WOLFGANG DIETRICH

Peaces

An Aestetic Concept, a Moral Need or a Transrational Virtue?

Paces

Un Concepto Estético, unha Necesidade Moral ou unha Virtude Trans-racional?

Resumo: A pesar de todo marco cultural existente no mundo definir a súa propia noción de paz, podemos identificar a paz enerxética como unha conquista da humanidade, derivada da experiencia arcaica do home nutrida pola Nai Natureza. Neste contexto, a participación na relación harmoniosa das cousas é sinónimo de paz. Este concepto foi desafiado cando as culturas mediterráneas criaron a verdade incuestionábel como mais alto principio do pensamento. Da verdade incuestionábel emanan normas absolutas, substituíndo a estética das relacións harmoniosas e promovendo, por tanto, o estabelecimento de institucións de poder. Este ensaio propón reverter o concepto moderno de paz moral chamando cara unha mudanza epistemolóxica en busca de paces trans-racionais.

Palabras-clave: Paz Enerxética, Paz Moral, Pós-modernismo, Trans-racionalismo, Psicoloxía Transpersoal.

Abstract: Even if every cultural framework in the world defines its very own notion of peace, we can identify energetic peace as an achievement of humanity, which derives from man's archaic experience of being nourished by Mother Nature. In this context participation in the harmonious relation of things is synonymous for peace. This concept was challenged, when Mediterranean cultures created the unquestionable truth as the highest principle of thinking. From the unquestionable truth derived absolute norms, which replaced the previous aesthetics of harmonious relations and therefore promoted the establishment of powerful institutions. This essay proposes to twist this modern concept of moral peace and it calls for an epistemological shift towards transrational peaces.

Keywords: Energetic Peace, Moral Peace, Postmodernism, Transrationalism, Transpersonal Psychology.

INTRODUCTION

Culture and Peace, as seen from the 21st century's continental European perspective of the author of this essay, are constructions based on the existential understanding of the world as experienced by certain individuals and groups in their every day's life. On an archaic, magic and mystic level of evolution this understanding is in a natural way "energetic", what means that individuals and commons derive their interpretations of the world, God and peace directly from their concrete experience with the divine.

The development of institutions such as the empire, the state, churches, monasteries, clubs or associations authorised gradually experts (kings, priests, lawyers, politicians…), holy books and codices to interfere in this natural relation and create binding norms for the masses. The direct link between man and the divine hence became interrupted by the ruling expert and his norm.

At the stage of rationality Enlightenment finally interrupted the peaceful relation to the divine completely and replaced it by rational explanations of binding norms. That is, rationality and modernity put reason in the place of God and one was satisfied with a sort of self referential interpretation of these norms. They are considered binding because the experts consider them rational.

The post-modern philosophy challenged this concept still by the use of rationality, that is, by the application of modernity's own tools, and contributed the insight of necessary perspectives for any interpretation of truths – that hence can only be understood as a plural.

This paper proposes to transcend this reduced concept of modernity. It does not call for "overcoming" modernity but rather for "twisting" it in the sense of Heidegger, that is, integrating rationality and differentiating it from its divine status in the modern world, so that the a higher spiritual-rational consciousness of peace and culture – which would always be than peaces and cultures – can be reached. Hence this paper does not call for a romantic illusion of earlier "energetic" interpretations of peace, but for a courageous integration of morally based, normative concepts of peace and energetically based spiritual ones for a non-violent and fruitful approach of the existing cultures, which at this level could gradually twist the pain of what we nowadays call the "clash of civilizations". For that goal we begin with a definition of what we call "energetic" and "moral" concept of peace.

EUROPE – THE CULTURAL PROJECT OF
BEING RIGHT INSTEAD OF BEING HAPPY

If we want to discuss the concept of *energetic peace* in the European context we have to unearth the ground of history until its profoundest structures. At the magic stage (Wilber 1995:258-315) of their evolution all the early cultures in the Mediterranean worshiped female divinities of fertility and peace. At least 55 variations of such Goddesses have been investigated so far with Isis, Astarte, Istar and Innana (Walker, 1983) as the most prominent among them. At this stage the creation of life, the nutrition of people and the privilege of living were all related to the Great Mother. The Goddess was the synonym of peace. Male kings derived their recognition from the grace of the Great Mother. They were considered sons, lovers and, in some cases even fathers of the Great Mother, or frequently all three simultaneously (this concept of course was the blue print for the later Christian concept of God). The king was responsible for the secular welfare of the community and often enough, when he failed, he was turned into the scapegoat. He was then sacrificed for the sake of the community to reconcile the Great Mother, when the harmonious and divine relation between society, nature and super nature – peace – had gotten out of balance.

Thus, in this ancient concept peace technically spoken was not too far away from what we still know today from Dao, Hinduism or Buddhism, including mystical traditions of Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

The continuous growth of societies, the development of more complex structures as well as the differentiation between horticulture and agriculture all resulted in an increased appreciation of the male counterpart to female peace and fertility Goddesses. Peace and fertility rituals dedicated to male divinities usually derive from stock farming. They emerged with the evolutionary transition from the magic to the mythical phase with extended social units defining themselves through abstract divinities and more complex systems of rule.

In the beliefs introduced to the Hellenic-European civilization by Indo-Germanic war folks war represented the natural state of social being. From this consciousness they developed a highly *moral* war ethic. Rather than a desirable state, they came to consider interruptions of war, known as *Eirene*, to be an inevitable interlude between more noble activities. Peace was not related to cosmic harmony or the Great Mother, it was

just an inevitable pause of virtue, like an onset of nothingness between the occurrences of battle. They are the "inventors" of the concept of *negative peace* understood as the absence of direct, physical violence.

It is only in the fifth century before Christ that Greek writers such as Herodotus (484-425), Aristophanes (ca. 445-385) or Plato (ca. 438-347) acknowledge this negative peace as a value in itself. Aristophanes in his comedy *Lysistrata* clearly opts for such a negative peace. However, he does not stand for pacifism and non-violence. In *Lysistrata* the women *fight* for peace against the men. Lysistrata´s peace is not a matter of having a heart of corn, but the result of every day's struggle and pain. People's lust for fighting is not out of bounds, but just harnessed for the goal of negative peace[1].

The recognition of negative peace by Greek philosophers and artists had a high price: It was Plato, who introduced into the debate a totally new concept of thinking not just about peace but of thinking and acting in general – *the truth*. If there is anything like a definite and still reachable bottom for the archaeology of modern thinking about peace in Europe, then we find it in this epistemological shift. With the transition from relational and harmonious peace to the concept of the one and only final truth the Mediterranean turns away from all its neighbours, invents philosophy as an intellectual virtue and Europe as a cultural project (Galimberti, 2005:85). For all the neighbours "con-science" continues to be the virtue of a common perception of reality and the central spiritual consideration continues to be the liberation from the illusion of the world, the individual and collective salvation, the harmony of things, while in the Mediterranean the emergence of truth creates a complete new and rather aggressive understanding of the world, in which justice, based on the supposition of the existence a final truth and the possibity of its interpretation through experts, reigns over energetic forgiveness. It is not a far distance from being expert of the truth to rejection of the other as untrue, condemnation, violence and war. This may be the road of glory, but it is by no means the road of happiness and peace[2].

With the emergence of the Greek city states (Polis) the concept of contractually arranged peace evolves. *Eirene* is the mythological daughter of *Zeus* and *Themis*, that is, peace is from now on considered a derivation of *power* and *order*. Peace thus does not float anymore within the harmo-

---

[1] It has been translated and published with a helpful commentary by Fried (1985).
[2] Heinz von Förster would later say, that truth is not only the invention of the lier, but even worse, just another word for war. Von Förster (1988:29).

nious relation of things but is rooted in the *One Order*, the *One Truth*, which is guaranteed by power. This change can hardly be overestimated because it fundamentally separates Europe from the rest of the world. For it is a frequently quoted wisdom of the spiritual traditions of the Orient, that you can be right and you can be happy (peaceful), but you cannot be both at the same time (*Apud* Rosenberg, 2004:9-16).

Through centuries from the Polis to the present the European understanding of peace has been based on the *One Truth*. This understanding inevitably produces a dangerous notion of security – *Phobos*, the phobic security of the institution - be it the empire, the nation state, the church or the capitalist world system. The institutional security overshadows the conviviality of individuals and communities. And throughout history this *phobic* security without conviviality turned out to be tremendously dangerous. Because where *Phobos* reigns, it needs and constructs agressors. It is fear that makes us perceive the mere existence of otherness as aggression, far more than a physically aggressive attitude of the other[3].

Security discourses serve as representations of danger and, in this sense, accomplish several functions. First, they interpret certain issues as threats from which the institution is supposed to protect the people. In this development, security discourses lift some issues or groups of people from the political and social scene and "*securitize*" them. From this angle and combined with the attitude of the *One Truth*, the representations of danger necessarily entail an interpretative task. Since the institution is presented as the protector of its people (the society), the same institution's role is reinforced through naming danger. In this sense the postulate of security tells us that total security is impossible. Insecurity is always present where ever security appears as an idea. Insecurity hence is not a paradox of security but the very condition of its possibility. Insecurity is the agonism that allows the promise of security to exist and provides the legitimation of the institution's defensive and protective role (Echavarría Álvarez, 2006:117-181).

The above concepts of truth, security and state were successively adopted by the Roman Empire. Under Emperor Augustus, *Pax,* originally one among many fertility Goddesses and Great Mothers of the Mediter-

---

[3] In the Buddhist's wheel of life *phobos*, fear is the key aspect of the animal's sphere. According to this Cosmo vision animals are fear driven by nature. Men have the potential to experience all aspects of the other spheres. Thus, fear driven human cultures are dominated by the beast's key aspect of life and hence rather unmerciful, unreasonable and unhappy.

ranean, was worshiped together with *Victoria*, the victory Goddess. Both together signify the peace of victory, while *Mars*, the fertility God of cattle raising and former companion of *Pax*, was redefined as a God of war approximated to the Greek *Ares*. The final transition from the magic to the mystical worldview was thus accompanied by a powerful and violent reinterpretation of the concept of peace (Weiler, 1995).

This also had an effect on the three large religions in the Mediterranean. Among Jews and Christians the word *Shalom (Salaam)* originally stood for the name of God, that is to say a God who was called peace and, therefore, *is* peace. With the institutionalisation of the church, he slowly turned into the *Creator God* that *gives* peace. However, this giving is bound to certain conditions as interpreted by God's earthly representatives. The myths of a personalised and singular God replaced the magical experiences of a highest divinity that most of the other cultures around the globe integrated into their mythologies and interpretations of the world.

In his epochal writing *De Civitate Dei* church father Augustine (354-430) still started from an *energetic* understanding of peace. According to him, for peace to reign, every being within the cosmic principle of order has to find its place. God is here again the *Creator* of peace. But peace and justice on earth, he says, would only be a temporary and imperfect reflection of the *pax aeterna*. Therefore God has to be the final goal of worldly peace. And with that the problem arises. In a reinterpretation of early Christianity's energetic principle towards a moral one, peace is no longer the *name* of God, but a *gift* of God. Humans, in the words of Augustine, can no longer be natural and spiritual members of the *house of God*, but they are on a moral road towards God. The road of a morally correct person towards God leads via justice, which manifests itself in the church as norm-giving institution. So the *social fit* (obedience) becomes a peacemaking imperative for the individual. And Augustine derives from the unavoidability of imperfection in temporary peace and justice on earth a reduced right to just war for peace (bellum iustum), if one of the conflicting parties obviously is at fault. The same process was observed within Islam and although it remained basically a Mediterranean-European phenomenon similar occurrences took place in other regions of the world.

Thomas Aquinas (1225-1275), at the peak of the European Middle Ages, substantially enlarged Augustine's principle of truth, social fit and just war, by declaring war permissible, if

- the warlord is the highest authority (auctoritas principis);
- a just cause is given (causa iusta);
- the war furthers the cause of Good (intentium bellantium recta).

With this proposal the institutionalized war is separated from the ancient, Germanic-anarchic concept of dispute and feud and declared an exclusively moral matter falling under control of the authorities. Peace once more becomes the negative not-war and therefore likewise a business of authorities (Ohler, 1997:59-82).

The Christian idea of a *Creator God* who *gives* peace to "men of good will" has fundamentally conditioned the modern concept of peace. From an enlightened social science's perspective the only possible interpretation of that would be that this peace is meant for those who count themselves among the community that resorts to this God. Those who do not are excluded from the peace order of this community and possibly exposed to an uncertain fate[4]. Modernity in turn while replacing God through rationality, Human Rights or progress still maintains the structure of belief. Such a concept of peace cannot be really universal because it rests upon the exclusion of all those social realities, which are not of "good will". Yet it has a universalistic claim in so far as pleasing for example God, Truth, Human Rights or Progress and Development refers to a moral code which is meant to apply everywhere on earth. The differential between this moral claim and social reality produces a merciless tension, which finds its expression, amongst others, in the missionary obsession, universalistic approaches to social and political questions and development thinking.

The self-conceptualization of the Enlightenment therefore included a rational reaction to the pre-rational concepts of peace and society. Wherever this succeeded, a new terminology for old paradigms developed. For example Thomas Hobbes (1651), one of the most important masterminds of modern peace regulations basically adopted the concept of a negative peace satisfying itself with the absence of physical violence, similar to the Greek *Eirene*. But there is an important difference. While the Greeks perceived *Eirene* as the less interesting nothing between virtuous something,

---

[4] This idea still was clearly expressed in the in the 1963 Pacem in Terris Encyclical Letter by Pope John XXIII: „Peace on earth, which all men of every era have most eagerly yearned for, can be firmly established only if the order laid down by God be dutifully observed".

Hobbes esteemed the negative peace as worthwhile societal goal. The impulse for a revaluation of the peace concept towards an ethic self-worth by agreement based on the model of the Roman *Pax* was given by Kant's famous treatise on Perpetual Peace (1795).

This approach later on transformed into the Realist and the Idealist schools of the academic discipline of International Relations. After the end of a "long bourgeois century" and out of the subsequent trauma of the First World War, an academic discipline for the analysis of the nature of peace had to be established, following the shocking insight that this long bourgeois century had not brought a system of perpetual peace, but instead an escalation of violence and destruction unprecedented in human history. With the agreement of May 30th, 1919, the British and American delegations at the Paris Peace Conference resolved to establish academic institutions for research on international relations. As early as 1920, the *Royal Institute for International Affairs* and the *US Council for Foreign Relations* were founded, followed by the German *Hochschule für Politik* in Berlin and the *Institut Universitaire des Hautes Etudes Internationales* in Geneva. These and other institutions were to conduct their research for several decades and through another World War before it became acceptable among experts to suspect that it may be precisely the linear, universalistic and reductionist basic assumption aimed at a paradise on earth, the *One Truth*, the one and perpetual peace, the one world society, and the one civilizing process that carries in it the germ of a self-reproductive structure of violence, and that this kind of idea of salvation is in itself intellectual violence because it simply lacks respect for otherness and its secrets.

These insights have been embedded in the new academic discipline of peace research that appeared in the late fifties of the 20th century. The introduction of a new debate was mainly attributed to the Norwegian Johan Galtung. As early as in 1958 this conscientious objector had founded his first peace research institute, PRIO, in Oslo with approaches very different to those of the science of International Relations. His breakthrough came in 1972 when he introduced the concept of *structural violence*, which soon proved to be an irresistible term for the debates around peace and war (Galtung, 1970). This post-Marxist notion completely discarded the realist idea of negative peace and was far more comprehensive than the idealistic concepts. According to Galtung, structural violence arises where political-economic structures impede individuals or groups from unfolding their mental and somatic skills. This approach inspired the claim for *positive peace* and a paradigm shift within peace research.

Twenty years after introducing *structural violence*, Galtung completed his model of violence with the term *cultural violence* and defined physical, structural and cultural violence as a coherent entity, in which the individual aspects mutually condition each other. The category of cultural violence, therefore, comprises any thought concept that legitimates structural or physical violence (Galtung, 1990). With this approach Galtung substantiated his pacifist criticism of Western capitalist and progress oriented thinking and called for the equal recognition of alternative concepts. The decisive factor is to no longer perceive conflict as an immoral opposite to negative peace but rather as a positive sign of social energy. This energy can then be extracted through non-violent means in order to transform problematic situations. Under this proposition key terms of international politics such as conflict prevention, peace building, peace keeping or even peace enforcement no longer make sense but are shown to block the potentially positive energy of conflict.

CONNECTING THE PIECES TO ACHIEVE THE PEACES

In modern, enlightened thinking, peace, and its twin concept development had been elevated to the mythical status of a worldly and eschatological paradise. From the assumption that every social phenomenon can be known and solved and that every conflict can be visualized in its entirety and understood in its concrete and subtle meanings and therefore also can be solved, it followed that peace and development were defined as feasible, practicable and desirable ventures, which could be attained through the civilizing process. The modern ideas of civilization and of development, thus, received their violent character not from being a fundamentally wrong project of domination. Many of the assumptions that it was based upon have been empirically proven by generations of sincere scholars and scientists and are *true* in an enlightened sense. Yet the relentless decoding of the secrets of being and their pornographic exhibition as well as their noisy commercialization had not brought a humanistic civilization, but an age of enlightenment, reason, modernity, civilization and development, which was synonymous with a global condition that has been empirically proven to surpass any previous period in terms of the military and industrial means of mass destruction. Never before was there a comparable destruction of social relationships, a comparable abuse of nature mistaken for a resource. The origin of the horror of this age is rooted in the link between the universal claim to truth and the possibility of its technical implementation.

It would follow that the idea of the one (perpetual) peace in the one world, as it is put down in all key documents of modern world politics, is, at least, sheer intellectual violence vis-à-vis those who cannot share this idea. Peace can neither be produced nor exported. Without being related to concrete places it will never have any social power and remain an abstraction in the brains of peace researchers (Illich, 1982:117).

Difference therefore is a key concern for peace studies. In the last quarter of the 20th century European peace research had arrived at this disillusioning and therefore *post modern* insight. The thinking of post modern peace research hence embraced concepts, which are located beyond universalism and the civilizing process, beyond the modernist belief in the One Truth of scientific stock-taking, and beyond the belief in the solvability of conflicts.

With post modernity we refer here to the state of mind of one or several generations that have had to painfully disassociate themselves from the great truths of the previous epoch, without having found for themselves a new unitary system of reference. This state could be described by the word disillusionment. People have become aware of the relativity of those truths in whose absolute validity they used to believe and they gradually turned away from Plato's epistemological inheritance. As a consequence, the One Truth has lost its binding character. From a pessimistic point of view, such a state could be interpreted and experienced as a simple loss of values and orientation, as anomy[5]. If one adopts an optimistic perspective, it is precisely the insight that there cannot be the One Truth (Derrida, 1985:9-91) or One Peace, which allows for a democratic plurality of truths or peaces.

Post modern thinking as a scholarly method is a response to this loss of basic truth of modernity, which before was viewed as certain. However, if modernity is understood as the societal project characterized by Newtonian physics, Cartesian reductionism and the nation state of Thomas Hobbes, then post modernity does *not* stand for an epoch which is equipped with a new paradigm of comparable efficacy and a comparable claim to truth. Instead, post modernity simply refers to that disillusioning

---

[5] The concept of anomy was introduced in the social sciences by Emilie Durkheim in Les règles de la méthode sociologique, Paris 1895. It denotes a condition of fear and lack of orientation of individuals, also a situation of lack of regulation in and among societies. In this paper the term is used to describe an analytical concept and is understood in the above definition, i.e. in its psychological and its social science meaning.

phase of the same modernity in which people increasingly doubt the universal truth of this paradigm. These doubts, and this perception, derive mostly from everyday experience, that is they stand for an important intellectual and social achievement, without being immediately the result of scholarly reflection in a more narrow, institutional sense.

The most important achievements and insights of post modern oriented peace research are the following:

- post modern condition and wisdom is to know and to act beyond the limits of one single criteria of truth;
- time-space, actors and themes of international relations are more numerous than the corresponding discipline believed during the previous decades;
- there is a higher potential and variety for action and the actions are not as easily foreseeable and predictable as the old think tanks still believe;
- legitimation, function and substance of international relations are only constructed and therefore no sacred truths;
- individuals, issues and their relations change permanently;
- what is perceived as true here and now might be wrong and unjust tomorrow and elsewhere (Tomassini, 1994:97-114).
- The consequences of such insights are as logical as they are revolutionary for traditional peace research and international relations:
- rationality is not enough for the categorizing of international relations;
- the claim of an unconditional rationality destroys the peaceful potential of modern thinking;
- supposedly marginal events at the peripheries, which do not fit with the explanations of realism and idealism, get unexpected importance for the international system and they can be established as „places of exile" within the modern world system[6].

Post modern peace research then had to acknowledge that war tends to "*assimilate cultures to each other, whereas peace is that state in which each*

---

[6] Referring here to the famous work of Wallerstein (1974), which provokes the question whether there is any escape from a modern capitalist world system.

culture blooms in its own, unique way" (Illich, 1982:116). The search for the One Peace was identified as part of a larger universalistic mode of thinking which in its totality rests upon disrespectful and therefore merciless basic assumptions, so that the guidelines for action and the real politics that derive thereof did at least have the potential for a continuous renewal of violence. But the disillusioning insight that the One Truth or the One Peace exist neither in the premodern/Christian/occidental sense nor in the enlightening/civilizing sense of modernity does not lead to arbitrariness. Instead, it is precisely the acceptance of a plurality of societies and pluralism within societies and their truths, often enough contradictory and incompatible, which requires a definition of difference.

For those societies, thus, which find themselves in anomy due to the conditions of modernity - anomy here referring to both the perpetrators and victims - the turn towards the pluralism of post modern philosophy does not offer a material rescue, but it certainly points a way. But if so, the world needs more than one peace for concrete societies and communities to be able to organize themselves. Therefore, about ten years ago we called for the post modern plurality of the *Many Peaces* (Dietrich, 1997). The respective paper provoked a lot of furious reactions. However, the story was not over. We still had the feeling to be caught within the invisible limits of intellectual taboos. Hence, the investigations had to be carried on and extended to even more profound grounds.

TRANSPERSONAL PSYCHOLOGY, TRANSRATIONALITY AND THE RECONCILIATION OF PEACES

Already from the very early tradition of Jean Jacques Rousseau the critique of modernity was always characterized by the paradox that this critique of rational thinking had to be expressed in a rational manner and argued along the lines of rationality. Post modern thinking was never able to overcome this paradox. Hence post modernity should not be misunderstood as the historical epoch that follows modernity, although the prefix "post" might suggest this. "Post" refers to a reflection of something, in this case, of modernity. Therefore, "post" indicates that the social value system of the time span that it circumscribes refers to a condition, which, although preceding it, still has effects, and remains relevant at a particular point in time. If this were not the case, the prefix "post" would be redundant. Therefore the fundamental question, how to overcome modernity, cannot be answered by the means of post modern thinking.

This is the fundamental dilemma of post modern thinking as a tool of peace research. But if the mass of factual knowledge, which was accumulated by modernity, is enriched by some orientative knowledge, not all truths of modernity have to be rejected or declared false or obsolete in order to be able to respect the parallel existence of truths which may be incompatible with modernity without being necessarily in conflict with it. These truths might be "aufgehoben" in a Hegelian sense: enhanced (lifted), preserved and neutralized[7]. And this leads indeed not only to a post modern interpretation of a multitude of peaces and societies but also to something beyond these (post-) modern notions.

Friedrich Nietzsche in *The Birth of Greek Tragedy* (Nietzsche, 1983:577-651) refers to *Dionysus* as the God of energy, and *Apollo* as the God of form. He demonstrates that the Greeks honored both Gods in kind. But with the occurrence of Christianity, the ethos of *Apollo* was identified with the way of *Christ*, and *Dionysus* was relegated to the dark. *Apollo* and *Dionysus* at the beginning are like form and energy, but later they are like *Christ* and *Satan*, like good and evil. The split between these two realities has created a psychic schism, which has determined the nature of Western civilization. It is crucial that the historic flight from *Dionysus* in the classic tragedy went hand in hand, as stated before, with the creation and development of the Polis and later the empires in the Mediterranean and their understanding of peace.

The modern nation state copies these originals. It is based on the systematic suppression of *Dionysian* energy. And the respective model of organization is not only expression of the actual condition of certain societies but a globalized imposition on conviviality. Thus the *Apollonian/Christian* ideal began to reign like a tyrant over the West and the rest of the world. A culture that constantly suppresses the energetic nature and desires within itself is reduced to a mere formal construct that – due to its formal character – cannot imagine or respect alternative Cosmo visions or energetic realities. Nietzsche calls this habit "*the white man's disease*".

If we begin with Nietzsche, we can follow at least two very important paths through the cultural history of Europe in the 20th century. The first leads via Husserl, Heidegger and Horkheimer to the French and Italian versions of post modern philosophy as expressed by authors like Deleuze, Derrida, Lyotard, Virilio or Vattimo, and to certain extend as well by Foucault and Baudrillard.

---

[7] I take this argument on Hegel from Ken Wilber and elaborate it in the next part.

The second is even more important in our context. Without Nietzsche Sigmund Freud and psychoanalysis can hardly be imagined. The idea of the suppressed *Dionysus* is the basic assumption for everything that has been developed in this context. Roberto Assagioli (1888-1974), one of the leading psycho-therapists of the first generation, would take Nietzsche's concept, rename his Gods *Eros* and *Logos*, integrate a lot of oriental wisdom into enlightened European tradition and demonstrate in his "psycho synthesis" the human potential to integrate constantly more and more complexity and awareness into the state of mind (Assagioli, 1927).

C.G. Jung would follow Freud and Wilhelm Reich, with Jung being the first one who, through his theory of the collective unconscious, went radically beyond Freud's theory on suppressed individual and sexual desires. Jung's proposal was nothing less than a fundamental concept, on which psychology could be established as an academic discipline, comparable to the importance of quantum theory for physics. While quantum physicians conduct research on wave-particle dualism or biologists on genes, Jung considered the investigation on the collective unconscious and its functional elements, which he would later call *archetypes*, the principal work of psychologists. Archetypes are "*universal, identical structures of the psyche*", which build in their total "*in all human beings the archaic legacy of ancient mankind*" (*Apud* Stevens, s/d:49). He defined them as neuropsychological centers with the ability to trigger typical patterns of behavior and experience for all human beings. Archetypes, according to Jung, provoke under similar circumstances the same thoughts, images, feelings, ideas and myths in every human being, independently of race, class, religion, geographic place or historic epoch. Jung did not oppose Freud's idea that the character of a person depends on individual experiences (e.g. suppression of desires) but he said that this would not happen on the base of a *tabula rasa*. The opposite would be true. Personal experience would serve to develop the "archetypical potential" of the Self, which is embedded in each and every individual from the very first moment of its existence, because it is a collective legacy of humanity. Our psyche, he said, would not be just the result of our experiences, as our body is not just the result of our food.

Especially from a peace studies perspective this is crucial: Jung says that each of us comprises the complete potential to the most horrible deeds of mankind, but at the same time also to the warmest mode of conviviality and solidarity. Nobody is free from even the cruelest aspects, but everybody has the potential to a very peaceful and harmonious interac-

tion with the others. It depends on the circumstances, which aspect is triggered and finally attributes a certain characteristic to an individual or even a whole group. However, nobody is absolutely free in the decision, which aspect is triggered. The psychic condition of an individual depends on the manifold interaction with the environment, and perhaps everything terrible in us is in its deepest being just something helpless seeking help. From today's perspective we can call this approach *trans-personal*.

CON-SCIENCE - QUESTIONS RAISING EXPERTS

Jung's theory opened the door for the modern European research on energetic phenomena in human perception. If one accepts the assumption of a complete and collective inheritance of human kind the question is raised how this could work technically respectively biologically. And at this point, through bringing to bear the energetic approach psychology can be re-united with physics and biology.

$E = mc^2$ means that material, visible existence is just one of many possible conditions of energy. Through the stipulation of quantum physics that every single particle carries the information of the whole universe, it also becomes evident that every human being due to its energetic nature and disposition is a carrier of the complete information of humankind. Through experience any of this information can be triggered and recalled.

While Wilhelm Reich dedicated his life to experiments with energetic phenomena and Assagioli developed psycho synthesis, *transpersonal psychology* emerged from humanist psychology, when Abraham Maslow (Maslow, 1969:200-208) launched the word in the late sixties and Tony Sutich founded the *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*. To cut the long story short, the fundamental insight – formulated against the mainstream of the time – was that deprived of transcendence and trans-personality human beings get sick, violent, nihilistic, desperate and anomic. They need something bigger than themselves to feel reverence and engage in a natural and empirical manner beyond the limits of the established churches and institutions. The trans-personal movement soon found its point of focus in the famous Esalen Institute in California, attracting besides Maslow people like Frederick Perls, Carl Rogers, Stanislav Grof and Ruth Cohn to conduct workshops of intense experimental and creative character (Walch, 2002:126). Thus, the institute and its experiments became a focal point of the alternative movements of the so called generation of 1968.

Scientists of various disciplines like Charles Tart, Roger Walsh, Francis Vaughan, Daisetz Suzuki and peace activists like Erich Fromm (1976), Ivan Illich (1982), Marshall B. Rosenberg (2003), Ervin Laszlo (1996) and probably the most famous author of this current Ken Wilber continued what those pioneers had begun.

The early link between these psychologists and the popular peace movement is Paul Goodman, one of the most influential social critics and radical peace activists of the 1960s who published *Growing up Absurd*, which looked at the problems of youth in the organized system of modern American society (Goodman, 1960). He wrote on many subjects, criticizing the failings of the organized technological society, and making practical proposals to create a modern society on the human scale.

Ervin Laszlo, philosopher and member of the Club of Rome, applied then a highly interdisciplinary method and, through his considerations on the *Akashic field* (Laszlo, 2005), managed to relate the mentioned observations of Jung and Assagioli to the latest theorems and theories of physics and biology, such as Ruppert Sheldrake's theorie of *morphic fields*. The "social field" that Sheldrake presumes as well as a magnetic or a genetic field, is a holon that continously expands and corresponds with every further field. Our mind, in his controversial theory, is not limited to our brain, it is extended between us and it connects us with the memory of the whole mankind (Sheldrake, *op. cit.*). Hence, as in the classical myth of Indra, everything that exists is interrelated. Ervin Laslo derives fom there the theory on the *Akashic field* and *Akashic record*. It says that anything that has happened is stored as universal memory and can always be accessed or recalled. Laszlo tries to explain how modern science has rediscovered the *Akashic field* of *perennial philosophy*. The result is a rather new approach to peace studies challenging the established mainstream presumptions.

When Johan Galtung (1996) launched the idea of *deep structures* for peace work and peace research, he referred exactly to this approach. It is also no coincidence that Galtung in 1993 named his newly founded peace and development network TRANSCEND <http://www.transcend.org>.

Ken Wilber, occasionally called "the brain" of the movement, emphasizes the existence of a universal mystic philosophy, the *philosophia perennis*, which is the beginning and the end of philosophy. He stresses that the evolution of the human psyche tends to generate a gradually increasing integration and complexity of awareness. The multidimensional *Self* acts in the center of the psyche amidst sensations, emotions, impulses, imaginations, thoughts, intuitions and in interaction with the external occur-

rences, as well as embedded in "love" for the evolution of individual and universal structures (Wilber, 1995).

In this manner the transpersonal psychology scientifically crosses the limits of individuality, which were so far constitutive of psychoanalysis and behaviorism. It turns the modern approach upside town. It is no more the distinguished expert, who raises a question, but it is the question (conflict) as an energetic phenomenon that gathers individuals. And as seen from this perspective everybody is an expert in the question that appeals him or her. The impact of this proposal on disciplines like peace studies is enormous. However, these new perspectives on human nature have not yet completely disseminated among the mainstream of social sciences. Therefore many analyses are lagging far behind the possibilities of the state of art.

The gain of transpersonal psychology as seen from a peace research perspective resides in the recognition of all earlier achievements of pre-modern civilizations and its practices. Pre-modern here comes close to pre-rational, but these terms are not identical in spite of the claim of modernity to differ from earlier stages of evolution precisely by the principle of rationality. However, it can hardly be denied that a multitude of rational wisdom emerged from pre-modern civilizations such as Buddhism, Hinduisms and Dao including Christianity, Islam and many more. Transpersonal psychology generally *twists[8]* such wisdom and its practice without in a conservative manner romanticizing a *Golden Age*. That is, it recognizes and integrates the tradition consciously into its own stock of knowledge, embedding, differentiating and re-interpreting it according to its own practice. It neutralizes eventual universalistic claims and enhances the traditional to the actual level of common awareness. Pre-rational wisdom hence is embedded in rational consciousness.

Rationality in this context is equally considered a specific wisdom and methodology related to a certain stage of evolution. Rationality is therefore no longer treated like another name of God – as it was the case in modernity and post modernity – but a useful tool that shall be twisted into a trans-rational interpretation of the world. Transrational, thus, is more than rational; it approaches spirituality, but not the ancient magic or mystic spirituality, which shall be twisted as well as rationality for the generation of a transrational re-interpretation of the world.

---

[8] *Twisting* refers to the Heideggerian term *Verwindung*, interpreted by Gianni Vattimo as a non-dialectical form of overcoming characteristic of a post modern, pluralist notion of history.

In the frame of peace studies this implies that the magic and mystic wisdom of pre-modern and pre-rational civilizations, in its still existing or as well as in its already disappeared forms, does not have to be overcome, forgotten or deleted from our memory, nor do we have to adore it in a romantic, conservative manner. But it must be recognized as common heritage of and for *all* human beings expressing the complete potential of our feelings, thoughts, words, actions and reactions. The more we suppress it in the name of rationality and *ego/persona*, the higher is the risk that it returns in an uncontrolled, violent and destructive manner, because we all are the carriers of the complete memory and everyone has the potential to trigger disaster.

As all the pre-modern and pre-rational societies were and are highly spiritual, twisting their wisdom includes the recognition of spirituality as a constitutive feature of human nature. Thus, a transrational approach inevitably has to acknowledge the spiritual character of human kind and has to fashion adequate tools to handle this aspect with all the achievements of rational thinking and the application of further human virtues, some of them forgotten, others suppressed in the name of rationality.

Such a concept allows transcending the contradictions of the modern age, without turning away from its most important achievements. For example the ideal of human rights can be recognized as a general achievement of the human race without insisting on the normative universality as stated in the respective declarations and covenants that disregard the cultural habits of many societies and hence created a lot of disagreement and irritation.

In the frame of transpersonal psychology the world ethos (<http://www.weltethos.org>) seems to be only the smallest common denominator of cultures, which is no longer needed here, because the *philosophia perennis* is the base of all cultures and their achievements are common heritage of mankind. This includes all the contradictions that may be twisted with the shift to a higher level of awareness - an awareness that we may call transrational.

CONCLUSION: BEYOND RIGHT AND WRONG IS THE PLACE WHERE WE MEET

More than anything the word peace describes the relations between human beings. Even the most radical esoteric understanding of internal

peace does not imagine it without an exoteric relation to the rest of the world. And, normally, if we talk about peace, we mean the relations between people and societies, not an absolute value. Therefore peace – how ever we define or perceive it – is about relations. It is relative and relational. Through the invention of the *One Truth* and its focus on absolute values the European culture lost a lot of its peaceful relativity and relationality. It became strong and cruel. However, once the absolute attitude is introduced into a culture it is no longer possible to return to a former stage of peaceful relation, as it is impossible to return to innocence. But it is possible to learn and to regain certain virtues on a higher stage of consciousness.

Traditional international relations and peace research from Kant's idealism to post modernism was always driven by a true longing for a *better* world in rational terms. Transpersonal psychology as a method of peace research does not overcome this traditional approaches of the discipline. It twists them and doing so it allows Europe and the North Atlantic a glimpse of a newly related and therefore peaceful world.

Transpersonal psychology acknowledges and preserves the spiritual virtue of pre-rational cultures as well as the achievements of rationality. Like post-modernism its roots can be in constructivism and the plurality of truths but additionally it uses phenomenological tools. One could say that post modern thinking still remains within the limits of the *Apollonian* world while transpersonal psychology tries to liberate *Dionysus*. Of course *Apollo*, not wanting to be ousted, tries to keep distance to all thinking that is not monologically rational. The appearance of anything real beyond the monologically rational causes fear to him – *Phobos*. And *Phobos*, as we have seen, drives his excluding and aggressive attitude against everything that smacks of heteronomy (Wilber, 1995:524). With other words, modernity, including post modern thinking, has to react hostile against any of these approaches, because it roots in the systematical rejection of pre-rational metaphysics. Further, the societal acceptance of any sort of transrational metaphysics means the immediate dissolution of modernity. Hence, the phobic reaction of the representatives of modernity against such proposals or considerations is logical and consequent.

Transpersonal psychology on the other side neutralizes these contradictions without resolving them. And it tries to enhance its own perspective on all these human legacies to rediscover the universal system of relations and reinterpret it in the frame of its newly gained transrational awareness. Thus, transpersonal psychology to a certain extent is applied

peace research. It starts from helping the enemy, who is a part of the whole, rather than destroying him – even the one inside ourselves.

That insight can be very helpful, because it allows us to learn about a multitude of different approaches to and experiences with peace without judging. It seems to be a rewarding new approach for peace research. It opens the door for mutual and intercultural respect and recognition. Especially in a European or North Atlantic context this concept helps to reconstruct the awareness for an energetic, spiritual sensitivity, that is an understanding that moral, normative concepts of peace may be respected in certain contexts – for example in the short and specific situation of an enlightened modernity - as absolutely useful, but that every normative concept of peace, how ever sophisticated it may be, comes from an energetic and relative ground and will inevitably be transformed into another energetic interpretation of relations, because on the long run without spirituality humans suffer anomy. Thus, peaces are relation. They have to be relative and relational, if taken seriously.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Assagioli, Roberto (1927; 1965; 1993). *A New Method of Healing – Psychosynthesis*. German: Reinbek; Rowohlt.

Derrida, Jacques (1985). *Apocalypse*. Graz, Wien.

Dietrich, W.; Sützl W. (1997). A Call for Many Peaces. *Schlaining Workingpapers*, n.º 7.

Echavarría Alvarez, Josefina (2006). *(In)seguridad en Colombia – Una Crítica de Identitades Políticas* [Unpublished Tesis Doctoral]. Castellón de la Plana.

Fried, Erich (1985). *Lysistrata*. Berlin: Wagenbach.

Fromm, Erich (1976). *To Have or to Be*. New York: HarperRow.

Galimberti, Umberto (2005). *Die Seele – Eine Kulturgeschichte der Innerlichkeit*. Wien.

Galtung, Johan (1970). Feudal Systems, Structural Violence and the Structural Theory of Revolution. In *Proceedings of the International Peace Research Association*. Assen.

Galtung, Johan (1990). Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, n.º 27.

Galtung, Johan (1996). *Peace by Peaceful Means; Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: Sage.

Goodman, Paul (1960). *Growing Up Absurd - The Problems of Youth in the Organized Society*. Random House.

Hobbes, Thomas (1651). *Leviathan*. [online] Available at [access 11.10.2005]: <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/phl302/texts/hobbes/leviathancontents.html>.

Illich, Ivan (1982). *Vom Recht auf die Gemeinheit*. Reinbek.

Kant, Immanuel (1975). *Zum Ewigen Frieden* [online]. Available at [access 11.10.2005]: <http://www.sgipt.org/politpsy/vorbild/kant_zef.htm>.

Laszlo, Ervin (1996). *The Wispering Pond*. Rockport: Element Books.

Maslow, Abraham (1969). *Die Reichweite der menschlichen Natur*. S. 200-208.

Nietzsche, Friedrich (1983). Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik; first published in 1872, republished with an autocritical commentary of the author in 1886. Nietzsche: Werke in vier Bänden/1; Salzburg [Caesar Verlag], pp. 577-651.

Ohler, Norbert (1997). *Krieg und Frieden im Mittelalter*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Rosenberg, Marshall B. (2003). *Nonviolent Communication – A Language of Life*. Puddle Dancer.

Rosenberg, Marshall B. (2004). *Konflikte lösen durch Gewaltfreie Kommunikation*. Freiburg: Herder.

Stevens, Antony: Jung; Freiburg, Basel, Wien. [Herder]. P.49.

Tomassini, Luciano (1994). Eine postmoderne Sicht der internationalen Beziehungen. *Welt Trends, Internationale Politik und vergleichende Studien*, n.º 2, pp. 97-114.

Von Förster, Heinz; Pörksen, Bernhard (1998). *Wahrheit ist die Erfindung eines Lügners – Gespräche für Skeptiker*. Bonn: Carl-Auer-Systeme Verlag.

Walch, Sylvester (2002). *Dimensionen der menschlichen Seele – Transpersonale Psychologie und holotropes Atmen*. Düsseldorf; Zurich: Walter.

Wallerstein, Immanuel (1974). *The Modern World System*. New York; London: Academic Press.

Weiler, Ingomar Hg. (1995). *Grundzüge der politischen Geschichte des Altertums*. Köln; Wien.

Wilber, Ken (1995). *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality*. Boston: Shambala Publications.

Walker, Barbara (1983). *The Women´s Encyclopedia of Myths and Secrets*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

*

Dr. Wolfgang Dietrich is a member of the faculty of the Institute for Political Sciences at the University of Innsbruck (Austria), visiting professor at the Institute for Political Sciences at the University of Vienna and member of the faculty of the Centre for Peace and Development Studies at the University of Castellón. He received a Ph.D. in history and literature at the University of Innsbruck in 1980 and a D.S.J. at the same University in 1984. In 1990 he was promoted to the degree of *Universitätsdozent* in Political Science. He was director of the European Peace University from 1995 to 1998. Currently he is program director of the MA Program for Peace, Development, Security and International Conflict Transformation at the University of Innsbruck and academic director of the Austrian Institute for Latin Americas, that runs a MA on Latin America Studies. Email: peacestudies@tirol.gv.at