The Peace of The East

I just returned from a sabbatical year in Asia, where I was studying the roots of non-violence. Almost ten months ago, Hindu militants demolished the Babri Mosque in Ayodhya, burned Muslim homes, and started to build a new temple to Lord Rama on the site. In retaliation Muslims desecrated Hindu temples, destroyed Hindu residences, and burned some of their hapless victims alive. In Pakistan, Iran, and Bangladesh, Indian diplomatic missions were under siege. In Bombay Muslims and Hindus continued to kill one another for several months thereafter. Peace was restored only after about 3000 people had lost their lives.

During those tragic events I was at Punjab University as a guest of the Department of Gandhian studies. My friends in Bangalore, where I had been staying previously, warned me about going to the Punjab. "Please don't go, professor Gier, it's not safe up there." (They were, of course, worried about Sikh terrorists.) Ironically, during the Ayodhya crisis, 22 people were killed in Bangalore, but there was not a single disturbance in Chandigarh, the city where Punjab University is located. I was, however, constantly reminded of the sad fact that my security there was ensured by the presence of army units on every street corner.

One day, not too long after the destruction of the mosque, some graduate students from Gandhian Studies invited me to visit one of their field projects. We drove about 15 miles to a small Muslim village in Harayana province. The 300 people in the settlement were very poor, and my student friends, five Hindus and two Sikhs, were tutoring the Muslim children in Hindi and English. Illiteracy rates are high among the Muslim population, especially Muslim girls. The goal of my student friends was very simple: to promote peace through basic education.

We also visited an impressive Shiva temple, built and maintained by rich Hindus from Chandigarh. (The local mosque was in complete disrepair.) Every day the temple priests prepare a simple meal of rice and curry for visitors and especially for the villagers. The Muslims, of course, did not worship at the temple, but I was moved by the fact that the two Sikhs students paid their respects at each of the Hindu idols. Here we were, only about 250 air miles from Ayodhya, experiencing the real India, one seldom written up in newspapers: a country of nearly 900 million people speaking 14 major languages, believing in six religions, helping each other and living in harmony. In this small Muslim village I had found the Peace of the East.

This was the India that Gandhi loved and for which he had such great hope. Gandhi’s enemies were Hindu and Muslim extremists, who attempted to undermine his ideal of nonsectarian peace. Gandhi’s assassin, Nathuram Godse, was a member of the Hindu Mahasabha, an early Hindu fundamentalist organization. These people were inspired by a book entitled Hindutva, a 1926 treatise praising the indigenous pacifist religions and condemning the “aggressive” semitic faiths, which it claimed were the
principal source of India’s problems. Unfortunately, these ideas are gaining more currency, even among India’s middle class Hindus, and the Bharatiya Janata Party (the BJP), which has increased its representation in Parliament from four to over 100 members, is now the primary leader of Hindu sectarianism.

The Roots of Nonviolence in India

During my five months in India, I travelled to every major area of the country. I found it remarkable that I did not once see any meat for sale. I was cooking vegetarian, so I did not search out the meat markets. (These, as I was told, were found only in the Muslim parts of the towns and cities.) Killing any animal, especially the sacred cow, is considered a heinous crime by hundreds of millions of devout Hindus and Jains. Many Hindus will not eat vegetarian food in a restaurant that also serves meat dishes, and Jains will not eat vegetables that still have any sign of life. Jain priests also shield their mouths with cloth to prevent any accidental ingestion of insects.

Long ago Hindus used to offer animal sacrifices on their altars, but over time Buddhists and Jains persuaded them to switch to fruit and flower offerings instead. Hindus in Nepal and Bali still practice animal sacrifice on a grand scale (thousands of animals at major festivals) even today. I entered a temple in Katmandu and found two water buffaloes, still gushing blood into specially designed drains, their heads placed at the feet of the royal goddess.

Buddhists are allowed to eat meat if they are not involved in animal slaughter. Jains are scandalized by this weak rationalization of violence against animals. There was Buddhist influence in both Nepal and Bali, so it must have been the radical Jains who were the most insistent about protecting animal life in India. Although they number only 3.5 million, Jain leaders, conspicuous because of their mouth guards, were part of every TV discussion I saw about the Ayodhya crisis. Despite their small numbers, the Jains are respected as people of peace and high spiritual development.

The Buddhist emperor Ashoka (3rd Century B.C.E.), however, was a great proponent of nonviolence. He banned animal sacrifice, and he may well have been the first person in world history to establish veterinary hospitals. The royal household became completely vegetarian and the royal hunt, the sport of Indian kings for centuries, was abolished during his reign.

As opposed to the Jains, Buddhists allow many practical exceptions to strict nonviolence. They may kill venomous snakes, and those in Kashmir believe they must sometimes trap and kill predatory wolves. Thai Buddhists may kill crop threatening pests because the good the food will bring ultimately outweighs the evil of killing.Vermin are sometimes exterminated in Zen monasteries, but a special purification rite is performed to aid the dead insects. While pacifism is the ideal, Buddhists may kill in self-defense. Buddhist monks have not only served as soldiers, but have raised and led armies. In 1392 one Buddhist abbot raised an army of 5,000 monks to defend against Japanese invaders.

Gandhi’s Views of Nonviolence

Gandhi’s greatest contribution to the concept of nonviolence (ahimsa) was to build a bridge, principally through action and only afterward by thought, between its application for the social good as well as individual spiritual development. Gandhi transported the Indian concept of ahimsa beyond its previous world-denying expressions into a world-affirming Realpolitik, one that drove an imperial power from India. Gandhi claimed that ahimsa is not “a resignation from all real fighting... On the contrary, ... nonviolence ... is more active and more real fighting against wickedness than retaliation whose very nature is to increase wickedness.” The culmination of his philosophy was the principle of “soul force” (satyagraha), its principal implication being that soul force will always, in the end, win over brute force.

Gandhi actually allowed many exceptions to ahimsa, based on very realistic and pragmatic considerations, exceptions that scandalized many Hindus and Jains. In contrast to their position, Gandhi’s ahimsa is re-active and flexible, not passive and absolute. Throughout October 1928, Gandhi carried on a lively debate with various respondents in his journal Young India. Gandhi defended his decision to euthanize an incurable calf, and even went on to list the conditions for human euthanasia. He also thought that tigers, snakes, and rabid dogs might have to be killed if they threaten human life. (In this he was very close to Buddhism, an affinity that the Hindu Gandhi acknowledged and celebrated all his life.) The vow of ahimsa is indeed absolute, but the exigencies of human finitude force us, tragically, to violate this vow every day.

Nicholas F. Gier is a UI philosophy professor and coordinator of religious studies. He is an Associate of the Martin Institute for Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution. His article “Gandhi, Ahimsa, and the Self” recently appeared in Gandhi Marg; and his paper “Ahimsa, the Self, and Postmodernism” will appear in the March, 1995 issue of International Philosophical Quarterly.
Internet Users Can Read Our Electronic Library

The Martin Institute has joined the rush toward making information available electronically. If you have access to the “Internet” computer network, and are able to use “Gopher” software, you can access our electronic library. Plans are to include information about the Martin Institute and its programs, information about Borah Foundation programs, and copies of Martin Institute working papers. In addition the library will be the repository for reports and working papers from the Transboundary Initiative for Dispute Resolution, an organization of government, private and university personnel working to promote use of alternative dispute resolution techniques in the northern mountain and plains states in of the US and the west-central Canadian provinces.

To access this library, work your way through the Gopher menus to the University of Idaho screen. Select the “UI Gopher Services” option, and from the resulting menu select “UI Programs in Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution”. Alternatively you can do a “Veronica” search using the key words “Conflict Resolution”.

While you are working your way around the Internet, you may also want to check out the electronic library being maintained at the University of Colorado by their peace studies program and by the Peace Studies Association. To access this via Gopher, first get the Colorado state screen, and from that screen pick “Communications for a Sustainable Future”. This will lead you to several choices related to peace studies and conflict resolution topics.

One further option is available for those of you who regularly use e-mail — you can subscribe to the “Peace” mail list. Subscribers regularly receive copies of working papers, announcements, book reviews, and bits of ongoing discussions posted by other subscribers to the mail list. This is a good way to get an idea what is going on in the peace studies community.

If you are interested in learning more about any of these computer communication options, feel free to contact me by e-mail at HAMILTON@uidaho.edu.

Institute Sponsors Public Programs

One of the things which the Martin Institute does to enrich the campus environment is to bring in speakers with expertise in some of the world’s conflict areas. Recent visitors have included:

Vladimir Volkov, one of Boris Yeltsin’s advisors on Balkan policy. Dr. Volkov, a historian, spoke about Russian perceptions regarding the disintegration of Yugoslavia, and the persistent ethnic violence in that region.

Mahendra Kumar, professor of political science at the University of Delhi and head of the Gandhi Peace Foundation. Professor Kumar talked about Gandhi’s concepts of nonviolence, and how they relate to the current sectarian political violence in India.

A.M. Ahmadi, a justice of the Supreme Court of India. Justice Ahmadi spoke on the relationship between the federal and state judicial systems in India and on current Indian human rights issues.

Sergio Diaz-Montano and David Villars, professors of economics and political science from the Universidad de Las Americas in Puebla, Mexico. They discussed Mexican perceptions of US-Mexican economic relationships, especially the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Yevgeny Kuznetsov, an economist with the Russian Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations. Dr. Kuznetsov spoke on the difficulties and prospects faced by Russia as it tries to move its economy away from military production and in the direction of free markets.

Rafique Ahmad, Former Vice Chancellor and now Director of the Centre for South Asian Studies at Punjab University in Lahore, Pakistan. Professor Ahmad spoke on the possibilities for economic integration and political cooperation among the countries of southwest Asia, especially the Moslem states of Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, Turkey, and the south Asian states of the former Soviet Union.
Given its importance to life, health, and agriculture, water has been at the center of many international conflicts.

Many international conflicts are really conflicts over access to and alternative uses for natural resources. Given its importance to life, health, and agriculture, water has been at the center of many international conflicts. The current dispute between Pakistan and India is partly rooted in the 1947 decision to run the line of partition through the middle of the Indus basin irrigated area, prompting heated disputes over water allocation. On the other side of the Indian subcontinent, Nepal, India, and Bangladesh argue over the implications of hydropower development, flood control, and water allocation on the Ganges. Relations between the US and Mexico have suffered for many years because of festering resentment over the quantity and quality of water from the Colorado and Rio Grande available to Mexico following use north of the border. On South America's Rio de la Plata, construction of water projects in Brazil and Paraguay has met concern and political hostility from downstream Argentina.

The political and cultural dimensions of the ongoing Middle East peace process tend to overshadow the fact that this process is also about more prosaic things such as water. Water has always been a problem in this region. It is an arid region of chronic water shortage, and (like oil) some states have a lot more of it than others. There are at least four water conflicts in the Middle East, each closely related to prospects for peace in the area but presenting profound challenges to those working to resolve the conflicts.

The Jordan River

Any complete and lasting peace agreement must include agreement on future allocation of Jordan River water. One of the more notable hydrologic features of the area, the Jordan River originates in the highlands of Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan, and provides water to the cities and irrigated farms of these three states plus Israel. Israel has built a "National Water Carrier", a system of canals and pipelines which divert water from Lake Kinneret (Galilee) to serve Haifa, Tel Aviv, Jaffa, Jerusalem, and smaller towns and irrigated farms as far south as the Negev. Jordan also has a canal and pipeline distribution system which brings water from several east side Jordan River tributaries to consumption centers, especially Amman. In the mid 1960's construction was started on an "all Arab diversion" of the upper Jordan, which would have conveyed water through Lebanon and across the Golan Heights to serve water needs of Syria and Jordan, and into Lebanon's Litani River valley to serve hydropower and irrigation needs in that country. This
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The peace talks must face the problem of reconciling administrative autonomy for Gaza and the West Bank with the reality of their hydrologic linkage to Israel.

The Aquifers of the West Bank and Gaza

In addition to surface waters of the Jordan River, any peace agreement must address groundwater. As an aftermath of the 1967 War, Israel occupied the West Bank, an area underlain by important aquifers. The natural underflow splits along the central highlands, flowing east toward the Jordan River, and west toward the plains near Tel Aviv and Jaffa. These groundwater supplies have become increasingly important in recent years as tubewells have tapped the aquifer to supply water for urban and agricultural use, both in Israel and the occupied territories by Jewish settlers as well as Arab residents. The growing aquifer use has also spawned conflict—many Arab settlements and farms traditionally relied on water from springs and shallow wells which have dried up, presumably because of groundwater withdrawals by deep wells. Israel is committed to continued groundwater use, since that has now become a significant part of its total water supply.

The aquifer which underlies Gaza is being severely overdrafted by tubewells, resulting in water level declines and saltwater intrusion. With the poor and deteriorating quality of the groundwater, Gaza now relies on the Israeli National Water Carrier for most of its supplies of potable water. The peace talks must face the problem of reconciling administrative autonomy for Gaza and the West Bank with the reality of their hydrologic linkage to Israel.

The Euphrates River

As if the disputes over groundwater and the Jordan River were not problems enough, the Middle East peace talks occur against the backdrop of two other water disputes. The Euphrates River originates in the moist highlands of Turkey, before crossing Syria and Iraq on its way to the Persian Gulf. Historically this river has served cities and irrigated areas in both Syria and Iraq. Both Syria and Turkey have succumbed to the temptation to develop the water for their own uses rather than allowing it to pass downstream to serve traditional uses. In the mid-1970s Syria built Lake Assad for power and irrigation purposes over the objections of Iraq. This conflict became so heated that only Saudi mediation prevented armed conflict. Now Turkey is in the midst of a huge project (the most recent phase being Atatürk Dam) to develop power and irrigation in economically depressed eastern Anatolia, a region made politically unstable by Kurdish separatism. Now both Syria and Turkey are trying to assert their historic claims to water, but Iraq is especially handicapped by its political isolation following its Gulf War defeat. The large quantities of water involved (by Middle East standards) and the political intransigence and isolation of several of the participants make this perhaps the most dangerous of the regional water disputes. In addition to the threat of war among these three states, their poisoned relationships complicate any attempts for multilateral agreement on Israel/Palestinian/Occupied Territory issues. On the other hand, some observers (including late Turkish President Öztal) have viewed Turkish water supplies as a possible key to agreement, based on the possibility of a "peace pipeline" conveying surplus waters from the Seyhan and Ceyhan Rivers to Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and other Arab states.

The Nile River

While the Nile River is not often thought of in the context of the Middle East peace process, it too has relevance. Nile water could possibly play a part in addressing the water problems of Gaza, and conceivably even those of Israel and Jordan. However Egypt sees its own Nile supplies as precarious. While present supplies from Aswan Dam are generally adequate for existing urban and irrigation use, they leave little margin for future demands from a rapidly growing population. More unsettling, proposed upstream projects in Sudan and Ethiopia threaten the current level of flows to Aswan. While the present political instability in these two countries, along with the weight of their present debt load, has so far stalled such development, the future is uncertain. On the other hand, projects that would improve the efficiency of Egyptian irrigation, or a proposed project to build canals across the Sud swamps of southern Sudan to reduce evaporation loss, might free up more water for new uses.
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Director's Corner

In late 1990 I agreed to accept a half-time position as interim director of the Martin Institute for Peace Studies & Conflict Resolution. It is interesting to look back on these three years. They began with the conflagration of the Gulf war, and the revolutionary but nonviolent changes in eastern Europe. They end with real prospects for resolving the generations-long conflict in the Middle East. On the other hand, we are now beginning to understand that the end of the bipolar Cold War, instead of reducing conflict, has released long pent up racial, religious, and ethnic hostilities. The study of war, peace, and ways of resolving conflicts continues to be just as important as it was at the height of the Cold War.

These three years have been exciting and productive ones for the institute. Our programs on peace and conflict issues and our workshops on dispute resolution have increased our visibility on campus and in the state. A dozen Martin Institute fellows and associates have become involved in the programs of the institute. Institute personnel, and others trained through institute programs are helping to resolve real-world disputes.

After three years with two half time jobs, I have decided to return to full time research and teaching in the agricultural economics department. We have now started the search for a new permanent institute director, who will also hold the title of Borah Professor of International Relations in the political science department. We also hope to recruit a conflict resolution professional to take the lead in institute training and service programs. If you know of anyone who might be interested in either of these positions, please let me know.

After working here this long, the Martin Institute has become very important to me. I hope that we can attract a dynamic permanent director who will continue to build institute programs. I expect to continue to work closely with the institute even after I return to my agricultural economics position, especially in the area of domestic and international natural resource conflicts.

[Signature]

Joel R. Hamilton
"Water and International Conflict"
To Be 1994 Borah Topic

The Borah Outlawry of War Foundation, affiliated with the Martin Institute, has chosen "Water and International Conflict" as the topic of its annual symposium for 1994. The topic is especially timely as water rights, water shortages and pollution of water sources are among the causes of international conflicts in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Europe as well as in the American West.

This year's symposium, scheduled for the evening of March 23, 1994, will feature three speakers knowledgeable on various aspects of the topic. Sandra Postel, Vice President for Research at the Worldwatch Institute (a non-profit research organization devoted to analyzing global trends) researches and writes primarily on global water issues and the economics of environmental sustainability. She is the author of Last Oasis: Facing Water Scarcity, published in 1992. Another speaker will be Dr. Barbara Sundberg, a professor of Political Science at St. Anselm College. Her special research interests are in the fields of Third World politics (especially in the Middle East) and international law, particularly as it pertains to the environment. She worked twelve years with the United Nations and has also been a Fulbright Scholar and an International Relations Fellow with the Rockefeller Foundation. The third speaker will be Mr. Jaques Baudot, currently co-ordinator of the World Social Summit for the United Nations.

The March 23 Borah Symposium will feature these speakers addressing issues related to current international conflicts over global water resources. The program will begin at 7:00 PM in the Administration Auditorium on the UI campus. Admission is free and the public is welcome to attend.
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MISSION STATEMENT

The Martin Institute for Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution is a multi-disciplinary center at the University of Idaho, founded in the belief that war and violence are neither necessary nor inevitable. Its purposes are to encourage education and research to advance peace at all levels, and also to resolve local and regional conflicts with alternatives to confrontation and litigation. Institute scholars seek to understand the major causes of disputes and violence and to provide information, training and assistance for the resolution of conflicts. The institute brings together scholars, students and present and future leaders to develop the knowledge needed for the ongoing and new challenges of establishing peace as a basis for long-range social and economic progress.