



Edited by

NORIKO KAWAMURA | YOICHIRO MURAKAMI | SHIN CHIBA

BUILDING NEW PATHWAYS TO PEACE

Building New Pathways to Peace

building

NEW PATHWAYS

to peace

EDITED BY

NORIKO KAWAMURA

YOICHIRO MURAKAMI

SHIN CHIBA

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS | *Seattle and London*

Support for the publication of *Building New Pathways to Peace* was provided by the International Christian University, Tokyo, and Washington State University, Pullman.

© 2011 by the University of Washington Press

Designed by Pamela Canell

Typeset in Sabon

Printed in the United States of America

16 15 14 13 12 11 5 4 3 2 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

University of Washington Press

PO Box 50096, Seattle, WA 98145, USA

www.washington.edu/uwpress

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Building new pathways to peace / edited by Noriko Kawamura, Yoichiro Murakami, and Shin Chiba.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-295-99103-0 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Peace-building. 2. Peace. 3. Security, International.

I. Kawamura, Noriko, 1955 II. Murakami, Yoichiro, 1936

III. Chiba, Shin, 1949

JZ5588.B85 2011

303.6'6—dc22

2010053507

The paper used in this publication is acid-free and it meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Contents

Foreword by Johan Galtung vii

Acknowledgments xi

Introduction 3

1 On Tolerance

Yoichiro Murakami 20

2 To Forgive Is Human:

A Theological Reflection on the Politics of Reconciliation

Anri Morimoto 32

3 On Perspectives on Peace:

The Hebraic Idea of *Shalom* and Prince Shotoku's Idea of *Wa*

Shin Chiba 48

4 Decency, Equality, and Peace:

A Perspective on a Peaceful Multicultural Society

Takashi Kibe 65

5 Globalization, Culture, and the Strategic Use of the Arts
for Peacebuilding

T. V. Reed 81

- 6 Impediments to Human Security:
Social Categories, Privilege, and Violence
Martha Cottam 97
- 7 The Lessons of Peacebuilding for *Kyosei*
Otwin Marenin 112
- 8 Media Discourses of Peace:
An Imperfect but Important Tool of Peace, Security, and *Kyosei*
Susan Dente Ross 126
- 9 Establishing Credibility under Globalization:
The Role of Higher Education in Promoting Peace, Security,
and *Kyosei*
Kano Yamamoto 148
- 10 Can Grand Theories of the State Help Us Envision a Grand
Theory of Peace?
Gregory Hooks 167
- 11 “Remembering Is Not an Innocent Act”:
Reflections on Postwar German War Memory and Peace Studies
Raymond C. Sun 182
- 12 To Transnationalize War Memory for Peace and *Kyosei*:
Reconciliation of Pearl Harbor and Hiroshima
Noriko Kawamura 204

Bibliography 223

Contributors 251

Index 255

Foreword

JOHAN GALTUNG

The content of *Building New Pathways to Peace* places this joint Japan–U.S. project firmly at the forefront of contemporary peace research. During the Cold War, research projects mobilized the world’s intellectual strength against both a possible nuclear holocaust and the propaganda that then allocated blame and responsibility to one party only. Transnational and transdisciplinary peace research emerged, very much focused on conflict resolution and on disarmament—and not only nuclear disarmament. During the Cold War period, the focus was mainly on *negative peace*, which I have defined, in “Toward a Grand Theory of Negative and Positive Peace: Peace, Security, and Conviviality,” as a limited sort of peace, merely an absence of violence (as in a cease-fire, which does little to resolve the underlying grievances of the parties involved). In negative peace, the two parties may not be fighting with each other, but neither do they have a harmonious relationship. At best, the two parties in a negative peace are indifferent to each other.

It was this type of peace that interested the Cold War peace researchers, and they concentrated especially on two aspects of negative peace: how to prevent unresolved conflict from causing war, and how to control, monitor, reduce, and eliminate the instruments of war. Although this type of research was limited in scope, the work nevertheless was more focused on issues of mutual concern than were the egocentric and sometimes paranoid “security studies” of that period.

But the authors of *Building New Pathways to Peace* go further than these Cold War researchers, well into an area I have called *positive peace*. This type of peace is marked not only by an absence of violence but also by harmony between parties (a harmony that may or may not be intended!). The borderline between positive peace and negative peace is not clear, nor does it have to be: it depends on the focus of new peace research that, like all research, tries to explore new intellectual territory (in contrast to the field of *peace studies*, which covers only old issues).

If our focus is violence avoidance or prevention—and this applies not only to direct violence but also to structural violence (in which the social order directly or indirectly causes human suffering and death) and to cultural violence (in which aspects of culture can be used to legitimate either direct violence or structural violence)—then *negative peace* is the right term for what we seek. However, if our focus is to realize ever higher levels of violence-avoiding togetherness (beyond the bleak words of mere tolerance), and if we are interested in cooperating on joint projects that carry all parties to higher levels of human existence—all the way into the spiritual and the transcendental, with no fear of treading precisely where the angels tread—then we need to seek positive peace.

For example, take collective memories—either traumatic memories or (equally peace-threatening) glorious collective memories—and look at efforts toward conciliation (I do not say *reconciliation* as there may be no actual event in the past to conciliate). In this case, we should look at the question, Conciliation for what? To prevent future violence? To create harmonious togetherness at a higher level? Or both? (Negative peace and positive peace do not exclude each other.)

As another example, take interreligious relations. A division into four stages may be useful here: intolerance, tolerance, dialogue, mutuality. Intolerance is loaded with violence, from prejudice toward and discrimination against another religious group, to expulsion, killing, and genocide. But tolerance of other religious groups is a negative peace—in this case, there is parallel but passive coexistence on both sides. But this state of affairs is far from sufficient. Much better is a dialogue, based on mutual respect for and curiosity about the Other. This kind of dialogue explores the possibility of positive peace. But the dialogue operates only through mutuality: “I take in some of you” and “You take in some of me.” Here we are really in the territory of positive peace. That is, you seem to have a Truth I am missing, and maybe I have some Truth you

have been looking for and have not known where to find. Could we both, through dialogue together, build on our two Truths?

And finally, take direct and structural violence. To stop the former through a monitored cease-fire is good, but this results only in negative peace. And it is a good but negative solution to stop structural violence through mutual decoupling (*coupling* here means diachronic correlation, or the tendency to trace a trajectory together). In order to really address structural violence, recoupling (that is, a kind of peaceful reengagement) is needed. And to develop this discussion further, *direct peace* is an exchange for mutual and (as it says in the Buddhist *pancha shila*) equal benefit. If we can make this a lasting pattern, we get a *structural peace* based on equity, reciprocity, integration, holism, and inclusion. Then we can infuse the pattern and the process with meaning, with an ethos for striving ever higher.

Building New Pathways to Peace reflects a wide range of disciplines, as has been the case for previous peace research and peace studies. The book is interdisciplinary, with each author contributing insights from her or his own field. At the same time, the instructive introduction comes close to a transdisciplinary approach (and thus can serve as a guide for future peace research) when it explores the multiple meanings of words in various languages—particularly when it looks at the concept of *kyosei* in East Asia and the possible translation of this term as “conviviality” in Western European contexts.

Personally, I might also emphasize the “we-ness” of positive peace, the jump, its transcendence to a new level, its *sui generis* nature. Thus, the European Union is considerably more than cooperation among states with a terrible history of direct warfare and structural imperialism. Similarly, seven other international communities or unions are now gestating or are in the early stages of development: African, South Asian, and Southeast Asian groups are already established, and Latin American, Russian, Islamic (Morocco to Mindanao), and East Asian Communities (perhaps like the Shanghai Cooperation Organization) are on their way.

But even if these new organizations should rank high on internal levels of positive peace, they still may tilt externally in at least three different and nonexclusive ways. That is, these organizations may use their high level of internal *kyosei* for belligerent purposes against other unions and communities; they may find a way of coexisting with other unions and communities; or they may enter into the very difficult process of positive

peace, that is, a peace not only *within* their own organizations but also among these international groups and communities.

A look at twenty-eight bilateral relations (among the eight international communities and organizations mentioned above) reveals that there will indeed be some very challenging external relations—for example, the relations between the mainly Hindu South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) and the emerging Islamic Community. We obviously also need a “*kyosei* among the *kyoseis*,” and a United Nations that assigns veto rights to the major powers can never play that role because there is no equity in such a system.

Nor, at least in this context, can we look to Zionism—or to the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, who, it was written, “shall judge between the nations, and rebuke many people; they shall beat their swords into plowshares” (Isaiah 2:3–4). Israel has certainly judged and rebuked its enemies (and more), and this has not worked. But maybe a *kyosei* of Israel with its neighbors in a new Middle East Community could work? Maybe *kyosei* only works when there is structural peace? That is, maybe *kyosei* requires peace with equity, reciprocity, and the like? We could also look at the European Union, which has no provisions for veto or coercive power among its members and which incorporates negative peace and some positive peace within its framework. But how will the European Union act in its external relations with the seven other international groups? And how will it act in a world of residual Anglo-American dominance?

Qui vivra verra. Time will tell. And those who have read this book will be better equipped to see farther and deeper.

Kyoto, October 2010

Acknowledgments

The editors of this volume are deeply indebted to many individuals and organizations for their support and encouragement. Our work is one outcome of the five-year research collaboration between International Christian University (ICU) in Tokyo and Washington State University (WSU) in Pullman, which began in 2003. This collaboration was made possible largely through the research grant ICU received from the 21st Century Center of Excellence (COE) Program of the Japanese Ministry of Education and Science under the title “Research and Education for Peace, Security, and *Kyosei* (Conviviality).” We would like to express our deepest gratitude to President Norihiko Suzuki of ICU, President Elson S. Floyd of WSU, former ICU president Masakichi Kinukawa, and former WSU president V. Lane Rawlins for their strong leadership and commitment to the collaboration between the two universities. We are also grateful for the funding support provided by the Thomas S. Foley Institute for Public Policy and Public Service at WSU, the College of Liberal Arts and International Programs at WSU, and the Graduate School and the College of Liberal Arts at ICU. In addition, we would like to extend our heartfelt thanks to Lorri Hagman and Marilyn Trueblood of the University of Washington Press for their kind advice and encouragement, to Laura Iwasaki, Alice Davenport, Ernst Schwintzer, and Howard Munson for editorial assistance, and to Patricia Thorsten-Mickelson of WSU and Tomoko Nagaoka of ICU.

We are very grateful to Dr. Johan Galtung, founder and codirector at TRANSCEND, Spain, for his guidance and warm support of our research project. He has kindly contributed the foreword for this volume. Last but not least, we would like to express sincere thanks to many faculty members and graduate students at both universities, and the Institute for the Study of Intercommunal Conflict at WSU, who have helped with this research collaboration in one way or another. The collaboration provided participants opportunities for intellectually stimulating and joyous interactions and fellowship across the Pacific: a true realization of *kyosei*.

NORIKO KAWAMURA

YOICHIRO MURAKAMI

SHIN CHIBA

October 2010

Building New Pathways to Peace

Introduction

This volume is the outcome of a fruitful, five-year research collaboration between International Christian University (ICU) in Tokyo and Washington State University (WSU) in Pullman. The project, Research and Education for Peace, Security, and *Kyosei*,¹ was sponsored by the Japanese Ministry of Education and Science through its 21st Century Center of Excellence (COE) Program. This volume shares the results of the ICU-WSU collaboration with a wider audience by outlining the findings and reflections (both methodological and substantive) that emerged from a common endeavor to build a multidisciplinary theory of comprehensive peace studies. We hope this introduction will serve as a methodological prolegomenon to our shared task of developing a new grand theory of peace.

The title *Building New Pathways to Peace* captures the spirit in which WSU and ICU approached their joint quest for a grand theory of peace. The first word, *building*, connotes the dynamic and ongoing orientation and process that characterize our search for a grand theory of peace. The second word, *new*, conveys the distinct nature of this quest. We are seeking new ways to look at this subject and exploring new ideas and concepts that will help frame contemporary discussions of peace. In this volume, we discuss relatively recent ideas and concepts such as human security, decent peace, credibility, accountability, plurality, and multiculturalism. And in order to find new perspectives for a contemporary grand theory of peace, we have redesigned, reexamined, or reformulated

old ideas and concepts such as tolerance, *nomos*, chaos, forgiveness, reconciliation, justice, *shalom*, and *wa*.

The term *pathways* conveys the key idea that our endeavor is a process or development in a quest for peace. This word also suggests directionality, durability, and sustainability. We believe that helping to achieve peace as a consequence of our endeavor is important, but we also maintain that the process of moving toward peace is no less significant. The quest for peace is seldom spectacular or conspicuous: it is the laborious and mundane work of creating and maintaining peace. For us, it has also been important to stress the use of the plural form: pathways. The road to peace is not limited to one way or a few ways—we believe there are multiple roads to peace. In this book, twelve scholars from a range of social and human science disciplines use their varied expertise to explore pathways to peace. Thus, this book aims to share with readers multiple and feasible pathways to peace.

The title clearly shows that our ultimate goal is to realize peace. The following chapters demonstrate that the idea of peace is always present, in individual as well as group relationships. They also suggest that elements of peace are almost always buried under, or intermingled with, actual situations in our everyday lives, situations replete with the potential for violence and conflict. In other words, there will be no peace that is pure and absolute, that is not mingled with conflict-laden situations. What one can reasonably expect today is the possibility of either a rare peace or a narrow peace, both of which can barely survive in a world filled with violence, conflict, and antagonism. Each of us can choose merely a few possibilities for walking along this road of scarce peace. But there is no peace essentialism here that specifies our way. Therefore, we contend that we need a two-track approach, one that includes studies of the burden of the past as well as critical analyses of the predicament of the threatening reality that we now face. And if we accept this idea of a two-track approach, we have to take seriously the possibility of seeking a negative peace (that is, the absence of war, conflict, and direct violence) as one step toward the positive peace of social justice, cooperation, and *kyosei* (conviviality).

Recent Developments in Peace Research and Peace Studies

This volume belongs to the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary studies generally called “peace research” or “peace studies,” and it has pre-

supposed some recent developments in this field. In today's post-Cold War world, as globalization trends grow ever stronger, the issues of peace, violence, and conflict have become enormously complex and multifaceted. If the discipline of peace studies aspires to retain its relevance, it must take these characteristics of the current violent world into consideration as its foundational reality.

First, the actors of peace and conflict have become multiple and complex. They now include not only sovereign nation-states in the classical nineteenth- and twentieth-century sense of international politics but also multiple agents—regional groups and groupings, such as the European Union, North America, OPEC (Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries), Southeast Asia, and East Asia; various kinds of international and global organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the World Trade Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, hedge funds, multinational economic organizations, international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and even international terrorist and criminal groups; oppressed minority nations and ethnic groups; and global networks of workers for human rights, peace, justice, and the environment.

Second, the issues of peace, violence, and conflict are defined more broadly in the present day. Today's peace researchers consider not only regional and local wars and conflicts (such as the Iraq War, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and ethnic conflicts in various regions and countries) but also analyze overt or hidden oppression and the asymmetrical disparities of wealth and power caused by structural violence. They are, for example, the issues sometimes caused by the so-called North-South dichotomy: poverty, hunger, food shortages and malnutrition, religious conflicts, and mass-refugee problems. Today's world also faces wide-ranging threats that include global warming, environmental degradation, the exhaustion of natural resources, the AIDS and SARS epidemics, drug addiction, gender inequality, the proliferation of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, and military expansionism in the global context. It has become increasingly apparent today that the problem of safety and security cannot be resolved merely through traditional national security schemes. And it is also increasingly apparent that there is growing recognition around the world of this new human security reality.

Significant changes like these present new empirical and normative challenges for the discipline of peace studies. First, the traditional theme

of peace and war, which remained the fundamental focus of peace studies in the earlier stages, had to be replaced by the new theme of peace, violence, and conflict. Thus, today's peace studies pay increasing attention to the task of elaboration and application of conflict resolutions and peacebuilding, especially in the early twenty-first-century context of Europe and North America. Peace studies developed in the West today are often carried out through interest-based approaches, policy studies, and game theories.

Since the appearance of such ideas as peacelessness (introduced in the 1950s by Indian peace researcher Sugata Dasgupta) and the concepts of structural violence and cultural violence (later formulated by Norwegian scholar Johan Galtung), the field of peace research began to pay closer attention to the hidden violence found in poverty, oppression, conflict, and exploitation often caused by historical, cultural, and religious traditions as well as by institutional and structural arrangements and practices. These problems do not necessarily imply an open state of war, but they often suggest covert violations of human rights and latent infringement of justice for oppressed groups and communities. In the development of the critical studies of structural violence and cultural violence, peace studies have further advanced the critical analyses of violence, whether overt or covert, observable in multiple forms in today's world.²

In post-World War II peace studies of Japan, the aforementioned practical and technical aspects of conflict and conflict resolution studies and peacebuilding studies have been relatively underdeveloped compared with their counterparts in Europe and North America. Nonetheless, what has dominated and come to the fore in current Japanese peace studies are, among others, historical and empirical studies of wars and conflicts, critical studies of the threats of nuclear wars and nuclearism, and normative studies of the right to live in peace in conjunction with the Preamble and Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. This is understandable when we consider the historical context out of which peace studies emerged in post-World War II Japan: the nation's atrocious assaults on neighboring Asian and South Pacific countries, the United States, and the European Allies, and the enormous damages and suffering caused by the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.³

Peace research in recent years has also made important advances in establishing viable methods. One such development is the application of medicine or health science schemes to peace research. Neil Arya, David F.

Barash, Johan Galtung, and other researchers have recently reformulated the methodologies used in medicine, health science, and health care (that is, prognosis, diagnosis, and treatment) so that these methodologies may also be applied to conflict resolutions and peacebuilding.⁴ Moreover, the complex, multifaceted, and interrelated nature of peace and conflict in today's world has led more peace researchers as well as scholars in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences to jointly explore peacebuilding through multidisciplinary collaboration. Due to the particular reality of the issue of peace and conflict, peace and peace studies will bear little fruit unless the issues of peace and conflict are approached from a multidisciplinary perspective. We hope this volume will be a good example of a productive and successful multidisciplinary approach to peace studies.

What Form of Grand Theory Will Be Possible and Relevant Today?

An early-twenty-first-century quest for a grand theory must take seriously the skepticism of positivist and postmodernist scholars who have questioned grand narratives for the past several decades. These two intellectual currents suggest a shared recognition of the increasing complexity of human existence in the world. Coupled with this recognition is an understanding that it is impossible for any finite reasoning, knowledge, or theory to fully explain the reality that surrounds us. And an important question can now be raised in this connection: What form of grand theory will be possible and relevant in the world today? It is beyond the scope of this volume to offer a comprehensive and final response to this question, but over the past five years, participants at ICU-WSU conferences and seminars have agreed that the following points represent a minimum basis for overlapping consensus on a grand theory that is both possible and relevant:

1. A caution against a *dogmatic* grand theory that pretends to know and explain everything about human nature and the nature of society
2. A bottom-up search for a grand theory, which starts with empirical investigation and with local and contingent knowledge

3. A search for a grand theory that can be applied to concrete policy proposals
4. A search for the notion of peace that starts with negative peace but tries to go beyond, to embody aspects of positive peace such as social justice, cooperation, *kyosei*, reconciliation, and peace-building
5. A notion of peace that is combined with justice
6. A notion of security that goes beyond national security or state security in order to embody some aspects of human security and common security
7. A notion of *kyosei* that goes beyond the idea of mere concession and compromise, that is, *kyosei* must also incorporate personal independence and creative tension

Furthermore, the following additional postulates, derived from five years of ICU-WSU collaboration, have also emerged:

1. The notion of *kyosei* should be considered as a constructive vision for the future, that is, *kyosei* should serve as an end in itself and not only as a means to peace and security.
2. A grand theory of peace is *grand* in its scope, as it includes not only spiritual-personal dimensions of peace, security (or safety), and *kyosei* but also sociocultural, political, and cosmic-philosophical dimensions of peace.
3. A grand theory is *grand* in its vision, as it means to be not only a critical vision (theory) of what *is* but also an imaginative and architectonic vision (theory) of what *should be* in a future world.

In summary, we believe that a search for a grand theory of peace should not be undertaken in terms of a quest for an omniscient, monocausal, sweeping theory of explanation and advocacy. A healthy skepticism about every kind of “grand narrative” should be maintained. Second, the search should be accompanied by a deep awareness of the power-laden and ideological character of every system of knowledge and theory. To be sure, knowledge and theory have a potential for criticism, creativity, and fertility, but knowledge and theory are, at the same time, imperfect, limited, and fallible. We must always keep this in mind so that knowledge, theory, and reasoning may not be regarded as philosophical trump cards that negate all other considerations.

Furthermore, the quest for a grand theory of peace should be a response to crises in today's world—wars, civil wars, violence, the absence of peace and safety, environmental destruction, and structural cleavage between the haves and the have-nots. To us, this search for a grand theory is justified only by the strong demand we see for a new normative theory, which should serve the world by responding critically and constructively to the crises of our age. We are in search of a grand theory of peace as a philosophy of crisis.⁵ In this way, our current task of building a grand theory will assume the quality of an “epic theory”—“a type of theory,” in Sheldon S. Wolin's words, that “is inspired by the hope of achieving a great and memorable deed through the medium of thought.”⁶

The Interrelationship of Three Concepts: Peace, Security, and *Kyosei*

It is important to understand how the three key concepts are related to one another.

Inherent Tensions among Peace, Security, and Kyosei

The interrelationship of peace, security, and *kyosei* is not always harmonious and compatible. Consider, for example, how modern nation-states were formed. It will be evident that, as a rule, the notion of national security led to the establishment of security for more powerful nations or for the chief ethnic groups within a country. But in most cases, this national security was achieved at the cost of increased insecurity for less powerful nations and for minority ethnic groups. Security for one party does not necessarily mean security for all parties; in the worst case, security for one means exclusion and suppression for the other. In this case, there is an inherent tension between peace and security. Overall, peace and security can be elusive concepts in the world of *realpolitik*. Struggles over power and vested interests are seen on a daily basis, and it is always necessary to ask *whose* peace and *whose* security are to be served and actualized.

Similarly troubling issues can be observed in interpretations of *kyosei*. Depending on how *kyosei* is defined, it can mean either a convivial life with others or a kind of cultural essentialism by which to retain the purity

of one particular culture. This latter tendency exists in seclusion policies that give sanctuary to one culture under the slogan of *kyosei*. In the first fruit of the joint ICU-WSU grand theory project, *Toward a Peaceable Future: Redefining Peace, Security, and Kyosei in the Multidisciplinary Perspective* (2005), we saw a possible danger in this self-enclosed notion of *kyosei*, which was first introduced in Kisho Kurokawa's popular book *Ideas of Kyosei: Lifestyle for the Future* (*Kyosei no shiso: Mirai eno raifusutairu*).⁷ To secure his version of *kyosei*, Kurokawa introduced constructs or devices such as mutual nonintervention, disinterest, exclusion, and isolation. Certainly Kurokawa's book is an important contribution to the development of a theory of *kyosei*. We named it the "toleration model," for in it we saw some resemblance to Michael Walzer's arguments on tolerance. Thus, in our view, Kurokawa's theory is a toleration model in that its aim is negative peace, or a situation without conflict. In this model, there is no intervention and no interference from others: this allows a space for the absence of conflict and war. We see a more compelling theory of functional tolerance as a meta-theory of peace in chapter 1, by Yoichiro Murakami, in this volume. Murakami's meta-theoretical formulation of fluctuant equilibrium is grounded in the perspective of the philosophy of science.⁸ For our ICU-WSU group, his meta-theory of functional tolerance serves as the common basis—the *basso ostinato*, so to speak—for our task of forming a grand theory of peace.

Seen this way, it is clear that our project needs to reformulate and reposition the three concepts: peace, security, and *kyosei*. We must make clear the meaning and role of each concept in an overall grand theory of peace. Therefore, we would like to define these three concepts and clarify the role and the interrelationship of each (as we would in a work of cartography).

Cartography provides a stimulating visual framework for the construction of a grand theory of peace. Seen from this perspective, we can divide the task of constructing a grand theory into four dimensions: conceptual mapping, historical mapping, philosophical mapping, and institutional mapping. According to Edwin J. Lester Ruiz, cartography is "strategic deployment of local knowledge whose goal is to illumine, if not understand, pathways to peace, security, and conviviality."⁹ In our view, a grand theory of peace, security, and *kyosei* cannot remain at the basic analytical level of knowledge, explanation, and analysis. A grand theory must dig down to the ontological and inner levels of understanding, to

reveal many possible forms of transformative practice. In order to accomplish this multifaceted task, we must first map out the aforementioned four dimensions.

Security-Safety as a Relevant Concept

Media reports, government regulations, and the pronouncements of judicial bodies, for example, reveal that today's world and society are often portrayed as a series of insecure life spaces. Not surprisingly, security and safety have become bywords—and issues of security and safety have become some of the most prominent concerns of societies around the world. One might even argue that such issues are among the gravest concerns of our time. Thus, many thinkers today call for efforts, both theoretical and practical, to address the issue of insecure life spaces.

The world is plagued by insecurity and anxiety caused by diverse kinds of direct violence (for example, wars and terrorism), personal troubles such as disease and poor health, climate change, structural violence such as gender injustice and the disparity in wealth and power between North and South, and various kinds of cultural violence. The problems that threaten us all point to an absence of security and safety. Therefore, we argue that “security and safety” (*anzen*) and “inner peace” (*anshin*) have become relevant concepts for peace. Today, the absence of security-safety and inner peace has often become the very reason that people around the world concern themselves with the issues of peace, security, and *kyosei*. In other words, security-safety issues have become an efficient cause (the *causa efficiens* as Aristotle has defined it), inducing us to reflect on the structure of multilayered threats to peace, security, and *kyosei*. Therefore, a task of grand theorizing is expected to unlock the riddle of the predicament of the present age.

However, the concept of security (in contrast to security-safety and inner peace) has been employed in international politics and international relations chiefly in the sense of “national security” and “military security.” Therefore, before looking at how security relates to peace and *kyosei*, the idea of security must be liberated from its traditional bondage to state security discourse. One way to accomplish this is to place the issue of security-safety back in its original position—that is, at the level of the everyday lives of ordinary people (*Lebenswelt*), in the inner worlds

of individuals, and in the dimensions of civil society—and to redefine, reconsider, and understand it in the context of ordinary people's lives. In this connection, our group has emphasized such endeavors as the advocacy of “safety studies” (*anzengaku*), presented by Yoichiro Murakami; the theory of inner safe space advanced by Hidefumi Kotani; and the notion of human security, which is being discussed in various academic fields today.

Therefore, one might justifiably claim that security-safety has become one of the most relevant concepts in today's world. The issue of security-safety invites, prompts, and challenges us to explore and understand our society and our world in order to bring about a peaceable and convivial life space for everyone. To state this in a different way, we are faced with an urgent need to tackle the problem of security-safety in toto, and this requires serious reflection upon the issue of peacebuilding and *kyosei* from a multidisciplinary perspective. The issue of security-safety is one of the greatest concern in the world of today, and this propels us to search for a grand theory of peace, security, and *kyosei*.

Kyosei as a Practical Concept

What is the concept of *kyosei*, and what is its role in building a grand theory of peace? The Japanese word *kyosei* is very difficult to translate into European languages, and the contributors to this volume have rendered it variously in English as “conviviality,” “living together,” or “symbiosis.” In *Toward a Peaceable Future: Redefining Peace, Security, and Kyosei from a Multidisciplinary Perspective*, the word is romanized, and there is no English equivalent for the Japanese term.

In our view, *kyosei* has a distinct meaning, and its nuances cannot comfortably be translated into English. Perhaps the word *conviviality* may be closest to *kyosei* in the sense that both terms point to the significance of the reciprocity and intersubjectivity of the self and others. Both also imply a joyous acknowledgment of the self and the others/the heterogeneous. Scholars such as Ivan Illich have used the term *conviviality* since the 1970s in the field of sociology, but somehow it was never solidly established as an academic technical term within the social sciences.¹⁰ One reason for this may be the connotations of the English word *conviviality*, with its overtones of pleasurable eating, drinking, and socializing, that is, of having a party. Native English speakers have often found it dif-

difficult to accept *conviviality* as a technical term in the social sciences. But interestingly, most scholars from Spanish-speaking countries, as well as scholars from Eastern Europe and Asia, have found the term *conviviality* interesting, relevant, and functional. Spanish-speaking peoples know and commonly use the corresponding term *convivencia* in daily and professional life, and Asian scholars easily found the equivalent to *kyosei* in their native languages. In standard Chinese (Mandarin), the term *kyosei* (共生), written with the same characters as in Japanese, is pronounced *gongsheng* and is used very often. In the Korean language, the same characters are pronounced *kong-saeng*, and the term is often interchangeable with *sang-saeng* (相生). The contributors to this book found these facts and observations fascinating: people from diverse linguistic and cultural traditions have a sympathetic understanding of the meaning of *kyosei* as a term that expresses a convivial and reciprocal mode of life. Hence, rather than try to translate this word, we use the Japanese word, *kyosei*, in its romanized form. In this volume, *kyosei* basically implies both the attitude and the mode of solidarity between the self and the others/the heterogeneous. And this mode of solidarity in *kyosei* is activated through the joy of encounter and a mutuality of expression.

Based on these linguistic connotations of *kyosei*, how shall we redefine the term today? In *Toward a Peaceable Future*, we introduced three models of *kyosei* that have been used in Japanese discussions for the past three decades: the toleration model, the conversation model, and the commonality model. After acknowledging the importance and effectiveness of each model and critically assessing the pros and cons of each, we concluded that the commonality model is the most stimulating and offers the most solid rationale and significance for the future.¹¹

Because of space limitations, we cannot elaborate on all the meanings of the three models of *kyosei* here. Suffice it to say that for us the significance and charm of *kyosei* resides in all the gradations of meaning embodied in and expressed by this term. And here it may be useful to rethink the meaning and role of *kyosei* in the whole scheme of our grand theory. In our understanding, the significance of *kyosei* lies in the fact that the concept can play a practical and transformative role in an insecure world. The transformative praxis of *kyosei* is directed toward building a more peaceable society and a safer world characterized by convivial life spaces. Into these life spaces, *kyosei*, which includes social justice, cooperation, and equity, will spread (“positive peace,” as Galtung defines it). Through praxis, *kyosei* aims to change the status quo of injustice,

exploitation, oppression, and unfairness in order to create and maintain a life space of commonality and solidarity. In this life space, various groups and communities meet one another and find a common space and a common project. The life space of *kyosei* stands for the common space of encounters and interactions with other individuals and with heterogeneous groups, whether these parties are different nations, various ethnic groups, diverse religious groups, or different genders.

What does *kyosei*, this convivial attitude of solidarity and commonality, mean in this context? First of all, *kyosei* includes a mutual acknowledgment of the distinct identity of both self and others as well as a mutual affirmation of the equality of others. Here, *kyosei* represents respect for distinction and equality. Hannah Arendt confirms this characteristic of distinction coupled with equality in her notion of plurality.¹² This Arendtian notion of plurality is the first element of the concept of *kyosei*.

We have already discussed the notion of tolerance. Tolerance is the second element of *kyosei* that is already implied in the concept of plurality discussed above. Tolerance can mean different things to diverse theorists. Michael Walzer, for instance, defined tolerance rather dispassionately in terms of “coexistence with the heterogeneous.”¹³ This is a considerably remote sense of tolerance that stems from the Latin word *tolero* (to bear or to be patient with). The remote, dispassionate, and distanced notion of tolerance is significant, because it provides the life space with the minimum and necessary condition for commonality in a pluralist society. As already mentioned, this distanced notion of tolerance somewhat resembles the concept of negative peace, the absence of conflict and antagonism. Murakami’s meta-theory of functional tolerance belongs to this category of negative peace.

The tolerance that *kyosei* presupposes, however, can be expressed in more positive terms. *Kyosei* also means a more substantial and positive attitude of commonality, which respects and affirms the distinct identities and difference of others as well as their personalities and characteristics. Tolerance here means an affirmation and respect for commonality with the others/the heterogeneous. Tolerance in this sense matters, especially in the context of *kyosei* with different nations and ethnic groups or with people of a different gender. Tolerance in this sense does *not* mean assimilation or annexation or fusion. This type of tolerance embodies respect for the existence and values of others: its premise is the due recognition of the heterogeneity of others.

Fairness is the third important element of *kyosei*. Fairness means due

recognition of the inherent identity and dignity of others. It incorporates a deep appreciation of the concrete situation in which others are placed and whether these others are individuals or groups. Fairness certainly is derived from the preceding elements of plurality and tolerance. The fact that *kyosei* embodies fairness within itself means that it harbors the Aristotelian sense of remedial justice. Remedial justice demands the rectification of such imbalances as inequality, differential treatment, and discrimination among parties. Aristotle's particular definition of remedial justice is that one should compensate and repay the same amount as the damage one has caused. Fairness against a backdrop of remedial justice is especially relevant to the idea of *kyosei* in relation to the natural environment.¹⁴

The fourth element of *kyosei* is conviviality, for *kyosei* includes an aspect of joyous recognition of self and of others. The commonality of *kyosei* is based on the sharing of joyous existence. In its original sense, *kyosei* always includes joyous solidarity with others. As the term *conviviality* suggests, *kyosei* also expresses a convivial attitude and mode of life together, that is, an enjoyment of encounters, fellowship, and inter-relationships.

If *kyosei* is viewed basically as a transformative and practical concept, it will be easier to understand its character as the normative principle that directs and propels one's action and commitment to others. For example, the aforementioned *kyosei* between humankind and the natural environment poses a normative value judgment such as fairness understood as remedial justice. Furthermore, *kyosei* in its relationship with peace is both an end and a means. On the one hand, *kyosei* incorporates the means and conditions for achieving positive peace; on the other, *kyosei* may also mean the goal of peace, as long as *kyosei* either remains a significant element of positive peace or embodies in itself the substantial value of peace. Thus, the relationship between *kyosei* and peace is paradoxical, as these two concepts signify both means and ends for realizing each other.

Peace as a Teleological Concept

In this section, the expression *teleological concept* has nothing to do with the philosophical teleology assumed by Aristotle's philosophy of nature or by Hegel's philosophy of history. By *teleology*, we mean the idea that a