

Man, Justice and Peace

**Knowing Oneself and Knowing the Other as a Basis for Peace in Law and the
World**

by

Dr. iur. André Marhaun

Speech delivered at Keimei Gakuen

at

the Symposium “Peace Without War”

A Symposium sponsored by the Keimei Gakuen Institute, the Keimei English Study
Center and Mitsui Takasumi International Fund

Saturday, May 10th, 2003

Keimei Gakuen Elementary, Junior and Senior High School
Haijima, Tokyo

Tokyo, May 2003

The Internet address of this document is www.jewel-of-light.org/peace/keimei1.pdf.

Official Version, also reprinted in part in the proceedings of the event available from Keimei Gakuen, Haijima, Tokyo (<http://www.keimei.ac.jp>). Here, preface and references are added. If you would like to access the full version, that includes (mainly German) footnotes containing sources and comments which both might be interesting to you, please access www.jewel-of-light.org/Gemeinsame_Dateien/knowningoneself.doc if you have got the login data.

Version 1.1.2 (with some corrections)

© 2003 by André Marhaun, Tokyo.

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be published or reprinted for commercial purposes without the agreement of the author. - Quotations may have been re-translated into English from German and therefore may not show the original English wording.

For contacting the author, please see here: <http://lichtharfe.de/tools/english/contact.html>

Preface

I would like to thank Keimei Gakuen and Mr. Shuji Usugi, both have given to me the precious opportunity in taking part in and hopefully contributing to this symposium.

I hope that whatever the state of my appearance in the world might have been during the time of writing this, it will still contribute to Peace and Enlightenment. It is a slightly enriched version of the speech I have held at the symposium at Keimei Gakuen at May 10th.

I would be happy if this document could fulfill its purpose and be a contributor to Peace within and without.

Tokyo, May 1st, 2003

André Marhaun

A. Introduction

We have already heard about various ways to peace, and through these descriptions, the image of the men shines forth who gave the suggestions. On the basis of my own experience, studies and maybe expectations, I would like to speak about “Man, Justice, Peace and Knowing Oneself”.

Having studied their influence and expression in law, namely international law, and international law being an important subject in the recent discussion of whether the war in Iraq was justified – if there ever can be a just war at all – I would like to make this a starting point for a more general discussion in my presentation today.

This year has been without the peace the individual yearned for in many a case.

A state declared to act in the interest of fellow man, and scourged the nation of another state with war. They spoke about freedom, and they spoke about human dignity. But freedom – what is it ? And what is dignity ? And how do they contribute to peace ? And how can we help ?

Have they known the true will of its people ? Have they done what peace demands by bringing war ?

A higher power might know. What we can do is to examine, in which way the knowledge of the others and especially of oneself can contribute to justice and peace in its fullest sense and conclude from thence, whether peace is, rather than trying to bring it by the power of brute force, possibly something to be achieved exclusively by the way of understanding and, ultimately, knowledge in its highest form.

Speaking from the perspective of international law, which has - during the last centuries - often been regarded as being rather the law between states than a law that could empower or would rule the relationships of individual human beings, what would justify the assumption that “Knowing oneself and knowing Others” could serve as a Basis for Peace in the Order of law *and* in the world ?

It is, of course, that the law serves men, but it is, even more, that despite the traditional assumptions the field of human rights is largely centered around man and even the individual, as it is human dignity that lies at their core, and this is a dignity of man not only as a social being, but also as an individual

It is also, in regard of the recent war in Iraq, that it has been talked about freedom of the individual, and this touching the field of human dignity and human rights, we have to

know what dignity is - and since it is the dignity of man, we have to know what man is, and since dignity is always the dignity of the individual, we have to take into consideration its special manifestation in each and every individual human being, although today only on a general level.

Thus, we have to examine the term “man” at first.

B. Elements

Let us have a look at the elements comprised by our question.

I. Man

Who is this man, who shall be free, who is this man, of whose suppression or about whose dignity it is being talked ?

Possible answers have been given, of course, by individuals for themselves and, as these, by philosophers, writers and people of law, and these answers have provided for the conditions, under which the norms of law referring to man and the legal and theoretical bases of the actions of states, which are sustained by the individual, have been formed.

1. Some definitions

a. A merely biological definition might either reach its limits in being unable to track the consciousness of animals for a valid demarcation or fail in not meeting man’s realization of himself having higher faculties, emotions or maybe spirit.

b. Ideas have been reaching from man as a “talking, mortal being”, an idea that finds expression, among others, in the Gilgamesh Epic and in the works of Marc Aurel, to man as the crown of creation.

Indigenous people often see man as embedded into the general coherence of life and in interconnectedness of life and interdependence with the cosmos. In more elaborated worldviews man then is regarded as reflecting the whole within himself (micro- in the macrocosm). This returned in collective doctrines as communism, although then veiled, and its returns anew in modern physics.

c. If there is a dualistic order like the relationship between man and god in the outer side of many religions, this enables another characterization of man, which some may call “sin“: he can rise up against his destiny.

d. The question who man is as such reveals another essential characteristic of man: He can and maybe has to ask what the sense of his life might be.

Thus, be it under the perspective of mortal or eternal man, human beings have been viewed as anything between man as a domesticated animal and as the Highest that exists, already both in India, and thus in the last thousand years. Man, the measure of all things, man as subjected to fate and the will of the gods. Man, being a social being, man being one with god. From his vanity to his greatness (the latter emerging in the renaissance again), and maybe both at the same time, like in the case of Pascal, we can see (I can just state that here) that all civilizations contain and often express all aspects of being human.

2. Facets in One

In this connection, an understanding as it can be found in Buddhism is interesting. It shows that an - essentially, tending to look at the parts rather than the whole, divisive - analysis of man cannot find what we call "man". But if this analysis does not take place, it is obvious that man exists. Man, so some Buddhist voices explain, exists in form of a notional convention, which is linked to the five physical and mental aggregates form, feeling, preception, mental formations and consciousness.

This missing of an analytically penetrable human core is also being felt in the modern secular world when it is said that human beings do only exist under and determined by the respective historic, special and temporal conditions. Similarly, Mao declares that the concept of man lacks contents.

This already hints into a similar direction as a closer look will show: the hitherto given descriptions show different facets of the human being; there is no necessary contradiction between them, if we understand the relationship¹ of the various levels of understanding from which it is spoken. It is also a question of which part of what exists we describe with the term "man", but not so much of reality itself. Therefore, man in the given context can be described as a being that can be in accordance with any or all of the aspects mentioned before, when it refers to the respective aspects of reality.

So we could say man has got all possibilities, but often limits himself by (definitorial) self – limitation.

¹ If one sees gods as psychologically or at least psychological active forces, then the existence of the One over all and everyone is not denied, and Buddhism does not necessarily imply that a god like Yahweh, at least at the level of appearances, does not exist (for the non – dual state cf. Griffiths, 24; for connections to Western science Dalai Lama, in: Böhm, esotera 1984, 210 (214), for forces can work in a hierarchy. But if one views the realm of the unmanifest or the essence of the manifest, so the idea of hierarchy is of no avail; it is a question of perspective and of which aspect of the reality of existence one describes as "man", but not so much of this reality itself.

With this definition, in which essentially is inherent the freedom of man to see himself as whatever he would like to, which also can be seen as a characterization of himself at the same time (freedom as his essence)², if considering the possible views described above, a sufficient link for our purpose is given, which also is open for sophisticated legal regulations.

² Even, by the way, if he uses it to limit himself – still this act of limitation can be regarded as an exertion of his freedom.

II. Justice (and Order)

1. Justice

Some argue that wars sometimes can be justified. On the other hand, peace without justice bears the seeds of new unrest and therefore the possibility of further war if the situation is not transformed otherwise. Both seem to be linked. But what is justice ? And who determines it ?

As the modern world used to be a world ruled by international law – despite some breaches the spectacularity of which should not conceal the fact that, at least until now –, there has been a general agreement that the world abides by this law stemming mainly from the law of treaties, customary law or maybe natural law, we will have especially to look at justice in public international law, too.

Justice depends on the measure - and that depends on the idea of order in the world or the special field, which is being contemplated.

It is, in fact, the implication of a measure as well as of the principle to give “to each his own” (Lat. *suum cuique*) which characterizes the essence of justice through the ages and, although not explicitly, shines through into international law as well.

In the UN Charter, justice is named after peace and human rights (preamble).

It is an aim as well as a principle and a (dynamic) value (just to give some of its actual legal functions), and not being able to determine its exact content if not more detailed norms are given in special cases without referring to a more general understanding of the word, the idea of justice as equity shines forth also in international law.

It is an aim as well as a principle and a (dynamic) value (just to give some of its actual legal functions), and not being able to determine its exact content if not more detailed norms are given in special cases without referring to a more general understanding of the word, this understanding has to be taken into consideration. Besides, the idea of justice as equity also shines forth in international law.

2. Order

At this point, speaking about justice in terms of a word implying a measure, it becomes clear that we cannot judge what is just without referring to a certain order – for even if

we give to “each his own”, we cannot say what is adequate without referring to a basis which is determined by a certain order.

This can be a system of values, of norms, of legal norms as well, as it is international law – or it can be something much greater, as it is the spiritual order of the world and the universe.

Since the term “justice” in international law transcends law by being not defined in a concrete way in general, but already if one would just take the term as measure for the quality of law or a synonym for everything that is law, one has to inquire in which order (i. e. sub-order of the universe) one wants to be just and what is the essence of this order. Only out of this, the measure for justice in the respective case springs forth. If one speaks of an all-comprising world-order, the – material and spiritual – laws of the Universe form the measure, if one speaks in the sense of sub-orders, as it is international law (we could, of course, see it as a reflection of the Higher Order, than the laws what be analogue) than this is the measure, i. e. justice is determined by the essence (contents, structure and aim) of this sub-order. The contents of the term “justice” can, already before having a closer look at the individual single case and its concrete solution, differ considerably. In the sense of the all-comprising order, whatever one does is just, because everything is a part of that order, and everything and any action we take has its place there. Judgment comes only, if we introduce the ideas of “good” and “bad” (or “

“evil”) and divide the One order into sub-orders. (I would already like to hint now at the fact that who lives in the consciousness of this one, highest order, would, of course, not do any ultimate harm to his fellow beings, because essentially, he would be one with them – being conscious of that every second). The Highest Order of Law would reflect this and accepting everything as just – although the *consequences* for different deeds (ideally being assigned by people being conscious of its full meaning) might have to vary, for being the order of formal law, it could not guarantee the consciousness-level of its subjects if not being understood by them properly. On the level of law and consciousness as most of the people living at present are aware of it, this sameness of being, deeds and justice would be devastating as a guidance for their actions, if they would not be limited by special norms (like the precept that there has to be peace and human rights).

This implies, that, as far as positive law, i. e. not only natural law, is concerned, that, when applying this law, its positive, e. g. written, contents limits the range of free choice within the respective order.

3. Justice again

Thus, if we turn to justice again, justice becomes in its core identical with the respective order in which it is applied, and the differences remain mainly those of speaking. As a measure for law and description of the ideal order of international law, it comprises the entire international law.

III. Human Dignity

One of the arguments for war in Iraq or, in fact, the justice of this war were human rights and human dignity. If justice is understood as it is above, then it comprises human dignity and we need not discuss here the latter as a special topic.

Yet, since the argument has been brought forth, we can have a look from that perspective, too and see justice working.

Human dignity is the source of human rights, which are derived from it, yet also winning its legal content as far as positive law is concerned from the positive verbalization of human rights. It acts in an inter-relation with the human rights of which it is the source, but by which it is also determined.

An Examination of the respective human rights would shows, that they can be traced back to freedom or to equality. In this context, equality takes effect into the same direction as freedom.

This, put into relation to the conclusions drawn from the idea of man as described above, leads, as a deeper examination would show, to the consequence that the core of human dignity is genuineness (“authenticity”), a condition for which and thus implied in the guarantee of human dignity is the freedom to live according to one’s own nature. This means, that the form of human dignity in the external world can be different not only from culture to culture, but also from man to man.³ As to the content of the term, this interpretation does not lead to problems, because not only the norms referring to human dignity, but all norms have to be construed in “practical concordance”. Freedom therefore is freedom in so far as the other norms do not confine them, themselves being confined by the norms of human dignity.

³ This subjects people who apply international law to considerable, but not unfulfillable demands.

So, since living in accordance with one's own nature has at its core the *suum cuique*, "to each his own"⁴, human dignity is identical with justice as far as justice aims at man.⁵

IV. Peace

1. Peace – documents in international law

Peace – documents in international law are countless. Here, I can just mention a very few.

a. One pre-condition of peace, that there is no war, can already be found in the beginning of the preamble of the **UN Charter**. According to Art. 1 I it is a primary aim. Yet, a positive definition is not given, albeit extensive norms dealing with peace (besides the once mentioned e. g. Art. 24, 33, 39 ff.). But among the principles mentioned in Art. 2 there is the peaceful settlement of disputes, which is then further described in Art. 33 ff. (cf. esp. Art. 33 I: inter alia negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements) and lit. 4. Art. 55 UN - Charter which indicates possible bases of peace, but because there is made no further difference between "peaceful", "friendly" and the other determinants of the relationships mentioned there, Art. 55 alone does not really give sufficient material for a definition. Nevertheless, peace appears as part of a complex, which is based on stability and welfare and is characterized by those aspects mentioned in lit. a to c.

b. There are **various resolutions** that give a clearer idea of peace under the system of the United Nations, although it must be said that UN resolutions do not have any legal validity out of their own right.⁶

aa) Resolution 290 (IV): Essentials of peace, December 1st, 1949, declares the Charter of the United Nations itself to be a "Pact of Peace". Thus, the elements of the international legal order based on the Charter and its rules in general appear to be

⁴ This is supported by an examination of the historical ways of understanding justice, for whenever the word "justice" is directly or indirectly applied to man, it assigns, starting from a certain measure. Then, it assigns to each his own.

⁵ As it is, as a norm of law, a concretion of justice. The following discussion of justice will therefore cover what could be said in our context about dignity, too. – The term "justice" is, thus, more comprehensive than the term "human dignity".

⁶ The legal validity of UN resolutions is limited, if they have not become customary international law. They may, nevertheless, be expression of what can already be found in sources of international law or serve as an aid in interpretation of these sources.

automatically elements of an Order of Peace. Afterwards, some essentials are named, including refraining from threatening or using force contrary to the Charter, refraining from any threats or acts, direct or indirect, aimed at impairing the freedom, independence or integrity of any state, or at fomenting civil strife and subverting the will of the people in any state; to promote, in recognition of the paramount importance of preserving the dignity and worth of the human person, full freedom for the peaceful expression of political opposition, full opportunity for the exercise of religious freedom and full respect for all the other fundamental rights expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, promoting nationally and through international co-operation, efforts to achieve and sustain higher standards of living for all peoples.

bb) It is also said (Art. 42 UN - Charter and **Resolution 377 (V): Uniting for Peace**) “that a genuine and lasting peace depends also upon the observance of all the Principles and Purposes established in the Charter of the United Nations, upon the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other principal organs of the United Nations intended to achieve the maintenance of international peace and security, and especially upon respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all and on the establishment and maintenance of conditions of economic and social well-being in all countries“

cc) In many resolutions, on the one hand side aggression, war and breaches of territorial integrity are seen as being prohibited. On the other hand it is stated that peace may, under certain circumstances, be reinstalled by using armed forces. (Art. 42 UN - Charter and paragraph A, No. 1 of the **Resolution 377 (V): Uniting for Peace** of November 3rd, 1950). But this, of course, already presupposes a state of non – peace. A breach of peace to preserve peace cannot be tolerated, and paragraph VII of the Preamble of **Resolution 2131 (XX): Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty** of December 21st, 1965 explains that “armed intervention is synonymous with aggression and, as such, is contrary to the basic principles on which peaceful international cooperation between States should be built“ and “direct intervention, subversion and all forms of indirect intervention are contrary to these principles and, consequently, constitute a violation of the Charter of the United Nations“ (paragraph VIII).

dd) In **Resolution 46/36 L: Transparency in Armaments [Register of Conventional Arms]** of Dember 9th, 1991 it becomes clear, that aggravating tensions and conflict situations can be a threat for peace. This hints at the fact that war can be understood as an “explosion“, a discharge of these tensions and conflicts. The perfect state of peace thus would be a state completely without tensions. Between these poles, then, there would be the level of transition.

Those examples show that “peace” comprises various elements, which are, as a matter of principle, linked with the absence of war, especially use of force and aggression, but which nevertheless transcend the state of non – war. It also becomes clear that, especially when the Charter is being described as a “pact of peace“ or when Resolution 377 (V): Uniting for peace indicates that peace is dependent on more than those facts described in the Charter, that it is a term the complexity of which it lets seem to be advisable to have at least a short look into the terms and forms of peace according to which it is often discriminated (see 2.)

c. In the Preamble as well as in Art. 1 Nr. 1 UN - Charter named in a prominent place, it reveals itself as being a highest *value*, as are justice and human dignity, such being part of a greater international legal order of values. In the interpretation of its parts, contradictions have to be avoided. Yet it may be asked, whether one of those values or rights in which those values manifest have got priority. Some say, peace is more important than the enforcement of human rights, because without peace the pre - condition of the realization of human rights would be abolished. But it concedes that peace at all costs would lead to pressure and coercion and extortion. Therefore, a substantial position in the field of human rights has to remain and may not be given up.⁷

There is a *right* to peace as there is a right to human dignity and a right to justice can be assumed. The Istanbul Red Cross Declaration, for example, declares that man has the right to enjoy lasting peace. According to GA Resolution 33/37, proclaiming the Declaration on the preparation of Societies for Life in Peace that each nation and every human being irrespective of race, conscience, language or gender has got the inherent right to live in peace. The Banjul-Charter gives (Art. 23) a right to national and international peace to all peoples.⁸

The peace of international law is no static state. It allows and requires development, for on the level of international law the developments on the level of states and of inter – human interpersonal relationships have to find an adequate reflection if international law wants to endure. Too great a contradiction would lead to its failure. Peace is, therefore, like justice and human dignity, **dynamic**

2. Peace in General

a. Various understandings of peace are possible.

⁷ Cf. Kriele, 57 ff. in the context of the former East – West – Conflict. – In the end, this opinion leads to an alignment in the sense of practical concordance, too.

⁸ [Retranslation into English from a German Source]

aa) These are an understanding of peace as a state of where there is no war and an understanding as peace out of its own. Especially the “cold war“ and “economic wars“ have made clear, that a “negative“ definition does not help too much. Besides, to secure peace, one has to know its essence. A negative definition does not suffice.

bb) Then, there are “inner” and “outer” peace. It can be inner peace in, e.g., a state of inner peace in a human being, and outer peace, then, refers to the relationship of this state or human being with his surrounding.⁹

Explicitly, International Law usually deals with “outer peace“. Whether therein lies “inner peace” as a pre-condition will be shown soon in this speech.

b. There are various other approaches for a definition of peace. For our purpose, we should consider the elements mentioned before and yet not forget the fact that *if* there is peace, people normally will know. This might not be too scientific, yet if our life is at peace, we usually do know. So, for reasons of time, let us continue in our examination with this in mind. I will not follow this idea here, but maybe we could also remember at some stage of our lives, that the understanding of peace itself might, indeed, *be* its realization.

C. Connections

Having examined the single elements essential to our question, we have to examine the interdependencies. The term “man” and his understanding become essential here:

The image of man has turned out to be an “open” image, and thus has justice. Yet, the concrete form that justice takes is linked to the image of man – and the respective man. So the question centers around man again.

Furthermore:

Peace is the Peace for Mankind. Without Mankind longing for Peace, it will not be done in a free world. Here, too, man is central.

⁹ Within the individual as well as within states, i. e. “inner peace”, we can discern again between “negative” and “positive” peace. Negative inner peace would be a state of inner non - violence (abstinence from thoughts of violence, maybe abstinence from thoughts at all as it is aspired to in some religions or weltanschauungen), “emptiness“, whereas positive would describe a certain „fullness“ which I do not describe here in detail. Both forms of peace influence each other: inner peace promotes outer peace, outer peace benefits the inner one.

If man is open to all those possibilities indicated above, if already the image he can choose to represent him can be anything between the Highest and lowest as mentioned above, if justice as a term that is open to be adequate to whatever order we choose to look at, which both hints at an inherent freedom of choice, which is the manifestation of freedom on the dual planes, the only measure that remains adequate to this outer form [the respective formal aspect] is the one one sets oneself. And how one does this, this is a result of one's own understanding - be it of Self, be it of Order.

Thus, understanding what oneself is and then acting in accordance with it seems to be crucial to any kind of order mankind is involved in. The order of peace, being a major part of the order of justice in international law, is such an order.

So we ought to have a look at the *process* of understanding one's essence, what oneself is, itself.

There are two possibilities: putting forth into the world an image one would like to represent, be or become identical with – or examining what one really is, beyond any conceptions.

If we do the first without further reflecting, it might be controlled by desires of various kinds, like, for example, fame, power or maybe even outer safety. But others might do the same, and their ideas on what the desired state should be as well as their ways to it might interfere with those of their fellow – men and, this desire for fame, power or security or maybe even “just” the will to force upon others what oneself thinks that is true are no way to peace – a lot of people and states did this. The results can be easily grasped.

The other possibility, that of examining what one really is, does, by its nature, normally not lead into the outer world at first. It is an inward way. Yet, a desire it may be, to know oneself. But this desire is, then, focused on oneself, and although one may get reflections of oneself in others, they are, until the Knowledge is gained, mere reflections and not the truth itself which, in fullness, has to be found in ourselves as long as our path itself uses the outer conceptions of what “we” are, that is limited by body and space. Of course, we can look for us in others, but this desire to find us in them will still mean we cannot shut out ourselves. Therefore, properly done, this desire will cause far less harm than in the first case, if it does not – and in most cases it will – become a vehicle rather than a hindrance up to a certain stage when it easily can be discarded.

To understand what one really is, one has to be ready to understand every part of one's being, whether they are positively shining or not.

Two of the biggest hindrances for peace are, besides the pure aspiring of nations (and individuals or groups who are using the states for this purpose) for power, prejudices and discrimination. These are rooted in the “shadow”, that is the „dark“ side of human subconsciousness. Besides, the experience of the shadow is also the archetypical experience of “the fiend”, the archetypical opponent, who appears to be evil personalized. As long as this subconsciousness is not made conscious – “The only moral suppression does not create permanent relief. The driving forces pent up in the civilized man are enormously destructive and much more dangerous than the drives of primitive man who lives his negatives drives constantly in a moderate way. Accordingly, no war in the historical past can rival the war of civilized nations in terrific atrocity“¹⁰ -, the danger exists that the projections of subconscious contents into the outer world – for what is banned in darkness does not keep silent - can lead to war.¹¹

But if one’s own ability to do evil is being accepted and if the psychological processes are not being politicised, a possibly existing outer opponent might not already altogether vanish, but no foes will be seen, where no foes are, and the relationship to “real” opponents is free to change. “If evil is not demonified, we are forced to accept it as something human and to deal with it as such“.¹² But what is consciously seen as human – and it is this what often does not happen in war -, one will kill with much more resistance. The acknowledgement followed by recognition or just recognition of what is called “evil“ in oneself (and this does not mean to keep “evil” as it is, but in starting the process of recognition we already can start diminish its power, for it becomes conceivable, and then we can decide to transcend or maybe transform it) the human being is not longer forced in his or her entirety to express those parts, which may “behave” like personal characters, by projections. The others will therefore not be seen as a bigger threat than they really are. The danger of miscalculations is reduced and the mechanism of mutually increasing shadow – projections is being stopped. Profound distortions of perceptions and tensions that might lead to war are abolished.

Thus, in understanding not only the “good“ parts of us, but also the so called „bad“ ones, and so doing justice to ourselves and fulfilling the command as well as using the right of our human dignity, for we cannot be authentic without being aware of every part of us, we contribute considerably to peace. This is only natural, since peace as a norm of international law is an expression of justice as understood before.

¹⁰ Jung, *Psychologische Betrachtungen*; cit. according to Nichols: *Der Teufel im Tarot*, in: Zweig/Abrams, *Die Schattenseite der Seele*, 1993, 143 (146).

¹¹ Cf. in this contexts the words of the Preamble of the UNESCO - Constitution: „wars begin in the minds of men“.

¹² Schmookler, in: Zweig/Abrams, 176 (177)

Thus, knowing oneself contributes to peace. But it also contributes to knowing the others. If the veils are taken from oneself, the veils of the projections are taken from the others, and understanding them becomes possible.

We will also understand, then, that their actions are probably not directed against ourselves (or our states or our nations), but only, if they are, against their projection.

And by understanding this, we have the means of helping them: making the subconscious process intelligible.

How can we do this ?

If it is one person against another, a way will be found.

If it is a state against a state or a nation against a nation – if we do not reach the leaders or the people by other ways (the ways to do this I would not like to discuss here, religion, spiritual or modern psychological science might help), we need an instrument to do this.

This instrument can be international law properly understood.

As indicated before, justice, too, is centered around man. Justice also describes the entirety of the norms of law and is, in another function, a measure of law. Both applies to the sub – orders of law as well, as it is international law, too.

If we cannot determine what is just but in each and every single case, we have to recur to what each and every man is, and we cannot do this without understanding him (*suum cuique*),

This being a requirement of law, and as well of international law, although on a more complicated level the “unit” man might have to be replaced by the functional unit of “state”, we have to remember that at the core and as the basis of this functional unit still stands man, and that states do not have a will of their own but the accumulated will of the individuals shaped by their cooperation, no way leads past the understanding of man’s condition as such – on every level. States, nations, individuals – and then, and only then can be decided what *is* Law, what is international law, properly spoken.

(And say not that this is not feasible. It might not seem feasible to many of our contemporaries. Yet, if complacency and ignorance of hitherto not yet consciously discovered human faculties does not allow this to many, yet there is much more to man. The present generation must give its best, and if it does, a new generation will arise, on a much higher level. I hope that many of them are present today. Understand, Understand yourself, on every level – on the level of flesh, of soul, of spirit. See, what unity means, as it is expressed in the trinity, as it is expressed in every religion (*Sat, Tat,*

Ananda or the *trimurti Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva*; as it is expressed in *Vairocana Buddha, Dainichinyorai*, as it was expressed in the unity of Buddhas and Kami in the concept of “*Shinbutsu-kongou*“, as it might be in the unity of *kami* and nature, just to give a few examples), as it is expressed in the doctrines even of worldly and secular regimes, be it the unity of so called equals in communism, be it the unity of free or - possibly - so called free people in capitalism, be it the unity of *umma* in Islam. If we look at the outer and the inner aspects together – maybe understanding will emerge.)

As I said – on every level. States, nations, individuals – and then, and only then can be decided what *is* Law, what is international law, properly spoken.

Thus, Law itself is a great call to man to *understand* – if not oneself, then the other, but by trying to do so, he has to realize, for the above stated reason, that he cannot do so without understanding himself first.

This is the instrument.

Either understand oneself first – or understand law – and then return to the so evoked understanding of oneself.

And, within and without, peace will be.

(May peace prevail on earth.)

May it be.

Final Remarks

Since there were only 30 minutes scheduled for this speech, many important points could not be developed in detail. Before you think of criticism, I would like you to refer to my book as indicated in the references, which will probably answer most of your questions in case you speak – or read – German.

There is one point, to which (I just read in the Universal Tao Newsletter of March 2003: “Chyan and Kun exemplify yang and yin in that they compliment each other. Developed beings know that yin and yang are expressions of oneness; one whose view partial thinks their energies are in conflict. However, with the image of T'ai Chi, one can clearly see their harmonious relationship. Through the interaction of yin and yang, wholeness is expressed and all life is produced and nourished. All movement and matter in the universe is an expression of yin and yang. Male and female, inhalation and exhalation, sound and silence, subject and object nothing exists that is not an integration of their energies.”) I would especially like to draw your awareness, if it is ok:

It may be that it already *is* peace. And we just have to realize that.

André Marhaun

References

These References have not been given out at Keimei Gakuen, they have been added as a part of the final version of this document. That they do appear here does not indicate any affiliations of the works or links cited with Keimei Gakuen, which is a Christian School. They have been added by the author because the author felt it would be good or acceptable in the framework of his homepage and the context of his speech.

I. Books

1. A guide to *understanding* offers

M e r r e l l - W o l f f, Franklin: Experience and Philosophy. A Personal Record of Transformation and a Discussion of Transcendental Consciousness. Containing his Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object and His Pathways Through to Space. New York: State University of New York Press 1994.

2. Peace is also a subject of my book with the title „*Human Dignity and International Law. Man, Justice and Peace.*“ It is in German.

M a r h a u n, André: Menschenwürde und Völkerrecht. Mensch, Gerechtigkeit und Frieden. Tübingen: Medienverlag Köhler 2001.

3. *Peace* is at the basis of the books of Masahisa Goi and the subject of other spiritual books.

五井昌久 : 神と人間, Byakkopress

There is also an English translation (Masahisa Goi, God and Man) and a very good German one. It is

Masahisa Goi: Gott und Mensch. Schutzgeister, Schutzgötter, Außerirdische. Ichikawa: Byakko Verlag.)

Another very good book is, by the way, „The Spirit of Lao Tsu“ by the same author.

Furthermore, and especially, you might want to have a look at the books written by Eckhart Tolle, see <http://www.eckhartolle.com>. Also, in the future, <http://www.books-for-enlightenment.com> might be of interest to you, if you are spiritually inclined.

II. Internet Pages

These data are valid as viewed in October 2003. Since this is a word document, but still to be opened at least with an Internet Explorer, I would like to ask you to read and accept my disclaimer at <http://www.jewel-of-light.de/Dateien/disclaimerinenglish2.htm> at first.

1. There are various **peace - sites** in the internet. Just have a look with google (also, e. g., for “peace” and “links” etc.).

2. As to the **books mentioned above**

- English Page about Human Dignity and International Law

<http://www.jewel-of-light.org/menschenwuerde/Survey2.htm>

- Homepage about Merrell - Wolff and his writings / ideas

<http://www.integralscience.org/gsc/>