

DHARMA WORLD

For Living Buddhism and Interfaith Dialogue

CONTENTS

Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution

The Debate over Constitutional Revision and Japan's
International Contribution *by Takeshi Kawabata* 3

Japan's Constitution and International Contributions
by Yoshiaki Sanada 4

Article 9 of Japan's Constitution: An Example of
Prophetic Realism *by Geiko Müller-Fahrenholz* 7

The Quest for Peace and Disarmament after World War II
by Jayantha Dhanapala 10

Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution:
The Foundation of Peace in Asia *by Byun Jin-heung* 13

A Buddhist View of Revising Japan's Constitution
by Ryumyo Yamazaki 16

Article 9 and Article 26: Twin Campaigns to Move the World
toward Peace and Social Justice *by Colin Archer* 20

Rissho Kosei-kai's Endeavor in Searching for
a World of Nonviolence *by Masamichi Kamiya* 23

Maintaining Article 9: Placing Some Limits on
National Sovereignty *by Agostino Giovagnoli* 24

A Buddhist View of Article 9 *by Koichi Kita* 27

The Value of Article 9 for Japan and for All People
by Vernon C. Nichols 28

Establishing Priorities That Cut Across National Interests
*An Interview with QUNO
Geneva Office's Director David Atwood* 31

Security in the Twenty-first Century *by Robert F. Smylie* 34

Reflections on an Article 9 Without Borders *by Chuck Overby* 38

Japan's Peace Constitution and the Lotus Sutra
An Interview with Rissho Kosei-kai's Founder Nikkyo Niwano 42

Reflections

All Are Precious *by Nichiko Niwano* 44

Essay

The Diamond and the Lotus *by Notto R. Thelle* 45

The Threefold Lotus Sutra: A Modern Commentary (92)

The Sutra of the Lotus Flower of the Wonderful Law
Chapter 13: Exhortation to Hold Firm (1)
by Nikkyo Niwano 46

Yomiuri Shimbun

Yomiuri Shimbun

Alamy/PPS

A montage of photos related to Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. Cover image: Anne Bergasse and Simon Etienne Rozner, Abinitio Design.

DHARMA WORLD presents Buddhism as a practical living religion and promotes interreligious dialogue for world peace. It espouses views that emphasize the dignity of life, seeks to rediscover our inner nature and bring our lives more in accord with it, and investigates causes of human suffering. It tries to show how religious principles help solve problems in daily life and how the least application of such principles has wholesome effects on the world around us. It seeks to demonstrate truths that are fundamental to all religions, truths on which all people can act.

Publisher: Yukio Yokota

Director: Akitaka Tsumuraya

Senior Editor: Koichiro Yoshida

Editor: Kazumasa Osaka

Editorial Advisors:

Gene Reeves, Yoshiaki Sanada, Michio T. Shinozaki

Copy Editors:

Stephen Comee, William Feuillan

Editorial Staff:

Toshihiko Nishino, Katsuyuki Kikuchi

Subscription Staff: Kazuyo Okazaki

Article 9: An Example of
Prophetic Realism 7

Article 9: The Foundation of
Peace in Asia 13

A Buddhist View of Revising
Japan's Constitution 16

All Are Precious 44

The Constitution of Japan (Excerpts)

[Promulgated on November 3, 1946; implemented on May 3, 1947]

Preamble

We, the Japanese people, acting through our duly elected representatives in the National Diet, determined that we shall secure for ourselves and our posterity the fruits of peaceful cooperation with all nations and the blessings of liberty throughout this land, and resolved that never again shall we be visited with the horrors of war through the action of government, do proclaim that sovereign power resides with the people and do firmly establish this Constitution. Government is a sacred trust of the people, the authority for which is derived from the people, the powers of which are exercised by the representatives of the people, and the benefits of which are enjoyed by the people. This is a universal principle of mankind upon which this Constitution is founded. We reject and revoke all constitutions, laws, ordinances, and rescripts in conflict herewith.

We, the Japanese people, desire peace for all time and are deeply conscious of the high ideals controlling human relationship, and we have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world. We desire to occupy an honored place in an international society striving for the preservation of peace, and the banishment of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance for all time from the earth. We recognize that all peoples of the world have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want.

We believe that no nation is responsible to itself alone, but that laws of political morality are universal; and that obedience to such laws is incumbent upon all nations who would sustain their own sovereignty and justify their sovereign relationship with other nations.

We, the Japanese people, pledge our national honor to accomplish these high ideals and purposes with all our resources.

Article 9

Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.

In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.

October 2001: The Diet enacted the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law.

June 2003: The Diet enacted a set of laws for war contingencies that outlines Japan's response to an emergency situation caused by an armed attack from another nation.

October 2005: The ruling Liberal Democratic Party drew up a draft for a new constitution, with Article 9 as one of the main targets of the revision, which was rewritten to officially allow Japan to possess a military force for defense.

May 2007: The Diet enacted the National Referendum Law, a procedural law allowing for constitutional amendment.

The Debate over Constitutional Revision and Japan's International Contribution

by Takeshi Kawabata

With a view to the political stability of Afghanistan and Iraq, Japan's stance on its international contribution is being widely debated. The Japanese government wants to ensure that the Maritime Self-Defense Force is able to continue supplying fuel and water to U.S. and British naval vessels in the Indian Ocean, but the nation's opposition parties insist that only activities that come under a UN mandate are permissible if members of the Self-Defense Forces are to be sent abroad, arguing that their recent mission has been unconstitutional.

What forms the basis of their opposition is a difference in interpretation of Article 9 of Japan's Constitution, which begins: "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes."

Through the constraints imposed by the wording of this article, Japan has never been involved in a war in the six decades since World War II, has never sent her troops abroad as fighting forces, and has maintained a continuing state of peace.

In 2001, however, the Japanese government submitted the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Bill to the National Diet, and after it was passed, under the terms of the new law, Japan began supplying fuel and water to war vessels of the United States, Britain, and other countries that had been dispatched to find and destroy enclaves of Al-Qaeda and other international terrorist groups. The subject of the current debate is whether sending Self-Defense members abroad to continue the refueling mission falls within the purview of the Constitution as a legitimate type of international contribution, or whether it goes counter to Article 9.

For this reason, within the government and the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, a movement to ease the making of military contributions by revising Article 9 has gained strength during the past few years. The National Referendum Law, which is a procedural law necessary for revising the Constitution, was enacted by the Diet in May 2007.

When we observe the brutality of the random acts of terrorist violence as well as the political turbulence not only in Afghanistan and Iraq, but also in neighboring countries,

surely there is no one who does not wish for peace to come as swiftly as possible. In that regard, it is only natural for the international community to expect a meaningful contribution from Japan commensurate with its position as one of the world's leading economic powers.

But is it only through military force, one needs to ask, that peace can be brought about? In a world undergoing ever increasing globalization and the deepening of relationships of interdependence, the idea that peace can only be achieved through military means may be a concept left over from an earlier time.

What is needed today is for us all to turn our eyes to such problems as the poverty, discrimination, and oppression that often become the causes of war, and to seek to ensure peace by maintaining a comprehensive viewpoint that encompasses such basic issues as economic and energy requirements, and protection of human rights and the environment.

Here, I am reminded of the preamble to the Japanese Constitution:

"We, the Japanese people, desire peace for all time and are deeply conscious of the high ideals controlling human relationship, and we have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world. We desire to occupy an honored place in an international society striving for the preservation of peace, and the banishment of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance for all time from the earth. We recognize that all peoples of the world have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want."

What this means is that there is a strong national determination to attain world harmony and to maintain peace without reliance on military means. If we can put into practice the spirit of the preamble, perhaps we could say that the actions currently being undertaken by the government are too heavily weighted toward military force. Rather than impetuously rushing to revise the Constitution, is it not the mission and duty of Japan, which established a Peace Constitution after World War II, to use its power to help rebuild the infrastructure and restore the people's livelihood in places such as Afghanistan and Iraq?

Speaking as a Buddhist, I believe that the greatest contribution that Japan could make to the world today is to widely spread the spirit of Article 9 around the globe. □

Takeshi Kawabata is director of the External Affairs Department of Risssho Kosei-kai.

Japan's Constitution and International Contributions

by Yoshiaki Sanada

The nation can achieve more by actively giving aid to developing countries and working hard to ease the problems that create breeding grounds for terrorism and violence, eliminating international disputes that are their root causes.

Revising the nation's Constitution is a major political topic in Japan today. In May 2007 a procedural law for a constitutional revision was enacted, providing for a national referendum on the subject; practical and concrete legislative work is ongoing. The main target of the revision would be Article 9, an embodiment of the spirit of pacifism.

Resolution to Renounce War

As a country involved in World War II, Japan participated in the slaughter and destruction of war and in its violence and plundering, and suffered the historic and unprecedented tragedy of having atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. On the basis of that historical experience, the Japanese, following the devastation caused by the atomic bombs, became aware of their special mission in history. That mission is "to never repeat the evil of war." They were given a mission, in other words, to show humankind that no matter what disputes or confrontations may arise with other nations, war must not be waged to resolve the issue, that there should be no military forces making war, and that war must be renounced.

The preamble to the Japanese Constitution declares the

principle of international cooperation, stating: "We, the Japanese people, desire peace for all time and are deeply conscious of the high ideals controlling human relationship, and we have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world." Article 9 of the Constitution renounces war as follows: "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes" (first paragraph), and "In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized" (second paragraph).

Because of its Article 9, the Japanese Constitution is called the "Peace Constitution" and is highly regarded as an outstanding contribution to the world's constitutional traditions. For example, ten thousand people from all over the world participated in the Hague Appeal for Peace Civil Society Conference, held in the Hague, the Netherlands, in 1999. The conference was attended also by then-secretary-general Kofi Annan of the United Nations and representatives of national governments. The conference issued Ten Fundamental Principles for a Just World Order, the first of which states: "Every Parliament should adopt a resolution prohibiting their government from going to war, like the Japanese article number nine."

Article 9 Buffeted by Two Forces

Now Article 9 is currently under attack from two quarters. The first attack is from within the country. The sense of crisis felt in Japan about such issues as North Korea's missiles and its nuclear tests has turned into a confrontational attitude, with assertions such as "It's time we called the Self-Defense Force an army," "The country cannot be defended unless the Constitution is changed so that we can have an army," and "We should become a normal country with its own army."

The second attack comes primarily from foreign countries

Until March 2007, Yoshiaki Sanada served as a professor of law at Chuo University in Tokyo, where he is now professor emeritus. He taught Western legal history and comparative law at the university's School of Law. He also has been a guest professor at the Institute of Comparative Law of the China University of Politics and Law in Beijing. He is director of the Peace Research Institute of the Japanese Committee of the World Conference of Religions for Peace.

and criticizes Japan for using its Constitution as an excuse for not performing the role befitting a major economic power. In January 1991 during the Persian Gulf War, multinational forces led by the United States engaged in battle with the Iraqi army that had invaded Kuwait. Since Japan is prohibited by its Constitution from dispatching troops overseas, it instead contributed to the effort with an expenditure of US\$13 billion, a huge sum. Certain foreign countries criticized this, asking, "Does Japan think that it can simply contribute money and that is the end of it? We are sending troops and suffering casualties!" and saying, "You should shed blood with us. You are cowards!"

For certain, under the provisions of the Constitution, Japan has kept its military buildup in check, created an industrial structure based on a nonmilitary model, and brought about tremendous economic progress. On the one hand, this success has given much confidence to economically and militarily weak countries. On the other hand, it is also true that Japan's approach is seen as self-serving in the "sensible" view of countries that rely heavily on their military might for national power. Taking these international circumstances into account, in 2003 Japan came to terms with the "sensible" approach of some of the leading nations that spend exorbitantly on their military, and embarked on a course to change its existing policy. The enactment of the "Law Concerning the Special Measures on Humanitarian and Reconstruction Assistance in Iraq" was the symbolic first step in that direction.

Two Paths of International Contribution

But is a policy of international cooperation that accepts this "sensible" view of some of the leading nations actually the path to true international service?

The question of extending the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law was a pressing issue in the Japanese Diet late last year. It was first put into force on November 1, 2001. Its formal title is "The Special Measures Law Concerning Measures Taken by Japan in Support of the Activities of Foreign Countries Aiming to Achieve the Purposes of the Charter of the United Nations in Response to the Terrorist Attacks Which Took Place on 11 September 2001 in the United States of America as well as Concerning Humanitarian Measures Based on Relevant Resolutions of the United Nations," which was the longest title of any law then in force.

Under that law, the Japanese government, in the name of "international service" in response to the anti-terrorist military action led by the United States and Britain that followed the simultaneous terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, dispatched escort and supply vessels of the Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force to the Indian Ocean to supply fuel and water to U.S. and British-led search-and-destroy missions against the international terrorist organization Al-Qaeda and others. The legislation initially limited this participation to a two-year period, but three extensions were later enacted. The government tried

to get a fourth extension authorized and the United States and others urged Japan to do so, but in the face of strong objections from the opposition parties, the law expired on November 1. The government continued to work hard to achieve the early enactment of a new special measures law, so as to resume the refueling activities as soon as possible.

The Japanese government explained that the warships to which the Maritime Self-Defense Force provided logistical support in the Indian Ocean were contributing to the anti-terrorism operations in Afghanistan. However, was the supplying of fuel and water, which depended on the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law, actually helping to bring

The Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force (JMSDF) supply ship Tokiwa (far left) refueling a U.S. warship (center), while two other JMSDF destroyers guard them. The JMSDF vessels were continually deployed in the Indian Ocean from November 2001 in response to the anti-terrorist military action led by the United States and Britain.

peace in Afghanistan? Are the search-and-destroy operations conducted by the United States, Britain, and others against the Taliban forces succeeding as a result of it? Or is the opposite true, that the Taliban forces are making a comeback and expanding?

More than 80 percent of the Afghan people are farmers, and yet Afghanistan's farmland is being lost to the desert due to war and drought and its food self-sufficiency has dropped from 94 percent prior to the year 2000 to under 60 percent today. And what does the comeback of the poppy production in Afghanistan, which now accounts for 93 percent of the world's production of opium, mean? Also, will

the farmers without land to farm become refugees, or will they become Taliban soldiers, or mercenaries for the U.S. military? They face truly tortuous life-or-death decisions.

The real question posed by the “international cooperation” referred to in the Constitution is which path to take—to contribute to the United States by participating in America’s wars in the name of international cooperation, or to act from the standpoint of the war’s biggest victims, the Afghan farmers, and support the rebuilding of an Afghan society that will have no need for the terrorist forces that have terrorism as an end in itself. The question is which path to choose—whether to cooperate in supporting war, or to cooperate in respecting life; whether to live in a culture of killing, or instead to live in a culture of life; whether to walk the road of warring nations, or to take the path of peaceful nations.

The True Path to Peace

An overwhelmingly large number of countries in the world today view their military might as the mainstay of their national policy. From their point of view, the logic of such statements as “Because of its Peace Constitution, Japan cannot become a major military power” or “Japan is safe because we have a Peace Constitution” will simply not hold water. Even if these have become slogans within Japan, they have no persuasiveness internationally. It is Japan’s conduct in international society that is being called into question.

In its preamble, the Japanese Constitution states, “no nation is responsible to itself alone.” In light of this constitutional principle, Japan must eliminate the various political, economic, and social roots of mistrust toward Japan,

always act on the principles of the UN, and continue to move forward actively with international cooperation, such as giving aid to developing countries.

There are many people in the world who are suffering from poverty, discrimination, or oppression, and who live with a feeling of being trapped with no prospects for the future. These problems create a breeding ground for terrorism and violence. To build peace, in addition to nurturing trust with every single country, we must turn our attention to and work hard toward eliminating the international disputes that are the root causes of terrorism.

For the past sixty-three years Japan has not gone to war once, nor has it killed any citizens of another country in combat. From the standpoint of human history the Japanese must take more pride in this fact, and it should be their duty to be more active in transmitting the spirit of their pacifist Constitution to the world. And when it takes this fact into account, Japan should be able to take on even more of a leadership role in conflict resolution, becoming a breeder of international trust.

With that being the case, it goes without saying that for peace to be realized the exchange between and support of grass-roots groups and civil organizations are indispensable. It will become more and more important to sponsor activities that respond to the needs and desires of the people who are suffering from war and conflict. The continuing efforts at interfaith dialogue and cooperation being undertaken by the World Conference of Religions for Peace and others, and further promotion of efforts such as the Donate-a-Meal Campaign, started by Japanese people of religion, are also of increasing importance. □

AP Images

An Afghan farmer, who has lost his leg to a land mine, takes a break as he works in a field of wheat in the outskirts of Kabul, Afghanistan in July 2005.

Article 9 of Japan's Constitution: An Example of Prophetic Realism

by Geiko Müller-Fahrenholz

It would be a tragic error to reverse the document's pro-peace component on the grounds that it is idealistic or impractical.

On August 6, 1945, a new epoch began. The bombing of Hiroshima, followed three days later by the bombing of Nagasaki, is more than just one more atrocity among many other atrocities in modern warfare. For the first time, nuclear bombs were dropped on two crowded cities. Tens of thousands of Japanese men, women, and children were killed in one instant, and for many decades, many more Japanese citizens have continued to die because of the radioactive fallout. With abysmal clarity these two atomic bombs have demonstrated that weapons of mass destruction can bring our world to a sudden and horrible end. And yet most of us choose not to look too closely. A history of denial has set in that lures people into thinking that the danger of global self-destruction somehow does not exist.

The Japanese people, shaken to the core by the massive death of so many fellow citizens, took a step that was as unprecedented as was the bombing itself: they made the possession of military forces, and the preparation and execution of war, unconstitutional. Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution renounces war and puts a stop to the possession of aggressive military forces. The preamble of the Constitution affirms that all peoples of the earth have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want.

Those of us around the globe who are committed to peace are listening with sadness to growing discussions in Japan that are aimed at the revision of this unique Article 9. It seems impossible to imagine that the Japanese nation should be willing to forget the lesson learned in August 1945 amid so much anguish and horror—namely, that peace is the one and only precondition for life on this planet.

The two bombs that were dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki were primitive compared with the sophisticated weapons of mass destruction that have since been developed, tested, and stored in the earth, in submarines, and in the holds of battleships. As a matter of fact, the development of ever more “intelligent” nuclear weapons is still going on.

Never in their history have human beings acquired this kind of power, namely to undo or “uncreate” themselves and most organic life on this planet. This is the power that

has ushered in a new and ultimate phase in human history. The well-known German theologian Jürgen Moltmann concludes:

Hiroshima 1945 fundamentally changed the quality of human history: *our history has become time with a time-limit. . . .* This time of ours, when humanity can be brought to an end at any moment, is indeed, in a purely secular sense and without any apocalyptic images, the “end-time”; for no one can expect that this nuclear era will be succeeded by another in which humanity’s deadly threat to itself will cease to exist.¹

The furies of the Cold War successfully prevented human beings from coming to terms with this scary reality. Rather, the confrontation between the two “superpowers” fathered the hectic development of more and more destructive nuclear bombs until a situation has been reached in which all of humanity and most of the organic life on earth can be annihilated many thousand times over.

After August 1945, it took more than twenty years for groups of men and women to realize the gruesome impact of this end-time threat. During the 1970s and 1980s a strong antiwar movement swept around the globe. It was capable

Geiko Müller-Fahrenholz is a German Protestant theologian who has studied and worked in the United States, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Costa Rica. Dr. Müller-Fahrenholz is now the World Council of Churches' coordinator for the International Ecumenical Peace Convocation scheduled for May 2011. His research is in the areas of reconciliation politics, fundamentalism, and ecological ethics.

of producing enough pressure for the leaders of the superpowers to negotiate treaties of nuclear disarmament. Hiroshima Day became an important reference point for the global peace movement around the earth.

To a large extent, these peace movements have become silent, however, while the nuclear race continues unabated. In spite of the nonproliferation rhetoric, the number of states trying to gain the ability to produce nuclear weapons keeps growing. The argument goes that having them is a matter of security, even if the assurance is given that they will never be used.

As the years go by, the process of forgetting appears to be growing. With the increasing uneasiness of the nations over access to, and control of, the world's essentials, we see the return of nationalist politics. Today it is not the clash between two superpowers that must serve as an explanation but the "war on terror." Both the Cold War and the "war on terror" fail to grasp the true character of our end-time era. As a matter of fact, they betray its urgent message.

The failure to comprehend the real, if hidden, character of our time is more than mere unwillingness. It is a kind of blindness that prevents us from seeing the unprecedented newness of our global condition. Admittedly, it is very difficult for us to comprehend something for which we do not have any reference points in the past. For many millennia, human beings lived with the endlessness of the world. They saw themselves as victims of nature's violent powers. Never did it occur to them that their activities might upset the carrying capacities of this world, whose resources seemed to be inexhaustible.

To be sure, wars have always been seen as terrible, albeit unavoidable, catastrophes, but there was always the hope that life itself would go on. Somehow, when the fighting had ended, the people would scramble to their feet, begin to rebuild their homes, to tend their fields, and to raise their children. Wars were the interruption; life itself was forever.

This fundamental experience is reflected in all of the world's cultures and religions. It is this basic experience, however, that is being challenged by the dire facts of our end-time condition: life, at least as we know it, is not forever. It is not endless. It can be wiped out, in its entirety, in one instant, not by outside interference, but by human beings themselves.

The self-annihilation by nuclear weapons is invisible to most of us. Hiroshima and Nagasaki, however, are the only places where a part of humankind did experience how it feels to be reduced to "point zero." In this sense, these two Japanese cities are unique reference points for our end-time situation. They need to remain part of our remembering. What happened to them can be part of our future if we fail to learn their lesson.

During the last few decades, an additional end-time factor has arisen: the threat of self-made ecological disaster. In a few decades, large parts of the earth may become permanently uninhabitable. The map of the world will have to

be redesigned. Again, this surpasses our understanding. Our minds cannot really comprehend the threat until the catastrophe hits us directly. And then it is often too late.

In sum, it is easy to use the term "unprecedented," but it is difficult to grasp its full impact in everyday life and politics. To deal creatively with facts and trends for which we have not enough experience to guide us does pose enormous challenges to our intelligence and our emotional capacities.

One troubling factor has to be added: the end-time character of our era has been brought about by human beings. Its terrifying threats are, therefore, a matter of human responsibility. To be more precise, the most powerful nations and their leaders are the ones who must be held accountable. This accountability borders on guilt.

Guilt, however, is a reality that human beings do not like to admit. Our political leaders are no exception. This applies even more to guilt on such a massive scale.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the United States of America—the first and only nation thus far to have used atomic bombs—has consistently denied the guilt aspect of what it did to the Japanese people. In 1995, the American researchers Robert Jay Lifton and Greg Mitchell stated:

From the start [of the atomic age], Americans were not shown the human effects of the bomb. This reinforced the psychological resistance to taking in the horror of Hiroshima. Nearly fifty years later, the same impulses were at play in the Smithsonian dispute. Curators, under pressure, removed from the exhibit nearly every photograph of dead or badly wounded Japanese civilians. There remains today a reluctance to face squarely what America did, or excuse it, perhaps even to wish it away.²

The situation in the United States has not changed much since then. Especially after September 11, 2001, the government of President George W. Bush has consistently emphasized the moral superiority of the United States. As a consequence, patriotism and nationalistic zeal have increased.

This is for me a significant example of massive denial. Instead of living up to failure and guilt, the "official America" prefers to regard itself as the champion of goodness and decency.³ The backbone of such denial is to be found in policies of national security that go hand in hand with heavy growths in military spending. In this way, massive denial further increases the end-time threats of our age.

But it will not do to point fingers only at the United States. My own country, Germany, has been tempted to go into denial over its role in causing the two World Wars and the Holocaust of the Jewish people in Europe. It is difficult for the German nation to remember both the good and the cruel things of its past and thus to resist the temptation of building its policies on false assumptions of its role in the world.

My impression is that denial over its historic role in large parts of Asia can also be found in Japan. Denial seems to be

the option to save a sense of pride. In fact, it takes much more critical courage and patriotic love to accept the ambivalence of one's past. It is a sign of political wisdom to remember not only the great things but also the pain and the suffering.

Perhaps it has proven to be somewhat "easier" for the two biggest losers of World War II, Germany and Japan, to integrate defeat into our national identity. Our nations have experienced what it means to bring war to other peoples and what it means to have war come to our own lands with utter devastation. We know firsthand the price of military arrogance: humiliation and unconditional surrender. "Nie wieder! (Never again!)" was the deeply felt motto of Germany's postwar years. We dare not forget it. Never.

To remember both the good and the evil things in our history is a way to have empathy with those who had to pay the price of our wrongdoing. This is what I call deep remembering.⁴ It leads to the insight that the well-being of humanity transcends the particular interests of particular peoples and nations. Deep remembering, therefore, is a prerequisite of end-time politics.

It was an act of prophetic realism for the Japanese Constitution to advocate, in its preamble, the right of all human beings to live in peace and without want and, as a consequence, to commit Japan to an antiwar policy. Sixty-one years later, this commitment is even more urgent than it was at the beginning of the atomic age. It would be a tragic error to reverse the pro-peace component of the Constitution on the grounds that it is idealistic or impractical. On the contrary, it was always realistic and practical. Rather, the return to policies of national security politics and the emphasis on military solutions are idealistic in the sense of illusionary and impractical. Under end-time conditions, no nation can be secure without a global system of sustainable peace.

Japan's Constitution should serve as a powerful antidote to the recurrent tendencies of nations and their leaders to deny our end-time situation. Its Article 9 is a healthy and much-needed reminder of the heavy, indeed unacceptable, risk of self-destruction by modern warfare. Japan has a powerful role to play in the world not simply in economic terms or in the financial markets but also in the sense that the immense suffering of Japanese civilians can best be honored by working for situations that shield all human beings all over the world from similar horrors. Peace is the precondition for dignified life.

It goes without saying, of course, that peace is more than the absence of open warfare. Peace begins in the hearts of

Hiroshima, early October 1945. The Industrial Promotion Hall (now the Atomic Bomb Dome). The city was devastated by the atomic bombing of August 6, 1945.

Yonihur Shinbun

human beings and protects them from self-destructive passions. Essential havens for learning to live together in peace can be found in our close communities, such as the families, the neighborhoods, the schools. We also need to be on the alert with regard to the fascination with violence in the world of "militainment," the war games and videos of the entertainment industries. Furthermore, there can be no peace on earth if we do not work for peace with the earth. Human beings are "earthlings," and we need to learn how to be proper economists and trustworthy keepers of the earth's resources.

With all of their various cultural and religious traditions, all of the world's peoples are earthlings. All of us depend on the same clean air, on the same pure waters, and on the Earth herself to yield her fruit. In spite of all the forays into space, this Earth is and remains our only home. The future of us earthlings depends on whether we have the wisdom to develop and sustain economic and political systems that remain safely within the carrying capacity of our earthly home. What we need is a new empathic intelligence that enables us to create systems of sustainable neighborhoods among the peoples, cultures, and religions of this earth. Such neighborhood systems will not be without many tensions. It would be naive to expect total harmony. Peace is the art of keeping such tension productive. As the biologist A. L. Kroeber said: "Peace is the highest state of tension that the organism can bear creatively."⁵

Article 9 of Japan's Constitution points in this direction. It is a piece of wisdom that all human beings, not just the Japanese people, need to treasure. □

Notes

1. Jürgen Moltmann, *Coming of God: Christian Eschatology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), pp. 205–6 (italics in the original text).

2. Robert J. Lifton and Greg Mitchell, *Hiroshima in America: Fifty Years of Denial* (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1995), p. xv. This study was inspired by the way an exhibit planned in 1995 by the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, DC, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima had been censored and ultimately stopped by associations of war veterans and officials of the Clinton administration.

3. I have addressed this in some detail in my book *America's Battle for God: A European Christian Looks at Civil Religion* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007).

4. See Geiko Müller-Fahrenholz, *The Art of Forgiveness* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1997).

5. Quoted in Thomas Berry, *The Dream of the Earth* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1990), p. 219.

The Quest for Peace and Disarmament after World War II

by Jayantha Dhanapala

The author stresses that in these unsettled times, we must reflect on the current dangers to international peace and security and examine what steps have to be taken.

Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution is in fact a “No War” article. It went into effect on May 3, 1947, shortly after World War II and reads:

Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.

In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.

The enactment of a special clause in the Japanese Constitution renouncing war as an option after World War II was not an accident. The United Nations Organization that was formed in 1945, benefiting from the failed experiment of the League of Nations, began its Charter with the words “We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind. . . .” The Charter went on to enshrine the principle of the nonuse of force in international relations in Article 2.4, which states: “All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the

territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.” Thus, what was made general for all states was made specific in respect of Japan because of Japan’s status as one of the defeated states in World War II and the opportunity in 1947 of drafting a new Constitution.

Other states, such as Costa Rica and Iceland, while upholding the UN Charter, have demonstrated their renunciation of war by not maintaining national armies at all. In any event, the UN is not a pacifist organization, and Article 51 of the Charter provides for “the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.” This implies that member states may maintain armies commensurate with their security needs for self-defense, and thus Japan maintains a self-defense force. Further on in the Charter, under chapter 7, provision exists for the Security Council to determine the existence of a threat or breach of the peace or act of aggression and to take action to restore peace and security. This action could ultimately entail, as Article 42 states, “such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary.” This is the use of collective force authorized by the Security Council in the defense of international peace and security, and member states are expected to make available their armed forces for this purpose. One example of this is the use of force to evict Iraq from Kuwait in 1991. In addition, of course, there are numerous examples of UN peacekeeping missions in which the armed forces of member states participate.

These restrictions on war and the unilateral use of force have not, of course, prevented wars from breaking out in the post-World War II period. However, the recent trend has been to have more intrastate wars than interstate wars, and for nonstate actors to be among the belligerents. The application of international law to nonstate actors is not easy, since these groups are, ipso facto, acting outside the framework of law and order. International terrorism is a phenomenon that has acquired a new dimension, and the danger of terrorist groups’ acquiring weapons of mass destruction is real. We have already had the use of chemical weapons by

Jayantha Dhanapala was the United Nations under-secretary-general for disarmament affairs from 1998 to 2003 and is a former ambassador of Sri Lanka to the United States. He serves as senior advisor to the president of Sri Lanka. From June 2004 to November 2005, he served as the secretary-general of the Secretariat for Coordinating the Peace Process in Sri Lanka.

one such group in Japan. In addition to specific injunctions against war, the international community has tried to evolve ways and means of either banning or regulating the tools of war as a disincentive to countries for going to war. This is in pursuance of the UN's objective of achieving "general and complete disarmament under effective international control." Of the weapons of mass destruction, biological weapons were banned in 1972 and chemical weapons were banned in 1993. Nuclear weapons, although still not banned, have had their proliferation prevented by the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1968, the most widely subscribed-to disarmament treaty. In addition, numerous nuclear-weapon-free zones have been created, mainly in the southern hemisphere. A number of bilateral treaties between the United States and the Russian Federation have also reduced the number of nuclear weapons in the world. Japan, as the only country that has suffered the use of nuclear weapons, has legally renounced the possession of all weapons of mass destruction (WMD) by treaty.

These steps are encouraging, and what must be done is to consolidate these gains and ensure that they are irreversible. Japan has moved resolutions in the UN on nuclear disarmament and has played a leading role in numerous disarmament initiatives, such as the control of the proliferation of small arms and light weapons. In this context, Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution is a bulwark and a beacon. Japan is an example, along with Germany, of countries that can achieve powerful positions in the international community without acquiring nuclear weapons and having powerful armies. This alone qualifies Japan to secure a permanent seat on the Security Council, apart from Japan's record as an aid donor.

We must now reflect on the current dangers to international peace and security and examine what steps have to be taken for our common security. Early in 2007, the Chicago-based *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* moved the hands of its famous Doomsday Clock forward two minutes, placing them now at five minutes to midnight. The rationale was that, in addition to the threat of nuclear danger, the world faces another catastrophic threat from climatic change. The forces of globalization and the relentless pursuit of industrialization have led to a vast demand for energy. With environmental concerns already being cited to justify an increasing reliance on nuclear power as an energy source, we must resolve the justifiable concerns that wider use of nuclear energy may lead to a proliferation of nuclear weapons. Thus, the atomic scientists see the two greatest threats to human security as inextricably intertwined.

We live in a world of escalating military budgets, despite the absence of antagonisms dividing major states. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), global military expenditure is at US\$1,204 billion (US\$1.2 trillion) per annum, with the United States accounting for 46 percent of the total. Japan has 4 percent of the world share of military expenditure, spending US\$43.7 bil-

lion or US\$341 per capita. Mitsubishi Heavy Industries in Japan is among the world's twenty-five largest arms-producing companies, selling US\$2,190 million worth of arms. In a world where more than one billion human beings live below the poverty line of one dollar a day, weapons spending amounts to US\$184 per year for every man, woman, and child on the planet. US\$135 billion per year would suffice to achieve the Millennium Development Goals by the target date of 2015. This is not only unacceptable; it is also unsustainable. Again according to SIPRI, there has been an almost 50 percent increase in the volume of major conventional arms transfers over the last four years, reversing the downward trend since 1977. The United States and Russia were the largest suppliers in the 2002–2006 period, and China and India were the largest arms importers.

Among the world's eight (not counting North Korea) known nuclear-armed states—five of them parties to the NPT—an estimated twenty-six thousand nuclear weapons remain, of which twelve thousand are actively deployed. Nuclear weapons are designed to cause terror and destruction on a vastly greater scale than any conventional weapon, killing thousands in a single attack and leaving behind environmental and genetic effects that can persist indefinitely. The risk of the use of these nuclear weapons—by states or terrorists, by accident or design—has actually increased in recent years. This threat, combined with the certainty of climatic change, presents an ominous challenge to humanity.

Globalization and the revolution in information technology have made our challenges more complex but also offer tools to assess and mitigate the problems we have created. Along with our scientific advances, our advances in governance—embodied in international institutions such as the United Nations and international law—provide mechanisms to coordinate the collective action that is needed to rid the world of weapons of mass destruction and take corrective action on climatic change.

It is for these reasons that in my final year as UN under-secretary-general, I proposed that there should be an international commission on WMD. The then secretary-general, Kofi Annan, was not ready to have such a commission function under the aegis of the UN. Sweden, through its courageous foreign minister at the time, the late Anna Lindh, accepted the challenge and set up the commission with Dr. Hans Blix as chairman. Fourteen of us, drawn from different countries—including China, India, Russia, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States—began our work early in 2004, meeting in different capitals and exchanging ideas with scholars, researchers, and diplomats from a wide range of countries over a period of more than two years. In June 2006, we presented our final report to the secretary-general of the UN, and this has now been issued as a document of the UN. Dr. Blix has also spoken to the First Committee of the UN, in October 2006, apart from addressing numerous audiences and media conferences in different parts of the world.

Our commission felt that the time for action on weapons of mass destruction has come, especially with regard to nuclear weapons. We see them as inhumane weapons of terror because they are in fact intended to intimidate those who do not possess these weapons. As the Canberra Commission, on which I also served, said in 1996: "Nuclear weapons are held by a handful of states which insist that these weapons provide unique security benefits and yet reserve uniquely to themselves the right to own them. This situation is highly discriminatory and thus unstable; it cannot be sustained. The possession of nuclear weapons by any state is a constant stimulus to other states to acquire them." The WMD Commission reiterates this, adding: "So long as any such weapons remain in any state's arsenal, there is a high risk that they will one day be used, by design or accident. Any such use would be catastrophic." Nuclear weapons must be devalued as the ultimate currency of power. That can only be achieved by their elimination.

A total of sixty recommendations have been made in the WMD Commission Report, including:

- The need to agree on general principles of action with disarmament and nonproliferation being pursued through multilateral institutions in a rule-based international order, where the UN Security Council is the ultimate authority; the revival of disarmament negotiations; the pursuit of policies that do not make states feel the need to acquire WMD
- The need to reduce the danger of existing arsenals by making deep reductions and securing them from theft, especially by terrorist groups; the need to take weapons off their alert status; the prohibition of the production of fissionable material; having no-first-use pledges by those who have nuclear weapons
- The prevention of proliferation through the entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT); implementing the commitments of the nuclear-weapon states under the NPT; continuing negotiations with North Korea and Iran to ensure their nonnuclear weapon status while assuring them of their security and their right to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy; making international arrangements for the supply of enriched uranium fuel and the disposal of spent fuel
- Working purposefully for a ban on nuclear weapons within a reasonable time frame; encouraging nuclear-weapon-free zones, especially in the Middle East; achieving the universalization of the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and Biological Weapons Convention (BWC); and preventing an arms race in outer space

On January 4, 2007, the *Wall Street Journal* published a remarkable op-ed piece written by George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn—all former holders of high office in the United States, all highly influential today. They called for "reversing reliance on nuclear weapons

globally" and viewed the doctrine of nuclear deterrence as obsolete, increasingly hazardous, and decreasingly effective. Recalling past efforts to rid the world of nuclear weapons, they called for a rekindling of the Reagan-Gorbachev vision and the achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free world as a "joint enterprise." Identifying a series of agreed-upon and urgent steps, the eminent authors included many of the measures featured in the Thirteen Steps of the 2000 NPT Review Conference and the sixty recommendations of the WMD Commission. This article was followed a few days later by an article in the same journal by former Soviet president Mikhail Gorbachev endorsing the four Americans' views and also calling for a dialogue between the nuclear-weapon states and nonnuclear weapon states within the framework of the NPT on the elimination of nuclear weapons. The British foreign secretary also spoke along the same lines in Washington, DC, in the summer of 2007, and this was reiterated by the U.K. representative at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

A breakthrough in reconstructing the fractured consensus on disarmament—and especially nuclear disarmament—must come through the political leadership of key countries. Public opinion—especially in democracies—can force policy changes through the electoral process, and civil-society organizations must work relentlessly to achieve this. Within a matter of twenty months, four of the five nuclear-weapon states in the NPT either will have changed or will be due to change their longstanding political leadership. This provides a unique opportunity for a change of policy on nuclear weapons and on climatic change. First, there has already been a presidential election in France leading to the election of President Nicolas Sarkozy. In the United Kingdom, Prime Minister Gordon Brown is the new leader. In 2008, both the Russian Federation and the United States will have elections for a new president. In China, the Communist Party will have a key congress at the end of 2008; and India, a non-NPT nuclear-weapon-capable state, will have elections in 2009. Japan has a new prime minister. This virtually simultaneous change in the political leadership of key countries will provide an opportunity in the post-Cold War world to make fundamental changes that can pull the world back from the brink of crisis. Civil society and global public opinion can assert pressure to ensure that the new political leaders act to create a new world order.

The time is therefore opportune for the implementation of Recommendation 59 of the WMD Commission, which urges the convening of a world summit on the disarmament, nonproliferation, and terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction. The date for such a summit could be after 2009, providing for thorough preparation and for the new leaders to formulate their policies. It would be a historic opportunity to demonstrate a recognition of the common danger to global society and of the need to make the right decisions at the right time. Japan is uniquely positioned to take the initiative in this. □

Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution: The Foundation of Peace in Asia

by Byun Jin-heung

*A leader in religious education on the Korean peninsula
fears that a constitutional revision by Japan could
portend a dangerous shift to the right.*

The amendment of Article 9 of Japan's Peace Constitution, as proposed by the ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), is of deep concern to all countries of Northeast Asia, as well as to Japan itself, because it directly influences the peace and stability of the entire region. However, with the resignation of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, who publicly promised delivery of the amendment within his term of office, and the inauguration of the more moderate prime minister Yasuo Fukuda, the urgency of the situation has eased somewhat. Despite that, however, outside of Japan many analysts continue to believe that Japan will at some time in the future repeal Article 9 of its Constitution.

Of course, Japan has the right to amend its Constitution. It must be remembered, however, that Article 9 is not just a part of Japan's Constitution; it is also a promise of peace to its neighboring countries. Especially to those countries that experienced hardships as a result of Japan's past colonization and expansionist wars. Through this article Japan pledged "the renouncement of war, of war potential, of belligerency." Without the cooperation of its neighboring countries, any revision of Article 9 may well revive the spirit of Japanese militarism and consequently threaten peace in the entire region. Therefore, any amendment to Article 9 is of concern to all countries of the region.

Concerns arising from the proposed amendment of Article 9 have led pacifists in Japan and South Korea to form the Article 9 Association. However, the challenge of constitutional reform is too serious an issue for the peace movement to deal with alone. This is because this issue is directly related to the political landscape of Northeast Asia and is also of immense importance for continued peace in Asia and in the world.

The Japanese Debate on the Revision of Article 9

The Diet's (House of Representatives') Research Commission on the Constitution published its report in April 2005. Taro Nakayama, its chairman, said in the foreword: "I was always mindful that the Constitution belongs to the people; in discussing the Constitution, rather than arguing from partisan positions, we should always adopt the perspective of the

people." He especially stressed "Nakayama's Three Principles": respect for human rights, the sovereignty of the people, and the commitment never again to become an aggressor nation. The report did, however, raise a question about Article 9, asking to what degree it reflects the current reality of Japan and the region. It concluded by saying that any discrepancy between Article 9 and the present political situation ought to be addressed. In line with this, the Diet passed the Referendum Law, which establishes procedures for a national referendum to revise the Constitution.

Lawmakers from opposition parties on the commission expressed concern about this situation. Rep. Masao Akamatsu of the Komei Party pointed out that the task of the commission was initially to examine only the reality, and not to propose any amendments. He said that it is not desirable to race to the misguided conclusion that constitutional amendments can meet all the challenges arising from both inside and outside of Japan. He further stressed that a rushed response to the problem may lead to dire consequences in the future.

Arguing that the Japanese people need to return to the spirit of the Constitution and its promise of a lasting peace, Rep. Akamatsu asserted that what is needed is a composed discussion and measured response, not a hurried reaction. Such an opinion would seem to be representative of the

Byun Jin-heung is secretary-general of the Korean Conference on Religion and Peace (KCRP). He teaches the religious policy of North Korea and the reunification of the Koreans at the Catholic University of Seoul. Dr. Byun is in charge of religious-dialogue affairs among the seven major religions in South Korea and has also been devoted to religious exchange between North and South Korea for a decade.

Japanese people as a whole, who tend to view Article 9 as an opportunity to build a permanent peace. Many Japanese people believe that Japan achieved its economic revival thanks to the peace promoted by the spirit of the Constitution, and that its economic power should be used to encourage the growth of such a lasting peace.

Rep. Tomio Yamaguchi of the Japanese Communist Party has pointed out that Japan's dispatch of Self-Defense Force members to the war in Iraq has greatly damaged the peace principle of Article 9. And he further stressed how over the years Article 9 has provided great vitality in the building of world peace. By opposing any revision of the Constitution, Rep. Yamaguchi claims that Japan is helping to promote peace, human rights, and democracy, both in Asia and in the wider world.

Takako Doi, former head of the Social Democratic Party, has pointedly remarked that her nation's Constitution is facing its biggest crisis since its establishment, in the form of attempts to reform Article 9. She has reproached the Research Commission on the Constitution for its activities, claiming that it has put the cart before the horse. According to her, the Japanese government has violated Article 9 of the Constitution, and it is attempting to revise the Constitution on the basis of this violation.

Korea's Perspective on the Revision of Article 9

The passage of the Referendum Law in the Japanese Diet has led to reaction in Korea. Prime Minister Abe's statement, made on Constitution Day (May 3, 2007), calling for a constitutional revision, drew the attention of the Korean media. This was exemplified by the coverage the issue received in the *Hankook Ilbo* (Korea Times) on May 4, 2007; the headline read: "Abe Desires Revision so that Japan Can Conduct a War." In this article, the *Hankook Ilbo* claimed that Abe had dressed up the revision under the guise of building "Japan's real independence." It also reported that Abe's move had incurred criticism from other countries, such as China, with firsthand experience of Japanese imperialism, which spoke of "Japan's reviving its militarism." The daily paper then claimed that even though many Japanese people support the revision in principle, they did not want to see a change in the core clauses of the Peace Constitution, with its clearly stated renouncement of war, of war potential, and of belligerency. The paper highlighted the fact that according to a survey conducted by the Japan Broadcasting Corporation (NHK), 44 percent of respondents opposed any change to Article 9, while only 25 percent supported it.

Lee Jun-kyu, policy director of the Korean Peace Network, described the passage of the Referendum Law as a "coup d'état by parliament" that opens the road to the repeal of the Peace Constitution. His analysis of the situation claims that the hard line taken by Abe was an attempt to "summon the conservatives" in order to raise cabinet approval ratings, but this attempt failed because it has been interpreted as a crisis for Japanese democracy. Lee recalled

how Professor Yoichi Komori of the University of Tokyo, secretary-general of the Article 9 Association, previously defined the constitutional amendment bill, as proposed by the LDP in 2005, as the "thinking of a de facto coup." Lee further warned of possible future "parliamentary coups" by Abe's government and stressed that the aim was to totally change the postwar system of Japan and Article 9.

Meanwhile, on June 1, 2007, the *Seoul Shinmun* ran a story about human-rights advocate Shin Suk-ok, a permanent ethnic Korean resident in Japan, who claims that the Japanese government's move to amend Article 9 demonstrates a rightward trend within Japanese society as a whole. Shin described this trend as a type of collective suicide that draws other groups into death. According to her, the rightward trend of the United States promotes a similar trend in Japan, which, in turn, draws the silent support of the Japanese business community. This reflects the American Republican Party's links with the military industries and, in some ways, is reminiscent of Japanese militarism of the 1930s. Although Shin's opinions may be somewhat overstated, she does clarify things when she says: "If the economy follows the law of the jungle, politics must then take care of the weak to secure a balance. But the core of any rightward trend is that politics follows the law of the jungle, too." Here, Shin seems to provide a valid criticism of the present neo-liberal world system. From this perspective, Japan's rightward swing can be understood as an attempt to consolidate its interests, its markets, and its resources through the threat of possible military power.

As outlined above, for many people the pro-constitutional amendment movement is regarded as an attempt to change twenty-first-century Japan into a "militarily ordinary country" that could actively intervene on an international scale by using political and military power. This would seem to be a move away from a noninterventionist security policy with its aims of "the renouncement of war, of war potential, of belligerency." To its supporters, such a move is a statement of real independence and an example of freely exercised sovereignty. To its opponents, however, this movement is interpreted as a move toward militarism and rearmament.

Why do Japan's neighbors still distrust it so strongly? The main reason is that the Japanese government has still not sincerely expressed an apology for its past militarism. This also explains, to some degree, why Japan's efforts to become a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council have met with such resistance. Its neighbors believe that an empowered Japan would use its newfound power unwisely instead of using it to promote peace. This is truly an unfortunate state of affairs for Japan as well as for its neighboring countries.

Common Efforts for the Peace of East Asia

If Japan carries out the planned amendment of Article 9 without listening to voices from outside, it will surely put

On August 24, 2007, together with members of three Korean religious organizations—Buddhist, Confucian, and Christian—Japanese religious youths held a memorial service in Seodaemun Independence Park for those who suffered under Japanese rule. The park was the site of Seodaemun Prison, where many fighters for independence from Japan were held until 1945.

the peace of East Asia in serious jeopardy. And equally, if Japan wants to actively promote peace in the region, it should first respect the pacifist voices from within its own boundaries—and before anything else, it should sincerely apologize to its neighboring countries for its past imperialism.

As for its relationship with Korea, in 1992 Japanese Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa expressed regret for the issue of the “comfort women,” a key element of Japan’s past wrongdoings. And in 1993, Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa defined Japan’s wars as “aggressive wars” and apologized for the colonization of its neighbors. In 1995, the fiftieth anniversary of the end of World War II, Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama recognized in the Diet that Japan’s aggressive activities were “wrongdoings of national policy” and issued a statement of repentance for its colonial past. However, with a movement toward a more conservative and nationalist stance within modern Japanese society, attitudes have hardened, as seen in the call for an amendment of Article 9. Therefore, our first task for the building of a peaceful society in East Asia is to block any attempted amendment to Article 9 of Japan’s Constitution.

Both Haruki Wada, professor emeritus of the University of Tokyo, and Professor Kang Sang-jung have proposed the

idea of setting up a Northeast Asian Common House for Humanity. This proposal suggests that Japan, North Korea, and South Korea together form a nonnuclear peace area that will create a buffer zone between the nuclear powers of China, Russia, and the United States. This idea would also aim at dissolving the military tensions in the region and go about the construction of an area of peace and security. If the six-party talks on North Korea are successful, then it would seem that there is real hope for the formation of such a Northeast Asian Common House.

In such a situation we are faced with the question of what people of religion should do. What is the role of any ecumenical religious movement that has been organized for the creation and promotion of peace in Asia and the world? Any answer to such a question must stress cooperation between religious people and religious leaders in both Japan and Korea.

Despite the fact that established religions tend to be conservative in outlook, it should be noted that religious people in Korea have, over the years, played an active role in the democratic movement in Korea by resisting the military dictatorship from the 1960s onward. During that struggle, many people developed a deep interest in the peace of Northeast Asia, and they went on to form strong links with religious pacifist movements in Japan. However, because many Korean religious leaders recognize the fact that a good number of Japanese religious movements are conservative in outlook, they have concluded that it is not easy to work in cooperation with such religious leaders.

Many differences exist between the religious cultures of Japan and Korea. For example, in Japan, after the establishment of the Peace Constitution, the principle of separation of religion and state was strictly adhered to. And again, in Korea there are no political parties founded by religious groups, but Japan has the Komei Party, strongly affiliated with the Soka Gakkai (a type of Nichiren Buddhism). This means that in the future, religious people of both countries need to make special efforts to understand each other better. A common effort for peace can be founded on this basis of mutual understanding. Such an effort might be based on the efforts of religious people to help solve problems of conflict caused by globalization in the twenty-first century. In short, a religious dimension is necessary in the project to promote international understanding and cooperation. A concrete example of this can be seen in the international cooperation system ASEM (Asia-Europe Meeting), within which an interreligious dialogue group has been formed. Following this example, we too must develop deeper understanding and friendship between the religious circles of both Japan and Korea. In this way, we can better understand why Korean religious circles are watching with great interest the unfolding debate concerning Article 9 of Japan’s Peace Constitution. For religious people, this debate is central to the development of a continued peace in Northeast Asia. □

A Buddhist View of Revising Japan's Constitution

by Ryumyo Yamazaki

Rather than changing the Constitution to legalize the waging of war, the author believes that Japan should renounce the menace posed by military power and work for peace.

I have been writing books and essays for nearly forty years, but looking at the blank page before me now I find myself feeling strangely nervous. This is not an exaggeration: what I am about to write is what I would like to be the testament to my life as a Buddhist.

War Hurts Both Sides

The Vietnam War started in 1965. America's savage bombardment of North Vietnam was undertaken as part of its official policy to protect Vietnam from Communism. However, in fact it was a war between the United States and the Soviet Union fought on Vietnamese soil. Human beings really are stupid. It seems we can never stop waging war, never stop killing one another. The twentieth century has been called the century of war; during those one hundred years, 250 major or minor wars were fought around the world, killing some 200 million people.

After the Vietnam War ended, wars continued to break out all over the world—the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the Persian Gulf War, the Iraq War, and ethnic conflicts in a number of countries. Wars are not natural disasters. Human

beings cause wars. Thus, human beings must be the ones to stop them. Indeed, we can without a doubt stop wars. In particular, people who profess religious faith should surely be sensitive to these acts of human folly.

Once a war has begun, nobody knows when it will be over. War hurts both the aggressors and the victims. That is why it is said there is no such thing as true victory in war. It has now been nearly forty years since the Vietnam War. Yet we read reports about some American soldiers who fought in that war who are still unable to take part in ordinary life because they continue to experience fear of the unseen enemy. Every strange person they see reminds them of a Viet Cong guerrilla. These men are both aggressors and victims. And now we read that more than thirty-two hundred American soldiers and more than thirty thousand Iraqi civilians have died in the Iraq War.

Even worse, there appears to be no end in sight in Iraq—not only that, but the course being taken is making the war bog down even further. This war will probably not be resolved no matter how many more American troops are sent in. Such a course will simply create an even bigger mountain of corpses. As soon as possible, all the combatants must admit to their own stupidity and savagery and start looking for a peaceful way to resolve the conflict. Public opinion polls in the United States show that more than 60 percent of Americans think the Iraq War is wrong. President Bush has become frantic and insisted on sending in thirty thousand more troops. Meanwhile, on March 20, 2007, the fourth anniversary of the start of the war, a huge antiwar demonstration took place in the United States, including a parade of coffins draped with the American flag. Japan also sent a contingent of its Self-Defense Forces to Iraq, but none of them were killed, and none used their weapons to kill anyone. Why was that? This raises the central theme of my essay: Japan's Constitution.

The sixtieth anniversary of the end of World War II occurred in 2005, and the topic of revising Japan's Constitution was much discussed at that time. As many Japanese readers may be aware, loud voices were raised by the move-

Ryumyo Yamazaki, a professor at Musashino University in Tokyo, teaches the history of Japanese thought in the Middle Age and Jodo Shin Buddhism. He also serves as director of the Institute of Buddhist Culture at the university and vice director of the Peace Research Institute, which is affiliated with the Japanese Committee of the World Conference of Religions for Peace. This essay is a translation from the author's article published in June 2007 issue of Daihorin (great Dharma wheel), a Japanese Buddhist magazine.

ment in favor of "throwing out the Constitution forced on Japan by the United States," or "creating our own, original constitution." I would like to delve into this issue from the perspective of my Buddhist faith. A nation's constitution is of extreme importance to its citizens. So, I am thoroughly disgusted by the spectacle of politicians who take the issue lightly or even ignore it completely.

The present Constitution is the means by which the people place restraints on the state to prevent it from abusing its power or infringing on their liberty and other rights. Article 98 clearly states that the Constitution is the country's supreme law.

Heading toward War

The authority of the Japanese state rests in its Constitution, which is based on the principles of (1) popular sovereignty, (2) fundamental human rights, and (3) pacifism. These principles are the priceless legacy of the countless people who suffered and died in the course of our history. And as some people may also be aware, Article 96 places certain restrictions on the process of amending the Constitution.

Our current Constitution's chapter 2 places special emphasis on the "renunciation of war," as stated in Article 9: "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes."

"In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized."

In the draft of a new constitution proposed by the Liberal Democratic Party on November 22, 2005, the part of this article's second paragraph that prohibits "maintaining war potential" was eliminated. Instead, the party offered four clauses dealing with a "self-defense military." The draft clearly empowers the state to maintain a self-defense military with the prime minister as its supreme commander. In January 2007, the Defense Agency became Japan's Ministry of Defense.

Though I will spare readers lengthy quotations from that draft constitution, I do not think I am the only person who believes that it was intended to open a swift, easy path to war. The thrust of its proposed revisions is to restore the Self-Defense Forces to full military status and clearly reinstate Japan's right to maintain war potential, and as such it must be interpreted as a menace to the above-mentioned principles of pacifism and fundamental human rights. Such revisions would not improve, but rather would degrade, our Constitution.

I think that the present Constitution is consistent with the spirit of Buddhism in that it embodies the three principles of respect for life, protection of human rights, and renunciation of war. Though there are many sects of Bud-

dhism, I am sure that the precept of not taking life and practicing nonviolence are fundamental to all of them. Can anyone blame me for saying that someone who denies or disregards these principles is not a Buddhist?

Our present reality is extremely harsh in some respects. Just as the twentieth century, the "century of war," came to a close and the new century began, the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in the United States were perpetrated. From that point on, our world changed. As an official policy to keep our homelands secure, advocates started calling loudly for massive military strengthening without reasonable balance. The nuclear experiments conducted by North Korea even seemed to transform most of Japan's population of some 127 million into militarists. All wars are fought for perceived reasons of self-defense, and the participants nominally consider them good wars (such as holy wars and crusades). But in truth there are no such wars. Whatever kind of wars there may be, they are humankind's worst folly and worst sin. This I learned from the Buddha.

I set great store by the words of the Buddha, who said that fear does not lead us to arm ourselves with weapons, but arming ourselves with weapons leads to fear.

The fear and uneasiness felt by nations without nuclear weapons leads them to conduct nuclear experiments, and to play this as a diplomatic trump card in the international arena. At the same time, countries that do have nuclear weapons criticize and bring tremendous pressure to bear on other countries for possessing or seeking to possess nuclear capability. This is the accepted order of things in our present world.

Something Wrong with Idealism?

A disciple of the Buddha shall not, out of personal benefit or evil intentions, act as a country's emissary to foster military confrontation and war causing the slaughter of countless sentient beings. (Brahma Net Sutra)

Do not use swords, staves, or other weapons, but always seek to drive all kinds of evil away through ways and means based on correct wisdom. (Mahaparinirvana Sutra)

This is the message from the Buddha. The Larger Sutra on Amitayus also says, "Wherever the Buddha comes to stay, there is no state, town, or village that is not blessed by his virtues. The whole country reposes in peace and harmony. The sun and the moon shine with pure brilliance; wind rises, and rain falls at the right time. There is no calamity of epidemic, and so the country becomes wealthy, and its people enjoy peace. Soldiers and weapons become useless; and people esteem virtue, practice benevolence, and diligently cultivate courteous modesty." I am always impressed by the line about how soldiers and weapons become useless. This is the world for which Buddhists should be striving.

Whenever I write something like this, I always receive the

same reaction: "That is nothing but idealism." This in turn always reminds me of a saying of the prominent Buddhist scholar and educator Junjiro Takakusu: "People without ideals inevitably become degenerate." It is said that in our present age, adults can no longer speak of having a dream for the future. Perhaps we can no longer speak of having ideals, either. It could be said that is a blind spot of our age, in which ideals are blocked out.

Katsumi Hirakawa, a well-known Japanese entrepreneur, writes, "Laws are not enacted to justify existing reality, but to bring reality into line with the principles expressed by the laws. This is the fundamental purpose of establishing laws, but as long as society does not respect the law, laws will continue to seem idealistic" ("Article 9: Is There Something Wrong with Idealism?" *Asahi Shimbun*, January 13, 2007).

Thanks to its constitutional promise to completely renounce war, Japan has not killed a single person, and no Japanese people have been killed, through a military exercise of Japan's "sovereign right as a nation" since World War II. We must not forget these facts. I think they have been forgotten by those who are prepared to create "a nation that can go to war at any time" in reaction to the tense international situation. That is leading to the constitutional degradation movement. This kind of overall context also allows us to understand recent legislation to revise the Fundamental Law of Education that aims to make children more obedient, patriotic, and willing to give up their lives for their country, although current social problems involving youth crime were tacked on to help justify the changes.

Recently, many letters have been written to the leading newspapers by elderly Japanese who are afraid of war taking place. Almost all talk of Japan's last war is confined to how the Japanese people suffered, however. This led one person to write of "handing down the stories of war's tragedy, even at times of victory." He wrote, "We need to do more about admitting our own faults in killing, wounding, capturing, and otherwise causing suffering to those on the other side" (*Asahi Shimbun*, June 29, 2005). A different sort of opinion was also expressed in that newspaper's readers' column by a *tanka* poet: "Military conscription seems not so bad / when I see young people lounging about on street corners." In answer to that, another person pointed out: "Isn't it too simplistic to think that putting idle young people into the military will solve these problems? The military is where humans are transformed into tools of war, not a place where young people are educated as human beings. The state of Japanese society causes young people to become wild and slovenly—shouldn't it be society's responsibility to rehabilitate them?" (August 4, 2006).

I know many people who think that military service is a good way to teach discipline to young people. This makes me sad. Reading the last letter above, I was greatly impressed by the writer's healthy approach. In *Shuju no Kotoba* (Words of a Dwarf) the author, Ryunosuke Akutagawa,

Members of the Japanese Ground Self-Defense Force set off for Samawah on a type-96-wheel armored personnel carrier. The photo was taken in Kuwait near the Iraqi border on February 27, 2004.

wrote: "The first job of the military is to deprive people of their reason." We must not think, even out of mere ignorance, that military service is a way of educating youth.

Toward Prohibiting War

Kiyohiko Koike, formerly a bureau chief at the Defense Agency and now mayor of Kamo City in Niigata Prefecture, circulated a petition far and wide calling for rejection of the Iraqi Special Measures Law, a bill enabling deployment of Japan's Self-Defense Forces (SDF) to Iraq. He has continued to protest this law on the grounds that it allows the SDF to be deployed overseas and is therefore unconstitutional. Many people, including retired Defense Agency officials, agree with his position. Koike is a constitutional revisionist and believes that Japan should have a strong military. However, while working with the United States military forces he gained a new understanding of the significance of the Japanese Constitution's Article 9. He writes of the Peace Constitution as Japan's treasure and declares that "without Article 9 Japan would have become totally engaged in the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and the Persian Gulf War. The Japanese people would also not be respected throughout the world as a peace-loving nation, as we are today" (*Asahi Shimbun*, November 30, 2003). He expresses his belief that those who lost their lives in the last great war would want more than anything for us to protect our Constitution and refrain from sending soldiers overseas.

That is what someone who studied at the Royal College of Defense Studies of the United Kingdom and served as president of the National Institute for Defense Studies and as chief of the Bureau of Education and Training of the Defense Agency had to say about Article 9.

The Iraq War has bogged down. As in the previous case of the Vietnam War, it has become guerrilla warfare that shows no signs of being resolved. America is finding it difficult to bear the cost and is looking to its allies to enter the war. We must not overlook the problems created by the constitutional degradation movement, which originated with the United States and is an attempt to accommodate the United States. Experts in the field have pointed to the strong influence exerted by American economic trends on an entire series of Japanese government administrative reforms as well. Japan is not one of America's states. When I think about the oppressive presence of American military bases in Japan, I begin to wonder if Japan is an independent country after all.

Nine years ago, the Hague Appeal for Peace Conference in the Netherlands brought together some ten thousand citizens from around the world. The first of the ten principles it issued called on the parliaments of all nations to adopt a resolution barring their government from engaging in war, as Japan's Article 9 does.

Thoughtful people in other countries who have been victimized and harmed by wars value and support the Japanese Constitution even more than the Japanese people do. This is something more Japanese ought to know. I will never forget what one young American said to me while I was in the United States: "Article 9 of your Constitution is a wonderful thing. I think Japan's Constitution is the only constitution that its people can universally be proud of before the whole world. Why don't Japanese people seem to realize this?" This conversation took place about ten years after the end of the Vietnam War.

I often say that the awareness of belonging to a group creates outsiders. The happy chatter of a close circle of friends makes pleasant listening, even from the sidelines. However, that very awareness of being a member of a group inherently includes an exclusiveness that repels those who do not belong. I do not really believe in the concept of nations as "allies," because this also inherently assumes shunning those nations that are not allies. This in turn gives rise to various kinds of hatred and conflict that often lead to war.

The menace posed by military power can certainly create tense relations, but it never does lead to reconciliation. It leads rather to a chain reaction of violence that is difficult to stop once it gets started. It is therefore a monumental task to achieve peace without relying on recourse to military power.

"Creating peace requires courage, wisdom and patience—not the kind of courage needed to fight and die, but the kind needed to say 'No,' together with the kind of wisdom that can discover alternatives and the kind of patience and broad-mindedness that can endure adversity without flinching.

"If local societies and entire nations could develop these powers, the world would be a happier place than it is at present. If they consciously accepted that as their goal,

conflict resolution methods other than war would become possible and a different world could be achieved," writes Mari Ichida ("War Is Not the Answer," *Zen no Tomo* [Zen Friends], [December 2006]).

Viewing the Misery of War

Now more than ever, it is time for humankind to join together and move toward creating peace. The twentieth century having been the "century of war," it seems that the twenty-first century should be a good opportunity to do this, even though at present the world is still a crucible of discrimination, poverty, and conflict. The flames of war burn all over the world, and its victims are many. The wisdom and faith of Buddhists are again being called into account. Former Prime Minister Shinzo Abe's proposed revisions to the Fundamental Law of Education were aimed at creating a younger generation that would be useful to the state, unwilling to defy their superiors, and ready to die for their country, forming a nation of a hundred million people with a single will, prepared to go to war at any time. To that end he and some of his colleagues were trying to revise the Constitution as well.

The first Japanese World War II war criminal to be executed by the Allied Powers was Kei Yuri, age twenty-six; he left behind his mother and his fiancée. He believed it was for the good of his country and to honor his beloved mother to grow up as a youth imbued with a militaristic spirit, experiencing no doubts as he followed that path straightforwardly. He quickly forged a successful military career and while still very young was appointed commander of Prisoner of War Camp No. 17-B at Omuta in Fukuoka Prefecture on Kyushu. He was executed for his responsibility for atrocities inflicted on Allied prisoners when he served in that capacity. After his death, his mother, Tsuru, declared, "I am the one who killed my son. It was the great sin of a stupid mother." She was a mother who single-mindedly taught her son that he should be a soldier and serve the emperor. He was a son who believed that obeying his mother was his filial duty, and who was executed at the age of twenty-six for his pains. At that time, most people said, "It was the fault of the government; we were tricked by the government." However, Tsuru Yuri acknowledged her "great sin of a stupid mother"—that was her apology to her son and her expression of profound repentance for her inability to see clearly the error and misery of war. Even now, more than sixty years later, countless people still live with unhealed wounds suffered in that war.

Before I put down my pen, I would like to finish with a comment from a reader's letter to the *Asahi Shimbun* that impressed me greatly:

We have the Peace Constitution now because my father and so many other people died. If they want to change it, they should bring my father back to life first. Only after that. □

Article 9 and Article 26: Twin Campaigns to Move the World toward Peace and Social Justice

by Colin Archer

*Protecting Japan's no-war Constitution and promoting the UN Charter's
disarmament for development clause must go hand-in-hand.*

Anyone who has followed the progress of the U.S.-led wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in the last few years would have difficulty in arguing that the military-led responses to the September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States have proved successful. Indeed, the truth is quite plainly the opposite. U.S. military might, based on the Cold War doctrine of deterrence (mutually assured destruction), no longer seems to deter anyone. Given the central role that the “global war on terror” plays in the mass media presentation of the current state of the world, it can be argued that this is a potentially fruitful moment in which to criticize militarism. Large sections of the general public in many countries are cynical and distressed about what the Pentagon and its allies have done in the Muslim world, and they are hungry to know that there may be better ways of tackling intractable conflicts. Belligerence and military threats do not seem effective. Analysts are more and more urging that attention be turned to employment creation and economic development as ways to undermine the appeal of the extremists. Moreover, new developments, such as the recent diplomatic settlement of the dispute over North Korea's nuclear program, also provide some hope that conflict does not inevitably spell war.

Article 9 and Its Significance

For all of these reasons, then, it is a promising time to be building support for the efforts by the Japanese civil society to protect Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. The International Peace Bureau (IPB) has long believed that it represents a vital contribution to the global effort of restraining militarism and ensuring a transition to a world free from aggressive wars and interventions.

Furthermore, Article 9 is an excellent model of what can be done at the juridical and political level to embed a firm nonaggression position into the policies and the very structure of the state. While this is not entirely unique—Costa Rica, Haiti, Panama, and twenty-four smaller states have abolished their armies¹—it is certainly rare. While it is true that Article 9 was drafted in very specific historical conditions—after the defeat of an imperial power at the end of a

very bloody world war—it remains a prime example of how a state and its people, with some help from their former enemies, can turn the page and set their face against aggressive military methods.

Japan—a Pacifist State?

It is of course no secret that Japan long ago abandoned (under pressure from the United States in the atmosphere of the Cold War) the literal pacifist interpretation of Article 9. It now maintains Self-Defense Forces (SDF) of more than two hundred thousand persons (all technically civilians), which gives it one of the larger collections of military personnel in the world. It also has a Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security with the United States, under which approximately fifty thousand U.S. troops are stationed in Japan.

Furthermore, Japan's US\$43.7 billion per year budget makes it the fifth-largest military spender in the world, after the United States, China, the United Kingdom, and France. The SDF consumes some 6 percent of the government budget or almost 1 percent of Japan's GNP.

Thus, it can in no sense be said that Japan is a demilitarized society. However, the renunciation of belligerency and the specific abandonment of nuclear-weapons aspirations

Colin Archer has been a peace, development, and social-justice activist for more than thirty-five years and has served as secretary-general of the International Peace Bureau since 1990. He was heavily involved in the World Court Project and Abolition 2000 (coalitions against nuclear weapons), the Hague Appeal for Peace conference in 1999, and the Global Campaign for Peace Education.

(through adopting Japan's Non-Nuclear Principles and by signing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty) represent two very important bulwarks against aggressive war in the Asia-Pacific region.

Even though Japanese forces have been involved in overseas operations, they have been small in scale and always unarmed. Even when the SDF were sent to Iraq, no use of force was allowed; Japanese personnel are protected by other coalition armed forces. No Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Forces have ever been involved in armed incidents near the various islands that are points of territorial dispute between Japan on the one hand and Russia, China, or Korea on the other. Thus, we can deduce that, until now at least, Article 9 has acted as an effective restraint.

More broadly, it is important to perceive that the strong grass-roots support for Article 9 in Japanese society acts to undermine excessive respect for the military, a fact that is observed in the relative lack of prestige attached to military careers and status in the SDF, and the poor social benefits allocated to SDF staff compared with other sectors. In some sense, Article 9 acts as a common reference point for the whole country, as a constant reminder of its imperial past and the disastrous consequences for the entire region—and indeed for the world. An increasing proportion of Japanese are too young to have personal memories of the war, and there are signs of impatience with the restrictions imposed by the postwar settlement. Yet the experience of Germany since 1945 shows the importance of a legally grounded framework that holds back any signs of a return to the aggressive militarism and imperialism of the past.

Article 9—a Moral Beacon

Article 9 also stands as a moral beacon to the world. It embodies an absolute rejection of the projection of state power through military aggression. This is a fundamental value shared by religious and nonreligious pacifists alike. And not only pacifists; many of those—in every country—who accept the need for self-defense are firmly opposed to the kind of war fighting forbidden by Article 9. As was declared at the historic Hague Appeal for Peace conference in 1999, “Every Parliament should adopt a resolution prohibiting their government from going to war, like the Japanese article number nine.”⁷²

This is especially important given the signs on the political horizon of the dangers of future interstate wars. Not only on account of nuclear proliferation (the alleged reason for the invasion of Iraq, and the source of the persistent tensions with Iran and North Korea), and not only because of severe intercultural strains between the “West” and the “rest.” Most important, it is because climate change and resource depletion may well lead states in the coming decades to use force in disputes over oil, water, land, and other precious assets. If the temptation is there, then both international law and national legislation along the lines of Article 9 could be important in reining in the militarists.

IPB and Disarmament for Development

A sense of global history is crucial for successful peace work. Efforts to constrain violent conflicts are as old as humanity itself, and though often unsuccessful, they hold valuable lessons for those of us who feel moved to promote the “no-killing” principle in today’s world. The IPB is privileged to be a very old, established organization, since it was founded in 1891, even before the creation of the League of Nations and the International Court of Justice—two institutions that the early IPB pioneers argued should be set up in order to avoid recourse to war between states.

Over the decades, the organization, which currently brings together 282 member organizations in seventy countries, has engaged in many peace initiatives and campaigns. These range from efforts to prevent or end particular armed conflicts to worldwide disarmament projects and educational schemes. In addition to its ongoing work in favor of nuclear disarmament, the IPB is currently engaged in a long-term program whose full title is Sustainable Disarmament for Sustainable Development.

This work grew out of our earlier activities on human security. It builds on a long history of research into military spending by bodies such as the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI),³ and political position taking by states within the UN, notably, the long series of General Assembly resolutions urging the transfer of financial resources away from the arms race and into development.⁴ Unfortunately, very few of these noble aspirations have so far been put into practice. No international fund, for example, has been created to channel monies released from the military sector into antipoverty strategies. What has been lacking too has been a coordination of international civil-society efforts in this field—a gap that the IPB is attempting to remedy.

Military Spending

The amount the world spent on the military in 2006 has been estimated by SIPRI as US\$1,204 billion. The larger part of this massive sum is spent on personnel, but military bases, weaponry, training, communications, and so forth, eat up billions more. The United States alone spends approximately half the total sum, and the numbers are growing with every additional troop request made by the Bush administration “for winning the war in Iraq.” The UN estimates that with one-tenth of this overall sum it would be possible to achieve the Millennium Development Goals—something most economists and analysts say is impossible “for lack of funds.”

Article 26 of the United Nations Charter

“In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world’s human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating,

with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Article 47, plans to be submitted to the members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.”

Article 26, as quoted above, is one of the lesser-known sections of the UN Charter, yet it is among the most important. For so long as member states fail to make serious and systematic attempts to implement its provisions, the UN’s two primary missions (the promotion of peace and of development) cannot be effectively realized. Symptomatic of the problem is the fact that the Military Staff Committee has failed to function. Nevertheless, the UN was able in 1980 to create a transparency tool known as the Standardized Reporting Instrument for Military Expenditures, which has been used by more than 110 states and provides at least a baseline for analysis of the phenomenon.⁵

The Impact of Weapons

Among the most important developments in the disarmament field in the period since the end of the Cold War has been the enormous growth in public awareness of the effects of weapons on ordinary civilians, and the sense that it is possible to do something about them. This was notably the case with land mines (banned by the Ottawa Treaty of 1996), but also to a lesser extent with small arms, and now cluster munitions and even depleted uranium, where some promising developments are taking place. All of these are weapons that have enormous human costs and can wreak devastation on poor communities desperately in need of development assistance. Thus, the way that militarism undermines sustainable development is not only in terms of the “opportunity costs”—money spent on weaponry and war preparations that could have been spent differently—but also through the direct effects of war on conflict zones and the people who make their livelihoods there.

There is a further, and in some ways new, dimension: the environment. Resources devoted to the military sector—and this includes private investment as well as government money—could and should be devoted, in today’s world, to preventing the growing threat of climate change. It is true that the military may be among the most important institutions equipped to carry out rescue missions when, for example, dams break and large numbers of civilians are rendered homeless in freak storms. This kind of protection and rescue work will always be needed. But it does not normally need to be carried out by armed personnel and certainly does not require nuclear weapons, space lasers, massive aircraft carriers, or jet fighters.

Strategies and Campaign Activities

Making an impact on the global system of “wrong investments” will require a formidable effort on the part of civil society. The sea change in attitudes to militarism that will be necessary to shift policies and budgets into different paths is unlikely to be a rapid one in most countries. The Interna-

tional Peace Bureau’s approach is to encourage the development of “Article 26” or “Disarmament-for-Development” coalitions and national networks. To this end we organize, together with local, national, and international partners in the peace, development, and environment fields, meetings for an exchange of perspectives and the development of joint advocacy. Last year, marking the twentieth anniversary of the 1987 UN Conference on Disarmament and Development, for example, we raised our campaign issues at the World Social Forum (Nairobi), at the UN Committee for the Rights of the Child (Geneva), at the Bibliotheca Alexandrina (Egypt), and elsewhere. In addition, the IPB is publishing campaign materials and working on a major photographic exhibition, all of which make the case for a radically different set of priorities.*

Conclusion

We can thus conclude that the strengthening of the Article 9 campaign (both in Japan and overseas) and the construction of an effective global program to promote Disarmament for Development (that is, Article 26 of the UN Charter) must go hand in hand. Both are essentially political endeavors, in that they assert certain collective choices decided at the political level. However, their promotion does not belong only in the political realm. They both require mobilization of a wide range of social sectors that are influential in national debates—not only parliamentarians and parties but also labor unions; students’, women’s, and religious organizations; youth; and environmental and antipov-erty organizations. Even police and emergency personnel may be able to ally themselves with the argument that *human security*, rather than militarism, should be the guiding principle for protecting the population. The IPB is willing to put its experience at the service of all who share our perspective, and we look forward to working closely with Article 9 advocates in the pursuit of our common objectives. □

Notes

1. Christophe Barbey, *La non-militarisation et les pays sans armée: Une réalité*, (Flendruz, Switzerland: APRED, 2001), www.demilitarisation.org.
2. www.haguepeace.org/index.php?action=history&subAction=conf&selection=what.
3. www.sipri.org.
4. Most recently, resolution A/C.1/61/L.8 (A/RES/61/64), “Relationship between disarmament and development.”
5. <http://disarmament.un.org/cab/milex.html>.

* The IPB gratefully acknowledges financial support from Rissho Kosei-kai in the development of this program.

IPB Publications

Warfare or Welfare? Disarmament for Development in the 21st Century (100 pp., 2005, from the Secretariat or at www.ipb.org).
Whose Priorities? An International Guide to Campaigning on Military Spending (forthcoming).

Rissho Kosei-kai's Endeavor in Searching for a World of Nonviolence

by Masamichi Kamiya

Instead of taking risks with arms, please take major risks for peace and disarmament," the late Rev. Nikkyo Niwano, founder of Rissho Kosei-kai, eloquently stated to the world political leaders at the First Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (SSOD I), which was held at the UN headquarters in New York in 1978. This historical moment was the genesis of Rissho Kosei-kai's genuine commitment to disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. Since then, Rissho Kosei-kai has been engaged in various initiatives in the pursuit of a world free of nuclear weapons in collaboration with the UN, while the late Founder Niwano addressed the participants of SSOD II and SSOD III convened by the UN in 1982 and in 1988, respectively.

Rissho Kosei-kai's involvement in disarmament activities derives from its firm belief in the teachings of Buddhism. Of particular relevance is the teaching of nonviolence. The members of Rissho Kosei-kai strongly believe that disarmament is a sine qua non for a world free of violence.

Chapter 12 of the Lotus Sutra, part of which tells the story of Devadatta, is a good example that stresses the importance of nonviolence. Although Devadatta was a cousin and one of the disciples of Shakyamuni Buddha, he tried to kill Shakyamuni on several occasions. In spite of Devadatta's dreadful wrongdoings, Shakyamuni never responded to him in a violent manner. Rather, he proclaimed that even Devadatta would attain buddhahood in the future. This story clearly illustrates that the value of nonviolence is indispensable for establishing a peaceful world.

Meanwhile, nonviolence can be interpreted as the peaceful settlement of international disputes in the glossary of international politics. In this regard, humankind has made worthwhile attempts in searching for a world of nonviolence.

Article 12.1 of the statutes of the League of Nations, which was founded in 1920 after World War I, reads: "The members of the League . . . agree in no case to resort to war." In addition, an international treaty, called the Kellogg-Briand Pact, was signed in August 1928, and the parties to the pact declared that they "condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it, as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another."

After World War II, the valuable concept of the peaceful

settlement of international disputes was then written into Article 2.3 of the Charter of the UN, which was inaugurated in 1945. It states: "All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered."

The concept of the peaceful settlement of international disputes—manifested in the League's statutes, Article 2 of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and Article 2.3 of the UN Charter—is without question identical with a symbolic ideal of the renunciation of war, and it was finally incorporated into Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. Article 9.1 of the Constitution stipulates: "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes."

As can be seen, then, the interrelatedness of the statutes of the League of Nations of 1920, the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, the Charter of the UN of 1945, and the Constitution of Japan of 1947 points to a very important fact: that the concept of the renunciation of war was *not at all* a newly formulated provision inserted into the Japanese Constitution. Rather, it had been a long-standing ideal for which the international community had longed since the dawn of the twentieth century.

Rev. Nichiko Niwano, president of Rissho Kosei-kai, said in the November 15, 2002, edition of the *Kosei Shimbun* that people renounce violence if they fully realize transience, a fundamental teaching of Buddhism. He continues to point out that those who can acknowledge the dignity of their own lives can understand the dignity of others' as well. Rev. Niwano further states that an act of violence that kills others is in fact meant to kill ourselves.

During the last several years in Japan, an argument for amending Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution has gained momentum. But the people must be reminded that the concept of the renunciation of war or the peaceful settlement of international disputes has long been sought for around the world in modern history and has been cherished by humanity for many years.

Being mindful that disarmament, the peaceful settlement of international disputes, and the renunciation of war are mirrored in the concept of nonviolence, a fundamental teaching of Buddhism, Rissho Kosei-kai is determined that it should redouble its efforts in initiating disarmament activities in cooperation with the UN, as well as like-minded nongovernmental organizations, until the international community can enjoy the peaceful benefits of a world of nonviolence. □

Masamichi Kamiya is minister of Rissho Kosei-kai of New York. He served as a deputy director of the External Affairs Department of Rissho Kosei-kai in Tokyo until November 2007.

Maintaining Article 9: Placing Some Limits on National Sovereignty

by Agostino Giovagnoli

Some limitations are necessary. We must not turn back, but rather proceed forward. Abandoning principles would in no way help to reach greater international stability.

There is a long history behind Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. It begins with the inworkability of the European system of international relations based upon the principle of power and on the balance of power between sovereign states. This system, ratified by the Peace of Westphalen in 1648, conferred upon every sovereign state the right to wage war against other states; this gave rise to a kind of “international anarchy,” tempered by the equilibrium generated by opposing forces. However, toward the end of the nineteenth century, following the Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902), a new kind of problem started to arise within the British Empire, an empire that reached all continents, ranging from Canada to New Zealand and passing through Africa and Asia. A kind of problem different from that present at the time in Europe, concerning the balance between national sovereign states, arose: the question now was, how could such different peoples, cultures, and nations live together within the same imperial frame? Representatives of the British liberal culture started to devise a new model of international relations, capable of unifying free exchange, liberal institutions, and relationships among peoples so distant and different from one another. The aim of leading the system of international relations toward a stable peace thus originated between the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, in a context that has been defined as pre-globalization, on a multinational, multicultural, and multireligious horizon.

Behind this debate, during the First World War, the dramatic experience that could result from international anarchy started to set in, even in the world that had given rise to the Westphalen system and was governed by equilibrium between forces, namely Europe. World War I was also the first total war that cost millions of victims, involved civilians and soldiers, caused the ruin of both victors and vanquished, and devastated the whole of Europe. This event showed the way in which developments of the industrialized society transformed war into something very different from the past, something not easily controlled by the stronger powers. In this context, the ideals of peace present in the Anglo-Saxon culture inspired the introduction of important amendments within the system of international rela-

tions, such as the creation of the League of Nations just after World War I. Between World War I and World War II, the ideal of peace spread, especially in Europe, but war started again because of German Nazism and Italian Fascism. In Asia, Japan waged war against China and other countries. In the meantime the United States, which had previously supported the accomplishments of the League of Nations, was experiencing a period of strong isolationism. However, the ideal of peace was not completely forgotten.

After the great tragedy of the Second World War, around the whole world a strong desire for peace emerged, which led to the resumption of some of the previously discussed issues and hopes. During these years, numerous constitutions of several different countries were written, such as those of Japan and Italy, affirming the refusal of war as an instrument to solve international disputes. According to Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, Japan forever renounces its right to wage war, sincerely aspiring to international peace based upon justice and order, acknowledging that peace cannot be reached through war as the expression of national sovereignty, and stating that peace is impossible if individual nations affirm their absolute right to use force. After the Second World War, also due to the strong pressure by the United States, Japan renounced using “the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes,” and

Agostino Giovagnoli is a member of the Council of Presidency and director of the Asian Department of the Community of Saint Egidio. Professor of contemporary history, he is director of the Department of Historical Sciences in the Catholic University of Milan. He carried out research on international relations, especially colonization, the Cold War, and globalization, with a special regard to religions.

according to its Constitution, Italy agreed "to limitations of sovereignty" where "necessary to maintain a legal system of peace and justice between nations" as established by international organizations. This was done in the hope of removing the danger that had emerged during the twentieth century, the possibility of devastating wars for the whole world, as had occurred during the First and the Second World Wars. The principle of Westphalen—the balance of powers as the basis for international order—however, was not then completely discarded. Later, during the Cold War, two superpowers appeared, namely, the United States and the Soviet Union, but the principle of balance based upon strength was applied rather effectively, thus preventing the outbreak of World War III.

Today, however, the situation is different, and unfortunately we are once again speaking of a World War III. Today there are many different kinds of states: superpowers (like the United States), regional powers (like China, Japan, and India), associations of states (like the European Union), rogue states (like North Korea), and nations without state (like Somalia). This results in a range of very different possibilities for the application of the right to wage war, theoretically recognized to be equal for all states. In practice, however, many states, even important ones such as Japan and Italy, have no real interest in starting a war unless it is in order to protect themselves, and threats of war are coming from less developed countries such as Iran and North Korea. While there are many painful local outbreaks of conflict in Africa, the United States plays its own role as a superpower by intervening militarily in places such as Iraq; great regional powers such as Russia make themselves heard on issues concerning international balance; and other states, such as China, threaten war on specific issues such as Taiwan. Last but not least, there have recently been wars waged by individuals, not states, such as terrorism. In all of this, the feeling is of global disorder within the international system: the principle of balance based upon strength, modeled on the basis of the European situation of the seventeenth century, is becoming ever more inadequate for an increasingly globalized world.

Moreover, this international context is very different from that of the post-World War II era, when the United States urged Italy and Japan toward peace, demanding that these countries write articles to avoid war in the future into their constitutions. It was thought that new international organizations, especially the United Nations, could mediate international conflicts and find solutions without war. Today, however, we feel the limitations of the "amendments" applied to the principle of the balance of powers introduced first by the League of Nations and then by the United Nations. This gives rise to an ever-growing feeling of uncertainty and fear.

Today in Italy and in Japan there are some people who think that in the face of these new dangers, it is necessary to change the articles of their constitutions that refuse the absolute right to war of their nation and deny them the use

of weapons as a normal way for solving problems, and who do not accept the idea that there should be limitations on their national sovereignty on behalf of international organizations. In this way, they believe that they might counteract the fear of the people. However, changing these articles, abandoning these three principles, and contradicting their main implications would in no way help to reach greater international stability and order, nor would it effectively reduce fear. We must not turn back but rather proceed forward.

It must be acknowledged, obviously, that limitations of national sovereignties have not always provided real results and that international organizations have not in the past always operated in a satisfactory way. After World War II, in a time of great difficulty, European states found the way to peace, thanks to a progressive giving up of the right of war and other privileges of national sovereignty, as suggested by the ideals present sixty years ago nourished by the tragedy of World War II. In other places, however, the same path was not taken, and in some sense this was natural, because of the great historical, political, and cultural differences present in the world. In fact, European states were able to reach better agreements thanks to a strong community of cultural, religious, and social roots. Such community is unknown in many other places. However, paradoxically, changing Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution or Article 11 of the Italian Constitution would go in the direction of a return to the old European "balance of power" system that originated from the Peace of Westphalen. This would be completely inadequate for today's world. In other words, changing these articles would be a great anachronism because now the international scene is completely different from that of seventeenth-century Europe.

International balance can rely upon the balance of power if the subjects of this balance be few and homogeneous, can control one another, and are within a well-defined and circumscribed context. But when, as in the present world, the quantity of subjects is so vast, their quality so different, their forces so uneven, it becomes no longer possible to limit conflicts within a regional horizon. Everything has become global, and international anarchy risks giving rise to a chaos that will sooner or later influence everybody. The issue is to abandon, once and for all, this anarchy, not through the assertion of abstract principles or the dilatation of international bureaucracies, but by placing some limits upon national sovereignty and developing international organizations in a context of not only legal but also social, cultural, and religious ties, able to support mutual solidarity even among citizens of different countries.

Between the late twentieth and the early twenty-first centuries, some problems that were already present between the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries became greater: there are in fact affinities between the world of pre-globalization and the present world, which is experiencing ever-growing globalization. Near the states—whose features

are nowadays very different—the role played by nations, cultures, and religions seems today more relevant, or at least it appears to be acquiring importance. States decide their own strategies, considering the role of nations, cultures, and religions in the present world. Facing today's problems, on the other hand, we frequently observe a limitation of states and politics, from Europe to Asia, from America to Africa, and this very limit imposes today upon religious men and women the burden of playing a role that perhaps, previously, they would not have considered: they have to commit themselves actively and directly for peace.

This is what Pope John Paul II achieved by inviting representatives of all the great world religions to pray for peace in Assisi in 1986, one next to the other, in the same place and on the same day. His example has been followed by Japanese religious people, who have met on Mount Hiei since 1987 to pray for peace. This is what the Community of Saint Egidio has done by, each year, inviting representatives of the great world religions to the International Meetings of Prayer for Peace, in memory of John Paul II's initiative and to keep the "spirit of Assisi" alive. Real commitments for peace were born by these initiatives, such as the intermediation of the Community of Saint Egidio, which led, in 1992, to peace in Mozambique after fifteen years of civil war. Now it is up to the members of Rissho Kosei-kai and other Japanese religious people to engage themselves to maintain Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution.

At the beginning of the 1990s, the Most Ven. Etai Yamada, then chief priest of the Tendai Buddhist denomination, told me that religions had to play a more significant role on the international level. At the time, I did not understand his words, for it did not seem possible to me to create international links among religions the way they were being created among economies or communications of the numerous countries in the world. However, the Most Ven. Yamada, who personally experienced World War II, was right, and his words are of great interest today. It is not a matter of building, as somebody suggested, a "UN of religions," which would also be rather hard to accomplish.

Instead, the issue is to identify, rediscover, and give more value to those spiritual affinities linking different religious worlds, passing through many cultural, economic, or political aspects and creating interreligious links able to transform disagreements into energy for peace. This is the case of extraordinarily important experiences, such as monasticism, which unite all religions notwithstanding theological differences or dogmatic conflicts. It is already present; it has been built over the centuries, a great "network of the spirit" going from Hinduism to Buddhism, to Judaism to Christianity, involving Islam and all other religions. Such a network is undoubtedly a great cultural heritage of humanity that, however, risks becoming helpless and unproductive or, even worse, becoming something that can be exploited by a will of conflict. Therefore, it is up to the men and women of religion to interpret, propose, and, especially, live such herit-

age according to the peculiarities of their different religious traditions, developing that heritage in the spirit of peace, encounter, and dialogue, and in particular, living together in a harmony of differences.

This is the proposal that Professor Andrea Riccardi, founder of the Community of Saint Egidio, recently made on the occasion of the twenty-first International Meeting of Peoples and Religions, which took place in Naples, October 21–23, 2007. In that same meeting, Pope Benedict XVI, speaking to the representatives of the Christian churches and the great world religions, recalled the spirit of Assisi. In Naples, Professor Riccardi observed that for today's peoples, nations, and cultures, fear is not only a feeling but something that "becomes politics" and "culture." In fact, "the incapability of a great plan that makes a country or the world a better place goes together with a culture of contempt toward the other, simply because he belongs to a different religion, ethnic group—because he is different. The culture of contempt is as ancient as human history, but in this time of globalization it is being revived in an appalling way." We perceive that we are "many in a world evermore crowded and for this reason we want to protect ourselves from and be separate from others."

The virus of contempt has dreadful effects, such as the extermination in Europe of six million Jews during World War II; it destroys fruitful bridges among believers of different faiths; it nourishes terrorism in the name of religion. Facing this situation, we could think that the efforts of men and women of faith have been in vain. But the religious leaders who came to Naples did not yield to pessimism; in fact, they came to the conclusion that "all religions remind us in a different way that Spirit gives life and that without Spirit a world is built in which mankind chokes." Professor Riccardi pointed out that "the world of the Spirit is not a pre-modern reality, brushed away from progress. Instead, it is a permanent structure of human existence." He acknowledged that certainly "religions have fought against one another," but he also reminded us that "deep spiritual currents have run through them, causing them to fraternize." How can we forget monasticism, which, in different religious worlds, from Asia to the West, has inspired human lives and brought together histories of spirits? "There is a secret history of intimate communication among believers, among saints." In a spiritual meaning "no man is an island," . . . and no world, no religion, is really an island, not even Japan, we might add. Professor Riccardi concluded: "Spiritual people can and must speak of the problems of the world . . . with politicians, men of culture, [and] lay people. . . . We need a new boldness to speak of peace in the name of the spirit and of man! It is a new undertaking which must blossom at the crossways of history, in the places of prayer. It must blossom in the culture and practice of living together, in the art of dialogue, in the sincerity of friendship. Much has been done, but now is the time to do more. We need a convincing initiative of peace." □

A Buddhist View of Article 9

by Koichi Kita

*A Japanese Buddhist who went to school amid a militaristic wartime
and who experienced the fear and destruction of repeated
air raids explains why Article 9 must be preserved.*

Sixty-one years have passed since the Japanese Constitution was implemented in 1947. A movement to revise the Constitution, in particular its Article 9, is gathering strength in response to criticism that the Constitution is a vestige of the period of the Allied Occupation, forced upon Japan by the officials of the Allied forces, and also in response to pressure from inside and out for the Japanese Self-Defense Forces to contribute even more to the war on terrorism. At the root of the Japanese people's defense of their pacifist Constitution, until now, in spite of these various pressures, has been a deep self-examination centering on Japan's prewar militarism and of the unspeakable horrors of its wartime experience. Moreover, many of the Americans who came to Japan immediately after the war to implement the Occupation policies sincerely wanted to make Japan into a better country. Among them were anti-war, pacifist Quakers such as Dr. Hugh Borton, who helped to draft the new Constitution. On the basis of their draft, the pacifist Constitution that determined that Japan would neither wage war nor bear arms was joyfully accepted by the people of the time, who had had their fill of the brutality of war. Upon rereading the text of this document, I believe that the Japanese Constitution is an ideal constitution, one that will go down in the history of the human race. It may have been received from others, forced upon us, but in my considered opinion a good thing is a good thing.

From the 1931 Manchurian Incident (the act of sabotage that led to the Japanese occupation of Manchuria) through the Pacific War to the signing of the Potsdam Declaration and Japan's defeat, Japan was continuously at war for fifteen years. I was born in 1931; the first fifteen years of my upbringing, until I was in the ninth grade, were either during war or under the clouds of war. The schools had a completely militaristic curriculum; our teachers taught us that Japan was a "divine land" where all the gods and goddesses of heaven and earth abide, that the Emperor reigned as the incarnate divinity who stood at the top of these gods, and that the war was a "holy war" to overthrow the brutal United States and Britain and bring about peace in the world. We

accepted all this on faith. In fact, however, Japan invaded other Asian nations in the name of the "holy war," taking many precious lives; the Japanese people themselves were the victims of repeated air raids and had atomic bombs dropped on them twice, suffering destruction on an unprecedented scale. After the predawn Tokyo air raid that occurred on March 10, 1945, in which approximately 100,000 lives were sacrificed in one night in a massive incendiary attack, we couldn't find an aunt who lived in an area that was destroyed by fire. I walked the fire-ravaged area for three days, peering at the faces of burnt corpses. My aunt was never found, so the day of the air raid became the anniversary of her death.

Today, as a Japanese Buddhist, I believe as follows: The foremost precept that a Buddhist must abide by is the precept of taking no life. The largest extent of killing happens during war. The optimum situation for having no wars is to not have weapons. Buddhists, for whom the foremost precept is not to kill, should not have weapons. Even if there were to be a war and an enemy were to attack us, it would be better to be killed than to survive by killing others (in other words, by violating the precept of taking no life). If asked if this would still be preferable even if our nation were to be overthrown as a result, my reply would be that even if the country were to be overthrown as a result of not killing, that cannot be avoided. This is why we must hold fast to the spirit of the Constitution's Article 9. To hold fast to the spirit of Article 9, we must do all that we can to make true peace possible.

"Thou shall not kill" is a precept that is not just Buddhist; it has been common to many religions since ancient times. Nonetheless, looking at the international situation these days, it seems that actions that result in the sacrifice of the lives of others are being coldly taken in the name of eradicating terrorism and protecting peace. What is more, these actions are undeniably happening against the background of a competition for underground resources. The justification of bearing arms and killing people in the name of peace, a contradiction that was put forth earlier in prewar Japan as well, is a contradiction that Japanese Buddhists must not allow. To avoid the contradiction, it is the duty of Japanese Buddhists to stand firmly by Article 9 of the Constitution. □

Koichi Kita is former director of the Chuo Academic Research Institute of Rissho Kosei-kai in Tokyo. He now serves as a lecturer on Buddhism on many occasions.

The Value of Article 9 for Japan and for All People

by Vernon C. Nichols

Supporters of the article's retention are challenged to mobilize public opinion, overcoming the attitude brought by the passage of time and the fading memories of the horrors of World War II.

The Japanese Peace Constitution, with its Article 9 renouncing war and the possession of military forces, is a treasure for the Japanese people. It ought to be retained for the sake of the Japanese people as well as for all of humanity. The present effort to revise it must be resisted. Beyond that, its message must be exported around the world. When it takes root in many other countries, it will bring this rich legacy to all of humanity. Already it has influenced Japan's foreign policy and role within the United Nations. This influence can certainly be expanded. Obviously when Article 9 is under threat, as at present, it is the primary responsibility of the Japanese people to ensure that it is retained. This is a responsibility with worldwide consequences. I think one of the strongest challenges is to enlist a sufficient proportion of the Japanese public, and especially of young people, in the retention movement. Those of us outside Japan in the peace and religious communities wish to provide our support in all possible ways. This exploration of the reasons for retention is one such effort. There are both idealistic and practical reasons that we can put forward.

There is ample documentation for the roots of Article 9 in the Peace Constitution. To those of us outside Japan, the atomic destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki would be reason enough. Definitely this was a factor. Within Japan, there was the additional clear awareness of the firebombed cities. That devastation affected a far greater proportion of the Japanese people, and there was more destruction throughout the Japanese islands. Also the loss of soldiers, another effect of war, resulted in the continuing sorrow that the absence of loved ones brought to so many families. All of these horrors of war became sources for the crafting of Article 9, and they remain today as compelling reasons for its retention.

As supporters, we are challenged to mobilize public opinion for retention. Among the attitudes to be overcome is one that the passage of time has brought. Memories of the horrors of World War II have faded from the minds of even some of the dwindling number of survivors who experi-

enced them. Successive generations do not possess such personal memories—only secondhand ones at best. For our youth, those horrors are buried deep in the past. We must find ways to make the lessons of these memories fresh again. Reflection upon the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, with their consequences for all of humanity, is an essential element of the argument for retention of Article 9. The world has been fortunate that no country has used nuclear weapons since 1945, but it would be foolhardy to assume that no country will in the future. As we develop our arguments in support of Article 9, we should not depend alone on the valuable lessons of sixty years ago but must also draw lessons from the conflicts that are causing deadly damage in the present. The loss of human life in wars and conflicts in the twentieth century was a staggering 110 million men, women, and children. This loss continues today and will continue until we abandon war as an instrument of policy.

While Japanese supporters of retention know best the strategies that might prove successful in retaining the Peace

Vernon C. Nichols was president of the NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace, and Security for twelve years and served as co-president for the last three years. A retired Unitarian Universalist minister, he served congregations in Manhasset, NY; Ottawa, ONT; West Hartford, CT; and Southfield, MI. He and his wife, Susan, were co-executive directors of the Unitarian Universalist United Nations Office from 1986 to 1993. He has also been active in the International Association for Religious Freedom.

Constitution and Article 9, I think there might be value in convening a conference of supporters from the religious and peace sectors of the country. Such a gathering could develop multifaceted strategies for enlisting the broader population, perhaps targeting different segments separately in building a coalition. In this effort, all of the informal contacts with political leaders that religious and peace organizations may have could be utilized as well. I would expect that generating massive publicity favorable to retention is a necessary component of this effort. No doubt that would accompany any major campaign envisioned to counteract pressure for revision.

My own belief that retention is vital springs from my heartfelt religious convictions, from the early training I received from my parents, and from the shock and horror I felt when the atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This was nurtured by my theological studies and especially by one of my professors, Dr. Amiya Chakravarty, who had worked with Gandhi in India and was long active in the international peace movement. It has been expanded by my activities within the nongovernmental organization community at the United Nations. It has been bolstered by my participation in several memorable August commemoration ceremonies in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Hermann Hagedorn's poem "The Bomb That Fell on America" had a profound impact upon me that still resonates powerfully. He described the unparalleled effect of the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Then he went on to speak of the spiritual repercussions upon the United States, as the perpetrator, that he believed were also tremendous (1946; rev. 1950 [New York, Association Press, 1951]).

A bomb fell on Hiroshima.
And the cloud mushroomed so high and spread so far
It put out the sun partly, and half the stars. . . .

Hagedorn's description included the spreading effect of radiation with its persisting influence. He implored God's mercy on both the victims and the perpetrators of the bombing. The effect of the bombing on America, while not physical, was profound in other, spiritual, ways that he recounts. Then he concludes, after describing the power of individual redemptive acts:

THERE IS POWER IN THE HUMAN SOUL
WHEN YOU BREAK THROUGH AND SET IT FREE.
LIKE THE POWER OF THE ATOM,
MORE POWERFUL THAN THE ATOM,
IT CAN CONTROL THE ATOM,
THE ONLY THING IN THE WORLD THAT CAN.

The human soul and human hope are the elements we appeal to now as we seek Japan's retention of the Peace

Constitution and its Article 9. "Having hope," writes Daniel Goleman in his study of emotional intelligence, "means that one will not give in to overwhelming anxiety, a defeatist attitude, or depression in the face of difficult challenges or setbacks." Hope is "more than the sunny view that everything will turn out all right"; "it is believing you have the will and the way to accomplish your goals" (Daniel Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence* [Bantam Books: New York, 1995]).

Force has too long been the resort of people and nations in their attempts to resolve problems. It has not worked and does not work. It only sows the seeds of the next conflicts. We need to embrace another kind of power. This is the power of the human soul, or spirit. This can control even the most powerful forms of force we have created. Religion has taught this truth in myriad ways. The majority of people have been slow to understand and reluctant to accept these teachings, but "a saving remnant" in generations past and present has done so and has sought to spread them. I think such an understanding is part of what Teilhard de Chardin has called the next step in human evolution. This is not to imply that we must wait for another age to dawn, but rather that those of us with such convictions already share this next evolutionary step. Our responsibility is to share our convictions in compelling ways that will draw into our ranks more and more people. They too will join in the thought and actions that will secure the retention of Article 9. We must maintain the human hope that our cause is right and will succeed.

Violence is destructive, and its consequences reverberate down the centuries. All violence in society is linked. Peace begins in the hearts of individuals, and it must be practiced in the home, the school, the workplace, the community, the nation, and the world. Martin Luther King Jr. wrote in *Strength to Love* (1963):

Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that.
Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that.
Hate multiplies hate, violence multiplies violence,
and toughness multiplies toughness in a descending
spiral of destruction. . . . The chain reaction of evil—hate
begetting hate,
wars producing more wars—must be broken, or we shall
be plunged
into the dark abyss of annihilation.

At the heart of personal and communal morality lies the conviction that killing is wrong. This principle does not change with state sanction. It has roots in all of the major religious teachings and in many philosophical positions. Human life is of the highest value. Might does not make right. Other life is to be valued as well. This has been taught through the centuries. We have progressed painfully in our

understanding that we are all one. Many still need to be convinced of this truth. Cooperation is more fundamental than competition in the human experience. The nation-state is not at the pinnacle of governance. We struggled in the twentieth century to bring into being the United Nations. As imperfect as it still is in its functioning, it embodies the proud ideals of humanity. The preamble to the UN Charter begins with these familiar words:

We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, . . . and for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, . . .

Article 9 is firmly aligned with these intentions. This opens the way for Japan to act internationally in peacekeeping and in peacebuilding through the United Nations. Both of these actions are of increasing importance. *Japan's Disarmament Policy* states: "Japan resolved not to possess any nuclear weapons, and . . . strongly believes that this is the path it should follow to achieve prosperity and to establish an honorable position through making a positive contribution to international affairs." Later, in answering the question "Why do we need disarmament?" it states: "War threatens people's lives and properties, destroys their lives and societies, and brings many tragedies to the world. Japan's diplomacy must be conducted on the Japanese people's deep-rooted desire for peace and security both regionally and internationally. The genesis of disarmament is based on the idea that 'the best solution is the total elimination of armaments,' while maintaining peace and stability" (Directorate General, Arms Control and Scientific Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Japan's Disarmament Policy* [n.p.: Center for the Promotion of Disarmament, Japan Institute of International Affairs, 2003], preface, p. 1).

Many of the resolutions introduced by Japan in the UN General Assembly have elaborated on specific issues in the light of these objectives. Foreign Minister Masahiko Komura stated at the United Nations General Assembly's high-level debate on September 28, 2007, that Japan is committed to bolstering global efforts for the elimination of nuclear weapons. He went on to say that Japan "will again submit a draft resolution at this session of the General Assembly to map out concrete measures toward the total elimination of nuclear weapons" (UNNews@un.org).

Japan can continue to be an even stronger example and can increase its leadership role. It shares responsibility with other countries for past military aggression committed in the name of empire, but after the end of World War II it embarked, in 1947, upon a different path with the Peace Constitution. This has increased the respect of its neighbors. It is one of the sources of the prosperity it has enjoyed. Still,

there have been governmental actions that have eroded Article 9. These need to be resisted. Japan has been generous in providing humanitarian aid around the world. Reduction of defense expenditures could permit more such aid. Nor do I think it is a breach of Article 9 to participate in UN peacekeeping. Foreign Minister Komura also said, as chair of the UN Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) established last year to help prevent countries emerging from conflict from slipping back into violence, that Japan "is resolved to making a significant contribution to international efforts" through such means as the launch of the Hiroshima Peacebuilders Center to increase Asian civilian experts' abilities to respond to events on the ground.

It may be argued by some that Japan's Peace Constitution was not a fully independent action under political conditions in 1947. This is not a reason for revision; indeed, it lends weight to its retention now as an independent act and in resistance to pressure, especially from the United States, to take a stronger defense role. The positive influence of Article 9 must be upheld. Under its control, Japan has not been directly involved in war. Other countries can be urged to follow this example, benefiting as societies and increasing international security. History has shown that large standing armies and military forces facing one another across frontiers dramatically increase the likelihood of erupting conflict.

Just as I agree with Hagedorn that the human soul is the only force capable of controlling the atom, I believe it is the only force that can ensure retention of the Peace Constitution with its Article 9. Our challenge is to mobilize that force. Both religious and peace organizations are in an advantageous position to do this, operating out of strong moral convictions. But a great amount of hard work is required to accomplish this goal. Both Japan's example in retaining Article 9 and its opportunity for international leadership that this provides are powerful reasons for retention.

The prayer expressed in his poem by the Bengali poet Rabindranath Tagore conveys my hope for Japan in its retention of the Peace Constitution with its Article 9, and for all countries.

Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not been broken up into fragments
By narrow domestic walls;
Where the words come out from the depth of truth;
Where tireless striving stretches its arms toward perfection;
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into
the dreary desert sand of dead habit;
Where the mind is led forward by thee into ever-widening
thought and action—
Into that heaven of freedom, my father, let my country
awake. □

Establishing Priorities That Cut Across National Interests

An Interview with David Atwood,
Director of the Quaker United Nations Office in Geneva

David Atwood, Ph.D. in political science, is director and representative for disarmament and peace at the Quaker United Nations Office (QUNO) in Geneva. The QUNO offices in New York and Geneva serve as a Quaker presence at the United Nations, representing Friends' concerns at the international level. On completing his degree, Dr. Atwood taught political science at the University of North Carolina and at Earlham College in the United States, and was tutor in peace studies at Woodbrooke College in Birmingham, U.K. He has also served as general secretary of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, headquartered in the Netherlands. Recently, Risho Kosei-kai's representative in Geneva, Mr. Yasutomo Sawahata, interviewed Dr. Atwood on the roles of nongovernmental organizations in international disarmament efforts as well as on how he views the Japanese Constitution, which is now under strong pressure for revision.

What do you see as the present situation surrounding disarmament in terms of positive and negative aspects?

I gave a little speech recently to the World Federalist Movement, and basically they asked me to talk about current disarmament and peacebuilding. I was trying to say that it depends on the angle you take, or the perspective you take. In English, we say, "Is the glass half full or half empty?"—you know that expression. I think that the nuclear-weapon situation is very worrying at the moment because we don't see any substantial progress on the nuclear disarmament side and we see a lot of threats on the nonproliferation side. Therefore, I think that if we were to get a kind of breakout from the nonproliferation treaty, we could suddenly have a situation in which we have a lot of nuclear powers.

On the other hand, I think there have been a number of areas in which things have improved a little bit. I even think that though the convention concerning biological weapons is unable to actually keep up with technological developments, the atmosphere inside that mechanism has become more positive, and so we have seen some positive steps there. And we have a number of other multilateral processes that are actually moving along without receiving much attention, such as the Chemical Weapons Convention and things of that nature, so you see, some things are improving; I don't feel totally negative at the moment.

How do you respond to questions, such as What roles do NGOs play in disarmament? or How can disarmament

activities by NGOs support those by national governments and the United Nations?

I think that NGOs play a lot of different roles. They get the government's attention about issues, so they act as a kind of alarm system on worrying trends. They play a very important role in raising awareness and help to develop agendas for action. They provide a lot of the expertise about particular issues. They can be very important in helping in the implementation of agreements. We can see this in a number of ways, particularly around dealing with conventional weapon systems. They are part of the monitoring system, so they help keep track of what governments are or are not doing.

This is very useful for governments because they can accept it or reject it, and it's not official. So there is a growing recognition that there are NGOs or civil-society organizations or independent research institutes or whatever that provide this very important expertise in advising and monitoring governments, in helping in the development and implementation of policy, and in raising awareness, as well as in keeping the public involved. So there are a lot of key roles that they play. This is precisely the message that I am always trying to put forward to the conference on disarmament on how to include NGOs.

So those are some of the roles that I see NGOs playing. This means that I see this as a kind of three-legged table, to make a simple analogy. You have the NGOs or civil society, governments, and the UN agencies.

Sometimes there is still, from my point of view, too much of an adversarial nature to the relationship. NGOs are not always going to agree with governments, and governments sometimes do not like that. NGOs are going to be difficult and they are going to be pushy and they are going to be assertive with their views and their beliefs, but if you can learn how to harness that energy, then everybody is working together.

I think that NGOs are becoming more and more sophisticated at understanding what to do, and some governments can now accept that they must work in more sophisticated ways than they used to, coming to realize that they cannot effectively do their job without the support of the civil-society people.

What are some of the potentials of NGOs in overriding national boundaries to promote disarmament?

This is where I came in, in terms of my own view of the role of NGOs. How much have governments recognized that there are things that must be done in a transnational or a multilateral or a global way because we simply do not live in a world in which states can live in isolation from one another or control everything that we do? Autarky is impossible. If it ever *was* possible, it certainly is *not* possible now. We have to deal with the world, and we have issues that do not respect national boundaries, human issues that require solutions that need to transcend national boundaries.

What we need to do is figure out how to put some parameters around it, so that the interests of the people are put first and not just the interests of private corporations or governments. And this is a real challenge; we see it in so many areas, particularly in the environmental area at the moment. Part of the NGOs' responsibility, I think, is to act globally and to establish priorities that cut across national interests or to put those priorities above national interest. I think that the essential step in global cooperation is to get individual national governments to recognize that their own interests can best be served by collaborating rather than resisting collaboration, that by doing so they are going to be able to look after what they perceive to be their responsibilities as governments to their own people.

Could you describe the religious principles that are at the basis of QUNO's activities?

I think I have to qualify what I am going to say by adding that this is my own particular point of view. We do not wear our religion on our sleeve, because we feel that the way we work and the way we behave in our work actually says a lot in itself. We are always prepared to talk to people about our beliefs if they are curious enough to ask, but that's not our main purpose. However, the work here is very much based on attitudes and approaches and a long historical way of thinking about the world and also some basic philosophical

or spiritual or religious principles, basically what we call the peace testimony. We have a lot of discussion in the Quakers about our "testimonies," but basically what we mean—and there is always a lot of debate—is that there are some texts that one can refer to, but it's not something that's carved in stone forever; it's something that is lived.

The testimony is about living out some basic things and how you demonstrate that. And in essence this is based fundamentally on the Quaker view of what we call "that of God in each person." In other words, each human being has something of the sacred within, and what we have to do is try to reach that sacred essence—and that effort in itself will help to transform situations. This is, of course, a very basic understanding. It is also the foundation for the peace testimony, which actually says that if we believe it, then we must live it out in our work. This is where our pacifist way of working and thinking comes from. We are all God's creatures and we are all manifestations of that kind of understanding, and therefore our obligation is to try to stop the things that cost people their lives or their dignity or whatever. But we also recognize that therefore it is not just a question of saying no to war; it's also a question of saying yes to a whole lot of other things that have to be in place in order to make it possible for the elimination of war, the elimination of militarism, or the elimination of all things that inhibit people's ability to be their own selves, to reach their own potential.

Each issue that we work on has to be completely grounded in something that grows from the basic Quaker sense of right and wrong. It's almost an intuitive thing after a while. As Quakers we find it hard to explain exactly why are we doing a particular piece of work unless we can base in this fundamental way of belief. It's only when we have an almost physical sense that this is the right thing to do that we proceed. We talk it through, we don't just suddenly come up with new ideas, and we have to test them with our committees and have a sense that there are other Quakers in other places who also think that these are important questions.

The pacifism of the Japanese Constitution is attracting interest among the world's NGOs working for peace, who evaluate it as a practical means to prevent war. One such example is the Ten Fundamental Principles for a Just World Order adopted in the Hague Appeal for Peace in May 1999, the first principle of which urges every national parliament to adopt a resolution prohibiting its government from going to war, such as Japan's Article 9. How do you evaluate the principle of nonviolence that sustains Article 9?

What would be interesting to me is to know to what extent this Article 9 is a fundamental belief of the Japanese people as the only way that they want to see their state, their country in the world, because there are so many forces that are at work causing fear, causing threat, causing a sense that we have to protect ourselves, bringing traditional, old-fash-

Constitution, you have a moral viewpoint to use the historical experience of having been the only country to have suffered the destruction caused by nuclear weapons.

Having experienced two world wars, human beings have created transnational bodies such as the United Nations and the European Union in the pursuit of creating a world system that emphasizes international cooperation and enables the resolution of international disputes without the use of military force. We believe that Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution is an asset that has been obtained at an immense cost of human lives and destruction but expresses the common wish of human beings for a world without war. What do you think of the present movement in Japan to revise Article 9?

The world cannot have double standards in approaching humanitarian crises; every diplomatic means possible must be exhausted before resorting to force under UN authority.

I think that there are probably situations in which we must have the capacity under the UN to be able to say, "Yes, we must act." This is where Quakers are not of one mind in terms of the role of the UN, not only in the question of peacekeeping, but also in the question of the so-called "responsibility to protect." But if, for example, there is to be a global capacity to have that kind of armed force available for what I consider basically policing actions, then somebody has got to do it, somebody has got to come up with the willingness to put their own people in harm's way, somebody has got to come up with the money, with the infrastructure, the planning, the people. So that has to come from somewhere, and if we believe that this is important, then there has to be that capacity. But similarly, there are all kinds of global capacities that are needed. Japan does not have to contribute.

It does seem to me, however, that revising Article 9 is not the solution. Article 9 is in itself a very important message to the world. Somehow we have to grow up, and I think that's the opportunity here that would be missed if you change the Constitution. Basically, if you got rid of that principle, then I think it would be a terrible loss for the future, because it seems to me that this is one country that has actually demonstrated that there are other ways to do things and that we can grow past these things and that we can give our support and our leadership in other ways.

Therefore, I think that you should look at a whole gamut of other things beyond peacekeeping that would allow you to play a role that could be undertaken within the present definition and without stretching that definition very far. But I think that the minute you move to heavy weapons and an offensive capacity, that's when you cross the boundary—and it seems to me that that's not necessary for Japan, whose resources should be spent much more on looking at its capacity to help in the neighborhood, including developing its diplomatic "muscle." □

On May 1, 2005, the day before the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference at the UN in New York, more than forty thousand people marched from the UN headquarters to Central Park, appealing for global nuclear disarmament.

ioned ways of understanding national interest back into play. And in this era of fear, manufactured or real in terms of terrorism and things of that nature, there is much tension on the part of the people responsible for looking after the public interest, needing to determine whether we are doing what we need to do to look after our own people.

What I have always felt is that, as witnesses to nonviolence, we have got to develop credible, feasible, realistic, believable alternatives. So Article 9 has to come with a whole lot of other things that are alternative ways of understanding national interests, alternative ways of constructing defense, alternative ways of helping to assist the nation to feel protected.

So I think it is incredibly important that people in the rest of the world be helping to preserve this element in your national Constitution and to resist the forces that are trying to erode it, the main one being the U.S. government it would seem, despite having had its own reasons for having written this into the Japanese Constitution.

At a certain point, it has to be asked if Japan is actually living up to its Constitution. Is Article 9 still actually working? I mean, what Japan did in its economic miracle was to prove that because it wasn't spending giant amounts of its national wealth on nuclear weapons and various other defense costs, it was actually able to put it into its economy. And I think sometimes, given its history as the only nation to have suffered atomic attack, its history with Article 9, its proof positive that you can actually pursue your national interest otherwise, develop your society, and move into a major prominent place in the world without what I call the virility symbols of nationhood—that is, nuclear weapons or massive military forces—that Japan doesn't do enough with that. Japan is on the right track here; now I wish that you would take it a little further.

But it has been interesting for me to observe that you have these things, and in that respect, on the question of the

Security in the Twenty-first Century

by Robert F. Smylie

The quest for political security can become a danger to religious communities if their values are subordinated or manipulated by the state for its own purposes.

Security is an inherent value and quest, both for individuals and for all human communities. Human life itself is intrinsically insecure and vulnerable; historically, communal security has always been transient. Security is hard to define and difficult to achieve. Security's elusiveness reflects the constant processes of change in human affairs. In the contemporary world, state security is a socio-political value that is dependent on power. Yet insecurity is a hallmark of our time. As more stress is put on security as the dominant value, other values are skewed, for fear or circumstance. This article offers six reflections on the dynamics of security.

Reflection I *The major paradigm for the security of the existing nation-state system has been military might, often accompanied by militarism (ideology) and militarization (practice), as it had been with earlier political and imperial forms.*

The historic nation-state system, with its focus on security, fosters the practices of militarism and militarization. That system, with its doctrine of national sovereignty, evolved over four hundred years in the West, spread erratically around the world, and became the dominant political system of the twentieth century. Paradoxically, the system itself is a source of permanent insecurity. The aims of states generally have been national security, interest, and power.

The ability to attain the three aims has always been relative, given constantly shifting circumstances, many of which are outside the capacity of nation-states to control. The more interdependent the world has become, the more sophisticated the reach of technology and communication, the more devastating the military capacities for destruction, and the greater the movements of population, the more difficult it is to provide for the state the security desired. Thus, the quest for national security and power and the protection of national interest are basic drives behind the arms race and its natural contributions to insecurity. The result is called by some the warfare state.

The greater the efforts to guarantee security, the greater the insecurity. Often, a false trust is cultivated when one takes military strength as the answer to insecurity. While arguments may occur on the degree of military strength a state may need for defensive purposes, grave risks exist for any state that pursues offensive military strength. Internationally, where conflict has been part of regional history, other states will perceive military activity as threatening and will respond in kind. Domestically, the existence of a strong military capacity is a temptation to political leaders to exploit that power for their own aggrandizement or that of the state. As long as the nation-state system remains dominant, arms control efforts will be the primary check on military growth, not disarmament.

British historian-philosopher Herbert Butterfield wrote after World War II about the "dominion of fear," linking state insecurity to its fear: "Fear and suspicion . . . give a certain quality to human life in general, condition the nature of politics, and imprint their character on diplomacy and foreign policy. . . . The demand for security, and the high consciousness that we now have of this problem of security, have increased the difficulty, and increased the operation of fear in the world. . . . This universe always was unsafe, and those who demand a watertight security are a terrible danger in any period of history."

Butterfield offered the formulation of a law stating "that no state can ever achieve the security it desires without so tipping the balance that it becomes a menace to its neighbors. . . . When a country achieves a position of predominance—a position which enables it to assert its will in many

Robert F. Smylie served from 1975 to 2002 as the Presbyterian Church's representative to the United Nations. Following his retirement, he worked as the director of the Disarmament Program of the World Conference of Religions for Peace. He has been a visiting professor at the Ecumenical Institute in Geneva, Switzerland, and a faculty fellow at New College, Edinburgh, Scotland.

by its nature is a weapon of mass destruction as experienced in Hiroshima and Nagasaki)

The century saw the fullest reach of colonialism and imperialism, as well as their decline following World War II. Many of the countries that emerged were driven by the dynamics of nationalism and the dominance of the nation-state system. Some of these countries still struggle for viability and survival.

The twentieth century also saw the creation of the League of Nations and the United Nations as international organizations to promote world order and peace. In the new century the UN serves as the only major international organization with any capacity for dealing with problems of global security and challenges that transcend national boundaries.

The United Nations Security Council in session at the UN headquarters in New York.

regions with impunity—it imagine[s] that its will is more righteous than it really is. . . . We must not imagine that all is well if our armaments make the enemy afraid; for it is possible that . . . it is fear more than anything else which is the cause of war.”⁹¹

Butterfield gave two warning signs: when people begin to suggest that use of nuclear weapons may not be so bad after all, and when they begin to think that it is better to destroy civilization than to permit a reign of barbarism on the part of a current enemy.

Reflection II *Since the present and the future are influenced by the past, it is helpful to understand the legacy of the twentieth century, its systems, wars, and patterns of imperialism and globalization.*

The legacies of World Wars I and II and the Cold War, and myriad lesser wars, sometimes proxy, are still with us:

- In existential terms for some: broken bodies, devastated spirits, painful memories and suffering, unrequited grievances
- In specific regions of conflict; for example, the Middle East, between Israelis and Palestinians; North and South Korea; and the Republic of China (Taiwan) and the People's Republic of China
- In all the political, economic, social, and religious consequences of forever-changed societies and institutions

The twentieth century also saw changes in the nature of war:

- An expansion from the practice of limited war to total war, with its compulsion for total victory and its genocidal effects
- The virtual elimination of any distinction between combatants and civilians
- The increased sophistication and lethality of weapons brought about by the revolutions in modern technology, communications, and energy, including the weapons now designated as weapons of mass fear—nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons (only the first of these

Reflection III *The United Nations, a product of the twentieth century, is a new paradigm pointing away from the dynamics that produced past wars and insecurities.*

Drafted during the final ravages of World War II and just weeks before the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki began the atomic age, the United Nations Charter reflected its time. The preamble set forth four mandates, with a vision that humanity had another chance. The mandates were to (1) end the scourge of war, (2) reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights for all, (3) establish the conditions for the international rule of law, and (4) promote social progress and human rights for all. The package was a security paradigm that was an alternative to militarism. Whether consciously intended or not, the mandates reflect four basic ethical and spiritual concerns of most every religious tradition regarding the nature and destiny of humanity.

The institutional structure that was created reflected the world's power structure and the disorders of the day, thus clouding the vision. The Charter, enfranchising sovereign states with equality of membership, gave the General Assembly no legislative capacity, no capacity to tax, no separate intelligence capacity, and no judicial mechanisms to hold member states or their leaders to accountability. Cold War realities prevented the creation of the intended military capacity to keep the peace. Furthermore, the concept of the democratic equality of states was thwarted when the five major wartime allies were given permanent seats with veto power on the Security Council.

The Charter was based on the premise that members shall settle their disputes by peaceful means, refraining from the threat or use of force. This can be seen as a utopian longing or as a realistic perception that the future of the world was dependent on somehow being able to arrive at this as the norm, not the exception. Failure to achieve these norms means that wars and rumors of wars continue, as does the continued motivation and demand for arms as deadly and accurate as can be produced. Notwithstanding this, the Charter recognized the importance of arms control and disarmament by vesting the General Assembly with responsi-

bility for establishing principles to govern those processes, and the Security Council with the responsibility for creating a system for the regulation of armaments in order to maintain peace and security "with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources." The failure to achieve that is evident in that the Permanent Five of the Security Council, all nuclear, are the world's most powerful countries and include the largest armaments producers. Unwilling to regulate themselves, their energies seem to focus on limiting the capacities of other states.²

Reflection IV *At the end of the twentieth century, a broader, more positive and inclusive paradigm of security emerged: security must be shared, human-centered, holistic, and sustainable.*

As has been seen, security issues have historically focused on the stability and survival of the political order in whatever form it took and wherever sovereignty was vested, even in the persona of a king or emperor. Since World War II, that view has been challenged by the following alternative perspectives.

First, genuine security must provide not only security of the state but also human security, that is, security for the individual living within the civil order. Human security must enable the possibility of human development and recognize the possession of rights, guarantees, and protections. Implicitly, the security of the state can neither morally, ethically, nor pragmatically be achieved at the expense of its own citizens or those of other states.

Second, security should be held in "common" among states; the benefits of security must be possessed by all states, not by some at the expense of others.

Third, security must be expressed and realized in a holistic manner, recognizing the full and complex range of shared human and community needs and the right to peace in the context of political order and safety.

The concept of common security gained attention in a 1982 report of that title by the Commission on Disarmament and Security, chaired by then-Swedish prime minister Olaf Palme. The 1983 Brandt Report, *Common Crisis*, expanded the concept to include economic and social development and justice; and the 1987 report *Our Common Future*, linked economic and social development to environmental sustainability.³ The UN Millennium Declaration (2000) reaffirmed the purposes of the UN "to create a shared future, based upon our common humanity." It identified the UN as the "common house of the entire human family," representing universal aspirations for peace, cooperation, and development, and it expressed determination to achieve these common objectives.⁴

Reflection V *Numerous forces are vying for dominance in the twenty-first century: a new world order, a clash of civilizations, globalization, and world governance. Each has implications for global security.*

With the alleged ending of the Cold War, a call for a *new world order* elicited hope and cynicism: hope based on the possibility that the UN, freed from superpower rivalry, might rise to its mandates; cynicism reflecting that all the old patterns of state behavior remained in place: the system; massive reliance on military force; new roles for NATO; selective responses to global tragedies; double standards; and continuing economic imperialism. In fact, the bipolar world had disappeared, but one power filled the vacuum without countervailing force or the constraints of international law. That power possesses the largest nuclear arsenal; it dominates the field of conventional arms, including their sales and transfers; and its hegemonic power is reinforced by a sense of global destiny and exceptionalism.

A second option suggested that a *clash of civilizations* would replace the Cold War, since the dominant power needed a new enemy. Made popular by Harvard professor Samuel Huntington, the prevailing interpretation identifies a clash between the essentially Western democratic-based coalition representing a secularized Christianity and the Islamic world represented by fundamentalist Arab-Muslim countries. Behavior in both camps raises the likelihood of a self-fulfilling idea. Huntington did not rule out a clash with an emergent, aggressive Chinese civilization, a resurgent Russia, or some combination of mutually interested parties seeking global hegemony.

Globalization, with all of its positive and negative dynamics, also vies to shape the future, even as its meaning is not clear. Some argue that globalization represents a major opportunity to overcome global poverty, with its human and environmental insecurities. Others view it as new imperialism and thus a source of insecurity. Still others suggest that globalization will gradually weaken if not end the state system. It seems to be clear, however, that if globalized ghettoization continues and a third of the world's population remains in abject poverty, then a more amorphous clash may engage the haves and have-nots, with constant eruptions of violence, failed states, massive population movements, and environmental degradation.

The military will play essential roles in providing security in any imposed new world order and in any violent clash of civilizations. In the third scenario, globalization, given the asymmetries of existing power, the power of the haves may wind up simply suppressing and containing the demonstrations of the powerless.

A fourth, more positive paradigm exists, namely the emergence of instruments of *world governance*. Global interdependence of the world is evident in every sector of human endeavor: political, economic, cultural, health, transportation, communication, migration, and so forth. Functioning regulatory regimes are operative in most of these sectors, born of necessity and expressed in treaties and agreements. The essential ingredient in every case is the recognition by all parties that self-interest and security are at stake. (Tragically, the arms control security regime that developed during

the Cold War seems to have been undermined since the Cold War ended.)

An optimistic worldview hopes that such forces of global governance may evolve into minimal forms of world government while preserving the values of pluralism. Yet the concept of world government also conjures fear that such a government means an authoritarian power imposing its will on all. That scenario is more likely to be the result of an imposed new world order, top down, or a response to anarchy, than the result of the incremental development of norms, standards, and regulations emerging from the bottom up in response to recognizable needs and to the benefit of all. The Commission on Global Governance (1995) portrayed a common humanity sharing a global neighborhood, bound together by a set of core values and a global ethic of common rights in a system of global governance, to the end that all people could have a secure life.⁵

Reflection VI *The quest for security poses challenges for a world community that is religiously pluralistic and diverse. How religious individuals and communities respond to the challenges of security may reflect whether they are driven by the dominion of fear or are acting on the basis of the values, tenets, beliefs, and faith that they espouse.*

Religious communities relate to the political order in different ways. They often have competing value systems and worldviews (including interpretations of theodicy and eschatology). Often there is tension between the individual-personal aspects of a religious tradition and its organizational interests. They are subject to the same dynamics that create general societal fear, caught up in the same group dynamics that can be manipulated for political purposes, and perverted to support violence in the name of religion. Either drive will be influenced by "interests" that come with institutional involvement in society, sometimes as powerful as those of states, particularly if partnered with the state: privilege, prestige, access to power. All may wish that this were not so.

The quest for political security can become a danger to religious communities if their values are subordinated or manipulated by the state for its own purposes and if the process results in the absolutizing of a state or system, which may then give rise to a false religion.

Religious traditions seem not to devote much time to questions of public security unless societies are in crisis and the tradition itself is impacted. Most major traditions address matters related to the fragility and vulnerability of the human condition: the total dependency on other humans for survival, the transient finiteness of human life, the ultimate encounter with death with anticipations of what may follow. The efforts are to provide support, comfort, and meaning, even if individuals cannot be shielded. However, much religious thought has been given to the study of the sources and meaning of suffering and evil, and sometimes the conclusions may become part of the problem.

Some religious traditions suggest that no human security can exist without personal peace. While it may be assumed that creating the spiritual disciplines of life can bring inner peace, it cannot be assumed that that in itself is sufficient for social justice, international harmony, and world peace.

Others suggest that human security will be achieved only through the conquest of evil, however defined. But is it a contradiction if the conquest is by evil means?

Some stress that ultimate personal security is to be found only in eschatological terms, that is, in some future contingent existence. However, such anticipations may result in an abdication of responsibility and a lack of accountability for the affairs of this world.

Some may argue that ultimately security and peace depend on the perfectibility of human society, that is, the creation of utopias. Yet history has shown that human efforts to create utopias end in tragedy, because fallible humans normally create fallible institutions. Deciding against utopian answers does not absolve individuals and communities from seeking proximate justice and ordered, compassionate societies.

Religious traditions do seem to agree that human security can exist in the social arena, but only if there is peace. Peace is not the product of security; rather, security is the product of peace. The emphasis shifts then to the positive: "How do we promote and achieve peace?" rather than "How do we guarantee security?" Among the most common answers are mercy, humility, sacrifice, openness to new truth, understanding, acceptance, forgiveness, and love. □

Notes

1. Herbert Butterfield, "Human Nature and the Dominion of Fear," chap. 5 in *International Conflict in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), pp. 85, 87, and 89.

2. UN Charter, preamble, Articles 1, 2, 3, 11, and 26. The full text in English is available on the UN Web site. The reference to the mandates is found in the preamble. Articles 2 and 3 state the nature and status of member states. Article 2 covers the settlement of disputes by peaceful means among states. Article 11 states the role of the General Assembly, and Article 26 sets the responsibility of the Security Council.

3. The works referred to in Reflection IV are The Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, *Common Security: A Blueprint for Survival* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982); The Brandt Commission, *Common Crisis* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983); The World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future* (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

4. The passage from the Millennium Declaration is available from the UN Web site. My sentences are a composite drawn from words in paragraphs 5 and 32.

5. The Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighborhood: The Report of the Commission on Global Governance* (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 43, 46, 48, 56, and 65; information was gleaned and assembled in a composite in much the same way as described in note 4.

Reflections on an Article 9 Without Borders

by Chuck Overby

*An outspoken American critic of the U.S.-led “war on terrorism”
offers his strongly felt views on the need to protect Japan’s
postwar Constitution for the benefit of the entire globe.*

Please allow me to begin this paper with a confession. I have fallen deeply and profoundly in love with the beautiful wisdom that is Article 9 of Japan’s Constitution and the wonderfully related words in that Constitution’s preamble.

I would like to share with you a tiny bit of the story of how, as a veteran of two of America’s wars, World War II and the Korean War (B-29 combat pilot in Korea), and as a professor of engineering, I came to be captivated by the wonderful treasure that is Article 9. Drawing from the great poem “The Road Not Taken” by Robert Frost, one of my favorite American poets, I think of my path as “a road less traveled by.” Unfortunately, there is not enough space here to share my story, so I have placed it on my simple Web site (www.article9society.org), listed as “Dharma-Appendix-A-Road.” For the same reason, I have placed two additional Appendixes—B and C, listed as “Dharma-Appendix-B-Poems,” which contains three of my poems, and “Dharma-Appendix-C-Books,” which contains brief excerpts from three new U.S. books that significantly support my frustration with America’s addiction to war, which also stimulates the United States to urge Japan to kill Article 9.

Also, because of space constraints, I am using the Internet

to amplify. Please see my Web site, where there is much more detail on almost everything I say here, including photos of me in a costume as Uncle Sam—a well-known iconic image of the United States—addicted to war. You should also find on this Web site my most recent 2007 paper presented in Japan, titled “Imagine the Magic of an Article 9 Without Borders.” Unfortunately, the Web site is only an English-language site. I also frequently refer to our bilingual (Japanese and English) book, *A Call for Peace: The Implications of Japan’s War-Renouncing Constitution*.¹ The best edition to see is the 2005 edition, which contains a 47-page preface update. Unfortunately, this new edition is not so easily available outside of Japan.

Recently, I found that the ideas and ideals expressed in two papers in DHARMA WORLD’s January-March 2007 issue most meaningfully relate to my concerns. I am speaking of the papers by David Loy, “The Three Institutional Poisons: Challenging Collective Greed, Ill Will, and Delusion,” and Masahiro Nemoto, “Rissho Kosei-kai’s Social Contribution: Bodhisattva Practice Today,” which relate to Buddhism and social responsibility.

Now allow me to share with you the Article 9 beauty by which I have been captured. It reads as follows:

“Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.

“In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.”

A few of the preamble’s relevant words are:

“We, the Japanese people, . . . proclaim that sovereign power resides with the people. . . .” and

“We, the Japanese people, desire peace for all time and are deeply conscious of the high ideals controlling human relationship, and we have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world. We desire to occupy an

Chuck Overby, Ph.D., has been a faculty member at the University of Wisconsin, Madison; Ohio State University, Columbus; and Ohio University, Athens. He is presently an emeritus professor in engineering at Ohio University. He founded the Article 9 Society in 1991 and has since made many lecture trips to Japan and around the world in support of Article 9’s wisdom.

honored place in an international society striving for the preservation of peace, and the banishment of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance for all time from the earth. We recognize that all peoples of the world have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want."

In the rest of this paper I will outline some of what I feel, see, and dream about Article 9. I will also comment on Article 9's current predicament in Japan, with a focus on the larger problem of America's addiction to war, which in turn endangers Article 9. Finally, even though Article 9's current predicament is frightening—I end on a small note of hope—for without hope, life loses meaning.

What I Feel, See, and Dream

I see Article 9 as not just Japan's but as all humanity's cry for an end to that brutal, dominantly masculine obscenity called war. I see Article 9, metaphorically, as having risen out of the radioactive ashes of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and out of the holocaust that was World War II. I see Article 9 as Japan's apology to all the nations of East and Southeast Asia that suffered from its militarism before and during World War II. I see Article 9 as Japan's promise to those nations that never again will this militarist scourge be unleashed on the world. I dream that all the former European and other colonialist powers of the world, including the United States, will also apologize for their past colonial arrogances and obscenities by themselves adopting Article 9-type clauses in their own constitutions and nation-founding documents. Thus I see Article 9 as a model to be emulated by all nations on Planet Earth before we eliminate all life on our beautiful jewel in space, (1) with our increasingly ominous application of engineering and scientific knowledge and talents to ever more lethal means to kill and destroy, and (2) by our unnecessarily profligate and inequitable consumptions of Earth's resources, globally warming ourselves to death by turning these bountiful resource gifts into irretrievable high-entropy waste streams.

I see Japan, with Article 9 as its badge of honor, fulfilling the inherent promises in Article 9: demonstrating to Planet Earth, nonviolent and nonmilitary solutions to our inevitable human and ecospheric conflicts and problems—almost none of which have any kind of military solution whatsoever.

Since most people on Planet Earth have never heard of Article 9, and the United States and Japanese governments like to keep us in that state of ignorance, I see a world that needs to be shaken and awakened to Article 9's wisdom. I see a world that needs to collectively organize itself so as to permit and massively encourage Japan to demonstrate nonviolent, nonmilitary means to prevent wars and violence and means for resolving our inevitable human conflicts under "rules of law" rather than under "rules of war." I see Article 9 as one of Planet Earth's most profound "rules of law."

What is wrong with one of Earth's most economically

powerful nations, Japan, being encouraged and protected by the world as it experiments with, and demonstrates alternatives to, that age-old-dominantly-masculine-stupidity called war? What is wrong with encouraging Japan to demonstrate how we, with appropriate use of our science and engineering talents, might keep our beautiful Planet Earth from becoming another lifeless Mars? I think that I speak for most of our species when I say that there is nothing wrong with our seeking for this to happen. We must allow and encourage this to happen, perhaps with help from a revitalized, democratized, and veto-free United Nations. In doing so we will be but responding to Japanese citizens' sovereign wishes as expressed in the preamble of their Constitution:

"We desire to occupy an honored place in an international society striving for the preservation of peace, and the banishment of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance for all time from the earth."

The Current Situation

The current situation in Japan is not so healthy for Article 9, and a major external threat to Article 9 comes from the United States' desire to be able to use Japanese Self-Defense Forces, rather than use U.S. soldiers, in wars of its choosing in East and Southeast Asia and elsewhere around the world. First, a brief comment on the current situation in Japan, then more on this larger picture—the present United States government's addiction to war and its related lust for Article 9's destruction.

Since Article 9 is in Japan's Constitution, the job of keeping it alive and well is primarily Japan's. We in America have the supreme challenge of reigning in the Bush administration's neo-"con-men's"² dream of a militarily driven worldwide global-warming U.S. empire. We in America are presently not doing very well in coping with this challenge. Money from the corporate structure and the rich has contaminated both the Republican and the Democratic political parties such that we no longer have a genuine two-party system—and thus basically no serious opposition party that might bring the corrective actions so necessary. Furthermore, we have giant corporatized and too often governmentally compliant media across much of the media spectrum, from newspapers to television—which fail to exercise their constitutional first amendment right of "freedom of speech and the press," media that do not do the necessary sifting and winnowing in search for truth that would enable them to adequately inform the American people, so that the people might bring about the necessary corrective actions.

Japan's recent prime minister Shinzo Abe, in his thankfully short tenure, unfortunately set the stage for making it easier for the U.S. and Japanese governments to destroy Article 9 and once again set Japan on a course toward another disaster like that experienced in World War II. I encourage the Japanese people to work hard to overturn the

December 2006 Fundamental Law of Education and the May 2007 National Referendum Law.

Our problem in the United States is that our government is addicted to war and violence and sees a military solution to almost every problem. Whereas the reality is that there are no military solutions for most problems that we in America face or that we as a species face on Planet Earth.

We in America have not yet found a way to cure our addiction to war. In 2007 with the help of a U.S. veterans' group of which I am a member, Veterans for Peace (VFP), I tried to get the U.S. government started on the long road toward a cure for its war-addiction. With the VFP's blessing, I mailed, on VFP letterhead stationery, to every one of the 535 members of Congress a proposed U.S. constitutional amendment modeled after Japan's Article 9. In this first modest attempt at an Article 9-type of constitutional amendment, we only asked that at least one member be courageous enough to read this proposed constitutional amendment into the *Congressional Record*, the document of record of Congressional business. In the months since these 535 letters were sent, VFP has not received a single response to our first-step request to begin the detoxification of the U.S. government's addiction to war.

There is no military solution to the 9/11 attack on the United States. Yet we launch a "war on terror" against Afghanistan, Iraq, and frighteningly now even threaten Iran. Rather than our unilateral military rampage after 9/11, we should have addressed the 9/11 tragedy with cooperative international police work to bring the perpetrators to justice. Rather than solve the 9/11 "terrorist" problem, our unilateral military rampage has hugely increased the numbers of people around the world who wish to harm us.

To read the official document that outlines and justifies this unilateral militarist behavior, type into your Web browser the following words: "National Security Strategy of the United States of America." You will find a 31-page document created by Bush-administration neo-"con-men," published on September 17, 2002, that nowhere asks the important question: "Why do so many people around the world hate the U.S. government and what might we do about this real problem?" Rather, you will find a clear-cut statement of military force and power—including the right to preemptively use any and all means of force necessary. We in the United States are not hated because of the great values in our founding documents. Our government is hated because of our nation's behavior as we pursue our greed-driven military-power-based globalized, privatized, corporatized, and inequitable empire around the world.

There is no military solution to the huge U.S. demand for illicit drugs. Yet we launch a "war on drugs," sending helicopters armed with machine guns and crop poisons to Central and South America, and now in Afghanistan, to destroy the cocaine and other drugs grown there by the small farmers who are simply responding to "free-market" forces—the humongous demand for illicit drugs in America. The U.S.

government has never seriously asked the most important question: "What is wrong with U.S. culture? Why do we have this immense need for illicit drugs?"

Our 2003 war on Iraq has a significant "oil-resource war" dimension. This preemptive war was based on Orwellian-like lies and intelligence information cooked up to suit neo-"con-men's" dangerously flawed ideological biases. It also reflects their ignorance about that region of the world. Our war on Iraq is also terribly more complicated by our huge lack of balance in favor of Israel in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

There is no military solution for the United States' and the world's addiction to oil. Yet the U.S. government prefers to use its military fist to keep other people's oil flowing into our wasteful and poorly designed technology systems—rather than seriously asking our creative engineers and scientists to give us orders of magnitude more energy and other resource-efficient technology systems, and new energy systems such as solar related ones—all of which also do not pollute the ecosphere and do not produce global warming. Most unfortunately, our consumption culture does not ask this of our technological people—and this is, sad to say, especially true in the United States. I call these kinds of technology, "Green Technology by Design" (GTBD). I have spent the last forty years of my professional engineering life promoting these GTBD ideas—thus far, without much success.³ See my Web site, Dharma-Appendix-B, for a GTBD poem.

GTBD essentially means that when engineers and scientists create new technology systems, these designs must include, at the very beginning of the design process, two new design criteria: the design must (1) minimize the consumption of Earth's resources, and (2) it must not pollute or globally warm Planet Earth. This is not the way we presently do things, especially in America. Why are these two new "design criteria" so important? Because, by the time a product or system's preliminary design phase is completed, some 90 percent of all the "costs" and "benefits" have already been fixed. It is essential that these two criteria be addressed at the very beginning of the design process.

On my 2007 Japan trip, for the first time in all of my Article 9 support trips there, I had an opportunity to meet with a few Japanese engineers, scientists, and eco-economists at three universities about these GTBD ideas. I suggest that Japan might do GTBD as one of its nonmilitary, nonviolent contributions to world peace and justice so as (1) to prevent oil-resource wars, and (2) to prevent global warming.⁴

Please see our book *A Call for Peace* for additional discussion about nonmilitary, nonviolent contributions that Japan might make with Article 9 as its badge of honor.⁵

I have painted a somewhat dismal picture of the milieu, both in Japan and in the United States, in which Article 9 exists. Much needs to be done to assure that Article 9 survives and spreads across Planet Earth to truly become an "Article 9 Without Borders." I am not without some hope,

however. Let me now comment on a few positive dimensions of where we are.

Some Hope

I see several things that help me to continue to have hope for Article 9's longevity and for ultimately becoming "Article 9 Without Borders."

(1) There is a healthy, growing interest in East and Southeast Asian countries in the wisdom of Japan's Article 9. The efforts of Japan's former prime minister Abe to make it easier to kill Article 9, with the National Referendum Bill—have frightened many people in East and Southeast Asian nations, resulting in a "surge" of interest in and commitment to Article 9. Many people outside of Japan have been stimulated to want to help Japan keep and strengthen Article 9. This is somewhat analogous to what has happened to the "terrorist" population of the world. Bush's preemptive war on Iraq, rather than reducing the numbers of these "terrorists," as the Bush administration said it would—has in fact significantly increased the numbers of people who wish to harm the United States.

(2) Hiroshima's mayor Tadatoshi Akiba and Hiroshima Peace Culture Foundation's Steve Leeper, in their commitment to eliminate all nuclear weapons from Planet Earth, are seeking to help educate U.S. citizens about the nature of nuclear city vaporization by bringing Hiroshima and Nagasaki traveling exhibits to the United States in 2008. Their exhibit may be in the Minneapolis–St. Paul area in late August and early September for the 2008 Veterans for Peace convention, and for the 2008 Republican Party presidential convention—both of which meet there at about the same time.

(3) There seems to be a growing interest in Article 9 in Japan itself, also partially explained by the government's push for the National Referendum Bill. I understand that the Article 9 Association (A9A), founded in 2004, now has more than six thousand local groups working to save Article 9.

(4) Peaceboat and several other peace and justice groups are planning a "World Conference on Article 9" to be held in Tokyo in the spring of 2008. This conference should help to make the planet a bit more aware of Article 9 wisdom. Hopefully, the conference might also produce some strong nonviolent activities around the world in support of "Article 9 Without Borders."

My Patriotic Hope for Article 9 and for America

I earnestly seek an "Article 9 Without Borders" for all of Planet Earth—so that we as a species, and all other species, and Earth itself—might continue to exist.

I am a nonviolent critic of my nation, for whom I have twice voluntarily placed my life on the line in two of its wars. It is my opinion that the United States of America has currently lost its way as a beacon of hope for many people. I am concerned that we are losing the essence of democracy in contemporary America. I love my country, and I, along

with millions of my fellow citizens, seek a United States of which we can once again be proud—an America that treats all people on Planet Earth with dignity and respect, rather than as "collateral damage," as "something to be manipulated," or as "consumption machines." I seek an America that maximizes equity, democracy, community, and non-military, nonviolent, ethical, ecological, caring, and loving relationships on Planet Earth. □

Notes

1. Charles M. Overby, Masao Kunihiro (trans.), and Kazuma Momoi (photos), *A Call for Peace: The Implications of Japan's War-Renouncing Constitution* (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1997, paperback 2001); new edition with 47-page update (Tokyo: Tachibana Publishing, Inc., 2005).

2. neo-"con-men"—I derive this term from the words "neocon," meaning neoconservative, and "men" to refer to those who have a neocon ideology and who "conned" the American public with their lies so that they could preemptively initiate the 2003 war on Iraq. "Con" is American slang meaning to swindle and dupe. People who do this are called "con-men."

3. To illustrate some of this problem from an engineering education perspective, I presented a paper on GTBD in 1991 at a Canadian university, where the American Society for Engineering Education annual meeting was held. I met our Ohio University dean of engineering and he asked me what I was doing there. I told him and he said: "Overby, I don't see why you are interested in this material because there is no interest in these matters and there is no money out there available to do anything about it." He was right. Then and even more so now—compared to the relatively large amounts of money available for engineering research and graduate education from the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) and related private weapons production companies (also funded by DOD)—there are practically no funds for education and research in GTBD. Thus I conclude that our U.S. culture does not seriously ask its engineers and scientists to engage in education and research on GTBD—matters that would help to reduce our government's propensity and need to fight resource wars, and also to prevent global warming, etc.

4. It is interesting to note that in the late 1960s and the 1970s the Japanese automobile industry almost drove the American automobile industry into the ground. One significant reason was that Japanese engineers and scientists were encouraged by their companies to include at the very beginning of their engineering design process two important design criteria: (1) high quality and (2) high reliability. Japanese engineers and scientists were doing Quality & Reliability by Design [Q&RBD] for their auto industry, analogous to my ideas of GTBD. See the last page of Dharma-App-A.

5. See pages 130–203 for an elaboration on a multitude of non-violent, nonmilitary contributions to world peace and justice by Japan: (1) experiment with and practice preventive diplomacy and other forms of war prevention; (2) work to reduce population growth; (3) assist social and economic development; (4) overcome world hunger and poverty; (5) cope with massive refugee problems; (6) reduce human-rights violations; (7) reduce nuclear arsenals to zero; (8) stop international trade in conventional weapons; (9) educate for nonviolent action and conflict resolution; (10) defend the nation with Civilian Based Defense as outlined by Gene Sharp; and (11) preserve and conserve natural resources, reduce environmental degradation, design, manufacture, and market "Green Technology by Design."

Japan's Peace Constitution and the Lotus Sutra

An Interview with the Founder of Rissho Kosei-kai, Rev. Nikkyo Niwano

At the time of the Persian Gulf War in 1991 after Iraq invaded Kuwait, Rissho Kosei-kai's founder and then president, the late Rev. Nikkyo Niwano, was interviewed about Japan's postwar Constitution by the organization's Japanese-language magazine Yakushin. An extract from that interview follows.

The Persian Gulf War has raised many questions in Japan regarding the deployment overseas of troops from Japan's Self-Defense Forces, such as whether they should be involved in the transport of refugees, and as a result a subtle shift seems to be taking place in the way many Japanese interpret the nation's Constitution. I would like to ask you, as a Buddhist, to give us your thoughts about Japan's postwar Constitution.

I always think of the postwar Constitution as the wellspring of Japan's pride and hopes for the future. Its most important clause is Article 9, renouncing war: "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes." For the first time in human history, a national law states that the country will never again engage in war. The Japanese have a lot of things to be proud of internationally, but I think this is the most important one.

Could you tell us a little more about what you mean by "most important"?

I say this because the deepest wish of people everywhere is to be free from war. I think that one aspect of how we measure the degree of human social development is the extent to which large-scale violence is used. In primitive times, small groups of people repeatedly fought one another over food supplies, or inflicted violence on one another in petty quarrels, or sought revenge if they had been attacked. This type of behavior gradually diminished as civilization advanced.

But at the same time the scale of violence changed. Whereas in the distant past the fighting took place between families or villages or tribes, as civilization developed, battles broke out on a larger scale, between states and nations. So when Japan as a nation renounced war, this was surely a sign of its intellectual and cultural advancement. That is why I think it is something of which Japan should be proud.

Yet many people assert that the Constitution was imposed on Japan by the Allied Occupation, after our country was defeated in the Asia-Pacific War.

Yes, many people do say that. However, I think we have to look at the matter from a different angle. That is, because the war and the subsequent defeat were such terrible experiences for the Japanese, the people realized fully how deeply precious peace is. This realization is invaluable, I think. That is why in all the years since the end of the war the Japanese have resolutely defended the new Constitution.

On the surface we can say that it was "imposed," but in fact what is called the "MacArthur draft" was very close to the adopted text that was prepared by a group of Japanese scholars. That formed the basis of the version sent by General Douglas MacArthur, Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, to the National Diet for revision and approval. So we cannot honestly say that it was completely imposed on us.

I think what is far more important than the details of how the Constitution came into being is what it actually says.

I understand what you mean. Why do you feel that the Constitution is the wellspring of Japan's hopes for the future?

After the Asia-Pacific War, Japan's future seemed very bleak. Many of the nation's cities had been reduced to bombed-out rubble, its industries and factories were destroyed, and the people suffered severe shortages of food and other necessities. So it was not surprising that people were asking themselves what type of future awaited them. It was at this time that the new Constitution was promulgated, and Japan became the first country ever to have officially renounced war. Thoughtful people felt this was a ray of hope. Wallowing in defeat, they found in it the one thing in which they could take pride in the eyes of the world, and this gave them the courage to begin again. That is why I say the Constitution was the wellspring of Japan's hopes for the future. The

Japanese people must always continue to have such pride and hope, not only now but in times ahead, as well.

It is well known that there is some disagreement concerning the interpretation of Article 9 of the Constitution. Leaving aside the disagreement, in your view what should be our understanding of the spirit of that article?

I cannot do better than quote the preamble to the Constitution.

We, the Japanese people, desire peace for all time and are deeply conscious of the high ideals controlling human relationship, and we have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world. We desire to occupy an honored place in an international society striving for the preservation of peace, and the banishment of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance for all time from the earth. We recognize that all peoples of the world have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want.

What do you think? Doesn't this recall the spirit of Mahayana Buddhism? I think a sentence like "[We] are deeply conscious of the high ideals controlling human relationship" reflects exactly the spirit of the Lotus Sutra.

Engaging in power politics still holds a strong attraction for some people in the world. It exerted a great influence on President Saddam Hussein of Iraq, for example, who abused the ideals of justice and truth. The result of this is the criticism that it is totally irresponsible to simply verbally extol peace but do nothing to ensure it.

What then should be the attitude of people of religion? The Buddha called anybody who was able to teach him something "a good friend," even someone like the treacherous Devadatta, who tried several times to kill him. And Bodhisattva Never Despair, who appears in chapter 20 of the Lotus Sutra, revered even those who threw stones at him, saying, "You will one day become buddhas." Such a sublime spirit will finally bring harmony to human relationships.

This ideal is expressed in terms of the perfection of everything on earth in chapter 21 of the Lotus Sutra, "The Divine Power of the Tathagata":

Then with various flowers, incense, garlands, canopies, as well as personal ornaments, gems, and wonderful things, they all from afar strewed the *saha*-world. The things so strewn from every quarter were like gathering clouds, transforming into a jeweled canopy, covering all the place above the buddhas. Thereupon the worlds of the universe were united as one buddha-land.

This passage describes the world as being united. It is not just a colorful description but an image of an ideal human society that can be realized in the future. If we take a good

look at how world events are progressing, we can clearly see that we are now slowly moving in that direction. Countries around the world are endeavoring to act according to the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations, the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union is largely over, and Germany has become one nation again. The European Community is also assuming greater importance.

You would see the Persian Gulf War as a historical retrogression then? It seems extremely ironic that Iraq's weapons should have been sold to that country by some of the world's great powers.

Yes, in that sense any country can still be overwhelmed by delusions. Stockpiling weapons is the delusion of using your assets to strengthen your nation's armed power. It is because Japan turned that delusion in the direction of peace that it has become as economically successful as it has. Truly, "delusions are inseparable from enlightenment."

It is truly inspiring that Japan has been able to maintain its Peace Constitution in a world in which delusions flourish among nations.

I am certain there have been many difficulties in achieving this. The important thing is to overcome them. Japan has come as far as it has and I am sure it will continue to uphold these ideals in the future. To do so, however, Japan has to build relationships of mutual trust with other countries. This is nothing but the practical application of the Buddhist teachings of dependent origination and that all things are devoid of self.

What should be our attitude to the opinion that the actual conditions in most other countries are still far from this ideal?

It is true that most countries are suspicious of one another and that as a result they continually try to increase their armaments. Thus if one country has nuclear weapons, others want to acquire them as well. Trust is lacking; only doubt, intimidation, deceit, and plotting seem to prevail. And yet, at the same time, we have the declaration to the world as national policy through our Peace Constitution that Japan is a country that trusts other countries and lives by that trust. The country has continued to make that declaration until now. It is highly praiseworthy, is it not?

Japan is said to be not very good at diplomacy, but surely it is creditable to avoid lies, deceit, and plotting. If Japan continues to act in good faith, that eventually will be recognized by international society, and Japan will hold a place of honor in it. I am convinced that Japan must continue to be seen as a peaceful and civilized nation, and I would like to see it strive to help other countries recognize that delusions are inseparable from enlightenment. □

All Are Precious

by Nichiko Niwano

When we realize that our own life is precious, we also will realize that the lives of others are equally precious.

If we were able to appreciate, from the bottom of our hearts, that each of us is equally wonderful without any exceptions, then how very pleasant our lives would be. The key to achieving this lies in developing an awareness of the truth of the Dharma.

Our lives are interconnected with everything in the world and are sustained in the here and now through the infinite interrelations of the causes and conditions that are so numerous no one can perceive them all. All things and phenomena arise from these unlimited interrelationships fusing with one another and becoming one. The wildflowers that bloom in the field, the animals, human beings, indeed, all sentient beings, essentially arise from the truth of the Dharma.

When we awaken to this fact, we also become aware of just what a foolish and self-centered, narrow viewpoint it is that judges things only by their appearance or that is paralyzed by fixed ideas or prejudices.

Blessed Mother Teresa of Kolkata (Calcutta), known as “the saint of the gutters,” devoted her life to caring for the destitute, ill people that society had abandoned to life in the streets. When such people were close to death, she would say to them, “You were born into this world because you were needed.” Their faces would become relaxed and they would respond to her, “I am grateful that I was born.”

Despite their poverty and illness, these people realized, because of Mother Teresa’s loving intervention, that they were not alone in the world, that life is precious, and that indeed they were interconnected with other people.

Humbling Ourselves Is Relaxing

People have different natures and abilities, and their faces and bodies differ as well. Everyone has an individual character and distinguishing features that are an expression of his or her own life. The life that each of us has is precious and irreplaceable.

When we realize that our own life is precious, we also will realize that the lives of others are equally precious and that

therefore we are all connected as one. When we become as one, then we can understand that respecting and supporting the individual character and distinguishing features of others is the way to enrich each other.

From this kind of awareness, if, for instance, at the workplace a coworker makes a mistake, instead of criticizing that person or passing judgment we can recognize humbly that we might have the potential to make the same kind of mistake. We then are able to listen to what that person has to say, and we can give appropriate advice.

In Rissho Kosei-kai, we use the Japanese word *sagaru* (to go down) for our religious practice of humbling ourselves. When we humble ourselves, we feel relaxed; but when we cannot humble ourselves, we become arrogant. If our arrogance becomes aggressive, we end up suffering when we clash with other people.

Let us continue in our efforts to grow spiritually so that we can take deeply to heart the understanding that everyone—not only ourselves but all others as well—has been given a precious life that is uniquely individual, so that we become the kind of gentle human beings who can draw deeply from the feelings and pain of others. □

Nichiko Niwano is president of Rissho Kosei-kai and the Niwano Peace Foundation, a president of the World Conference of Religions for Peace, and chairman of Shinshuren (Federation of New Religious Organizations of Japan).

Mother Teresa’s Home for the Dying in Kolkata, India. For more than forty years she ministered to the poor, sick, orphaned, and dying.

The Diamond and the Lotus

by Notto R. Thelle

The truth is like a diamond. It is perfect, like the most precious stone, and cuts through lies and falsehood.

The diamond and the lotus are Buddhism's foremost symbols for the truth. The diamond stands for the perfect truth, which casts its rays over everything else. Its crystal structure refracts the light, so that it plays in all the colors of the rainbow. As the hardest of all minerals, the diamond is not crushed when it meets resistance. Rather, it cuts through everything.

The Buddhist knows that truth has the nature of a diamond. The truth is perfect, like the most glorious precious stone. It is immutable, and cuts through lies and falsehood and darkness.

But if the truth possessed only the perfection of the diamond, it would be almost inhuman—cold and hard and unattainable. In its wisdom, Buddhism points to another aspect of reality: the truth has the nature of a lotus. The lotus sprouts and grows from a tiny seed in the mud, reaching upwards to the light. Finally, its blossom opens up in immaculate beauty.

The truth is not only something achieved once and for all. The truth also exists as the potential for growth, and this growth can be delayed and stunted. It is unprotected and faltering—but it opens itself to the light.

Sometimes another image is used too: the womb. Reality is described as two worlds, the world of the diamond and the world of the womb. One world is complete, perfect, and immutable, and crystal-clear like a diamond; the other world has the soft warmth of the womb, with its potential for prenatal growth, for birth, and for growth after birth.

Although each image can be contemplated on its own, they must not be understood as two separate worlds, since they are describing two aspects of one and the same reality.

Perhaps this symbolism can help us look a little more deeply at our own relationship to the truth. When Jesus proclaimed the kingdom of God, he was speaking of something perfect—but at the same time, this was still emerging as a visible reality. He described the kingdom as a shining

pearl and as a treasure hidden in the field for which one sacrifices everything. But he also spoke of the kingdom of God as a seed that is sown in the earth and then grows into a huge tree.

I do not wish to press these images too far, but the pearl and the seed can function as symbols in a manner similar to the diamond and the lotus. God's kingdom is a perfect reality; but at the same time, it is still emerging, and we can catch glimpses of it when his word takes root and creates new life, when God touches a human person in such a way that hatred yields to forgiveness, or when violence and injustice give way to freedom and justice. We know that the kingdom is God's perfect gift; but we perceive his kingdom chiefly in its tiny beginnings, as an unprotected seed that germinates and grows towards the light.

As Christians, we believe that the truth is one and that it is perfect: it has the nature of a diamond. We have experienced how its light shone into our lives and cut through falsehood and darkness. Sometimes we even stop traveling, and think that we have reached our goal, or that we have grasped the truth in its fullness.

The faith is crystallized in clear formulations with sharp and harsh edges. We stand there with the diamond in our hands, and speak in absolute terms—we have found the answers and solved the riddles. But after a while, we discover that the crystal has stopped glittering and that its surface has dimmed. We try to cut through lies and cheating, but our "truths" have no cutting power. We had failed to see that our little insights and our partial truths were only reflections of a divine reality that we did not hold in our own hands. What we presented as the perfect diamond was only a cut-glass imitation.

We must not forget the other image, the seed that grows. The truth has the nature of a lotus: it lives in us, as a potential for growth, and hesitantly seeks the light. One day, it will unfold as a radiantly beautiful blossom.

The diamond and the lotus are one. The perfect pearl and the seed symbolize one and the same reality: the kingdom of God. □

Notto R. Thelle, D.Th., is a professor in the Faculty of Theology, the University of Oslo, Norway. Having studied Buddhism at Otani University in Kyoto, he acted as associate director of the NCC (National Christian Council) Center for the Study of Japanese Religions in Kyoto from 1974 to 1985. He was also a visiting scholar at the center in 1999 and 2000.

This essay is a translation from the author's 1991 book (in Norwegian) whose title translates as "Who Can Stop the Wind? Travels in the Borderland between East and West."

The Sutra of the Lotus Flower of the Wonderful Law

Chapter 13

Exhortation to Hold Firm

(1)

This is the ninety-second installment of a detailed commentary on the Threefold Lotus Sutra by the late founder of Rissho Kosei-kai, Rev. Nikkyo Niwano.

INTRODUCTION This chapter relates how the bodhisattvas and others in the assembly, deeply moved by what the Buddha had taught so far, especially his exposition in the previous chapter, “Devadatta,” of the truth that all possess the buddha-nature in equal measure, vowed firmly to protect and practice this precious teaching even at the cost of their lives. “Exhortation to hold firm” means to urge others to receive and keep the Buddha’s teaching. Interestingly, however, the present chapter concerns not exhorting others to hold firm but the bodhisattvas’ own pledge to hold firm. Thus the original Sanskrit title of the chapter, “Utsaha” (Ceaseless Effort), seems to fit the content better. But one cannot exhort others to do something unless one first resolves firmly to do it oneself; and one cannot truly guide others to the teaching unless one practices it oneself. This being the case, Kumarajiva’s decision to title this chapter “Exhortation to Hold Firm” when he translated the Lotus Sutra into Chinese is most interesting.

In this chapter Shakyamuni also predicted the buddhahood of the bhikshunis Mahaprajapati (Gautami) and Yashodhara. The description of their forlorn feeling, after seeing the dragon king’s daughter become a buddha before their very eyes, because their own Perfect Enlightenment had not yet been predicted, suggests that the two women had still not succeeded in overcoming their sense of inferiority. The way all this is presented demonstrates the marvelous skill with which the Lotus Sutra is organized.

The Buddha’s prediction instantly dispelled the bhikshunis’ gloom. This indicates the great power of words, impressing upon us that while the Buddha Dharma is always the truth, the actual words of those who teach it are also important.

TEXT At that time the Bodhisattva-Mahasattva Medicine King and the Bodhisattva-Mahasattva Great Eloquence, with their retinue of twenty thousand bodhisattvas, all in the presence of the Buddha, made this vow, saying: “Be pleased, World-honored One, to be without anxiety! After the extinction of the Buddha we will keep, read, recite, and

preach this sutra. In the evil age to come living beings will decrease in good qualities, while they will increase in utter arrogance [and] in covetousness of gain and honors, [and will] develop their evil qualities and be far removed from emancipation. Though it may be difficult to teach and convert them, we, arousing our utmost patience, will read and recite this sutra, keep, preach, and copy it, pay every kind of homage to it, and spare not our body and life.”

COMMENTARY *Good qualities.* This phrase, translated into Chinese with two ideograms meaning “root of good,” refers to the state of mind underlying good deeds—in other words, virtue.

- *Arrogance.* This indicates an unwarranted high opinion of oneself, the deluded state of mind that leads one to think that one knows what one does not, to think that one is enlightened when one is not. There are various kinds of arrogance or pride (*mana*), and we will discuss them in detail later in this chapter.

- *Covetous of gain and honors.* This means the inordinate desire for money, goods, and recognition from others.

- *Evil qualities.* This phrase, translated into Chinese with two ideograms meaning “root of evil,” refers of course to the mental state underlying evil deeds—that is, vice.

- *Far removed from emancipation.* To be released from the mental state that is clouded by illusion and to attain the pure mental state in which one is unswayed by phenomena is emancipation. “Far removed from emancipation” describes the low mental state in which one lacks even the aspiration to gain emancipation—an uncomfortably apt description of people today, rapt as they are in the pursuit of money and status.

- *Pay every kind of homage.* To pay homage to the Lotus Sutra means to “read and recite this sutra, keep, preach, and copy it”—in short, to practice its teaching.

- *Spare not our body and life.* This passage is the origin of the phrase “spare neither body nor life,” which we might call the motto of practitioners of the Lotus Sutra. It means being so determined to accomplish enlightenment and bring

enlightenment to all others that one is prepared to sacrifice life and limb in the process. It is simplistic, however, to interpret “body and life” as applying to physical existence alone. The phrase also has a deeper, spiritual significance. Because this is so important, let me take the opportunity to elucidate it.

In spiritual terms, sparing neither body nor life means abandoning the small self, that is, one’s egotistical preoccupations, sacrificing the self-centered desire for ease, a comfortable life, worldly success, honor, and so on. What do we sacrifice these things for? Needless to say, we sacrifice them to gain enlightenment—and not only to gain enlightenment for ourselves but also to spread it to everyone, to give all people real happiness and thus bring true peace to the world.

As our sense of self-sacrifice and service deepens, we achieve a state of mind in which we would readily give up not only our selfish desires but even our very lives. I imagine young people today will balk at this idea. They will argue, “The self is precious. To sacrifice oneself is to betray oneself. Life is the most valuable thing there is. There’s nothing worth sacrificing one’s life for.” This, however, is a superficial philosophy reflecting a misguided Western way of thinking. Westerners have long considered the self to be the essence of a person’s being. They have also regarded life as synonymous with the life of the individual in the present world. Leading Western thinkers today recognize that their culture has reached a spiritual dead end. The root cause, I think, is this narrow interpretation of the self and of life.

As we see in the Buddha’s discourses, the Eastern concept of self is not the ego but the true self (the buddha-nature) that is one with the Original Buddha, the cosmic life force. Thus our life is not limited spatially to this body or temporally to this world. It is the boundless life that is one with the Original Buddha; it is eternal and infinite life. This is the true nature of the self, identified by the deep wisdom of the East. To “spare not our body and life” for the sake of the Law means to abandon the small self that is a tangle of illusions and let our buddha-nature shine forth. In other words, it is to *truly live*; it is to grasp *eternal life*, not the temporary life of this world.

Unless the human spirit is elevated to that level, it will be impossible to create happiness for humankind as a whole no matter how far material civilization may progress and no matter how much political and social institutions may be reformed. This is why the Lotus Sutra places so much emphasis on sparing neither body nor life. I must stress, however, that this does not mean that life is not to be revered. We have been given our present life so that we can practice in order to attain supreme enlightenment, and for that reason we must value this life. Thus, while there are situations in which we must not hesitate to sacrifice our lives for the truth, there are also situations in which we must continue to live, enduring hardship, for the truth. Chapter 20, “The Bodhisattva Never Despise,” concerns a bodhi-

sattva who revered the buddha-nature in everyone. To remain true to the conviction that drove him to try to awaken all people to their buddha-nature, whenever others sought to harm him, angered because they thought he was making fun of them, he would run away and then, from a safe distance, continue to pay them reverence.

Running away seems shameful, but Never Despise cared nothing for appearances or reputation; he ran away to follow through on his conviction. In short, he abandoned the small self and lived in the true self. Since he had so thoroughly thrown off the small self, he must have been prepared to give up his life at any moment. Nevertheless he ran away without a thought for shame or repute. His attitude of sparing neither body nor life is one that we today should be able to relate to. What is important is that we engrave deeply in our minds the fundamental principle that sparing neither body nor life does not mean merely giving up one’s physical life; it means abandoning the small self and living in the true self.

TEXT Thereupon the five hundred arhats in the assembly, whose future had been predicted, addressed the Buddha, saying: “World-honored One! We also vow to publish abroad this sutra in other lands.”

COMMENTARY These arhats were saying, “Since the Bodhisattva-Mahasattva Medicine King, the Bodhisattva-Mahasattva Great Eloquence, and the twenty thousand bodhisattvas in their retinue are going to preach the Lotus Sutra in this land, we will do the same in other lands.”

TEXT Again the eight thousand arhats, training and trained, whose future had been predicted, rising up from their seats and folding their hands toward the Buddha, made this vow, saying: “World-honored One! We also will publish abroad this sutra in other lands. Wherefore? Because in this *saha* world men abound in wickedness, cherish the utmost arrogance, [and] are of shallow virtue, defiled with hatreds, crooked with suspicions, and insincere in mind.”

COMMENTARY These arhats, bhikshus who had just completed training (*ashaiksha* in Sanskrit) or still in training (*shaiksha*), were saying, “Dealing with this *saha* world is still beyond us, so we will preach the Law in places that are not beyond our powers.” Instead of indulging in empty boasts, they wisely recognized their limitations.

• *Virtue*. For a discussion of this term, see the October-December 2007 issue of DHARMA WORLD.

• *Crooked with suspicions*. The two Chinese ideograms used to translate this phrase mean “sycophancy” and “sophistry.” Sycophancy leads to sophistry toward both others and oneself. These are vices extremely widespread among people today.

TEXT Then the sister of the Buddha’s mother, the

Bhikshuni Mahaprajapati, with six thousand bhikshunis, training and trained, rose up from their seats, with one mind folded their hands, [and] gazed up to the honored face without removing their eyes for a moment.

COMMENTARY *The Bhikshuni Mahaprajapati.* Shakyamuni's mother, Maya, died seven days after giving birth, whereupon her younger sister married Shakyamuni's father, King Shuddhodana, and brought up the prince as lovingly as if she had been his biological mother. We can imagine her grief when he renounced the world. What is more, her biological son, Nanda (Shakyamuni's younger half brother), and her step-grandson, Rahula (Shakyamuni's son), also renounced the world to follow the Buddha, and then the king died. She was a person who tasted to the full the bitter cup of parting from loved ones. But she was a cultivated and strong-minded woman and did not allow herself to be beaten down by such changes in her environment. When she was living as a laywoman, she fulfilled her duties as a wife and mother; and when she renounced the world, she won the love and trust of the other bhikshunis as their leader. (For an account of her renunciation of the world, see the March/April 2005 issue.) She was called Gautami, the feminine form of the Shakra clan name of Gautama, but her religious name was Mahaprajapati, which means "way of great love."

Mahaprajapati was the first woman to join the Sangha. Not only for this reason but also because of her sterling qualities, Shakyamuni gave her total responsibility for the community of bhikshunis. Unable to bear the thought of Shakyamuni's dying before her, at the age of 120 Mahaprajapati went to Vaishali, entered *samadhi*, and died. Despite her venerable years, she is said to have showed no signs of aging. Shakyamuni honored her by conducting her funeral himself. He, along with Nanda, Rahula, and Ananda, is said to have borne her body to the tomb. We could say she was the most fortunate woman in the world.

The Buddha never let personal feelings influence his treatment of Mahaprajapati in life, however. He denied her request to join the Sangha several times, and when he finally did allow it, he required her to observe extremely strict monastic regulations. The humanity and filial piety he showed in personally bearing her body to the tomb brings tears to our eyes and impresses upon us once again what a great man he was.

TEXT Then the World-honored One addressed the Gautami: "Why, with sad countenance, do you gaze at the Tathagata? Are you not thinking to say that I have not mentioned your name and predicted for you Perfect Enlightenment? Gautami! I have already inclusively announced that [the future of] all shravakas is predicted.

COMMENTARY Mahaprajapati's Perfect Enlightenment had already been predicted, but Shakyamuni perceived that her

mind would not be at rest until he delivered a prediction specifically directed at her.

TEXT Now you, who desire to know your future destiny, shall, in the world to come, become a great teacher of the Law in the teachings of the sixty-eight thousand kotis of buddhas, and these six thousand bhikshunis, training and trained, will all become teachers of the Law. Thus you will gradually become perfect in the bodhisattva way and will become a buddha entitled Loveliness Tathagata, Worshipful, All Wise, Perfectly Enlightened in Conduct, Well Departed, Understander of the World, Peerless Leader, Controller, Teacher of Gods and Men, Buddha, World-honored One.

COMMENTARY *Teacher of the Law.* This refers to one who preaches the Law, who guides others in the Law. It has nothing to do with whether one is ordained or a lay believer. A priest who does not preach the Law for the sake of other people is not qualified as a teacher of the Law, whereas a lay person who does so is a fine teacher of the Law.

TEXT Gautami! This Buddha Loveliness and the six thousand bodhisattvas will each in turn predict the Perfect Enlightenment [of others]."

COMMENTARY Just as in chapter 8, "The Five Hundred Disciples Receive the Prediction of Their Destiny," Shakyamuni had predicted that as the five hundred bhikshus became buddhas "in turn [each] shall predict" the buddhahood of others, so here he proclaimed that the Buddha Loveliness would predict the Perfect Enlightenment of one of the six thousand bodhisattvas, who upon becoming a buddha would then predict the Perfect Enlightenment of another bodhisattva, and so on indefinitely.

TEXT Thereupon the mother of Rahula, the Bhikshuni Yashodhara, reflected thus: "The World-honored One in his predictions has left my name alone unmentioned." [Then] the Buddha said to Yashodhara: "You, in the teachings of the hundred thousand myriads of kotis of buddhas in the world to come, by your doing of bodhisattva deeds shall become a great teacher of the Law, gradually become perfect in the Buddha Way, and in the domain Good become a buddha entitled The Perfect Myriad-rayed Tathagata, Worshipful, All Wise, Perfectly Enlightened in Conduct, Well Departed, Understander of the World, Peerless Leader, Controller, Teacher of Gods and Men, Buddha, World-honored One. The lifetime of that buddha will be innumerable *asamkhyeya* kalpas."

To be continued

In this series, passages in the **TEXT** sections are quoted from *The Threefold Lotus Sutra*, Tokyo: Kosei Publishing Company, 1975, with slight revisions.