

## GLOBAL JUSTICE AND THE CALLING OF PEACE <sup>1</sup>

Ananta Kumar Giri

### Abstract

*Justice and peace are crying invitations of our times and the present essay shares some reflections on these. It invites us for a new view of justice involving simultaneously political and moral considerations. Global justice calls for sharing, sharing of knowledge and resources. It also calls for dialogues across borders of cultures, religions and civilisations. Realisation of justice contributes to realisation of peace.*

Reflections of Kim Dae Jong (2005) and Richard von Weizsacker (2005) point to the issues of peace and justice and it is helpful to reflect further on these issues. Justice is weeping in our world today as her sisters dignity, peace and responsibility. Our everyday life and institutions that govern us from our local communities to the global structures contain many “islands of problematic justice” (see Habermas 1990; Giri 2002a) which block fuller realisation of our potential. Institutions of problematic justice around the world block paths of universal self-realisation (see Bhaskar 2002). Universal self-realisation means that each of us has opportunity to realise our potential through a creative life of labour, love, health, and learning. Many of our fellow beings around the world—and not only in the so-called developing world—are prevented from adequate opportunities for fuller self-realisation, societal realisation and world-realisation in not having opportunity to participate in creative education, love, and labour. Not only millions in the world die of starvation but many people in the world especially in the so-called affluent global North are slowly killing themselves in their routine lives of work. They do so as servants of profit-making and life-commoditising capital and an aggrandising will to power. They do not have time to express themselves, be with oneself

---

Ananta Kumar Giri, Faculty Member, Madras Institute of Development Studies, 79 Second Main Road, Gandhi Nagar, Adyar, Chennai – 600 020. Email: ananta@mids.ac.in, aumkrishna@yahoo.com

as well as each other, and be together in art, dance and music of life. This is also a condition of slavery and social death as the many millions whose lives are statistically portrayed in such figures: one billion people live on the equivalent of less than one dollar a day,<sup>2</sup> and targets of global will-formation such as Millennium Development Goals.

The project of universal self-realisation that everybody should have the opportunity for their creative self-realisation through unfolding of their various capabilities and functioning —through access to education, health and creative engagement with labour, love and learning — is linked with projects of global justice. But this also involves a profound rethinking and reconstitution of justice. Today the issue of justice is no longer the issue of mathematical equality between the have and have-not but the challenge of creating condition of fuller human realisation—universal self-realisation—everywhere. It is this spirit of universal self-realisation that animates the moving spirit in us who weep at the fact that so many die because of hunger and so many kill themselves—albeit slowly—in the name of money and power. When individuals and institutions as slavish instruments of power and capital block our self-realisation it is a question of problematic justice that urgently calls for transformative strivings. In our multi-linked globality now we find many such instances of problematic justice in the continued existence and production of poverty, disease and anxiety. Transforming these conditions of destruction of potential for fuller self-realisation, co-realisation and societal realisation in the multiple locales of our world is a subject of global justice, and is facilitated by dialogues, including those on the theme of justice and modes of its realisation.

The project of global justice is multi-dimensional both in its constitutive conceptualisation as well as in modes of realisation. In terms of conceptualisation we have to rethink global justice by rethinking the project of justice itself. In contemporary theories of justice, for example in the seminal works of John Rawls (1971), justice is primarily thought of as political and is divorced from considerations of morality. But is justice mainly a project of politics? Does it not touch our moral concerns? Jurgen Habermas extends a primarily political conception of justice to our contemporary global predicament and writes: “The burning issue of a just global economic order poses itself primarily as a political problem [...] The unjust distribution of good

fortune in the world was certainly a central concern of the great world religion. But in a secularised society, this problem primarily belongs on the political and economic table, not in the cupboard of morality” (Habermas 2002). Here Habermas is within our habitual traditions of opposition between political and moral in thinking about and realising justice. But overcoming this dualistic opposition is an important theoretical and practical task in our projects of justice. This also calls for overcoming another opposition in modernistic projects of justice, namely the opposition between knowledge and sympathetic personal participation in transformation, between epistemology and ontology. Global justice involves not only knowledge of suffering in the world but our own personal involvement in transforming the conditions of such suffering which, again, is multi-dimensional—suffering of malnutrition as well as suffering of alienation including alienation from one’s higher self, a self which strives for friendship and solidarity across the borders. As Amartya Sen would challenge us: “[...] justice across borders must not be seen merely as ‘international justice’ [...] A feminist activist in America who wants to help, say remedy some features of female disadvantage in Africa or Asia, draws on a sense of identity that goes well beyond the sympathies of one nation for the predicament of another” (Sen 2002: 48).

Thus the project of justice is a personal project, and not only a project of state and society. It is not only a matter of epistemology, a matter of instituting rights procedures and interventions but also an ontological project where ontology means practical action of labour, love and learning (see Giri 2004, 2006a). As Gerry Cohen challenges us in his *If You’re an Egalitarian, How Come You are so Rich?*: “[...] egalitarian justice is not only, as Rawlsian liberalism teaches, a matter of the rules that define the structure of society but also a matter of personal attitude and choice [...] a change in social ethos, a change in the attitude people sustain towards each other in the thick of daily life is necessary for producing equality” (Cohen 2000: 3). Thus global justice calls for ontological involvement not only institutional epistemic procedures and intervention, but also knowledge of suffering in the world that one billion people live with less than one dollar a day. Global justice, as with justice, involves both knowledge and transformative action, epistemology and ontology going beyond the dualism between the two. It is a project of an ontological epistemology of participation where “knowledge of” is integrally linked with our manifold practices

of “knowing with” (see Giri 2004, 2006a; Rajan 1998). In ontological epistemology of participation we learn from and with each other and in the process also transform ourselves.

There is an epochal challenge to create spaces of mutual learning and self-transformation — an ontological epistemology of participation — for nurturance and realisation of global justice. The emergent global civil society, through the work of varieties of movements across borders, transnational movements and NGOs, as well as the work of such forums as World Social Forum, European Social Forum, Bergen Social Forum and Brazilian Social Forum, creates spaces for an ontological epistemology of participation where all concerned can share their knowledge of suffering around the world as well as renew their commitment to transforming these conditions. This also finds a resonance in varieties of political, religious and spiritual movements around the world. Much of alternative globalisation movement involves travel to varieties of alternative political experiments in the world— Brazil, Chiapas, Bangladesh, and India, for examples. The socio-religious movement of Habitat for Humanity originating in the United States nearly forty years ago and now working world wide has a project of global village where people from the materially affluent countries come to build houses with low-income families in low-income countries (see Giri 2002b). The socio-spiritual movement of *Swadhyaya* originating from India but also now working among diasporic Indians in England and the United States, among others, has a project of *bhaktipheri* or devotional travel where people move from village to village, from one country to another, and share time and space with fellow beings (see Giri 2004). Global justice calls for varieties of global *bhaktipheris* — political and spiritual — and creation of global public spheres in the multiple locales of our world, in fact wherever we are and wherever we belong to. In these global public spheres emerging locally we can discuss about issues of justice and dignity as well as take concrete steps to realise these in our lives and institutions.

John Rawls (2001), the principal philosopher of justice in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, speaks about the necessity for “overlapping consensus” in realising the project of justice. In overlapping consensus all parties may not agree about everything but they agree on some. But is overlapping consensus a matter of fixed point or fixed star? What is the process of generating this overlapping consensus? Does not

overlapping consensus involve the overlapping circles of our existence—rich and poor, happy and anxious, knowledgeable and those of us who need a hand? Overlapping consensus which is crucial to the project of justice is facilitated by the work of overlapping circles at many levels of our interlinked globality today—self, family, community, nation, region and our world. Our emergent global public spheres, which emerge locally but reach out to the world in a series of concentric circles, provide a space where these different overlapping circles for example can meet and interpenetrate. The work of overlapping circles and concentric circles is a work of autonomy and interpenetration where the involved actors and institutions are related with each other and continuously challenged to overcome their self-interest and domain interest, and acknowledge the interpenetrative presence of the other. We can, for example, look at the issue of the rich and poor. If the poor people in the world continue to live a life of degradation then it is not good for the rich even from the point of view of their own interest. Similarly if the poor wish to kill all the rich it also does not contribute to their own self-interest. At the same time the logic of self-interest alone is not enough for such a realisation; we need to overcome our self-interest as the sole criterion and acknowledge the other. But overcoming one's interest calls for transcendence of interest, at least, in some ways. Thus overlapping consensus and overlapping circles, crucial for realisation of justice, including global justice, call for work of transcendence. This work of transcendence has various manifestations—spiritual and artistic as well—but our habitual traditions of justice do not speak much about it, and here again is an important conceptual and practical task for all of us concerned.

Rawls' "overlapping consensus" was primarily confined to nation-state but his conception of international justice in his later works, for example, in his *Laws of Peoples* (1999), does not overcome this binding. In her recent work, *Frontiers of Justice*, which has important implications for projects of global justice, Martha Nussbaum (2006) challenges us that we must rethink the Rawlsian analogy between person and state. But here we have to think much deeper as well. Not only the analogy between person and state is inadequate, our conceptions of person and self in modernity as only the citizens of nation-states are inadequate as well. We need a richer and multi-dimensional conception of self which can facilitate the work of overlapping circles of interpenetration and transcendence of

exclusivistic interest required for realisation of justice. But in our conventional conceptions of justice the subject of justice is primarily a political self, a right-seeking agent. But this self is also a sharing self, willing to transcend one's self-interest to realise an overlapping circle of consensus. We need to realise that the subject of justice is not only political but also aesthetic and spiritual.

Global justice is related to enhancing the functioning and capabilities of each of us. It is the aesthetic and spiritual dimension of our self which can help us understand our own limitations and facilitate connections and solidarity across borders. This is a project of education—*Bildung*—and here art, including public art, can play a greater role. In the history of struggle for justice, we have to remember the significance of novels, art and music in arousing our sensibility in anti-slavery, anti-colonial, post-colonial, racial justice and gender justice movements. For realising global justice we need a new art, a new public art, literature and music to arouse our sensibility to the predicament of global justice. We see it in varieties of arts and images emerging in our emergent global public sphere, for example, in the evocative images of suffering, joy and shared humanity that I saw last year depicted in a public exhibition in a park in Paris organised by *Reporter Sans Frontier*.<sup>3</sup> We see such globally sensitive art and music in various emerging global forums today such as World Social Forum.

Enhancing the functioning and capability of individuals is an important goal of social development in our present day world (see Sen 1999). Martha Nussbaum (2006) urges us to globalise our capabilities and presents us the following, among others:

1. Over-determination of responsibility: the domestic never escapes it.
2. Prosperous nations have a responsibility to give a substantial portion of their GDP to poorer nations.
3. Multinational corporations have responsibilities for promoting human capabilities in the regions in which they operate.
4. The mainstream structures of the global economic order must be designed to be fair to poor and developing countries.

5. We should cultivate a thin, decentralised, and yet forceful global public sphere.
6. All institutions and (most) individuals should focus on the problems of the disadvantaged in each nation and region.
7. Care for the ill, the elderly, children and the disabled should be a prominent focus of the world community.
8. The family should be treated as a sphere that is precious but not “private.”
9. All nations and individuals have a responsibility to support education, as a key to the empowerment of currently disadvantaged people.

But realising the above as well as related proposals of global justice has economic implications. It touches upon the issue of global redistribution of resources. As Naila Kabeer tells us: “It requires measures of the kind proposed by the Brandt commission at the end of the 1970s, and more recently by a number of countries that countries be taxed on a sliding scale related to national income in order to generate revenue for a global social fund” (Kabeer 2005: 25). We need adequate resources for transforming our condition of misery into one of shared joy and happiness around our planet. Here projects for a global fund for universal self-realisation are important, and Attac’s struggle for Tobin Tax is an important part of creative global will formation here. But the founders of Attac themselves realise that Tobin Tax is not a panacea. As Bernard Cassen (2003) writes: “We treated the Tobin Tax as a symbolic terrain [...] We never for a second thought that the Tobin Tax was the only solution to the dictatorship of financial markets”. But does the percentage ( %) flag of Attac predominantly give the message of money and number? During a conversation last year in his office in Paris I asked this and Cassen did not give a direct reply but only an advice: “Do not read much into the symbol.”

### **The Calling of Sharing**

I was in an Easter lunch with a friend’s family in Northern Jutland, Denmark, in April 2004. After our moments of togetherness our host, a senior person who works as an electrician in the locality, shared his pain: “Oh all the jobs from Denmark are now going to China and India.” I said: “There is possibility to use this in a creative manner.

If jobs are going to other countries then people of Denmark can have more free time but they should not live on unemployment benefits. Given the centrality of employment in people's self-perception everybody in society, especially those needing it, should have some hours of jobs. Retrenchment in the wake of job flight should not be borne by only the poor and the low in companies and the wider society. If our labour and free time are shared equally then it would create a condition for a more creative and happy life. At the same time people in India and China who are getting some of these jobs should have a salary and life of dignity. They should not be subjected to brutal conditions of work as it is happening in such places of work as call centres."

I also said: "But we also have to ask why jobs are flying from one country to the other now? This has to do with the high cost of production and management in the so-called affluent countries. The salary difference between the highest and lowest paid in many companies now is more than 500 times. Why has it to be like this? Here we need a much shared conception of time and labour, happiness and joy so that only high economic differential does not become a sole measure of our self-worth."

Global justice calls for new initiatives in sharing, sharing of resources, knowledge, pain, joy and suffering. Shared joy and shared suffering are keys to global justice in our contemporary moment. Here we can learn from our many different traditions of practices of sharing from around our world. Various experiments in creative socialism and cooperative production abound in societies and histories some of which are presented to us by Dada Mahesvarananda (2002) in his *After Capitalism*. While doing fieldwork with the environmental movement of *Chipko* in the Himalayas way back in 1987 I was staying in Laxmi Asrham, Kaushani, India, for a few days. Every morning before breakfast we used to pray and then save a handful of grain saying: "*ek muthi anname biswasanti he* (In this handful of grain lies world peace" (also see Bajaj and Srinivas 1996; Tutu 2005).

### **The Calling of Peace**

There is an integral link between food and peace, material fulfilment and peaceful co-existence. Peaceful co-existence contributes to better human development while an inclusive infrastructure for

development including realisation of autonomy and dignity contributes to the realisation of peace. Both Kim Dae Jong and Richard von Weizsacker point to this. As Kim Dae Jong (2005: 2) tells us, “In Europe, the United States and other Asian countries, we see the widening gap between the rich and the poor emerging as a main cause for social conflict. On the basis of terrorism, the biggest threat to world peace in the 21st century, always lies this issue, directly or indirectly. Left unresolved, such conflicts would lead to catastrophes in the future.” This is in tune with the perspectives of some of the leading scholars in the field such as John Clammer and Johan Galtung. For Clammer, “[...] Peace, conflict and social development are intimately linked and that the achievement of peace and resolution of conflict are to a very great extent the product of equitable and just social development, both at the global and local levels [...] the conditions for peace are created by equitable development—development that respects the social, cultural and psychological dimensions of human needs and attempts to integrate them with the economic” (Clammer 2006: 6). Similarly Johan Galtung, the inspiring scholar of peace studies, challenges us to take an interconnected perspective on peace by linking peace to health.<sup>4</sup> Inspired by Gandhi, especially his view that “There is no way to peace, peace is the way,” Galtung (1996) challenges us to pursue peace by peaceful means which is an alternative to the contemporary dominant ideology of peace by war. For Galtung, “[...] there is cognitive, intellectual road to peace” (Galtung and Ikeda 1996: 19).<sup>5</sup> This means that mutual dialogue and learning can contribute to peace while lack of knowledge of each other can perpetuate mutual suspicion and hatred. Thus peace is a project of knowledge of the self and others including working on self-cultivation for a better mutual understanding. This way peace is a project of both epistemology and ontology; like our discussion of justice before, peace is also a project of an ontological epistemology of participation.

Dialogue is a multi-dimensional process of mutual knowledge and self-transformation and it is an integral part of peace. Like peace, dialogue itself is a way pregnant with new possibilities and beginnings. Today the pursuit of peace calls for dialogue. Dialogue is not only a road to peace, it is also a way to justice.

Such a practice of peace calls for a new vocation of peace in our everyday life and commitment to it. Our religious traditions have

glorified martyrs who can die for the cause of their faith. Modern nationalism has glorified martyrs for the cause of nationalism. Today the calling of world peace calls for a new vocation of martyrdom in our lives. It calls for us to sacrifice our small egos and if necessary our lives for the sake of peace, and not for war. Felix Wilfred challenges us:

Religious traditions need to counterbalance the classical ideal of martyrdom with education for tolerance and peace. [...] Today the world needs *witnesses* (original meaning of “martyr”) of love, justice, peace and tolerance who will be ready to sacrifice their very selves for greater understanding among peoples, nations and religions. [...] They will belong to the whole of humankind since, through their sacrifice, steadfastness, fidelity and fortitude, they bear witness to the universal values of truth, love, justice and peace. Could the various religious traditions jointly create the climate for the emergence of such *universal martyrs*? (Wilfred 2005: 181).

But this task of preparing for universal martyrs for the sake of peace is not a challenge for different religious traditions but also other traditions of thought such as nationalism. All these traditions of discourse and practice, which had valorised martyrdom for mutual annihilation, can contribute to generate universal martyrs for the sake of peace and realisation of human unity.

### **Ideals of Human Unity**

Today, the nation-state model is not sustainable and is a source of much violence and agony. In this context, quest for peace has to be part of post-national transformations within and across national borders. Realising unity across fractured borders is a perennial human challenge but unity itself is not a monolithic Absolute; unity itself has to be a multiverse of diversity. Both Weizsacker and Kim Dae Jong discuss the challenge of unification in the context of Germany as well as Korean peninsula. But German unification has been a process of one-sided absorption where East Germany lost some of its finest traditions of social security and co-operative education. Weizsacker seems not to acknowledge the pains that East Europeans have gone through as a result of German unification in which West Germany

absorbed East Germany. There was also a promise of a new constitution for the new united Germany after the 1990 unification. Since it happened during Weizsacker's presidency, Weizsacker can help us understand why there has not been a new constitution for united Germany. Weizsacker also refers to a United European Union but here again the challenge is a multiversal Europe which strives for a better life for everybody and not just for a more profitable Europe. European Union needs a new social pact. The debates over European Constitution are important here. At the moment, major proponents want to make European identity Judeo-Christian but why not also acknowledge religious and cultural pluralism in the very European constitution itself? Europe is not just Judeo-Christian in its identity; Islam has been a part of Europe for a long time and so have other religions influenced modern European consciousness and imagination.

Reflecting on the challenge of unification in the Korean context, Kim Dae Jong (2005: 4) tells us: "Unification through absorption will only cause catastrophe [...] Unification should be achieved when both feel reassured that right conditions are set. Whether it may take ten years or twenty, a stable process of unification must be pursued based on the principles of Sunshine Policy<sup>6</sup> of peaceful coexistence, peaceful exchange and peaceful unification." Kim Dae Jong's cautious approach to the challenge of Korean unification is helpful to think of the challenge of unification at the world level. Today, pursuit of human unity has to have a cautious approach realising the dangers of monolithic and gigantic structures of human unity. It has to be part of post-national transformations and dialogues across borders working towards a coordinated framework of shared sovereignties.

But this is a challenge for us to overcome. In modernity, our self, society and nation-state valorise sovereignty. Today different movements of fundamentalism and terrorism also celebrate the cult of sovereignty. Not only nation-states unleash violence in the name of sovereignty, but also anti-state actors—whether it is LTTE in Sri Lanka or global terror groups—valorise the cult of sovereignty. Our habitual selves, societies, states, and anti-state actors celebrate the logic of the sovereign, the One. This valorised One has to learn to share space with the Many (see Hardt and Negri 2004; Giri, forthcoming). This is the calling of shared sovereignty or the calling of a new logic of multiversality and multitude.

In this context, some of the reflections on ideals of human unity offered by Sri Aurobindo a seeker and visionary from India are worth living with. In his *Ideals of Human Unity* written in 1919, Sri Aurobindo tells us: “A free world-union must in its very nature be a complex unity based on free self-determination” (Sri Aurobindo 1962: 517). Hinting at the challenge of post-national transformations, Sri Aurobindo writes: “[..] in a free world-union though originally steering from the national basis, the national idea might be expected to undergo a radical transformation; it might even disappear into a new and less strenuously compact form and idea of group-aggregation which would not be separative in spirit, yet would preserve the necessary element of independence and variation needed by both individual and grouping for their full satisfaction and their healthy existence” (Sri Aurobindo 1962: 524). Sri Aurobindo challenges us with the question: why do we need unity, a unity which is not a uniformity?<sup>7</sup> For Sri Aurobindo: “It must be remembered that a greater social or political unity is not necessarily a boon itself; it is only worth pursuing insofar as it provides a means and a framework for a better, richer, more happy and puissant individual and collective life” (Sri Aurobindo 1962: 263).

Like this foundational question of why unity, Sri Aurobindo also raises basic questions about the relationship between the individual and the collective. So far this relationship has suffered from much opposition and violence, and the task is how we work out a transformative relationship between the individual and the collective, the State idea and the Person idea. These questions are as much a challenge in a primary group such as family as in an expected condition of world unity.<sup>8</sup> Sri Aurobindo hints that the future task is to realise a unity “based upon the complete individual freedom and freedom also of natural unforced grouping” Sri Aurobindo hints that the future task is to realise a unity “based upon the complete individual freedom and freedom also of natural unforced grouping” (Sri Aurobindo 1962: 391). Our proposed path of shared sovereignty resonates Sri Aurobindo’s plea for meeting of self-determination with mutual determination: “There remains the problem of relations, of the individual and collective self-determination, and of the interaction of the self-determination of one on the self-determination of another. That cannot be finally settled by any mechanical solution, but only by the discovery of some meeting-place of the law of our self-determination with the

common law of mutuality, where they begin to become one. It signifies the fact of discovery of an inner and larger self other than the mere ego, in which our individual self-fulfilment no longer separates us from others but at each step of our growth calls for an increasing unity” (Sri Aurobindo 1962: 604).

The pursuit of ideals of unity is a multi-dimensional one, political, psychic and spiritual. Sri Aurobindo challenges us to understand the significance of the psychic unity of humankind. For realisation of global justice and peace Sri Aurobindo also challenges us for a new religion of humanity which would help us take the direction of spiritual evolution of humanity: “A spiritual oneness which would create a psychological oneness not dependent upon any intellectual or outward uniformity and compel a oneness of life not bound up with its mechanical means of unification, but ready always to enrich its secure unity by a free inner variation and a freely varied outer self-expression, this would be the basis for a higher type of human existence (Sri Aurobindo 1962: 555).

### Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Prepared for a book in dialogue with the presentations of President Kim Dae Jong, former President of South Korea and Richard von Weizsacker, former President of Federal Republic of Germany at the *Global Forum on Civilisation and Peace, Seoul*, December 5, 2005.
- <sup>2</sup> We have to ask ourselves what do such figures mean. Living with less than a dollar a day: does it mean living miserably? In many places around the world I know one can live creatively with a dollar a day if one cooks oneself and if one does not have to purchase bottles of water for drinking. Such figures do not also raise the issue of quality of life and the joy of life. We need a much more nuanced global sensitivity which can understand varieties of creative and joyous lives that people live with less and while not romanticising poverty seeks to transform it in the direction of dignity.
- <sup>3</sup> Reporter Sans Frontier (RSF), based in Paris, is an international voluntary organisation working for the freedom of the press.
- <sup>4</sup> For Galtung, “Exploitation and cancer resemble each other in that a part of the social or human organism lives at the expense of the rest. Peace research and health research are metaphors for each other; each can learn from the other. Similarly, both peace theory and medicinal science

emphasise the role of consciousness and mobilisation in healing” (Galtung and Ikeda 1995: 39).

- <sup>5</sup> Galtung here draws our attention to the life and works of Spinoza: “[Spinoza] bridges the moral and the cognitive. For instance, he says that lack of understanding produces evil whereas understanding brings good” (Galtung and Ikeda 1995: 39).
- <sup>6</sup> Sunshine policy is the policy of peace and dialogue initiated by President Kim Dae Jong during his tenure in relationship with North Korea.
- <sup>7</sup> Sri Aurobindo tells us: “Unity we must create but not necessarily uniformity” (Sri Aurobindo 1962: 401).
- <sup>8</sup> For Sri Aurobindo: “In the relations between the individual and the group, this constant tendency of Nature appears as the strife between two equally deep-rooted human tendencies, individualism and collectivism. On one side is the engrossing authority, perfection and development of the State, on the other the distinctive freedom, perfection and development of individual man. The State idea, the small or the vast living machine, and the human idea, the more and more distinct and luminous Person, the increasing God, stand in perpetual opposition. The size of the State makes no difference to the essence of the struggle and need make none to its characteristic circumstances. It was the family, the tribe or the city, the *polis*; it became the clan, the caste and the class, the *kula*, the *gens*. It is now the nation. Tomorrow or day after it may be all mankind. But even then the question will remain poised between man and humanity, between self-liberating Person and the engrossing collectivity” (Sri Aurobindo 1962: 272-273).

### References

- Bajaj, J.K. and Srinivas, M.D., 1996, *Annam Bahu Kurivita*, Chennai, Centre for Policy Studies
- Bhaskar, Roy, 2002, *Reflections on Meta-Reality*, Delhi, Sage Publications
- Cassen, Beranrd, 2003, Article on Attac in *New Left Review*, [www.newleftreview.org](http://www.newleftreview.org)
- Clammer, John, 2006, “Social Development and Peace,” Paper presented at the Workshop on *New Horizons of Human Development*, Chennai, University of Madras, February
- Cohen, Gerr, 2000, *If You're an Egalitarian How Come You are So Rich?*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press
- Dae Jong, Kim, 2005, “A New Beginning for Peace and Coexistence” Message to the *Global Forum on Civilization and Peace*, Seoul, December 5
- Galtung, Johann, 1996, *Peace by Peaceful Means*, London, Sage Publications

- Galtung, Johann and Daisaku Ikeda, 1995, *Choose Peace*, London, Zed Books
- Giri, Ananta K., 2002a, *Conversations and Transformations: Towards a New Ethics of Self and Society*, Lanham, MD, Lexington Books
- Giri, Ananta K., 2002b, *Building in the Margins of Shacks: The Vision and Projects of Habitat for Humanity*, Delhi, Orient Longman
- Giri, Ananta K., 2004, *Reflections and Mobilisations: Dialogues with Movements and Voluntary Organisations*, Delhi, Sage Publications
- Giri, Ananta K., 2006a, *Creative Social Research: Rethinking Theories and Methods and the Calling of An Ontological Epistemology of Participation*, Aalborg U, DIR, Working Paper
- Giri, Ananta K., 2006b "Cosmopolitanism and Beyond Cosmopolitanism: Towards a Multiverse of Transformations" in *Development and Change*, Vol. 27, No. 6, 1277-92
- Giri, Ananta K., (ed.), Forthcoming, *The Modern Prince and the Modern Sage: Transforming Power and Freedom*, Delhi, Sage Publications
- Gorringer, Timothy, 1999, *Fair Shares: Ethics and the Global Economy*, London, Thames and Hudson
- Habermas, Jurgen, 1990, *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action*, Cambridge, Polity Press
- Habermas, Jurgen, 2002, *Religion and Rationality*, Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri, 2004, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, London, Penguin
- Kabeer, Naila (ed.), 2005, *Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and Expressions*, London, Zed Books
- Mahesvarananda, Dada, 2002, *After Capitalism*, Prout Publications
- Nussbaum, Martha, 2006, *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press
- Rajan, Sunder R., 1998, *Beyond the Crises of European Sciences: New Beginnings*, Shimla, Indian Institute of Advanced Studies
- Rawls, John, 1971, *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press
- Rawls, John, 1999, *Laws of Peoples*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press
- Rawls, John, 2001, *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press
- Sen, Amartya, 1999, *Development as Freedom*, New York, Alfred A. Knof
- Sen, Amartya, 2002, "Justice Across Borders," in *Global Justice and Transnational Politics: Essays on the Moral and Political Challenges of Globalization*, Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press

Sri Aurobindo, 1962, *The Human Cycle, The Ideal of Human Unity, War and Self-Determination*, Pondicherry, Sri Aurobindo Ashram

Tutu, Desmond, 2005, *God Has a Dream: A New Vision of Hope for Our Times*, London, Rider

Weizsacker, Richard von, 2005, Opening Address to the *Global Forum on Civilisation and Peace*, Seoul, December 5

Wilfred, Felix, 2005, *The Sling of Utopia: Struggle for a Different Society*, Delhi, ISPCK