

*Triumph of Civilization* by Glen T. Martin  
Institute for Economic Democracy Press, 2010

## Chapter Nine

# A Nonviolent Peace System for Spaceship Earth

### *The Anatomy of a Holistic World Community*

*The ultimate problem of production is the production of human beings. To this end, the production of goods is intermediate and auxiliary. It is by this standard that the present system stands condemned. "Security" is a means, and although an indispensable social means it is not the end....The means have to be implemented by a social-economic system that establishes and uses the means for the production of free human beings associating with one another on terms of equality. Then and only then will these means be an integral part of the end, not frustrated and self-defeating, bringing new evils and generating new problems.*

John Dewey

*Democracy and violence can go ill together. The States that are today nominally democratic have either to become frankly totalitarian or, if they are to become truly democratic, they must become courageously nonviolent. It is a blasphemy to say nonviolence can be practiced only by individuals and never by nations which are composed of individuals.*

Mahatma Gandhi

**T**he philosophy of nonviolence that has been developed through much of the twentieth century has made an indispensable contribution to all theories of legitimate transformative social change. Yet the implications of the philosophy of nonviolence are often not well understood. Nonviolence is integral to the realization of authentic democracy on our planet, just as it is integral to creating a global economics of universal prosperity rather than today's agonizing scarcity for sixty percent of the Earth's people. It is also, of course, integral to the process of world demilitarization and the activation of a civilized world order for the first time in history.

## 9.1 The Philosophy of Nonviolence and World Law

Neither Mahatma Gandhi nor most of the subsequent philosophers of nonviolent transformative social change repudiated all use of force. Gandhi himself said that if one lacked the courage to fight injustice through nonviolent means, one should pick up a gun. Worse than using a gun to fight injustice is cowardice: doing nothing, refusing to act: “I have been repeating over and over again that he who cannot protect himself or his nearest and dearest or their honor by nonviolently facing death may and ought to do so by violently dealing with the oppressor” (1987: 144).

What Gandhi advocates in this and similar passages is not violence “as a last resort” or a “slippery slope” that opens the door to militarized violence. Rather, he is pointing out that nonviolence means an activation of the universal potential of our humanity that is within us all. Nonviolence is the actualization of true courage, honor, faithfulness, integrity, and loyalty to truth and justice. It is not that the use of force is always prohibited, but rather that our selves and our institutions must be premised on clinging to gigantic Truth (*Satyagraha*). If we do this, then the use of force will nearly always be the *minimum necessary* to protect everyone involved. It can be the actions of a civilian police force or individual self-defense, but it can never be militarized violence, which always intentionally seeks to harm a perceived “enemy.”

The philosophy of nonviolence is not a utopian ideal of starry-eyed “pacifists” placing their bodies for slaughter before implacable military machines. It remains a pragmatic and common-sense understanding directed toward breaking the infamous “cycle of violence” that has characterized most human history to date and toward activating our higher human possibilities. It understands, as Gandhi did, that the use of force is sometimes necessary, despite the fact that every human being has inalienable rights and an inviolable dignity. We live in a concrete world filled with dangerous institutions, dangerous forces, and occasionally dangerous people. The task is to deal practically and justly with all these dangers without ourselves sinking into the cycle of violence and the corruption it entails and to move ourselves and the world forward substantially beyond these dangers. The task placed upon all of us is to deal with these dangers morally and pragmatically while transforming the world system beyond its present nightmare of violence and corruption.

Legitimate social change within truly democratic societies, of course, is always necessarily nonviolent. Democratic societies institutionalize provisions (through numerous channels) for citizen participation: discussion, public debate, freedom of information, public demonstrations, referendums, election of officials, and both individual and collective forms of action. Societies that are not truly democratic (all national governments today) institutionalize empty forms of citizen participation as a propaganda mechanism for legitimating their authority while in reality relegating decision-making to special interest groups like corporations, the rich, dominant elites, those with “security clearances,” etc.

The rule of universally applicable and fairly enforced laws is the foundation for a largely nonviolent society. Gandhi identified the institutional violence of Indian society with those features that did not conform to this pattern: the vast disparity between rich and poor, colonial privilege for a certain group, untouchability, etc. But in an interdependent world possessing horrendous high speed weapons, as well as vast inequalities, there can be no democratically run, nonviolent society anywhere unless there is the rule of democratic world law that ends most institutional violence everywhere on Earth. Only such world law can eliminate the primary causes of imperialism, militarism, subversive violence, state terrorism, and private terrorism.

For Gandhi, and for the philosophy of nonviolence, genuine democracy very definitely requires a tremendous reduction in the gap between rich and poor. In this, he agrees with John Dewey who argued, we saw, that progress in democracy necessarily required a democratization of the sphere of economic decision-making as well as the sphere of politics. The *Earth Constitution* is premised on both these aspects of genuine democracy, one that institutionalizes real provisions for citizen participation and nonviolent change and the other that creates a global economics of prosperity and removes the possibility of massive exploitation of the poor by the rich.

We have seen that the *Earth Constitution* is premised on the moral foundations of the sovereignty of the people of Earth, universal human rights, the principle of *unity in diversity*, human equality, and the right of all to a freedom compatible with the equal freedom of everyone else. For this reason, establishing a genuine world democracy requires removing the institutional violence of economic scarcity, manipulation, and exploitation: “That economics is untrue,” Gandhi writes, “which ignores or disregards moral values” (1972: 118).

In *The Morality of Law* (1969), Professor Lon L. Fuller raises sharp objections to all those theories of law that assert or assume “that the distinguishing mark of law consists in the use of coercion or force” (p. 108). He argues correctly that coercion is a necessary feature of law but only insofar as there needs to be some “efficacy” in which people are encouraged to behave in cooperative law abiding ways and discouraged from behaving in socially destructive ways (pp. 108-109). He points out that the mechanisms by which people can be induced to behave in certain ways are vastly larger than the threat of coercion. In a world society united around our common humanity and the principle that the diversity of all can only be effectively protected through the solidarity of all under world law, the incentives for obedience to the law can be very broad and creative indeed.

Nonviolence includes the activation of universal moral values in every sphere of life, since it is premised on the foundation of nearly all moral values, that is, the inviolable dignity of the human person. Those moral values that claim to respect this dignity yet try to legitimize war, economic relations that allow mass poverty and misery, or “security” arrangements that protect dominant elites from social change are false and hypocritical. Nonviolence does not abjure all use of force, but insists that social arrangements be transformed so that the use of force becomes the absolute minimum of what is necessary (within rigorous due process restraints) for the protection of everyone equally.

“The extension of the law of nonviolence in the domain of economics,” Gandhi writes, “means nothing less than the introduction of moral values as a factor to be considered when regulating international commerce” (1972: 118). This must be true on a global scale. “Immediately as the spirit of exploitation is gone,” he asserts, “armaments will be felt as a positive unbearable burden. Real disarmament cannot come unless the nations of the world cease to exploit one another” (1972: 112).

All militarism under the world system, like all terrorism, derives from the same undemocratic root. For when genuine democracy does not exist (and it cannot exist without democratic world government), then the only alternative is to institutionalize violence: to use the police and the law to repress the poor, to protect the privileged, to institutionalize lying and deceit to the public, to militarize society with the bogus threat of implacable enemies everywhere, to imperialistically control the wealth-producing processes of the world to the advantage of the already wealthy and powerful in the imperial centers of capital (Smith 2005a).

World revolution through world law means founding genuine universal democracy for the first time in history. This necessarily entails not only activating citizen participation in governing but modifying global economics to a system of truly universal prosperity. “If the recognized leaders of mankind,” Gandhi writes, “who have control over the engines of destruction were wholly to renounce their use, with full knowledge of the implications, permanent peace can be obtained. This is clearly impossible without the Great Powers of the Earth renouncing their imperialistic design. This again seems impossible without great nations ceasing to believe in soul-destroying competition and to desire to multiply wants and, therefore, increase their material possessions” (1972: 111).

The “Great Powers” can only achieve this if they are federated within democratic world government and subject to demilitarization within an economic system that maintains their prosperity while also creating prosperity for everyone else on the planet. They can only achieve this if their mutual security is assured by effective, enforceable world law that demilitarizes all nations and organizations equally. And they can only achieve this if it is demanded by the people of Earth.

Gandhi introduced a resolution to the Indian National Congress that was passed on 5 August 1942. It read:

While the Indian National Congress must primarily be concerned with independence and defense of India in

this hour of danger, the Committee is of the opinion that the future peace, security, and ordered progress of the world demand a world federation of free nations, and on no other basis can the problems of the modern world be solved. Such a world federation would ensure the freedom of its constituent nations, the prevention of aggression and exploitation by one nation over another, the protection of national ministries, the advancement of all backward areas and peoples, and the pooling of the world's resources for the common good of all (Hudgens 1986: 14)

This is a very close description of what the *Constitution for the Federation of Earth* offers. Gandhi understood that a nonviolent world order is not only a spiritual commitment on the part of persons everywhere but must be institutionalized both politically and economically in the form of democratic world government that is federated at all levels of governing.

“The entire social order has got to be reconstructed,” he says, “a society based on nonviolence cannot nurture any other ideal” (1972: 120). “Democracy and violence can ill go together,” he writes, “it is a blasphemy to say that nonviolence can only be practiced by individuals and never by nations which are a compound of individuals” (ibid. p. 134). Given the cycle of violence today that also protects massive institutionalized violence, founding a demilitarized democratic world government is the most practical and common sense course of action for humanity.

A reconstructed social order of this kind would necessarily be founded on truth, freedom of speech, inquiry, and press, rather than on manipulation of the public by dominant elites through deception and propaganda. Its democratic framework and its ways of dealing with law-breaking: with police practices, with due process procedures, with court practices, with sentencing, forms of punishment, and imprisonment would all cultivate the spirit of nonviolence in the population. People would see for themselves that their rights were respected and that equality, freedom, and justice were promoted. Such government would by no means eliminate conflict. Rather, it would institutionalize nonviolent ways of dealing with conflict on all levels. Nonviolence does not eliminate conflict, Gandhi asserts. It eliminates the intention to harm one's opponent:

To say or write a distasteful word is surely not violent especially when the speaker or writer believes it to be true. The essence of violence is that there must be a violent intention behind a thought, word, or act, i.e., an intention to do harm to the opponent so-called. False notions of propriety or fear of wounding susceptibilities often deter people from saying what they mean and ultimately land them on the shores of hypocrisy. But if nonviolence of thought is to be evolved in individuals or societies or nations, truth has to be told, however harsh or unpopular it may appear to be at the moment. (1972: 91)

Can police be trained to arrest lawbreakers with the intention of using the minimum force necessary to secure the safety of themselves, the suspect, and any innocent bystanders? Of course. In some European nations, police are already being trained in such methods of apprehension and arrest. Conflict can be democratically institutionalized in a way that minimizes both violence and the tendency to violence in dissidents and lawbreakers. North American philosopher Robert Holmes advocates a similar practical understanding of the philosophy of nonviolence:

This doesn't require changing human nature or transforming the world into a community of saints. It does require recognizing that if we don't cherish the human person, there is no point to the many other activities and strivings that consume our time; no point to saving the environment unless we value the beings that inhabit it; no virtue in self-sacrifice when at the expense of the lives and happiness of others. It does require a massive commitment of time, energy, and moral and financial resources to exploring nonviolent ways of getting along in the world.

The aim should not be to end conflict. That would be utopian and might not even be desirable. The aim should be to develop nondestructive ways of dealing with conflict. Violence by its very nature cannot do that. Nonviolence can. As Gandhi demonstrated, rather than approaching conflict with a view to trying to prevail at any cost, it's possible to approach it with a view to trying to see that the truth prevail – trying to see that the best solution emerge, whether or not it be one to which you were predisposed at the outset. People can learn this. They can be trained in techniques to implement it. They can incorporate it in their institutions. (1990: 139)

Given the truth that nonviolence can be institutionalized to minimize the use of force in human relations, what will the nonviolent democratic world government look like? How will its police behave? How will it deal with terrorism, killers, or violent dissidents? The *Constitution for the Federation of Earth* provides the framework for a nonviolent world order. We have seen that this framework requires both genuine democracy and general economic prosperity with an end to economic exploitation. Article 10, "The Enforcement System," makes the following declaration concerning enforcement by the World Police force:

- (1) The enforcement of world law and world legislation shall apply directly to individuals, and individuals shall be held responsible for compliance with world law and world legislation regardless of whether the individuals are acting in their own capacity or as agents or officials of governments at any level or of the institutions of governments, or as agents or officials of corporations, organizations, associations or groups of any kind.
- (2) When world law or world legislation or decisions of the world courts are violated, the Enforcement System shall operate to identify and apprehend the individuals responsible for violations.
- (3) Any enforcement action shall not violate the civil and human rights guaranteed under this World Constitution.
- (4) The enforcement of world law and world legislation shall be carried out in the context of a non military world federation wherein all member nations shall disarm as a condition for joining and benefitting from the world federation, subject to Article X VII, Sec. C 8 and D 6. The Federation of Earth and World Government under this World Constitution shall neither keep nor use weapons of mass destruction.
- (5) Those agents of the enforcement system whose function shall be to apprehend and bring to court violators of world law and world legislation shall be equipped only with such weapons as are appropriate for the apprehension of the individuals responsible for violations.
- (6) The enforcement of world law and world legislation under this World Constitution shall be conceived and developed primarily as the processes of effective design and administration of world law and world legislation to serve the welfare of all people on Earth, with equity and justice for all, in which the resources of Earth and the funds and the credits of the World Government are used only to serve peaceful human needs, and none used for weapons of mass destruction or for war making capabilities.

This set of six principles defines the framework for the operation of the World Police and the possession of weapons. No legitimate government or democracy requires a military apparatus, since all democratic legislation applies to individuals, not governments, institutions, or corporations. Militaries are organized for mass destruction of some perceived "enemy," not for the apprehension of individuals according to the due process of law.

Once the international anarchy and chaos of the system of "sovereign" nation-states is replaced with real world law and a federation of nations, militaries will no longer be necessary. "Nations will no longer lift up their sword against nations." At this point, enforcement will only need to apply to individuals. Therefore, the police under democratic world law "shall be equipped only with such weapons as are appropriate for the apprehension of the individuals responsible for violations." They will possess no weapons of war. The triumph of civilization will have begun.

Since a constitution provides a framework, not a body of specific laws, the question of what weapons allowed the World Police is left to the World Parliament to decide. However, they must be only those necessary to apprehend individuals. All tanks, warships, warplanes, bombs, missiles, etc., are necessarily excluded since these are military weapons, not those necessary to apprehend individuals using a minimum of force while protecting the rights and safety of all concerned. The philosophy of nonviolence implies exactly this social transformation to the point where the use of force is minimized in human relations.

(Note: a version of section 9.1 was first published as part of Chapter Six of *World Revolution Through World Law*, IED Press, 2005.)

## 9.2 Civilian Police versus Military Force

It is very important here to distinguish between the role of civilian police and the role of military force, including a militarized police force. Military institutions destroy democracy and freedom both within and without individual nation-states, as we have seen, for democracy itself requires a nonviolent institutional framework that is incompatible with militarism. This is why the world government cannot be militarized, not because of some utopian idea that human beings will be without conflict or without requiring the occasional use of force.

The innermost meaning of democracy as a world society organized as a community of rights on the principle of *unity in diversity* is only possible under non-military democratic world government. Any militarized society will inhibit the solidarity and mutual respect among all people that lies at the heart of genuine democracy. Military doctrine and practice, we have seen, are incompatible with the principles of both due process of law and individual accountability.

Civilian police, on the other hand (the only kind of police allowed under the *Constitution*) are accountable to the citizens for their behavior, their obedience to the law, their use of force, and their job security. We already have a measure of this in many cities that require a civilian review board to monitor police behavior. Civilian police are normally mandated to use (and can be trained to use) the minimum force necessary to apprehend individuals suspected of crimes. But these police under the Earth Federation will operate on a qualitatively different basis from that of police within traditional sovereign nation-states.

The World Police are required to respect the rights of all citizens, to “protect and serve.” A nonviolent set of governmental institutions would insist that police are highly trained and educated in the proper function of a civilian police force. Police within a genuine democracy are mandated to use the minimum necessary force, and to make every effort to use non-lethal force. Their role will be that of peacemakers and community builders, in addition to being merely law enforcers.

It only makes sense that their weapons would be more and more *non-lethal* as technology in non-lethal weaponry advances. Stun guns, propelled body nets, non-lethal darts, and other technology of non-lethal weaponry yet to be developed will likely become the stock and trade of the World Police. It may well be that in most instances the World Police will not find it necessary to carry weapons at all. There is much evidence that de-escalation of the readiness for violence tends to result in the de-escalation of violence. The World Police are under mandate to weaken and ultimately break the cycle of violence.

A civilian police force within a framework of real democratic justice, respect for individual rights, and freedom will be tasked to continually examine how it can accomplish its mission of effectively apprehending criminals while at the same time continually maximizing the safety of themselves, those apprehended, and innocent bystanders. Very high quality training and education will necessarily supplement whatever weapons are authorized by the World Parliament. Police will be trained in nonviolent techniques of apprehension and arrest (and in self-defense techniques such as judo) as well as in the techniques of minimum use of necessary force, de-escalation, and conflict resolution.

The *Constitution* also leaves open for the World Parliament to legislate what weapons are acceptable for *private individuals*. A constitution is not a blueprint. Many decisions must be made through the democratic processes set up by the *Constitution*. However, the Provisional World Parliament has already passed provisional world laws in this regard specifying that individuals may possess only those weapons also permitted to the World Police.

Provisional world laws are not binding on the established World Parliament once it has been activated. They serve as guidelines, models, and a preliminary groundwork. This particular provisional world law of the Provisional Parliament was controversial and by no means unanimous, yet it appears consistent with the *Constitution's* founding premise of the dignity and inviolable rights of every individual on Earth, including the right to self-defense. We saw above that Gandhi affirmed even the use of force in defense of one's self and loved-ones if a person lacked the capacity to do this nonviolently.

The Provisional World Parliament has followed the *Constitution* closely by outlawing the design, development, sale, transportation, or possession of all weapons of war for individuals, groups, corporations,

governments, and even the world government. Weapons of war are illegal under the *Constitution* even though the World Parliament will define what personal weapons are available to world citizens and the World Police. If the established World Parliament sees fit to follow the Provisional World Parliament in allowing individuals the same weapons as it allows the World Police, this may serve as an incentive for the World Police to develop ever-more and better non-lethal forms of apprehension and arrest and to progressively eliminate lethal weapons. Article 12 of the *Constitution* gives each citizen of the Earth Federation the following rights:

- Safety of person from arbitrary or unreasonable arrest, detention, exile, search or seizure; requirement of warrants for searches and arrests.
- Prohibition against physical or psychological duress or torture during any period of investigation, arrest, detention or imprisonment, and against cruel or unusual punishment.
- Right of habeas corpus; no ex post facto laws; no double jeopardy; right to refuse self incrimination or the incrimination of another.
- Prohibition against private armies and paramilitary organizations as being threats to the common peace and safety.
- Safety of property from arbitrary seizure; protection against exercise of the power of eminent domain without reasonable compensation.
- Right of privacy of person, family and association; prohibition against surveillance as a means of political control.

The security, safety, and freedom of citizens is clearly a primary focus of the *Constitution*. And, given what we have seen in this volume, it should be clear that the Earth Federation will be nonviolent regardless of whatever stun-guns, handguns, pepper spray canisters, or rifles citizens are allowed to possess. If people feel they need to possess these items, they will do so. But given the framework of a deeply nonviolent society that is built by the *Constitution* (in which true democracy is realized and institutionalized violence and exploitation are eliminated), it is unlikely that many will feel this need.

The law could easily maximize their freedoms in this regard without the fear that there would be many people using such weapons to break the law or do violence. This list of rights possesses a fundamental difference from the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights that duplicates many of the rights in Article 12. For the U.N. Declaration is “merely symbolic.” It has no legal force. Whereas under the *Earth Constitution*, the people of Earth have an enforceable legal right to these protections, and numerous effective legal options through which to ensure these protections are carried out.

As Gandhi made clear, if we will create real democracy on Earth, and real economic justice and prosperity on Earth, then we must *institutionalize nonviolence*. With today’s system of militarized “sovereign” nation-states and vast disparities between extreme wealth and extreme poverty, we have *institutionalized violence*. This violence requires the military to enforce its global system of injustice and exploitation. But if we ratify the *Constitution for the Federation of Earth* and create world institutions premised on the dignity, freedom, and equality of every person on Earth, we will eliminate the perceived need not only for the military but also for most personal or terrorist violence. And what is even more fundamental, we will have laid the groundwork for a transformation of the human spirit.

Today, the human spirit is distorted by the violent institutions that pervade our lives. The process of realizing a democratic world order under the *Constitution* may be marred by having to contend with the violence of the nation-states that currently eat, sleep, and breathe violence through their every institution. As we have seen above, the people of Earth (and each of us insofar as we act from what is universal in ourselves) not only have the right, but the duty to create democratic world government and exit the immoral state of *de facto* war and institutionalized violence under which we are currently forced to live.

Under Article Nineteen of the *Constitution*, the people of Earth have the mandate to elaborate the institutions of *provisional world government* until such time as the *Constitution* has been formally ratified according to the provisions set forth in Article Seventeen. This means we are building what is sometimes called a “parallel government” to the ones currently falsely claiming legitimacy in the world. This “parallel government” is not a competing claim to nation-statehood, of course, but includes the invitation

to all national governments to reclaim their legitimacy and integrity by becoming part of the emerging Earth Federation. In this regard, it is not “parallel” at all but the entity representing the sovereignty of the people of Earth capable of restoring the legitimacy of the national governments as well as eliminating their violent and unjust characteristics.

Yet in our efforts to elaborate the infrastructure of world government, members of the emerging Earth Federation avail themselves of many of the techniques of nonviolent action. Professor Gene Sharp in Part Two of *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* entitled *The Methods of Nonviolent Action*, lists 198 techniques or methods of nonviolent struggle. Number 198 is listed as “dual sovereignty and parallel government.” Sharp writes:

This method involves the creation of a new government, or continued loyalty to an existing rival government to that of the opponent. If the parallel government receives overwhelming support from the populace, it may replace the opponent’s established government....This general phenomenon has occurred in a variety of situations and is by no means a product of twentieth century revolutions. (1985: 423)

Sharp goes on to describe historical examples of when this method was used, often without conscious intent as a nonviolent method. He describes the Netherlands struggle against the Spanish king in 1575-77, the conflict in England between Charles and the Long Parliament during the 1640s, the struggle during U.S. revolutionary times between the Continental Congress and British rule, “Door’s Rebellion” in Rhode Island in 1841-42, the Russian Revolution of 1905, and again of 1917, the general strike in Winnipeg, Canada, in 1919, the Indian struggle against the British, especially during the 1930-31 campaign, and the contest in China between the Japanese and the “Border Government” during the 1930s.

Given this long history of transformative movements developing an alternative government to replace or parallel an existing government, one can say that the work of the Provisional World Parliament and the members of the emerging Earth Federation are definitely engaged with time-honored methods of nonviolent action. As the institutions of the Federation develop (assuming the *Constitution* has not yet been ratified by the people and nations of Earth) we will be elaborating the world ministries, the World Parliament, the world courts, and the world enforcement system of police and attorneys general.

The World Police may be called upon to apprehend criminals (for example, any persons engaged in weapons research, design, manufacture, transport, sale, purchase, or deployment, which are all criminal activities under existing provisional world law). From what has been said above, it should be clear that even the provisional World Police will be well trained in what it means to be a civilian police officer within a genuine democracy. That is, they will be trained to use the minimum force necessary to apprehend the suspect, protect themselves, ensure the safety of innocent bystanders, and follow due-process procedures ensuring the rights of all.

In addition, citizens (as well as the World Ombudsmus) will be free to monitor the behavior of the police to be sure that they fulfill their function of reducing the use of force to a minimum. Provisional World Legislative Act 14.3 reads in part as follows:

Civil Empowerment. Behavior of World Police Officers while on duty may be freely audited by both non-interfering private Earth citizens and by the World Ombudsmus, to assure compliance to least necessary force and to appropriate behavior on the part of the Enforcement System. The World Ombudsmus and Earth Citizens may file legal complaints or legal charges, and seek rectification for damages arising from the improper use of weapons. At which time the World Police begins its formation and forever thereafter, the World Police Force may develop, use and possess only weapons legal to the citizens of the Earth Federation without requirement of permit, registration or disclosure.

( [http://www.worldproblems.net/english/legislation/full\\_texts](http://www.worldproblems.net/english/legislation/full_texts))

The World Police under the Earth Federation will be truly servants and protectors of the people as this passage states. Under provisional world law as it now stands, world citizens may possess any weapons possessed by the world police “without requirement of permit, registration or disclosure.” Nonviolence, as well as the right of citizens to self-defense, is therefore institutionalized within both the

*Constitution* and Provisional World Law.

This is practical and commonsense nonviolence in action. It does not demand some *utopian* abjuring of all reasonable use of force. It clearly forbids an “intention to do harm to the opponent” that Gandhi says is a defining characteristic of violence. It does not assume some “peaceful human nature” or conflict-free future for humanity. Human intelligence can build communities of rights and solidarity. “Human nature” is extremely flexible. When the levels of suffering, fear, and tension are reduced, the level of violence is also reduced.

Nonviolence involves action in the service of authentic democracy, which is necessarily nonviolent to every extent possible. It is also action in the service of the nonviolent method of developing a “parallel government” that appeals to the allegiance to the people of Earth precisely because it is democratic, just, liberating, and nonviolent. Just as “violent means” inevitably lead to violent results (as the institutionalized violence of today’s world illustrates), so nonviolent means are the only legitimate transformative strategy to realize a truly new and fundamental goal: a nonviolent world democracy of justice, freedom, equality, and peace.

### **9.3 Principles of Nonviolence behind the Institutionalization of Peace**

**I**n sections 1 and 2 of Chapter Eight, we examined the philosophical principles expounded by Immanuel Kant concerning human freedom, morality, and the categorical imperative. The key form of all moral principles is precisely their universality. They must be in principle valid for all persons confronted with this particular situation. The principle of universality implies the equality and dignity of all human beings. Therefore, Kant asserts that every person should be treated as an end in themselves, never merely as a means. Every person has intrinsic value: the dignity from which their inalienable human rights flow and their inviolability as a human being.

We saw that these principles are equivalent to the principle of autonomy in which valid moral principles are seen to flow from a free decision of one’s practical reason or rational will. It is this subjective rational affirmation that makes them valid and is the reason why they cannot come from any heteronomous source. This, we saw, is a fundamental reason why military service is self-contradictory. One cannot universalize giving up one’s rational autonomy, for this undercuts the very possibility of moral action and our intrinsic dignity as human beings.

Finally, the universality of the categorical imperative implies the kingdom of ends: a world society in which all human beings treat one another as ends and in which government is premised on the fundamental reality that all human beings are intrinsically valuable and should be socially related to one another as such. The kingdom of ends is a society of peace, just as it is also necessarily a society of freedom, since free rational choice is the foundation of all moral principles and human dignity. In these principles we have the philosophical basis for the institutionalization of peace and the moral impossibility of our present world system of institutionalized violence and war.

It is this inviolability of all human beings, together with the gigantic truth that we are all one in our fundamental humanity or species-being, that is at the heart of the philosophy and practice of nonviolence. Above we have seen some of the principles that Mahatma Gandhi elaborated as the principles behind *satyagraha* as a “clinging to truth” or “soul-force.” Similar principles are expressed by Martin Luther King, Jr., in *Stride Toward Freedom* and other works. King identifies seven principles at the heart of the philosophy of nonviolence on which I will draw here to articulate the principles that must be institutionalized if government is ever to be constructed on the basis of nonviolence.

The *first* is that nonviolence is active resistance to evil and injustice, whereas military service may be active physically but is passive spiritually. This principle relates to Kant’s formula of autonomy. To be active spiritually is to legislate the maxims of one’s actions on universal grounds. Military service places the individual under a command structure in which this power is largely given up. In practice, responsibility is deferred upward to commanders and the most horrible actions are performed by those obeying orders.

To institutionalize peace in the first place must be to make military service illegal so that all citizens can be held accountable for their actions. Military service in nation-states is not “service to one’s country” under the rule of democratic law. It is a function of the lawlessness that exists between nations and the refusal of nation-states to recognize any law above themselves. Non-military community service for the common good, on the other hand, is a perfectly reasonable requirement of government and can be the subject of democratically legislated laws.

The *second* principle of nonviolent action outlined by King involves effort directed toward reconciliation and redemption of the conflict, not toward the defeat and domination of the perceived enemy. Human life is filled with conflict among religions, ethnic groups, nations, races, cultures, and individuals. Is it possible to create governmental structures built around an inclusiveness that respects all who are party to conflicts? There are many programs in conflict resolution that exist today, some of them associated with national governments. These programs serve as a model for building world government structures. A world government premised on truly universal human rights and directed toward the institutionalization of peace would necessarily act from such an inclusive orientation.

*Third*, nonviolence seeks to defeat injustice, not people, whereas militarized violence seeks the destruction of people and their life-support systems. Under good government, the distinction between justice and injustice need not be a vague slogan used to cover up an oppressive reality. If justice is the primary consideration, rather than military or some other “victory,” then conflicts can be dealt with effectively rather than repressed or manipulated from the motivation of strategic interests.

*Fourth*, nonviolence involves voluntary suffering or willingness for self-sacrifice (*tapasya*), whereas military action attempts to inflict suffering on others in ways that often make reconciliation impossible. Article 12 of the *Earth Constitution* gives citizens “freedom of assembly, association, organization, petition, and peaceful demonstration.” When people deeply believe that injustice has taken place and are willing to nonviolently suffer to stop the injustice, these factors can and must be included in the recognition of those governmental institutions responsible for dealing with the conflict: courts, police, prosecutors, Ombudsmus, etc. A bill was passed at the Eleventh Session of the Provisional World Parliament in July, 2009, in Nainital, India, that legally empowers and protects nonviolent civil disobedience for the citizens of the Earth Federation – ensuring that the *reasoning* behind this disobedience be heard in court. Civil disobedience involving voluntary suffering is clearly worthy of respect by government institutions. The concerns of citizens willing to take risks by breaking the law deserve careful government attention.

*Fifth*, nonviolence treats the opponent as a “thou,” whereas military and violent action treats the “enemy” as an “it.” We have seen that this is why military service cannot be included in any government that wishes to institutionalize peace, since to obey orders to kill strangers who one does not know regardless of their due process rights necessarily includes a denial of their personhood and their dignity as human beings. A world government based on universal human rights solves crime, violence, and conflict through investigation, apprehension, and trial by due process of law for all citizens. Such practices can be premised on the human rights of all suspects. Unlike military service, they are capable of treating all persons as a “thou” while still enforcing the laws.

*Sixth*, Martin Luther King, Jr. says that the person of nonviolence acts from oneness with God, the source of being, or a sense of the sacredness of justice, etc. Government for all human beings cannot, of course, legitimately affirm any particular religious beliefs or religions. However, government can fulfill King’s principle insofar as it recognizes the inviolability of the human person and human rights. The commitment to human rights affirms our human dignity in a way that requires no religious beliefs but functions with the same absoluteness and sacredness as traditional religious commitments. Utilitarian grounds or pragmatic grounds are not sufficient to establish inviolability of human rights (cf. Martin 2008: Ch. 7).

People in government need not believe in a transcendent ground for these rights but must be committed, under the *Earth Constitution*, to treat them as inviolable. The *Constitution*, therefore, calls these rights “inalienable.” It is this commitment to a set of inalienable rights that can be institutionalized.

The prologue to the Article 12 Bill of Rights of the *Earth Constitution* makes this commitment and hence the determination to institutionalize peace:

The inhabitants and citizens of Earth who are within the Federation of Earth shall have certain inalienable rights defined hereunder. It shall be mandatory for the World Parliament, the World Executive, and all organs and agencies of the World Government to honor, implement, and enforce these rights, as well as for national governments of all member nations in the Federation of Earth to do likewise. Individuals or groups suffering violation or neglect of such rights shall have full recourse through the World Ombudsmus, the Enforcement System and the World Courts for redress of grievances.

*Seventh*, nonviolence is based on truthfulness, honesty, and openness whereas violence and militarism require secrecy, lies, propaganda, and deceit. A world filled with the institutionalized violence of domination and exploitation by the ruling elites in the imperial centers of capital will necessarily be permeated by the *spiritual violence* of lies, deceit, propaganda, and distortion. The same multinational corporations who operate in league with imperial governments to control the wealth-producing process in their own interest at the expense of the poor worldwide also control, own, or influence the mass media in the imperial centers. Just as imperial governments spew forth an ideology that justifies and covers up what is really going on so the privately owned corporate mass media spew forth similar ideological constructions. A world of institutionalized violence and overt (military) violence is necessarily complemented by the spiritual violence of massive propaganda and deceit.

The conversion to institutionalized peace eliminates the need for government and the media to lie. Just as the advocate of nonviolence insists on truthfulness and openness (since if one is not trying to destroy or exploit an opponent, one has no need to lie) so government must be committed to truth and institutionally predicated on truthfulness. To set up a system on this basis (that includes even privately-owned media) is not difficult. The corporation must be stripped of its artificial legal personhood (now common under the system of violence) and have transparency required by law. Corporations must not be allowed to illegitimately influence elections or otherwise legally put government officials in their debt. Freedom of information, research, and knowledge of government actions must be citizen rights under law. These are indeed the arrangements under the *Earth Constitution* and the acts of the Provisional World Parliament to date.

All seven of these principles embodied within democratic world government constitute a transformation of the old order of institutionalized violence into a new order structurally organized for peace. They are not utopian ideals but the practical consequences of the way we organize our institutions and the basic premises from which we operate. Philosophically, the framers of the *Earth Constitution* realized this fact. The Preamble to the *Earth Constitution* includes the following statements:

Aware that the traditional concept of security through military defense is a total illusion both for the present and for the future;  
Aware of the misery and conflicts caused by ever increasing disparity between rich and poor;  
Conscious of our obligation to posterity to save Humanity from imminent and total annihilation....  
We, citizens of the world, hereby resolve to establish a world federation to be governed in accordance with this constitution for the Federation of Earth.

As we saw in Chapter Seven, the Preamble abolishes war and the institutional violence of the disparity between rich and poor on behalf of “a new age, when war shall be outlawed and peace prevail; when the earth’s total resources shall be equitably used for human welfare; and when basic human rights and responsibilities shall be shared by all without discrimination.” The founding philosophical principles of the Earth Federation involve nonviolent social structures, nonviolent economics, and the establishing of a nonviolent human community for the Earth. The triumph for civilization demands nothing less.

## 9.4 The Institutionalization of Peace

Just as war is *institutionalized* within the nation-state system and in the economics of global capitalism so peace, if it is ever to occur, must be institutionalized. We are often under a misunderstanding regarding “law.” Law is not a necessary coercion placed over human beings who have a tendency to violence and require its force to keep them in order. Rather, human beings without law are already in a state of *defacto* violence with respect to one another, for they have no objective, common universal principles through which to relate to one another as equals: nonviolently and democratically. By entering into civil society under democratic government, John Locke asserts, men “have excluded force” (1963: 464). Peace and nonviolence can only be institutionalized through democratically legislated, universally enforceable laws.

Exactly the same holds true regarding nation-states. As we saw in Chapters Four through Six, the sovereign nation-state system is inherently violent, for there is no common set of objective universal principles over sovereign nations by which they might relate to one another nonviolently and democratically. The few small, weak nations that do not have a military in today’s world have security arrangements with states that do have a military and rely on these states for protection within an intrinsically violent world. But they themselves, insofar as they are not willing to recognize universal law over themselves in the form of Earth Federation, remain part of the violence – scorers of law, freedom, and democratic equality for everyone on Earth.

Peace not only requires that we all place ourselves under universal democratically legislated laws, it requires that we address the vast inequalities of the world, eliminating poverty, disease, and deprivation as far as possible. Only an Earth Federation can accomplish this, eliminating from the world imperial and exploitative relationships among nations. Peace requires that we preserve our global environment and that we equitably share the hardships that destruction of the environment is rapidly bringing upon humankind.

Indeed, the institutionalization of peace under world government will require substantially solving all the multidimensional global crises that today plague humankind: to prevent war and secure disarmament, to protect universal human rights and equal opportunities in life, to obtain for all people the conditions for equitable economic and social development, to regulate the use of world resources and other international processes, to protect the environment and the ecological fabric of life, and to solve any unforeseen problems that transcend national boundaries.

This list, we have seen, recounts the six broad functions of the world government listed in Article 1 of the *Constitution for the Federation of Earth*. Poverty and exploitation can only be eliminated by law, but the interdependent planetary crises of our day make it clear that poverty can only be solved if the problem of the environment is also solved, and only if militarism is solved, and only if human rights and freedom are protected. The world order is deeply interrelated and interdependent. Just as all the planetary crises are interdependent (e.g. poverty, militarism, environmental degradation, etc.) and are consequences of the fragmented system of nation-states in conjunction with monopoly capitalism so democratic world government must address all these aspects of the world order *simultaneously* in order to institutionalize peace. The solution must be holistic.

We have seen above that all military service is both immoral and self-contradictory for individuals. These principles are now embodied in law, as they should be. Citizens of Earth within the Federation are protected by law from having to do any form of military service. They cannot legally be conscripted by their nations or localities. As the Bill of Rights in Article 12 makes clear, people have the *right to peace*, just as they have the right to a healthy planetary environment, quality healthcare, and educational opportunities. Article 12.11 makes all military conscription illegal. Article 12.15 prohibits all private armies and paramilitary organizations. Article 17 requires all nations joining the Earth Federation to begin the process of demilitarization with simultaneous conversion of their economy and social order toward peace.

In the first stages of the emerging world government when all nations are not yet under the aegis of the Earth Federation, external nations will undoubtedly remain militarized. However, under the *Constitution* it is not possible for the Federation itself to militarize in response to these threats (Federation nations need not fully demilitarize until the second stage). Otherwise peace can never be established. The Earth Federation

must deal with external militarized nations in the early stages of world government by showing the people of Earth (including those in the militarized nations) that it has established a new order that is to *everyone's* benefit. The purpose is to break the cycle of violence and war that has characterized all human history and that is intrinsic to the system of sovereign nation-states. This cycle can never be broken through military action, nor through the mouthing of pious ideals. It can only be broken through the *institutionalization* of peace.

One aspect of this effort has been the establishment of the World Disarmament Agency (WDA) that is tasked to eliminate all weapons of mass destruction from the Earth. The first session of the Provisional World Parliament in Brighton, England, (1982) created the World Disarmament Agency as World Legislative Act Number 1 (WLA 1). The act criminalizes not only possession of WMDs but their research, design, testing, transport, installation, maintenance, storage, buying, selling, or detonating. This is what is meant by the institutionalization of peace: the entire framework that made war and exploitation possible is transformed by the simple act of uniting human beings under a single constitution and legislating for peace across the spectrum of human activities.

The World Disarmament Agency is tasked to work with nations to systematically and methodically reduce and eliminate WMDs so that no nation feels vulnerable or threatened by the disarmament process. However, the systematic reduction and elimination of these horrendous inventions is not a voluntary process. The reason why no significant progress has been made in this direction under the current world system, despite many attempts and many treaties, is because under the nation-state system all treaties are voluntary.

The WDA is a governmental agency with the authority behind it of the World Parliament, the World Police, and the World Court System. Those not cooperating are held accountable as individuals. Those found designing, researching, transporting or otherwise involved with WMDs are arrested by the World Police and arraigned in court. Only the genuine rule of law can institutionalize peace, just as is now done *within* the borders many nation-states. Within stable nations with effective governments people are *disarmed* by law, that is, what weapons they are allowed to possess is regulated by law. To have the weapons one is allowed to possess regulated by law is to be effectively disarmed. As a private individual, I cannot buy a cruise missile or a nuclear submarine. In the chaos of sovereign nations, however, nations can be destabilized by having weapons smuggled in from outside. Criminal groups within the present international legal vacuum attempt to buy missiles or even nuclear weapons.

The Provisional World Parliament has also activated the Global Ministry of the Environment (WLA 9) within the framework of the *Earth Constitution* and created an Emergency Earth Rescue Administration (WLA 6) to work with the Global Ministry in reversing the process of climate collapse and environmental destruction. An Earth Federation Funding Corporation (WLA 7) has been created to fund the operations of these agencies. The global war system can only be transformed through changing the very premises of the system from sovereign nation-states to *unity in diversity* under world government. This requires dealing with the world system as a whole, which only world government can do. Peace can never be institutionalized unless the entire interconnected panoply of global problems can be dealt with simultaneously.

The Provisional World Parliament in its second session in New Delhi, India, (1985) created the World Commission on Terrorism to study terrorism, its causes, the specific complaints of groups behind terrorism, and to work with the World Police and the World Economic Development Organization (WLA 2), not only in prosecuting terrorists, but in eliminating the major causes of terrorism through creating a free, just, and equitable world order. The Commission on Terrorism carefully examines both local conflicts where terrorism has occurred and larger economic, social, and political causes of terrorism. It works with other governmental agencies not in a “war on terrorism” but to institutionalize a world of peace where the causes of most terrorism have been eliminated.

The World Peace Act (WLA 13), adopted by the sixth session of the Provisional World Parliament in Bangkok, Thailand, in 2003, extends the provisions of the WMDs prohibition passed in WLA 1. The act prohibits United Nations Security Council veto power so that the work of institutionalizing peace cannot be interfered with by the system that has institutionalized war (the U.N.). The act also initiates a worldwide minesweeping operation for the millions of mines that plague the civilian populations of the Earth,

establishes incentives for conversion to less lethal munitions, and administers the disbanding of military forces.

Similarly, WLA 26, passed at the eighth session of the Provisional World Parliament in Lucknow, India, in 2004, delineates and establishes the educational system of the Earth Federation. The act establishes a broad set of curricular criteria for all public schools and institutes that receive support or funding from the Earth Federation. (Free public education through the pre-university level is a universal right under Article 13 of the *Earth Constitution*.) Within a broad, flexible framework geared to the level of students, all schools must require: study of the *Earth Constitution*, reflection on, and development of, their own “quality of life index,” reflection on the requirements for world peace, development of their own *unity in diversity* index, and, similarly, development of a good government index.

In other words, students everywhere will be required to thoughtfully consider the *Earth Constitution*, what *unity in diversity* means, what constitutes a real quality of life (certainly not only material wealth), and the meaning of world peace and good government. Once again we see the multidimensional character of the institutionalization of peace. It cannot be done by disarmament alone if the economic, educational, and other systems are left untouched. It can only be accomplished by a unified effort directed to all major aspects of our presently failed world order. No ideology is imposed or suggested, for serious reflection alone will confirm the valid philosophical premises at the heart of the *Earth Constitution*.

The ninth session of the Provisional World Parliament in Tripoli, Libya, in 2006 passed WLA 32: enabling legislation for a Department of Conflict Resolution within the Federation of Earth. The Preamble to the act states that:

A basic condition for preventing outbreaks of violence which the Enforcement System shall facilitate in every way possible, shall be to assure a fair hearing under nonviolent circumstances for any person or group having a grievance, and likewise to assure a fair opportunity for a just settlement of any grievance with due regard for the rights and welfare of all concerned.

([http://www.worldproblems.net/english/legislation/full\\_texts\\_en\\_htm/wla\\_32\\_conflict\\_resolution\\_act.htm](http://www.worldproblems.net/english/legislation/full_texts_en_htm/wla_32_conflict_resolution_act.htm))

A central function of the Department of Conflict Resolution, with offices mandated in every part of the world, will be to give a fair hearing in a non-courtroom setting for all groups or persons having a serious grievance that might lead to violent conflict. Of course, under Article 11 of the *Earth Constitution*, all such groups already have available to them the Office of the World Ombudsmus, charged with protecting human rights everywhere on Earth. And under Article 9 they have available the World Court System that can legally address and enforce grievances involving a violation of law. But the institutionalization of peace requires a manifold of governmental organizations and programs designed to make peace a reality in human affairs: not just the temporary absence of war (so-called “negative peace”) and not simply repression of the aspirations of oppressed groups. The Department of Conflict Resolution uses experts trained in conflict resolution worldwide to further ensure a world order premised on peace.

This clearly does not mean that the Earth Federation government will be weak or wishy-washy in the face of the immense conflicts tearing our world apart. On the contrary; we have seen that the *Earth Constitution* creates a planetary government and democratic community with sufficient authority to pacify the multi-dimensional violence of today’s world disorder. As Hannah Arendt says “power needs no justification, being inherent in the very existence of political communities; what it does need is legitimacy,” and she describes the way in which legitimacy in any form is *eroded* by violence. A nonviolent Earth Federation can and should be powerful.

When Dr. Robert Muller (later U.N. Assistant Secretary-General for 18 years) was a young law student in France of 1947, living amidst the devastation wrought by the World War, he won an essay contest on the subject of “world government” in which he wrote:

It must be comprised of all the organs characteristic of government – legislative, executive, and judicial. It must have all humans as subjects. World government is very different from international government, which has been a bankruptcy, unable to provide humans with peace. There are needs that are common to all humanity.

World government must not be a slave. It must be the master, and the State its servant. The notion of an army must be reduced to its true meaning, that of a police. Only this world police would be allowed to intervene and impose the sanctions of world rules. Many voices have been raised and have grown over the past 50 years, proof that the challenge is not utopian. (In Gillies 2003: 224)

The nation-states must be the “servants,” and the people of Earth “the master.” This principle is “not utopian,” but the most fundamental common sense. The *Earth Constitution* and the Provisional World Parliament have taken many concrete steps to accomplish just that: a common sense way to eliminate structural violence and found a system that institutionally embodies peace, which can only mean effective democracy at the planetary level.