How Asia Can Contribute to World Peace Psychology: Creating a Dignified and Peaceful World by Employing Unity in Diversity as Guiding Principle

Evelin G. Lindner, MD, PhD, PhD (Dr psychol, Dr med)
Social scientist
Founder of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (www.humiliationstudies.org)
and affiliated to
the University of Oslo, Department of Psychology (http://folk.uio.no/evelinl/),
the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris,
and in cooperation with
the Columbia University Conflict Resolution Network, New York

October 2008

Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2008). How Asia Can Contribute to World Peace Psychology: Creating a Dignified and Peaceful World by Employing Unity in Diversity as Guiding Principle. In Montiel, Cristina Jayme and Noor, Noraini M. (Eds.), *The Theory and Practice of Peace Psychology in Asia*, New York, NY: Springer Science and Business Media (Springer SBM)

Abstract

This chapter discusses how Asia can contribute to world peace psychology. It is based on the proposition that peace is best advanced by promoting unity together with equal rights and dignity for all (as stipulated by human rights). It suggests that the nondualistic principle of *Unity in Diversity* is a suitable guide, both as philosophical foundation and practical guideline.

Asia can contribute to *Unity in Diversity* in three major ways, at least. First, Asian emphasis on harmonious societies entails great potential (when designed in nondualistic ways) to help forge *Unity*. Second, Asia can also contribute to *Diversity*. Asia offers a whole range of valuable peace-inducing cultural competencies. Third, Asia, since it is a cradle of nondualistic ontologies, can help the world with the metaphysical orientation that is needed to connect unity and diversity in peace-inducing ways into the principle of *Unity in Diversity*. All chapters of this book underpin those three perspectives and are woven into this chapter.

Introduction

Kaku (2005), a renowned physicist born in California of Asian background, writes: "The generation now alive is perhaps the most important generation of humans ever to walk the Earth. Unlike previous generations, we hold in our hands the future destiny of our species, whether we soar into fulfilling our promise as a type I civilization [meaning a civilization that succeeds in building a socially and ecologically sustainable world] or fall into the abyss of chaos, pollution, and war" (p. 361).

Peace psychology stands at the very center of the formidable task that Kaku describes for humankind, and it carries an enormous responsibility at this crucial historical moment. What makes peace psychology so important is that it bridges all levels, from the innermost psyche of each individual at the micro level, to the large-scale processes at the highest global macro level. Christie (2006) explains how peace psychology is distinguished from neighboring fields (for example, social psychology) through its frequent reference to the systemic and cultural origins of violent episodes.

Christie lays out the contemporary scope of peace psychology as follows: "In particular, three themes are emerging in post-Cold War peace psychology: (1) greater sensitivity to geohistorical context, (2) a more differentiated perspective on the meanings and types of violence and peace, and (3) a systems view of the nature of violence and peace" (p. 3).

This book addresses all three of Christie's themes. Through placing Asia in the spotlight, this book widens the geohistorical lens of peace psychology and makes it more differentiated and globally inclusive, since Asia provides greater diversity (a more differentiated view) for peace psychology. Thus, this book promotes a higher level of global unity within the field of peace psychology and helps it develop improved systemic views of the nature of violence and peace.

What peace psychology in Asia brings to the table is summarized by Montiel (2003) as a focus on active non-violent political transformation, interethnic peacebuilding processes, social voice and identity, and culture-sensitive peacemaking.

This chapter is entitled "How Asia Can Contribute to World Peace Psychology." It starts from the stipulation that, simplified, there are two reasons for why Eastern approaches are increasingly in demand: The first reason relates to Kaku's warning that humankind risks falling into the abyss of chaos, pollution, and war: the Earth is finite, and interlocking issues of population, environment and development cause humanity to approach a crisis point. Nobody today can overlook the signs on the wall, from a global financial crisis, to a global climate, energy, and food crisis. However, and this is the second reason, the solutions that the "West" has promoted so far may be rather insufficient and may fail to save humankind from decline – merely continuing with maximizing short-term financial gains through long-term destruction of social and ecological systems is not sustainable.

This is the dilemma of our time: a dire situation facing insufficient awareness and responses.

This Chapter Uses a Large-scale Geohistorical Lens

A large-scale geohistorical lens is used in this chapter that encompasses the entire history of the species *Homo sapiens* – see more in Lindner (2006). This lens helps highlight deep commonalities that all humankind shares, commonalities that would otherwise remain unseen and unappreciated. This lens also helps pinpoint where the Asian experience is different, and where it is similar to the rest of the world.

This chapter uses furthermore a Weberian *ideal-type* approach that differentiates levels of abstractions – see, for example, Coser (1977), p. 224. It distils and highlights the core

essence of issues – not denying the significance of complex details, but putting less emphasis on them.

By using this approach, the problem of the West – to distill the core essence of the problem and formulate it starkly – is the misconception that *dualism* is a feasible ontological orientation for our contemporary world, and that it can and ought to be maximized.

This problem is increasingly being recognized. Ever louder voices decry the fall of humanity from nonduality into dualism, nihilism, and overshoot (exploitation) – see Bender (2003). Recent forms of ecopsychology and transpersonal ecology, for example, hold that the dualistic split between planet and self must be healed – see, for example, Winter (1996). The *DMA syndrome*, or *Dualism-Manichaeism-Armageddon syndrome* – Galtung, Jacobsen, Brand-Jacobsen, & Tschudi (2000) – is a label that summarizes how creating and firing up Manichaean self/other and good/evil dualisms prepares people for violence and convinces them that wars are worth fighting.

How could dualism ever become dominant, and what can be done to change this state of affairs? The analysis laid out in this chapter begins roughly 100,000 years ago, in line with the conceptualization of human history by anthropologist William Ury (1999), who describes three major types of society: *simple hunter-gatherers*, *complex agriculturists*, and the current *knowledge society*.

Homo sapiens populated planet Earth, starting out in Africa, throughout the first ninety percent of human history as hunter-gatherers, always moving on to the next valley of abundant wild food. However, circa 10,000 years ago, this era ended – what anthropologists call *circumscription* set in (Latin *circum* means "around," and *scribere* means "to write," with circumscription meaning "limitation," "enclosure," or "confinement"). Humans had populated planet Earth, or at least its easily accessible habitat, to the extent that the next valley was already inhabited and used by other humans. Humankind had to learn to make do with the land under their feet. *Intensification*, or agriculture, was *Homo sapiens* main adaptation (pastoralism another), which, until very recently, dominated the planet almost everywhere. (The hunter-gatherer communities still around today only offer glimpses into the lives of their forefathers prior to 10,000 years ago – the more they are affected by circumscription, the less their lives resemble the designs of the past.)

Asia was as impacted by these large-scale transformations as were other parts of the world. Important empires with feudal systems based on agriculture evolved also in Asia – from China, to Japan, or Korea. In her book *The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future*, Eisler (1987) explains in great detail how otherwise widely divergent societies, from the Japan of the Samurai to the Aztecs of Meso America, were characterized during this era by very similar agriculture-based hierarchies of domination and a rigidly male-dominant "strong-man" rule, both in the family and the state. Hierarchies of domination were maintained by a high degree of institutionalized or socially accepted violence, ranging from wife and child beating within the family to aggressive warfare on the larger tribal or national level.

I call the past 10,000 years the "era of ranked honor" in human history, superseding the earlier "era of pristine pride." Almost everywhere on the globe, the untouched egalitarian pristine pride of early hunter-gatherers was pressed into social and societal structures of ranked honor. Human value and worthiness became ranked – *higher* beings

ruled over *lower* beings. And this system was regarded as a divinely ordained and honorable order. Even though important religions around the world have always entailed significant ideals of equality (Buddhism has a claim for equal dignity, as has New Testament Christianity, Islam, the Sikh religion, and so forth), it seems that these ideals were pushed into the background by the overall hierarchical structures of their larger social and societal environments throughout the era of ranked honor.

The rise of dualism has its anchoring in agriculture or, more precisely, in certain features of it. Dualism feeds on and maximizes the *win-lose* frame and the *security dilemma* that are introduced when the possession of land is the resource of livelihood. With the onset of agriculture, the resource of livelihood transmuted from being abundant (wild food) to limited (land), creating a malign win-lose logic from which nobody could flee. Fear to have one's land taken away became definitorial. *International relations theory* uses the term security dilemma to describe how arms races and war were almost inevitable in this atmosphere of fear of attack from outside one's community. (The term "security dilemma" was coined by Herz (1950), to explain why states that have no intention to harm one another may still end up in competition and war.)

In such a situation, the dualism of "we, the in-group, have to stand up against you, the out-groups" finds fertile ground. Small elites learned how to preside over in-groups – in the service of keeping out-groups out or conquering them – while in-groups, comprising the majority of the population, learned how to bow and kowtow to their superiors. Underlings who succeeded in toppling their masters only replaced them, keeping the hierarchical system intact. Even though the ways in which these cultures of domination/submission evolved varied, the core concept of ranking human worthiness was as definitorial in most of Asia as elsewhere.

The West learned to maximize dualism particularly ruthlessly and, as colonizers, conquered the world and used up its resources (long before countries such as China and India followed suit). If China had continued with the immense naval expeditions that the Ming Dynasty sponsored between 1405 and 1433, long before Europe was even near Chinese levels of development, China may have colonized the world and foreclosed later humiliation at the hands of the West. It may be a mere historical accident that Chinese did not become a lingua franca of the world already many centuries ago.

And if planet Earth had a larger size, the colonizing campaigns of the past might still be ongoing. However, Earth's limits are being reached yet again, as profoundly transformational, globally and universally, as 10,000 years ago. When there are no "new territories" left to be subdued, one has to learn to live with what one has.

The emerging reality and awareness of *one single interdependent world* represents a shift that is a ground-shattering. "For the first time since the origin of our species, humanity is in touch with itself" explains Ury (1999, p. XVII). Ury discusses (e.g., in chapter 4, "And Back Again") how this shift also brings to the fore a new resource for livelihood, namely *knowledge*, to increasingly replace dependency on land. This opens space for what I call the "era of equality in dignity." Friedman (2005) describes how global interdependence contributes to making the world *flatter*, thus representing a push not just for unity, but also for the human rights ideal of equality in rights and dignity.

However, there is one condition: humankind must grasp this chance and not gamble it away. This chapter – indeed, the entire book – contributes to explaining this challenge.

A Historical Shift toward Global Interdependence Is Presently Unfolding

In a single interdependent world, the maximization of dualism that could bring "victory" during the past 10,000 years turns into a recipe for collective demise. Global challenges require global cooperation to be solved – today's challenges are no longer "enemies" over which "victories" can be won. Ecological sustainability for human life on Earth is not achievable through mistaking finite resources to be limitless and everybody racing to be "victorious" in exploiting them, either out of poverty or to maximize profit. Dualistic competitive approaches merely intensify the malignity of the win-lose nature of finiteness. Nor can social sustainability be achieved through local "victories" – from poverty to global terrorism, or mafia criminality, nothing can be tackled locally alone. In short, holding a fragmented human family together, and forging a new culture of global cooperation, presents itself as the only strategy left to attain security and peace.

Global interdependence, a historically entirely novel condition, thus entails a call to solve challenges in new ways; however, it also opens space for the chance to do so, a chance that can and must be grasped by humankind: in an interdependent world, with a growing significance of knowledge as basis for livelihood, opportunities arise for nondualistic win-win approaches. However, even though this new space represents a push for new solutions, these solutions do not realize themselves automatically and without human intervention. They need to be pro-actively implemented.

Humankind must purposely strive for *unity* and *cooperation* (no longer division and confrontation) in an atmosphere of *equal dignity* (no longer unequal ranked honor, no longer the subjugation of people and nature).

*Human rights represent a suitable normative and legal framework for this new world. Article 1 of the of the Human Rights Declaration states that every human being is born with equal rights and dignity (and ought not be humiliated). Incidentally, the change of the meaning of the verb "to humiliate" in the English language provides a marker for the rise of visibility of the human rights ideal of equal dignity for all: it is documented that in 1757 "to humiliate" had lost its connotation of "to humble" and acquired the new one of "violating dignity" (Miller (1993), p. 175).

The linguistic change of 1757 highlights the ascent of a new kind of uprising, a new script of inclusive systemic change à la Gandhi and Mandela: no longer merely bowing to, or simply confronting or replacing elites, no longer oppressors merely being replaced by new ones (as was done during the past 10,000 years), but the system of domination/submission itself being dismantled. Slavery, Apartheid, or traditions such as foot binding, have since been abolished.

Yet, even though the human rights movement around the world has progressed considerably throughout the past decades, there is a caveat, a caveat that relates to humiliation and dualism. As soon as human rights gain visibility, the phenomenon of humiliation (as act, feeling, and relational and institutional process) plays not only a positive role, but also a negative one. The negative impact may be so strong that it may fire up dualism in completely new ways (no longer empires being pitted against each other, but masses that harbor feelings of humiliation supporting global terrorism, for example), thus undermining humankind's chances to realize the promise that otherwise is entailed in the increase of global interdependence.

Human rights teach the disadvantaged, downtrodden and oppressed people around the world – low class people, underlings, inferiors, or subalterns, whatever label – together with those who identify with them, to feel humiliated by conditions that formerly were accepted as "normal." Chinese writer and intellectual Lu Xun (Lu Hsun; real name Zhou Shuren, 1881-1936), for example, unmasked and condemned the humiliating effects of the feudal system (Lindner (2007b), p. 16).

The positive side of the increase of feelings of humiliation is that they imbue the human rights movement with the necessary emotional force to drive it forward. The human ability to feel such feelings is a crucial prerequisite for the human rights movement, because this movement requires *conscientization* for its advancement. Conscientization, explains Christie (2006), is "a psychological process in which individuals and groups are politically transformed by building a common consciousness that embraces the value of active political nonviolence" (p. 13). Conscientization is the mediator between humiliating antecedent conditions and pro-democracy movements. According to Montiel (2006), active non-violent movements, locally and globally, become increasingly powerful when conscientization informs their activities. The ability to feel humiliated, on behalf of oneself and others, in the face of violations of dignity, represents the emotional engine that connects new awareness with conscientization, which then can drive systemic change. Atsumi and Suwa (this volume) make a case for the need for more conscientization in Japan.

However, humiliation, particularly fear of future humiliation, can also have violently destructive or at least debilitating effects if not guided toward Mandela-like strategies. This is the negative side of feelings of humiliation. As soon as cycles of humiliation are in motion, they destroy any chance for unity and cooperation. Lindner (2002) contends that feelings of humiliation, when translated into hatred and leading to retaliation with acts of humiliation, represent the strongest force that hampers cooperation – feelings of humiliation as the "nuclear bomb of the emotions" (pp. 127-129). In Rwanda, the former underlings, the Hutu, targeted their former elite, the Tutsi, with genocide. Mandela did not follow their example; he did not instigate genocide of the white elite in South Africa. He promoted constructive systemic social change instead.

Feelings are the arena of psychology, and feelings of humiliation are therefore an important topic for peace psychology to attend to. However, the discussion of dualism versus nondualism, though the turf of philosophers, and the discussion of human rights as normative and legal framework, are equally important issues for peace psychology to look at, since all three, philosophy, human rights, and humiliation are different perspectives on the opportunity to achieve unity in diversity.

We Need a New Philosophical Foundation: Nondualism and Unity instead of Dualism and Division

In order to transcend living conditions that condemn millions of people around the world to abject poverty while a select few indulge in maximizing profit, and in order to give true life to equality in dignity in a cooperative win-win frame, the nondualistic principle of *Unity in Diversity* is helpful as conceptual guidance – see, for example, Bond (1998). *Unity* is needed to create cohesion in the global community with respect to the entire range of the *human condition*, from thought to narratives, ideology, purpose, and action, at all levels, from the individual psyche to global institution-building. As to *Diversity*, maintaining cultural diversity is as crucial for the peaceful survival of humankind as protecting biodiversity. Biodiversity may hold yet unknown medical remedies in store for humankind, and cultural diversity may provide essential social remedies. Finally, nondualistic ontologies are required to connect unity with diversity in peace-inducing ways so as to arrive at *Unity in Diversity*.

For the past 10,000 years the world was characterized by dualistic *Uniformity and Division*: uniformity within in-groups was achieved through ruthless oppression and routine subjugation/humiliation of underlings, while division defined the relationship with enemy out-groups. The relationship between unity and diversity was regarded as zero-sum win-lose game – unity was conceptualized as only achievable at the expense of diversity, and vice versa.

In contrast, in a human rights context, unity is to be achieved through enabling and optimizing complex diversity by embedding difference into a shared normative foundation. Unity in Diversity means neither suppressing diversity by aspiring to uniformity, nor elevating diversity to destructive division that undermines unity. The first fallacy was committed, for example, in contexts that labeled themselves as communist and attempted to achieve equality through leveling all diversity and forcing their citizens into uniformity and sameness – as for Asia, the Cambodian genocide provides a gruesome example. The latter fallacy describes how in-groups during much of the past 10,000 years of human history used to develop their identity, namely, in opposition to out-groups, thus giving differences between groups the status of unbridgeable divisions.

Unity in Diversity, by steering clear of both fallacies, can foster a dignified non-humiliating win-win context. It is best realized by increasing both unity *and* diversity in a win-win fashion and can therefore be read as *More Unity in More Diversity*.

Yoshikawa makes the Unity in Diversity principle graphically visible through the infinity symbol, or Möbius Strip (∞) – see Yoshikawa (1980), Yoshikawa (1987). He developed a model for dialogue whereby unity is created out of the realization of differences, and the dialogical unity does not eliminate the tension between the contradictions between basic potential unity and apparent duality. He calls his model a *double-swing* or *identity in unity* model.

Concepts such as *social peace, reconciliation, face,* or *harmony* are all deeply affected by shifts in ontological orientations and their practical application. As described above, traditionally, within in-groups, these concepts meant subservient acquiescence to domination/submission. Elites kept underlings in an iron grip and called it “peace” when nobody dared protest. In present North Korea, for example, a dictatorship ensures calm and quiet and labels this state of affairs “peace.” In human rights frames, social peace,

reconciliation, face, or harmony, together with all related concepts, are defined in profoundly different ways: all these concepts now entail the responsibility to realize human rights in a Mandela-like fashion. Human rights frame the entire peace discourse in new ways. "Peace" can no longer only be defined as success in holding down underlings – now this definition is rejected as illegitimate humiliation that warrants uprisings. In the new context, peace must be achieved by creating enabling conditions so that everybody can enjoy equality in dignity. Peace without equality in dignity is no longer peace.

Peace psychology uses the latter definition of peace and rejects the first. Using the term "peace" without qualification can create great conceptual confusion. The situation of China vis-à-vis Tibet, for example, suffers from this confusion – all speak of peace and harmony, but use contradictory and mutually exclusive definitions. The large-scale geohistorical lens introduced earlier is indispensable to achieve the necessary differentiation: Using the traditional normative order that characterized the past 10,000 years of human history, peace would be defined as quiet submission of Tibetans, while human rights define peace as dialogue between equals.

How can the new kind of peace be nurtured and developed? One way is by scrutinizing all human cultures, including Asian cultures, and by "harvesting" those cultural world views, practices, and social-psychological skills that have unifying and equalizing effects – see also Lindner (2007a).

The yield of this harvest can then be used to better inform the two-fold transformation that humankind must muster at the current juncture of its history: deep systemic change out in the world and deep change in our psyches. A novel kind of cognitive and emotional consciousness or awareness is needed, a more inclusive grasp on the human condition, a *post-individual consciousness* – Heard (1963) – a *unity consciousness* – Hollick (2006) – or *global consciousness*, as discussed by Liu (this volume).

Yoshikawa's model illustrates how Eastern and Western thought can fertilize each other. His model draws on two main sources, on Martin Buber (1944) and his idea of "dialogical unity" in I and Thou – a two-fold movement between the self and the other that allows for both, unity and uniqueness – and on "*soku*," the nondualistic Buddhist logic of "not-one, not-two."

Asia can contribute to (1) *Unity*, to (2) *Diversity*, and to (3) *Unity in Diversity*. First, Asian emphasis on harmonious societies entails great potential (when designed in nondualistic ways) to help forge *Unity*. As to *Diversity*, Asia can offer a wide variety of valuable peace-inducing cultural and anthropological know-how and lessons-learned with respect to the human condition. Third, Asia, since it is a cradle of nondualistic ontologies, can help the world with a new metaphysical orientation that can bring about peaceful equality in dignity for all world citizens through successfully realizing *Unity in Diversity*.

Since Asia can contribute to *Unity*, can add to *Diversity*, and can help merge both into *Unity in Diversity*, this chapter mirrors those three contributions in its structure: The first section discusses what Asia can contribute to the notion of unity, the second section looks at the diverse cultural know-how from Asia that world peace psychology can harvest, and the third section addresses the ontological frame that is needed to keep Unity and Diversity connected.

We Need More Unity: Generating Systemic Change with a Global Scope

In a world that increasingly grows interdependent, people who formerly lived apart become neighbors. Unfortunately, neighborhood is not sufficient to motivate people to care for the common good. Even though the so-called *contact hypothesis*, or the hope that mere contact can foster friendly cooperation, does work at the aggregate level, contact does not always guarantee peace – see a meta-analysis of the contact hypothesis by Pettigrew & Tropp (2006). Noor (this volume) illustrate this point. Merely being neighbors, as Malays and Chinese are in Malaysia, is not sufficient for peace (also Serbs and Croats in the Balkans, or Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda turned upon each other even though they were neighbors – some were even married – as did Germans with their Jewish neighbors in Nazi-Germany).

Equally, a peaceable culture cannot assure peace either. Khan (this volume) describes the relative weakness of Kashmir's culture, originally among the most peaceable cultures in this world, when being caught in the conflict-ridden context of the division and confrontation between India and Pakistan.

Ross and colleagues have carried out illuminating work on the role of *framing* – see, for example, Ross & Nisbett (1991), and Liberman, Samuels, & Ross (2004). When students were asked to play a game where they had the choice to cooperate or to cheat on one another (Prisoner's Dilemma game) and they were told that this was a *community game*, they cooperated; however, they cheated on each other when told that the same game is a *Wallstreet game*.

Currently, the Wallstreet game is the frame that is definitorial for most players at the highest global level, while people on the ground hope for a community game in vain – higher global levels force local neighborhoods into Wallstreet frames.

And as soon as local neighborhoods are at each others' throats, insecurity is being diffused to the rest, as shown, for example, by Marshall (1999). The statistics speak for themselves. Global terrorism can be described as one outflow of the diffusion of insecurity – young men in peaceful England, for example, identify with the suffering of Palestinians and prepare to die as suicide bombers – see, for example, Lambert (2008). The 2008 global financial crisis starkly illustrates how short-term profit maximization trumped the long-term safeguarding of the common good, both socially and ecologically, for too long. The gap between rich and poor has widened, locally and globally – see, among others, the Millennium Development Goals Indicators at http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Default.aspx. Zhou's (this volume) "To Hate or to Like: Attitudes toward the Rich of the Public in Chinese Society," speaks to this theme and its consequences.

Evidently, it is insufficient to merely focus on solving local conflicts or to address ecological challenges only locally. Systemic change with a global scope is needed, so that local processes on all continents and in all world regions can be "framed" in a global community game spirit. Noor (this volume) champions this point at the end this book, emphasizing that peace psychology's long-term goal is for fairness and justice to prevail also at the macro-structural level of society.

The concept of harmony, as it is particularly emphasized in Asia, can help the world with this task.

Harvesting from the Asian Concept of Harmony

Since shame, face-saving, and harmony are closely related, I first turn to shame and face saving and then proceed to the notion of harmony.

Shame and Saving Face

Fung & Chen (2001) argue that shame is a powerful and prevalent emotion in Asian cultures, and even though shame in Chinese culture is an emotion of disgrace, as in most cultures, it is also a moral discretion and sensibility that people desire to develop. In other words, shame can be directed to positive and negative ends. Li & Fischer (2004) suggest that shame and guilt shade into each other in Asia. Both emotions "direct people into self-examination in social situations in order to recognize their own wrong doings, as well as to motivate people to improve themselves" (p. 411). The ability to feel shame and humiliation is not just something to be avoided, but represents an asset that society needs for conscientization and the maintenance of a harmonious society.

Face refers to a person's public self image. Face is also used in sociolinguistics, particularly politeness theory, and discussed in literature on negotiation and mediation.

The universality of concepts such as politeness and face saving are continuously explored, with Asian culture often being associated with face saving more than others.

Matsumoto (1988) and Ide (1989) see important intercultural differences with regard to the question of individual volition and choice as drivers of politeness as compared to social structures. Japanese language, for example, encodes politeness at its very core. Japanese language has two main levels of politeness: one for intimate acquaintances, family, and friends (in-groups, or *uchi*, 内 "inside"), and one for other groups (out-groups, *soto*, 外, "outside"). The morphology of verbs reflects these levels. Japanese also employs different personal pronouns for each person according to gender, age, rank, degree of acquaintance, and other cultural factors. Politeness is thus not based on individual volition and decision, but on what in Japan is called *wakimae*, or "finding one's place" within prescribed social norms. In Chinese social relations and everyday speech, face refers to the social perceptions of a person's prestige and authority (*mianzi*, Chinese 面子), and to the confidence and trust within a social network in a person's moral character (*lian*, Traditional Chinese: 臉, Simplified Chinese 脸) – see Ho (1976). So-called polite lies are acceptable, even expected.

As is evident from these brief descriptions, these concepts are inscribed into the larger historical social and societal changes alluded to in the introduction to this chapter. Three profoundly different ideal-type cultures arose during the past 10,000 years of domination/submission, in different mixes within each cultural realm, with different ways of saving face: first, the "supremacist culture of the dominating elite," second, the "subaltern culture of those underlings who had been successfully co-opted into accepting subservience," and third, the "culture of covertly resisting underlings." (Any "culture of overtly resisting underlings" had to emulate a dominator's culture in order to last; see further down.)

As to saving face, superiors feared losing supremacy, and underlings feared punishment. Elites typically defended their honor against humiliation in duel-like ways (the first type of culture), a defense that was not permitted to underlings. A Samurai

warrior in historic Japan, for example, would even commit ritual suicide if he lost his face and honor, while this culture was out of bounds for subordinates. A lord and his warriors in feudal Japan had the legal right to use their swords to kill lower persons, such as farmers, traders, or outcasts, when they deemed it necessary, without having to expect any duel-like responses. Consequently, it was potentially lethal to displease one's superiors, and fear reigned among the majority of people (since the majority were inferiors). It was prudent to be cautious and preserve an acceptable face. Some subalterns accepted this fate (the second type of culture), others did not, at least covertly (the third type). As to this third type, scholars who analyzed slavery note that sometimes a very special accommodation-resistance dialectic of obeying but not necessarily complying evolved, which allowed slaves to carve out a degree of autonomous and very distinctive culture, which eschewed the values embraced by the master class - see Engerman & Genovese (Eds.) (1975), Genovese (1975), and Smith (1998).

In sum, in traditional honor societies, the practice of saving face can serve domination, submission, and covert resistance to domination. Human rights call for a rejection of all three forms and advocate a *salutogenic* view of shame – Webb (2005) – with shame and face saving serving the ideal of equality in dignity rather than submission/domination.

Harmony

Within the context of human rights, also harmony can no longer be defined as the meek subservience of underlings.

The term "harmonious society" is writ large in Asia (in Europe the term "social cohesion" is used more). China currently plans to develop a "Harmonious Society Measurement Standard" (http://www.chinacsr.com/2007/10/11/1744-china-plans-harmonious-society-measurement-standard/). The notion of a harmonious society is also a central part of the "Asian way" debate – certain East Asian governments and intellectuals criticize the individualistic focus of liberal rights in the West, "as opposed to models of harmony in, most prominently, Confucian political thought" (Brown (2002), p. 112).

Like the notion of face, in the traditional world of ranked honor, everywhere on the globe, notions of harmony were inscribed into the three types of culture listed above. Harmony was regarded as being achieved when underlings behaved in a quiet and subservient manner. Many elites and subalterns identified fully with this definition of harmony, with others acquiescing only overtly, not covertly.

Human rights advocacy view harmony differently. From the point of view of human rights, harmony must be defined as the successful flourishing of reciprocal connections and dialogue embedded into mutual respect for equality in dignity. The human-rights inspired concept of harmony realizes true *intersubjectivity* – that we live in each others' minds and look at ourselves with the eyes of others. Intersubjectivity is the basis of Yoshikawa's model introduced earlier, and it includes the idea of *pendulation* – Levine (1997) – a back and forth movement between subjective and intersubjective consciousness, which, when it succeeds, results in a relationship of harmonious interdependence – neither independence nor dependence.

Human rights defenders like me oppose and feel humiliated by attempts to maintain harmony in ways defined by the traditional order of ranked honor. They also reject it

when human rights are promoted with aggressive methods, because this is as inherently inconsistent with the very spirit of human rights. As mentioned earlier, in former times, when underlings succeeded to rise up, they replaced the tyrant, but kept the system in place, including the old definition of harmony. In contrast, the human rights message introduces two core transformations; (a) dismantling the tyrant and (b) dismantling and transcending all tyrannical systems and practices, in this way also introducing a new definition of harmony. Revolution means often only dismantling tyrants (a), while reform is typically more amenable to combining (a) and (b). Asia offers several examples of reform-versus-revolution debates. In Philippine history, for instance, José Rizal, in contrast to Andrés Bonifacio, was a proponent of institutional reforms by peaceful means rather than by violent revolution.

We Need More Diversity: Protecting Cultural Difference

As noted earlier, protecting cultural diversity is as crucial for the peaceful survival of humankind as protecting biodiversity. Yet, if we wish to create a world that is informed by the Unity in Diversity principle, we have to take great care that cultural identifications do not undermine unity, but are kept fluid and multifaceted, connected in nondualistic ways, rather than mutually exclusive. Huang (this volume) describes the dilemma that emerges when Taiwanese consciousness and Chinese consciousness and identities are conceptualized as separate and pitted against each other.

What is needed are new forms of identity and consciousness, less monolithic and more accepting of diversity.

This topic is as important for individual identity creation as for collective identity and memory creation. Muluk (this volume) shows how groups "adjust" their collective memory for reconciliation purposes and building peace. Indeed, sometimes it is more important to forget than to remember, at least in the sense Volf (1996) defines forgetting, namely, as an active act of nonremembering: remembering the past, its grievances and humiliations, choosing to forgive while purposively embracing the other in an act of preservation and transformation.

Harvesting from Diverse Cultural Know-how

If we think of harvesting from cultural know-how, we need to avoid preserving two kinds of traditions and practices: first, practices that rank and mutilate (such as feudalism, or Chinese foot binding), and, second, practices that base in-group cohesion on out-group hatred or, in weaker form, on neglecting out-group concerns (for example, since decades, Japanese insensitivity to the latter causes serious tension between Japan and its neighbors).

What peace psychology must do is identify and nourish peaceful traditions such as "peaceful Islam." Khisbiyah (this volume) presents the Indonesian Muslim debate on violence, non-violence, social justice and peacebuilding. "Civil Islam" is another important notion – Pohl (this volume) reports how commitment and tolerance are negotiated in Indonesian Islamic education. The Baku Bae Movement in Indonesia,

discussed by Muluk (this volume), offers another important lesson that can inform peace psychology world-wide, namely how successful bottom-up conflict resolution can be led by civil society

Asia can furthermore help world peace psychology highlight the role of women. Batistiana (this volume) illustrates how Philippine women, former combatants, were able to become agents of peace and development.

Also the importance of technology needs to be heeded by peace psychology. Estuar & Montiel (this volume) discuss this point when they review the "Human-Technology Interface in Active Nonviolent Civic Engagements and Social Movements in the Philippines."

In sum, Asia has vastly diverse cultural knowledge in store to enrich the understanding of diversity in world peace psychology.

We Need Unity in Diversity

Unity has now been discussed, as has Diversity. What would be the best ontological frame for our endeavor to create a better, more inclusive world where Unity is combined with Diversity in constructive ways?

Harvesting an Ontological Frame

Metaphysics is the branch of philosophy that reflects on "the study of being," in Greek "ontology." Philosophy of mind is the ontology of the mind, mental events, mental functions, mental properties, consciousness, and their relationship to the physical body, particularly the brain – see, for example, Beakley & Ludlow (Eds.) (2006).

As noted earlier, the dominant Western metaphysical orientation that underpinned its spree of conquering the rest of the world over the past centuries was *dualism*. Dualism holds that ultimately there are two kinds of substance. René Descartes' dualistic view of a mind-body dichotomy is perhaps the most widely known expression of dualism. Dualism is to be distinguished from *pluralism*, which holds that ultimately there are many kinds of substance, from *nondualism* and from *monism*, which is the metaphysical and theological view that all is one, either the mental (*idealism*) or the physical (*materialism and physicalism*). Physicalism is thus a monist concept, holding that that there are no kinds of things other than physical things.

Contemporary scientists usually are no longer dualists, but physicalists (even though dualistic views still linger on in many spheres of life). However, also physicalism does not hold all the answers, at least not physicalism that is fashioned on Newtonian physics. *Quantum social science* is being proposed – "Human beings are in effect 'walking wave particle dualities,' not classical material objects" (Wendt (2005), p. 7).

At present, we observe growing fascination with so-called *nondualistic* approaches. To the nondualist, reality is ultimately neither physical nor mental, but an overwhelming state or realization beyond words. This view is being developed in many variations, with the gist of nondualism holding that while different phenomena are not the same, they are inseparable, or that there is no hard line between them.

Peace psychology is well served with adopting nondualism as its ontological orientation, because nondualism celebrates the diversities of this world – be it cultural, ethnic, political, and so forth – while avoiding that these diversities attain the status of unbridgeable divisions. As alluded to in the introduction to this chapter, creating and firing up Manichaean self/other and good/evil dualisms prepares people for violence and convinces them that wars are worth fighting. Nondualism, in contrast, allows for the peaceful celebration of diversity precisely because, while it acknowledges that there are differences, it keeps them together in a unifying loop. Yoshikawa's use of the infinity symbol illustrates this approach particularly well.

Geopolitical particularities (intertwined with arbitrary processes) that would take up too much space to discuss here have caused an East/West difference in ontological approaches. Nondualistic approaches have evolved particularly in the mystical traditions of Asia's religions and philosophical traditions. The main sacred traditions that have stimulated the rise of nonduality in Asia are Advaita Vedanta, Kashmir Shaivism, Zen Buddhism, Vajrayana Buddhism, and contemplative Taoism.

Kashmir, traditionally comprising the valley surrounded by the Great Himalayas and the Pir Panjal range, was once known as a "paradise on earth," a place "known for its peace loving, artistic and intellectual populace" attests Khan (this volume). In this unique valley the Pratyabhijna school (part of Kashmir Shaivism) developed the teachings that are needed today at a global scale, namely, how to achieve the nondualistic leap of consciousness or the "spontaneous recognition" of the Supreme – see, for example, Sharma (2007).

The ultimate nondual reality can also be called "God," "Shunyata" (emptiness, especially emphasized in Mahayana Buddhism), "Brahman" (see the Indian philosopher Shankara, possibly 788 – 820 AD), "Spirit" (see Integral Advaita and the Indian thinker Sri Aurobindo, 1872-1950), "The Self" (see Tamil sage Ramana Maharshi, 1879-1950), or "The Dao" (see the Chinese philosopher Lao Zi). Also the mystical traditions of Sufism can be labeled nondualistic.

Nondualism can also be expressed in nontheistic ways. Consider, among others, "The All" as conceptualized by the philosopher of the ancient world, Plotinus (circa 205–270 BC), "The Absolute" by German philosopher Schelling (1775-1854), who was influenced by German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832), or simply "The Nondual" by British idealist philosopher Bradley (1893) (1846-1924). We find similar thoughts in various branches of psychology and psychotherapy, for example, in Fromm (1976), or Jung, 1875-1961.

Other relevant terms are interrelatedness, pantheism, mutual transformation, person-in-community, or panexperientialism, as well as the "Unity in Diversity" principle that is used in this chapter.

In agreement with Mahayana Buddhism, the contemporary Western thinker Wilber (1996) believes that reality is ultimately a nondual union of emptiness and form. Wilber describes the history of philosophy in general, especially of the West, as a continuous swinging between two poles of "truth" – be it subject-object, mind-body, culture-nature, or individual-group. While the West tended to conceptualize those dualities as solid, separate opposites, the East tended to see them rather as a continuum, arising simultaneously and mutually like a concave/convex line - Wilber (1979), p. 25.

To round up this section, Unity is held together with Diversity in a dignified win-win fashion only if nondualistic approaches are used, and this is valid at all levels, from micro to meso and macro levels. Huang's (this volume) discussion of Chinese versus Taiwanese consciousness may serve as an example. Unity in Diversity as a guiding principle cherishes both identities by encouraging their coexistence in the hearts and minds of each Taiwanese citizen, and it fosters peaceful cooperation between Chinese and Taiwanese political institutions. As long as Unity in Diversity reigns as ontological orientation, Taiwanese and Chinese consciousnesses can be regarded as equally worthy and dignified, and everybody can reap gains from the cooperation between both political realms. Uniformity or Division, in contrast, would foster top-down coercion and could even unleash violence, in ways that would be perceived as utterly humiliating by human rights defenders: if Uniformity were used as guiding principle, Taiwanese identity, as well as Taiwan as a political entity would most probably have to be abandoned for a uniform Chinese consciousness and country; if Division were the guiding principle, Taiwanese and Chinese consciousness and political institutions would become pitted against each other and war could be the consequence.

Concluding Remarks

The past 10,000 years of security dilemma produced a Pandora's Box of malign dualistic biases – for example, "good in-group" against "evil out-group" – that were culturally forced into human minds and hearts all around the world in various ways and to various degrees. At the current point in human history, increasing global interdependence weakens the security dilemma and opens space for global win-win cooperation in an atmosphere of equality in dignity and nondualistic Unity in Diversity.

The security dilemma poses a problem as long as communities live in a medium distance to each other, too close for geopolitical security and too far for human security. There is no problem as long as groups of people live far enough apart so as to remain unaware of each other. This may have been the case during the first ninety percent of human history, when planet Earth was only very thinly populated and there were plenty of resources. Only when people move geographically close enough for mutual raiding, but psychologically too far away to build good communication and trust, leaders become trapped in the security dilemma and have no choice but to invest in arms. Global interdependence means that separate "villages" coalesce into *one global village*, thus removing fear-inducing fault lines between out- and in-groups and weakening the threat from the security dilemma.

Global interdependence thus opens space for unprecedented unity among humankind, a unity that brings peace, a unity that entails the potential to transcend the enmities of the past that brought war and mayhem. However, this unity cannot be peaceful if it is conceptualized as a new kind uniformity that is forced on humankind. Unity can only have peace-promoting effects, if it integrates differences in ways that do not cause hostile divisions. Human rights are a suitable unifying normative stance.

Human rights, to be fully realized, need the nondualistic principle of Unity in Diversity both as ontological fundament, and as practical guide for their operationalization. And since dynamics of humiliation can trigger hostile divisions, if not

harnessed in Mandela-like ways, they must be prevented and healed. Moreover, feelings of humiliation, if guided constructively, can help create a peaceful world.

At present, we, as humankind, must grasp the historically unprecedented window of opportunity the global interdependence offers, and exit from the mutilating frames of the past 10,000 years and their malign reverberations, lest we risk losing our habitat. Huge changes must be implemented. Peace psychology carries the significant responsibility to explain how Diversity embedded in Unity can promote peace in a human-rights inspired context of equality in dignity for all, while diversity in form of divisiveness impedes and violates equality in dignity. The application of the principle of Unity in Diversity has the power to dignify and counteract humiliating violations of dignity, and thus realize peace as it is defined by human rights ideals.

I believe that learning from Asia will enable humankind to build a *decent global community*, following the call for a *decent society* by Margalit (1996), a society with institutions which do not humiliate their citizens but dignify the world. I believe that Asia can help create the "era of equal dignity" in human history that needs to be urgently implemented at the current historical juncture. This is the moment for Asia, and peace psychology is called upon to make the wealth of Asia's contributions visible. This book is an important step. This book draws a path from describing division (South Asia) and diversity (East Asia) to envisaging Unity in Diversity (Southeast Asia).

When humankind needs new input, new ideas, and new creativity to forge a novel, much more inclusive global awareness, and design better global institutions and management strategies for our world, Asia can contribute to *Unity*, to *Diversity*, and to *Unity in Diversity*: Asian emphasis on harmonious societies entails great potential (when designed in nondualistic ways) for large-scale systemic change toward *Unity*. A wide variety of valuable know-how can be drawn from Asia, know-how that can bolster *Diversity*. Finally, Asia, since it is a cradle of nondualistic ontologies, can help the world with the metaphysical orientation that is needed to bring about peaceful global cooperation and cohesion, embedded into equality in dignity for all world citizens, namely through successfully realizing *Unity in Diversity*.

Reference List

Beakley, B. & Ludlow, P. (Eds.) (2006). *The philosophy of mind: Classical problems / contemporary issues.* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bender, F. L. (2003). *The culture of extinction: Toward a philosophy of deep ecology.* Amherst, NY: Humanity Books.

Bond, M. H. (1998). Unity in diversity: Orientations and strategies for building a harmonious, multicultural society. In *Trames, A Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences,* 234-263.

Bradley, F. H. (1893). *Appearance and reality: A metaphysical essay.* New York: Macmillan.

Brown, M. A. (2002). *Human rights and the borders of suffering: The promotion of human rights in international politics.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Buber, M. (1944). *I and Thou.* Edinburgh: Clark, translated from *Ich und Du*, Leipzig: Infelverlag, 1923.

Christie, D. J. (2006). What is Peace Psychology the psychology of? In *Journal of Social Issues, 62*, 1-17, retrieved on August 14, 2007, from www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00436.x.

Coser, L. A. (1977). *Masters of sociological thought: Ideas in historical and social context.* (2nd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Eisler, R. (1987). *The chalice and the blade: our history, our future.* London: Unwin Hyman.

Engerman, S. L. & Genovese, E. D. (Eds.) (1975). *Race and slavery in the Western hemisphere: Quantitative studies.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Fromm, E. (1976). *To have or to be?* New York: Harper and Row.

Fung, H. and Chen, E. C.-H. (2001). Across time and beyond skin: Self and transgression in the everyday socialization of shame among Taiwanese preschool children. In *Social Development, 10*, 420-437.

Galtung, J., Jacobsen, C. G., Brand-Jacobsen, K. F., & Tschudi, F. (2000). *Searching for peace: The road to TRANSCEND.* London: Pluto Press in association with TRANSCEND.

Genovese, E. D. (1975). *Roll, Jordan, roll: The world the slaves made.* London: Deutsch.

Heard, G. (1963). *The five ages of man.* New York: Julian Press.

Herz, J. H. (1950). Idealist Internationalism and the security dilemma. In *World Politics, II*, 157-180.

Ho, D. Y. F. (1976). On the concept of face. In *American Journal of Sociology, 81*, 867-884.

Hollick, M. (2006). *The science of oneness: A worldview for the twenty-first century.* Ropley, Hampshire, UK: O-Books.

Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. In *Multilingua - Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication, 8*, 223-248.

Kaku, M. (2005). *Parallel worlds: A journey through creation, higher dimensions, and the future of the cosmos.* New York: Doubleday.

Lambert, R. (2008). Empowering Salafis and Islamists against Al-Qaeda: A London counterterrorism case study. In *PS: Political Science & Politics, January*, 31-35, www.apsanet.org.

Levine, P. A. (1997). *Waking the tiger: healing trauma.* Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.

Li, J. & Fischer, K. W. (2004). Thought and affect in American and Chinese learners' beliefs about learning. In D. Y. Dai & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Motivation, emotion, and cognition: Integrative perspectives on intellectual functioning and development.* (pp. 385-418) Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Liberman, V., Samuels, S. M., and Ross, L. D. (2004). The name of the game: Predictive power of reputations versus situational labels in determining prisoner's dilemma game moves. In *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 1-11.

Lindner, E. G. (2002). Healing the cycles of humiliation: How to attend to the emotional aspects of "unsolvable" conflicts and the use of "humiliation entrepreneurship". In *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 8*, 125-138, www.informaworld.com/smpp/ftinterface~content=a785828772~fulltext=713240930.

Lindner, E. G. (2006). *Making enemies: Humiliation and international conflict.* Westport, CT: Greenwood/Praeger Security International.

Lindner, E. G. (2007a). Avoiding humiliation - From intercultural communication to global interhuman communication. In *Journal of Intercultural Communication, SIETAR Japan, 10*, 21-38.

Lindner, E. G. (2007b). *How multicultural discourses can help construct new meaning.* Hangzhou, China: Paper prepared for the Second International Conference on Multicultural Discourses, 13-15th April 2007, Institute of Discourse and Cultural Studies, & Department of Applied Psychology, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China.

Margalit, A. (1996). *The decent society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Marshall, M. G. (1999). *Third World War: System, process, and conflict dynamics.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Matsumoto, D. R. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of Face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. In *JOURNAL OF PRAGMATICS, 12*, 403-426.

Miller, W. I. (1993). *Humiliation and other essays on honor, social discomfort, and violence.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Montiel, C. J. (2006). Political psychology of nonviolent democratic transitions in Southeast Asia. In *Journal of Social Issues, 62*, 173-190, retrieved on August 14, 2007 from www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00445.x.

Pettigrew, T. F. and Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751-783.

Ross, L. D. & Nisbett, R. E. (1991). *The person and the situation: Perspectives of social psychology.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Sharma, C. (2007). *The Advaita Tradition in Indian Philosophy: A study of Advaita in Buddhism, Vedanta and Kashmir Shaivism.* New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Smith, M. M. (1998). *Debating slavery: Economy and society in the Antebellum American South.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ury, W. (1999). *Getting to peace. Transforming conflict at home, at work, and in the world.* New York, NY: Viking.

Volf, M. (1996). *Exclusion and embrace: a theological exploration and identity, otherness, and reconciliation.* Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Webb, T. (2005). *Working with shame and other strong emotions: Experiential workshop script from 'personal and political tools for social change' course.* Sidney: Centre for Popular Education, University of Technology.

Wendt, A. (2005). Social theory as cartesian science: An auto-critique from a quantum perspective. In S. Guzzini & A. Leander (Eds.), *Constructivism and international relations.* New York and London: Routledge, forthcoming.

Wilber, K. (1979). *No boundary.* Boston: Shambhala.

Wilber, K. (1996). *A brief history of everything.* Boston: Shambhala.

Winter, D. D. N. (1996). *Ecological psychology: Healing the split between planet and self.* New York: HarperCollins.

Yoshikawa, M. J. (1980). *The "double swing" model of Eastern-Western intercultural communication.* Honolulu: Paper prepared for the Seminar on Communication Theory from Eastern and Western Perspectives, East-West Communication Institute.

Yoshikawa, M. J. (1987). The "double swing" model of intercultural communication between the East and West. In D. L. Kincaid (Ed.), *Communication theory: Eastern and Western perspectives.* (pp. 319-329) San Diego, CA: Academic Press.