THE PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY OF INTERCULTURALITY: A VEHICLE FOR CREATING INCLUSIVE IDENTITIES AND POSITIVE PEACE

LA ANTROPOLOGÍA FILOSÓFICA DE LA INTERCULTURALIDAD: UN MEDIO PARA CREAR IDENTIDADES INCLUSIVAS Y PAZ POSITIVA

Geneviève Souillac[1]
University of Leuven - KU Leuven

Douglas P. Fry[2]
University of Alabama at Birmingham & Åbo Akademi University

Abstract: This chapter illustrates how a philosophical anthropology of interculturality can be the vehicle of higher level social, political, and ethical identities. It explores interculturality as a dynamic and inclusive model

[1] (souillacg@orange.fr) Geneviève Souillac is currently conducting research at the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at the University of Leuven—KU Leuven. She has held positions as Senior University Researcher at the Tampere Peace Research Institute (TAPRI) at the University of Tampere, Finland, Senior Associate Professor of Philosophy and Peace Studies at the International Christian University in Tokyo, Japan, Lecturer at Sydney University's Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies in Sydney, Australia, and Academic Program Associate at the United Nations University's Peace and Governance Program, Tokyo, where she directed a project on the ethics of international NGOs which led to the publication *Ethics in Action* (Bell, D. & Coicaud, J-M. (eds.), Cambridge University Press, 2006). Her interests include contemporary European Philosophy, the philosophy and ethics of peace, religious ethics, and civilizational dialogue. She is the author of *Human Rights in Crisis. The Sacred and the Secular in Contemporary French Thought* (Rowman & Littlefield/Lexington Press, 2005), *The Burden of Democracy. The Claims of Cultures, Public Culture, and Democratic Memory* (Rowman & Littlefield/Lexington Press, 2011), and *A Study in Transborder Ethics. Justice, Citizenship, Civility* (Peter Lang, 2012).

[2] (dfry@uab.edu) Douglas P. Fry is Professor and Chair of the Anthropology Department at the University of Alabama at Birmingham, USA, and concurrently Docent in the Developmental Psychology Program at Åbo Akademi University in Finland. Fry earned his doctorate in anthropology from Indiana University in 1986. He is author of *Beyond War* (2007, Oxford), *The Human Potential for Peace* (2006, Oxford) and coeditor of *Keeping the Peace: Conflict Resolution and Peaceful Societies around the World* (2004, Routledge) and *Cultural Variation in Conflict Resolution: Alternatives to Violence* (1997, Erlbaum). His most recent edited book is *War, Peace and Human Nature* (2013/2015, Oxford), which brings together contributions from peace studies, evolutionary ecology, primatology, forager studies, cultural anthropology, psychology, and related fields to explore the latest findings relevant to a peaceful view of human nature.

for the encounter with cultural, ethnic, national, and religious difference. Anthropology offers cross-cultural perspectives on social behavior and moral learning regarding the management of conflict. Anthropology, with its vast documentation of indigenous societies, past and present, including descriptions of nonviolent modes of conflict resolution, approaches to peacemaking, and creation of peace systems, provides a pool of knowledge about successful approaches to creating and maintaining interculturality, for example, with pro-peace values and inclusive identities.

Key-words: Interculturality, Indigeneity, Peace System, Nonviolence, Identity, Values, Iroquois, Upper Xingu.

Resumen: Este capítulo refleja cómo una filosofía antropológica de la interculturalidad puede ser la herramienta de identidades de un mayor nivel social, político y ético. El texto explora la interculturalidad como modelo dinámico y participativo en su encuentro con diferencias culturales, étnicas, nacionales y religiosas. La Antropología ofrece perspectivas interculturales sobre comportamiento social y aprendizaje moral con respecto al manejo del conflicto. Así mismo, con su amplia información sobre sociedades indígenas, pasadas y presentes, la antropología incluye descripciones de modalidades no violentas de resolución de conflictos, acercamientos a la Paz y a la creación de sistemas de paz, y proporciona un acervo de conocimientos sobre métodos eficaces a la hora de crear y mantener la interculturalidad, por ejemplo, con valores pro-paz e identidades participativas.

Palabras-clave: Interculturalidad, Indigeneidad, Sistema de Paz, No-violencia, Identidad, Valores, Iroqueses, Alto Xingu.

Introduction

Intercultural communication has become central to political theory and debates on ethics. Whether at local or global levels, social reality is increasingly plural and complex, requiring broad conceptions of justice. Democratic procedures of representation and respect for rights are supplemented with inclusive, participatory models of communicative ethics and citizenship. Yet obstacles remain to the mainstreaming of interculturality as an ethical horizon for democratic societies. As the respect of diversity and difference extends, so does the concern with cultural authenticity and integrity, leading to the clash of identities and social exclusion. This chapter illustrates how a philosophical anthropology of interculturality can be the vehicle of higher level social, political, and ethical identities. It explores interculturality as a dynamic and inclusive model for the encounter with cultural, ethnic, national, and religious difference. This chapter argues that interculturality –the encounter with difference– is a matter of moral learning and ethical necessity, entailing processes such as dialogue and conflict transformation at the interface of borders. Drawing on reflections from philosophy and anthropo-

logy, interculturality finds its ground in a philosophical anthropology in which the shared quest for common existential concerns and answers occupies an important function. This philosophical anthropology includes processes and values of conflict resolution and transformation, peace with justice, nonviolence and interdependence, and goals of biosustainability.

The chapter begins with a brief survey of dilemmas of the contemporary normative landscape as they relate to the question of pluralism in political debates on democratic governance, globalization and cosmopolitanism. This first section indicates where classical normative theories of democratic justice have a limited view of the potential reach of civic life. However, defending an expanded approach to civic life and the experience of multiple levels of ethnic, religious, cultural, social and political identities need not be synonymous with the loss of authenticity and integrity. Instead, we suggest identities which are capable of expansion through various experiences of interculturality can address complexity by developing reflexive awareness about the historical context of identity-development within an evolutionary timeframe. Pluralism can be the ferment of expanded identities. Pluralism also can be the ferment of an enlarged experience of citizenship which draws on the contemporary quest for identity and on the complex realities of multiple social encounters. The second section of the chapter illustrates the anthropological function of moral learning in the context of social identity. It surveys data from various cultures which exemplify the importance of crafting shared moral spaces for human societies, where human practices such as conflict resolution and peace values can integrate local identities into higher level normative identities. The third section illustrates the case for interculturality as a model for the crafting of shared spaces and expanded identities. Drawing on anthropological data both methodologically and thematically illustrates the importance of an inclusive approach to different experiences of existential time when tackling the problems of modernity. In this final section of the chapter, examples are provided for the practical application of a model of interculturality that broadly stands for the creative response to borders of all kinds, the search for integrative solutions, and the building of higher level moral identities.

Section I – Building a Model of Interculturality

Our contemporary social and political condition emerges out of a complex modern history featuring the growth of centralized state power and an expansion of the economic sphere. These political and economic mutations accompanied the secularization of Western society and the gradual exit of the political authority of religion[3]. In this context, the source of political legitimacy

---

[3] See Gauchet, M.: *The disenchantment of the world: A political history of religion.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999 (trans. Burge, O.); Habermas, J.: *The philosophical discourse of modernity.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1990; Taylor, C.: *A secular age.* Cambridge: Harvard Belknap Press, 2007.

has shifted from religious to human rights values, reflecting a complex synthesis of the Christian respect for human dignity and the legal language of rights. The ambivalent nature of this modern genealogy of democratic values is reflected in the ambiguous marriage between popular and state sovereignty and its consequences in the form of democratic fatigue and disenchantment[4]. Despite the complexities and differences of various democratic transitions throughout the world since the end of the Cold War, and despite a loss of trust in democratic politics[5], the political and moral weight of democratic norms of governance have been mainstreamed at a global level. A society of states exists at the beginning of the twenty-first century loosely regulated by international organizations and by the norms and standards which emerge from the participation of states in these organizations. At the same time, the international context has been reconfigured in terms of intercivilizational conflict featuring the assertion of mutually exclusive identities. The fragmentation of the world in distinct civilizations announced by Samuel Huntington generated justified critique and controversy[6]. In *Identity and Violence*, Amartya Sen noted that the focus on identity could lead to violence.[7] However, the overt signifiers of conflict must not detract from identifying the economic, social and political problems of global dimensions that cause conflict and affect those most vulnerable[8].

Classical theories of democratic governance have broadened to include the question of difference in a plural world. Debates on cosmopolitan forms of justice and global human rights ethics, including the implications of constructivism for global state legitimacy and relations, are wide-ranging[9]. The debates span national and regional types of democratic frameworks, including regional institutions such as the European parliament and the European Court of Human Rights, to pursue cosmopolitan forms of citizenship and even world

[4] See Rosanvallon, P.: *Counter-democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008 (trans., Goldhammer, A.); Souillac, G.: *A study in transborder ethics: Justice, citizenship, civility*. Brussels: Peter Lang, 2012 ; Innerarity, D.: *La transformación de la política*. Barcelona: Peninsula, 2002.

[5] See Fukuyama, F.: *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. Free Press, 1996. See also Fukuyama, F.: *Political order and political decay*. New York: Macmillan/Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2014.

[6] Huntington, S.: *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996/2011. See also Moïsi, D.: *La géopolitique de l'émotion*. Paris: Flammarion, 2008.

[7] Sen, A.: *Identity and violence*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2007, p. 1.

[8] See Cox, R.: *The political economy of a plural world*. London/New York: Routledge, 2002.

[9] See Beitz, C. R.: *Political theory and international relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999; Brooks, T.: *The global justice reader*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2008; Caney, S.: *Justice beyond borders*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006; Charvet, J.: *The international ethical society*. Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1995; Frost, M.: *Ethics in international relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996; Wendt, A.: *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999; Linklater, A.: *The problem of harm in world politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

government[10].The intensification of globalization since the end of the Cold War has led to explorations into the new ethical problems posed by globalized conditions, building from normative theories of difference based on gender, ethnicity and race[11] to critiques of economic inequality and its impact on capacity[12], to the question of the accommodation of the cultural and religious dimensions of life in democracy[13]. The appropriation of citizenship is revealed in all its complexity as individuals inhabit multiple layers of identity across private and public spheres of democratic life. Debates on pluralist justice share a common inspiration, namely the achievement of social change and just outcomes. They also share a common commitment to the basic legal and procedural framework of democracy which allows for both dissent and consensus-seeking through communicative action. Communicative ethics and the discourse theory of democracy, as Habermas argues in his foundational work on discourse ethics, allow for the nonviolent deliberation on what constitutes just outcomes and decisions through the rational exchange of reasons[14]. This procedural and communicative context of exchange allows for multiple interpretations of a diverse world to be accommodated and for pluralist ethics to attain public resonance[15].

Pluralist conceptions of democratic justice allow for the confrontation between the particularist perspectives of subjects who embody specific life trajectories and the universal norms and values on which democratic procedures rely. A purely agonist vision of democracy relies on dissent and contestation for its renewal[16]. From a pluralist perspective, democratic stagnation is prevented and democratic renewal encouraged when the widest variety of situated selves are given a chance for self-expression and claims are made on behalf of particularist perspectives[17]. Democratic theory seeks for just resolution of

[10] See Archibugi, D. and Held, D. *Reimagining political community. Studies in cosmopolitan democracy;* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999; Held, D. *et al.* (eds.): *Debating globalization.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005; Held, D.: *Cosmopolitanism.* Cambridge: Polity, 2010; BOHMAN, J.: *Democracy across borders.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010;

[11] Young, I.: *Justice and the politics of difference.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990; Young, I.: *Inclusion and democracy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002; Young, I.: *Global challenges.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006; Benhabib, S.: *Situating the self.* Cambridge: Polity, 2013.

[12] Sen, A. and Nussbaum, M. (eds.): *The quality of life.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

[13] Benhabib, S.: *Another cosmopolitanism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006/2008; Benhabib, S.: *The rights of others.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[14] Habermas, J.: *Between facts & norms.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996 (trans., Rehg, W.); Habermas, J.: 1990, *Op. cit.*

[15] Benhabib, S., & Dallmayr, F. (eds.), *The communicative ethics controversy.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1990.

[16] See Mouffe, C.: *The democratic paradox.* London: Verso, 2009; Mouffe, C.: *Agonistics.* London: Verso, 2013.

[17] See Benhabib, S.: *The claims of cultures.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002; Benhabib,

claims made against the state and its norms, from the point of view of individuals and groups, such as in the quest for cultural and religious rights[18]. The theorization of the creative interface between different perspectives needs to be pursued further[19]. Certainly, the critique of patterns of exclusion, where economic and cultural inequalities converge, challenges the limits of participatory democracy. At the same time, a dualist framework pitting state against citizens, or state against civil society, or political parties and interest groups against each other, does not always respond satisfactorily to the new complexity of contemporary societies. The representation of conflicts between different views in the media generates a needlessly polarized landscape of ideas. These polarizations threaten established forms of consensus with regard to values and norms established after significant struggles. The stagnation of conflicts also generates political fatigue and disinterest. Daniel Innerarity describes effects of confusion within our contemporary experience, arguing that the multiplication of images and representations in the media distorts our access to a reality ultimately rendered invisible[20]. While transparency and the delivery of instant information have never been so emphasized, one is left with the sense of opacity and even dissimulation with regard to the real layers of economic and political reality.

While these insights are important, the antidote for a disillusionment arising from the ruins of grand narratives and the saturation with images of social conflict needs to be carefully thought through. Innerarity rightly points out that democratic discouragement and social confusion can be repaired with an alternative force, an optimistic skepticism which harnesses curiosity with regard to complexity[21]. This chapter will argue that alternative approaches to complexity lie in interdisciplinary perspectives which highlight the quest for commonality in political and social anthropology. While building on the gains of democracy, addressing social complexity also means that common existential goals of biosustainability and conflict transformation emerge as vital elements of social and political organization and development. Critical perspectives are commendable from the point of view of deepening democratic inclusion. But solutions must also be identified as conflictual stagnation defers the identifica-

S.: 2004, *Op. cit.*; Watkins, R.: "Negotiating rights and difference: liberalism, cosmopolitanism, and democracy" in *Political Theory* 34, 2006, p. 628-633.

[18] See Benhabib, S., 2006/2008, *Op. cit.*; Baubock, R.: "The rights of others and the boundaries of democracy" in *European Journal of Political Theory* 6, 2007, p. 399-405; Means, A.: "The rights of others" in *European Journal of Political Theory* 6, 2007, p. 406-423.

[19] See Laborde, C.: *Critical republicanism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. See also Parekh, B.: *A new politics of identity.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008; Parekh, B.: *Rethinking multiculturalism.* London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2000/2006.

[20] Innerarity, D.: *La sociedad invisible.* Madrid: Espasa, 2006.

[21] Innerarity, D.: *El futuro y sus enemigos.* Barcelona: Paidos, 2009.

tion of areas of common concern and cooperation on matters of existential urgency such as the protection of the environment and the reduction of violence, destruction and harm[22]. Further, democratic dissent and legislative renewal are crucial to empower historically oppressed groups and revisit dominant paradigms and narratives. The dialogic and hermeneutic function of debate and dialogue can be further harnessed to encompass existential goals such as conflict transformation and peace values. As decision-making and the negotiation of legitimate outcomes become increasingly tenuous, and lead to issues of democratic deficit, so does the need for creative solutions increase with regard to new political struggles and the inclusion of new values related to peace and the protection of the environment. For Jürgen Habermas, a process exists whereby solidarity takes constitutional shape around certain crucial norms such as fairness, equality, and individual rights[23]. Emancipation is classically read as the struggle for autonomy and rights in a configuration which negates rights, whether within or beyond national borders. But the consolidation of rights acquired through political struggle then deepens as these rights are practiced, leading to their normalization. Further struggle then builds on previous layers of rights. As layers of rights accumulate, as occurred throughout the historical development of democracies, so must an archeology of rights be developed which recognizes not only their theoretical but also practical interdependence.

Interculturality refers to the interdependent nature of emancipatory life and encourages the further expansion of emancipatory civic experience. When interculturality is viewed as encompassing the hermeneutic engagement with complex meaning at the interface of borders of understanding, it becomes an integral part of a social and political project for a plural universe which expands, rather than splits, the experience of identity. Interculturality is already occurring where there is communicative action about rights. These communicative processes continuously build and renew the public sphere where citizens practice and embody their rights, and where their different interests and beliefs diverge and converge. An overarching system of democratic values allows these same citizens to express their differences, and in so doing they are embodying not only their own values, but also practicing a civic, democratic and even normative form of identity. This reflects Habermas' insight that political autonomy is accompanied

[22] See Souillac, G.: *Op. cit.*; Souillac, G.: *The burden of democracy.* Lanham: Lexington Books, 2011, especially Section I; Souillac, G.: "The cosmopolitan ideal and the civilizing process: Expanding citizenship for peace" in De la Rosa, S. & O'Byrne, D. (eds.): *The Cosmopolitan ideal. Challenges and Opportunities.* London/New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015. On the question of harm reduction in international relations, see Linklater, A.: 2011, *Op. cit.*

[23] See Habermas, J.: 1990, Op. cit.; Habermas, J. & Dews, P. (ed.): *Autonomy and solidarity: Interviews.* London: Verso, 1986; Habermas, J.: *The inclusion of the other.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998.

by increasing solidarity around certain shared norms. Whether individual or collective, the experience of autonomy cannot be disassociated from the coalescing of consensus around key normative values that are both enabled and encapsulated in communicative action. Autonomy and solidarity are neither purely individual nor purely collective experiences, but synthesize both. Normative solidarity expresses the reconciliation between the allegedly purely self-interested subject of liberalism, and an embodied, contextual participant whose life trajectory recognizes the inter-subjective and interdependent nature of a social and political life oriented towards emancipation for all[24]. As citizens claim and experience their rights, they experience the importance of a broader social and political ecology of interdependent rights which gives meaning to the emancipatory project which they share.

Interculturality as an experiential model for civic life adapts to a contemporary political condition characterized by increasing complexity and builds on modernity's normative ambitions for human well-being. Even if global citizenship and a world government remain unlikely in the near future, the resources of global movement of populations and the wide variety of encounters between views and customs under conditions of globalization can be tapped to explore further possibilities for civility and the reduction of violence at the interface of borders. The experience of citizenship symbolically expands when allegiance to national borders comes to include norms and values of universal moral reach such as human rights[25]. This symbolic extension is furthered when social complexity is embraced and the peaceful encounter with difference is encouraged as a form of democratic participation. Kwame Anthony Appiah explores the notion of cross-cultural conversation to defend his view of the function of cosmopolitan citizenship in a plural world[26]. Negotiating the various cultural avenues, multiple borders, and different actors we encounter means that civic life becomes increasingly complex. The function of citizenship no longer stands for mere national belonging or as a territorial signifier, but indicates participation on a public and fragmented scene of global civic life. Borders in turn have acquired greater symbolic resonance. The delineation between various territories is expressed by borders which symbolically separate fields of ethnic, cultural and religious affiliation. For Etienne Balibar, a normative regional citizenship such as belonging to the European Union counteracts the exclusionary effects of national citizenship, and completes the European democratic project[27].

---

[24] Habermas, J.: *1998, Ibid.*

[25] Souillac, G.: *2012, Op .cit.*

[26] Appiah, K.: *Cosmopolitanism*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2007.

[27] Balibar, E.: *We, the people of Europe?* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001 (trans. Swenson, J.).

Interculturality synthesizes and builds on three important features to develop higher level identities within a framework of deep citizenship[28]. First, it is a cognitive model in the sense that moral learning is both sought and achieved at the meeting point between local meaning and values of universal significance and potential application. Second, it is a contextual model as historical factors are important in the mapping of complexity. Third, interculturality includes the identification of common areas of concern, which play an important binding role. We have reached the point where the deepening of interculturality will reflect the inclusion of complexity as a matter of survival. A new form of existential political will is necessary. When we engage with our own narratives, we recognize that alternative perceptions exist and that these must be negotiated and reinterpreted within the public sphere in order for common ground to be identified. Daniel Innerarity makes another important observation. The world is shrinking spatially, leading to an accelerated proliferation of information. Yet the same cannot be said of our cognitive engagement with political time[29].

This point is applicable to the argument that the reconstruction of the goals of civility through interculturality will depend on a renewed approach to describing and explaining the experience of time. Experiences of historical time are framed by narratives of founding events and ruptures that are not uniform, but follow cultural, religious and social variants, overlapping and confronting each other as cultures and civilizations meet. Borders are unwittingly crossed in a temporal as well as in a spatial sense. Habermas cites the case of post-War Germany to illustrate the institutional, social and political implications of constitutional patriotism, in particular where, as in the case of Germany, a "self-critical 'politics of memory' "[30] forged new public awareness. As Habermas writes, "citizens wholeheartedly accept the principles of the constitution, not only in their abstract substance, but very specifically out of the historical context of the history of each nation"[31]. The economic and institutional unification of Europe after the disastrous consequences of two world wars also illustrates how the conscious engagement with history produces new institutional forms designed as antidotes to fragmentation and to promote shared spaces. One could cite here French politician Simone Weil, elected first president of the European Parliament from 1979 to 1982, for whom "Europe is first and foremost, peace".

[28] Souillac, G.: 2015, *Op. cit.*

[29] See Innerarity, D.: *Ética de la hospitalidad*. Barcelona: Ediciones Peninsula, 2001; Desroches, D. & Innerarity, D.: *Penser le temps politique: Entretiens à contretemps avec Daniel Innerarity*. Laval: Presses de l'Université Laval, 2011, p. 22-24.

[30] Habermas, J. & Ratzinger, J.: *The dialectics of secularization*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2006, p. 33 (trans. McNeil, B.).

[31] *Ibid.*

Section II - Responding to Human Complexity: The Human Potential for Conflict Resolution, Internally Peaceful and Non-warring Societies, and Peace Systems

Inclusive, integrative responses are possible in a world of extremes where exclusion constitutes the default response to intractable conflict or historical violence. Historical instances of expanded citizenship through norms and values demonstrate how higher level identities are built as the social, political, and moral transformations of interculturality emerge over time. A critical reconfiguration of our relationship to historical time and space broadens our subjective experience of civic identity as we consider how the histories of others overlap with ours. The dynamic management of various levels of experience of belonging, identities, and values both facilitates and arises from our own historical experience and our interaction with the historical experience of others. As we will now examine, a political anthropology integrating levels of identities is further supported by ethnographic data which exemplifies behavioral models of sociality such as conflict resolution and the development of peace systems for the purpose of common survival and flourishing. Comparatively contextualizing our social and political experience with that of our forbearers continues the project of situating ourselves in the widest and broadest human evolutionary timeframe.

The remainder of this section and the following section explore the implications of this methodological choice. The confrontation with data and findings from anthropology also illuminates the metaphysical dimension of time that necessarily underpins our modern emancipatory experience. Key events in our histories of democratic struggle illuminate the role played by moral learning, interculturality, and the new depths of citizenship as our understanding of democratic belonging expands. The interdisciplinary encounter between social and political philosophy, and anthropology, provides the broader perspective required to craft a social and political anthropology that is more broadly based in its consideration of humanity. Both disciplines assist the effort to identify how and why human beings reach for values and meaning that can be universally shared.

Anthropology offers cross-cultural perspectives on social behavior and moral learning regarding the management of conflict and the importance of peace within communities. A cross-cultural perspective demonstrates that conflict resolution and conflict management practices exist in all societies, and furthermore that the overwhelming majority of conflicts are handled without physical aggression[32]. For instance, third party involvement as mediators

---

[32] Fry, D.: «Conflict management in cross-cultural perspective» in Aureli, F. & de Waal, F. (eds.): *Natural conflict resolution*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000, p. 334-351; Fry, D.: *The human potential for peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

is extremely common across different cultural settings, but people also deal with their disputes and grievances through negotiation, discussion, avoidance, moots, courts, contests, and ordeals. An anthropological view also reveals the plethora of social control mechanisms such as shunning, criticizing, mocking, gossiping, and the like, which can be viewed as preventative measures to physical manifestations of conflict[33]. The human tendency to address conflict without bloodshed is further reflected in the development of highly peaceful social systems wherein nonviolence reigns[34]. Internally peaceful societies promote and actualize nonviolent patterns of social interaction among their citizenry. Physical violence is simply not an accepted behavioral option. Nonviolent beliefs, values, attitudes, and practices are inculcated in the young, modeled by adults, and practiced in daily life[35]. Many internally peaceful societies also shun the practice of war. Fry has compiled from a review of ethnographies a list of over 70 cultures that do not make war; over twenty of the world's nations lack armies; and some countries such as Iceland, Sweden, and Switzerland have not participated in war for generations[36]. Bonta and Fry (2006) present a listing of 40 societies from around the world that neither engage in war nor allow violence to intrude upon a largely tranquil social life; some of these peaceful societies are nomadic foragers, whereas others practice horticulture, and still others are agriculturalists[37].

We can also comparatively reflect on the peace systems of two traditional societies, the Upper Xingu River basin tribes of Brazil and the Iroquois Confederacy. These examples show that values, consensus decision-making and normative citizenship are pivotal to the creation of peace in these traditional systems as much as in globally interdependent societies. Gregor applies the concept peace system to ten neighboring tribes of the Upper Xingu River

[33] Fry, D.: *2006, Ibid*; Fry, D.: "Human nature: The nomadic forager model", in Sussman, R. & Cloninger, C. (eds.): *Origins of altruism and cooperation*, p. 227–247. New York: Springer, 2011.

[34] Bonta, B.: «Peaceful societies prohibit violence». *Journal of Aggression, Conflict, and Peace Research* 5 2013, p. 117-129; Bonta, B.D. & Fry, D.: «Lessons for the rest of us. Learning from peaceful societies», in Fitzduff, M. & Stout, C. Stout (eds): *The psychology of resolving global conflicts* (Vol.1). Westport, CT: Praeger Security International, 2006 p. 175-210); Fry, D.: *2006, Op. cit.*; Fry, D.: «Life without war». *Science* 336, 2012, p. 879-884; Howell, S. & Willis, R. (eds): *Societies at peace*. London: Routledge, 1989; Kemp, G. & Fry, D. (eds): *Keeping the Peace*, New York: Routledge, 2004; Montagu, A. (ed.): *Learning non-aggression*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

[35] Endicott, K. & Endicott, K.: "Batek childrearing and morality", in: Narvaez, D., Valentino, K., Fuentes, A. et al. (eds.): *Ancestral landscapes in human evolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014, p. 108-125; Kemp, G. & Fry, D.: *ibid.*; Montagu, A.: *ibid.*

[36] Fry, D.: 2006, *Op. cit.*; Barbey, C.: Nonmilitarisation and countries without armies, in Evans Pim, J. (ed.): *Nonkilling security and the state*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling, p. 153-176.

[37] Bonta, B.D. & Fry, D.: *Op. cit.*

basin because they shun war with one another[38]. Peace systems can be defined as clusters of neighboring societies that do not make war on each other, and sometimes not with outsiders either[39]. A completely warless system is illustrated by Malaysian societies such as the Batek, Btsisi, Chewong, Jahai, and Semai, whose nonviolent practices including their nonwarring tradition are well established[40]. In other cases, however, the member societies of a peace system do make war outside the realm of the system. The Upper Xingu tribes, although consisting of member groups from four language families, have developed bridging interconnections through trade relations, a high degree of intermarriage, and common ceremonies[41]. "Intertribal bonds within the upper Xingú Basin were based on peaceful relations between the tribes," write Murphy and Quain[42]. The presence of the Upper Xingu peace system was first recorded in the 1880s and certainly had already been in existence for some time[43].

The Iroquoian peoples from New York provide another example of a peace system. Archaeology and ethnohistory reveal that before the Iroquois of five separate tribes—the Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, and Seneca (later joined by the Tuscarora)—united into a confederacy, a chronic state of feud, war, and cannibalism existed[44]. The Iroquois confederacy became a peace system that promoted new values. The people developed a supra-tribal system of governance, the grand council of chiefs, to handle mutual concerns and to resolve intergroup conflicts without bloodshed. Within the peace system, revenge killings, feuding, and making war were outlawed. Homicides that did occur were thereafter settled through the legal mechanisms of paying compensation rather than with the wrath of vengeance. The Iroquois peace system became stronger over time with the deepening of intertribal bonds and the develop-

[38] Gregor, T.: "Symbols and rituals of peace in Brazil's Upper Xingu", in Sponsel, L. & Gregor, T. (eds.): *The anthropology of peace and nonviolence*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1994, p. 241-257.

[39] Fry, D.: *2006, Op. cit.*; Fry, D.: "Anthropological insights for creating non-warring social systems". *Journal of Aggression, Conflict, and Peace Research* 1, 2009, p. 4-15; Fry, D.: *2012, Op. cit.*; Fry, D.: "Cooperation for survival: creating a global peace system", in Fry, D. (ed.): *War, Peace, and Human Nature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013, p. 543-558.

[40] Dentan, R.K.: "Cautious, alert, polite, and elusive. Semai of Central Peninsular Malaysia", in Kemp, G. and Fry, D. (eds.): *Keeping the Peace*. New York: Routledge, 2004, p. 167-184; Endicott, K. & Endicott, K.: *Op. cit.*; Howell, S.: "To be angry is not to be human, but to be fearful is." Chewong concepts of human nature, in Howell, S. & Willis, R. (eds.): *Societies at peace*. London: Routledge, 1989, p. 45-59

[41] Fry, D.: *2006, Op. cit.*; Fry, D.: *2009, Op. cit.*; Gregor, T.: *Op. cit.*

[42] Murphy, R. & Quain, B.: *The Trumai Indians of Central Brazil*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1955, p. 10.

[43] Gregor, T.: *Op. cit.*

[44] Dennis, M.: *Cultivating a landscape of peace*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993; Kupchan, C.: *How enemies become friends. The sources of stable peace*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

ment of a common sense of identity[45]. The history of how the peacemaker-prophet, Deganawidah, delivered peace to the peoples of the five nations was kept vibrant over the generations by the recitation of the historical legend at council meetings and on other occasions[46]. The Iroquois created symbols of peace and unity, laden with cultural meaning, for instance, by drawing an analogy between how the five nations symbolically inhabited a communal longhouse, living together in peace, just as related nuclear families, each gathered around its own hearth, concomitantly share the warmth and protection of the common longhouse. As Kupchan observes, the Iroquois confederacy "proved remarkably durable, maintaining the peace among the Iroquois for over three hundred years"[47].

Section III – Applying Interculturality: Practical Implications

People do not always respond to problems of human complexity and intercultural encounter with hostility and violence[48]. Anthropological data show that a wide spectrum of responses exist, including the capacity to form inclusive peace systems and build expanded social and moral identities across time. Core values represent culturally important life-guiding principles that reinforce individual behavior and also are apparent in the functioning of institutions and practices. Values are reflected in and reinforced though social customs and institutions; they tend to be reflected in speech events, rituals, myths, and drama. A system of core values may promote prejudice or acceptance, hierarchy or egalitarianism, and authoritarianism or democracy. A culture's core values may support war or positive peace—a concept that views peace as more than just the absence of war (negative peace) and includes interrelated elements such as social justice, human rights, equality, sustainability, and human security. Core values are learned during socialization and regularly reinforced in social life. Psychological research shows that societal values influence which behaviors are applauded and which negated, the latter type being greeted with ridicule, shaming, and other social sanctions[49].

---

[45] Fry, D.: *2013, Op. cit.*

[46] Dennis, M.: *Op. cit.*; Wallace, P.: *White roots of peace: The Iroquois book of fife*. Santa Fe, NM: Clear Light Publishers, 1994.

[47] Kupchan, C.: *Op. cit.*, p. 308.

[48] Souillac, G. & Fry, D.: "The human quest for peace, rights, and justice: convergence of the traditional and the modern", in Seibt, J. & Garsdal, J. (eds.): *How is global dialogue possible?* The Netherlands: DeGruyter, 2015, p. 225-249.

[49] Miklikowska, M. & Fry, D.: "Values for peace. Ethnographic lessons from the Semai of Malaysia and the Mardu of Australia". *Beliefs and Values* 2, 2010, p. 124-136; Souillac, G. & Fry, D.: *Op. cit.*

Awareness of and adherence to collective values can foster political learning and citizenship. Collective values also can help to expand social and political identities within a global epistemic field. The Upper Xingu tribes have a peace-supporting value system with several mutually reinforcing facets. First, violence and war are viewed as immoral and uncivilized, activities unworthy of Xingu participation. As Gregor notes, "A good citizen is therefore peaceful in response to both the moral imperative of peace and the aesthetics of behavior"[50]. Desired personal traits include being nonviolent, self-controlled, and calm. Second, in his value system, red blood, whether animal or human, is seen as vile and disgusting. Therefore, the spilling of blood whether through individual or group violence is repugnant. Third, Upper Xingu peoples reinforce their nonviolent values by contrasting themselves to warlike neighbors, who they consider immoral —accusing them of beating and kidnapping children, murdering their own kin, raping their wives, and relishing war— in order to remind themselves that civilized people should never become violent and warlike[51]. Significantly, they do not demonize their neighbors to justify attacking them, but do emphasize the moral superiority of their own nonviolent, antiwar values. Finally, in contrast to warrior cultures that promote values of valor, aggressiveness, fortitude, and self-sacrifice, the role of the warrior among the Upper Xingu peoples is devalued. No prestige, status, or material gain is culturally prescribed to valor in war. As Murphy and Quain explain, "warfare was an occasion for fear, and not an opportunity to enhance one's status"[52]. And Ireland concurs, pointing out that the term warrior translates to a "man whose greatest talent is losing his self-control."[53]

The Iroquois also explicitly valued peace within their confederacy. For example, chiefs dedicated themselves to "righteousness, justice, and peace"[54]. And like their chiefs, male and female citizens were enjoined to be respectful of others, repress any feelings of anger or hostility, and contribute to the common good[55]. Self-control against the expression of anger was in accordance with Iroquois cultural values more generally. Jesuit Father Joseph-François Lafitau observed early on that the Iroquois have "an admirable composure and do not know what it is to burst out into insult. I do not remember ever seeing any one of them angry… [They] would think themselves degraded if they showed any emotion"[56].

---

[50] Gregor, T.: *Op. cit.*, p. 246.

[51] Gregor, T.: "Uneasy peace: intertribal relations in Brazil's Upper Xingu, in Haas", J. (ed.): *The Anthropology of War*, 105-124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990; Gregor, T.: *Op. cit.*

[52] Murphy, R. & Quain, B.: *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

[53] Ireland, E.: "Neither warriors nor victims. The Wauja peacefully organize to defend their land". *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 15, p. 54-60, p. 58.

[54] Dennis, M.: Op. cit., p. 87.

[55] Dennis, M.: *Ibid.*

[56] Lafitau is quoted in Dennis, M.: *Ibid*. p. 111.

Individuals and groups have the capacity to hold simultaneously multiple levels of belonging, as members of a family, neighborhood, clan, village, nation, and so forth. Additionally, the capacity to experience a sense of belonging to humanity as a whole is amply documented in literature and other art forms which seek to identify those affects such as joy, sadness, and hope which are common to humanity. The anthropological data on peace systems in traditional and contemporary contexts demonstrates the human capacity to promote cultural, political and normative peace-supportive values and to expand social and political identity. Successful peace systems expand the sense of belonging to include previously separate social entities. Among the Upper Xingu tribes, tribal identity exists alongside a common identity that includes the other tribes[57]. The supra-tribal sense of belonging is promoted via performance of common rituals, intervillage trade, tribal exogamy, and peace-promoting values[58]. As one citizen explained, "We don't make war; we have festivals for the chiefs to which all of the villages come. We sing, dance, trade, and wrestle"[59].

The Iroquois also expanded belonging to encompass not only the members of one's own tribal group but also the members of the larger social entity of the confederacy. Dennis writes that "The historical experience of consolidation in the interest of peace —understood in terms of balance and harmony among kins-people within a single domestic world— became central to Iroquois identity and culture"[60]. The development of a pan-Iroquois belonging is reflected in various ways. As the Iroquois peace system evolved, the practice of exacting blood revenge following a homicide was replaced by the payment of compensation, and the practice of cannibalism among the member tribes became obsolete. Outsiders became insiders; nonrelatives were transformed into kin. The distinct pottery styles that archaeological investigations show characterized earlier times became progressively uniform across Iroquoia, reflecting the development of a common identity[61]. Intermarriage also increased, being both a contributor to and a mirror of an additional layer of belonging; ritualized adoptions connected people within and across tribal lines; and importantly, the construction of kinship imagery reinforced the new view of Iroquoians as relatives[62].

[57] Fry, D.: *2006, Op. cit.*; Fry, D.: *Op. cit.*; Fry, D.: *2012, Op. cit.*; Gregor, T.: *1990, Op. cit.*; Gregor, T.: *1994, Op. cit.*

[58] Fry, D.: *2006, Op. cit.*; Gregor, T.: *1994, Op. cit.*

[59] Gregor, T.: *1990, Op. cit.*, p. 113.

[60] Dennis, M.: *Op. cit.*, p. 44.

[61] Engelbrecht, W. : *Iroquoia: The development of a native world*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2003.

[62] Dennis, M.: *Op. cit.*; Wallace, P.: *Op. cit.*

Peace systems described in the indigenous world deserve much closer consideration for their very presence shows that neighboring societies can integrate the lessons of interculturality to generate higher level values. Peace systems also strengthen a shared social identity and sense of unity through ongoing interaction, rituals, and exchange, as well ceremonies and symbolism. A study of extant peace systems suggests that certain ingredients may be useful for creating sustainable peace at regional and global levels: build upon interdependence and the need for cooperation over competition, strive for exchange and inter-linkages among countries and regions, promote higher levels of shared social identities, create new overarching institutions of governance, develop effective conflict resolution mechanisms, and promote value orientations that favor respect, responsibility, reciprocity, and redistribution (social equality) over profit and power[63].

Current-day relations among nation states are in some ways parallel to those of the Iroquoian tribal nations before they joined together and stopped warring with each other. Since the end of the Cold War, the rapid growth of civil society groups and nongovernmental organizations advocating for human rights and humanitarian goals on behalf of distant strangers is also an illustration of the extension of political identity beyond territory and the expansion from local cultures to moral values and ideals relevant to all humanity—such as respect and the sharing of material and intellectual resources. Various mechanisms including the negotiation of peace treaties and the complex operations enabled by the international community in the areas of peace-making, to peace-building, conflict prevention and the reconciliation and restoration of war-torn communities, rely on a set of principles and norms which signify the importance of peace as a counterbalance to conflict, violence and war. These values and norms are communicated by a wide variety of standard-setting texts, laws, and institutions developed since the Second World War and aimed at generating a new vision of the interdependence of peace with a justice centered on human rights and human security. The preamble to the United Nations Charter establishes the legal framework which ideally should govern the peaceful interaction of states[64]. This preamble states that the prevention of the scourge of war is accompanied by the respect for human rights and the equality of nations, the observance of just rules of coexistence and dispute resolution, and the provision of social welfare.

---

[63] Fry, D.: *2012, Op. cit.*; Harris, L. & Wasilewski, J.: "Indigeneity, an alternative worldview: Four Rs (relationship, responsibility, reciprocity, redistribution) vs. two P's (power and profit): Sharing the journey towards conscious evolution," *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 21, 2004, p. 489-503; Souillac, G. & Fry, D.: "Indigenous lessons for conflict resolution," in Coleman, P., Deutsch, M. and Marcus, E. (eds), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice. 3rd ed.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2014, p. 604-622.

[64] United Nations: Charter, Preamble. Available online: http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/preamble.shtml, 1945. [Accessed 08/02/2015].

In addition, the open-ended, dynamic relationship to borders and belonging encapsulated in expanded citizenship and identities typical of peace systems reconciles both the quest for consensus and the recognition of conflict. The deterritorialization of human rights norms as an integral element of peace, from their Western legal origins, has not occurred without struggle, as resistance to their universal applicability periodically emerges on the grounds of cultural difference. Human rights have now obtained cosmopolitical significance as local struggles against monopolies of power erupt across the globe in a multiplicity of cultural and political contexts. The sources for political legitimacy and moral authority in contemporary democracies are increasingly diversifying, becoming more inclusive and less authoritarian as formal and informal, political and social communicative opportunities increased. Here, the model of interculturality understood as the possibility of dialogue at the interface of narratives can serve the creative intervention of a wide variety of voices within such contexts, including those who do not have a chance to be heard. There is a dialectical relationship between expanded citizenship and the creation of new knowledge platforms, including knowledge about peace values as an antidote to war and violence that is at the core of peace systems and peaceful identities. New participatory endeavors promote moral learning and an expanded experience of civic identity. Expanded models of civic identity, in harmoniously blending adhesion to particular traditions and to values of global significance, highlight the encounter with other identities and values. Instead of intractable conflict, the transformation of conflict and the adhesion to norms which support the containment of human suffering emerge. Those endeavors which promote dialogue are particularly noteworthy since they focus on the tenuous problems posed by communication across borders of understanding.

One example of how indigenous wisdom has been harnessed to generate ethical decisions is that Americans for Indian Opportunity have fine-tuned a technique called Structured Dialogue Processes (SDP) to formalize dialogue in multiple and global democratic agoras[65]. Harris and Wasilewski discuss how SDP democratically cross the boundaries of culture, indigenous and non-indigenous, beginning with the identification of four Native American core values. First, human-human and human-environment relationships are crucial and should be maintained[66]. The second core value is responsibility, broadly conceived, to include people and the environment, so that indigenous leadership thrives on caring and avoids coercion. The third core value is reciprocity. Fourth, in contrast to materialism, redistribution, based on the value of equity, keeps relationships in balance through obligations to share material and social goods. The four core values are interrelated in their conceptualization and in

---

[65] www.globalagoras.org

[66] Harris, L. and Wasilewski, J., *Op. cit.*

their social manifestations. Under such an ethos, everyone in society is interdependent upon everyone else.

The dynamic interdependence captured by Harris and Wasilewski in the notion of indigeneity presents one clear example of interculturality where solutions creatively emerge at the interface between indigeneity and modernity[67]. Exploring indigenous collective wisdom through SDP allows for the emergence of peace-building, conflict resolution, and peace values that illustrate the positive resourcing of interculturality. Harris and Wasilewski show how harnessing indigenous conflict resolution, justice-seeking, and peace-making is conducive to a productive relationship between traditional practices and contemporary frameworks. This participatory and inclusive communicational model is innovative in three ways. First, it confronts a modern context with an alternative time frame where learned ways of peaceful being are preserved by members of indigenous community. The application of interculturality necessarily involves the encounter with different experiences of historical time which introduces an existential dimension to dialogue, and an ideational challenge to an assumed linear progress regarding human well-being. This illustrates Innerarity's point about the comparative experience of the historical time of civilization and culture. Second, this communicational model of interculturality, in blending traditional practice into a contemporary context, extends classical, democratic rights-based values, such as respect and recognition, to those explicit values of peace and biosustainability such as interdependence, relationality, reciprocity, and cooperation. Third, through the SDP, moral learning takes place concomitant with reflection on the dialogue process itself as participants identify the dominant values manifested in the process.

Conclusion

The pooling of anthropological and indigenous resources within a global public agora expands a global epistemic field. More attention must be directed to the intersection of political philosophy and anthropology for discussion on contemporary ethics. Advances in contemporary anthropology illustrate how moral learning with regard to social integration and cohesion has always accompanied the competing response of conflict and violence to continuously emerging social complexity at the interface of evolving ways of being. Insights from traditional peace systems in these areas can contribute to a vision of the positive role of global normative belonging for a more peace-oriented 21st century. In particular, peace systems as described by ethnographic data demonstrate how interculturality can be successful as an ethical model for an interdependent, cooperative future. Under conditions of pluralist modernity,

---

[67] *Ibid.*

the building of peace systems can be supported by an approach summarized in terms of the two main goals of interculturality: 1) the reflexive exploration of identities and values under conditions of open, public and dialogic communication, including with regard to the ongoing challenges posed by a political, economic and social patterns of inequality; and 2) the forging of inclusive, higher level ethical identities and the identification of shared values.

The pooling of knowledge and resources on values related to social sustainability, conflict transformation, encourages reflexivity about identities, and builds a shared epistemic field on pressing existential issues of common concern such as ecology and the reduction of violence[68]. Intercultural approaches confront experiences of time and development within the modern narrative of progress and also integrate a richer array of moral learning goals in human society. Anthropology, with its vast documentation of indigenous societies, past and present, including descriptions of nonviolent modes of conflict resolution, approaches to peacemaking, and creation of peace systems, provides a pool of knowledge about the diversity of successful peaceful approaches to creating and maintaining interculturality. This widens available normative responses to the existential condition of human complexity. Exploring evidence from cultural anthropology with regard to conflict resolution, the avoidance of war, and the expansion of cultural identity for peace supports the argument that interculturality understood in its broadest sense of the overcoming of borders fulfills a vitally important dimension of human life and meaning.

---

[68] Souillac, G.: *2012, Op. cit.*