

Two Papers by Johan Galtung:

The European Union- are there Alternatives?

Eco-Logic and Polito-Logic - are they Compatible?

Johan Galtung, Professor of Peace Studies at the University of Hawaii, visited the Centre for European Studies in May, and again in December, 1992, and gave two public lectures. Both talks were presented in German; they are published here in their original English versions to be accessible for a wider audience.

THE EUROPEAN UNION: THERE ARE ALTERNATIVES!

Public lecture given at the University of Trier on 14 May 1992

1. The European Union: A Bird's-Eye View

The summit meeting in Maastricht 9 - 10 December, last week, is behind us and should leave nobody in doubt: the European Union is coming and quickly. They may have taken out the reference to "federal goal" to give the British Premier, Mr. John Major, something to show the Conservatives back home. But they replaced it by "ever closer union" which means exactly that. Look at the major decisions taken [1]:

- **single currency** managed by an independent European central bank at the latest by 1999 and as early as 1997 if seven members meet strict economic criteria;
- **joint foreign policy**, unanimity among foreign ministers for foreign policy principles, "qualified majority voting" (according to size of country) for implementation;
- **defence**, the Western European union to become the vehicle for deciding or implementing defence policies, compatible with NATO. Greece to join by 1993;
- **majority voting**, meaning no consensus needed, nor veto possible, also in labour and industrial policies, education, public health, environment and energy.

To this should be added one point: the draft treaty for the European union, supposedly everlasting, has no exit clause [2].

Much attention has been paid to the opt-out clause for Britain, giving it alone the right to decide later whether and when to join the single currency. But this can also be read another way: the other 11 did not care enough about having the British with them to yield to Britain at the margin is probably already a reality.

Nothing new here. Charlemagne's Europe (770 - 843), Napoleon's construction (12 - 14 years), Hitler's *Neuordnung* (5 years) were all done without Britain. Abbe Pierre Dubois' master-plan from 1306, *De recuperatione de terrae sanctae*, written after the Crusades had been defeated by 1291, is in another category; Dubois was not a statesman. The continental countries can do without Britain; they can also do without the Nordic Countries. Being expendable, the political staying power of the margin is exactly that, marginal.

For a quick recapitulation of forty years of EC history the clock on the next page may be useful, using the European flag with the twelve golden stars, circled (like wagons) against a dark blue background. The process started in 1950, at noon, with the Coal and Steel Community, then the Treaty of Rome with the Communities, the Yaounde-Lome treaties and the outer market with the former ACP colonies, the European Community, the financing system, a European Parliament, the symbolism of passport-flag-hymn, the expansion of membership, the Single European Act, and now enters the future:

- 9 o'clock, 1993: the inner market;
- 10 o'clock, 1994-1997: a single currency, a European Central Bank;
- 11 o'clock, 1998: a European Defence Community (fusing with WEU).

And then, at midnight for some, at bright noon for other: the European Union, encompassing the 12 members, possibly partly minus Britain, but then plus some others (Malta? Austria? Switzerland? Sweden? Finland? Norway? Hungary?) and all communities and systems. This is the process. The present author may be wrong by a year or two (these predictions were made in 1986), but the general trend is very clear. And has been clear from the very beginning [3].

Today the EC has 340 million or 6% of the world population; in other words a very small minority. It may be argued that their influence is greater, using a very undemocratic way of reflecting a very undemocratic world. The members of the white race, mostly living in the north from the Bering Strait to the Bering Strait, also constitute a minority, of 22 %. In Europe the EC is big, 63 % of Europe from Brest to Brest, 41 % if we include the (former) Soviet Union. But Europe itself is only 10 % of the world population. By joining the European Community/Union one joins a small minority of the world, but a majority of old time Europe.

An "ever closer union" is by definition circling the wagons, creating fences relative to the rest of the world. Given GATT and the Uruguay round etc. the economic fences may be much less important than political, military and cultural fences, and the super-nationalism bound to accompany the union. Politicians who have not informed their voters about this process are either very badly informed; or well informed but lying. Either way, and these cases are the rule, they should not be trusted as navigators in these troubled waters, or as conductors on the "train to Europe".

2. The European Union and Peace Politics

At this important point a major ambiguity enters in the image of the European Community/Union. On the one hand the EC/EU is brilliant piece of peace engineering, bringing together in a confederation former enemies (and not only Germany and her neighbours, but also, for instance, France and Britain) making war among them almost unthinkable. And on the other hand a federation is taking shape giving birth to a new superpower with tremendous centralized foreign policy and even war making capacity, already involved in several conflicts and capable of producing more.

How can a major actor on the world political stage be both peaceful and a threat to peace? Because a confederation is one of the best formulas there is for peace among states, whereas a federation can easily become a formule for the opposite.

In a confederation the ties are strong enough for the member states to benefit from equitable symbiosis and develop a machinery for conflict processing. But they are not strong enough for the confederation to become a coherent actor on the world scene.

In a federation the goals of “speaking with one voice” (joint foreign policy) and “acting as one” (joint defence policy) have been obtained, like in a unitary state. But the federation may actually be even more free to act on the world scene, given the division of labour between centre and periphery, with finance, foreign and defence policies handled by the centre.

The federation, according to the founding fathers, was the goal from the very beginning. The EC/EU ambiguity is nothing new.

The interesting question is the nature of the conflict formations in which the EC/EU will be a party. The conflicts within need not worry us from the point of view of peace, at least not in the short and medium terms. The EC/EU has excellent conflict regulation machinery and even a final arbiter in the Luxembourg based European Court, with enforcement mechanisms.

In the longer run there is always the possibility that a federation will become too much of a straitjacket, unable to contain the century old tensions in Western Europe. To mention only one: the EC/EU bridges a divide between 3 Germanic/Protestant countries (D, NL, DK) and 6 Latin/Catholic countries (F, P, E, I, L, B; although the latter is divided); Britain being closer to the former culturally and Ireland to the latter, Greece being marginal and not only geographically. A German-French rivalry activating such fault-lines may be more than the criss-cross with Catholics in Germany (Kohl) and Protestants in France (Delors) might be able to contain. The German economic dynamo will lead to a demand for (and eager supply of!) German language competence, till the breaking point comes. People have gone to civil wars over less.

However, the major conflict formations with military implications for the short and medium terms are obviously:

- *in Eastern Europe*, with groups defined in ethnic and class terms, discontent with the post Cold War deals. They will be numerous.
- *in the ACP countries* of Africa, Caribbean, Pacific with groups protesting old and new, single and EC/EU joint colonial patterns.
- *with Arab/Islamic neighbours*: Maghreb, Mashreq, Turkey and beyond.

This is not the place to go into any detail with these three conflict formations [4]. They have deep roots in European history. For the conflict border with Eastern Europe revisit Charlemagne, Napoleon and Hitler; for the conflicts with the ACP countries consider that 9 of the 12 present member states were colonial powers, and some still are; and for the conflicts with the Arab/Islamic world remember the Roman Empire, the Arab/Islamic invasion, like all colonialism legitimated through a civilizing

function, the Crusades, and more recently the Sykes-Picot betrayal, the Balfour Declaration and the Israel/Palestine syndrome.

Deeply engraved into European history these conflicts do not go away. They are not solved, only transformed. The present phase is only one more chapter in these three tales of Western European expansionism and confrontation with neighbours, accommodating some, at war with others, playing the former against the latter. The memories are fresh and kept alive on both sides, particularly among those recently oppressed. There are important class, ethnic and even racial fault-lines running through the conflicts; not like the intra-Western European where those conflicts were more shallow and nevertheless found very violent expressions.

The military approach will be custom-tailored to the nature of the conflict and the socio-cultural distance between the parties, probably with (soft) peacekeeping operations for Eastern Europe, (not so soft) rapid deployment forces for ACP, and (hard, even nuclear) confrontations with the Arab/Islamic world. No doubt they will also integrate as a response to European integration.

To this kind of argument, that there is a Janus face to EC/EU peace politics, the response is often that Nordic countries can exercise an influence, and presumably in a more peaceful direction. There are at least two problems with that kind of position. First, although there certainly are peace forces in the Nordic countries, including among and inside political parties, it is not obvious that they will be represented in the key decision-making organs of the EC/EU; the Council of Ministers and the Commission. And even if they were their weight would be minor with one member each on the Commission and 14 - 16 votes out of 89 in the Council of Ministers if all Nordic countries are members. To get a law accepted 63 out of 89 would be needed (today 54 out of 76), meaning that the Nordic countries cannot block anything whereas three of the Big 4 (D, F, GB and I), with 10 votes each, can. Who are stronger, the Big 4 or the Nordic 5?

Then there is the European Parliament. Here the percentage of the votes given to Nordic countries is of the same order of magnitude or less, like 15 out of 533, or 3 %. The combined vote of the Nordic countries would be like 23 million to the present 335 million (340 - the population of Denmark); less than 10 %.

To this an answer sometimes heard runs as follows. "But all these plans about political and military union are just something they say and do not really mean" [5]. What made Nordic politicians so arrogant that they think they know what others mean, and what they do not mean? Or could it be that they try to keep their voters quiet? Either way, one more case of inadequate politicians.

3. The Motivation of Nordic Elites for Joining the EC/EU

No study has been made, to my knowledge, of the motivations guiding ruling Nordic elites in this question, so there is room for some speculation. The plebiscites in 1972 showed a heavy centre-periphery gradient [6] in the Norwegian case: massive resistance in the periphery, massive acceptance in the centre. The periphery saw their interests threatened and focused on the local impact of membership, the centre saw their interests promoted by the EC and focused on Western Europe. They were more cosmopolitan except for the globalists to whom EC was only a small part of the world. In short, some voted against membership because the EC was too big, others because it was too small. Elite motivations today probably include the following:

- [1] To avoid being outside, by the wayside, as "Europe moves on"
- [2] To get out of economic stagnation by joining the inner market;
- [3] To join a new security system given the vulnerability of NATO;
- [4] To feel big by associating with the really Big, not Nordics;
- [5] To join and be part of a Europe running the world again;
- [6] To share responsibility for decisions in an increasingly complex and interdependent world with others higher up;
- [7] To enter a community/union with a built-in guarantee against "red" (socialist) and "green" (environmentalist) experiments;
- [8] To prove Western, and more particularly European, allegiance after years of non-alignment, or critical alignment;
- [9] To join a technocratic alternative to Nordic democracies;
- [10] To join a patriarchal alternative to Nordic feminist inroads.

Comments could fill volumes; let us try to get down to basics. The fear of loneliness, possibly splendid, certainly isolated, is based on a misreading of the alternatives, to be explored below.

The truth about the economic effects of the inner market is that nobody knows. Tariff barriers do not influence quality/price ratios in a major way; and they are low anyhow. Non-tariff barriers are

important, and the stronger countries/companies will probably gain from access to bigger markets, having cutting edge capital. The smaller may become periphery districts and daughter companies. The merits of joining a security system have to be evaluated against the insecurities produced by that system. The benefits to Nordic elites inside the EC/EU system, not the least economically as Eurocrats, are undeniable; but should non-elites pay the costs? And only very few will have the dubious roles of running the world.

More important is having somebody high up to blame in a world where much can go, and does go, wrong. Autonomy will be seriously curtailed given that even EC/EU directives, not to mention the Treaty of Rome, have priority over even national constitutions. For elites that may be a pro-, not a counter-argument, however.

To Nordic business elites, worried about the green successors to the red wave that used to challenge blue, conservative policies, levelling the field of competition by paying lower social and environmental costs must be most welcome. The four freedoms (of capital and labour, goods and services) are designed to make capital mobility serve profitability, which may be where labour costs are lowest. Privatization of the welfare state is the consequence.

The last three arguments are also psycho-political, meaning probably even more important than the arguments that can be made openly, in public debates, particularly the first five.

Sweden and Finland were non-aligned during a Cold War which was essentially between the United States and the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that majority sympathy was with the U.S., not with the S.U. But there were doubts about the real goals of the former and sympathies with the professed goals of the latter. Moreover, better not antagonize a Soviet Union very close at hand; Finland knew the consequences. Nonalignment served both countries well, but left some elites with a deficit in proven Western-ness. With the Soviet Union in demise the basic danger of provocation is gone; with Western Europe rather than the ambiguous U.S. to join there is even a feeling of belongingness. Questions about Germany (not my argument) are answered by reference to a new Germany contained inside the EC/EU. Questions about the world role of the EC/EU as opposed to the internal roles (my argument) are left unanswered and generally not raised at all, for obvious reasons.

Those who point out, correctly, that there is a serious democracy deficit in the very technocratic EC/EU construction, and a serious feminist deficit (not to be confused with the proportion of women at various levels in the EC/EU hierarchy) might do well to contemplate that these could be important pro-arguments for male elites tired of democratic "meddling" and feminist critique. Men who would otherwise escape into the corporate world might find in the EC/EU a highly attractive political alternative; a Boys' Club.

4. Alternatives to EC/EU Membership

The basic point to be made under this heading is alternatives as a noun in plural. No single political community has a domain and a scope as broad and as deep as the European Community, with the exception of the Soviet Union (too late to join) and the United States (too early?). But the point about EC membership is that foreign policy options will be reduced; the optimists might say "to the least common denominator acceptable to all" and the pessimists would say "to the policies acceptable to at least 3 of the Big 4".

Here is a list of alternatives, in the sense of being complementary, economic and political options:

- [1] A focus on one's own country, using tariff and non-tariff barriers, and a separate currency, as instruments, producing as much as possible using national, even local factors; particularly for the basic human needs for adequate food, clothes and housing;
- [2] A focus on Nordic construction, blowing new life into the very successful Nordic construction [7], learning from the European Community how to build confederations; even taking steps toward a Nordic Union knowing that its limited size and only indirect involvement so far in serious conflict formations will make this step very innocuous relative to the moves decided in Maastricht;
- [3] A focus on the European Community/Union, with trade agreements, exchange of observers and in general the best possible relations to the big (and growing) neighbour to the South; short of membership. The EC/EU wants to have relations to all other parts of the world, so do the Nordic countries.
- [4] A focus on Eastern Europe, on the whole belt of countries from Finland in the North to the Balkans in the South, between the European Community/Union and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Geo- and euro-political interests would be well served by having a dynamic zone in-between with good relations in both directions. As the situation is today the former and the upcoming superpowers are getting dangerously close to each other with German/EC de facto expansion to the East (Poland, Czechoslovakia) and the Southeast (Slovenia, Croatia), and also to the Islamic South (Bosnia, Kosovo, Turkey and six Islamic, former Soviet Republics). At the same time there is a North-South continuum of cultural kinship, with economic ties to benefit from, to revive and to construct. Not all relations in Europe are East-West.
- [5] A focus on the CIS, not only because it is big and because it is there and because it needs help, but also because very good relations can be built to a giant economy and policy almost sure to make some kind of come-back. CIS is now in a state of infancy, meaning

that memories are sharp and long. The EC/EU and the U.S. try to make maximum use of that principle through emergency aid. Joint Nordic efforts might be even more welcome having fewer strings attached, and the comparative advantage of proximity.

- [6] A focus on the U.S. and Japan, two countries almost predestined to be on a collision course with the EC/EU, the former because of political/military interests, not having many economic interests to lose, the latter because of economic interests, not having many political/military interests to lose. There will be ample space for Nordic countries, singly or combined, to steer a middle course, being "reasonable Europe". The same applies very much to the relation to Islamic countries.
- [7] A focus on the Third world, meaning the whole Third world with no preference to the ACP system. Like for Eastern Europe and for the Soviet Union: the best way of helping is by giving Third world countries challenging tasks, meaning ordering sophisticated goods and services. To do so requires economies not able to produce all such products themselves. For the EC/EU, highly self-sufficient in sophistication, it would be difficult to extend this kind of true help being so self-sufficient; for the Nordic countries more easy.
- [8] A focus on the United Nations, emphasizing small power politics and the interests of the underprivileged against the veto powers; promoting the peaceful functions of the UN against those who want to use the UN for warfare.

The alternative to membership in the EC/EU is not any single one of these but all eight; the alternative is the complete set.

But can Nordic countries not do this as members of the EC/EU? The answer is No. Not a single one of these policy options would be available as EC/EU member. The inner market has to be homogeneous, with no major reason why Nordic cooperation has not progressed (Denmark is EC member since 1973). Needless to say, membership excludes having a good free trade agreement. Separate policies relative to Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, the U.S. and Japan are of course excluded; these will be matters of major concern to be decided centrally in the EC/EU, and at the highest level. And the same goes for UN policy in general, and any challenge of the double veto enjoyed by the EC/EU in particular.

In short, joining the EC/EU is to curtail in a most serious manner Nordic foreign policy options. There will be more power behind the foreign policy course ultimately steered by the EC/EU. But what does that help if the course is wrong, like it can be argued in the case with the EC/EU Yugoslavia policy? Recognition of Slovenia no problem, but of Croatia with not guarantee for the Serbs in Croatia in place, hoping the UN will sort it out?

5. Conclusion

"But we can join the economic and political aspects which we are most interested in, and opt out of the defence community!"

The argument is naive. Even if a special arrangement is found for the non-aligned and the doubtful it does not take much imagination to foresee the pressure: "Aha, you like the economic benefits, but not the costs of maintaining the law and order needed for the system to work!" Imagine the pressure from national armies not permitted by their politicians to participate. An untenable stance.

As Bonde points out as a capsule formula: by joining the EC citizens of Nordic countries will pay less for tobacco and liquor, and have to pay for cancer, and liver diseases. The annual membership fee in this customs union is considerable (Denmark 8 billion kroner, Sweden possibly 15 billion kronor). Is it worth it?

NOTES

- [1] From *The Guardian*, 11 December 1991.
- [2] For anyone to see, but pointed out by Jens-Peter Bonde, MEP, in "Frihed er det bedste", Bonde and Duetoft, *Folkestyret og Unionsplanerne*, Copenhagen, Fremad, 1991, p. 33.
- [3] For some quotes, see my *Europe in the Making*, New York, Taylor & Francis, 1989, chapter 2, footnote 18 (p. 167).
- [4] For an earlier formulation, see my *The European Community: A Superpower in the Making*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1973, last chapters.
- [5] Max Jacobsen comes very close to saying this publicly, in "Europe's neutrals should relay and join right in", *International Herald Tribune*, 17 October 1991: "Fortunately, logic has never been allowed to stand in the way of what is politically expedient".
- [6] The components of a centre-periphery index are male-female, middle-aged vs young and old, high vs low on education and income, urban vs rural, North and West versus East and South in the geography, secondary/tertiary sector vs primary, and management/functionary vs worker.

ECO-LOGIC AND POLITO-LOGIC: ARE THEY COMPATIBLE?

Public lecture given at the University of Trier on 9 December 1992

1. The Problem of Adequatio

The basic problem to be discussed here has a rather general formulation. A problem appears on the political agenda, remedies are proposed; but, *are they adequate to the problem?* This should not be confused with efficacy, whether the remedies in fact are up to the problems. Adequacy is a necessary but not sufficient condition for efficacy; it is more like relevance. If a car breaks down, calling a mechanic is adequate, but does not necessarily work. Kicking the car in anger can hardly be said to be adequate, although the level of efficacy may be quite high if the right points are affected. Adequacy presupposes theory.

Then an example more relevant to the theme of this paper. *A does violence to B*; physical (including sexual) violence to B's body, psychological violence to B's psyche, or economic violence to B's livelihood¹. This constitutes an A-B relation between perpetrator (A) and victim (B)², socially defined by the violence. However, what then happens in social reality in Western, or generally State-based societies, is that S, the State, enters and transforms A-B to an A-S relation. B, the victim, tends to be forgotten, the assumption being that B has been wise enough to take out multiple insurance, building B-I relations (I may or may not be underwritten by the State). S may end up punishing A, and compensating B, meaning that the A-B relation becomes vacuous, except for a court encounter³.

This can now be analysed in terms of protecting A from the rancour and vengeance of B, of protecting B from having to administer that vengeance, of protecting both of them from the pain of direct confrontation, particularly after physical (including sexual) assault. But there is another analysis. Jesus Christ (JC) says (Matthew 25:40, 45): "When you did it to these my brothers you were doing it to me!" and "When you refused to help the least of these my brothers you were refusing help to me". In other words, although not transforming an A-B relation (positively defined in the 25:40, negatively in 25:45) to an A-JC relation, opening for the transformations mentioned if we assume the State to be a successor to Christ in a secularizing world. That Jesus Christ is establishing himself as above others, an instance of highest accountability, or as a medium in which all relations are acted out, is clear⁴. That the state is doing or attempted something similar is clear. That there should be a relation of isomorphism within Western civilization between sacred and secular stands to reason; with *rex gratia dei* and *vox populi, vox dei* in-between⁵.

The question of *adequatio* can now be raised: is the new, or additional, relation relevant as a remedy to the problem of violence, leaving alone its efficacy? Does healing the relation to Jesus Christ, through confession, repentance and forgiveness heal the relation to the victim? Does paying a fine to the State or doing time in the prison of the State compensate the victim adequately, rebuild the personality of the perpetrator and improve their joint karma? A's relations to JC and S may perhaps improve. But how about the relations to B⁶?

2. On the Logic of Ecological Degradation

Given a Nature-Production-Consumption cycle the basic logic is clearly seen. Nature generously gives raw materials to Production for transformation (processing) and eventual end use, let us call it mediated (through production) consumption; and to Consumption for immediate consumption (examples being breathing, water from wells and springs-not bottled water-fruits and berries, etc.). Production gives industrial waste back to Nature, and Consumption gives household waste; both having conceived of Nature as a garbage heap, a junk-yard. A poor deal!

In and by itself this is not serious. Nature might have been able to handle the problem given her transformation capability, breaking down complex compounds into the simple (H_2O , CO_2 , CH_4 , with some N-, S-, P- and K-based compounds). But today that does not work because of the presence of synthetic organic and anorganic compounds, beyond the breaking-down capability of rank-and-file enzymes. **Industrialization at work**, in other words. Thus, Nature can no longer renew herself with cyclical processes, and becomes a victim of the linearity of depletion and pollution, emptying Nature of raw materials, returning non-degradable waste.

In addition, human beings are less motivated to come to the rescue of Nature when her automatic defence against ecological degradation breaks down. The distance from cause to effect, or from perpetrator to victim, is too great with today's Nature-Production-Consumption cycles spanning the whole globe. What happens may be visible locally. But the connection between economic action in different corners of the world becomes too abstract. **Commercialization at work**, in other words. But if industrialization and commercialization are the two major forces behind the tremendous increase in eco-degradation in recent generations⁷, then one conclusion might be to de-industrialize and de-commercialize, using more bio-degradable and renewable material to sustain the cyclical nature of natural processes, and more local or national economic cycles to facilitate control by human agency. Green policies can to a large extent be identified with these approaches. But such policies, very contrary to the idea of progress as measured by the gross domestic product are not practised today; twenty years after the Stockholm 1972, and in the year of the Rio UNCED, conferences⁸.

In the meantime eco-degradation finds new forms. Here is one overview of major eco-catastrophes, using cross-tabulation of the shallow eco-variables "depletion" and "pollution" with the deeper eco-variables⁹ "diversity" and "symbiosis":

Table 1. Major eco-catastrophes:

	Decreasing diversity	Decreasing symbiosis
Increasing depletion	biodiversity decrease genetic erosion	ozone layer problem deforestation//desertification
Increasing pollution	global warming toxic pollution	human overpopulation toxic pollution

Some classification may be discussed¹⁰. But the seriousness of the situation is very clear. Moreover, these are only some of the problems discussed today. Depletion/pollution continue affecting diversity/symbiosis and thereby eco-resilience.

It is tempting to try to speculate a little based on this Table, trying to make guesses about the problems of tomorrow.

Thus, the Table is an effort to see ecological resilience in terms of diversity (in both biota and abiota) and symbiosis. An eco-system high on both is in principle robust, mature, able to resist insults, producing and reproducing all the time.

Then, two insults are defined: depletion and pollution. Human overpopulation will probably counteract most efforts to decrease the depletion; deforestation for wood for burning and cooking being one example. But how about pollution?

Depletion is above all a threat to diversity, and pollution above all a threat to symbiosis by tampering with the delicate mechanisms underlying these processes, photosynthesis being a major example. Two types of pollution not included in this Table and in the current debate come to mind; possibly very harmful.

Thus, radioactive pollution, released through the use of fission and fusion processes for military (testing) and civilian (energy) purposes might be the kind of insult impacting on symbiotic potentials. Mechanical factors, like cutting down forest, or depletion through burning, would work on the quantity of photosynthesis; chemical and radioactive pollution could work on intra-molecular and intra-atomic factors.

And the same might apply to electromagnetic wave pollution. If ultraviolet rays coming through the ozone hole are dangerous, then how about the electromagnetic waves of telecommunication? Are we really to believe that they have no impact on life in general, from micro-organisms (including virus) to humans? Who studies such assumptions even before there is any evidence?

Let us now try one formulation to capture the essence of this "trend toward ecocide", to use the terse conclusion of a group of German ecologists¹¹: *Nature's eco-logic (except for catastrophes) is basically cyclical; human-made eco-logic in an industrializing/commercializing world is basically linear.* More particularly, there is increasing pollution and depletion because the former cannot compensate for the latter. In addition, the cyclical relation between human causes (the perpetrators) and human effects (the victims) is broken because the effects can be displaced far away in social space (lower classes, castes, outgroups), in geographical space, and in time (major changes in the climate, for instance, such as a global warming of +2.5C will take 40 years; +5C maybe one hundred years; the critical borderline being at +1.5C¹²). There is no immediate feedback from human victims to human perpetrators. This also applies to humankind as a parasite on Gaia as a whole: non-human nature may react in ways humans do not understand, except when directly hit by (toxic) pollution and material scarcity due to depletion. So serious a situation, and yet so little action. But why?

Another formula: this is a cybernetic system with very poor negative feedback mechanisms. Deeper readings not being promoted shallow readings in terms of pollution and depletion will be used,

depositing pollutants and fetching scarce materials from ever farther away. High knowledge of disastrous effects is cancelled by very low synchronic (social and geographical space) and diachronic (time) empathy/solidarity. The conclusion seems inescapable: only by closing these cycles, bringing cause and effect, perpetrator and victim closer, will remedies emerge.

In principle it is not difficult to see how this can be done. Cause and effect can be brought closer to each other by contracting the economic cycles, as mentioned above. If both are within the horizon the unguided human mind will more easily comprehend what is going on, and can act upon the cycle. If we now assume that this actually is human practice then eco-problems with both local causes and local effects would already have been reduced, a key reason why human farmsteads for local production have survived as an institution. But local causes with global effects, global causes with local effects, not to mention global causes with global effects would not be eliminated, and they are the kinds of eco-problems that show up in Table 1. It should be noted, however, that "global" means nothing but "same local cause" or "same local effect" many places. Global is an aggregate, not *sui generis*; even the ozone hole is a sum of local ozone holes, granted that there may be synergies.

Perpetrator and victim can also come closer to each other by building down A-S relations and B-I relations. The purpose would not only be to confront the perpetrator with "look what you have done to me", but also to enter an A-B dialogue to identify remedies, "what can be done about it". A precondition is mutual awareness; with B understanding A's suffering and A understanding why B engaged in those practices. The thesis would be that both of them have a potential awareness brought about by experience for which no abstract theory can be a substitute; moreover, they potentially complement each other seeing only one side of that praxis. Together they might arrive at deep remedies, improving their joint karma¹³; a theme to be taken up later.

The extreme case in closeness between perpetrator and victim is identity; the extreme in bringing cause and effect closer to each other is also identity, with the effect impacting directly on the cause. An example of the former may be active smoking, with the smoker playing both roles. Of course, there is also passive smoking, with the victim being so close enough to the perpetrator(s) that the smoke has not cleared. According to the theory the less extended the cycle the higher the chances of the cycle repairing itself; a theory that seems relatively well confirmed by the decrease in smoking in population groups more likely to have received the cancer/emphysema message. Other population groups, such as young women in developing countries, may still be under the influence of other messages, using smoking as entrance ticket to adult society.

In this case the smoker him/herself closes the vicious circle; in other cases the vicious circle could be constructed. A water-pipe bringing downstream water into the director's office, and downwind air into the airconditioning would have an impact on his decision-making; amplified when used during meetings of the board of directors. Underlying this would be an assumption of enlightened self-interest. Like in the smoker case the perpetrator becomes the victim of his own toxic pollution. If he is not, so the theory goes, the suffering of others has to work through "enlightened other-interest". Capitalists in search of consumers, and governments in search of voters, know what that means. But

even with no vested interest knowledge of effects, and empathy with the victims, not to mention the product of the two may still "stir sluggish consciences" (Gandhi).

3. On the Logic of Political Action

So far we have focused on the diagnosis of the problem of eco-degradation, with the obvious prognosis that this is going to deteriorate into eco-(sui)cide unless there is a course correction, and even fairly soon. Above we have examined some of the conditions for eco-cycle self-healing, the key word being closeness. But failing this alternative human agency is needed. Where does it come from, and what is the politico-logic carried in the baggage of potential actors? Does it possess *adequatio*?

We shall limit this discussion to "modern" society, assuming that this society is culturally based on state logic, capital logic and plain Western (Aristotelian) logic. Structurally a similar tripartite division also applies, between two pillars, State and Capital and then the Civil Society: People with their countless associations and organizations. Each modern country has all three. In the world system they meet their opposite numbers from other countries, constituting IGOs, international governmental organizations, regional or functional, with the UN on top; transnational corporations, TNCs and IPOs, international people's organizations; by some referred to as nongovernmental organizations. What is their politico-logic, and which politico-logic(s), if any, have *adequatio* relative to the eco-problems? Let us first state that all three sectors consist of human beings, that there are perpetrators and victims everywhere (such as polluters with household waste in civil society), that there are causes and effects everywhere, and knowledge and empathy everywhere. No sector is perfectly good or perfectly bad; they are mixes of good and bad, in empirical and potential reality.

However, that being said most causes and perpetrators are found in Capital, and most victims and effects in Civil Society, particularly in remote niches in social and geographical space, and time. The eco-logical thing to do would be to bring together CEOs and some others from Capital with the victims from Civil Society, as happened with Minamata victims of mercury poisoning, with victims of the World Bank's numerous dam projects, etc. The question is, how should such encounters be conducted? Cannot even be attempted answered before something is said about State logic, Capital logic and what we perhaps might simply call People logic, as they will meet each other with different deep assumptions.

If State logic is built around Power and Capital logic around Money, then how about the roots of People logic? Let us try Basic Needs, spelling them out as a quartet of survival, wellbeing, freedom and identity (antonyms mortality, morbidity, repression and alienation)¹⁴, and see where that leads us. The three centrepieces do not exclude each other but certainly have an awkward and partially contradictory relationship that is the essence of much of social science. They can safely be assumed to try to maximize the level of Power, Money, and Basic Needs (satisfaction) respectively. How-

ever, power may be used to protect Citizens and to Repress, even kill them; Money may get back to the Clients, used for livelihood but also be extracted, remaining on top; People's wish to survive with a minimum of well-being and freedom may put them on a collision course with State, Capital or both; and they may seek identity in Civil Society, national or international, rather than with State or Capital. No clear formula emerges, at most, unstable equilibria.

A glance at Table 1 informs us that all four basic needs are endangered, meaning that human beings in their totality are endangered. This is clearly the case for survival and well-being, to the point of humanity behaving in an ecosuicidal manner. But under such circumstances freedom will also be curtailed. And even with no estimate of how much of our identity derives from sensing the nature around us, eco-degradation probably affects mind and spirit and not only our bodies, in ways so far unknown.

So people react in self-defence, and their reactions will be to shout "Stop it!" to Capital and "Help us!" to State. If the State runs Capital the double cry will have the same addressee. The question is whether they can provide *adequatio*.

State logic is based on power (i.e., force) monopoly; more particularly as ultimate power over non-State power relations inside and between countries. Any direct deal struck between Capital perpetrators and Civil Society victims would be watched jealously by State lest that power monopoly should be threatened.

The inclination would be for State to bring eco-problems on normal form, meaning transforming the relation Capital-People to a relation Capital-State, possibly compensating People from State (or Insurance), playing the double role as *l'état gendarme* and *l'état provident*. The fine tuning of these transactions would be left to the guardians of normal form Power, the lawyers.

But then there is an inter-country state-system, today organized according to New World Order logic with a number of hegemons presided over by the hegemons' hegemon, the U.S.; and themselves presiding over inner and outer peripheries. Major debates and decisions have to reflect this hierarchical order.

Capital logic is based on capital monopoly, not in the sense of handling all money (State and People, meaning households, may handle equal or larger amounts), but in having major leverage over money dynamism (an interventionist State, e.g., practising keynesianism may play some of the same role, but People only when organizing mass strikes, boycotts etc.). Direct deals with People, and particularly with victims are not impossible if they can have a positive impact on the money flow. Compensation to victims may hurt financially, but not compensation even more. Cutting out, or modifying production processes and/or products that are ecologically harmful may also hurt financially, but not doing so even more. Heavy negative and positive public images derive from eco-behaviour, all of them money-convertible.

The inclination would be for Capital to bring eco-problems on normal form, meaning transforming the relation Capital-People to a relation Capital-State, even as punishment (but preferably as compensation for modification) if in monetary form (fines), and not, for instance, as imprisonment. Or, still worse, to the psyche by confronting the CEOs with the impact of their eco-crime on concrete

people. Or, much worse: by letting they themselves suffer the consequences of their malpractice¹⁵. The fine print of these complex transactions will be left to the specialists on normal from Capital, cost-benefit neo-classical economists.

But then there is an inter-country Capital system of world transactions, some of them inside TNCs; hierarchical and not easily controlled by Inter-State or Inter-People organizations. Operating standards may be adjusted to the power of State and/or People locally, and become very violent when both are weak.

Thus, State logic and Capital logic are not incompatible but even mutually reinforcing. Capital gives State what State wants: ultimate authority, including the power to inflict monetary pain. State gives Capital what Capital needs, exoneration from guilt. There is no painful face-to-face confrontation, with highly emotional charges that in addition carry considerably more than a grain of truth, possibly accompanied by threats of physical vengeance (or at least so perceived by the perpetrators). Instead, the conflict is acted out in cool board and court rooms, in the professional discourse of two well selected disciplines, and with experts chosen from scientists informed by the same scientific logic (atomistic, deductive, contradiction-free, disciplined to stay within the discourse of one discipline) that produced intellectual underpinnings for industrialization and commercialism. Capital is helped getting off the hook; and no new epistemology (holistic, dialectic) is called upon.

There are, of course, strong structural forces backing up this "deal of the century". Class is operating in a double sense, both at the level of the Prince and the Merchant, the supreme wielders of the power of force and the power of money; and at the level of *homo academicus*¹⁶ as an interlocking network of two conservative (in the sense of conserving) academic professions, lawyers and economists, protective of State and Capital respectively; both of them often intelligentsia rather than (free-speaking) intellectuals. And People: demobilized.

Thus, not much is to be expected if the system has been deprived of the most effective lever for self-healing. But we shall return to that option in section 4 below.

The workings of intra-country State logic is low on *adequatio* given the transformation of the violence relation. And eco-crime, like crime in general, is a form of violence, against non-human and human nature. But what kind of violence, direct, structural and/or cultural? The argument made here would be essentially direct. But the State-Capital alliance will try to transform it into structural violence, as something "global" that just happens, built into the system, unintended and working with long time lags; thereby again getting capital off the hook legally speaking. But a glance at Table 1 suffices to inform us that in most cases some are more directly responsible than others, and even if harm is unintended the amount of eco-publicity available makes unawareness (nearly) impossible.

In the inter-State system the situation is not better. There is overwhelming evidence that the major perpetrators are found in the hegemon countries US-EC/EU-Japan-Russia, and particularly the U.S.; less so in India and China¹⁷. To point this out in an IGO conference is a modern equivalent of lese majeste. Hence, IGO fora are ill-suited to identify clearly the geography of particularly eco-degrading eco-cycles; a major reason for their use since articulation can be controlled, if not eco-degradation. On the other hand, such fora may be well suited to incriminate the lesser fry among countries,

particularly the former socialist countries when they were down on their knees. In this there is also a fallacy of misplaced concreteness: in the socialist countries with low world trade cause and effect showed up in the same county; capitalist countries high on trade know how to export the problems by spinning world-wide eco-cycles.

Capital will demand cost-benefit analysis, trying to minimize the costs and maximize the benefits when they calculate the fines, compensation payment and bad reputation among the costs to be included in any budget-process. Increased costs can be pushed onto employees, customers or written off as investment costs, particularly if the product has low demand elasticity. Companies with a more eco-friendly production process will be rewarded by less fines and, hence, higher Q/P (quality over price ratios)¹⁸. But in many branches the companies will tend to use about the same technology meaning that they are all punished equally and there are no market advantages to reap from honing individual skills. Rather, collective bargaining (meaning lobbying) will be the likely response.

In the international arena the TNCs hold one basic key to *adequatio*: if they cover raw material location and excavation, processing, and sales points, in other words the economic cycle, they control the whole eco-cycle knowing its composition and its precise geographical topology. But why should they if perceived costs exceed perceived benefits? More likely, the TNC will be used to shift operations, and have sales points surface where the taxation structure is propitious and locate the production points where eco-regulations are acceptable.

In saying this there is no denial that parts of the eco-problems probably may be addressed by internalizing the negative externalities depletion and pollution in monetary terms and let the depleters and polluters pay. However, the condition is, of course, that the money made available is used for, say, alternative technologies, including cleaning-up technology.

4. On the Logic of Non-Violent Perpetrator-Victim Relations

We are now back to the point of departure, building improvement on the relation that went very wrong, improving the *karma* at its worst point, so to speak. Generally speaking this is assumed to be in the Capital-People relation, granting the numerous exceptions. What encounter format would have *adequatio*?

Two paradigms will be discarded right away as inadequate: **Christian paradigm**: confession of sin, repentance, forgiveness **Legal paradigm**: confession of crime, adjudication, fine, quits.

The Christian paradigm may internalize norms, but is inadequate because by presupposing faith in divine presence and intervention. The legal paradigm may institutionalize norms, protecting them with high likelihood of punishment. However, by not internalizing norms against eco-crimes, the paradigm may even engender cost-benefit mentality, and mafia-style behaviour. An alternative paradigm might include the following steps that can be enacted both before and after an eco-crime:

- Step 1:** The victim makes public a consequence-analysis of the eco-relevant action, and presents it to the perpetrator;
- Step 2:** The victim invites a dialogue about alternative action, trying to take into account all perpetrator motives;
- Step 3:** Victim and perpetrator together design alternative courses of action, but not at the expense of new victims;
- Step 4:** Failing step 3 civil disobedience is launched;
- Step 5:** Failing step 2 demonstrations etc. are launched;
- Step 6:** Failing step 1 the State is called upon.

At all these points the victim can be joined by any group of concerned citizens. But the victims also have to be present.

The purpose behind this paradigm of action would be to bring home to the perpetrator that the livelihood of concrete human beings is at stake, and that these human beings may have been absent from the perpetrator's analyses because of remoteness in social and/or geographical space. Awareness of victims remote in time may be enhanced by bringing in children, by definition with a higher stake in the future, as political agents (but only if their consciousness level is sufficient). Awareness of harm done to non-human life may be enhanced by bringing in that endangered or mutilated life. At any rate, the perpetrator, if the plan has been enacted, will not be spared confrontation with the (unintended, one presumes) effects of the action. But again, unintended is not the same as unaware. The very fact that such consequences are concealed, by deceptive practices and double standards, or by externality-blind economic discourses, may itself be taken as indication of some inner awareness.

For a dialogue to take place there has to be some shared discourse. To cross international linguistic borders is no problem compared with the border between common language and a discipline language where everything has been transformed and brought on "normal" form to facilitate intra-disciplinary precision and communication. These goals are laudable. But in a democracy anyone with power, including cultural power (or "academic capital" as Bordieu would have said) has to make him/herself accountable. This presupposes a language community, and the burden of intelligibility rests on homo academicus.

Without this direct link perpetrator-victim the future looks bleak. With it, even inadequate remedies may gain in adequatio.

The case for this assertion can perhaps be built as follows.

In principle this process should have a very conscientizing impact on perpetrator and victim alike. They should be able to learn from each other, seeing the total cause-effect cycle that they themselves make

a cycle through their dialogue. If at all possible key perpetrators and victims should participate, not their representatives, such as their lawyers.

The dialogue will also be mobilizing, for good and for bad. Both parties are likely to exit from the encounter resolved to do something. If human suffering carries more conviction than blue-prints sanitized for any possible communication of suffering the victims may win some of Capital over to their side.

The element of confrontation is certainly there from the beginning. But this may be a prelude to a meta-confrontation, possibly making Capital a divided house, against itself.

And this is where the real struggle starts. A condition is probably that *there are alternatives*, in the sense that alternative courses of action, acceptable to both sides, can be defined (a solar park and massive investment in biomass converters instead of a dam?). People of all kinds tend to accept problems more readily when remedies are available.

Fifth, one could imagine at the end of this process a victim-perpetrator alliance, resolved to work together along eco-compatible lines. And if that happens, the can certainly be said to have been improved; with the warning that processes like the one described may have to be repeated, even quite frequently to take form roots. But if they do, a basis for that elusive sustainable development may have been laid.

Notes

1. The list is an effort to mirror the three classical categories of crimes: for gain, bodily violence as sexual crimes. Here they all appear as types of violence.
2. The German word "Verursacher" points to causality, A as the cause of a (negative) effect in B; and "Verbrecher" points to the breaking of a norm. The English "perpetrator" carries less interpretations.
3. And even that may be left to the lawyers and the insurance company agents.
4. For further indications in the same direction, see Matthew 10:35-40, particularly 10:37: "If you love your father and mother more than you love me, you are not worthy of being mine; or if you love your son and daughter more than me, you are not worthy of being mine". Also see Matthew 12:48-50, particularly 10:50: "Anyone who obeys my Father in heaven is my brother, sister and mother". Jesus Christ is in all relations, one way or the other, so is the totalitarian state.
5. For an elaboration of this in the case of human rights, see Johan Galtung, "The University of Human Rights Revisited: Some Less Applaudable Consequences of the Human Rights Tradition", in Eide and Hagtvet eds., **Human Rights in Perspective: A Global Assessment**, Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

6. See the author's **Fengselssamfunnet (The Prison Community)**, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1957, for an effort to analyse the reasons why imprisonment does not lead to any character improvement (but possibly to deterioration), in addition to building a wall (literally speaking) between perpetrator and victim. Of course, the literature highly critical of both the individual and general prevention doctrines is today enormous.
7. Thus, of the depletion of the most elementary basis for our livelihood, air, water, soil, biodiversity and nutrients in general during the last 300 years more than half took place during the last 30 years. On tenth of the time, one half of the negative impact. See footnote 11 for reference.
8. The gross domestic product is, indeed, based on the total flow of goods and services produced by the economy over a specified time period, by valuing the output at market prices, excluding all intermediate products, counting only goods used for final consumption (**The Penguin Dictionary of Economics**, London: Penguin, 1987, p. 181). Thus, processing and marketing are key constituents.
9. The shallow-deep distinction is taken from the seminal work of the founder of the deep ecology movement, Professor Arne Naess.
10. Thus, is human overpopulation, also known as the population explosion, a form of pollution? From an anthropo-centric point of view perhaps not, from a gaia-centric position certainly. Moreover, the population explosion has certain similarities with the explosive growth of cancer cells in the society of cells that make up, for instance, a human body, including the metastasis. Human overpopulation, thus, leads to parasitism rather than symbiosis, human beings giving less back to the non-human environment than they take out.
 Global warming is here seen as thermic pollution; if the result is massive flooding it will also decrease diversity. Whether "greenhouse-gases" have that effect, and whether ozone layer holes are caused by CFCs from spray-cans and fridges or from, for instance, from space-ships and rockets burning holes and leaving gases behind, remain to be seen.
 A distinction is made between decreasing bio-diversity and genetic erosion, the former affecting the number of species, the latter the variety within a species.
 Deforestation and desertification are seen as so similar in, like the ozone layer holes, decreasing photosynthetic capacity that they are combined in the table. Toxic pollution, on the other hand, is seen both as a killer (of diversity) and a destroyer (of symbiosis).

11. **Ökologische Selbstverpflichtung - Aufruf zum Handeln**, lists a number of eco-predicaments: the acceleration mentioned in footnote 7 above, including pointing out that 40 countries soon will not be self-sufficient where water is concerned and that desertification is now threatening an area the size of Africa; that eco-catastrophes may show up only 3-40 years after they were predicted, affecting next generation more than ours; that changes may be discontinuous rather than gradual, such as the sudden increase in hurricanes; and that the population increase make us double all our calculations: today's humankind produces 21 billion tons CO₂ which has to be reduced to 10 billion tons by year 2050, but by that time there will possibly be 10 billion and not 5.3 billion humans on earth, meaning that only 1 ton is permitted per year whereas in Germany the production today is 13.7 tons per year — Many such lists of eco-calamities have been produced these last 20 years and they have probably changed our problem priorities. But the authors of this particular list are so desperate given the lack of action that they promise to act as examples of eco-moral action, by pledging themselves

[1] *to cut the use of cars by 30% and respect speed limits;*

[2] *to cut energy and water consumption by 50% and 30%;*

[3] *not to use CFCs, and to cut down on household chemicals;*

[4] *to cut meat consumption by 50% and switch to organic food;*

[5] *to boycott tropical wood.*

12. Quoted from the pamphlet quoted in footnote 11 above.

13. This Buddhist concept brings with it the admonition to improve that karma, with everybody concerned participating actively.

14. See Johan Galtung, "Basic Needs", in Lederer, Katrin and Galtung, Johan eds., Human Needs: A Contribution to the Current debate, Königstein: Hain, 1980; pp. 55-125.

15. Some time in the 1970s an architect in Moscow who had forgotten to include an elevator in his drawings of a condo was condemned by a court to live on the 10th floor; in other words, suffering the consequences of his malpractice.

16. See the book with that title by Pierre Bourdieu (Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, 1984).

17. Thus, the U.S., then USSR; Western Europe and Japan had in 1990 together 20% of the world population but 74% of the world consumption of oil, coal and gas and 69% of the world emission of CO₂ (from Development and Co-operation, No. 3 1992, p. 36).

Deforestation could also have been mentioned in this context; not being limited to the Amazona. Thus, the logging company Louisiana-Pacific, currently active on the U.S. north Coast is now focusing on Baja California and seems then to be moving to "Siberia where it has a contract to log the 57% of old-growth fir left in the world" (Alexander Cockburn, "The Green Pygmy", *The Nation*, June 29, 1992, p. 883. U.S.-Russia . continue co-operating destroying or at least threatening the earth.

Then, "The Earth Charter". Principle no. 7 states rightly that "States—corporations and peoples are unequal in their contribution to environmental harm" and goes on saying that "those who have expropriated or consumed the majority of Earth's resources or who continue to do so—must bear the costs—by providing the majority of financial and technological resources. No names mentioned.

18. This argument is made cogently by Alan S. Binder in "What wasn't on the Rio agenda: A little common sense", *Business Week*, June 29, 1992.