds., *What's Wrong with Anzac?* Sydney: University of New South Wales, pp. 24-44

Ryan, Stephan (2007). *The Transformation of Violent Intercommunal Conflict*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing.

Scates, Bruce (2002). "In Gallipoli's shadow: pilgrimage, memory, mourning and the Great War," *Australian Historical Studies*, 119:1-21.

Schmitt, Carl (1996). *The concept of the Political*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, Anthony, D. (2008). *The Cultural Foundations of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant, and Republic.* Oxford: John Wiley and Sons.

Smith, Anthony, D. (2009). *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: A cultural approach.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Stirrat, Reno, L. (1984). "Sacred Models," *Man,* 19(2): 199-215.

Summers, Jennifer, A., Wilson, Nick, and Baker, Michael, G. (2011). "Ethnic Gradient in Mortality among the New Zealand Military Personnel in World War I," *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 65(1): A466.

Thorsteinsson, Amanda (2009). "To remember is to work for peace," *Canadian Mennonite*, 13(21): 18.

Tyner, James (2009). "Toward a Nonkilling Geography," In Evans Pim, Joám, Ed., *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*. Honolulu: Centre for Global Nonkilling, pp. 169-88.

Urbain, Olivier (2009). "Nonkilling Arts." In Evans Pim, Joám, Ed., *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*. Honolulu: Centre for Global Nonkilling, pp. 169-88.

Volkan, Vamik (2006). *Killing in the Name of Identity: A Study of Bloody Conflicts*. Charlottesville: Pitchstone Publishing.

Wainwright, Martin (2013). "Rare memorial Inspires Contemporary Quaker Work," *The Guardian*, April 16.

Winter, Caroline (2009). "Tourism, Social Memory and the Great War," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(4): 607-26.

Young, Sarah (2011). "A Renewal of Interest in Anzac Day Observance," *The Nelson Mail.* Available at: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/nelson-mail/news/4927287>..

Chapter Thirteen

The Nonviolent Crescent

Eight Theses on Muslim Nonviolent Actions[1]

Chaiwat Satha-Anand
Thammasat University

From 1982 to 1984, Muslims from two villages in Ta Chana district, Surat Thani, in southern Thailand had been killing one another in vengeance; seven people had died. Then on January 7, 1985, which happened to be a Maulid day (to celebrate Prophet Muhammad's birthday), all parties came together and settled the bloody feud. Haji Fan, the father of the latest victim, stood up with the Holy Qur'an above his head and vowed to end the killings. With tears in his eyes and for the sake of peace in both communities, he publicly forgave the murderer who had assassinated his son. Once again, stories and sayings of the Prophet had been used to induce concerned parties to resolve violent conflict peacefully (*Sanyaluck*, 137, Jan 30, 1985).

Examples such as this abound in Islam. Their existence opens up possibilities of confidently discussing the notion of nonviolence in Islam. They promise an exciting adventure into the unusual process of exploring the relationship between Islam and nonviolence.

This chapter is an attempt to suggest that Islam already possesses the whole catalogue of qualities necessary for the conduct of successful nonviolent actions. An incident that occurred in Pattani, southern Thailand, in 1975 is used as an illustration. Finally, several theses are suggested as guidelines for both the theory and practice of Islam and the different varieties of nonviolence, including nonviolent struggle.

---

[1] Originally published in *Islam and Nonviolence*, ed. Glenn D. Paige, Chaiwat Satha-Anand and Sarah Gilliatt (Honolulu: Center for Global Nonviolence, 1993). A slightly modified version of "The Nonviolent Crescent" was translated into Arabic as "La 'unf fee al-Islam" (Islam and Nonviolence) and published in *Al-Muqawama Al Hadanieh Fi Al-Nidal Al-Siyyas* [Civilian Resistance in Political Struggle], ed. Saad Eddin Ibrahim (Amman, Jordan: Arab Thought Forum, 1988). It was also translated in its entirety into Indonesian (*Bahasa Indonesia*) as "Bulan Sabit Tanba Kekerasan: Delapan Tesis Tindak Kekerasan Dalam Islam," and published in *Menggapai Dunia Damai*, ed. Mochtar Lubis (Jakarta, Indonesia: Yayasan Obor Indonesia, 1988).

Jihad

A discussion of Islamic action against injustice is necessarily an examination of one of the most controversial concepts in Islam— jihad. Generally translated as "holy war," the term jihad connotes to non-Muslims desperate acts of irrational and fanatical people who want to impose their worldview on others. But this imposition is virtually untenable because the Qur'an says "Let there be no compulsion in religion." In fact, it can be argued that the great Arab conquests were essentially political and ideological. The Muslims were willing to tolerate pluralistic societies, which allowed the tensions of older tyrannies to be relaxed. Islam simply offered many peoples of the seventh and eighth centuries a freer, more secure and peaceful life than they had experienced in the past (Goldstein, 1979: 55). Sometimes the conversion process took place in exchange for a Muslim divine's bureaucratic, religious, and educational services. Historically, especially in Southeast Asia, Islam seemed to stress continuity rather than conflict with previous cultures (Levtzion, 1979).

What then is the meaning of jihad? Some Muslims considered jihad to be the sixth pillar of Islam (Enayat, 1982: 2). Among the Muslim legal school, the Khawarij (seceders) used jihad to impose their opinion on the rest of the Muslim community in the name of transcendent and extreme idealism. They insisted that because the Prophet spent most of his life in war, the faithful should follow his example—that the Islamic state should be organized for war, and heretics forcibly converted or put to the sword (Ferguson, 1977: 132). But for Muslims, whose criteria for conduct are the Qur'an and the Hadith (traditions of the Prophet), historical examples pale in the face of the Qur'anic verses.

> Fight in the cause of Allah
> Those who fight you,
> But do not transgress limits;
> For Allah loveth not transgressors. (2:190)

According to this verse, aggression is prohibited in Islam, and the fighting that is permitted has its limits. The admonition of other relevant verses provides clarification:

> And fight them on
> Until there is no more
> Tumult or oppression,
> And there prevail
> Justice and faith in Allah. (2:193)

> Altogether and everywhere. (8:39)

One of the reasons for fighting oppression is

> For tumult and oppression
> Are worse than slaughter. (2:191)

In this sense, fighting in the cause of God in Islam is basically synonymous with fighting for justice. The Qur'an has a precise injunction to substantiate this point:

> And why should ye not
> Fight in the cause of Allah
> And of those who, being weak
> Are ill-treated (and oppressed)?
> Men, women and children,
> Whose cry is "Our Lord!
> Rescue us from this town,
> Whose people are oppressors;
> And raise for us from Thee
> One who will protect;
> And raise for us from Thee
> One who will help!" (4:75)

There is no need to probe deeper into the exegesis of these verses. For the purpose of this analysis, it can be concluded that *jihad* means to stand up to oppression, despotism, and injustice (whenever it is committed) and on behalf of the oppressed (whoever they may be). In its most general meaning, *jihad* is an effort, a striving for justice and truth that need not be violent. According to 'Abd-af-Radhiq's reading of the Qur'an, God has instructed the Muslims to propagate their religion only through peaceful persuasion and preaching (Enayat, 1982: 64).

Classical Muslim scholars have placed *jihad* in three categories. Ibn Taymiya, for example, argues that *jihad* is achieved sometimes by the heart, sometimes by the tongue, and sometimes by the hand. *Jihad* of the heart, against one's own weaknesses and inner evil, is often described as the "greater *jihad*," while the "lesser *jihad*" is fought against external enemies. Ibn Taymiya also suggests two cardinal rules for *jihad* by the tongue and by the hand: understanding and patience (Sardar, 1985).

Jihad can be differentiated according to the direction (inner and outer) and method (violent and nonviolent). The inner *jihad* in the narrowest sense is fought within the individual. In a broader sense, the outer *jihad* may be seen as a struggle to eliminate evil within the *ummah*

(community). On an even broader reading, *jihad* can be thought of as a struggle within that portion of humanity that accepts some form of spiritual guidance in order to purify itself (Legenhausen, 1985). In short, *jihad* is the command of Allah Almighty and the traditions of Prophet Muhammad that demand a perpetual self-reexamination in terms of one's potential to fight tyranny and oppression—a continual reassessment of the means for achieving peace and inculcating moral responsibility (Annes, 1985).

The point, however, is not to dwell on the conventional wisdom of separating the concept of *jihad* into wars and selfpurification. What is most important for contemporary Muslims is that *jihad* categorically places the notion of war and violence in the moral realm. The purpose of *jihad*, ultimately, is to put an end to "structural violence." (Galtung, 1969: 167-9) But the means used are not independent of moral scrutiny. On the basis of the Qur'an and the Sunnah, rules have been enunciated to forbid Muslims to kill noncombatants. One of the Hadiths reports these instructions by the Prophet: "Go in God's name, trusting in God, and adhering to the religion of God's messenger. Do not kill a decrepit old man, or a young infant, or a woman; do not be dishonest about booty, but collect your spoils, do right and act well, for God loves those who do well." (Robson, 1975: 838) Not only are the lives of the noncombatants deemed sacred, but the Qur'an requires that even a tree must be spared:

> Whether ye cut down (O ye Muslims!)
> The tender palm-tree
> Or ye left them standing
> On their roots, it was
> By leave of God, and
> In order that He might
> Cover with shame
> The rebellious transgressors. (59:5)

The placing of *jihad* within the Islamic ethical sphere also means that wanton destruction of an enemy's crops or property is strictly forbidden. This principle was clearly stated in a speech the first Caliph, Abu Bakr, made when he sent his army on an expedition to the Syrian borders:

> Stop, O people, that I may give you ten rules for your guidance in the battlefield. Do not commit treachery or deviate from the right path. You must not mutilate dead bodies. Neither kill a child, nor a woman, nor an aged man. Bring no harm to the trees, nor burn them with fire, especially those which are fruitful. Slay not any of the enemy's flock, save for your

> food. You are likely to pass by people who have devoted their lives to monastic services, leave them alone (Siddiqi, trans., 1976-9: 940).

Transgressors of these principles were rebuked. At one time during the conquest, the authorities apprehended a girl who had been publicly singing satirical poems about Caliph Abu Bakr and amputated her hand. When Abu Bakr heard this news, he was shocked and wrote a letter to the *muhajir* who had punished the girl.

> I have learnt that you laid hands on a woman who had hurled abuses on me, and therefore, had her hand amputated. God has not sought vengeance even in the case of polytheism, which is a great crime. He has not permitted mutilation even with regard to manifest infidelity. Try to be considerate and sympathetic in your attitude toward others in the future. Never mutilate, because it is a grave offence. God purified Islam and the Muslims from rashness and excessive wrath. You are well aware of the fact that those enemies fell into the hands of the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) who had been recklessly abusing him; who had turned him out of his home; and who fought against him, but he never permitted their mutilation. (Ibid.)

From the verses of the Qur'an and these examples from one of the Prophet's companions, it can be concluded that the lesser *jihad*—the use of physical violence against others—has certain limits. These moral injunctions are possible because Muslims have to practice greater *jihad*—the process of struggle against worldly passion in oneself. The perpetual inner and greater *jihad* will guide the conduct of lesser *jihad* in both its objectives and its conduct. This requirement in Islamic teaching raises the question of whether a lesser jihad can ever be practiced in an age of mass warfare and nuclear weapons.

It is interesting to note that the first symposium in the Islamic world on the nuclear arms race (organized in Karachi, Pakistan, by the World Muslim Congress in cooperation with the University of Karachi in March 1984) was held with the theme "The Nuclear Arms Race and Nuclear Disarmament: The Muslim Perspective." Inamullah Khan, secretary-general of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) said:

> Since 1976, it [the OIC] has addressed itself regularly every year to a consideration of the twin issues of the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear weapon states against the threat or use of nuclear weapons, and of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones . . . an

> enunciation of the principles that nuclear disarmament must be universal and non-discriminatory for it to have any sense.[2]

Echoing the same idea, a retired Pakistani general candidly pointed out the frightening capacity of nuclear overkill: "What is worse, there are no signs of reduction in the stockpiles. Instead there is an unbridled race for qualitative and quantitative superiority and more sophisticated weapons are being added to the nuclear arsenal every year." (Khan, 1984) He then suggested that Muslims must make their full contribution to the international efforts for general and complete nuclear disarmament. Nuclear-free zones should be established in the Middle East, South Asia, Africa, and other parts of the world, with the ultimate aim being to rid the entire globe of nuclear weapons. States possessing nuclear weapons should extend unconditional and legally binding assurances to refrain from using or threatening to use such weapons against states without nuclear arms. Instead peaceful nuclear technology must be shared among the people of the world. Finally, the Muslims should strengthen themselves through political unity, economic development, and acquisition of necessary technologies, including know-how in the nuclear field.

The argument against nuclear wars and nuclear weapons is fundamental to the question of Islam and violence in the nuclear age. Inamullah Khan argues that although Islam permits fighting, it insists that the use of force be minimal. Furthermore, the Muslim conduct of war must be as humane as possible. A Muslim soldier does not fight for self-glory or plunder, and he is ordered not to kill indiscriminately. Given this mandate, Islam prohibits nuclear weapons because they are weapons of mass destruction and can in no way distinguish between combatants and noncombatants nor between military targets and fields and factories (Khan, 1985).

It is important to note that this argument is incomplete. Inamullah Khan twice pointed out that "Nuclear weapons are not weapons of war. They are instruments of mass extermination." But the analysis that Muslims are not permitted to use these weapons because they do not conform to the Islamic conduct of violence overlooks an important fact: Nuclear weapons are not the only kind of weapons that cannot distinguish between combatants and noncombatants or between military tar-

---

[2] *Proceedings of the World Muslim Congress*, Karachi, Pakistan, March 1984. I cannot help but ask if a full-scale war breaks out between any two powers, will any of the "ordinary" states survive?

gets and farmers' villages. Khan's omission of this point arises out of an incomplete consideration of the nature of modern warfare.

War casualties have dramatically increased in the twentieth century, which has been characterized as "the century of total war." (See Aron, 1955.) In its first fifty years over one hundred million people, military and civilian, were killed, and World War II claimed almost thirty-five million civilian lives (Beer, 1981: 35-37). This astonishing rate of civilian casualties is basically a result of new technologies such as aerial bombardment, submarine warfare, and chemical/biological warfare (Wilson, 1983: 19). It can thus be said that throughout modern history, especially since the onset of the industrial revolution, technology has had profound implications for the capacity to wage war (Miller, 1985).

The issue has become more complicated with the proliferation of terrorism. Over the decades, the tendency has been to choose methods that minimize the terrorists' risks. As a result, the targets increasingly have become defenseless victims who have little value as symbols or who are not responsible for the conditions the terrorists say they want to alter (Rapoport, 1984). This analysis holds that the critical variables for understanding terrorism are not related to technology but rather to the purpose and organization of particular groups and the vulnerabilities of particular societies to them. Nevertheless it is possible to argue that the societies' vulnerabilities more or less depend on the level of destruction of the technology used in terror.

If the effect of terror becomes the prime focus of analysis, then the extent of damage done to human life by modern and sophisticated weapons must be taken into account. In this sense, technology assumes paramount significance.

Michael Walzer points out that one of the hardest questions in the theory of war (or violence in the modern age) is how those victims of war who can be attacked and killed are to be distinguished from those who cannot. The moral quality of war lies, among other things, in the tendency to set certain classes of people outside the permissible range of warfare, so that killing any of their members is not a legitimate act of war but a crime (Walzer, 1977: 41-42).[3] Perhaps one of the best sets of

---

[3] Medieval writers distinguish *jus ad bellum* (justice of war) from *jus in bello* (justice in war). "*Jus ad bellum* requires us to make judgments about aggression and self-defence while *jus in bello* primarily concerns the observance or violation of the customary and positive rules of engagement." (Walzer, 1977: 21).

guidelines for judgment in the conduct of violence includes two major principles: proportionality and discrimination. The principle of proportionality centers on the means of violence. It implies that battlefield use of particularly inhumane weapons should be restricted. The principle of discrimination centers on the objects of violence. It suggests that the belligerents should discriminate between combatants and noncombatants and that noncombatants should be protected (Beer, 1981: 91-2).

The question is how noncombatants can be protected when the level of violence used is so overpowering that it destroys the possibility of discriminating between combatants and noncombatants. Moreover some users of violence do not intend to discriminate but instead want the terrorization per se to attract attention from the world media so that their causes can be furthered. As a result it is virtually impossible for the innocents to remain safe in an age when the sophistication of modern technology of destruction is coupled with the growing disregard of human life.

Islam does not tolerate such indiscriminate methods. Nor does it allow God's creation—human lives, trees, animals, the environment—to be destroyed. For example, the use of napalm is unacceptable, as are explosions in department stores, hijacking and killing hostages on any means of transportation, and bombing civilian targets. The modern world has made primitive weapons obsolete, but the encompassing moral sphere of Islam also renders modern weapons morally illegitimate. Does this conflict mean that oppressed Muslims should submit and ignore the command of God to fight? Is there any alternative for Muslims in the contemporary world? Before these questions can be discussed, Islamic ideas and teachings conducive to the absence of violence should first be appreciated.

Islam and the Promotion of Life

In the Beginning, Allah Almighty said:

> Behold the Lord said to the angels
> "I will create a vicegerent on earth." (2:30)

God created people to be the vicegerents on earth and instilled His spirit in every man, woman, and child.

> When I have fashioned him
> (In due proportion) and breathed
> Into him of My spirit,

> Fall ye down in obeisance
> Unto him. (15:29)

This verse suggests the sacredness of human life because the spirit of the Creator resides within the otherwise empty body. In this sense, also, humankind is one.

> Mankind was one single nation,
> And Allah sent Messengers
> With glad tidings and Warnings. (2:213)

The unity of humankind is asserted repeatedly in the Qur'an.

> Mankind was but one nation,
> But differed (later). Had it not
> Been for a Word
> That went forth before
> From thy Lord, their differences
> Would have been settled
> Between them. (10:19)

Once these verses are appreciated, then it is possible to understand the meaning of a verse such as this:

> And if anyone saved a life,
> It would be as if he saved
> The life of the whole people. (5:32)

Human life is thus sacred. Humankind is one single family, and every human life has a value equivalent to the sum total of all human lives.

Murder is considered one of the four major sins in Islam (Robson, 1975: 16). Yet there is a paradox: If Islam values the sanctity of life, how can Muslims fight "tumult and oppression" to the end? Unless Muslims forsake the methods of violence, they cannot follow the seemingly contradictory injunctions. It is evident that fighting against injustice cannot be avoided. But the use of violence in such fighting can be eschewed. Alternatives to violence must be adopted if the sanctity of life is to be preserved. Because nonviolent alternatives do exist (Sharp, 1973), an argument can be made that for Muslims to be true to their faith, they have no alternative but to utilize nonviolent action in the contemporary world. The question then is whether Islam embodies conditions conducive to the use of effective nonviolent actions.

Nonviolent Action as an Islamic Mode of Struggle

What is needed to practice nonviolent action? Gandhi answers:

> Belief in non-violence is based on the assumption that human nature in its essence is one and therefore unfailingly responds to the advances of love... The non-violent technique does not depend for its success on the goodwill of the dictators, for a nonviolent resister depends on the unfailing assistance of God which sustains him throughout difficulties which could otherwise be considered insurmountable (1948: 175).

In another place, he writes:

> Truth and non-violence are not possible without a living belief in God, meaning a self-existent, all-knowing, living force which inheres in every other force known to the world and which depends on none, and which will live when all other forces may conceivably perish or cease to act (1948: 112).

A Muslim following Gandhi's teaching would not feel estranged. In fact, it may be possible to trace the Islamic influence on Gandhi concerning the omnipotent and incomparable God. Faith in the supreme Allah already exists in the hearts of every true Muslim.

If Gandhian nonviolence is not sufficient, a modern theory of power may suffice. Gene Sharp writes:

> Political power disintegrates when the people withdraw their obedience and support. Yet, the ruler's military equipment may remain intact, his soldiers uninjured, the exiles unscathed, the factories and transport systems in full operational capacity, and the government buildings undamaged. But everything is changed. The human assistance which created and supported the regime's political power has been withdrawn. Therefore, its power has disintegrated (1973: 63-64).

For Muslims, this so-called modern theory of power simply embodies the basic Islamic principle that a person should submit only to the Will of God. As a result, a Muslim is not bound to obey anyone whose power has been used unjustly. The Qur'an gives the following warning:

> When (at length) the order
> For fighting was issued to them,
> Behold a section of them
> Feared men as—
> Or even more than—
> They should have feared Allah. (4:77)

Yet there is assurance as well:

> Behold! verily on the friends
> Of God there is no fear,
> Nor shall they grieve. (10:62)

Complete submission to the Will of Allah means that if Muslims are oppressed and too weak to fight back, they nevertheless must refuse to obey an unjust ruler. They do have a means to refuse—they can leave. And leave they must, because the command of God on this issue is quite clear.

> When angels take
> The souls of those
> Who die in sin
> Against their souls,
> They say: "In what (plight)
> Were ye?" They reply:
> "Weak and oppressed
> Were we in the earth."
> They say: "Was not
> The earth of Allah
> Spacious enough for you
> To move yourselves away
> (From evil)?" (4:97)

Whether Muslims are weak or strong, they must do something, and it is this tendency toward action that enables them to engage easily in nonviolent struggle. As a technique, nonviolent action is not passive: "It is *not* inaction. It is *action* that is nonviolent." (Sharp, 1973: 64-65) Hence, by definition, nonviolent action cannot occur except by the replacement of passivity and submissiveness with activity, challenge, and struggle.

Nonviolent Action in Pattani, 1975

The proximity between Islam and nonviolence can be illustrated with a case study. On November 29, 1975, five adult Malay Muslims and a thirteen-year-old boy traveling in Narathiwat, southern Thailand, were stopped and put into a dump truck by a group of people dressed in dark green suits. When the truck reached the Kor Tor bridge separating Narathiwat from Pattani, the six civilians were stabbed in the back, their skulls crushed, and their bodies thrown into the river. Fortunately, the boy survived, and the massacre was brought to public attention by a group of Muslim activists who began a protest (Satha-Anand, 1987).

The people started their peaceful demonstration on December 12, 1975, in the compound of the central government house in Pattani, then formed the Civil Rights Protection Center to keep the protest going. On behalf of the Muslims, the center issued four demands to the government: the arrest of the criminals by rule of law, compensation for the victims' families, withdrawal of government troops within seven days, and a meeting by December 16 between Prime Minister M. R. Kukrit Pramoj and the people. The government did not seem to take these demands seriously, but the Muslims persevered.

On December 13, 1975, University students from institutions in the south came to join the protest. The military and the police surrounded the city of Pattani. During a panel discussion that evening, a bomb exploded among the people. One of the coordinators of the protest rushed to the microphone shouting "Do not flee!" He was fatally shot on the stage. The police came and put an end to the protest. There were twelve deaths and more than thirty people injured, seven of whom were women and children.

This incident caused the people grave concern and sadness. On the same day, around fifty thousand gathered again at the central mosque in Pattani, patiently braving the torrential rain. In retaliation, schools in Pattani and Narathiwat were burned, and the people accused the soldiers of committing arson. One more officer of the Civil Rights Center was stabbed to death. The government did not yield—but neither did the people. On December 21, Muslims from Bangkok rallied at their central mosque to pray for those killed. On the following day, nine educational institutions joined the protest by suspending classes.

The government responded by saying that the protest was but a minor incident involving only a few hundred people, a claim that prompted a huge demonstration on December 28. The mass of people formed themselves into a parade more than three kilometers long, marching in orderly fashion with Thai flags and portraits of the Thai king and queen leading their procession. Even a heavy rain could not weaken their will as they walked toward the Toh Ayah graveyard. The organizers pointed out that this demonstration was an attempt to fight for justice, display the people's strength, and demonstrate that the protest was not the "minor" incident the government claimed it to be. The protesters prayed for the souls of the deceased and then dispersed at 6:00 p.m.

On January 2, 1976, Thai Muslim government officials from the five southern provinces met to consider how to encourage the prime minis-

ter to come to Pattani. They announced January 4 they would strike on the following day if their demands were not met. On January 10 their representatives met with the prime minister, who promised to go to Pattani. The protest ended after forty-five days with, among other things, the removal of Pattani's governor and his replacement by a Muslim (*Thai Rath*, Dec. 13, 1975-Jan. 26, 1976).

There seem to be five conditions that enabled the Muslim protesters to stage a sustained nonviolent protest in Pattani. First, they possessed the will to disobey, without which no nonviolent action can be realized. The Muslims are willing to disobey because for them God alone is supreme. This total submission to Allah in turn means a rejection of any other form of absolute authority, including the state's.

Second, the Pattani Muslims were courageous despite severe repression by the state apparatus. Because they submitted to Allah alone, they did not have to fear any mortal. Muslims believe as a precept of iman (faith) that all the good and bad incidents in their lives are bestowed upon them by God. As a result, resignation while working for a just cause, without fear of punishment, becomes possible. In the final analysis, they believe God will take care of them.

Third, Muslim discipline enabled the gathering, the protest march, and even the threat to resign en masse to be carried out efficiently. All of the activities were well orchestrated. The quality of discipline bears little relationship to the leadership of the group because it takes time to cultivate such a collective trait. Muslims, however, are already disciplined in their everyday life; that they pray five times a day contributes to this quality.

Fourth, the concept of *ummah* (community) is very strong among Muslims, who find this unity of brotherhood expressed in the Qur'an:

> And hold fast
> All together, by the Rope
> Which God (stretches out
> For you) and be not divided
> Among yourselves. (3:103)

Fifth, the feeling among the Pattani Muslims was anything but passive. Islam repeatedly encourages action, and although *jihad* can be performed by the heart, the tongue, or the hand, the important requirement is that it be performed in one way or another. It is also important to note that two out of three ways of performing *jihad* are action-

oriented. Action, therefore, is of paramount importance for Muslims, just as it is at the core of the modern theory of nonviolence.

These five characteristics of the Muslims evident in the Pattani case can be termed the "Five Pillars of Muslim Nonviolent Action." Interestingly they correspond well with the sacred Five Pillars of Islam: *shahadat* (a vow that proclaims there is no god but God and Muhammad is His messenger); *salat* (prayers at specific times five times a day from sunrise to sunset, each preceded by proper ablution); *zakah* (compulsory religious tax that every Muslim has to pay); *sawn* (fasting in the month of Ramadan every year by abstaining from food and drink from sunrise to sunset while purifying both the tongue and the heart in the process); and *hajj* (pilgrimage to the holy city of Mecca at least once in a lifetime if one can afford it).

Each of these five pillars produces a special quality for those who continually practice them. The *shahadat* vow by a Muslim is an act asserting that the person will not allow other things to supersede the Will of God. This obedience to God entails the possibility of disobedience to any power that contradicts God's command. The *salat*, at a lower level of understanding, is an exercise in disciplinary action. When offered in a congregation, which is usually encouraged, it becomes an assertion of equality because the poor can stand shoulder to shoulder with the rich in such a prayer. The *zakah* reminds Muslims of their obligation to society at large because the tax sensitizes them to the problems of others and induces them to do something about it. The *sawn*, both a lesson of self-sacrifice and empathy, enables Muslims to develop patience, the quality that Abdul Ghaffar Khan, the leader of the nonviolent struggle by the Pathans against the British, regards as crucial for nonviolence in Islam (Easwaran, 1985: 117). Finally, the *hajj* is a reaffirmation of brotherhood and the belief that all Muslims form one nation, regardless of race, color, nationality, or class. It is a return to the beginning, an immersion in the eternal source of life that has guided their ancestors for millennia.

In other words, a practicing Muslim should possess the potential for disobedience, discipline, social concern and action, patience and willingness to suffer for a cause, and the idea of unity—all of which are crucial for successful nonviolent action (Sharp, 1973). It remains to be seen how Muslim intellectuals will attempt to tap the fertile resources of nonviolent thought within their own tradition and resolve the paradox of living as a true Muslim in the contemporary world.

Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to address Muslims and others interested in the relationship of Islam to the modern world. The points of reference made here are primarily sources most Muslims accept—the Qur'an and the Hadith. It is indeed essential that Islam is looked at from a fresh angle. Because the conventional worldview accepts violence as normal, a nonviolent Muslim must part with this paradigm. To have a paradigm shift, the fundamental acceptance of violence must be seriously questioned.

The eight theses on Muslim nonviolent action that follow are suggested as a challenge for Muslims and others who seek to reaffirm the original vision of Islam so that the true meaning of peace—the absence of both structural as well as personal violence—can be obtained:

1. For Islam, the problem of violence is an integral part of the Islamic moral sphere.
2. Violence, if any, used by Muslims must be governed by rules prescribed in the Qur'an and Hadith.
3. If violence used cannot discriminate between combatants and noncombatants, then it is unacceptable in Islam.
4. Modern technology of destruction renders discrimination virtually impossible at present.
5. In the modern world, Muslims cannot use violence.
6. Islam teaches Muslims to fight for justice with the understanding that human lives—as all parts of God's creation—are purposive and sacred.
7. In order to be true to Islam, Muslims must utilize nonviolent action as a new mode of struggle.
8. Islam itself is fertile soil for nonviolence because of its potential for disobedience, strong discipline, sharing and social responsibility, perseverance and self-sacrifice, and the belief in the unity of the Muslim community and the oneness of mankind.

That such theses of Muslim nonviolent action are essential to peace in this world and the true meaning of Islam is evident from the Qur'an:

> Peace!—a Word
> (of salutation) from the Lord
> Most Merciful! 36:58)

References

Annes, Munawar Ahmad (1985). "Responsible Strength," *Inquiry* (London) 2, no. 10 (October): 52-53.

Aron, Raymond (1955). *The Century of Total War*. Boston: Beacon.

Beer, Francis (1981). *Peace Against War*. San Francisco: W.W. Freeman.

Enayat, Hamid (1982). *Modern Islamic Political Thought*. Austin: University of Texas.

Ferguson, John (1977). *War and Peace in the World's Religions*. London: Sheldon Press.

Galtung, Johan (1969). "Violence, Peace and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research*, 3: 167-69.

Gandhi, Mohandas K. (1948). *Non-violence in Peace and War, Vol. 1*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House.

Goldstein, Robert (1979). *The Sword of the Prophet*. New York: Fawcett Crest.

Khan, Inamullah (1985). "Nuclear War and the Defence of Peace: The Muslim View," *International Peace Research Newsletter*, 23(2): 9-11.

Khan, Maj. Gen. Rahim (1984). "Horror of Nuclear War," *Defence Journal* (Pakistan) 10(5-6): 13-16.

Legenhausen, Gary (1985). "A Sermon on Jihad," *Muslim Students Association of Hawaii Newsletter*, 5(6).

Levtzion, Nehemia (1979). *Conversion to Islam*. New York: Holmes and Meier.

Miller, Steven E. (1985). "Technology and War," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, December: 46-48.

Rapoport, David (1984). "Fear and Trembling: Terrorism in Three Political Traditions," *American Political Science Review*, 78(3): 658-677.

Robson, James, trans. (1975). *Mishkat al Masabih*. Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf.

Sardar, Zaiuddin (1985). "The Other Jihad: Muslim Intellectuals and Their Responsibilities," *Inquiry* (London), 2(10): 40-45.

Satha-Anand, Chaiwat (1987). *Islam and Violence: A Case Study of Violent Events in the Four Southern Provinces of Thailand 1976-1981*. Tampa: University of South Florida.

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

Siddiqi, Abdul Hamid, trans. (1976-1979). *Sahib Muslim Vol. 3*. Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf.

Walzer, Michael (1977). *Just and Unjust War*. New York: Basic Books.

Wilson, Andrew (1983). *The Disarmer's Handbook*. New York: Penguin.

Appendix

Protecting Sacred Spaces

Policy Brief based on International Protection of Religious Places and Personnel, Bangkok, Thailand, May 29, 2011*

Presented to the ASEAN Secretary General, H.E. Dr. Surin Pitsuwan by the Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research, Just International and the Center for Global Nonkilling

Principles

The international conference on "Protecting Sacred Spaces and Peoples of Cloth" has explored the phenomenon of ethno-religious conflicts and found that these conflicts are deadlier when sacred spaces become targets of violence by armed groups. The notion of "sacred spaces" is specifically defined as places of religious worship that have been used for this purpose by religious communities through time. If these sacred spaces are protected by a regional cultural norm, they might avoid becoming tainted with violence and fulfill their historic roles as places of sanctuary and compassion.

There are several ways to support the ASEAN community-building efforts. One obvious way of advancing this goal is in the realm of economic collaboration. However, there comes a time in the life of an organization of 10 different states, comprising 600 million people with a combined nominal GDP of $1.8 trillion, where it might be useful to move beyond economic interest to a cultural cooperation aimed at ensuring that all sacred sites in ASEAN are under the protection of each state guaranteed by a regional organization.

Criteria for the Proposal

If this principle is acceptable, criteria that would guide this proposal would be as follows:

---

* Originally published by the Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research in April 2013. Also in the volume *Protecting the Sacred, Creating Peace in Asia-Pacific*, ed. by Chaiwat Satha-Anand and Olivier Urbain (New Brunswick: Transaction, 2013).

1. It will be nonthreatening to ASEAN member states.
2. It is in line with the ASEAN Charter launched in December 2008, especially the following fundamental principles:
   - Respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity, and national identity of all ASEAN Member States;
   - Shared commitment and collective responsibility in enhancing regional peace, security, and prosperity;
   - Renunciation of aggression and of the threat or use of force or other actions in any manner that is inconsistent with international law;
   - Reliance on peaceful settlement of disputes.
3. That it is conducive to the construction of ASEAN as a community, and it is consistent with each state's responsibilities to protect citizens of every faith.
4. That a sense of community could be enhanced by doing something meaningful and practical together in order to evolve into an ASEAN community of caring and sharing societies.

The Proposal

The ASEAN secretary general initiates an ASEAN Dialogue (in the most appropriate forum) on protecting sacred spaces to contain ethno-religious conflicts and to prevent them from sliding into deeper violence. Meaningful results from this ASEAN Dialogue on Protecting Sacred Spaces could later be formulated into a regional policy that could be shared with other international forums as ASEAN's cultural gift to the world.

*

Violence Against Sacred Spaces: A Rising Global Threat

by Chaiwat Satha-Anand

On Aug 6, 2011 neo-nazi Michael Page walked into the gurudwara (Sikh temple) of Oak Creek, Wisconsin and murdered six people, including the temple president, before he was shot dead by police.

While Sikhs in the United States have suffered from discrimination since they started coming to the US in the early 20th century—they were driven out of Bellingham, Washington, in 1907 and out of St John, Oregon in 1910—this most recent killing in Wisconsin sparked a global outcry from

Washington DC to New Delhi. In India, members of Sikh communities staged protests in several cities including New Delhi and Jammu, Kashmir.

There are many ways to understand this abominable incident. Page's ersonal history of associating with far-right groups and his psychological profile would be one way.

The violent history of America, with its prevalent gun culture—including the recent mass killing at the screening of The Dark Knight Rises at a Denver cineplex on July 20, 2011 which claimed 12 lives—would be another.

Situating this case in the larger context of the growing number of hate groups in the US would be yet another way.

According to the Southern Poverty Law Center, there are now 1,018 hate groups in the US, a 69% increase since the beginning of the 21st century.

There is also a resurgence of the anti-government "Patriot" movement, which includes groups with armed militias. Its membership soared by 775% during the first three years of the Obama administration, from 149 in 2008 to 1,274 in 2011.

In Wisconsin alone, there are eight hate groups including the neo-nazi "New Order" in Milwaukee, "Crusaders for Yahweh" in Eau Claire and "Aryan Nations 88" in Green Lake, among others. Situating the Wisconsin killing in the American context is certainly important, but I would argue that the case is much more dangerous if viewed in the global context of a heinous trend conducive to deadly religious-ethnic conflicts—that of violence against sacred spaces which includes killing worshippers in their houses of worship.

This article attempts to show that there is indeed such a trend of violence against sacred spaces and that to cope with such a phenomenon, it is important to understand why violence against sacred spaces is dangerous.

An Emerging Global Trend?

In southern Thailand, there have been cases of violence against sacred spaces and religious personnel since the new round of violence reignited in 2004.

Two of the most significant cases were the killings of 10 Malay Muslims, including the imam, while they were praying in the Al-Furqan mosque in Narathiwat on June 8, 2009; and the bomb attack that killed two Buddhist monks from Suan Kaew temple while they were making their daily rounds of alms-begging under military protection on a road in Yala on May 16, 2011, one day prior to the most important date on the Buddhist calendar, Visakha Bucha Day.

Incidents such as these prompt me to ask if they are isolated cases or symptomatic of a global trend.

In 2010, I conducted a study on the issue of violence against sacred spaces covering 2009-2010.

I found that there have been 104 incidents related to sacred spaces and religious personnel around the world—49 took place in 2009 and the number rose to 55 in 2010.

In 2010, the number of people killed in incidents related to sacred spaces increased by 19.8% and those wounded rose by 29.1%.

These incidents combined have killed 1,730 people and wounded 3,671.

Most of these incidents took place in Iraq and Pakistan which together accounted for 77.2% of the casualties in 2009 and 71.2% in 2010.

If one considers the fact that Iraq has been in a state of war and Pakistan has not, it is important to point out that the number of people killed and wounded in Pakistan is 33.8% more than the number of casualties in Iraq in relation to sacred spaces and religious personnel.

The year 2010 saw a dramatic increase of 147% in the number of casualties in Pakistan resulting from violence against sacred spaces and religious personnel compared to 2009 (*Peace & Policy* 17 2013).

In addition, a cursory glance at what has happened to sacred spaces in the first six months of 2012 yields the following results:

- January/People's Republic of China: More than a thousand Northwest Muslims fought against the Chinese police who demolished their mosque in the Ningxia autonomous region (*Bangkok Post*, Jan 3, 2012).
- February/Thailand: suspected insurgents threw two M79 grenades into a Buddhist temple in Southern Thailand to avenge the earlier killings of four Malay Muslims by Thai rangers (*Bangkok Post*, Feb 2, 2012).
- March/Australia: the white supremacy symbol "KKK" and "white power" were scrawled across a wall and several headstones were vandalized at the Fingal Head Cemetery, a burial ground for Aborigines in New South Wales (*Bangkok Post*, March 9, 2012).
- April/Sri Lanka: Buddhist monks led an angry protest calling for the government to demolish or move a mosque in Dambala, north of Colombo (*Bangkok Post*, April 24, 2012).

- May/Jerusalem: Vandals, believed to be ultra-orthodox Jews armed with hammers, caused serious damage to a 4th century synagogue in the town of Tiberias on the shore of the Sea of Galilee (*Bangkok Post*, May 31, 2012).
- June/Iraq: Coordinated bombings and shootings took place during a major Shi'ite religious commemoration killing at least 59 people and wounding more than 200 in and near Baghdad (*Bangkok Post*, June 14, 2012).

Each case needs to be construed in context of the dynamics of its own local conflict.

But taken together, what these incidents mean is that violence against sacred spaces could happen anywhere; the targets could belong to any religion or belief system; the perpetrators could be organized or spontaneous; and the violence that took place could be either provocative or reactive.

Moreover, some of these cases engender deadlier violence.

For example, recent explosions at three churches in Kaduna, northern Nigeria, killed at least 16 people. Very soon this incident led furious Christians to retaliate against Muslims in a subsequent riot that killed at least 45 and wounded more than 100 (*Bangkok Post*, June 19, 2012).

The use of violence against sacred spaces that has occurred around the world is possible precisely because of the uncertainty of the cultural line separating the sacred from profane spaces. When these sacred spaces are attacked, it is their sanctity that generates cultural power and collective identity, often times through moral outrage.

Because of this complex conditionality, Muslims, Christians or Buddhists, among others, who witness their places of worship attacked, react with outrage, and at times with vengeful violence.

One of the reasons why attacking these targets endowed with religious symbolism can be extremely dangerous, making conflicts even deadlier, is because the acts are perpetrated not against individuals but an entire community.

The site that hurts is not the body or physical entity but the self—at times the collective self.

Through the anger of those communities of faith attacked—a kind of moral outrage as evident in Nigeria and elsewhere—violence against sacred spaces oftentimes make conflicts deadlier and intractable.

As a result, this kind of conflict becomes increasingly difficult to resolve.

Anticipating such incidents which seem to occur with increasing frequency, the Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research, together

with the Center for Global Nonkilling in Honolulu, the Berghof Foundation, and the Peace Information Centre in Bangkok, organized an international conference on "Protecting Sacred Spaces and Peoples of Cloths: Academic Basis, Policy Promises" in Bangkok on May 28-29, 2011.

The conference explored a specific class of ethno-religious conflict when perpetrators target sacred symbols and peoples, especially religious, which usually render existing conflicts deadlier and/or much more difficult to cope with.

At the conclusion of the conference, international scholars and policy makers in attendance, including the eminent secretary-general of ASEAN, Dr. Surin Pitsuwan, seemed to agree that this issue is indeed a dangerous global problem rarely touched on by researchers.

Those in attendance also agreed that some appropriate regional and/or global policy needs to be formulated to prevent existing conflicts from sliding further into the realm of deadlier violence.

Perhaps the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century is the right time for a country such as Thailand or a region such as ASEAN to do something globally significant—initiating a cultural code of conducting conflicts that would render violence against sacred spaces internationally and formally unacceptable, for example.

By overcoming its local or regional shortcomings, this country and/or ASEAN could help re-imagine a world where ethno-religious conflicts would be contained by putting sacred spaces and lives of religious personnel outside the curse of violence.