



Contributions to
CONFLICT MANAGEMENT,
PEACE ECONOMICS
AND DEVELOPMENT

VOLUME 24

BUSINESS, ETHICS AND PEACE



Series Editor **MANAS CHATTERJI**

*Professor, School of Management, Binghamton University, US
Guest Professor, Peking University, Beijing, China*

Editors

LUK BOUCKAERT AND MANAS CHATTERJI

Emerald Group Publishing Limited
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2015

Copyright © 2015 Emerald Group Publishing Limited

Reprints and permissions service

Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-78441-878-6

ISSN: 1572-8323 (Series)

Printed and bound by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY



ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

PEACE IN AN ORGANIC WORLDVIEW

Knut J. Ims and Ove D. Jakobsen[†]

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the chapter is to explore peace economics in the perspective of an organic worldview. Peace economics are discussed on two levels – the level of individual economic actor and the macro level related to the systemic interplay between economic actors. The main argument is that a change from shallow authenticity and competition towards deep authenticity and cooperation presupposes a paradigmatic shift from a mechanical to an organic worldview. Such a change in mindset should be supported by introducing peace economics in the curriculum on different levels of education. In an education for peace-building there should be a focus on what constitutes true personal development in the sense of obtaining more 'inner' peace as well as more peaceful interpersonal interactions. On the 'outer' spheres, the need for equity and joint projects is fundamental. The concept of equity emphasizes mutuality, equality and co-creative responsibility.

[†]The names of the authors are alphabetically listed. The chapter is a result of long-lasting organic collaboration between the authors.

Business, Ethics and Peace

Contributions to Conflict Management, Peace Economics and Development, Volume 24, 25–44

Copyright © 2015 by Emerald Group Publishing Limited

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

ISSN: 1572-8323/doi:10.1108/S1572-832320150000024015

INTRODUCTION

Peace economics concentrates on reduction of conflict and on peace-enabling structures in the economic sphere. To be more specific, peace economics, inspired by Johan Galtung's work (2007, 2012a, 2012b), Santa-Barbara, Dube, and Galtung (2009) focuses on reducing the conflict between the economy and the social and natural environment in order to increase the quality of life and wellness for all living beings. In this article, we discuss to what extent authenticity and cooperation may contribute to reduce the number and levels of conflicts and promote peaceful, non-violent and sustainable relations between the economy and the social and natural environment.

We will discuss peace economics on two levels: on the micro level related to the individual economic actor and on the macro level related to the systemic interplay between economic actors. On the micro level, we will make a distinction between shallow and deep authenticity, and on macro level, we will distinguish between competition and cooperation. Our central argument is that a change from shallow authenticity and competition towards deep authenticity and cooperation presupposes a paradigmatic shift from a mechanical to an organic worldview.

In order to elaborate on these issues we have structured the article in the following way. First, we give a brief description of relevant literature to put our topic into the context. Second, we present elements in Galtung's peace theory, which is summed up in a 'peace formula'. Third, we present and discuss some defining characteristics of mechanic and organic worldviews. Fourth, we introduce shallow and deep authenticity as relevant concepts in peace economics. Fifth, we focus on the differences between competition and cooperation in relation to peace economics. Finally, we discuss the four possible connections between the two dimensions. We conclude that peace is most likely in the combination between deep authenticity and cooperation, and a war is characterized by the combination between shallow authenticity and competition.

The Metapsychological Roots of War and Peace

The purpose of the conference 'Business for Peace – Strategies for Hope' is commemorating the centennial of the First World War. What was the cause of the destructive World War in which 12 million people were killed? Was the war an accident or designed, inevitable or planned? What should be learned from the First World War to avoid new wars? The immediate reaction to the assassination plot of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his

wife Sophie on 28 June 1914 in Sarajevo was that Austria-Hungary put forward a number of claims to Serbia. The Serb government could not accept all, and war was proclaimed. Some political leaders hoped for a local, short lasting war. However the chains of the events lead to a global war that lasted four years.

It is naïve to believe that the real cause is to be found in the assassination. According to Eric Fromm:

The brutal and massive violence of the ‘Great War’ was due to a mixture of economic interests, ambition, and vanity on the part of the leaders, and a good deal of stupid blundering on all sides. But once the war had broken out it became a ‘religious’ phenomenon. The state, the nation, national honor, became the idols, and both sides voluntarily sacrificed their children to these idols. (Fromm, 1973, p. 206)

Webel (2007) argues that modern mainstream psychology has not been geared to understand and solve the most important conflicts of all – the conflicts that lead to war. However, in early psychoanalysis we find some exceptions. In 1914, Freud tries to understand new dimensions of human aggression based upon his own theory (Fromm, 1973), and a famous exchange of letters between Albert Einstein and Sigmund Freud took place in 1932 (see Einstein & Freud, 1933, p. 193): ‘Warum Krieg? Ein Briefwechsel’.¹

‘Metapsychology’ is one term used by Freud who wrote several essays just after the start of the First World War. Here Freud develops his tripartite ‘structural theory’ in which the ego, the superego and the unconscious are in continuous interaction. This is Freud’s theoretical effort to provide a portrait of the dynamics of emotional life. Webel (2007) applies and revises Freud’s theory in the field of political psychology of peace and conflict formation. He claims that there are three dialectical, dynamic ‘spheres’ of greater or lesser peace: (i) the ‘inner’ peace that is the mental and emotional life of the individual defined as ‘unconscious, pre-conscious and conscious thoughts, impulses, needs, desires and perception’; (ii) the ‘outer’ economic arena that is macroeconomic and political forces and (iii) interpersonal peace that is the field of human interaction in everyday life and work. States of inner peace are characterized by low degrees of inner conflict, but even a psychologically sane person has difficulty maintaining his harmony in a pathogenic environment. The interpersonal sphere mediates inner and outer peace. Being at peace is possible but difficult in an environment in which cultures are desperately poor and war-ridden. These spheres of inner, outer and intersubjective peace are never static and always in interaction (Webel, 2007, p. 11).

Webel’s beliefs seem to be in accordance with the Dalai Lamas’ writings: ‘... Peace must first be developed within an individual. And I believe that love, compassion, and altruism are the fundamental basis for

peace Once these qualities are developed within an individual, he or she is then able to create an atmosphere of peace and harmony. This atmosphere can be expanded and extended from the individual to his family, from the family to the community and eventually to the whole world' (Dalai Lama in Thich Nhat Hanh, 1991, p. vii, as cited in Webel & Galtung, 2007, p. 3).

In several books, Fromm (1955, 1956, 1960, 1973) develops and revises Freud's original ideas in the direction of what he calls a humanistic psychoanalysis, emphasizing that progress can only occur when changes are made simultaneously in the economic, socio-political and cultural spheres. One concept developed by Fromm is *narcissistic character* described as the opposite pole to love, reason and objectivity. Fromm writes that 'the insane person is the one who has completely failed to establish any kind of union' (Fromm, 1955, p. 30). The necessity to unite with other living beings, to be related to them is an imperative need on the fulfilment of which man's sanity depends. For the narcissistically involved person there is only one reality, his own thoughts and processes, his own feelings and needs. The world outside is not experienced or perceived objectively, that is as existing in its own terms. The insane person has lost contact with the world and has withdrawn into himself.

'Alienation' is another important concept used by Fromm defined as the mode of experience in which the person experiences himself as an alien, estranged from himself: 'He does not experience himself as the centre of his world. The alienated person is out of touch with himself as he is out of touch with any other person'. A related concept used by Fromm (1955) is *identity*. Fromm emphasizes that the development of Western culture in the direction of individuality has its problems. The hope was to make the individual politically and economically free, but this hope was not always fulfilled. The original clan identity had disappeared, and to feel 'I' in the sense that a person was the centre and active subject of his own power was problematic. According to Fromm 'many substitutes for a truly individual sense of identity were sought for' ('I am a businessman'), but not found. And the 'need to feel a sense of identity stems from the very condition of human existence, and it is the source of the most intense striving' (Fromm, 1955, p. 63).

When no identity is found, one attitude towards oneself is described as a *marketing orientation*. This is a phenomenon in which man experiences himself as a thing and aims to sell himself successfully on the market, competing with other individuals (Fromm, 1955, pp. 141–142). According to Fromm, such a man does not experience himself as a man with love, fear

or convictions, but as an abstraction alienated from his real nature, which fulfils certain functions in the social and economic system. His sense of value depends on his success. Also, the alienated personality will lose a sense of dignity.

Fromm supports his thesis drawing on Ibsen's dramatic poem 'Peer Gynt' (Fromm, 1955, p. 186). Ibsen made the loss of self the main theme of his criticism of modern man (see also Ims & Zsolnai, 2010). Peer Gynt is a modern capitalist who chases after profit and material gain and finally discovers that he has lost his self and that he is like an onion with layer after layer but without a core. Losing himself, he also loses his identity. Then he is attempting to acquire a secondary sense of self by being successful and useful – a saleable commodity fitting well into one of the current patterns.

In his comprehensive opus *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*, Fromm (1973) analyzes in depth the character of Adolf Hitler, categorizing him as a 'highly narcissistic, withdrawn person for whom phantasy is more real than reality' (p. 427). Hitler failed the *Realschule* and was a drop out. Many young students are drop outs, but the problem of Hitler was that 'he was not only not interested in his school subjects, he was also uninterested in *everything*' (Fromm, 1973, p. 431), perhaps with the exception of his dog later in his life. Fromm emphasizes that the drop out was felt as a personal failure for the young Hitler. But Hitler did not change his behaviour. Instead of 'taking a step toward reality he withdrew more into his phantasy world and away from closer contact with people' (Fromm, p. 425).

Another central concept used by Fromm to explain Hitler's character is *necrophilia*, an attraction to death and to everything dead. Necrophilia can be contrasted to biophilia, which means a passionate love of life and all that is alive, whether it concerns a person, a plant or a social group. In contrast to Freud, Fromm argues that biophilia is the normal impulse (not the death drives/instinct emphasized by Freud). Freud is missing the relational needs, the needs for affective attachment, the need for confirmation of existence and value (Vetlesen, 1994, p. 264). According to Vetlesen, the problem is that the psychic mistreatment or suffering as a child will cause the inability to form affectionate relations with others (Vetlesen, 1994, p. 253). Vetlesen's main point is that such mistreatment leads to a self that is seriously damaged and as a consequence the faculty of empathy fails to develop. Vetlesen also strengthens Fromm's position that necrophilia involves a deficient sensitivity to the pain of others that leads to stunted growth, to psychical 'crippledness' (Fromm, 1973, p. 483).

Biophilia is related to Gandhi's *ahimsa*, which strictly means non-killing. But for Gandhi, *ahimsa* means much more than not-killing. *Ahimsa* means

that you should not violate any sentient being; you should not nourish an unmerciful thought, even with him or her that may regard you as an enemy. For a person who has cultivated ahimsa there is no room for any enemy. Ahimsa is a contrast to curses, spiteful words, unfair and biased language, and unfriendly thoughts. Above all ahimsa is compassion and feeling togetherness with all livings, a willingness to act to the best of mankind (Galtung & Næss, 1994).

Reading Fromm we see the close relationship of the individual's social conditions and his attitudes and behaviour. The importance of such a social perspective is supported by Bauman (1989). One of the results from reading the literature related to evil and human destructiveness is nicely summed up by Vetlesen (1994) who argues that the ethics of care and the importance of moral sensitivity should obtain a much more central place amongst moral theories (see Gilligan, 1982).

Towards a Holistic Peace Theory – A Model

Peace studies, inspired by the work of the Norwegian founder of the Norwegian Peace Research Institute Galtung (2007, 2012a, 2012b), Fischer (2007), Santa-Barbara et al. (2009) have a dual focus. It focuses on the existence of peace as absence of violence as well as the existence of peace-promoting structures. In this part, we will describe and discuss peace theory and connect it to the development of economy with regard to rebuilding a peaceful harmony between economy, nature and society. We will address the relationship on both individual and structural levels. In addition we suggest that peace theory is inextricably connected to cultural value systems. We argue that the connection between research in peace and economy, respectively, can contribute to fruitful developments in peace economics.

According to Galtung (2012a), peace could be described as a formula:

$$\text{Peace} = \frac{\text{Equity} \times \text{Harmony}}{\text{Trauma} \times \text{Conflict}}$$

The formula means that peace is holistic, and indicates that the more of the good (Equity x Harmony), and the less of the bad (Trauma x Conflict), the better.² The lower limit is zero, and there is no upper limit. We define trauma in a wide sense, also involving mistreatment as a child. Here Freud's metapsychological analyses and Fromm's concept of alienation can

be used to clarify and understand traumatic experiences. One way to reduce trauma is reconciliation, acknowledging wrongs, wishing them undone and engaging in true dialogues about how to do it and about future solutions. Some trauma may be deep-rooted and caused by the fact that the individual's basic needs as a child were not satisfied, in particular due to lack of love from a mother or father.

It is important to solve conflicts in a sustainable way and it is necessary to make incompatible, contradictory goals more compatible. To promote equity and harmony we have to develop fair back-ground institutions and authenticity that leads to compassion and a sense of enjoying the joy of others and suffering the suffering of the other. Equity involves cooperation for mutual and equal benefits. It also presupposes working against structural violence by which we mean the difference between the potential and the actual, typically a justice gap. A violent structure impedes the development of the group and the self through a structure that is generally invisible. For example, cultural violence is very hard to change since it is a deep-rooted phenomenon that legitimizes different forms of inequality, in casu discrimination between sexes and class differences.

A fruitful concept in peace theory and peace economy is therefore *joint projects* in which the numerator of the peace formula is increased; for example, by putting people together, joint projects invoke strong I-we cultures, extending structures based on weak individualist cooperation. The structures could be established through social pacts, contracts, or other more or less formal arrangements (Galtung, 2012a, p. 42). If the denominator of the peace formula increases by extensive competition among individuals or economic actors, the result decreases the value of joint projects. According to Galtung, 'The more pronounced I-culture at individual or collective levels, the less likely positive peace, the more likely direct and structural violence' (Galtung, 2012a, p. 42). Galtung's advice is to write simple rules for both negative peace, avoiding violence and positive peace, building peace with nature, in self, couples, companies, states, nations, regions and civilizations.

An economy based on this peace perspective has implications on both micro and macro levels, and the two levels are strongly interrelated. Concerning conflicts, we need sensitivity within persons. Otherwise frustration in one level may lead to aggression on the other level. In our opinion, peace is more like a process than a product. An increase of the values in the numerator and a decrease of the values in the denominator of the peace formula leads to a peaceful structural change process. On the cultural level, according to Galtung, increasing values of the formula could be stimulated

by introducing arts, for example music, theatre, poetry, painting, and sculpture in the public space. Art can lift individuals beyond the ordinary and unite them, and creating such unity may be peace-building (Galtung, 2012a, p. 162).

Perspectives on Mechanistic and Organic Worldviews

In this part we will dig deeper into the differences between mechanistic and organic worldviews as contexts of interpreting changes on micro and macro level in the economy. The mechanistic perspective is characterized by the idea that pieces of matter are isolated individuals (atomism), related to each other only externally. In a mechanistic perspective, society (and the market) is nothing more than a mere mechanism based on the interplay between egocentric individuals seeking their own ends.

One of the most important consequences of the mechanistic worldview is that the whole universe is completely causal and deterministic. Everything that occurs has a defined cause and gives rise to a defined effect, and the future of any part of the system may, in principle, be predicted with absolute certainty, if its state at any time is known in detail. There is no capacity for creativity, spontaneity, self-movement or novelty in the mechanistic worldview. According to Whitehead, an important precondition in the mechanistic world view is that coordination in nature is regulated through external rules of connections. This is called the doctrine of laws as imposed (Whitehead, 1967b, p. 113).

In much the same way, the norms regulating the interplay between individuals in an atomistic, materialistic society are based upon mechanical solidarity. Durkheim uses the term 'mechanical' to illustrate that the social molecules 'lack any movement of their own, as do the molecules in inorganic bodies' (Durkheim, 1991, p. 84). This does not mean that the term 'mechanic' indicates that the solidarity is produced by mechanical or artificial means. Instead mechanical solidarity represents an 'analogy with the cohesion that links together elements of raw materials, in contrast to that which encompasses the unity of living organisms' (Durkheim, 1991, p. 84).

The mechanistic worldview does not leave much space for ethics or, for that matter, aesthetics. If nature is valueless, there is, on the one hand, no reason to feel deep respect and esteem of natural or artistic beauty. On the other hand, there is no reason to orient our practices around such values. In the field of economics, it is obvious that ethics is often reduced to purely instrumental values. In much the same way as for aesthetics, ethics is

regarded as a competitive tool to increase the market value of the firm or the product (Porter & van der Linde, 1995).

Whitehead (1967a) argues that it is necessary to introduce an organic categorical scheme to establish a foundation for a holistic worldview based on ethical values. As a beginning we have to rethink the status of life in nature. The mechanistic paradigm presupposes a dualistic separation of 'nature' and 'life'; whereas, in the organic concept of nature, 'life' and 'mind' are interwoven with matter and motion. It is the essence of life that it exists for its own sake, as an intrinsic value. The point is that we can understand neither physical nature nor life, unless we fuse them together as essential factors in the composition of the whole universe.

Referring to Capra's *The Turning Point* (1982), an organic worldview refers to a reality composed of living entities having a high degree of 'non-linear' interconnectedness. The interconnectedness is non-linear in the sense that freedom is considered as the claim for self-assertion. Spontaneity and originality of decision are the supreme expressions of individuality. In a civilized society the general end is that the variously coordinated groups should contribute to the complex pattern of community life presupposing that individual freedom within each group should be possible without the destruction of the ends of the whole society.

As we have mentioned earlier, stronger relations between the actors stimulate growth in the peace formula. This means that individuals and community make each other and require each other at the same time. Thurows develops this further when he argues that societies are not merely statistical aggregations of individuals engaged in voluntary exchange but something much more subtle and complicated: 'A group or community cannot be understood if the unit of analysis is the individual taken by himself. A society is clearly something greater than the sum of its parts' (Daly & Cobb Jr., 1994, p. 7).

According to Whitehead, a society is self-sustaining, having its own reason. A society is more than a set of entities to which the same class-name applies: 'The self-identity of a society is founded upon the self-identity of its defining characteristics and upon the mutual immanence of its occasions (...) and the creative advance into the future' (Whitehead, 1967b, p. 204). Therefore, it is important to ask questions about patterns, organization, rhythm and flow.

Within the organic perspective, it is reasonable to replace mechanistic solidarity with organic solidarity based on coordination and cooperation. According to Durkheim, societies based on organic solidarity are based upon 'a system of different organs each of which has a special role, and

which are themselves formed of different parts' (Durkheim, 1973, p. 69). Organic thinking is based on the concept of culture as a collective phenomenon, not as the sum of individuals. Economy is like a living organism, which means that its order, structure and function are not imposed by the environment but are established by the system itself. Following this reasoning we can conclude that the doctrine of 'laws as immanent' (Whitehead, 1967b, p. 112) represents an important condition in the holistic and teleological perspective of the organic worldview.

Shallow and Deep Authenticity

In this part we give reasons for claiming that developing authenticity could contribute to increase the value of Galtung's peace formula defined on p. 30. Taylor (1991) criticizes the prevalent individualization in the modern society as the 'malaise of modernity'. Taylor claims that we have ignored seeing an individual in a deeper sense, as a 'self' that has ties to communities as well as a 'horizon of meaning'. For Taylor, authenticity is the courage to be true to oneself as a *moral ideal* within a horizon of important values. By a *moral ideal* Taylor means 'a picture of what a better or higher mode of life would be, where "better" and "higher" are defined not in terms of what we happen to desire or need, but offer a standard of what we ought to desire' (1991, p. 16). The core-aspect of moral ideal involves a contrast with the concept of narcissism as well as hedonism. In the first part, Hitler's personality was described as a narcissistic character. Taylor's definition eliminates shallow, self-centred narcissistic forms of behaviour like Hitler's with the above mentioned definition. Taylor strongly argues against 'soft relativism' favouring 'some forms of life are indeed *higher* than others' (p. 17). We believe that many lives have been self-absorbed, flattened and narrowed in the modern individualistic culture. Even if many argue they are living in harmony with their own values and principles, we think it is important to pose the question; What does it mean to live an authentic life?

We believe (Ims & Jakobsen, 2011) in accordance with Taylor that traditional concepts of individuals are one-dimensional and instrumentalist and do not emphasize the importance of social and dialogical relations with others. Authenticity in our sense is a kind of self-fulfilment that is inseparable from a horizon of important values. According to Taylor a self has an identity defined in terms of certain essential strong evaluations that provide the horizon. And to be human is to have the capacity for second-order desires,

that is strong evaluations of desires, which means the capacity for second-order reflections on one's first order preferences. By posing the question – Are my preferences worthwhile? – I may start to discriminate right or wrong, better or worse, higher or lower. This discrimination is dependent on a standard by which they can be judged. However, the deepest evaluations are the most hidden and most subject to illusions. Thus, the struggle for self-interpretation is not trivial. For most people it is important to live as authentically as possible; however, in our globalized, complex world it is not easy to achieve this goal. In the Western world, the advertising pressure oriented towards individuals is very strong, with its main purpose to delude the individual into the belief that self-realization is depending upon their consumption habits.

Taylor uses the term 'deep reflection', as a kind of radical evaluation, as 'a reflection which engages the self most wholly and deeply' (Taylor, 1985, p. 42). The fallacy is that individuals are not generally open to the horizon of significance. One consequence is loss of meaning. We suggest a conception of authenticity that interprets humans as a part of a web of life.

The concept of 'authenticity' has been described and discussed within philosophical existentialism for centuries. Kierkegaard (1978) maintains that we are able to choose ourselves, and we have the ability to live in different existential modus. We can move from living a purely aesthetical life, in the sense of being an ego, to a stage of being, which is called ethical. The aesthetic man lives in dread and despair because he cannot sense that he is meant for something higher. The ethical man in contrast truly chooses himself. Individuals who do not live authentically often lose the meaning of life and can be suffering from chronic anxiety, boredom or despair. We believe that in our modern societies many people avoid the responsibility of living authentically, and in the worst case, they end up anesthetizing themselves with drugs. For most people it is important to live as authentically as possible.


From an existentialistic point of view, authentic persons must see themselves as fundamentally free, thereby acknowledging responsibility for their actions and lives. The only way to experience freedom is to regard and treat other people as free. The acceptance of other people's authenticity is a condition of oneself being authentic. Some existentialists argue that authenticity is based upon intimate personal relations – love and friendship. We have elsewhere elaborated the concept of 'self-understanding' within an organic worldview by distinguishing between 'inner' and 'outer' experience and 'me' and 'other' beings, emphasizing the need to be in a continuous dialogue with other people (see Ims & Jakobsen, 2011, pp. 218–221).

We have, like Taylor, problematized the concept of authenticity. We will proceed on this line of thought by drawing a demarcation line between 'shallow' and 'deep'. This distinction indicates our inspiration from 'the deep ecology movement' (Drengson & Inoue, 1995; Næss & Rothenberg, 1989; Witoszek & Brennan, 1999). The difference between shallow and deep ecology concerns the willingness to go to the roots of problems and ask critical questions about oneself as well as about the society with its prevailing institutions. The second concept we will problematize is the concept of self. One danger is to confuse the 'self' with the 'ego-centric self'. Deep authenticity depends on our ability to switch to an organic worldview where awareness of an 'eco-centric self' becomes possible. An eco-centric self may be understood as a self with a capital Self – including all the sentient beings in the world. This radical and necessary change in mindset is visualized in Table 1.

What follows from the previous arguments is that an organic worldview, which presupposes an eco-centric Self, is more suitable than the mechanistic worldview for interpreting authenticity. When we take into consideration the highly advanced technologies prevalent in our modern times, these technologies have typically many dangerous hidden and unintended consequences. One result is that what we do today will have a multitude of consequences for our Selves, for others, for nature and for future generations. Once we discover that we as individual persons are in a sense interwoven – always relating to other human beings, society and nature, we have to clarify our positions in the web of life. A consequence of eco-centred awareness is that we become much more responsible in the social and ecological worlds. To become more responsive, openness and dialogue are vital. We need courage to change our interpretative map to discover the interconnectedness in the social and environmental realities. The concept of deep authenticity is essential for grasping these new perspectives. In the context of deep authenticity, we are free, and we are aware of the burden of responsibility that is laid

Table 1. Shallow and Deep Authenticity.

	Mechanic	Organic
Ego-centric	1. Shallow authenticity	3.
Eco-centric	2.	4. Deep Authenticity



upon us. Freedom is a burden because we are called upon to act in response to the highly interwoven world. Each single individual has to face this oneness of reality, and if necessary, break with the ruling norms that hinder to take the deeper reality into account. To handle the individual, social and environmental challenges we are facing today, we have to make a transition away from the idea of 'economic man' to that of 'ecological man'.

To be inauthentic is to choose the easiest way and thereby follow the avenue to self-deception – to circumvent and avoid facing up to the real challenges in the world. To be inauthentic is even to ignore inconvenient truths, crucial facts about the state of the world in the hope that the problems in the end will be resolved by someone else. Seemingly, this ignorance is strongly present in the lack of willingness to counteract the massive emissions of CO₂ that lead to global warming.

In the perspective of marketing and management literature, assumptions about an organic worldview lead to new perspectives for all stakeholders and the relations between them. Responsibility towards all living beings illuminates the inherent value in the web of life. One obvious consequence is a necessary shift from maximizing shareholder values to increasing the self-realization and flourishing of life for all stakeholders in the context of a long-term perspective.

Competition and Cooperation

In this part, we will explain competition and cooperation in the context of contrasting worldviews. Textbooks in business strategy often describe a continuum between hostile competitive behaviour and collaborative relationships. At one end of the continuum, the competitive game consists of atomistic players involved in a zero-sum game, and cooperation, if used, is reduced to an instrumental and tactical way of operation. When collaboration takes place it is typically a conspiracy of the strong to restrain competition and eliminate competitors. At the opposite end of the continuum, the embedded perspective, partnerships leading to a win-win situation are developed. Based on this, strategists have two alternatives, and must choose between competition and cooperation.

Competition between autonomous actors in the market has a fundamental standing in mainstream liberalistic economics. Competition is based on the idea of conflicting interests between the actors in the market. According to Adam Smith, the logic of the competitive market implies that private

vices will be turned to public virtues by means of the market's 'invisible hand'.

Every individual necessarily labours to render the annual revenue of society as great as he can. He generally, indeed, neither intends to promote the public interest, nor knows how much he is promoting it ... he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention By pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that of society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it. (Smith, 1976, pp. 477–78)

Today Smith's 'invisible hand' has global influence. According to OECD, all member countries fundamentally rely on competition to organize their economic activities. The reason is that they believe that competition stimulates innovation and efficiency in the use of resources, and thereby leads to greater product diversification and lower prices: 'Therefore, competitive product-markets are in the interest of all consumers' (<http://www.oecd.org/about/>). The rationalism of competition is linked to economic efficiency, without any rationality claims linked to the ends of economic activity. The reduction of the human being to a consumer exemplifies the argument that our Western concept of rationality is linked to economic ends (Allinson, 2004).

Cooperation means that different participants or partners try to find solutions in which all relevant information and values are considered. In an economic context, the participants are typically defined as stakeholders. Freeman defines the organization's stakeholders as; 'any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives' (Freeman, 1984, p. 46). In practice, different stakeholders have their own values and aims, and the organization has to interact with the stakeholders for mutual benefit. Values are not reduced to preferences (weak evaluations) since the stakeholders' fundamental values (strong evaluations) are also taken into consideration (Taylor, 1985).

In cooperative decisions, the ideal is to establish a platform of consensus, that is to find solutions all stakeholders can agree upon. This way of thinking is different from voting in which the plain majority wins all power. In cooperation all the stakeholders have a common starting attitude saying, 'You may be right and I may be wrong' (Habermas, 1990; Popper, 1983). Table 2 summarizes some of our main arguments so far, including the consequences of the two different coordinating principles in the market.

It can be reasonably argued that the principle of competition is insufficient to establish solutions based upon a long term social and environmental perspective. Welford emphasizes that 'productive cooperation ... always (will) be

Table 2. Some of Our Major Concepts Dichotomized for the Sake of Analysis.

<i>Mechanistic Worldview</i>	<i>Organic Worldview</i>
The market consists of isolated, egocentric actors (atomism)	Individuals and society are inter-woven (holism)
The market is regulated through instrumental, externally defined norms	Internalized values and norms are essential
<i>Shallow authenticity</i>	<i>Deep authenticity</i>
Ego-centric (economic man)	Eco-centric (ecological man)
Instrumental rationality	Free and responsible
<i>Competition</i>	<i>Co-operation</i>
Competition anchored in productivity and efficiency	Communicative action to reach common goals
From private vices to public virtues	

superior to blind competition and recognizing cooperative opportunities are part of recognizing interconnectedness’ (Welford, 2000, p. 141). Hence, Welford’s argumentation is based on the presupposition stating that the market cannot be defined as an aggregate of autonomous actors; instead the market must be considered as an integrated whole. Korhonen lends support to this reasoning by stressing that ‘Competition is ... a barrier of the efforts of increasing stakeholder cooperation and cooperation between the firms and its suppliers or the local community actors’ (Korhonen, 2002, p. 70).

This indicates that the focus shifts from merely means to include ends. Through cooperative processes the members might agree on the priority of different ends as well as of the use of available means. Cooperation based on dynamic dialogue allows more integrated solutions than the mechanisms of an atomistic and competitive economy. Equality and mutuality among the involved actors are necessary conditions for constructive cooperation. When competition is replaced by cooperation as the main principle for interaction in the market, the development of solutions based upon the common good will gradually take place. Cooperation presupposes that the partners disclose relevant and valid information without strategic action (Habermas, 1982, pp. 263–271).

DISCUSSION

In order to develop a framework for peace economy, we will construct a four dimensional matrix consisting of shallow and deep authenticity on the

Table 3. Peace Economy.

	Shallow Authenticity	Deep Authenticity
<i>Competition</i>	1. Decreasing the numerator and increasing the denominator <i>War</i>	2. Reducing the denominator <i>Negative peace</i>
<i>Cooperation</i>	3. Reducing the denominator <i>Negative peace</i>	4. Increasing the numerator and decreasing the denominator <i>Positive peace</i>

one hand and competition and cooperation on the other hand, as shown in Table 3. We assume that shallow authenticity combined with a competitive market implies a situation in which there exist a strong tendency to a war-like relation between economy and the environmental conditions. The reason is that both nature and individuals in society are reduced to instruments for economic growth (see cell 1 in Table 3). Mainstream economic literature presupposes that this constellation will lead to the most efficient use of natural and human resources. Both Adam Smith and Milton Friedman, representatives from two different epochs in Western history, presupposed a mechanistic worldview, claimed that competition between actors in the market will lead to resource efficiency. In this perspective, competitive power is based upon the actors' preferences, or weak evaluations (Taylor, 1985).

If economic actors with shallow authenticity cooperate, they can come up with measures that could reduce the negative impact of egocentric behaviour. In other word, it is possible to reduce the negative side effects of a violent economy based on shallow authenticity by imposing rules and norms from outside, even if the conflict still exists on micro level. This is a situation that could be characterized as *negative peace*. The value of the peace formula increases when the denominator becomes smaller (cell 3 in Table 3).

Looking at cell 2 in Table 3, we can see that the constellation between economic actors characterized by deep authenticity and a competitive market does not eliminate the fundamental reason for the conflict between economy and the environmental framework. Hence, the situation is almost identical with the one in cell 3. The value of the peace formula increases when the denominator becomes smaller (cell 2 in Table 3). It is possible to reduce the negative side-effects of competitive market transactions, even if conflicts still exist on macro level. This is a situation that could be characterized as *negative peace*, in the same way as we found in cell 3. We argue that even if the actors have an organic worldview as indicated with the

concept of deep authenticity, on the economic arena the actors will be confronted with competitive macroeconomic and political forces in Webel's (2007) sense. Furthermore, there will not be any interpersonal peace because we assume that competitive behaviour in itself will increase the number and intensity of conflicts.

In cell 4 in Table 3, we assume an organic worldview, in which the actors (micro level) are characterized by deep authenticity and the market structure (macro level) is based on cooperation. In those constellations the partners are perceived as integrated, through dialogical processes, and they share common long-term values and interests. The organic paradigm presupposes cooperation that leads to 'fair trade', which is a core phenomenon within the 'Equity' variable in the peace formula. The organic worldview involves collaborative projects as well as open and transparent communication processes between the partners of the market. Here the value of the peace formula increases because the numerator of the fraction increases simultaneously as the denominator becomes smaller (cell 4 in Table 3). When structures that eliminate the reasons for war are introduced, the situation is close to what Galtung calls *positive peace*. One central conclusion is that we have argued that the concept of cooperation has to be qualified. Cooperation within an organic worldview is quite different from cooperation within a mechanistic worldview.

CONCLUSION

With reference to nature, in which different organisms cooperate in the nutrition cycle, we advocate that peace economy must be based on similar principles. In addition to the synergic co-existence, different life forms living in the same niche in the eco-system compete for the same food. The natural principle of 'the survival of the fittest' decides which individuals and species win the competition for food. Interpreted in an economic context this means that cooperation is the fundamental principle for coordination of activities, while competition has a subordinate function. When competition dominates as the principle for coordination (cells 1 and 2 in Table 3), the different players on the market enter into a fierce competition, the level and numbers of conflicts increase, and the value of the peace formula is reduced.

We claim that the organic world view provides a better and often more accurate description of the interplay in the market, and that market behaviour based on competition will often lead to disintegration and egocentric behaviour.

Based on the above argumentation, we reach the conclusion that the discussion concerning shallow and deep authenticity (on micro level) and cooperation or competition (on macro level), should not be isolated from a discussion concerning the contextual worldview. And we see the importance of qualifying the concept of cooperation. Cooperation within a mechanistic context is quite different from cooperation within an organic context.

Awareness of the ontological and ethical preconditions can help us to see the limitations of the mechanistic worldview. To grasp the whole human being both as an individual as well as a member of the society, it is necessary to expand the perspective. The organic worldview is more fundamental as the cosmos is seen as interrelated and connected manifestations of one inseparable reality – always in motion, alive, organic, spiritual and material at the same time (see cell 4 in Table 3).

Webel's (2007) distinction between the three 'dialectical, dynamic "spheres" of greater or lesser peace' indicates the importance of the interaction between the 'inner', the 'outer' and the 'interpersonal' spheres of peace. We believe that the ontological and ethical assumptions that we have dealt with might add new fruitful dimensions to Webel's framework.

To change the worldview requires a change in mindset. Such a change needs new thinking about the importance of peace building as part of education. Peace-work, in which peace business and peace economics are central topics, should be integrated in the curriculum on different levels of education. In an education for peace-building there should be a focus on what constitutes true personal development in the sense of obtaining more 'inner' peace and more peaceful interpersonal interaction. On the 'outer' spheres, the need for equity and joint projects is fundamental. On this 'outer' arena, economists can increase the understanding of what constitutes good business and fair trade. As we have argued, a good business, a business for peace, should not be valued only by a one-dimensional profit rate but rather by how much it promotes deep authenticity and facilitates a society characterized by equality and fairness.

The concept of structural violence should be an important part of the peace-work curriculum. It entails that the concept of peace business should expand from a focus on the role of business in violent conflicts to the structural violence against both people and nature, perpetrated by businesses as a normal part of their operations. The equity concept also emphasizes mutuality and equality in order to increase the importance of relations (not the importance of attributes) and co-creative responsibility. To reduce structural violence, it is important to establish equal relations or relations based on symmetry, in which no one dominates the other. In this context competition means conflict, because victory for one excludes victory for the

other, just as we find it in war, or debates, but not in dialogues. Business for peace should play an important part in a society to satisfy basic human needs like survival, wellness, identity and freedom.

NOTES

1. When this exchange of letters was published in 1933, Hitler was already in power and the exchange of letters was only being reprinted in 2000 exemplars in German and 2000 in English.

2. Galtung writes that the equation should not be interpreted as a theory but may rather be seen as a kind of statement summing up some core concepts of peace research (Galtung, 2012a).

REFERENCES

- Allinson, R. (2004). The birth of spiritual economics. In L. Zsolnai (Ed.), *Spirituality and ethics in management – Issues in business ethics*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Bauman, Z. (1989). *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Capra, F. (1982). *The turning point – Science, society and the rising culture*. London: Flamingo.
- Daly, H., & Cobb, J. B., Jr. (1994). *For the common good – Redirecting the economy toward community, the environment, and a sustainable future*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Drengson, A., & Inoue, Y. (1995). *The deep ecology movement: An introductory anthology*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.
- Durkheim, E. (1973). *On morality and society*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1991). *The division of labour in society*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Einstein, A., & Freud, S. (1933). *Warum Krieg? Ein Briefwechsel*, Norwegian edition 2003, Kolbotn, Bazar.
- Fischer, D. (2007). Peace as a self-regulating process. In C. Webel & J. Galtung (Eds.), *Handbook of peace and conflict studies*. London: Routledge.
- Freeman, E. (1984). *Strategic management – Stakeholder approach*. Boston, MA: Pittman.
- Fromm, E. (1955). *The sane society*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.
- Fromm, E. (1956). *The art of loving*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- Fromm, E. (1960). *Escape from freedom*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fromm, E. (1973). *The anatomy of human destructiveness*. Greenwich, CT: A Fawcett Crest Book.
- Galtung, J. (2007). Introduction: Peace by peaceful conflict transformation – The transcend approach. In C. Webel & J. Galtung (Eds.), *Handbook of peace and conflict studies*. London: Routledge.
- Galtung, J. (2012a). *A theory of peace: Building direct structural cultural peace*. Transcend University Press. Retrieved from www.transcend.org/tup
- Galtung, J. (2012b). *Peace economics. From a killing to a living economy*. Transcend University Press. Retrieved from www.transcend.org/tup
- Galtung, J., & Næss, A. (1994). *Gandhis politiske etikk*. Oslo: Pax forlag.

- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1982). A reply to my critics. In J. Thompson & D. Held (Eds.), *Jürgen Habermas – Critical debates*. Cambridge, MA: Macmillan Press.
- Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Ims, K., & Jakobsen, O. (2011). Deep authenticity – An essential phenomenon in the web of life. In A. Tencati & F. Perrini (Eds.), *Business ethics and corporate sustainability* (pp. 213–223). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Ims, K., & Zsolnai, L. (2010). Self-realization in business: Ibsens's Peer Gynt. In R. Ghesquiere & K. J. Ims (Eds.), *Heroes and anti-heroes. European literature and the ethics of leadership*. Antwerp/Apeldoorn: Garant.
- Kierkegaard, S. (1978). Enten – Eller. Samlede Værker. Bind 2, København, Gyldendal.
- Korhonen, J. (2002). The dominant economics paradigm and corporate social responsibility. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 9, 67–80.
- Næss, A., & Rothenberg, D. (1989). *Ecology, community and lifestyle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Popper, K. (1983). *The open society and its enemies*. London: Routledge Classics.
- Porter, M., & van der Linde, C. (1995). Green and competitive – Ending the stalemate. *Harvard Business Review*, (September–October), 120–134.
- Santa-Barbara, J., Dubee, F., & Galtung, J. (2009). *Peace business. Humans and nature above markets and capital*. Transcend University Press. Retrieved from www.transcend.org/tup
- Smith, A. (1976). In E. Cannan (Ed.), *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. Two volumes in one, first edition 1776, the citations are from the 5th edition. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, C. (1985). *Human agency and language, philosophical papers* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1991). *The ethics of authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vetlesen, A. J. (1994). *Perception, empathy, and judgment. An inquiry into the preconditions of moral performance*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Webel, C. (2007). Introduction: toward a philosophy and metapsychology of peace. In C. Webel & J. Galtung (Eds.), *Handbook of peace and conflict studies*. London: Routledge.
- Webel, C., & Galtung, J. (2007). *Handbook of peace and conflict studies*. London: Routledge.
- Welford, R. (2000). *Corporate environmental management – Towards sustainable management*. London: Earthscan.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1967a). *Science and the modern world*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1967b). *Adventures of ideas*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Witoszek, N., & Brennan, A. (1999). *Philosophical dialogues – Arne Næss and the progress of ecophilosophy*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.