

# Creating a Stable World Peace

Emily Markides

Stillwater, Maine, U.S.A.

## *Abstract*

*Converting the present war system into a peace system requires analysis and action on several levels. Analysis of the surface structure of peace reveals a need for global reforms: disarmament and then political, economic, social, ecological, and cultural changes. These are important, but by themselves are not enough to bring about a stable world peace. The deeper structure of peace calls for transcending and nonduality—a permanent alteration of human consciousness rooted in respect for the sacredness of nature and the need to reintegrate humanity into the ecosystem of the whole world. Action from these deeper levels is the most important; altering human consciousness and creating coherence in collective consciousness is the direct means to reduce conflict and to bring peace.*

## **The Failure of “Peace Through Strength”**

As the Cold War becomes relegated to a place in recent history, it should come as no surprise that President Bush’s “new world order” has begun with a war. The president’s decision to use military power in the Persian Gulf commits us to the same old world order renamed in a new phraseology, namely resolving international conflicts by means of military solutions. The option to rush into war rather than wait for diplomacy to work manifests most of the symptoms inherent in the power politics model of resolving conflict, that is, choosing to resolve conflict through violence, threats, and coercion, by blaming and demonizing the opponent. This old way of dealing with conflict is one of the main obstacles to living in peace; it is mainly expressed as a rigid adherence to narrow definitions of social allegiance, as the ethnocentricity and concerns for power of national, political, religious, and ethnic groups who see things through their own lenses and do not hear or acknowledge the perspectives of others.

From the very beginning of the Gulf conflict the prospect of war has been given priority over the possibility of a peaceful settlement. The price the world is paying is not only in terms of the lives lost and the economic and environmental degradation

---

Address correspondence to: Emily Markides  
P.O. Box 172, 30 Free Street, Stillwater, ME 04489

*Modern Science and Vedic Science*, Volume 5, Numbers 1–2, 1992, Special Issue  
Proceedings of Approaches to Creating a Stable World Peace, April 5–7, 1991

Sponsored by the Institute of World Peace  
Maharishi International University

©1992 Maharishi International University

---

incurred, but mostly in the message given out that war is a necessary means to resolve international problems. Arrogance, impatience, and unbridled ideological rigidity perpetuate the wheel of the military industrial complex that President Eisenhower warned us against in his farewell speech to the nation. The power politics model, or the “peace through strength” perspective, as it is otherwise known, has been thoroughly discredited as a model for bringing about peace. Whatever justification a state or a group of states may have for resorting to military deterrence, that is, resorting to armaments for their security, the argument brought forth is simply not convincing—deterrence implies high military capability which leads to war proneness, to war addiction. No planetary citizen, no universal institution, can ever lend support to the idea of a planet of armed nations. There is a strong relationship between military strength, or military and economic strength combined, and the tendency of a nation to go to war.

In the aftermath of the Gulf crisis, what educational, economic, political and cultural changes must be made in order to ensure a stable peace and a just world? What do we, in the peace movement, want to accomplish, and how do we propose to bring about the desired changes?

### **Educating for Peace**

We live in a world which is basically raised and educated in the ways of war, but not in the ways of peace. Most of our ways of thinking are war ways. Point, counterpoint—there are thousands of examples of how our language itself expresses this war mentality. The challenge right now is to begin educating for peace, to bring into our curricula a new vocabulary, a new language of educating people to think in peaceful ways and to not only think and live peace, but to be peace. Being peace is a very important issue. It was evident during the Gulf crisis that the peace movement is filled with anger and hatred. Marches and protests are very justifiable forms of social action, but what is needed is to channel the anger and aggression into positive action.

Having that goal in mind, I have tried to combine my linguistic background and my involvement in the peace movement to create a synthesis and to bring a certain coherence to this movement. I propose that what we need to be doing in the peace movement is to be looking at life in a systemic way. To bring about peace we need to look at war as an entire system which has penetrated society in its every institution, including our ways of thinking and our ways of talking. We must adopt a systemic way and begin transforming an entire system from a war system to a peace system.

Modern physicists think that the word “observer” is no longer valid because an observer is distinct from the object she observes. So they propose the word “participant.” The French language has the word “comprendre,” which means to understand, to know, to comprehend. *Com* means “to be one,” “to be together,” and *prendre* means “to take” or “grasp.” To understand something is to be one with it. The English language also has the very significant word, “compassion.” *Com* means “to be one,” and *passion* means “to suffer.” Compassion means to have the ability to feel the suffering of another and wish for it to cease. One more important word, derived from the Greek language, is the word *metanoia*, which means repentance. The peace movement cannot fulfill its

mission while it is in the grips of anger and aggression. How can we move out of a mindset of hatred and fear to a new way of thinking and living that is so necessary for survival? How can we move from paranoia to metanoia, from fear and intolerance to repentance and compassion?

Our task at hand is to convert the war system by envisioning and designing a future of peace. Peace is not solely the concern of governments, international agencies, and academic institutions. Peace is the wish of every single human being. Since there are over five billion inhabitants on planet Earth, we can say that there is an immense, untapped power for peace somewhere out there. Every peacemaker's task is to tap and unleash this unused power for peace and put it to work. The goal is to convert the war system to a peace system, to move from power politics to an ego-free politics. In order to do that, clarity of our goals is essential. The more vivid the goal, the more it will inspire and sustain us. In envisioning and designing a future of peace a three-fold process is required:

1. Analysis of what presently exists;
2. Vision of what could come to exist in the future;
3. Strategy for getting from present to desired future by means of a system design and problem solving.

### **Surface and Deep Structures of Peace**

The undertaking is vast, complex, and very difficult. I therefore suggest that we use a linguistic analysis to look at the peace system as a text. A peace system can be perceived as a text with a surface structure, or what the psychoanalyst semiotician, Julia Kristeva, would call the "pheno-texte," and a deep structure, called the "geno-texte." Pheno-texte is the surface layer of the text. Geno-texte is the deep structure, or the structure of language, which is not at the mercy of grammatical, syntactical rules. The surface structure of the peace system requires us to reduce the causes of war by bringing about global reforms in the form of, first, disarmament, and second, political, economic, social, ecological, and cultural changes. The deep structure moves us in the direction of transcending and nonduality.

"Armaments are." to quote Robert Muller (1984), Chancellor of the UN University of Peace in Costa Rica, "a folly, a disgrace, and an intolerable waste. It is a folly that insane, life-annihilating weapons are being produced and accumulated on our fragile planet at the expense of development. Armaments are a disgrace for they cast a severe doubt on human intelligence and the validity of our present sociopolitical system. And it is an intolerable waste that nearly one trillion dollars is being squandered each year on armaments when so many hundreds of millions of human beings cry out for food, shelter, medical care and schools on our planet" (p. 103). The tension between militarization and development should be *the* issue on the peace agenda in the 1990s because in reality most of the Third World countries' budgets go into military build-up rather than development.

Disarmament is a gradual shift to defense policies that pose no threat to others. With the end of the Cold War, and as the dark clouds of Operation Desert Storm loom

menacingly over our heads, we are presented with an unprecedented opportunity to demilitarize international affairs. Disarmament is a process that involves the phased elimination of the war-making capabilities and institutions of all states and the creation of alternative structures and mechanisms for settling international disputes peacefully. An important lesson that was learned from the nuclear age is that building more weapons creates less, not more, security. In addition, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union can afford the enormous cost of sustaining a large military establishment. Armaments kill even if they are not used. They kill thousands of children and people who could have been saved from hunger, malnutrition and malady. Unlike arms control, world-wide disarmament ultimately seeks to abolish war and weapons and substitute peaceful means of resolving disputes. During the last 30 years, a number of comprehensive disarmament plans have been painstakingly worked out. The challenge before us is to make disarmament the priority item on political agendas, particularly on the agendas of the superpowers, who bear the main responsibility for this matter.

Global political, economic, social, ecological, and cultural changes can reduce tensions and hostilities and lift the systemic frustration of progress towards satisfaction of current needs. The Gulf war has changed the dynamics of public debate on military spending and reductions, and on reinvestment of the savings in domestic and environmental programs. Operation Desert Storm cost this country \$25 to \$35 billion. While the war raged in the Middle East, creating an unbridgeable chasm between First and Third World countries, Americans were faced with very real threats to security here at home: lack of adequate housing or access to affordable health care, widespread poverty, budget deficits, and failures in the educational system. Although the Gulf crisis has been a setback for the supporters of new national priorities, the lesson learned from the war is that a coherent conversion policy is needed now more than ever before. With a projected deficit of \$253 billion in fiscal year 1991, advocates of converting the American economy look at how the military budget could be cut by an average of \$70.5 billion annually over the 1991–1994 period. The economy and society in general could benefit by reinvesting these savings in education, housing, health care, social services, job training, and the environment.

### **Transformation Through Healing**

From even this brief analysis it can be observed that the surface structure of any peace system implies an extremely ambitious program of global reform to reduce the causes of war, to restore ecological sustainability, and minimize social and political inequities. But while disarmament and economic conversion are absolutely vital components in the process of building structures for peace, they are, in and by themselves, quite inadequate in effecting deep changes in the fabric of social behavior. In order to bring about earth healing, what is needed is a sociocultural and spiritual transformation to change peoples' belief systems, business ethics and lifestyles—a permanent alteration of human consciousness, based on a widespread sense of the sacredness of nature, and the recognition of the urgent need to reintegrate human society into the ecosystem of the whole world.

The deep structure of a peace system is, in my opinion, in many ways the most important. At this level, attempts are made to create coherence in collective consciousness as a direct means to reduce conflict and to enhance peace. While the surface layer deals with knowledge, the deep structure implies transcending or letting go of knowledge, abandoning all doctrine, theory and ideology. While the surface layer implies education for peace, and conceptual knowledge, the deep structure presupposes learning and practicing nonattachment. While the surface layer belongs to the realm of activity of production and consumption, the deep structure teaches us to stop and relearn silence. While the surface layer is caught and trapped by economics, ideology and politics, the deep structure asks of us to learn the practice of breathing and mindfulness and to develop concentration and understanding. While the surface layer is caught in the traps of dualism and dichotomies, the deep structure is characterized by one key word: nonduality.

Because we don't live in a peaceful world, we need to use our imagination. Visualizing a peaceful world is of enormous importance. So I urge all of you to use your imagination, to be daring, to be outrageously daring, to visualize a world just as you would like it to be. Visualize your ideal world, your ideal Utopian society. Much of the frustration we feel is because we are never allowed to give free rein to our imagination, to imagine the world the way we want it to be. It is terribly important that we empower ourselves, because part of the peace building process is to empower individuals, from the grassroots level all the way to the top, to first become empowered and then to bring about change. Change is not going to come from the top. If we are going to bring about change, it is going to come from individuals like you and me, working together, spinning the web of life together, and changing our societies from war societies to peace societies.

#### **Reference**

Muller, R. (1984). *New Genesis: Shaping a Global Spirituality*. New York: Doubleday.

# Reflections on Collective Consciousness: The Persian Gulf Debate

Francis A. Beer

University of Colorado at Boulder  
Boulder, Colorado, U.S.A.

## *Abstract*

*The traditional theory of international relations presents collective consciousness as a single, simple foreign policy mindset deciding issues of peace and war. However, the Persian Gulf debate demonstrated a more complex, multiplistic view, one that displayed varied interests and opinions. The outcome of this collective consciousness was war. Maintaining progress toward peace requires constructive collective learning that creates a change in collective consciousness allowing people to conceptualize and enhance peaceful images and to inhibit warlike ones. A smarter and wiser humanity with a more comprehensive and complex view of international relations will incorporate and reflect a more developed collective consciousness.*

## **Introduction**

At the beginning of August 1990, Iraqi military forces entered Kuwait. A period of concentrated diplomatic activity followed. Led by the United States, the allies of Kuwait attempted to persuade Iraq to withdraw. At the same time, there was an intense American domestic debate. This debate occurred in the general public, the media, and in the United States Congress. It culminated in the middle of January 1991, when the U.S. Congress voted to authorize the president to use military force.

The Persian Gulf debate may be the most comprehensive war initiation debate in our history. The discussion was impressive from many points of view. It dealt with one of the most important and difficult issues any state faces. It was long and thorough. The members of Congress deeply felt its gravity.

## **The Field and Properties of Collective Consciousness**

We may take the debate as one reasonable reflection of the state of collective American consciousness about peace and war at this time. Talk is not thought. Yet talk

---

Address correspondence to: Department of Political Science  
University of Colorado at Boulder, Box 333, Boulder, CO 80309  
*Modern Science and Vedic Science*, Volume 5, Numbers 1–2, 1992, Special Issue  
Proceedings of Approaches to Creating a Stable World Peace, April 5–7, 1991  
Sponsored by the Institute of World Peace  
Maharishi International University  
©1992 Maharishi International University

---

implies a thinking speaker and a thinking audience who try to communicate through conversation. If our words do not completely reflect our ideas, they still suggest how we attempt to represent our thinking and create ourselves for our fellow citizens.

The Persian Gulf debate thus provides a rhetorical self-portrait of the collective American mind. This self-portrait includes multiple dimensions, among which are past precedents stored in memory. Issues are formed and given meaning through frames and scripts derived from Constitutional law, economics, religion, ethics, and morality, and the superordinate national interest.

### **Past Precedents**

One of the important dimensions of American collective consciousness lies in shared memories of past historical events. American legislators paid strongest attention to their own history, but their discourse also touched some of the precedents in the experience of other actors in the Persian Gulf.

**Munich and the Gulf of Tonkin.** In the Persian Gulf debates, precedents from World War II and Vietnam were particularly important. Munich and the Gulf of Tonkin were the symbols that condensed these experiences. Haunted by the ghosts of the past, Americans were torn between two courses of action. The generation which had lived through the 1930s had burned in its collective memory the lessons of that painful history. Neville Chamberlain's shameful policy of appeasement culminated in his agreement at Munich to accept the German occupation of Czechoslovakia without resistance. If the Allies had forcefully resisted earlier, as Churchill had wanted them to, they could have deposed Hitler and avoided the terrible bloodshed that followed. Based on the Munich precedent, the United States should intervene early and directly, with sufficient military force.

The generation which had come of age in the 1960s had other memories. The United States had resisted communism in Southeast Asia for dubious benefits and at a terrible price. The United States had no clear, tangible major interest that it was defending. President Johnson had tricked Congress into supporting a major war through his manipulation of the Gulf of Tonkin incident. Tens of thousands of young Americans had died in faraway jungles to support a regime that may have been more corrupt than its opponent. And finally, it was all for nothing. The United States withdrew, and North Vietnam controlled a unified Vietnam. The Vietnam precedent suggested that direct military force was not the answer. A continuing economic embargo could bring the same benefits with much lower risks and costs.

**Jews and Arabs.** Preoccupation with strictly American precedents overshadowed the importance of different precedents for particular groups. American Jews remembered long centuries of discrimination and segregation in the ghettos of Europe and the regular pogroms that denied them the status and security of other citizens. Jewish experiences with Hitler and the Third Reich were still alive. Jews remembered the yellow stars that they were forced to wear, which stigmatized and separated them. Those who escaped the horrors of the concentration camps and fled from their neighbors into foreign exile had etched into their minds such names as Auschwitz, Babi Yar, Buchenwald, Dachau, and Treblinka. Jews would never forget the lesson that weakness meant death, that the only hope for survival in a hostile world was in forceful resistance to attack, wherever and

whenever it occurred. Better the honorable destruction of Masada, than the corrosive shame of surrender.

Arabs could proudly remember historical precedents including events from the long ebb and flow between the Christian and Muslim world: the glories of early Mesopotamian civilizations, the spread of Arab culture and science across the Mediterranean into southern Europe. But history also carried memories heavy with humiliation and bitterness: the burning of the library at Alexandria and the destruction of Carthage, the Crusades, the yoke of British and French colonialism, the expropriation of Palestine and the pauperization of the Palestinians.

### **Commander in Chief and Declaration of War**

These deep memories ran through the debate over the Persian Gulf. Yet much more was involved. The Administration conducted its foreign policy far from the watchful eyes of Congress. As war drew closer, Congressional leaders grew increasingly concerned about the Constitutional issues involved in taking the country to war

In hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees, Secretary Baker stated his belief that the president, as commander in chief, had the authority to order American forces into battle. The president, as head of the executive branch, was responsible for the conduct of foreign policy.

Past presidents were past precedents. Other national leaders—Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson—had acted forcefully and aggressively by themselves to defend the national interest. President Bush had patiently explored and finally exhausted all diplomatic means of redress. Acting in the spirit of American tradition, and in the present circumstances, he now had no recourse except military means and deserved Congressional support.

Senators and representatives recognized the president's proper diplomatic and military prerogatives. Many, particularly Republicans, gave very heavy weight to the need to stand behind the president. They felt their patriotic duty to "rally round the flag," to follow the president, and to present a united American front confronting a foreign aggressor.

At the same time, members of Congress forcefully asserted their rights under the Constitution and the War Powers Act to authorize such action. They maintained their rights to declare war, to provide funds, and to give their assent. Their position stood on the ground of constitutional law. It was also based on a very practical political desire to show the weight of majority opinion behind the president before moving on to this fateful step.

### **Spending and Taxing**

Economic issues also entered the peace/war debate. During fall, 1990, Congress rebuffed the president's bargain with Congressional leadership over taxes. The continuing crisis of the national debt threatened to activate mandatory cuts required by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act. The debate over the new budgetary agreement required a balance between financial stringency, equitable burden sharing, and concern for the weakest members of society. While the rich resisted heavier taxation, increasing numbers of the poor were homeless. In its own way, the budget debate was as complex and agonizing as that over the Persian Gulf. And the two were related. If the United States did not act, it ran the risk of higher oil prices that would worsen its financial problems.

If it did act, the costs of the military operation would strain the already unraveling American economy. Further, increasingly hard-pressed Americans were reluctant to pay more money to the state. They hardly wanted to give their lives and those of their loved ones in the absence of a clear and present national emergency.

With the collapse of the Berlin Wall, many Americans were relieved that the long, dispiriting Cold War was finally over. Mikhail Gorbachev's new policy of *glasnost* and *perestroika* had won him the Nobel Peace Prize. Americans were ready for a military demobilization. The resulting "peace dividend" would help the United States solve its financial problems. Taxes could be reduced. Money would still be available for deferred maintenance on bridges and roads, hospitals and schools. The decay of the cities and an emerging underclass, AIDS and cancer, global warming and the ecology all needed urgent attention.

Those who opposed the war evoked the preceding debate. Those who favored the war promptly forgot it. As the country made up its collective mind, many of the same people who had fought in the trenches, at the bridgeheads, for maintaining a balanced budget, almost overnight forgot about it.

### **Church and State**

Many Americans were concerned by the military dominance of foreign policy and the economy. Not only did this produce undesirable political and economic distortions; it also involved the most serious ethical issues that impinged on the separation of church and state. Religious debates between the right to life and the right to choice had dominated political campaigns in the late 1980s and the early 1990s. Issues at the core of private religious belief stimulated public discussion and required public decision.

American use of military force recalled some of the same issues. Theologians had debated the issue of the just war for centuries. More contemporary concerns such as the right to life and the right to choice took on new meaning in the military context. Americans debated whether or not war against Iraq was just. Those in favor of military action pointed to dictatorship and atrocities. Saddam Hussein was neither legitimated by, nor accountable to, any democratic process. He had supported international terrorism and fought a long bloody war against Iran. He had developed chemical weapons and was well on the way to a nuclear capability. Indeed he would already have nuclear weapons had the Israelis not attacked and destroyed them several years earlier. The most awful evidence of his brutality and cruelty was his premeditated use of chemical weapons on his own defenseless people, the Kurds of northern Iraq. The present aggression against Kuwait must be quickly stopped and reversed, lest Saddam Hussein further export violence beyond his borders and terrorize the entire Middle East.

Those who opposed the war countered that national rulers operated under the international law of sovereignty. Sovereignty covered a multitude of sins. There was much injustice in the world, including the United States itself and its close allies. Democracy was still the exception rather than the rule, including in Kuwait. Millions of children were sick, suffered, and died from malnutrition. Terrorism, murder, and even attempted genocide were morally deeply repugnant but continued to exist. The United States could not clean the Augean stables of the world. Even if it could, military force was not the only, or even the best, way to do this. American use of military force would add the

deaths of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of innocent victims to the atrocities that had already occurred. It was unsophisticated, primitive, and barbaric. The cure was worse than the disease.

Where did the lesser evil lie? Was the balance of reasons sufficient for individual Americans to make the ultimate sacrifice, to give up their lives and the lives of their children? Saddam Hussein's own rhetoric spoke to this concern when he warned of death in the sand and the sad, black body bags returning home. Many Americans were increasingly concerned with the other side of the coin: the obligation to kill, especially when they were not deeply persuaded of the justice of the cause. An absolute religious ethic was particularly powerful when individuals strongly disagreed with the timing and objectives of the war. Many suspected that economic rather than moral concerns were the deep causes, the hidden agenda of the war. For such citizens, "blood for oil" was a bad exchange. A more patient, measured, deliberate policy was preferable. Continuing economic embargo against Iraq would ultimately prove effective, as it had for Rhodesia, and would soon for South Africa. Embargo was a less violent and more civilized way for the international community to exert pressure on a deviant regime.

Religious concerns also mixed with ethnicity. In spite of its formal absence from the allied coalition against Iraq, Israel was a central player and a major issue in the crisis. American Jews were torn between their identification with Israel and with the United States, between the concern for their own lives, as well as the lives of husbands, sons, and grandsons. For the first time, women serving in the armed forces expanded these concerns to wives, daughters, and granddaughters. Americans were worried for the lives of those in the Jewish state. Though it was less publicized, American Muslims and those of Arabian descent had the same difficulties.

### **Short- and Long-Term Interests**

Finally there were those who were concerned over the implications of war for the long-term national interests of the United States. An American-led war against Iraq might regain Kuwait and safeguard the oil fields, the "moderate" Arab regimes, and the state of Israel. But it would not solve the continuing grievance of the Palestinians who had been ejected from their homeland and were making a permanent life in desperate refugee camps. It would not solve the problem of the Intifada in Israeli-occupied territories. It would not solve the inequalities between the very rich and the very poor in the Arab world, nor the undemocratic nature of most of their regimes, including that of Kuwait. War would not solve the clash between traditional Arab and Muslim spiritual values and those of the more secular West, nor the long-standing Arab resentment over Western imperialism and its aftermath. War, even a short, victorious war, might make all of these problems worse, rather than better.

### **Collective Consciousness and Stable Peace**

The idea of collective consciousness suggests that there is a single, simple foreign policy mindset, deciding issues of peace and war. This has certainly been the view of the traditional theory of international relations. There is a collective consciousness

according to this theory. Foreign policy makers represent this collective consciousness when they decide peace and war on the basis of national interest defined in terms of power.

### **Competing Images**

The Persian Gulf debate suggests a different and more complex view. Collective consciousness about peace and war swirled and eddied through different currents. The national interest, as always, appeared in different costumes. What was the national interest of the United States? Which components should be given heavier or lighter weight? Which policy or policies promised to maximize benefits and minimize costs? Should greater attention be given to short- or long-run concerns?

Further, the contents of the debate were partly determined by past experiences and memories that were stimulated by the immediate crisis in the Persian Gulf. Was Munich or Vietnam the relevant image driving American interests? Legal, economic, and cultural perspectives also competed for attention. Who should make the final choice, Congress or the president? How much importance should different economic issues have in the decision? What was the proper place for religious concerns? Ultimately, was the use of force necessary and desirable?

The outcome, the culmination of the debate, came in the final votes in the Senate and the House. These votes reflected the final weight of collective opinion. This final specification defined the collective consciousness and the national interest of the United States.

### **Multiple Minds**

If there is a collective consciousness, its reality may be much different than the one imagined by traditional international relations theory. At some level, such consciousness might be imagined as a unified field. Yet the collective consciousness of peace and war, as it is reflected in the Persian Gulf debates, appears extremely complex and multiplistic.

It may be more useful to think of collective consciousness as an emergent property of a massively parallel, multidimensional system. We may imagine that this system includes multiple interconnected minds. These minds perceive, decide, and influence issues of peace and war on very different grounds in very different ways. The various minds, in turn, contain multiple images. Each war activates old images—land mines in the minds. Each war also creates new images waiting to be activated in new wars at some future time.

### **Collective Learning and Evolution**

This paper has focused on external observation of collective consciousness as revealed in speech acts. The individual actors and observers change from war to war, but some collective learning occurs.

Observation encourages collective learning. It leads us to be more reflective about the role of our own consciousness in peace/war events. Further, such reflection has a

reflexive effect on our subsequent thoughts and actions. As we think about our collective consciousness, we subtly change it.

Progress toward stable peace finally depends on constructive collective learning (Alexander & Langer, 1990). It depends on our ability to conceptualize and enhance peaceful images and to inhibit warlike ones. If we are to make progress, we must also develop a better understanding of phase and sequence. It does little good to develop peaceful learning, if it disarms some for the profit of others, if the peaceful become prey for the belligerent. If humanity is to evolve further, it needs to become much smarter and wiser, at a faster rate than in the past (Salk & Salk, 1990). Such evolution is far from certain. If it does happen, it will require a more comprehensive and complex view of international relations. It will necessarily incorporate and reflect a more developed collective consciousness.

#### References

- Alexander, C. N., & Langer, E. J. (Eds.) (1990). Higher stages of human development: Perspectives on adult growth. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Salk, J., & Salk, P. L. (1990). An evolutionary approach to world problems. *World Affairs* 1, 5–10.

### Discussion

**John Hagelin, Maharishi International University.** Professor Markides's presentation was insightful and sensitive, and I particularly appreciated her remarks about the importance of *being* peace, an element in today's peace movement that is not fully addressed. There is a sincere desire and commitment to peace, but the quality of peace itself is often lacking on the part of the advocates of peace. This, I think, is basically a shortcoming of education in that, although education structures thinking and action, it does not really affect the level of Being itself, the level of consciousness which underlies both thought and action, and which is the ultimate source of peace.

In a typical university there is no study of consciousness, there is no research in consciousness such as we have here at Maharishi International University, and there is no systematic means to develop intelligence, creativity, and higher states of consciousness. That is why education does not touch the level of Being.

It is very much like creating effects on the molecular, atomic, and nuclear levels of nature. You can effect an atomic transformation by taking recourse to the more fundamental level of nuclear transformations. But you cannot effect an atomic transformation by manipulating matter at a more superficial level. The problem with education is that it has been too superficial in its handling of the individual's intelligence and personality.

With Maharishi's Vedic Science and Technology, we have technologies to develop peace itself—to develop consciousness, which is at the basis of thinking, which in turn forms the foundation of action, achievement, and fulfillment. One of our principal themes of education at Maharishi International University is that *knowledge is structured in consciousness*; extend the roots of education to the unmanifest field of consciousness and develop consciousness and the individual from the inside out.

I would also like to comment on the interesting concept of a new language of unity or nonduality that Professor Markides proposed. Physicists have been in search of such a language ever since quantum mechanics introduced the concept of the "participator" to replace the observer, recognizing that the separation of the observer from the observed is fundamentally ill-founded. They have searched for a new language that would aptly and appropriately reflect the fundamentally unified dynamics of natural law at its deeper levels.

In fact, such a language already exists, fully developed, in Sanskrit, and particularly the *Samhita* or unified aspect of the ancient Vedic literature. It is a language of consciousness, which is more fundamental than language of the intellect. It is the nature of the intellect to discriminate, i.e., to divide, to create boundaries, and to introduce diversity into that unified state of wholeness at the basis of mind and matter. A language of consciousness, of wholeness, would help to reestablish unity in the midst of diversity. It is very interesting that Professor Markides's work has led her in the direction of this language of unity, of nonduality.

[For more on the language of unity, please refer to Dr. Hagelin's article, Restructuring Physics in Light of Maharishi's Vedic Science, *Modern Science and Vedic Science*, 3 (1), 1989.]

Dr. Beer's talk was extremely stimulating and interesting. The idea of using the

expressions of leaders of government as a reflection of the collective mind is especially fascinating. I think the term “collective mind” is quite similar to what we mean when we say collective consciousness, i.e., a consciousness that reflects the sum total of all the individual consciousnesses and forces functioning in society. If there is a difference, it is just that they may represent two different levels of the same thing. Consciousness is fundamental to thinking. The expressions of national leaders, diplomats, and so forth, may be a verbal, more concrete manifestation of the more fundamental level of collective Being, or collective consciousness.

When we function as a group in our group practice of Yogic Flying, what we are really doing is creating coherence on the level of transcendental consciousness, the innermost, silent, universal, abstract level of the collective consciousness of society. This increased coherence should manifest through the collective mind as more intelligent and effective speech and action on the part of the leaders of society. Therefore, it has been common practice in our research on collective consciousness to use the statements of the political leaders as a gauge of the quality of the underlying collective consciousness.

**David Orme-Johnson, Maharishi International University.** I appreciated Dr. Markides’s analysis of a surface structure and a deep structure. The idea of a deep structure, or we could say, basic laws of nature underlying human behavior, is very old in the Western philosophical tradition. It comes up as the forms of Plato, the idea of God of St. Augustine, the monads of Leibnitz, and more recently in modern psychology, it has been expressed in the idea of archetypes of Carl Jung.

The Vedic tradition of India, which Maharishi has brought to light, has a very well-developed conception of natural law in terms of deep structures of the human mind. The Ved itself is conceived of as a vibration at the primordial level of pure consciousness, which gives rise to all the forms and phenomena in creation. From the Vedic perspective, Dr. Markides will be interested to know, natural law is much more like a language with a grammar than the way we usually think of it as a set of mathematically described laws. I really appreciate her idea that we have to do something on both levels of deep structure and surface structure in order to create peace. From the perspective of Maharishi’s Vedic Science and Technology, we have to connect life with the laws of nature in its deep structure first, and then the surface structure changes as a reflection of that. If we are established within the deep structure of our own consciousness, our behavior will spontaneously and naturally be more integrated and peaceful.

Maharishi’s various technologies are very much technologies to connect life with the deep structure of natural law. Maharishi’s Transcendental Meditation technique, for example, takes the the mind from its surface activity to its silent depths, transcendental consciousness, the unified field of natural law. The whole purpose of the Transcendental Meditation program is to reconnect our individual life with the deepest level of natural law. Another technology of peace that Maharishi has brought out recently is Gandharv Ved. Gandharv Ved puts life back into balance with the basic structure of natural law by creating the rhythms and melodies that exist at the level of the deep structure. It is based on a profound understanding of biological, circadian, and seasonal cycles, in which different rhythms and melodies are suitable for different times of day and different seasons.

Hearing the appropriate music at the appropriate time reconnects or resonates the awareness with the level of the deep structure and puts one's life back into harmony with the laws of nature.

With regard to Dr. Beer's talk, I want to bring out a central theme in Maharishi's theory of collective consciousness—that government is a reflection of the collective consciousness. Maharishi talks about government as the innocent mirror of collective consciousness, and the analogy he often uses is that when we see the handwriting, it is not the hand that is doing the writing. The intelligence that governs the hand is doing the writing. The hand is only the instrument of that intelligence. Like that, we see the government acting, but it is the collective consciousness of society that is the intelligence that governs the government.

It would be very interesting to analyze those periods in Congress when the logic of peace seems to be winning and other times, when the logic of war seems to be winning, and see how that related to the size of the coherence-creating group at Maharishi International University. We have noticed that when we went to war, the dome numbers were well below the threshold of 1,600 that we predicted would be needed to create coherence in the U.S.

We have noticed in some of the conflicts, like Lebanon, that there will be a logical argument for peace and then another logical argument for war. Which one wins out depends upon the underlying collective consciousness. The government, again, seems to be the innocent reflector of stress or coherence in society, and when society is more stressed, then it goes in the direction of paranoia; when it is more coherent, then it goes in the direction of metanoia. It is a topic that would be a whole new level of study on the Maharishi Effect.