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Background

In recent times the teaching of philosophy in almost all regions of the world has been dominated by the writings of Western philosophers. This relates to the predominance of published works in European languages, to colonial ideologies, and to the higher output of postgraduate degrees in philosophy in North America and Europe, over the past two centuries. In order to strengthen local, regional and global awareness of the rich philosophical traditions of many regions of the world, UNESCO Social and Human Science Sector's program in philosophy has launched programmes on inter-regional philosophical dialogues in 2004. The programme currently has three working groups, and this one examines the role of philosophy in war and peace.

This was the second meeting of the Asia-Arab Interregional Philosophical Dialogues working group on the Roles of Philosophy in War and Peace, following the first meeting held in 2006 in Rabat, organized by UNESCO Rabat. The philosophical dialogues are coordinated by the UNESCO offices in Rabat and Bangkok, in coordination with the Philosophy Section in UNESCO Paris headquarters. This meeting was jointly hosted by the Regional Unit for Social and Human Sciences in Asia and the Pacific (RUSHSP) of UNESCO Bangkok and UNITAR Hiroshima. This meeting was also held overlapping with a meeting of Working Group 12: Nuclear Dialogues and Nuclear Energy Technologies, in the Ethics of Energy Technologies in Asia and the Pacific (EETAP) project, and Hiroshima was chosen for its linkages to promotion of peace following its experience as the site of the first bombing of a city by a nuclear weapon.

Summary

The working group had extensive interactive discussion on the role of philosophers in war and peace. In the conference sessions on 26-27 July, presenters were asked to give 15 minute talks, followed by questions and discussion. The presentations will be made available on the RUSHSP website (http://www.unescobkk.org/rushsap). The meeting was jointly chaired by Darryl Macer, UNESCO Bangkok and Souria Saad Zooy, UNESCO Rabat, the project coordinators. The papers are expected to be published in an eBook, which will be supplemented by some papers from the first meeting held in 2006 in UNESCO Rabat.

There were approximately twenty-five meeting participants in the working group session from Australia, Canada, France, India, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Korea, Morocco, New Zealand, Switzerland and USA. Participants attended in their individual capacity and in addition to philosophy, they came from engineering, education, political science and international relations, ethics, environmental science and environmental studies, law, medicine, and anthropology, as well as persons from civil society organizations. There were fifty participants at the workshop.

Meeting Report
Dr Macer explained the role of the working group and noted that he wanted to bring philosophers back into relevance on the subject of war and peace. Dr. Macer also provided brief descriptions of some closely related working groups in the project, explaining the background and providing an overview of the Asia-Arab Philosophical Interregional Dialogues project, and the rationale for the Roles of Philosophy in War and Peace working group. He also provided brief descriptions of the working groups currently in the project, which include:

- Challenges of globalization to philosophy and democracy
- Philosophy facing the challenges of modern technology
- The roles of philosophy in war and peace

Ms. Nassrine Azimi, director of UNITAR Hiroshima, welcomed participants and there were excursions to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, with an introductory lecture by the Assistant Director and a chance to visit the Museum and Hiroshima Peace Park.

The working group first actively discussed the role of philosophers and philosophy in general. Dr Sivanandam Panneerselvam, professor of philosophy at the University of Madras in India, said that the definition of philosophy has been changing, and currently it is the duty of the philosopher to interpret practical matters, respond to social problems, and shape the future of society. One example of this is Habermas’ inquiry of the duty to respond to the 911 event (the 2001 terrorist air strike in USA). Thus, the philosopher's role has an aspect of social responsibility. Philosophers collectively need to involve themselves in all problems because they may be the only thinkers who have the tools to solve some of them, including terrorism and human rights.

Dr Abessamad Tamouro, professor of philosophy at l’AMP Rabat in Morocco, noted that citizens might not independently decide their courses of action. It may be desirable to ensure that people decide independently and philosophers may have a role to play in facilitating this. There are three ways of thinking in philosophy: each individual’s ‘personal’ philosophy in life, the products of thinking philosophically, and teaching. He said that while we have questions to think about in life and on the teaching content for philosophy, we need to have philosophers to generate the products of philosophical thinking. Mr Kouame Oussou, an international relations graduate student at International Christian University in Japan, thought that laws merely reflect political interests. We need to find values. How can we revive the sense of value into people – could the philosopher merely discuss such problems or should s/he do more?

An issue raised by the group included the definition of philosophy. Dr Tamouro said that it is not a solution to problems, but rather the process of thinking about them. Philosophy is an interrogation about real problems such as decisions about our life, health, and peace. Philosophy is also about asking how we can have a 'moral conscience', and in this regard, we need inquiry. Philosophy’s solutions to problems need to be distinguished from philosophy itself; otherwise, confusion exists and society will ask philosophers to come up with solutions to social problems. Politicians ‘create’ or frame the problems/issues, not philosophers. Thus, in thinking about and posing problems, we need to be aware about the supposed 'source' of these problems. Dr Ayoub Abu-Dayyeh, an engineer and president of the Society of Energy Conservation and Sustainable Environment in Jordan, believed that philosophy had taken on a different duty in contrast to earlier eras. Philosophers expressed the ideologies of their time, sometimes bad and sometimes good. Contemporary philosophical ideology now links philosophy, economics, political science, and other academic disciplines. This can also be seen if one considers contemporary philosophers, such as Francis Fukuyama. Mr Oussou stressed the etymological roots of ‘philosophy’ as a combination of philos and sophia, which
mean ‘love’ and ‘think’. Thus he said philosophers are meant to think, and to provide solutions, but not be activists or politicians. Activism changes the subject which philosophers think about. Participants agreed that philosophers change what they start. Dr Daniel Nesy, professor and head of philosophy at the University of Kerala in India, noted that philosophy needs to be developed as a way of thinking, and that philosophy prompts the answers but does not answer them directly. Rather, the philosopher helps others find their own answers. In this regard, the Socratic method can be used.

Another issue discussed concerned philosophical methodology. Dr Rainier Ibana, professor of philosophy at Ateneo de Manila University in the Philippines, said that philosophy begins with finite and local problems. Through a process of critical reflection, we are able to manage to aspire for global humanity. It is important to recognize all the local starting points and elevate each starting point to reach the abstract and fundamental levels. Dr Ali Benmahklouf, a member of a French bioethics advisory board and professor of philosophy at the University of Nice in France, said that philosophy helps with governance of the self and understanding the philosophical ‘other’. True mutual understanding, an understanding of the ‘other’, can be engendered through learning about various philosophical traditions other than one’s own. This can also involve studying one’s own philosophy; the deeper one reaches into a given philosophical tradition, the closer one becomes to other philosophical traditions because similar themes and values can be unearthed. It is also about the spirit and effort of attempting to understand others as much as possible. Other philosophical challenges include bridging cultural divides, gender inequality, and implementing the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Dr Nesy noted that philosophy needs to be developed as a way of thinking, and that philosophy prompts the answers but does not answer them directly. Rather, the philosopher helps others find their own answers. In this regard, the Socratic method can be used.

Another issue concerned the role of philosophy among the humanities and social sciences. Dr Masahira Anesaki, a medical doctor and professor at Kinki Health Welfare University in Japan, noted that if the role of philosophy is to observe phenomenon, induce knowledge, and apply it through deductive thinking, then this process should be used to help develop other subjects. Can this role also be incorporated into other subjects? Dr Naoshi Yamawaki, professor of philosophy at the University of Tokyo in Japan, thought that philosophy in Japanese universities was no longer progressing and that it cannot be institutionalized, but philosophy needs to be revived, led by political or public philosophy. The new role of philosophy was to mediate the different academic disciplines. Masahiro Morioka, professor of philosophy at Osaka Prefectural University in Japan, also believed that the subject of philosophy was not non-progressing in Japanese universities. There is little dialogue between university academic disciplines. Ms Kayo Uejima, a primary school teacher and director of the Lablink NGO in Japan, was of the opinion that, at least in some ways, philosophy overlaps heavily with psychology.

Another issue discussed concerned the freedom of philosophers and dangers to philosophy. Dr Tamouro observed that in some places, philosophical thinking outside of accepted limits is forbidden or limited. Dr Abu-Dayyeh questioned why state governments would exercise control over philosophers, and as Dr Ibana noted, in some instances, philosophers lose their lives due to persecution by the state. Dr Akira Tachikawa, professor of philosophy at International Christian University in Japan, noted that philosophy can become a political tool, with financial compensation being a factor. Thus, a spirit of criticism to constantly examine, question, and inquire not only philosophical content but the role of philosophy itself is important so that it does not get subverted.
There was substantial discussion about philosophy, education, and general society. Dr Insuk Cha, professor of philosophy at Seoul National University in Korea, introduced the Asia-Pacific Philosophy Education Network for Democracy (APPEND), inaugurated in 1995. It is now engaged in a project on philosophy teaching. Dr Nesy said that in India, philosophy is the least desired subject in universities, and one of the philosophical journals has asked how philosophy could become more popular at universities. She thought that UNESCO should show leadership in introducing philosophy at all educational levels. Ms Azimi said that philosophy needs to be taken into the public space because there is an absence of it at UN meetings, boardrooms, and other settings. The role of philosophy is to be in the public space. Currently, however, important meetings are devoid of philosophical values and reflection. Yet, such understanding could greatly aid in areas such as treaty-making, where without consideration of values, implementation can become difficult. Thus, philosophy should be taken beyond academic curricula, so how can this be done? Dr Ibana said that philosophy is for everyone, regardless of their occupation. For instance, engineers need to have philosophical and ethical training in addition to their technical training. Dr Nesy asked how philosophy could be taken into the public sphere and to policy-makers. Regarding the former, she suggested a short-term course. Regarding the latter, she commented that governments often ignore philosophers. Dr Luca Scarantino, professor of philosophy at EHESS in France, noted that philosophy is playing a role in society and does contribute to public debate. However, he noted that further action could be taken by organizations such as UNESCO and FISPH in countries where there is a lack of philosophers. He suggested providing courses to such countries and mix philosophy from different regions and cultures together in a true interregional dialogue.

There was detailed discussion of philosophy teaching at universities. Dr Nesy said that in India, philosophy is the least desired subject in universities, and one of the philosophical journals has asked how philosophy could become more popular at universities. Dr Morioka believed that at Japanese universities, philosophy teaching consists primarily of European philosophy. Western philosophy forms the core of teaching activities and other traditions are on the periphery. Mr Keisuke Tachiyama, an environmental studies graduate student at Kyoto University in Japan, noted that, as a student in a Japanese university philosophy course, the debate was often one-sided, whereas Canadian university courses had debates that were multi-faceted. Dr Abu-Dayyeh said that only a fraction of universities in Jordan teach philosophy. One possible reason is because it is perceived as a play of words.

As another sub-issue on philosophy and education, there was discussion about philosophy and children’s education. Dr Benmakhlouf believed that philosophy is also for children. By changing the ‘scale of analysis’, philosophy can be made accessible to children, despite loss in breadth in depth. One example involves an analysis of Alice in Wonderland. Such analyses can instill a sense of healthy skepticism which may help in large-scale problems such as a perceived ‘clash of civilizations’. Ms Uejima said that, as a primary school teacher, she found that experience and process are very important for children. She used a holistic approach involving awareness, intention, and harmony with everything. There is too much ‘artificial’ civilization impinging on the learning and living process which dampens reflection and thinking. Teachers, as part-philosophers, need to use a holistic approach with reflection and thinking.

The participants unanimously agreed that a declaration or a statement may be forthcoming from the meeting. Dr Ibana believed that a Hiroshima statement would be beneficial, and it could include the subject of philosophers being restricted and killed in some
countries; that death is tragic; and that attention needs to be drawn attention to misery. Dr Cha said that he had earlier proposed a universal declaration on perpetual peace by leading philosophers of the world, and perhaps this idea could be revived because it had not been taken up. Consciences need to be awakened over the plight of the oppressed. There was a question whether a Declaration of perpetual peace is meaningful now, but Dr Cha responded that if a Declaration of perpetual peace is not, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would be illogical. Dr Benmakhlouf mentioned that if there is a UNESCO book on perpetual peace, perhaps there should be such a declaration. In addition, the more explicitly such a perpetual peace is made, the more one contributes to such a change. Ms Azimi asked whether a point of view, such as a declaration, could be developed as a higher point of reference to crystallize intangible values which can be used to provide greater recognition to moderate voices (which are often drowned by extremist ones). She commented that it is difficult for philosophers to adjudicate without such tools. The two Statements which were proposed and agreed at the end of the workshop are in the annex.

The next day saw the start of the Joint UNESCO-UNITAR Dialogues on the Role of Philosophers in War and Peace, with the number of persons doubling. In the Introduction, Dr Darryl Macer provided an overview of UNESCO’s activities as relevant to the conference and an overview of the Asia-Arab Interregional Philosophical Dialogues project. It was noted that War and peace, however defined, are in constant change. Although war and peace have been discussed by innumerable philosophers over the course of human history, consideration of war and peace from a philosophical perspective remains just as important for discussion and debate today. Some factors that call upon the community to engage in dialogue include:

- The changing political nature of war. For instance, wars between state and non-state actors have increased (as in the “war on terror”) even as wars have become less often colonial in motive.
- Mass communication has brought current events, including those involving war and peace, to more people than before.
- New technology can be abused, including nuclear and biological weapons and warfare by remote control.

In previous cross-cultural dialogues of the UNESCO Asia-Arab Interregional Philosophical Dialogues (coordinated by UNESCO Bangkok and UNESCO Rabat), philosophers clarified some basic philosophical premises and applied them to concrete experiences of war and peace. Emphasis was also placed on the importance of practical philosophy, which seeks to find the “path” to greater understanding of war and peace through dialogue. The objectives of the Dialogues are to:

- Provide materials, case studies, and/or papers to be incorporated into volumes for publication which will be useful resources for philosophy teaching;
- To bring philosophers together for ongoing collaboration;
- To facilitate cross-cultural dialogue with goals of joint paper-writing and collaboration; and
- To identify concrete areas to focus further dialogue on war and peace from a philosophical perspective.

The mission of UNESCO’s Social and Human Sciences (SHS) division is to advance knowledge, standards, and international cooperation to facilitate social transformations conducive to universal values of justice, freedom, and human dignity. UNESCO has been active in bioethics, and it has facilitated several bioethics declarations that member countries have unanimously agreed to. The first Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights
was part of UNESCO’s 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, but the core principles in such declarations are about ethics – both descriptive and normative – can be used in other areas of discussion. One of the goals of philosophical dialogues is to discuss how to balance such principles, while recognizing that dialogue is temporally dynamic. Another goal of dialogue is to develop an understanding of ourselves and others. There is a predominance of western philosophy, reflecting the number of published works and graduate degrees in North America and Europe. To strengthen other traditions, the UNESCO SHS program on philosophy launched the interregional dialogues. The aim is to publish papers, provide resources for philosophy teaching, and networking to identify common philosophical and/or ethical issues.

The first session of the conference was Violence and Non-violence, starting with “The Use of Non-violence in War and Peace” by Dr Sivanandam Panneerselvam, professor of philosophy at the University of Madras in India. Dr Panneerselvam illustrated various means of using non-violence in war and peace, with a particular focus on the Indian philosophical tradition. He began with some general comments about peace and war, noting that war is not the opposite of peace but rather as an effort to establish a true peace in a situation of injustice. There needs to be a deliberate and serious commitment to avoid conflict because it can evolve into armed violence of war. He provided perspectives from Indian philosophy, as well as explaining pacifism, just war theory, and war crimes and universal human rights.

On the issue of conflict, he discussed the tension between individuality and group rights, noting that communitarianism has superseded libertarian individualism and statism because it provides a balance between the two. A politics of equality needs to be balanced with a politics of difference, especially in the context of multiethnic communities and nations. These two approaches can also be seen in Habermas’ reinterpretation of the tradition of universal individual rights and Taylor and Kymlicka’s efforts to develop a liberal theory of group rights, both being attempts to resolve conflicts at a political level.

Dr Panneerselvam then turned his attention to the use of non-violence by Gandhi, whose two main principles were truth (satya) and non-violence (ahimsa). Gandhi used these to explain the dangers and consequences of war. Divinity in human beings established the possibility of permanent peace, or when humans recognize essential unity with truth or god. Gandhi was of the view that when a person achieves this state of realization, s/he develops a spirit of renunciation towards imperialism, power, and violence. Finally, Gandhi’s principles could be useful in resolving terrorism.

In the discussion, Dr Ayoub Abu-Dayyeh, an engineer and president of the Society of Energy Conservation and Sustainable Environment in Jordan, said that arguments for both peace and war can be found in every religion and tradition. Dr Panneerselvam replied that events such as 9/11 are a reflection of different cultures interacting, so it is prudent to examine philosophical issues from different perspectives. He agreed that while all religions preach peace and non-violence, their application differs; theory and application are separate. The application of religious principles can often become narrow-minded and often fails to take into consideration the wider perspective.

The next presentation was “Violence and Dialogue: An Epistemic Analysis” by Dr Luca Scarantino, professor of philosophy at EHESS in France. He applied an epistemic analysis to violence and dialogue. While the conditions in which violent attitudes and behaviors come about fall within the domain of the social sciences and the humanities, the fundamental
The epistemic modalities underlying them belong to philosophy. The epistemic experience emerges through lived experiences, which transpose on to a transcendental plan where it can be developed in common and give rise to discussion rather than dogma, consultation rather than coercion, and persuasion rather than violence. This common plan of communication and elaboration of our experiences is the public and historical moment of the formation of meaning. In releasing the intuitive level from its determinateness through a system of transcendental ideas, reason projects the different and particular pragmatic experiences into a relational framework of ideas. It is at this higher level that the different individual intuitions can interact together, participate and alter the shared heritage which is the transcendental subject.

The epistemic roots of violence lie in a substantialization of the formal and intentional structures of knowledge. To reduce the transcendental plan to a substantial concreteness means cutting off the development of the interaction and meaning of formation. Authoritarian imposition arises out of this act of prevarication. At the same time, social cohesion is destroyed. Public participation and exchange are erased in favor of an enforced compliance with norms imposed from above. The individual is no longer an actor in the social process but becomes a mere passive receiver. The moral and epistemic roots of violence lie in this negation of the shared universal plan of rationality in favor of one or some of specific determinations. It is an obliteration expressing the refusal to carry our arguments and those of our interlocutor to a level of dynamic universality to interact and modify one another. Any system enclosed within a rigid ethical corpus will end in a conflict with this fundamental constitutive level. Intercultural dialogue can only take place at the formal, open level of hierarchies of values, rather than historically crystallized level of ethical systems. Exchange between individuals must work to construct personal identities, which result from exchange.

Following the presentation, Dr Rainier Ibana, professor of philosophy at Ateneo de Manila University in the Philippines, noted that one can aggregate ethical perspectives and look for universality and test it, but it is not possible to do it the other way: arrive at universality, and then deduct and see whether these patterns exist in other cultures. That would be trying to verify what you have arrived at. Dr Scarantino noted that you cannot test your knowledge except by concrete experiences. Also, the general framework affects the way you select the experiences.

Mr Kouame Oussou, an international relations graduate student at International Christian University in Japan, asked whether the term of “philosophy” used in the presentation overlaps with psychology, mutual trust, and sharing. Dr Scarantino replied that it does, and there is a need for mutual exchange between the disciplines. In Europe, there are groups working on this.

The next session was On War, and the first presentation in the session was “On Preventive War” by Dr Ali Benmakhlouf, a Moroccan philosopher who is a member of the French National Bioethics Consultative Committee and a professor of philosophy at the University of Nice in France. Dr Benmakhlouf noted that justice in a war is a justice beyond any philosophical tradition. But if war occurs, some conditions are to be respected in a tradition of humanism. However, this humanist tradition faces issues from increases in “preventive war”, such as the war against Iraq. Dr Benmakhlouf divided his presentation into two, the first part dealing with war crimes and crimes against humanity. In both, the issue is how to apply the responsibility principle. In both, the complex division of national and
international justice shows that there is a complementary practice between international and national governments and levels.

War crimes have been defined in the Geneva Conventions to protect war victims, and article 6 indicates that war crimes are the violations of laws and war customs mainly assassination, bad treatments, deportations, hostage executions, and the destruction of towns and villages. The creation in 1998 of International Criminal Court (ICC) was a way to transform indignation into common signification in the midst of cultural diversity. Common human rights can be a common language because it uses phrases as ‘elementary considerations of humanity’. While states remain sovereign, the ICC attempts to ensure rules of minimum humanity.

Preventive war and pre-emptive wars are wars against crimes and wars against terrorism. These wars justify all transgressions, so much so that the UN General Assembly in 2001 enacted two resolutions: all civilizations share the same humanity, and the affiliation of any religion to terrorism needs to be avoided. However, instrumental rationality in the form of such preventive and pre-emptive wars leads to the destruction of non-negotiable rights. After 9/11, for instance, the natural rights of self-defense for states, once thought by the UN as an exception, became the rule. Such preventive and pre-emptive wars have no agreed-upon objective criteria.

Dr Benmakhlouf concluded that we speak less about first and more about second kind of war. The first puts limits on the inhuman and the second makes it acceptable - e.g. while torture was once completely banned, it is now up for re-discussion in connection with Guantanamo Bay. Such a change in circumstances is hard to justify.

In the discussion, Dr David Leary, a lawyer and a post-doctoral researcher at UNU Institute of Advanced Studies, observed that war crimes are still war crimes, and simply because one state puts itself above the law does not make it legal. He also asked whether there is a linkage between war crimes and the environment. Dr Benmakhlouf replied that there is an extension of the crimes against humanity definition which includes destruction of cultural and religious goods and damage to nature (in the sense of reproduction of human cloning, for instance).

Dr Scarantino asked whether the notion of preventive war authorizes renewed debates about torture. In other words, are preventive wars are elevated in moral status? Dr Benmakhlouf said that it changes moral attitudes towards concepts such as self-defense. Preventive wars also allow war crimes under conditions. War crimes legislation, however, was enacted to limit this kind of behavior.

Mr Keisuke Tachiyama, an environmental studies graduate student at Kyoto University in Japan, commented that the Afghanistan and Iraq wars have lost their original purposes and that one of the reasons they continue is because of political support. Dr Benmakhlouf noted the main problem in debating philosophy is that one can always justify anything, which is a formal logical problem. When one begins with justifications, any number of reasons can be given for a decision. In other words, for those who justify the war, war is done not because it is just, but simply because it is war. This decision occurs at a transcendental level.

The next presentation in the session was “Japan’s Kamikaze Pilots and Contemporary Suicide Bombers: War and Terror” by Dr Yuki Tanaka, director of the Hiroshima Peace
Institute in Japan. Dr Tanaka began by noting that terrorist attacks have taken place around the world frequently, but what makes an individual capable of suicide in a war? He attempted to gain insight by comparing and contrasting Japanese Second World War kamikaze pilots and contemporary Palestinian suicide bombers.

Japanese kamikaze pilots rationalized their own death to defend their country. Dr Tanaka made a number of observations about them: (1) “country” meant their local hometown, as most were not especially loyal to the emperor; (2) they thought they were doing something for their parents, to compensate for the misery to their parents; (3) solidarity with other kamikaze pilots was significant; (4) there was a strong sense of responsibility and contempt for cowardice; (5) the lack of an image of an enemy but no hatred of it; (6) a preoccupation with philosophy (i.e., how to spend their remaining time and justify their suicide); and (7) the targets of kamikaze were military, but never civilians.

With Palestinian suicide bombers, Dr Tanaka made observations which could be compared and contrasted to Japanese kamikaze pilots: (1) the Palestinians said it would destroy the social, economic, and security system of Israelis to force them to leave the country because they were afraid; (2) the Hamas political bureau said that Israeli society is overwhelmingly militarized with few genuine civilians and everyone over 18 years are conscripts and are military combatants because they carry arms; (3) there is a similar lack of image between strategic bombing and kamikaze; (4) a similar technology gap between military capabilities, a (5) a similar national and cohesive psychology, (6) they both had rituals and ceremonies before their suicides; (7) the ultimate goal was to force the enemy to make concessions; (8) they turned their target victims into ‘others’. He concluded that it is crucial to disrupt the vicious cycles of these two kinds of terrorism.

In the discussion, Mr John Mensing, a graduate student at the University of Peradeniya in Sri Lanka, suggested that images of enemies for kamikaze pilots did not exist because they simply were not described in the sources Dr Tanaka used. Dr Tanaka replied that in their mind, images of enemy were lacking because the Second World War was described at an intellectual level, and their main concern was the justification for their death. Mr Mensing suggested that there may have been a religious motivation for kamikaze pilots which is undiscovered. Dr Tanaka responded that the pilots did not believe in Shintoism and Buddhism. Dr Masahira Anesaki, a medical doctor and professor at Kinki Health Welfare University in Japan, asked whether the idea of suicide bombers were taken from kamikaze pilots. Dr Tanaka responded that such linkages are unknown. However, the plight of desperation is common to both kamikaze pilots and suicide bombers.

The next presentation in the session was “Popularizing a Philosophy of Peace” by Mr Steven Leeper, president of Hiroshima Peace Culture Foundation in Japan. Mr Leeper asked the audience to consider a philosophical framework in which a culture of peace is juxtaposed to a culture of war or violence. He also asked help in reframing today’s most obvious global conflicts to graduate from the war culture to the peace culture.

Rather than intelligence and strength, we now need to evolve our capacities for communication and love. This change is being forced on us by two main factors: one is nuclear weapons, the other is the environment. None of the most important threats to our environment can be solved through war and competition, unless we are willing to kill a high percentage of the human population and irradiate much of the planet. One of the key differences between the war culture and the peace culture lies in the attitude toward conflict.
itself. In the war culture, a conflict is a competitive situation that offers an opportunity to win, to achieve a victory, to extend one’s dominance and control, or to obtain something of value at the expense of another. In the peace culture, a conflict is understood as a social or physical problem to be solved. Furthermore, the problem is only solved when all parties are satisfied. The goal is not a just or efficient or profitable solution. The goal is to make everyone happy, including the ecosystem.

Philosophy and philosophers are vital to our effort to graduate to a peace culture. What we need desperately are peace culture philosophers, people who will lay out in clear, popular, easy-to-understand terms why war is unacceptable and how we have to change our minds, hearts, philosophies and societies to preserve the peace. We need a modern philosophy that builds on what we learned from Gandhi and King and makes a powerful, airtight case for abandoning violence. Most of all, we need philosophers who can reframe today’s violent conflicts as struggles.

Following the presentation, Dr Abu-Dayyeh said we need to have a plan of recruiting peace makers rather than just charity. Mr Leeper agreed that while poor countries do not require any more charity, they need wealthy countries to stop interfering in their development. African governments are underdeveloped because western governments ensure African governments cannot develop; it is an extension of imperialism and colonialism. Mr Leeper also commented on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In the US peace movement, one cannot criticize Palestinian violence. Palestinian violence has created state-lead terrorism by Israeli. Both sides have to solve problems in non-violent way together. There needs to be a common assumption that there will be no violence for negotiations.

The next session was On Peace, and the first presentation in the session was “Considerations about the Foundation of Wisdom for Peace” by Dr Abdessamad Tamouro, professor of philosophy at l’AMP Rabat in Morocco. He began by noting that war is not a banal act, but according to Thomas Hobbes, man is pushed by fear to a state of war.

Dr Tamouro noted that wars are often started by politicians who hide behind titles, values, decorations and speeches which link war to patriotism, victory, glory, honor and courage. The politician has ideology, wealth, and legal authority and does not have to involve in actual combat. He pointed to wisdom for peace, which requires teaching peace to every generation, and having to work on permanent or perpetual peace and justice and the well-being of everyone. Dr Tamouro addressed the philosophy of peace, which, among other things, required wisdom, based on meditation, listening, modesty, accepting the other, dialogue, tolerance, giving priority to rationality and the morality, and a decisive act for peace.

Examples of applying wisdom for peace in action involve South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission as well as Morocco’s Justice and Reconciliation Commission, which investigate, arbitrate, and make recommendations about forced disappearances, arbitrary detention, torture, sexual abuse, and deprivation from right to life, as a result of unrestrained and inadequate use of state force. The goal is to foster development and dialogue, to create grounds for reconciliation which is crucial for a democratic transition towards justice and law, and advance values and a culture of citizenship and human rights. The commission prepared a final report to safeguard the memory of tragedies and ensure non-repetition.
Dr Tamouro concluded with permanent conditions required for peace: teaching and promoting the ethic of peace and experience of reconciliation; creating a real education of peace; banning hate speech, violence and war, and insult; promoting human rights; creating communication and speech of peace; and promoting philosophical studies related to tolerance, peace, and dialogue.

In the discussion, Dr Leary asked whether Morocco is satisfied with the reconciliation efforts and whether it has given victims a sense of justice. Dr Tamouro replied that despite financial compensation, there are still debates because not all the human rights hoped for are seen to have materialized. They can only believe, and have to believe, that the law will act and help them.

The next presentation was “The Implications of the Structure of the Human Brain on War and Peace” by Dr Rainier Ibana, professor of philosophy at Ateneo de Manila University in the Philippines. Discussions about the triadic structure of the brain – the human, mammalian, and reptilian vortices – coincide with the findings of classical moral theorist and confirmed by Kohlberg’s formulation of the three levels of moral development. The contemporary understanding of the human brain confirms the basic moral intuitions of classical philosophy that dates back to the ancient times and the modern period. Plato’s triadic structure of the soul, divided among reason, emotions and appetites, for example, are exemplified by the tripartite structure of the brain propounded by Paul McLean of the American National Institute for Health in Bethesda Maryland when he announced that the brain has three vortices: the human neo cortex that is correspond the human beings’ capacity for long-term rational planning, the mammalian cortex that is equated with our emotional care for others and the reptilian mind that triggers our survival instincts. The malleability of the brain’s neurons indicate that the human brain is the latest in the evolutionary trajectory of the species and that more deliberate choices are required in order to strengthen the synaptic connections that will promote peace and global understanding.

Dr Ibana then turned his attention to practical applications. Written and oral examinations can be devised, following Kohlberg’s experiments, in order to determine the dominant brain centers of individual aspirants so that people can be advised and placed in occupations that fit their temperaments during times of war and to cultivate the aptitude for enforcing law and order during times of peace. Formulating an examination that will determine the moral competencies of the police force can be a challenge to philosophers who would like to apply their academic knowledge to the pivotal social system that serve to balance peace and order in society. The practical demands of this project can be initiated by means of workshops and focused group discussions in order to determine the common moral dilemmas that confront policemen and policewomen in the performance of their duties.

Case studies can then be formulated from these moral problems that can be used as examination questions that test the kind of responses that the applicants will have against a scoring matrix that corresponds to the triadic structure of the brain and Kohlberg’s stages of moral development. A point system can be devised to eliminate reptilian instincts by giving six points for the highest level of moral development, five points to the second level and only one point to the third stage. These will ensure the elimination of those following only the reptilian instincts, the so-called crocodiles and snakes in the police force, because in a ten point questionnaire, the passing mark can be pegged to fifty points in order to accommodate the socially concerned applicants while eliminating the self-centered candidates. It is precisely because of the monopoly of force in their hands that police and military officers must be given all the opportunities to become well-trained and properly educated in terms of...
the fundamental principles of humanity if they are to exercise respect for human rights during situations of war and even during times of peace when armaments are no longer that necessary in order to enforce the rule of law and order.

Following the presentation, Dr On-Kwok Lai, professor at Kwansei Gakuin University in Japan, asked what is socially acceptable and how such proposals could be managed. Dr Ibana said there could be many applications; for instance, tests can be administered to students, which could reveal their moral development.

Dr Macer asked why it is more desirable to have more human, rather than mammalian or reptilian vortices. Dr Ibana replied that philosophers believe that the higher (human) vortex is more comprehensive, more lasting and indivisible. Philosophers have produced all sorts of reasons why the higher is more desirable, as they are sensitive to themselves and it is only now that science has provided scientific validation.

The next presentation in the session was “Philosophical Reflections on the Relationship between Peace, Human Rights and Social Justice” by Dr Naoshi Yamawaki, professor of philosophy at the University of Tokyo in Japan. Roughly speaking, there are two concepts of peace, negative peace and positive peace.

Negative peace means the absence of overt violent conflict. We can see this concept in Hobbes’ theory of Leviathan. To escape from the state of nature characterized as ‘bellum omnium contra omnes’, Hobbes advocated that we should make by our mutual contract ‘Leviathan’, which secures our peace and safety. In Dr Yamawaki’s view, this Hobbesian idea has not yet lost its actuality. Yet, it must be pointed out that the people under the control of Leviathan can only have the right to live safely, the right to reject to go to the life-threatening war and the right to keep silence under arrest. Any other human rights such as the freedom of speech, expression, academic thought cannot be always guaranteed under Leviathan. Furthermore, Leviathan is based upon the fear of state authority as well as upon a distrust of human nature.

On the other hand, positive peace means the state where peoples have collaborative and supportive relationships. In retrospect to the European social philosophy, this concept of peace was defined clearly by Spinoza, who said “peace is not the mere absence of war, but a virtue based on strength of mind.” According to him, the Hobbesian thought ‘bellum omnium contra omnes’ would be realized, in so far as the human being is subordinated to the passive mind (passion). The human being is, however, able to obtain the active mind by intuition, intellect and intellectual love of God (=Nature). It is just this active mind that creates the positive peace. In the contemporary perspective, positive peace is the state in which there is no structural violence. Structural violence denotes a form of violence which corresponds with the systematic ways in which a given social structure or institution kills people slowly by preventing them from meeting their basic needs. Institutionalized racism, sexism, elitism, ethnocentrism are examples of this. The positive peace cannot be realized without eliminating such structural violence, in other word, without realizing human rights in the sense of both economic, social cultural rights and civil, political rights as International Covenants on Human Rights declare.

Global justice includes various sorts of justice such as distributive justice, restorative justice, ethno-cultural justice, and environmental justice which must be discussed together with positive peace and human (economic, social, cultural, civil, political) rights all over the
world. In this context, Dr Yamawaki reflected on the Japanese word Heiwa (平和), which means peace. Literally seeing, the character 平(Hei) means mild, impartial, flat, horizontal etc. and the character 和(Wa) means harmony, softening, mitigating, appeasing, calming etc. We should understand the concept “Wa” as “Harmony in Diversity and Differences” as well as “Peace based upon Reconciliation”. Wa without recognizing the diversity and differences should not be called Wa but rather should be called Doh （同、 sameness）. There would be no reconciliation if one would forget errors in the past and there could be no peace building without reconciliation. He emphasized that Wa in contrast of War should be renewed in terms of Heiwa （平和）, Chowa （調和） and Wakai （和解） in order to generate the “reconciliation-promoting gentle human solidarity” ( Nyuwa de Yawaragiau Rentai no Wa, 柔和で和らぎあう連帯の輪) all over the world.

In the discussion, Dr Lai noted that justice has been often been transformed in diplomatic and violent ways. Dr Yamawaki said that in the atomic era we cannot think about justice without positive peace. There might be controversies between positive peace and negative peace – which should have a priority? The role of philosophers is to define first the various meanings of war and peace according to context; otherwise there could be a misunderstanding because the same words have different meanings. Restorative justice requires time and process. Dr Yamawaki also posed the question whether there is a transnational memory between China/Japan/Korea?

The last presentation in the session was “The Creation of a Harmonized Society by a Holistic Approach: Lab Link can have Roles for Modern Philosophy to Create a Peaceful Society” by Ms Kayo Uejima, a primary school teacher and director of the Lablink NGO in Japan. The laws of modern philosophers include: (1) the creation of modern philosophy to unify science and the soul; (2) proposals of ethics used for development for modern science and society; and (3) design of systems where human beings harmonize with nature. In the process of modernization, humanity has benefitted from: (1) a rich and convenient consumption-driven lifestyle; (2) new artificial materials by science and technology; (3) new knowledge by modern science; (4) networking through information technology; (5) extension of western ideas and capitalism and democracy through globalization; (6) linkages from sharing different ideas from different cultures. What have humans lost? (1) body awareness and functioning; (2) connection to nature; (3) cultural and community identities; (4) healthy lifestyles; (5) a real sense of life and community as a natural creature; (6) holistic wisdom and a sense of ethics. The problems can be reduced to: (1) the limits of reductionalism and rationalism; (2) the limits of a material civilization; (3) the limits of the current social system. Her solutions include: (1) the use of holistic approaches; (2) the use of holistic harmony theory; and (3) the design of lablink, which includes: (a) the evolution of consciousness to developmental consciousness; (b) harmony with all natural creatures; (c) shifting our value structure to economic system to sustainable economic growth; and (d) a change of personal lifestyle. Ms Uejima has developed a “nesting hierarchy of the self”, which is a matrix of holistic harmony theory and expresses every phenomenon of modern human beings.

Ms Uejima concluded that we should focus on our sense as natural creatures living in modern society, and experience body awareness and function as natural creatures. To this end, she cited relaxation methods, holistic medicine, sustainable tourism, dialogues, and self-acceptance as possible resolutions.
The next session was Philosophy and Philosophers, and the first presentation was “Can Philosophers enlighten Global Anti-war (for peace) Movement?” by Dr On-Kwok Lai, professor at Kwansei Gakuin University in Japan and Ms Shizuka Abe, a researcher at Kwansei Gakuin University in Japan. Dr Lai focused the presentation on the application of new methods of electronic media and communication on philosophy, and in particular, on the anti-war movement.

According to internet use statistics, there is a large gap between developed and developing countries, but one which is being closed quickly by countries such as China and India. Such trends in internet usage will inevitably affect intercultural dialogues, including those on war and peace. Language issues will also affect dialogues, as English is the most commonly used internet language but one not commonly used in many countries. There is thus a need for more content in local languages, both to cater to local sensitivities as well as ensuring that nothing is lost in translation. Such trends will also affect the quantity and quality of intercultural debates in cyberspace. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) will also harness the internet to generate debates about war and peace. How exactly they will use the internet is a complex question, but one which is important to understand because NGOs simplify debates and make them more easily understood by laypersons in addition to having the ability to network and mobilize global movements. Finally, ‘micromedia’ and user-interactive sites such as youtube and myspace also have latent ability to generate discussions about global peace and philosophy.

In the discussion, Dr Anesaki observed that so-called ‘cyberweapons’, which bring knowledge about the outside world to ‘closed’ countries who often violate human rights, have been used against totalitarian states to prevent wars. He asked for Dr Lai’s opinion on the fate of such weapons and countries such as North Korea and Myanmar. He also asked whether cyberweapons could be used to generate internet dialogue. Dr Lai replied that it is only a matter of time before Burmese are able to access the internet; the Myanmar government cannot repress internet use for much longer. North Korea will also have a difficult time controlling the internet, as it is positioned next to South Korea, which has one of the highest broadband penetrations in the world. Dr Lai believed that internet censorship was unsustainable in the long run.

Mr Tachiyama remarked that while the internet is useful in generating new discussions, it also creates new problems such as the proliferation of child pornography and electronic crime. Moreover, the capitalist-driven system of having webpages listed at the top of internet search engines creates fierce competition on the internet. Amidst this, will discussion and dialogue be overridden? Dr Lai replied that discussion and dialogue partly depends on internet governance, but the internet is always opening up new streams of communication (in a bottom-up approach).

The second presentation in the session was “The Importance of Philosophy of Life in Contemporary Society” by Dr Masahiro Morioka, professor of philosophy at Osaka Prefectural University in Japan. Dr Morioka’s presentation focused on a new philosophical concept called ‘philosophy of life’, which has a connection to war and peace. He noted that a philosophy of life is needed to understand and inquire into radical changes in life situations, such as the prospect of nuclear war and technological intervention into human life. “Life” means not only human life, but also non-human life and nature, and furthermore, the relationship between them. As an academic field, it covers (1) cross-cultural, comparative, historical research on philosophies of life, death, and nature; (2) philosophical approaches
toward contemporary problems surrounding human and non-human life. Theoretical issues in
the philosophy of life include fundamental questions about what life and death and nature are; meta-philosophical questions, such as what is the philosophy of life, and individual philosophical problems. The latter includes issues of life extension, how to accept one’s own death in the age of life extension; brain death, whether brain death is human death; and future generations, where the theory of justice cannot be used which is used for “existing” people.

In the discussion, Dr Scarantino noted that the historical context of intuition cannot be separated from the term itself. Philosophy cannot work without historical reflection of our experience. Dr Morioka said our intuition is sometimes constructed by history and our value system so it is important to think politically about our intuitive instincts. Dr Ibana commented that there is an “agent” of intuition, and there is something transcendental about the intuition itself. Dr Morioka said that he understands that intuition is a judgment that partly comes from biology. Dr Ibana said that intuition is content beyond our lives, however because we can do this, there is something beyond the biological current life.

Mr Oussou remarked that the main question is the kind of relationship we want to have with future generations. Dr Morioka replied that the fundamental philosophical question is why we need a connection to the future. Why do we need a future to the unborn? Dr Tamouro commented that schools in Canada, France, and Belgium exist which deal with content similar, if not the identical to, the philosophy of life. He also mentioned that it is present in bioethics, but it is desirable to include questions about life under one philosophical subject. Dr Lai observed that the philosophy of life is also about social timing. The fertility rate in developed countries is declining, which creates generation gaps, which in turn causes social changes. However, social timing is different from the concept of lifetimes, which we are liberated from – while the older tradition was to reproduce, we are often liberated from such social roles (of being a mother or father).

The next session was Recognizing and Reconciling Differences, and the first presentation was “Toward a Transcultural Ethics of Human Rights” by Dr Insuk Cha, professor of philosophy at Seoul National University in Korea. Dr Cha first stated that multiculturalism aims at a transcultural ethics. When ideas, articulated in the idiom of a culture outside our own, are transferred to our own world, we may first view them as different and analyze them as alien. However, we come to recognize them as our own if, and only if, they connect in some way with the deep structures and schemata of our own value and belief systems. When a connection can be made, the concept is transformed so that it absorbs the features of our own culture. And, it must be remembered, our connection with the concept, our transformation of it becomes part of the conceptualization of the culture or cultures whose idiom was so different from our own that we did not at first think the concept had anything to do with us. When this mutual transformation occurs, everyone’s knowledge of what it means to be human expands and hence, our responsibilities to ourselves and to other human beings also expand. While societal institutions, customs and mores appear to be quite different, they, nonetheless, follow patterns and structures that are recognizable in their difference. Multiculturalism stipulates mutual recognition of diversity. However, it aims ultimately at connecting us through the common elements in our different cultures, that is, it aims at a transcultural ethics.

Dr Cha spoke of the need for transcultural ethics, and how it might be shaped. A comparative study of the concepts of human rights and human dignity must look at the
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practices and acceptance of respective concepts in the cultures that advocate them. When we examine those concepts of our respective cultures, self-reflection should be rigorous. The examination of one’s own culture must be as rigorous as examination of another’s, or else we risk manufacturing dangerous differences. For some time now, many groups, including UNESCO, have sought ways to humanize market globalization practices precisely because those practices do not recognize valid cultural and religious differences and so have exacerbated income equality and poverty. Finally, a commitment to real tolerance, based on understanding and shared loyalties, to building a peaceful cooperative existence and developing truly shared goals for global justice and equality is imperative for global survival. We have great need for the dialogues among, between and in cultures and civilizations that will build bridges between human rights and cultural values.

Following the presentation, Dr Tamouro inquired about the true definition of multiculturalism. Dr Cha responded that he is not happy with the Convention on Cultural Diversity, as it can be abused by political leaders. For instance, in the Republic of Korea in the 1970s, the state advocated a Confucian form of democracy, and used its ideology to dominate others. Dr Anesaki noted that there is often controversy about the content of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. For instance, while Japan is a democracy, there are often barriers to social mobility and the voting turnout is often less than 50%. However, it is possible that human rights have proliferated because of the Universal Declaration. Dr Cha shared Dr Anesaki’s concerns about Japanese society, and he also had concerns about the United States and Germany.

The final presentation in the session was “Tolerance: The Indian Perspective” by Dr Daniel Nesy, professor and head of Philosophy at the University of Kerala in India. Dr Nesy explained the concept of tolerance and some of the Indian concepts which may help increase tolerance. Tolerance is a virtue, a virtue of understanding the full significance of the action or situation. The failure to appreciate others will result in intolerance, which is deep-rooted and pervasive. Strategies to promote tolerance and reconciliation can be encouraged through media, international organizations like UNESCO, adopting peace building strategies.

One of the prominent causes of intolerance is economic depression and political subjugation. Discrimination, dehumanization, repression and violence may occur in such situations. People affected by poverty and unemployment find something to vent. Often the negatives, negative beliefs, images or biased historical accounts of cultures and educational curricula perpetuate intolerance. The issues of identity, security, self-determination and similar issues result in continuous inter-group violence that divides groups creates permanent separation, and racial division, leading to vicious cycles of resentment and hostility. In a climate of multiculturalism, intolerance is not acceptable.

She noted that India is a country of immense diversity – and one of its slogans was unity through diversity or unity in diversity. The Indian constitution enshrines special provisions for groups that suffer from accumulated disabilities and discrimination including religious and linguistic minorities. The diverse thoughts in India which may help increase tolerance include: undivided wholeness, the whole world is one family, syncretic tendencies, tolerance, mutual respect for each others’ belief. Dr Nesy concluded that all societies need to return to judicious good sense, acceptance, fellowship, and mutual concern. Imperfections of the world must be viewed as problems to be solved rather than indignities to be crushed or pollutants to be purged. Secular institutions with secular aims need to be accepted where conflicts over trade, resources, and political power are negotiable. The process of the breaking down of old
attitudes of isolation, hostility and domination are to be encouraged and should be replaced by respect and sharing.

Following the presentation, Dr Maria Keiko Yasuoka, a post-doctoral researcher in medical anthropology at Hokkaido University in Japan, noted that the study of anthropology is in a crisis, and it could use assistance from different cultural perspectives and other academic disciplines, including philosophy. Dr Cha observed that anthropology and philosophy cannot be separated as the elements of pre-understanding are derived from all cultures. Dr Yasuoka noted that however each culture is hard to define, and furthermore, cultures change - some quickly, some slowly. These cause ‘gaps’ between cultures, which may make intercultural dialogue difficult. Dr Cha noted that while there is some element of control of media (such as television stations), the younger, more cyber-active citizens, can engage in true democratic dialogue. Dr Yasuoka said that the division between the ‘older’ and ‘younger’ generation is not significant. For instance, the older generation will interact with new technology. Dr Cha thought the issue was how we can set a technological policy direction.

The next session was Recognizing and Reconciling Differences II, and the first presentation was “The Present Challenges of Cultural Diversity” by Ms Souria Saad-Zoy, a lawyer and program specialist at UNESCO Rabat in Morocco. Ms Saad-Zoy began by defining cultural diversity. UNESCO's conception of "cultural diversity" contains a broad definition of "culture": in addition to literature and the arts, it covers modes of life, value systems, traditions and beliefs, as well as ways of living together. This approach to cultural diversity makes it possible to tackle a two-fold challenge: ensuring, on the one hand, a harmonious coexistence and a readiness to live together in peace, and on the other hand the defence of that creative diversity as each culture takes shape in the framework laid down by its heritage or regenerates itself by adapting to a contemporary setting. The promotion of cultural diversity – the "common humanity heritage" according to the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, 2001 – has become one of the most pressing contemporary issues and, for this reason, is central to the Organization’s mandate.

Ms Saad-Zoy then investigated the role of cultural diversity in war and peace. UNESCO’s Constitution implies an approach to conflict prevention based on knowledge as the key to mutual understanding and peace; it says: “Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed". Ignorance was thus seen to be the underlying cause of suspicion, mistrust and war between peoples; so the basis for peaceful relations lay in the defence of "the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind". Cultural diversity is related to a series of elements that are the key to development, as it introduces pluralism, social cohesion, growth and sustainable development, cultural dialogue and judicial security. In 2007, UNESCO, in a study on cultural diversity focused on review and strategies, concluded by stating that respect for cultural diversity has become the key to harmonious coexistence not only between nations but also within each nation. Though this internal diversity was long regarded as a threat to national unity and social cohesion - from the claims of historical minorities or the expectations of the immigrant groups - it is now being increasingly taken into account, despite the terrorist incidents and the challenge they pose to national and international security. International security cannot be divorced from the evolution of intercultural relations, in which culture is seen as a common investment based on the optimistic bet that cultural diversity will not prove an agent of conflict and division but on the contrary, reveals the underlying unity of humanity.
Ms Saad-Zoy then spoke about the philosopher’s role in promoting cultural diversity. According to Dr. Birgit Poniatowski, Academic Programme Officer, United Nations University, “facilitating cultural pluralism” are the key words and I would go further: philosophers could facilitate cultural pluralism. To reach this goal, it seems necessary to create the basis for informed choices. Exploration and discussion of the values and norms, traditions and social conditions actually at work in influencing worldviews in different societies today would help to identify real as opposed to perceived cultural differences. By doing so, mutual understanding would be increased, bearing in mind that the recognition of differences alone does not yet lead to mutual understanding, but has to be accompanied by a genuine receptivity to other viewpoints. Of course, education is the perfect way to convey the knowledge of other cultures as well as one’s own. In that regard, philosophy can encourage self-respect, pride in one’s own cultural, ethnic, national or other group identity, without basing that respect on negative value judgments about other cultural groups. Also, education administrators, aided by scholars and practitioners, should develop curricula that emphasize the achievements of different cultures and put increased stress on foreign language education. Programmes should be established to improve multi-cultural teaching methods, meaning to teach not only one approach to problem solving, but to demonstrate the multiplicity of possible solutions to any given problem. Teaching on all levels of education should emphasize intercultural communication skills: basic literacy, language and interaction skills; skills that stress information gathering and broader analysis; skills to determine how one’s actions impact others; skills to recognize and appreciate both the similarities and the differences in other cultures, and to consider and explore how other viewpoints or ways of living can contribute to solving conflicts, inequities, and other global challenges. Public and private academic institutions and funding agencies should also be encouraged to create and implement programmes to study, report and analyse history from a variety of angles, presenting views from different cultural contexts on a given historical event so as to increase understanding of the diversity of historical experiences.

Following the presentation, Mr Oussou asked whether there is a difference between multiculturalism, pluralism, transculturalism, and cultural diversity. Ms Saad-Zoy responded that they all have the same objectives. Dr Macer added that multiculturalism emphasizes cultural diversity aspects. Transculturalism hints at universalism or common elements. Dr Tamouro added that where there is no conflict it is multicultural, and if there are differences, it is cultural diversity. Ms Saad-Zoy said that cultural diversity acknowledges multiculturalism; there are many meanings of cultural identities and cultural diversities.

Dr Mitsuo Okamoto, director of the Hiroshima Center for Non-violence and Peace in Japan, asked how society could overcome linguistic diversity, where English is the dominant culture. Minor languages are rapidly disappearing. Some commentators have suggested individuals utilize several languages, but Dr Okamoto disagreed with this. Ms Saad-Zoy noted Quebec’s encouragement of French study before students are given the choice of learning in English. It is the role both of government and civil society to protect languages.

The next presentation in the session was “Understanding the Impulse to War in Terms of Community Consciousness and Culturally Specific Religious Values” by Mr John Mensing, a doctoral candidate at the University of Peradeniya in Sri Lanka. War rests upon assumptions, some soundly geopolitical, others opportune and preservationist. Cultural formations appraised as religions, instead of being dismissed as elective choices and essentialized under a rubric of universalistic human values, may be better understood as offering an understanding of local cultural priorities and historical imperatives in a way, which allows for
negotiations of translocal concerns. In an effort to emphasize this difference, he compared conceptions of Buddhism in the United States with conceptions of Buddhism in Sri Lanka, showing how the term 'Buddhism' has been used both to convey the concept of an individual elective choice and to convey the concept of a community identity. These two meanings are fundamentally different. When Buddhism is used as term to describe an individual elective choice, that kind of individual has a radically different notion of what it means to be a person and what it means to hold a religion than someone who uses the term Buddhism (or Budha-sasana) to describe a shared community identity. When pristine Buddhism is viewed as a 'religion' in America it conjures and then projects this vision upon cultures with a radically different sense of who is the self and who are the others. By viewing Buddhism as a rhetorical configuration (a semiotic nexus for the shared traditions by which the liminal is given meaning), we can easily recognize how Buddhism not only signifies the Pali canon, the Jātaka stories, the Mahavamsa; bana preaching, the ritual practice of dana-sil and pirit ceremonies; Buddhism also means national Sri Lankan identity. The difference between Buddhism as an elective choice and Buddhism as a shared community/ethnic/caste/national identity is based on different notions of what constitutes an individual self and what constitutes a community. When one locates this fundamental difference in the varying conceptions of who is the self and who are the others, one jettisons a universalistic outlook in favor of a distinction made on the basis of who is an insider and who is an outsider. One of the major institutionalizations of the paribbājakā role in Indian society occurred in the form of Buddhism. If we typify Buddhism as the institutionalization of this paribbājakā ideal, then we can see that having the outsider ritualized guarantees that the insider will have a clear delineation of where society begins and where society ends.

In contrast, American culture premises that all individuals are all inherently out-worldly, presenting a comodified consciousness which elevates individuals as potentially in charge of making discrete decisions with regard to consumption; this will-to-private property is thought to supersede any claim made by shared group values. While it is not possible to reconcile these two different viewpoints, recognizing their basis in different conceptions of the self and community (rather than in corrupt and pristine religious practices) presents a more workable schema for negotiating the differences between post modern cultures and cultures still making the transition to modernity. It is hypothesized that a shift in emphasis in development activities, from exclusively materialistic development goals toward goals which honor and sustain pre-modern social hierarchies, will nurture conflict reduction modalities, and allow for the creation of new arenas for negotiation, ultimately reducing the risk of physical confrontations.

In the discussion, Dr Abu-Dayyeh asked what socioeconomic conditions enhance Buddhism’s calls for vegetarian food. He also pointed out that he wanted to differentiate contemporary Islam as practiced in Saudia Arabia and Islam in places such as Iraq. Wahhabi Islam is a political tool of the Saudi government. Iraqi Islam, on the other hand, is not supported by the state, and it shares its culture with other monotheistic religions and others. Mr Mensing replied that the socioeconomic conditions include Buddhism being adopted by emerging bourgeois (at least according to one commentator), and that it is a part of Indian culture. Mr Mensing also noted that Buddhism is often viewed as a monotheistic religion.

The next session was Dangers and Cautions: Past, Present, and Future, and the first presentation was “Japanese Students Soldiers on War and Peace” by Dr Akira Tachikawa, professor of philosophy at the International Christian University in Japan. Dr Tachikawa contended that student soldiers often exceeded professional soldiers in their courage and
audacity in military actions. He presented examples of three students. The first was Tatsuki Matsunaga, graduated from university after ten months when he was drafted in 1942. He was more devoted to the army than those who had been professionally trained for militaristic actions. First, Tatsuki knew wherein the Japanese army needed a radical reformation, a project which Tatsuki himself located personally. Then, he knew that right up to his participation in the army, he had been consistently trained in reason. In short, Tatsuki set his own target for the attainment of which he was determined to devote his whole life. Only one more year was left before he died in a battle in Honan province, and apparently Tatsuki did not have time to materialize his plans.

The second was Sasaki Hachiro, an economics major at Tokyo Imperial University, drafted in 1943, who lost his life as a kamikaze pilot in Okinawa a year and a half later. Kamikaze attacks required that soldiers would enter into a fateful mission with minds that could overcome fear and dread attendant upon certain self-annihilation. Paradoxically enough, it was often the educated university students, like Hachiro, who could draw on their breadth of knowledge to place their own fatal acts in a broader social or historical context (in however ambivalent a manner). Without such student soldiers, the Kamikaze attacks at the last phase of the Pacific War would have remained a much more limited program. The third was Kimura Hisao, a Kyoto Imperial University student executed in Changi, Singapore as a war criminal. Hisao has attracted special attention because of a few reasons. First, even though it was after the end of the war, he openly criticized professional military officers for their unreasonable and irresponsible behaviors. Second, Hisao also pointed to the indirect responsibilities on the part of the Japanese people in general who allowed the militarism become rampant. Third, more than any other individual, Hisao seems to have symbolized the student soldier as the victim of arbitrary militarism.

Dr Tachikawa arrived at the conclusion in relation to the prosecution of Japan’s military activities, that higher education could claim to have made neither singularly positive nor singularly negative contributions. The universities in fact made mixed and divided contributions. Apparently, students seem to have been affected similarly regardless of their differences in the areas of specialization. That is in part why a number of notes by perished student soldiers have been collected together in the same volumes, although there lingered a few complicated issues in the compilation of the documents. The universities’ influence upon student soldiers showed a subtle but profound cleavage, with reference to war and humanity, warning such institutions against any simple kind of self-complacency. The point applies even to the phases of pre-war education at its best. The problem of elite education especially at the imperial universities was largely overlooked during the critical years of postwar education reform. A critical analysis and reform may still prove even more important than the restless contemporary reforms which would prove quite inadequate with regard to the universities’ roles of education concerning war and peace.

In the discussion, Dr Macer recollected his experience as a Japanese faculty member at the time of the Tokyo Sarin gas attacks, where former students of University of Tsukuba (and others) had used technical knowledge acquired in university to cause death. Given such attacks, it is not surprising that engineers in Japan are now required to complete a course on professional ethics.

Dr Ibaña pointed out that there is a difference between knowledge and wisdom, and asked how professional knowledge was to be balanced with knowledge. Dr Tachikawa asked how knowledge and wisdom could be differentiated. For instance, in the second example
(Hachiro), was his decision the result of knowledge or wisdom? Dr Ibana said that in a situation of war, it could be the result of self-defense. The events occurred at the ‘lower end’ of power, and terrorist activities occur when people are in a weaker position. Dr Tachikawa said that those who engaged in violent attacks had really reflected on the consequences. He also said that he does not have faith in enlightenment, as Japan started the war to naively combat overwhelming western influence. The more educated one is, the more dangerous you could be.

Dr Nesy reflected on values in the Indian philosophical tradition. Wealth and physical pleasures (for this physical world) are to be controlled by karma. Karma looks after the welfare of others, the community. Indian ethical values emphasize not just physical values but also guiding principles. Students who chase wealth and power must be subject to self-rule by such principles.

Dr Leary noted that Dr Tachikawa’s conclusions are potentially disturbing. Many modern Japanese have extensively travelled, are worldly, and educated. Should we be more frightened of Japan today? Dr Tachikawa noted that many of the younger soldiers during the war expressed their desire to lose their life well before the end of the war, which is disturbing; intellectuals had a universal desire to die. This is different from modern Japan. Mr Nahomi Doi said some kamikaze pilots were afraid of dying but more concerned about being blamed by future generations for losing the war. In other words, it was a sense of shame which drove such soldiers to their actions.

The next presentation was “DU (Depleted Uranium) Weapons as a Challenge for Environment and Philosophers” by Dr Nobuo Kazashi, professor of philosophy at Kobe University in Japan. Dr Kazashi argued that depleted uranium weapons were the result of a nuclear “shadow” or footprint because they are derived from used nuclear fuel in reactors, and/or side products of nuclear weapons manufacture. Because of their high density, depleted uranium has been cast into weapons, such as the tips of ammunition rounds, to effect greater armour-piercing. However, the aftermath of using such weapons can lead to extremely toxic effects on humans. The depleted uranium once impacting to a solid surface is carried as particles in the air, which can enter the lungs and cause radiointoxication. There have been denials of danger from various governments, including a WHO report. There has also been high level support for banning such weapons at the United Nations General Assembly, with only a handful of countries, including the United States, voting against such a resolution in 2007. Dr Kazashi noted that currently, the banning of DU weapons is receiving low priority in disarmament because of the Oslo process of banning cluster munitions is more prominent and the inability to clearly and scientifically show that DU weapons are causing the alleged radiointoxication.

In the discussion, Dr Anesaki asked whether there are any ‘humanitarian’ weapons. Dr Kazashi responded that this is the debate. The humanitarian law has been trying to make an impact. This has been in question in humanitarian law. Dr Abu-Dayyeh noted that many are cautious when voicing their opinion against superpowers. He was astonished how slowly the UN was working on banning DU weapons. We need faster action, and we need victims, American soldiers, and security personnel to share any information they have. Greater collaborative work would be helpful. Dr Kazashi noted that such sentiments are shared by scientists and campaigners.
Dr Benmakhlouf asked for details about the specific resolution and possible instruments at the UN. Dr Kazashi said that first resolution adopted in last December 2007 was led by nonaligned countries led by Asian, African, and South American countries. However, the detailed discussions over the wording of resolutions is complicated because of many political factors. For this reason, resolutions are often agreed to outside the UN framework, but diplomats heavily favor a UN-backed resolution. Thus, a resolution is being debated inside the UN system at this point; however, if a result is not achieved soon, a resolution may be attempted outside. Mr Mensing said that it may be possible to strike a covenant and negotiate for a cleanup and remediation. Dr Kazashi said that when it comes to concrete situation of negotiation, that is a possibility.

The last presentation in the session and the conference was “War and Peace in Modern Philosophy” by Dr Abu-Dayyeh, President of Society of Energy Conservation and Sustainable Development in Jordan. Dr Abu-Dayyeh discussed war and peace in modern philosophy beginning from the 18th century and ending at radical Islamic fundamentalism and the ‘dissection’ of the world into a land of peace and a land of war. In the 18th century, philosophers such as Rousseau and Bentham began discussing the viability of perpetual global peace. Kant published *Perpetual Peace* in 1795. By the end of the 19th century, however, some argue that Christian ethics was destroyed by Nietzsche, stamped out as the ‘ethics of the weak’. This revived the Greco-Roman-German ‘ethics of the strong’ and gave way to the ‘super being’ and destruction of reason. This coincided with Europe’s outward expansion, imperialism. Nietzsche’s philosophy culminated in the first and second world wars between the imperialist countries. European rivalries over colonies spread throughout the globe, eventually destroyed Europe and many other parts of the world. Subsequently, the United States rose to superpower status and the world was divided into the wealth North and developing South.

Dr Abu-Dayyeh then discussed the Arab world. The Arab world was divided into colonies since 1917 and there was a shift to secularism brought upon by the Ottoman Empire in 1924. Ideological differences with communism arose. These factors influenced many Arab thinkers who later become associated with Islamic fanaticism. Such fanaticism was nurtured by the western powers until the fall of the Eastern bloc. There is also a historical anti-Christian sentiment in the Arab world, which started as early as Islam’s birth, deepened by the era of crusades, the retreat from Spain, and Israel’s birth. Finally, Dr Abu-Dayyeh posed questions about the necessary conditions that might enable peace to be possible, not only for the well-being of all individuals but also to save the ecosystem from holocaust.

Following the presentation, Dr Abu-Dayyeh noted that perpetual war is easier to maintain than perpetual peace. Dr Tamouro observed that one problem with religion, such as Islam, is that it is analogous to a supermarket: one can pick and choose sets of Koranic interpretations. Dr Benmakhlouf said that from a semantic point of view, when reading the Koran, the sense is that many people are not grateful to God. If one is thankful, s/he is spared in the afterlife, but infidels are not.

Dr Ibana noted that you said we will always have war until we have justice, but Dr. Yamawaki said that there are many questions of justice. Unless we have restorative justice, we will not have solidarity in justice. Dr Abu-Dayyeh was reminded of the concept of Justice in Plato, where all enjoy being obeyed and obeying, which is applicable to the situation between the United States and Arab countries.
At the conclusion of the conference there was discussion of two Declarations, which were also the subject of further electronic dialogue. The final texts are in the annex to this report.

Annex 1: A Proposal to Make a Declaration on Enduring Peace and Justice

Background
In order to strengthen local, regional and global awareness of the rich philosophical traditions of many regions of the world, UNESCO launched its programmes on inter-regional philosophical dialogues in 2004. Through a series of meetings and dialogues there was consensus that war and peace is a critical issue for dialogue.

In the most recent meeting of this dialogue series, the Joint UNESCO-UNITAR Asia-Arab Interregional Philosophical Dialogues on the Roles of Philosophy in War and Peace, held in Hiroshima, Japan on 25-27 July, 2008, the participants discussed themes pertaining to the philosophical analysis of War and Peace. These included the roles of philosophical dialogue in the practice of non-violence, analysis of the Culture of Peace, analysis of how to recognise and reconcile conflict, and peace education. There was analysis of past and present wars, examination of so-called just, pre-emptive, and preventative war, the use of depleted uranium*, and how we can link traditions of philosophical reflection to policy making and implementation of policy.

The meeting recognised that 2008 is the 60th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and that violence is counter to the protection of human rights, and to the survival of the biosphere, environment and all species on the planet. The participants made the following proposal, in mutual abhorrence against all forms of violence, noting that the distinctions between war and terrorism are difficult to define.

Recommendation to the International Philosophical Community
As a group of philosophers from many cultures, we urge all thinkers to recommit themselves to the goal of mutual understanding between people of different worldviews and traditions.

We realize the fragility of our contemporary global institutions to sustain the necessary social and environmental conditions that will protect and enhance the well-being and dignity of our peoples.

We also find that every religious and philosophical tradition in the world strives to promote a philosophy of life, peace and non-violence. We urge philosophers around the world to analyse, teach and research how ideas can be used to overcome the prevailing culture of violence and strengthen the culture of peace.

Given the growing gaps between the rich and poor in the world, and the uneven distribution of risks and benefits, we urge greater attention be paid to examining social and environmental justice, and nurturing traditions that promote a culture of peace. We also urge philosophers to find ways to promote the philosophy of love and justice as a necessary response to violence and hatred.
Recommendations to States

The freedom of thought and expression are enshrined as human rights, yet philosophers in many states continue to face repression and threats to their lives. The targets of this violence have included those who promote peace. We urge all states to enable thinkers to work in intellectual freedom, while they take responsibility for the growing ways in which ideas are shared with information technology.

We urge states to include human rights in the constitutional processes of their laws, promoting social responsibility and justice.

We urge states to support the teaching of philosophy at all levels to assist in the development of critical thinking among their citizens.

Mindful of the tragic loss of lives and resources that the history of war has caused as a consequence of the aggression of those who have dominated the economic, technological and political imbalances within our social and environmental systems;

We propose to the UNESCO, as a specialised organization that aims "to build the defences of peace in the minds of men" to rejuvenate its efforts for the construction of an enduring peace through the promotion of social and environmental justice and a culture of peace in our world today. We propose that UNESCO consider developing a “Declaration for the Construction of an Enduring Peace Through the Promotion of Social and Environmental Justice” (Short title: Declaration on Enduring Peace and Justice).

Agreed in Hiroshima, Japan, 27 July, 2008


In response to the Depleted Uranium (DU) Resolution adopted at the United Nations General Assembly on 5 December, 2007, the participants of the Joint UNESCO-UNITAR Asia-Arab Interregional Philosophical Dialogues on the Roles of Philosophy in War and Peace, and the Joint UNESCO-UNITAR Workshop on the Ethics of Nuclear Energy Technologies, noted that they are deeply concerned about the DU issue especially because it is understood that children are most susceptible to toxic radioactive materials.

Thus, the participants considered it is urgent to:

1. To alert the peoples and children living particularly in the DU-affected areas to the dangers caused by DU weapons;
2. To give serious consideration to the harmful effects of DU weapons by setting up an expert committee on the DU issue as quickly as possible;
3. To place an international moratorium on the use of DU weapons to prevent further DU-caused harms on human health and contamination of the environment.
4. To establish a Body to transport DU polluted war machinery and ammunition away from populated areas, and to properly dispose of them in remote and safe locations.

Agreed in Hiroshima, Japan, 27 July, 2008