

**Institute for Conflict Analysis  
and Resolution**

**Occasional Paper 12**

**Conceptions of World Order:  
Building Peace in the  
Third Millennium**

by  
**Dr. Anatol Rapoport**  
**Professor Emeritus**  
**of Psychology**  
**University of Toronto**

---

**George Mason University**

Institute for Conflict Analysis  
and Resolution

Occasional Paper 12

Conceptions of World Order:  
Building Peace in the Third  
Millennium

By Dr. Anatol Rapoport

Tenth Annual Vernon M. and Minnie I.  
Lynch Lecture on Conflict Resolution

April 23, 1997

ICAR publications, which are available to academic institutions and to the public, are listed in this booklet. They include curriculum guides, books, papers, and reports on topics of interest to the field, and the Institute's Annual Vernon M. and Minnie I. Lynch Lectures.

## CONTENTS

About the Institute .....	iv
About the Author .....	v
Introduction .....	vi
Conceptions of World Order .....	1
End Notes .....	14
ICAR Publications List .....	addendum

*June 1997*  
*Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution*  
*George Mason University*  
*Fairfax, Virginia*

## ABOUT THE INSTITUTE

The Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, has as its principal mission to advance the understanding and resolution of significant and persistent conflicts among individuals, communities, identity groups, and nations.

In the fulfillment of this mission, the Institute conducts a wide range of programs and outreach. Among these are its graduate programs offering the Doctorate and Master of Science in Conflict Resolution, clinical consultancy services offered by individual faculty, and public programs and education that include the Institute's Annual Vernon M. and Minnie I. Lynch Lectures.

The Institute's major research interests include the study of conflict and its resolution, the exploration and analysis of conditions attracting parties in conflict to the negotiation table, the role of third parties in dispute resolution, and the application of conflict resolution methodologies in local, national, and international settings. The Institute's Applied Practice and Theory Program (APT) develops teams of faculty, students, and allied practitioners to analyze and address topics such as crime and violence, conflict in schools and other community institutions, and jurisdictional conflicts between local agencies of government.

Associated with the Institute are affiliate organizations, including the Consortium on Peace Research, Education, and Development (COPRED), an international network of more than 300 college and university peace studies programs; the National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution (NCPCR), which conducts a biennial conference and maintains communication with conflict resolution professionals nationwide; and the Northern Virginia Mediation Service (NVMS), which offers conflict resolution and mediation services and training to schools, courts, and local agencies and practitioners in communities across Northern Virginia and the Washington metropolitan area.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Born in 1911 in Lozovaya, Russia, and an officer in the United States Army Air Force from 1942 to 1946, Dr. Anatol Rapoport is among the founders of the field of peace and conflict studies. Dr. Rapoport is a professor of mathematical biology, psychology, and peace and conflict studies; a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; a member of the American Mathematical Society, the Society for Mathematical Biology, the International Society for General Semantics (president 1953-1955), the Society for General Systems Research (president 1965-1966), the Canadian Peace Research Association (president 1972-1975), and Science for Peace (president 1984-1986). Dr. Rapoport has taught at the Illinois Institute of Technology (1946-1947), the University of Chicago (1947-1954), the University of Michigan (1955-1970), the Institut für Höhere Studien, Vienna (1980-1984), and the University of Toronto (1984-1986), and has been a guest professor at the University of Warsaw, the University of Hiroshima, the Technical University of Denmark, the Institut für Höhere Studien, the Wissenschaftszentrum of Berlin, the University of Mannheim, the University of Munich, and the University of Bern.

Dr. Rapoport has been awarded honorary degrees by the University of Western Michigan, the University of Toronto, the Royal Military College of Canada, and the University of Bern. He is editor of *General Systems*, an associate editor of the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *Behavioral Science*, *ETC*, and *A Review of General Semantics*, and a member of the editorial boards of ten other journals. He is the editor of several volumes and translations and the author of more than 400 journal articles, ten encyclopedia entries, forty chapters contributed to books, and of many books, including *Science and the Goals of Man* (1950), *Operational Philosophy* (1953), *Fights, Games and Debates* (1960), *Strategy and Conscience* (1964), *Prisoner's Dilemma* (with A.M. Chammah) (1965), *Two Person Game Theory* (1966), *N-Person Game Theory* (1970), *The Big Two* (1971), *Conflict in Man-Made Environment* (1974), *Semantics* (1974), *The 2x2 Game* (with M. Geyer and D. Gordon) (1976), *Mathematische Methoden in den Socialwissenschaften* (1983), *Mathematical Methods in the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (1984), *General System Theory* (1986), *The Origins of Violence* (1989), *Decision Theory and Decision Behavior* (1989), *Canada and the World* (with Anthony Rapoport) (1992), *Peace, an Idea Whose Time Has Come* (1993), *Gewisheiten und Zweifel* (1994).

## INTRODUCTION

It is a very great pleasure to welcome Dr. Anatol Rapoport to George Mason University to deliver the Tenth Annual Vernon M. and Minnie I. Lynch Lecture, "Conceptions of World Order: Building Peace in the Third Millennium," in this, the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution's Fifteenth Anniversary Year.

Anatol Rapoport, along with four previous Lynch Lecturers, John Burton, Kenneth and Elise Boulding, and Johan Galtung, can quite justifiably claim to be a founding parent of peace and conflict studies. Dr. Rapoport's work on decision making, game theory, and the interpersonal sources of competition and cooperation remain classics in the field. His work has spawned a number of experimental studies and has framed the field for a whole generation of scholars.

One of the reasons that Dr. Rapoport has been so influential is his unique combination of passion and intellect—born into a secular Jewish family in the Ukraine, he was taught by his parents the aesthetic and ethical values that have shaped his life. His parents encouraged him (first in Russia and later in North America) to follow his aspirations, first into music and then into mathematics. When Anatol was 14 years old, his father arranged for him to meet Rachmaninov. This set him on the musical path that he followed in Vienna and later in the United States. His discomfort with music entrepreneurship and the competition associated with getting work and concerts led him to study at the University of Chicago where he received his Ph.D. in biological mathematics on December 5, 1941. When Pearl Harbor was bombed the following weekend, he enlisted in the United States Army Air Force on December 8, 1941. His war experience took him to Montgomery, Alabama, and from there to Alaska to be liaison with the Russian Airforce, and then on to the Bangladeshi part of India to support the Allies' airlift into China over the Hump.

After the war, Professor Rapoport returned to teaching. In addition to pursuing his interests in biological mathematics, he had developed his own unique philosophy of science and social science—a combination of logical positivism, experimental empiricism, and empathetic understanding. At breakfast today, as he and I talked about Max Weber, Anatol told me of a translation error that he had discovered when reading Weber's *Theory of Social Action*; the translator had misplaced letters and translated "*verstehen*" as "emphatic" rather than "empathetic understanding." Rapoport has not made that type of mistake; his studies have been informed throughout by a strong desire to understand others on their own terms and in a way that makes sense of the deeper principles

that unify the human species. His movement into psychology flows from his concern with the significance of the effect of *a priori* beliefs on action and on ways that psychological and socio-economic realities combine to determine what is and what is not possible.

Lynch Lecturer Kenneth Boulding was fond of saying, "If it exists, it is possible," and "Nothing fails like success." Anatol Rapoport has dedicated his life to pushing the implications of both these statements, by enlarging the realm of the possible, and by identifying the attitudinal traps that confine people individually and collectively. A secular humanist, he has lived a scholarly life dedicated to the realization of the higher values in music, mathematics, and creative peacemaking. Not for him a woolly-minded commitment to peace and the nonviolent resolution of conflict, his goal has been to establish a true *science* of peace, in which people's deepest aspirations will combine with knowledge and wisdom to ensure that they do not delude themselves—or, worse, enter into wars—because of fuzzy thinking, misperception, or slavish commitment to false ideology.

Anatol's life work as a scholar has been committed to providing people with the skills needed to understand the distorting effects of power and the positive and negative roles of system dynamics. He is equally at home with strategic analysts or peace researchers, although, in relation to the former, he would prefer that their strategic analysis be based on a desire for win-win solutions and best-case rather than worst-case assumptions.

To all these endeavors Anatol brings a renaissance mind capable of making creative and exciting connections and unifying links between a variety of discourses and peoples. His work has been dedicated to clarifying areas of both certainty and doubt, i.e., to becoming doubtful about the certainties and certain about the doubts. His mission has been to clarify what is true, good, and beautiful and how these contribute to peaceful relations and human evolution.

It gives me great pleasure to present to you Dr. Anatol Rapoport.

*Kevin P. Clements, Ph.D.*  
*Vernon M. and Minnie I. Lynch Professor*  
*of Conflict Resolution*  
*Director, Institute for Conflict Analysis*  
*and Resolution*  
*George Mason University*  
*Fairfax, Virginia*  
*April 23, 1997*

Tenth Annual Vernon M. and Minnie I. Lynch Lecture  
on Conflict Resolution, ICAR, George Mason University  
April 23, 1997

Address by  
Dr. Anatol Rapoport

## CONCEPTIONS OF WORLD ORDER: BUILDING PEACE IN THE THIRD MILLENNIUM

As the term "world order" implies, conceptions of it involve a conception of "the world" and a conception of "order." Both have undergone changes throughout history. Initially, "the world" was understood to be the known world, that is, a region in which the inhabitants were able to communicate or interact. To the Greeks and the Romans, for example, "the world" was essentially the lands around the Mediterranean. For several centuries after the dissolution of the Roman Empire, the world of Europeans was essentially Europe exclusive of Russia. Only after the voyages of discovery was this concept extended to include the entire planet.

Unlike the conception of "the world," which has irreversibly broadened, various conceptions of "order" co-exist today. While all have in common some idea of social control, the *modes* of control that underlie the different conceptions of a world order differ radically. Three modes of social control succinctly described by Kenneth Boulding are "threat," "trade," and "love." "Threat" or coercion is the prevailing mode of control in totalitarian or authoritarian societies in which people are motivated to behave as the authorities desire by the threat of punishment meted out for disobedience. "Trade" or exchange is the mode of control applied in relations among equals and is the basic mode of control in so-called "democratic," predominantly capitalist societies. Unlike threat, embodied in a declaration such as, "If you don't do as I say, I will punish you," an exchange implies reciprocal commitments: "If you will do this for me, I will do that for you." People work not because they are threatened with whipping if they don't, but because they are paid.

The third, "love," is a term usually excluded from the lexicon of the social scientist because its sentimental connotations are deemed to be out of place in scientific discourse. Indeed, Boulding himself eventually replaced the term by "integration," a term with no sentimental or romantic connotations,

meaning essentially the same as “love” as the word is used in Boulding’s description of modes of social control. A society based on “love,” in this technical sense, is characterized by an expanded range of public goods. A public good is, by definition, something that is accessible to everyone in society regardless of ability to pay, simply because everyone is entitled to it. For example, children are fed and protected not because they can threaten those who neglect them and not because they can pay, but simply because they are children. It is that example that probably suggested the term “love” to Boulding. However, in a more general context, public goods are not generated by affection toward others in a society. Instead, in people-oriented social systems, they are generated by a policy of respect for *human rights*. Members of the society receive them not because they can pay for them and not because they can threaten with reprisals if they are deprived of them, but simply because they are members of the society. Integration was at one time projected as the dominant mode of social control in an idealized communist society.

Corresponding to the three modes of social control are three types of world order. Corresponding to the threat system is a world order based on *hegemony*. Corresponding to the trade system is a world order based on *balance of power*, at times coupled with so-called *collective security*. Corresponding to the love system is a world order based on *common security*, an idea quite different from that of collective security. While all three of these different conceptions of order work to shore up a society against violence generated by anarchy, i.e., the absence of any system of control of human behavior, they do so in different ways. A threat system uses intimidation; a trade system uses distribution of rewards; an integrated system uses induced identification of self with others.

A clear example of a world order based on hegemony was the Roman Empire. The last centuries of its existence were marked by what is called, sometimes nostalgically, *pax Romana*; peace in the empire’s conquered regions was kept by military monopoly. In later times analogous terms were used to describe the hegemony of Great Britain over its vast imperial domains, *pax Britannica*, and, more recently, with reference to the geopolitical aspirations of the United States after World War II, *pax Americana*. Social order was maintained by one central power through the implied threat of annihilation.

The conception of a world order based on collective security has an interesting history. One example, dating from the fifteenth century, is the attempt by King George of Bohemia to unify Europe in 1464. In the preamble of *The Universal Peace Organization of King George of Bohemia: A Fifteenth Century Plan for World Peace*<sup>1</sup>, the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences’ 1964 publication marking the 500th anniversary of King George’s project, we read:

“In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ...Let this be known to one and all for all eternity. We learn from the writings of ancient historians that Christianity once flourished and was blessed with men and goods, spreading far and wide, that it held in its womb one hundred and seventeen rich kingdoms, that it also brought forth so many people that for a long time it held a large part of pagandom including the Holy Sepulchre; in those days there was no nation in the world which would have dared to challenge Christian rule. But we all know how lacerated it is today, how broken, impoverished, and deprived of all its former brilliance and splendor it is. For not long ago Christendom passed through such a change that if any of the ancient kings, princes, or notables were to rise from the dead and visit the Christian countries, he would not recognize his own land...”

The proposed treaty contained specific provisions for establishing a permanent peace in Europe. It continues:

“...In order to facilitate the suppression of dissidence and wars, the very thought of which pains those who have to experience them, and in order to strengthen peace among others faithful to Christ who are not parties to the present covenant, we hereby provide and order that if discord or war should occur between other Christian princes and magnates who are not included in our fraternity, our below described assembly shall dispatch in our name and at our mutual expense envoys whose task will be to restore concert between the parties to dispute...”

Comments by the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences on the document, published in 1964, are noteworthy. The academy writes:

“The most prominent place is occupied by proposals whose purpose was to exclude war from human society. This purpose is openly and exclusively followed in the first eight articles, that is, the whole of the first third of the project; these articles contain very detailed and complete regulations designed to eliminate wars, to settle disputes between states peacefully, and to punish those who disturb peace. War against the Turks is not mentioned once...”

“Mankind of the fifteenth century was shown prospects of a world without wars in which even the apparently insurmountable antagonism between the Christians and Moslems appeared to be replaceable by a situation for which we can hardly find a more fitting,













