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This is a paper about the psychological obstacles to making societal structural changes. It begins with a discussion of the structural changes advocated by the UNESCO Culture of Peace Program and how making these changes requires an understanding of our human condition. Our condition poses challenges that must be faced by those who wish to build a nonkilling world. After discussing the nature of these challenges, the paper uses our understanding to discuss the development of the communities that are needed and the political work that must be done. It concludes with a suggestion as to how we might begin to build the sort of organization that could help us construct a nonkilling society.

There are a number of objective structural barriers between us and our goal of a nonkilling world. We live in a global culture that is awash with weapons and used to warfare, in a global economy where we have little control over corporations that are devoted to making profits often without regard to the welfare of workers or effects on the environment, and where the elites within most nations deal with one another in ways that maintain the existence of strong class differences in their own countries. In the U.S. we must deal with a military industrial complex that has congressional representatives competing for campaign funds and defense jobs in their districts created by companies that produce weapons that often have little military justification. This paper asserts that these objective barriers can be overcome if we address certain psychological problems. It addresses these problems and suggests a step we can take towards achieving a non-killing world.

The objective barriers are aspects of a social system with various structural problems. Marxist analysis stresses the problems stemming from the structure of capitalism; feminist analysis focuses on the structure of patriarchy, and anarchist analysis the problems of states and their bureaucracies. Yet all these structures are interrelated: The exploitation of labor and need for new markets, hegemonic masculinity, and the obedience to orders and rules, are dynamically intertwined aspects of a societal system that involves killing others and is related to a culture of war. To change this system we need to become aware of the extent of the problem without becoming overwhelmed with despair. This is one of the psychological challenges considered below.

We can only meet this challenge by realizing that we are active agents who help create the culture in which we live. Our individual actions help establish the norms that influence behavior (Johnson, 2005), our collective actions help establish the societal institutions that support the social system (Hearn, 1997), and our vision of the future
helps establish that future (Boulding, 2000). Thus, if can envision a peace system that is structured to promote a nonkilling world, facing our psychological problems will enable us to overcome the objective barriers and reach our goal.

Fortunately, we have a description of such a culture, and an outline of the underlying structural base that is required for a nonkilling system. Such a vision is provided by UNESCO’s program for building a global culture of peace (UNESCO, 1995). I begin this paper by describing this vision, the support for it, and how the first attempt at its actualization failed. Then I will describe the psychological obstacles, the development of the communities we need, the political work that must be done, and how we might build the sort of organization that could help us construct a nonkilling society.

Building a Culture of Peace

Beginning in the mid 80’s, the UNESCO leadership suggested that citizen groups could work with national governments to begin building a global culture of peace. Such a culture would involve values, attitudes and behaviors that rejected violence, would endeavor to prevent conflicts by addressing root causes, and would aim at solving problems through dialogue and negotiation. The culture would not be without conflict but would attempt to manage violent competitive conflicts by transforming them into cooperative development for shared goals.

Conceiving such a culture as the opposite of a culture of war, they articulated eight different structural bases that became an action program to develop a culture of peace. These are shown in table 1.

Table 1
Bases for a Culture of Peace

(1) Education (and especially, education for the peaceful resolution of conflict)
(2) Sustainable development (viewed as involving the eradication of poverty, reduction of inequalities, and environmental sustainability)
(3) Human rights
(4) Gender equality
(5) Democratic participation
(6) Understanding, tolerance, and solidarity (among peoples, vulnerable groups, and migrants within the nation, and among nations)
(7) Participatory communication and the free flow of information
(8) International peace and security (including disarmament and various positive initiatives)

Note that these components are all interrelated. Education on peaceful conflict resolution is needed for the nonviolent struggle involved in achieving sustainable development and preventing the exploitation of workers and the environment. Sustainable development helps insure a respect for human rights and this respect is linked to the gender equality that helps prevent the dominance of men over women. This equality is related to democratic participation, and this participation requires the participatory open communication that is more apt to occur under conditions of security. Further, the components unite the major social movements of our time: the movements
for peace, human rights and tolerance, gender equality, democracy and open communication, global economic justice, and a sustainable environment. Implicit in the uniting of these components under the rubric of a culture of peace is that they form a coherent whole that might be contrasted with a culture based on war. Unfortunately, such a formulation was resisted by the leaders of many Western nations including the United States. They objected to the idea that we live in a culture of war and argued that their military dominance was maintaining peace. Wanting to maintain military and economic dominance they refused to financially support culture of peace programs. Although the idea had popular appeal —the U.N. General Assembly passed a resolution detailing programs of action to build a culture of peace and 70 million people in dozens of different nations signed a petition in its support —programs of action never received sufficient funding and many people today are unaware of the idea and its potential to address the root causes of war and injustice and unify those of us who want peace and justice.

The vision of a culture of peace that could be created by people and states merits the full support of all who wish to create a nonkilling global society. Initially, the UNESCO promoters of a culture of peace appear to have hoped that the UN would support the establishment of such a culture. However, the resistance of powerful nation-states has led many to abandon that vision and Adams (2009) now argues that it is impossible to realize such a vision as long as we are living in a system of nation states. He suggests that the best approach is to encourage citizens to work with local governments to establish cities with peaceful cultures. Others agree that international institutions, such as the UN, are not capable of creating a new world order, but argue that states are necessary for democratic control and are gradually evolving so that a new transnational order is being built. For example, Slaughter (1997) suggests that the functions of the state are being disaggregated and bureaucrats are networking across national boundaries to form a transgovernmental community. Are nation-states the problem or part of a solution that involves numerous building blocks? In any case we must face their current existence in an international system that involves struggles for dominance and an acceptance of killing and the threat of killing. How may we develop the sort of civil society that will demand that powerful governments work towards the nonkilling culture we need? I believe that we need to form a new sort of political organization that will enable us to cooperate to attain a culture of peace. Before addressing how this might be done I want to articulate the psychological challenges that must be faced. For the macro barriers to peace such as corporations, elite power nets, and the military industrial complex, are held in place by “micro matters” that have been identified in the psychological literature, matters such as egoism, personal needs for power, the fear of identity loss, and the intergroup favoritism that leads to moral disengagement and violence. A nonkilling culture of peace must consider our human nature and this means facing certain conflicts that are experienced by those of us who live in our current culture.

When we assume that people have a propensity for violence and selfishness we forget that our assumption is based on cultural norms and that many of these norms are products of our current culture of war. In fact, there are not only peaceful people; there are also peaceful peoples—societies without war, murder, or rape. See Fry, 2007). The UNESCO promoters of a culture of peace point out that we humans are not
necessarily violent and can produce nonkilling collectives. We are quite capable of creating peaceful cultures and human nature is a cultural product that is quite malleable. However, our propensity to use violence is undeniable and I believe it is incorrect to assume that we only kill in extreme conditions. I doubt that it is only nation states, multicultural corporations, and elites in general, that hold the culture of war in place because we humans created these very structures. Although a majority of U.S. citizens may want peace, they also want to be number one and elites can always make national power salient and lead many to support military strength and the numerous military bases that maintain U.S. national dominance. Hence, it seems to me that our human nature is quite problematic and involves psychological challenges that must be addressed if we are to create a culture of peace. Our problem is not simply with oppressive structures and those with power, it is also with what in us stops us from changing these structures in a nonviolent way. So before discussing what we need to do, and proposing a way to do it, I want to discuss our identity as human beings.

Our Problematic Human Nature

But how may we attempt to describe our human nature? It is hard to assess because it is a cultural as well as a biological product, and we are so very malleable. There are people and cultures that are immersed in violence while others are horrified by it. In our own society there is an attraction to violence and a horror of it, a fascination and a disgust; we have both an incredible capacity for empathy, courage, and sacrifice, and a disturbing propensity for cheap thrills and cruelty. In fact, a central problem in establishing a culture of peace is that we have different understandings of our nature and hence what peace requires. Here, I want to describe the difference between conservative and liberal understandings of our nature and suggest a third way of conceiving of our identity that I believe accounts for these differences and offers a more accurate picture of our nature and what a culture of peace would require.

It may be argued that conservatives tend to believe that we are individuals with a basically sinful nature with which we need to struggle. Most conservatives accept the idea that we have aggressive impulses, might like to cheat, steal, philander, but can learn self control. To help control our own nature we need to learn self discipline, and to control the general human tendency towards egoism we need a government that can enforce laws. Hence, conservatives support authority, and within the family, many believe that a father should have this authority.

On the other hand, liberals tend to believe that we are basically good and can learn to cooperate for the common good. They see our negative traits as stemming from an unfortunate childrearing or an environment that offers only negative choices. Problematic behavior is not due to a fundamental selfishness or struggles for power but to trauma. Rather than advocating authority and self control they stress empathy and the need to develop supportive environments.

Yet neither of these belief systems, nor seeing our nature as a struggle between love and hate, seems to capture our basic human nature. A more fundamental model has been proposed by the Scottish philosopher, John Macmurray (1961). Rather than portraying us as in conflict between selfish/aggressive tendencies and unifying/loving tendencies, he argues that a more fundamental choice is between a fear that we are not loved and a love for what is other than our self. From his perspective, hate occurs as a
response to the frustration of our need to care and be cared for. Thus, the basic choice is not between love and hate, but between love and fear. The dynamics involved in this choice explain the differences between conservatives and liberals, and are involved in the fundamental problem we all face (de Rivera, 1989).

Our Human Identity

Macmurray points out that we humans are born into personal relationships. As soon our self is differentiated from what is other (initially our mother) these relationships necessarily involve both a caring for what is other and a fearing for self. Although both these motivational strands are present, one is always dominant in the relationship. We are dependent on the caring of the other and when this seems to fail we are hurt and the fear for our self becomes dominant over our caring. Since the person only exists in relation to others, the person is not really the self. Personal identity exists in relating to others. However, when we are hurt and our fear for self dominates, this fact is overlooked and we lose our sense of personhood. We either experience ourselves as an individual self who must look out for him or her self (because we cannot depend on the other), or we abandon our self to identify with the other on whom we must depend. In the latter case, we identify the self as part of a group with a common good to which we must conform. Of course, we do have an individual self and a group self but when our fear for our self dominates our caring for what is other we lose a sense of our personhood and become split. Thus, our fear for ourselves leads us to become either individualistic and stress a “realist” need for power and authority or collectivistic and emphasize the “idealistic” goodness of others.

Whenever fear dominates splits develop, and these prevent the unification that is needed. We may split reason from emotion, mind from body, self from other, and realism from idealism. These lead to the tensions that I will address later as fundamental challenges for the peace movement. From this perspective, when we overly stress either our identity as an individual or our identity as a member of social groups we are betraying a fear for self that is generated by a sense that we cannot really depend on the caring of what is other than our self. Our identity as a creative person who is in relation to others has been masked, along with the fact that we are most ourselves when we care about someone or something that is other than our self. This personal identity is revealed when our caring becomes dominant and this can most readily occur when we feel cared for so we are not afraid for ourselves.

Who are we? When we identify ourselves as male or female, as American or European, as white or a person of color what is involved? Many current social psychologists distinguish between personal and social identity. Personal identity is said to refer to individual personal characteristics (such as handsome, intelligent, witty, or the reverse), whereas our social identity is supposed to consist of the groups with which we identify (American, white, male, psychologist, etc). An extensive body of research shows that we can easily be led to categorize ourselves as members of a group and that when this group membership is made salient we discriminate in favor of our own. However, this way of parsing our identity as individual or social misses the very essence of personal identity or ubuntu, which lies in our relationships with others rather than in either our individual characteristics or the groups to which we belong.
Thinking that we are individual selves may lead conservatives to rely on the choices provided by a putatively free market and ignore the need for regulation and corporate responsibility. Confusing our personal identity with the groups to which we belong may lead liberals to the presumption of a common group welfare to which all should conform when, in fact, what is good for some is often not good for others, and may lead us to overly depend on state power to secure human rights. Paradoxically, the fear of loss of self may lead authoritarians from either right or left to abandon their individuality by submitting to a leader or movement with whom they identify.

If this view is correct real security does not lie in either independence or group membership, but in the relationships that constitute a caring community. The contrast between the favoritism that occurs when we identify ourselves in terms of group membership and the caring relationships that form community recalls Kosterman and Feshbach’s (1989) distinction between nationalistic attitudes (characterized by feelings of superiority and privilege) and patriotism (with its love and attachment for place and people). Congruently, rather than seeing common humanity in terms of our belonging to a common human group that is different from space aliens or better than other animals, we may see our humanity in terms of our relating to others in the human community. Our common humanity depends on the extent to which we are aware of our interdependence. Yet the commonness of this identity is obscured whenever harm leads our fear to dominate our love and to suffer the splits that hinder our working together to achieve a nonkilling culture of peace.

Three Psychological Splits that Hinder Our Work

Three basic tensions hinder our ability to construct a nonkilling culture: the tension between authority and liberty, between peace and justice, and between real and ideal. 1 When caring dominates fear the tension between these poles can be productively managed, but when fear dominates caring the peace movement is paralyzed by splits.

1. Authority and organization vs. rebellious anger and creative networking. Those who favor the sort of organizational unity and national political agenda that could address the structural problems of society are often opposed by those who distrust organization, believe that many flowers should freely bloom and that peace depends on rebellion, personal relations and community. It seems obvious that we need both governmental organization and free community. Yet any such integration is prevented when splits prevent the supporters of each view to appreciate what the other is trying to accomplish. This tension seems related to emotional predilections for authority and rebellion, and to contemporary gender dynamics. Those who believe that organization is necessary have a basic trust in authority (which they see as quite different from dominance) and are impatient with the perceived inefficiency of peace groups who insist that peace will happen from individual change, emerge from spontaneous protest, and happen without hierarchical organization. They wonder if those opposed to organization really think that military-industrial complex will collapse from its own weight and the supporters of peace simply need to encourage the blooming of many flowers. Those who insist that it is unnecessary to unify believe that unity implies hierarchical organization and will prevent the spontaneity and true democracy needed for peace. Since they see organization as
involving dominance they don’t want to believe that organization is necessary. They ask if those who believe that the movement must unify really believe that organization can occur without dominance.

There is a related disagreement within the peace movement about how peace can best be achieved. Reformers believe in the basic benevolence of liberal authority, endorse the need for state power, and advocate better laws and strengthening world government. They are opposed by revolutionaries who distrust authority and want a new political power or who favor a focus on community and the sort of networking between communities advocated by Gandhi. 8 The latter believe that it is foolish to rely on state structures because these are based on power and inevitably susceptible to corruption, and they distrust global institutions, fearing that a world government could simply add another layer of bureaucracy that will frustrate local action to solve local problems. The reformers can work to improve government but tend to ignore the danger of being co-opted by those in power. The revolutionaries can support social forums that seek to voice the needs of those without power, but their distrust of authority hinders them from creating an executive group with the power to implement programs that can address those needs. 9

The ambivalence towards authority and organization in the peace movement is sometimes manifested in a reluctance to openly discuss the management of power, and is an important stress line in the peace movement that makes it vulnerable to governmental co-optation. We need to recognize and discuss the tension so that peace advocates have a common language to discuss the management of power differentials and the difference between domination and authority. If issues of power are squarely faced and temperamental differences are accepted with humor, the peace movement may be able to reconcile the need for both centralized authority and decentralized responsibility. Those who want organization need to realize the need for structures that will enable those who are marginalized to have access to power. Those who are uncomfortable with power need to realize that people who accept responsibility need to have the power to fulfill that responsibility. 10

2. The tension between those focused on harmonious peace and the development of compassion vs. those focused on justice and the direction of rage against injustice. This is a deep psychological conflict within the peace movement that must be addressed if it is to have the unity needed to meet the challenges posed by the politics of nationalism and the danger of co-option. Many people who are focused on peace tend to work from the inside out; that is, they prioritize transforming the human heart so it is more compassionate, and they are more comfortable with reconciliation with opponents than confrontation with enemies. By contrast, many who are focused on justice want to change oppressive institutions and remove those in power who are opposed to change. They are more comfortable with rage and the perception of “enemies”. Those committed to peace are often reluctant to engage in what appears to be an aggressive confrontation with people who use power to dominate and may not be comfortable with justice seekers who want to work on changing societal structures and believe in the necessity of engaging in an aggressive (though nonviolent) confrontation with those in power. Yet changing societal structures requires an assertive energy that can confront politicians, clergy, and talk show hosts who seem unaware of those who desire justice and peace. Conversely, those
committed to justice are often unaware of the needs of those with whom they are in conflict, and how their insistence on justice and inclusion may obscure possibilities of reconciliation and result in the exclusion of those with less tolerant ideologies. The disagreement as to whether the goal should be more about peace or more about justice contributes to a fear to challenge American nationalism. Persons such as Gandhi and King managed to resolve the conflict between compassion and aggression by committing themselves to nonviolent action. They held to the idea of insisting on change without considering their adversaries to be evil. It seems clear that we need to promote the discipline and training this requires.  

This disagreement may be related to the difference between persons who prioritize harmony and cooperative community building and those who are comfortable with conflict and competition for excellence. Likewise, some cultures (such as the Chinese) define peace as harmony and prefer to mask conflict while others (such as our own) see conflict as inevitable and define peace in terms of contracts. Many in the peace movement prefer cooperative enterprises. Yet there are always competing views, and finding productive, non-bruising, ways of dealing with these differences is necessary both for the peace movement and the government. In the former, we must deal with differences of opinion about what is most needed for peace. In the latter, entrenched interests struggle to maintain power and real conflicts of interest must be carefully considered. If such conflicts are faced they may be solved with skillful negotiation or mediation. However, this requires acknowledgment and skills that need to be developed within the peace and justice community.

3. The conflict between the ideal and the real. I have already noted the challenge posed by the need to face the reality of a system based on power and domination without falling into a despair that prevents action. It is all too easy to assume the ideal, pretend that the system is good so that justice actually exists in this world (or will be awarded in heaven) and one need not act or may idealistically act without considering the realities of power. Conversely, one may base all pragmatic action on the realities of power and abandon ideals. Moral action requires us to maintain the tension between ideal and real. When the tension is not tolerated it results in a split. On the one hand, this split is illustrated by those “realists” who keep insisting on the need to maintain power without regard for the ideals of peace and justice. They dismiss these ideals as illusory, avoid looking at the data that shows how often power fails to protect, and even fail to consider how aspects of a culture of peace can contribute to “soft” power. We need to encourage such “realists” to seriously consider what they really want and to think more broadly about how it might be achieved. On the other hand, the split is illustrated by an insistence on perfection and the distain which some activists have for working with corporations or governments. Rather than seriously considering the problem of how co-option can be avoided and ideals can be maintained, some prefer to maintain their purity by simply rejecting working with corporations or the government. There are instances where corporate support is mere window dressing that distracts attention from the real issues that are involved. However, there are other instances where corporate support has enabled important programs to continue. Likewise, some governmental initiatives have obstructed but others have furthered a culture of peace. It seems to me that we should be studying examples of these
failures and successes and the dynamics of how co-optation occurs and can be avoided, rather than simply rejecting working with corporations or government.

If we face each of these three psychological conflicts and encourage our caring for one another to dominate our fear we will be able to appreciate the different roles required by social movements (Moyer, McAllister, Finley and Soifer, 2001). Rather than derogating those playing a role that is different from our own we can support those who are playing a role well and challenge those we think are playing it poorly. If we realize that it is fear that leads ourselves and others to rigidly cling to a dogmatic position we may be able to foster the caring that is essential.

Unifying the movements for peace and justice requires the integration of many different primary concerns. Some want to pragmatically persuade congress to take small but necessary steps to advance peace, others want to work towards underlying institutional changes, and still others on grassroot’s organizing for a new political party. Some focus on getting soldiers back from Afghanistan, preventing war with Iran, closing the School of the Americas, or ending nuclear proliferation. Others on ending domestic abuse or gay bashing, or on stopping environmental degradation, getting health care, or achieving more economic or racial justice. Integrating these concerns require us to cope with the inevitable struggles for leadership that often involve big egos. They requires us to cope with the negative energy of those who want to use violence, the differences we have addressed between people on the right and left of the political spectrum, and the self righteousness with which they reify their differences rather than work together. Further, the movement towards a nonviolent society must cope with the fact that any structures it seeks to establish will require a political will stronger than the politics of nationalism, will involve bureaucratic conflicts, and will require funding that leaves it vulnerable to co-option.

How may we achieve the kind of unification that will give us the power needed to establish peace with justice? I believe that if we face the conflicts that have been described we will be able to achieve the sort of organizing that is needed to build a non-killing society. Such organization must have its base in the community groups that furnish fellowship and provide spontaneous energy for peace. However, it also requires a political organization that uses a positive agenda to promote governmental peace and justice. Finally, it needs a new sort of civic organization with a small centralized office that is devoted to building a culture of peace. I want to address each of these components in turn: The cultivation of community, the building of a political organization for peace, and the formation of a new sort of civic organization.

Attaining a Culture of Peace by Cultivating Community

Our personal wellbeing depends on the integrity of our local communities (Hearn, 1997), and our view of human nature suggests that building a culture of peace requires us to cultivate communities of people who care for one another and are related to a global community. Although it is not sufficient, grassroots community building is necessary, and I will discuss it before addressing the political organization that will also be required. Our moral may be sustained by the realization of how many caring people are involved in building a peaceful culture and it is theoretically important to know how much such
building already exists. Hence, before considering some factors needed for the cultivation of more community we shall attempt to assess the extent to which it already exists.

Assessing How Much Is Happening

In each of our states we have dozens of small local peace groups. In addition to these local groups there are national and international groups or movements such as WRL (War Resisters League), FOR (Fellowship of Reconciliation), FCNL (Friends Committee for National Legislation), WILPF (Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom), Vets for Peace, Citizens for Global Solutions, Council for a Livable World, Peace Action, and so forth. There are professional groups such as psychologists, physicians, educators, and lawyers for social responsibility, and groups begun by committed individuals (such as Human dignity and humiliation studies, and World march for peace and justice). Yet there is no list of these or estimations of their memberships. Finally, we have networks and non-membership lobby groups such as Moveon, True Majority, Peacemajority, Democracyinaction, Truthout, etc. and coalitions of groups such as United for Peace and Justice. Although it is not clear how the people on these sites should be counted or how much overlap is involved, it might be fruitful to begin estimating the growth or decline of activity on such sites in different nations.

Perhaps the best estimate of the extent of what is happening in the movement for peace and justice is the one made by Paul Hawken and reported in Blessed Unrest. Hawken’s (2007, 18) observes that a broad social movement is occurring that is based on localized needs and ideas rather than ideology. Seeing the connection between environmental concerns and the human rights of indigenous groups he began collecting groups working on environmental sustainability and human rights and has established a wonderful model for a citizen’s peace network at wiserearth.org. In the Wikipedia tradition, anyone may post news of their peace/justice group on this site. The Wiserearth site currently lists well over a hundred thousand NGO’s and Hawkins estimates he knows of a million such NGO’s and that there are probably seven million in existence globally. It is interesting to note that the categories used by the wiserearth site can easily be related to the bases for a culture of peace. In table two I give an example of a few of the most obvious NGO’s, and the names of the most relevant categories used by Hawken’s together with the number of NGO’s listed in these selected categories.

Insert Table 2 about here

Table Two

Bases of Culture of Peace, Some NGO’s, Hawken’s Categories, and Number of Sites.

1. Education (and especially, education for the peaceful resolution of conflict):
   Educators for social Responsibility, War Resisters League,
   [Environmental education, 11,789 sites]

2. Sustainable development (viewed as involving the eradication of poverty, reduction of inequalities, and environmental sustainability):
   Bread for the World, Friends of the Earth,
   [Sustainable communities 8,999 sites, Poverty alleviation, 9,240 sites]
(3) Human rights:
Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, International Peace Brigade
(Human rights 8,052 sites)

(4) Gender equality:
National Organization of Women,
(Gender equality, 4,836 sites)

(5) Democratic participation:
Common Cause,
(Democratic participation (3,448 sites).

(6) Understanding, tolerance, and solidarity (among peoples, vulnerable groups, and migrants within the nation, and among nations):
Fellowship of Reconciliation
[Not categorized as such]

(7) Participatory communication and the free flow of information:
Freedom House, Committee to Protect Journalists, Reporters without Borders
[Media and communication, 1,575 sites]

(8) International peace and security (including disarmament and various positive initiatives):
Peace Alliance, FCNL, Vets for Peace
[Peace and peace making, 7,916 sites]

Actually, all the categories used in the wiserearth site probably should be related to the culture of peace categories. However, those involved in Wiserearth and those involved in Culture of Peace do not appear to know of each other! And in the fact lies a hint of the problem. Given the fact that we probably have more individuals quietly working voluntarily for peace than personnel getting paid to serve in the military, and far more local peace groups than militia, one might think that the peace movement could substantially impact foreign policy. But there is one crucial difference, the military is organized, the peace movement is not.18 This is related to the fact that the military is well funded by nation-state taxes while the peace movement currently relies on voluntary contributions.

On the one hand, Hawkins has hope in this blessed, unorganized unrest. He offers an organic metaphor, suggesting that we humans are like an organic immune system that is mobilizing against the threat to our earth. However, unlike our immune system, this wonderful mix is almost completely without coordination and organization. Participants lack awareness of the important work that others are doing, NGO’s compete for funds rather than coordinate programs. Wonderful endeavors, work that deserves to be well known is unknown, organizations are continually strapped for funds, and most groups are so involved in trying to combat violence and injustice that they are not very involved in the community building that is required.
Cultivating Local and Global Community

The building of what Gandhi characterized as his constructive program is a time consuming task. Non violent activists such as Randy Kehler emphasize the need for the sort of energy that will sustain a movement, something that is close to people's everyday concerns. In the absence of a draft or a widespread depression this sort of energy can only be met by the sustained relationships inherent in local community groups and building these local communities and relating them to a sense of global community may require the development of a new human narrative.

The Western narrative that is most widely accepted today by both conservatives and liberals is the narrative of democratic liberalism with its emphasis on individual freedom. However, if freedom is conceived individualistically Hearn (1997) points out that it becomes conceived in terms of the choices involved in a free market economy or in terms of individual rights that must be guaranteed by states. This democratic liberalism neglects the idea of community as the mutual obligations and the norms of peace and justice that arise when people care about one another. Yet what we need is a narrative of community, and one that relates local to global community.

Such a narrative must give a sense of what is good and bad, and it is difficult to imagine a global community that does not share a common morality. This morality must encourage all humans to respect and care for one another, must involve a world cultural agreement on who we humans are, a world “religion” in which people from different faith communities have tolerance and support one another in their quest to overcome fear. We may be on spaceship earth but it is either moving without purpose or it is in relationship with something much greater than we can easily conceive. Maalouf (2000) acknowledges the need for spirituality and a transcendence that gives a meaning to our lives, but insists that our need to belong, to have an identity, cannot be met by religion. He argues that belonging to a religion involves an exclusivity that may be contrasted with language--where speaking one language in no way prohibits speaking others. Since religion (as opposed to spirituality) involves exclusion, he argues that it cannot be used in the formation of an inclusive human community.

However, Spirit itself may be universal amongst human beings and a global community is going to require a rapprochement among the world's many faith communities, a way to move beyond the intolerance of religious dogmas. Macmurray’s analysis suggests a difference between religion that is illusionary and that is real. Illusory religion seeks to reassure that what is feared will not happen. It will either be pragmatically focused on magical practices or prayer that will help a person to gain power on earth, or idealistically focused on what will happen in some future heaven. By contrast, real religion allows that what is feared may well happen but insists that one need not be afraid. It insists on a fundamental Goodness that can be relied upon, and deals with the tension between real and ideal by taking as a goal the making of heaven (the ideal) on this (real) earth. This sort of faith may be found in all religions (as well as in many putative atheists).

Besides a common communal narrative we need a consensus about what to do about power and its role in the maintenance of order. It seems to me that many liberals are uncomfortable with power because it is so often associated with dominance and status differences. Some tend to ignore the fact that people who accept responsibility need to
have the power to fulfill that responsibility. When Maslow and Benedict (Maslow, 1977) investigated the difference between happy and unhappy societies they discovered that the crucial difference did not lie in the type of staple crop, presence or absence of chiefs, or type of marriage arrangement, etc. It lay in how power was distributed. All societies appear to have some people who are particularly concerned about gaining power and prestige. However, the happy societies were arranged with a synchronicity. Power and prestige were acquired in the process of helping others. Conversely, the beliefs and institutions in unhappy societies led people to acquire power and prestige by hurting others. We can try and give power to people but most people do not want the power to govern, they are interested in other pursuits. What most want is power for people. Rather than trying to either avoid or distribute power, I believe we should foster arrangements that ensure that political and corporate power is gained and maintained by those persons who help others.

Although peace is fundamentally a matter of personal relationships and the quality of these relationships must always be central in our thinking so that love rather than fear and dominance is primary, these personal actions occur in a social (behavioral) environment that affects what is possible by providing opportunities for employment, information, learning, volunteer activities, communication, and organizing. Individual attitudes, values, and ways of behaving are affected by community norms and obligations, cultural ways of knowing, societal institutions, and form of government. Hence, social movements must affect institutions if they are going to affect permanent change and we will only obtain more peace and justice when we unite in building nongovernmental, business, and governmental structures that will promote peace and justice. Yet Hawkins (2007, p. 19) observes “…as yet there has been no coming together of organizations in a united front that counter the massive scale and power of the global corporations and lobbyists that protect the status quo.” We must build the political organization that promotes a culture of peace.

Building the Political Organization for Peace

We have many separate peace organizations that are doing important work. We have FOR, WILPF, WRL, FCNL, Council for a Livable World, Citizens for Global Solutions; we have Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Oxfam, etc. And until its funding disappeared we had a federation of 1,400 groups in United for Peace and Justice. Yet the peace movement has very little political power. Bill Scheuere, from Democracy in action, asks us to do a thought experiment. He asks if the public can name a group that represents the interests of the elderly (Yes, the ARRP-with 38 million members); can they name a group that represents the interests of gun owners (Yes, the NRA, with 4.3 million members.) Do these groups have clout with politicians, the media and the public? Can the public name a group that represents the peace movement? (No). Larry Wittner, argues that until we have a powerful national organization with cohesion, strength and programmatic direction, we will not be able to effectively challenge the masters of war. Unrest and protest, individual actions and community building are necessary but not sufficient; we need organization.

Of course, the idea that the peace movement needs more organization is an anathema to those liberals whose fear has led to a split between authority and liberty.
Those who distrust authority will view the very idea of organization in terms of male dominance hierarchies, leaders far removed from the needs of local groups, and being told what to do. “Build an organization? We will lose spontaneity; we will be told what to do; anyway it will be impossible to achieve; and anyway it would be run by white guys who won’t address the real problems of racism and poverty; and anyway to gain power it must work with the establishment so it will be co-opted.” Why is it that these sorts of objections spring to mind and dominate thinking so that the positive possibilities enabled by organization are completely forgotten?

I do not mean to dismiss the objections; there are real issues. However, rather than present these issues in an oppositional way that defeats the idea of organization, it seems to me that they can be presented as challenges that should be addressed. Doing so requires dealing with the conflict between authority and spontaneity. It also requires dealing with the tension between peace and justice. A narrow focus on peace overlooks central structural problems including racism, class issues, and institutionalized power. However, this tension is not really addressed when we have a loose federation of separate organizations. We need a central organization with a positive agenda that unites peace and justice and deals with the conflicts between different issues and interest groups and the dangers of co-option that result when the conflict between the ideal and the real is not addressed. There have been attempts to achieve such organization by creating a federation of groups. For example, United for Peace and Justice succeeded in creating a loose federation of many groups that agreed on the formulation of a positive unifying statement. However, it immediately became focused on a negative anti war agenda, and was unable to sustain the funding needed to maintain a central office. A nonkilling psychology needs a way to sustain a positive agenda, and it needs a way to influence the governmental bureaucracy and not simply the executive and congress.

The Need for a Positive Agenda

Most people who want peace can probably agree that we should have publicly funded elections, be spending far less money on the military and far more on developmental aid, gain control over corporation charters, have presidential candidates with strong peace platforms, and lead political leaders from both parties to support a Department of Peace. Yet none of this is happening and the peace movement cannot seem to unify around such goals. Why is it that it seems psychologically easier to organize around negative than positive goals? It is worth noting that during the early 1980s, when the bill for a peace academy was being debated, the peace movement was largely focused on opposing nuclear weapons. It aimed at achieving a nuclear freeze rather than attaining a Department of Peace or funding a Peace Academy. In fact, although it would seem that the goals could have been combined, works on peace movements during this period do not even mention the movement to attain a peace academy, the movement that eventually resulted in a watered down Institute for Peace. Yet there is no reason why demonstrations against war and injustice cannot include advocacy for a Department of Peace. Indeed, it seems evident that this would strengthen the cause of attaining a just peace. Why is it easier to be against tyranny than to be for peace and justice, easier to mobilize against than for? As noted, when we imagine building something up we seem to imagine more barriers and objections than when we imagine bringing something down.

I believe it is crucial for us to encourage groups to have positive goals and energy rather than simply be against the establishment, war, and injustice. The distinction involves more than simply being pro peace vs. anti war. Groups that are pro peace and justice may work against a particular war or injustice. Even a group whose organizational goal is primarily anti—such as the America’s Watch goal of closing down the School of the Americas-- has a fundamentally non violent, pro justice message that suggests a positive goal. On the other hand, United for Peace and Justice has a stirring positive statement that called for “…new foreign and domestic policies based on the peaceful resolution of disputes amongst states; respect for national sovereignty, international law, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the defense and extension of basic democratic freedoms to all; social and economic justice; and the use of public spending to meet human and environmental needs.” However, in practice it unified around negative messages—anti troops in Iraq, anti troops in Afghanistan, anti war funding, and anti nuclear weapons. It emphasizes the negative aspects of the status quo rather than offering a positive alternative. Thus, it is seen as leftist and easily dismissed by centralists.

Delineating the difference between positive and negative is extremely important because the pursuit of justice and human rights often calls for attention to all sorts of “negative” facts and the peace movement needs to include groups that argue for the reduction of poverty, ending prejudice against people of color, inner-city needs, and transgender rights. The peace movement is often accused of being a White middle class movement and there is much truth to this. Middle class Whites are much more likely to attend an anti nuclear arms rally in a nice park than to march for funds in an inner city neighborhood; there is often a tension between activism and middle class norms; and there is an issue of who has political power and status within the movement organization. Hence, the positive goals of the peace movement need to include the welfare of workers and inner city youth, and its organization needs to include the voices of labor, the poor, and those who suffer from the prejudices in our society.

How can peaceworkers overcome the split between positive ideals and negative facts? Activists who are committed to community outreach, such as Mathew Smucker (See his Building a successful anti-war movement) argue that activists should use informative narratives that involve a love of country rather than inflicting analysis that may be accurate but off putting, self righteous, or anti-patriotic. Analysis must be accurate, and Galtung’s description of imperialism is an important tool for our understanding of the culture of war that we must confront. However, referring to “U.S. imperialism” is bound to be misunderstood by many U.S. citizens. Scott Ritter suggests that the Center of Gravity that best links activists to our own country is the constitution and its proclamation that we have a government that is by the people and that our will should be expressed through congress. Most Americans believe in a rule of law and we can link the nation to the UN via treaty obligations.

The organizational issue that most hinders the formation of a positive agenda involves the limited energy and funding that is currently available. Those working to mobilize communities must focus on local concerns and are reluctant to expend too much energy to get their constituents involved in working with national organizations that are attempting to influence the numerous federal laws that would eventually be of benefit to their constituents. Larger more abstract issues that are yet another step away from immediate concerns, issues such as corporate reform, or economic conversion are not
The necessity of funding raises yet another important challenge. If we are to build something other than a business or another NGO we must secure funding and that means dealing with either corporations or the government and risking co-optation. Taking money may contribute to an illusion that we are doing something good when we are leaving intact the very institutions that are making poverty and violence inevitable. I want to note why we need to incur this risk.

Influencing the Governmental Bureaucracy

We are citizens of a nation that has departments of state and “defense” to look out for our national security (narrowly defined). However, we do not have a department of peace to promote peace education, support campaigns of non violent action, help coordinate the work of different NGO’s, and look after the welfare of those in other nations and the human security that is good for our earth as a whole (de Rivera, 2007). If our nation is to eventually be a part of a larger system of world government it must begin to cultivate a global perspective within its own governmental bureaucracy. Indeed, this is already occurring, often detrimentally, under the influence of the World Bank, the WTO, and the lobbying of transnational corporations.

Funding for peace must come from somewhere and if not from business corporations or nonprofits (which are dependent on civil society donors) funding must come from our government. Our government is funded by taxes. Fifty percent of our discretionary tax dollars goes to the military. Why not have some go to peace education, research, and jobs? Those working for peace are so used to poverty that they forget that congressional representatives are socialized to get money for special interests. I have found that some representatives who do not understand their constituent’s interest in peace, do understand that their constituents are interest in getting money for their university’s peace programs.

A fair number of peace activists, are opposed to having anything to do with the government. Caught in the split between authority and spontaneity, they only see the government as interested in a narrow gage foreign policy that is devoted to protecting U.S. corporate power and in the grips of the military industrial media complex. They have good reason to suspect that any peace organization that relies on the government for money is apt to be co-opted. Hence, they can cooperate in advocacy to limit U.S power, but hold back from endorsing a positive program to create a part of the bureaucracy that would work for peace. They overlook the governmental programs that run social security and Medicare, the park service, the environmental protection agency, the enforcement of labor laws, and the hundreds of other things which we ask government to do and which it seems to do reasonably well. They are afraid that working with a governmental agency such as the U.S. Institute of Peace will prevent an honest critique of foreign policy, deflect energy that is needed elsewhere and involve us in something that lacks purity. Further, though this is not stated, it seems to me that many do not want to risk hoping that we might actually be able to achieve peace. Those who do not hope can not be let down.

Although both the cultivation of community and political organization are crucial, a third sort of civic organization is essential for furthering a nonkilling society. For to some extent, the fabrication of a new system requires an analysis of what is needed and the building of a new civic consensus, and the creation of a new culture requires transcending local community norms and political interests.
An Organization to Construct a Culture of Peace

Many of our current peace organizations have a central Washington office that is involved in lobbying work. Most are sustained by individual memberships, with a few significant donors and modest grants. Peace Action, our largest lobbying group, has a center, an individual membership, and over a hundred local chapters and affiliates. The lobbying work of our peace organizations usually focuses on practical but limited solutions. For example, Peace Action mobilizes around clear problems such as controlling or abolishing nuclear weapons, getting us out of military actions, addressing the conflict in the Mid-east. In a related vein FCNL sponsors bills to fund civilian peacebuilders, diplomatic offices, reconciliation, and UN peacekeeping and developmental work.

Groups that attempt to influence legislation must pay attention to what is possible, to timing, the emotional climate within the beltway, the public’s mood, to their reputation in Washington as pragmatic, effective, and non nonsensical. Thus, excellent lobbying groups such as FCNL and Peace Action cannot afford to spend energy and reputation on legislation that is unlikely to pass, such as the establishment of a Department of Peace, or outside of the usual peace agenda, such as working for publicly financed elections or sustainable energy. They focus on current issues that they may be pragmatically able to affect. Although success helps secure donations, the very need for success may lead to a neglect of important but difficult issues such as small arms control. The different organizations have their own memberships and although they may be able to secure some foundation money they are largely dependent on promoting their membership base by working on issues that are important to their members and related to their special identity and expertise. Thus, WRL offers nonviolent training sessions, FOR builds groups to develop mutual understanding, Witness for Peace organizes delegations to Latin America, PBI accompanies human rights workers who are under death threats, and so forth. Each group has allies and forms coalitions for joint projects but cannot merge without risking a loss of their membership base.

The above issues are all important. Yet we clearly need something in addition. It seems to me that we need to establish a center that could work with both local community groups and national lobbying offices to advance the much broader positive agenda needed for a culture of peace. Those interested in international security and abolishing nuclear weapons, are not necessarily moved by environmental sustainability and climate change, nor are the latter necessarily involved in promoting gender equality, or media reform, or addressing poverty or human rights. Yet all these issues are intimately connected and we need to encourage a central organization that is dedicated to the promotion of a culture of peace and the strengthening of our identity as global citizens.

There have been a few endeavors to encourage the development of a network to support a culture of peace. UNESCO initially supported a number of exciting programs and still maintains a culture of peace website (www3.unesco.org/iycp), but its current support is minimal and it needs to keep funding for the site. I presume the decline in its sponsorship initially occurred when the U.S. was angered by UNESCO’s support of fair economic polices and pulled out of UNESCO and am unclear if the situation has changed enough to allow a renewal of support and how that might be encouraged. David Adams
has maintained a site (www.decade-culture-of-peace.org) where hundreds of groups working on aspects of a culture of peace can post what they have accomplished and access the World civil society report on a decade of progress towards attaining a culture of peace, but lack of funding prevents development. And there is a site for the Culture of Peace Initiative www.cultureofpeace.org, a group that is supporting individual initiatives and the observance of UN world peace day. The data from these sites suggests that the idea appeals to the public but not to any of the national or corporate interests that could provide funding.

The idea of an organization devoted to cultivating a culture of peace is probably too removed from the immediate interests and needs of most NGO’s to enable an alliance that could provide funding. However, I would think that a membership organization could support a small central office that could support a web site, organize small meetings among critical players, and communicate suggestions to groups such as Peace Action, FCNL, and Move On. Although such an organization would be centralized, it could be based on partnerships rather than hierarchy, and its leadership could be in touch with local needs and the voices of the marginalized. Rather than having elites working together to preserve their individual interests we can imagine a community of group leaders who cooperate because they care about what each other needs. Since such an endeavor would involve overcoming the psychological challenges to creating a non-killing world, psychologists may want to take the lead in supporting such an endeavor.

A center to cultivate a culture of peace could foster citizen rather than consumer identity, command media attention, provide a situational analysis, support strategic goals, and implement a plan of action that uses a rhetoric focused on creating a culture of peace for our communities. Such a center could emphasize how solutions must be both local and systemic, both funneling aid to local groups and supporting those Washington lobbying groups with positive agendas such as Common Cause’s efforts for public financing of elections, and Peace Alliance’s efforts to get a Department of Peace. It could encourage Peace Action in its outreach efforts, work with America’s Watch to convert the School of the America’s from training military police to educating about a culture of peace for the world’s children, and support groups that are working to encourage support for local economies to convert the military-industrial complex into an environmental sustainability complex.

What I have in mind is not a center that attempts to build a critical mass of like-minded people, but a center devoted to the weaving of a web of influences that bridges the gaps between liberals and conservatives, and connects persons in different positions and organizations with different interests and views. Lederach (2005) has pointed out that cultivating and nourishing relatively few well-intentioned people who are placed throughout our society may, like yeast in a mass of dough, operate to transform the entire system. I can imagine such a group considering the linkages among the whole array of culture of peace issues (poverty reduction, indigenous human rights, environmental sustainability, gender equality, international security, and democratic participation and open communications), focusing on an analysis of the systemic problems and the barriers that prevent change. Such a center would not itself engage in lobbying or the support of particular political parties or candidates. Rather, it would seek to develop a consensus on prioritizing solutions and whether to encourage an initial focus on publicly financed elections, corporate charters, a department of peace, a particular nonviolent action, or
some other promising initiative. Such a communal think-tank could connect those who
caring transcends individual interests regardless of whether they value authority or
spontaneity. It could facilitate the forming of the communitarian relationships
needed for nonviolent actions that integrate peace and justice. It could provide a point of
identification for those committed to global personhood, strengthening the faith needed
for actions that attend to both ideals and reality. It would help us to overcome the
psychological tensions inherent in our human nature so we can weave the civic fabric
necessary for a nonkilling society.

1 There are two caveats: First, although this approach to (or theory of) peace presents peace as dependent
on transforming a social system, it should not be presumed that we are dealing with static systems. Rather,
we must wrestle with dynamic systems that may be based on how conflict is managed. Second, the social
system has a spiritual or mythic dimension. It may actually involve Spirit.

2 The concept of a culture of peace is related to the idea of a peace system (Irwin, 1988); a related concept
is that of human security (as opposed to national security), and a similar vision is suggested by the World
Charter.

3 A number of building blocks are described in de Rivera (2009)

4 Although Adams (2008) argues that it was situational circumstances, such as resource scarcities, that led
humans to produce our current culture of war, Otterbein’s (2009) data suggests that warfare develops as
soon as societies develop economic inequalities that lead to internal divisiveness.

5 Lakoff (2002) suggests that these differences may be best understood in terms of different cognitive
models of the family. Conservatives believe in a morality based on a strong father who can provide the
authority needed for impulse control, while liberals believe in nurturing parents who can model and
encourage the empathy that is needed. Although Lakoff portrays his models as neutral cognitive science,
the models he presents are designed to be incompatible, and since he favors the liberal model he advocates
working for the dominance of this model. But what if our human nature is not so simple; what if both
empathy and authority are needed? Certainly if we look at child rearing in our own culture, the evidence
suggests that children need both nurturance and structure. Arguing that we should strive for a community
that includes conservatives is antithetical to viewing conservatives as the enemy. To my mind the real
enemy is the self-centeredness of many people of both persuasions, the selfishness of many who hold
power, and defects in many of our institutions.

6 Some psychological theorists, such as Freud, suggest that we can best describe our basic human nature in
terms of our having both aggressive and loving drives; others, such as Fromm, argue that we must all
confront certain existential choices and can do so in either destructive or creative ways, giving meaning by
either destroying or creating; still others, such as some cultural psychologists, stress the contrast between
individualistic and collectivist cultures. Wink (1992) suggests still another choice: A belief that there is a
need for violence to create order vs. a belief that the world is fundamentally good and that evil lies in
certain institutions.

7 I do not mean to imply that this is the only way to characterize the basic conflicts that divide us. See
Lederach (1997) for a related but somewhat different description. However, it is these conflicts between
caring, well-meaning folk, that hinder the construction of ways to deal with the hate, greed and ignorance,
of those who are less caring, and the rigidity of dysfunctional groups.
They may also argue that working through NGO’s can be more reformist than working with political parties because many NGO’s work with governments and hence become close to power.

To some extent these differences may be understood in the terms of some of the defenses revealed by psychoanalysis. Thus, Rogow (1974) points out that conservatives sometimes contain their aggression by identifying with authority while liberals sometimes harbor unconscious aggressive impulses towards authority, a dynamic that may lead them to be more adept at criticism and resistance than governing. Or we may think of the disagreement as related to the tension discussed by Elise Boulding (1992) when she writes about the tension between the passion for a peaceful and just order and the longing for the “spontaneous untidy, abundance of nature.”

Those who are more trusting of authority may remind their fellows of the need for coordination between communities and the necessity for some system of government in order to achieve just solutions for the intergroup conflicts. Certainly, even as we attempt to build small peaceful communities, we must live in a wider society, are subjected to the impositions of state government, and must be mindful of maintaining the structural factors important in the use of state nonviolence. These include both political factors (such as an adequate division of power within a government, and the separation of the military from politics and industry) and factors crucial in the building of civil society (such as the presence of civic groups that include people from different ethnicities and religions). Thus, if our aim is not simply how to better become a peacemaking community within a violence prone society but also how to transform this culture of violence into a culture of peace, we must unite to transform the bureaucracy by obtaining a Department of Peace. Those of less trusting or more rebellious natures may remind their comrades that the way such a department is governed must illustrate how power may be used to create rather than dominate, and they may insist that the Office of Peace Education and Training should consider nonhierarchical ways to manage power. They may object to compromises that are politically expedient but damage long-term goals. And to the extent they are convinced that authority can be exercised in ways that are caring rather than dominating, they may be willing to harness rebellious energy for the work of creating a caring authority.

Whenever the proponents of peace begin to raise an effective challenge to our current culture of war, they are faced with the aggressive opposition of those who see their proposals as a threat to American power and nationalism. Advocates of peace tend to either demonize this opposition as the enemy or surrender and withdraw rather than to struggle with the opposition to create a new human identity. There is a real conflict between people who are seriously committed to establishing a global culture of peace and those whose main preoccupation is the maintenance of U.S. superiority. The latter are afraid that a focus on peace will inevitably compromise American power and weaken American security. Peace is suspect because it is seen as the opposite of the strength necessary for aggressive competition. It is equated with idealism and a misplaced reliance on a morality of love and brotherhood that may work within one’s group but that leads to weakness and an appeasement with outside powers. Given this way of thinking, any acknowledgment that the nation may have some problems is seen as close to surrender.

To some extent these concerns can be addressed with public education about how peace can be attained. In positioning themselves to be elected, politicians are well aware of the public’s susceptibility to fear and desire for security. Peace education can convincingly show the public that international cooperation is safer and less expensive than national power. For example, keeping weapons out of space provides more security and is less expensive than U.S. domination of space. This education must provide concrete images of how peace can be structured in ways that prevent war. People have an image of war; they are aware that war costs money. However, they tend to think of peace as the absence of war and thus think that it has no cost. Public peace education must lead people to realize that one must build peace and that this requires money as well, even though this expenditure is a fraction of what is spent on military defense.

However, those involved in the peace movement need to realize that they are in a conflict that involves a disagreement about American identity and the nature of political reality. For example, the idea of creating a Department of Peace raises disturbing issues that are morally equivalent to past conflicts about colonization and slavery and cannot be won by compromises. Of course, a Department of Peace is not...
really in opposition to adequate defense. However, it is in opposition to the idea that the United States must focus on maintaining its status as the number one military power in the world. This conflict needs to be aggressively debated.

12 We need to find ways to deal with the tension of conflict and ways to make it more enjoyable for those who find it uncomfortable. Some find conflict exciting and value competition for its usefulness in encouraging excellence and its role in preventing corruption. However, those who prefer cooperation may find conflict inherently disturbing and be concerned about its production of winners and losers. Of course, dangers are inherent in both temperaments. Those who find conflict enjoyable or creative are sometimes inclined to insist that their views are the only correct ones, and they may overlook how competition can breed a factionalism that prevents solutions that would benefit the whole. Those who value harmony may neglect important differences and be overly inclined to compromise. If bureaucratic conflicts of interests are to be addressed, those who value harmony must be willing to face conflict and work with those who value conflict (and help them with the egoism and self-righteousness that may accompany fighting for valued positions). If the two temperaments work together they can develop an analysis of how responsibility should be divided between the existing departments of government and a new Department of Peace. Research on this issue could be initiated by conducting a series of interviews with civil servants from different departments. The results could then be included in a request for the Friends Committee on National Legislation to sponsor the sort of problem solving workshop that has proved so useful in the mediation of international conflicts. Such workshops, conducted with members of different departments who do not have immediate responsibility for maintaining bureaucratic power, can establish an underlying climate of cooperation that may help attain rational divisions of responsibility.

13 When caring dominates it is possible to discuss the conflicts among those competing for resources and attention, and the differing concerns of those with and without money,

14 In the state of Massachusetts, for example, Worcester has a Center for the Nonviolent Solutions, the North Shore has a home for refugees, Sherborne has an incredible Peace Abbey, the Pioneer Valley has the Wolman Center and a Peace Pagoda, and none of these groups are among the 70 other Massachusetts groups that are named as members of the coalition of United for Peace and Justice. Further, there are numbers of successful local nonviolent actions of which people are unaware. In Webster, for example, a group of our citizens defeated a proposal for a dump and landfill that would have polluted its lake. There are peace studies programs at Clark, Holy Cross, Brandeis, Tufts, Salem State and other community colleges. This sort of local peacebuilding is happening in all of our states and in all nations. Many are promoting human rather than national security and if one goes to U tube it is possible to see nets of music groups singing the same peaceful songs in many different countries. Since many are unaware of the extent of this movement it might be worthwhile to access its development. One way would simply be to count local peace and justice groups with web sites, although I am unsure as to exactly what criteria should be used. I presume that one would want to include groups that are devoted to nonviolently promoting the rights of workers, immigrants, and other marginalized groups.

15 In this regard, how might one create criteria for what to include? Should groups such as Amnesty International, Doctors without Borders, Common Cause, Human Rights Watch, and the Red Cross be included?

16 The large number of people interested in peace and justice suggests business possibilities and there is now a new peace business venture that is establishing a web site for peace news (www.pwpp.org), that will feature unknown persons who are doing wonderful things for peace--starting barefoot schools, defending human rights, beginning international peace youth groups, volunteering in poverty stricken areas, etc. The founders dream of a online peace newspaper with continually updated news and photos about actions for peace and justice. How many people might read such a news-source? The business plan for this venture initially estimated demand on the basis of survey data asking individuals to report whether they would be more likely to look at an internet story with a violent or positive headline. The bad news is that 80% of American’s report that they would be more likely to go to the violent headline. The good news is that
leaves millions of Americans who are likely to go to a site featuring positive headline. The PWPP business plan is projecting that by the end of 2012 there will have 17,000,000 "US People" collectively visiting the sites of its projected 862 media partners—reaching approximately half of its target market, of 34,000,000 within the U.S.; a market they define as "those citizens desiring widespread acceptance of UN resolutions on building cultures of peace."

17 Hawken’s (2007, p.16) observes “Ideas question and liberate, while ideologies justify and dictate.

18 Further, to be successful foreign aid requires organization and one reason the federal government gives aid money to the military is because the military is sufficiently organized to deliver the aid.

19 Joanne Sheehan, one of the organizers for the War Resisters League, has noted the differences between organizing grassroots resistance movements and developing NGO’s. Community building—requires continual organizational work to keep programs going. One problem for NGO’s is that they may begin organizing around a good goal but then need staff that require funding. Hence, the organization can wind up employing its own people and lose touch with the grassroots work that needs to be done. Further, although some communities such as Burlington, Ithaca, and Minneapolis have a culture that supports community work, others suffer from a lack of the ingredients that Gardiner (1992) notes are needed for community.

20 Our need for a global human community must confront some basic problems: 1. We are currently in a global economic system that is based on capitalistic expansion and consumerism. Keenes demonstrated that such a system requires a way to handle its overproduction, and the current way of doing this is by the constant waste involved in military expenditures. 2. Our traditional masculine identity is often based on a warrior rather than a builder identity. 3. We humans don’t seem to know how to deal with tribalism without imposing a system of domination. 4. We have issues such as the control of nuclear weapons, the small arms trade, and genocide that require international solutions.

21 Back when Bush was president the Maine Vets for Peace organized a march at the Bush summer residence to impeach him for violating the constitution. Any activity to call attention to misdeeds and apply a bit of pressure for peace and justice seemed worthwhile to me; it was fun march and we got a bit of national publicity. However, I did not think that we were really going to succeed in getting impeachment. Yet, I have a bright grandson who was on the march and it became clear to me that he, and many who were marching, actually thought we had a chance of getting an impeachment. The group attempting to close down the School of the Americas has organized thousands of Americans for yearly nonviolent protests in Georgia. They eventually managed to get the government to change the name of the school but have not yet succeeded in shutting it down. Yet they continue. Their hope is still alive. We somehow do not think so negatively when we are opposed to something. What is going on?

22 The statement continues: “We come together to turn the tide, to overwhelm war with peace, and oppression with justice. We hold that sovereign nations have the right to determine their own future, free from the threat of “pre-emptive attacks” and “regime change,” military occupation, and outside control of their economic resources. We call for new foreign and domestic policies based on the peaceful resolution of disputes amongst states; respect for national sovereignty, international law, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the defense and extension of basic democratic freedoms to all; social and economic justice; and the use of public spending to meet human and environmental needs. We seek to build a broad mass movement for peace and justice composed of all who are threatened by the new war program. We envision UFPJ as a movement-building coalition that coordinates and supports the work of existing groups and builds linkages and solidarity where none exist. We will link the wars abroad with the assaults at home, and U.S. militarism to the corporate economic interests it serves. We will work to make the peace movement a strong ally to movements for social and economic justice in the U.S. and abroad. We will pay special attention in all aspects of our work to the inclusion and leadership of constituencies bearing the brunt of the war’s impact at home, such as people of color, youth, women, and workers. We will be proactive in addressing internal power dynamics within our movement, especially regarding issues of race,
class, gender, religion, sexual orientation or gender identity, nationality, disability, cultural heritage, or ethnicity. We will work for peace and justice through nonviolent means. We will strive to embody in our day-to-day work the values we espouse and the world we seek to build.”

23 The mission statement notes that UFPJ is “… opposed to the “pre-emptive” wars of aggression waged by the Bush administration; we reject its drive to expand U.S. control over other nations and strip us of our rights at home under the cover of fighting terrorism and spreading democracy; we say NO to its use of war and racism to concentrate power in the hands of the few, at home and abroad.”

24 In an attempt to achieve diversity, the coalition of groups in United for Peace and Justice established a requirement that its steering committee consist of at least 50% women, 50% persons of color, 20% of persons under age 25, and 15% persons who identified as lesbian, gay or transsexual. Unfortunately, such a composition neglects issues of class. Further, it appears to result in a selection of persons who do not represent the composition of most peace and justice groups.

25 We need protest movements and anti war protests and Saul Alinsky tactics usually involve a good deal of independent enthusiastic energy that often results in behavior that is guaranteed to put off conservatives. But protests against the establishment do not have to be anti patriotic; they can be calls to the patriotism of Woody Guthrie, that “this land is my land; this land is your land.” The practice of nonviolent struggle may be used to support the opportunity of constituents to speak with representatives and senators about ways to insure peace. Certainly, competent representation requires knowing what constituents believe, and a respectful demand for access to representatives should have wide public support.

26 Why should a local activist be interested in corporate reform as much as in the building of local economies?

27 A number of corporations are beginning to recognizing the need for a good local environment and supporting work that recognizes the potential of inner city youth, such as the work done by The Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence in Providence.

28 I understand and support the behavior of organizations such as the FCNL who work for legislation that attempts to achieve a bit more peace and justice by working with the current power structure. However, the current bureaucratic structure has not worked to implement the suggestions of the Blix Commission to prevent nuclear proliferation; or for the International Criminal Court or the suggestions for a New International Economic Order; and it completely failed to support the nonviolence movement in Kosovo. It seems clear that we also need to begin transforming the structure our current system of government so that it works in the general interest of overall peace and justice. Some reject working with the government because of its problems and impurity, yet continue to support it with their tax money. They overlook the fact that there are many people in government who do their best to work for peace and justice in the current system. These include at least 70 congressional representatives, a few senators, and numerous workers in the civil service.

29 We are used to groups with different interests competing for power, attention, and money, and although we are used to hearing that groups should work cooperate for common goals we rarely hear that groups should care about what other groups need. Why is this? Cannot networks be organized so that issues of group maintenance can be addressed? Why note use transformative negotiation between liberals and conservatives and between those oriented towards authority as opposed to anarchy. Why not stress the personal transformation and training for non violent communication, non violent action, and compassionate witnessing that will enable community building?

30 There are a number of ways we can work to change underlying structures. We can support a new political party, caucus to influence the leadership of the Democratic party, work for bureaucratic changes such as a department of peace or create a new congressional committee to oversee peace efforts. I believe we should
work for the creation of a department of peace charged with working for the good of all peoples and not simply for those in power in the U.S. Of course, there will be efforts to coop such a department. But such efforts cannot succeed if the movement for peace and justice keeps its eye on what is happening. A Department of Peace can do little if it is not backed by citizens. But if it is backed it can be as important for peace as the Department of "defense" is for war. It should be funded by Congress with a new congressional peace committee and its appointees should be scrutinized by this committee.