

Revolutionary Democracy

Glen T. Martin

(forthcoming 2008, copyright 2008)

Chapter 9. The Peace and Nonviolence Foundations

The Immorality of Military Service and Violence and the Institutionalization of Peace

Contents of Chapter:

[9.1. The Kantian Principle of Moral Autonomy](#)

[9.2. Military Service Is Both Contradictory and Immoral](#)

[9.3. The Nation-state System as Inherently Terrorist](#)

[9.4. Terrorism as a Criminal Act or an Act of War?](#)

[9.5. The Nation-state System as Institutionalized Violence](#)

[9.6. The Philosophy of Nonviolence and World Law](#)

[9.7. The Philosophical Principles Behind Institutionalized Peace](#)

[9.8. The Institutionalization of Peace](#)

9.1. The Kantian Principle of Moral Autonomy

Moral growth is growth in autonomy. Unless an individual can legislate universal principles for themselves on the grounds expressed so well and consistently by Noam Chomsky, Alan Gewirth, Immanuel Kant, and others, that appeal to "moral rules" is merely conventional and socially conformist.

The principle as expressed by Chomsky has two aspects to it: (1) Universality: apply the same standards to others as you apply to yourself. If moral principles are appealed to at all, they must be universalized so that all persons or groups are measured equally by the same norm. (2) Persons or groups are responsible for the likely consequences of their actions.

The second of these principles is not necessarily a utilitarian principle in contradiction to the so-called "deontological" first principle. Kant, who first formulated these principles in an explicit and systematic way, never says that we should not consider the consequences of our actions when we act according to a universalized maxim of a proposed action. Of course we should. Every reasonably considered action will include necessarily an evaluation of action and its consequences together. It would be absurd to assert the morality of an action blindly performed regardless of any deleterious consequences that might reasonably ensue.

When Kant says that the morality of an action is assessed in terms of its faithfulness to the categorical imperative alone, he means that the source of the rightness of an action is not dependent on some estimate of consequences. For moral obligation is an absolute command of reason in the present. What Kant wishes to avoid is the loss of the "categorical" character of moral principles to some morass of vague calculations of possible consequences. A morally alive person experiences absolute imperatives best summed up in the general principle: "Always do what is right regardless of your inclinations."

The formal principles by which we try to decide what is right in a complex world, as presented by Kant, have overlapping similarities and differences that attempt to give us an insight into the categorical imperative for human life. But the main idea is that the maxim of my proposed action: "Can I make a universal principle that everyone act as I propose to act in this situation?" necessarily involves a rational estimate of consequences of the action. It would be absurd and bizarre if it did not.

Kant gives four versions of the categorical imperative to describe a range of ways the absolute obligation in human life can be understood and formulated. The first is the "formula of universal law" that Kant immediately reformulates as the "formula of the law of nature." The three examples that Kant gives to illustrate the operation of this principle (whether to commit suicide, whether to borrow money and pay it back, and whether to cultivate a natural talent) all involve a rational estimate of the consequences of the proposed action. It could not be otherwise. Kant's only point is that the universalization of a conception of a proposed action *and its likely consequences* must give us an absolute (categorical) imperative to do nor not to do the action. The principle of utility by itself omits this "absolute command" dimension of morality. [footnote: see my critique of Habermas' principle of universalization use

of Kant's moral ideas for a critique of Habermas on precisely these grounds]

This idea is borne out in the second formulation of the Categorical Imperative, the formula of the end in itself: "Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end." In other words, always treat persons as ends in themselves, never merely as a means. Here again we find Kant's main point that moral principles are categorically commanded. The principle of utility cannot generate this fundamental aspect of morality.

This principle would be nonsense if we could not reasonably predict the consequences of our actions as part of assessing the maxim of our proposed actions. If a World Bank economically exploits another country to the point where the economy of that country collapses and desperate, starving people descend into social chaos and civil war, then neither in the first place have I acted morally. For economically exploiting people violates the principle of treating them as ends in themselves. Nor have I acted morally in the second place. For the likely consequences of my actions are implicit in the principle of exploitation by which I operated in the first place.

The third formulation of the categorical imperative is the "formula of autonomy" in contrast to all principles that appeal to "heteronomy," that is principles that require a certain self-interest to be valid. Kant says that the only valid moral laws are laws that are legislated by each of us as a rational being and yet at the same time are universal. He remarks that the failure to discover the foundation of moral principles throughout the history of philosophy lies precisely in that no thinker ever identifying this principle of autonomy as the basis of valid moral law.

Any moral law or principle deriving from a "heteronomous" source, that is, a source outside the rational self, is compromised because the self requires incentives, some form of self-interest, to be induced to obey it. One of the greatest 20th century philosophers, Ludwig Wittgenstein, agrees with the insight that Kant is attempting to evoke in his readers. Wittgenstein says: AAs soon as one gives me a command that this or that is right to do, my first thought is "What if I disobey it?"

This underlines exactly Kant's point. To obey a heteronomously imposed rule or command, I require some incentive, something that appeals to my self interest, for example, the approval of my community, the fear of punishment by the legal system, or some reward in heaven or fear of hell. But precisely these do not make the command right. What can be the source of this rightness?

If it is God, then we have an anthropomorphically conceived God who, like a stern (or loving) father, gives moral commands. But to obey these commands because they are right in themselves means I have to affirm (legislate) this rightness for myself and act because it is right to do so and not for the motive of some reward (e.g., pleasing God, avoiding hell, or winning heaven). Kant's point is that the only valid source of an absolute command must be my own affirmation of this as an absolute command, worth doing because I affirm its intrinsic rightness. If what God commands is by definition right, then I affirm that rightness (objectively universalize the commands) myself and follow these commands because they

are right, nor for some external reward or fear of punishment. This is what Kant means by "autonomy." There can be no valid external source of moral laws unless I rationally affirm the law as valid by legislating it for myself (independently).

In addition the law is only valid if I recognize it as objectively valid independent of any interest I might have in acting according to my proposed maxim. The issue raised by Habermas and others as to whether Kant is unnecessarily a "dualist" who ascetically excludes any self-interest from morality misses the main point. An objectively valid principle may or may not coincide with my interests. But its objective validity can obviously never rest on my interests or even consider my interests, for, if it did so, it would no longer be universal (equally applicable to all). Universality requires autonomy, that is, exclusion of all self-interest in the affirmation of the moral rightness of a law.

This is what gives human beings the exalted status of ends in themselves (that is, intrinsic dignity beyond all price), precisely our ability as rational beings to exclude self-interest from our evaluation of moral principles. If we only acted wholly or partially from self-interest, we would be merely creatures of opportunity, chance, taste, or whim. But we have the capacity in principle to legislate objective universal laws. Thus each human being is more than an empirical creature pursuing its own interests. We are each vehicles of objectively valid, universal moral laws.

There is no need to attribute some superhuman power to persons with regard to the formula of autonomy. There is no need to point out that it may be next to impossible for the ordinary person to exclude all interest from his or her actions. The point is that each of us can and often does make the distinction between our subjective tastes, needs, and inclinations and what we can meaningfully affirm as morally objectively valid. Every normal person can distinguish his or her feelings, needs, and inclinations from what that person takes to be objectively right. Since we can do this in principle, the possibility of doing this in practice in any particular moral legislation is always there. As long as we are aware of this possibility (by distinguishing our own subjectivity from what might be objectively valid) then our dignity as human beings (who have the capacity to legislate objective moral laws for themselves) is assured.

The fourth formulation of the Categorical Imperative is the "formula of the kingdom of ends." If we abstract from the personal differences of persons and from their multiplicity of private ends, we are left with all human beings as ends in themselves. Insofar as all human beings have the dignity of being able to universalize the maxims of their actions under the idea of objectively right principles, then human beings are the same in their dignity, as ends in themselves. From this arises the idea of a systematic union of ends in themselves, the idea of a kingdom or society where people treat one another as ends in themselves, never merely as means.

The idea of a kingdom of ends is a necessary aspect of the concept of the categorical imperative because implied in morality is the idea of other people (as well as oneself) as ends in themselves. Morality implies a kingdom, a society. This society is a universal (world) society insofar as all human beings share the same dignity. As a society legislation must be enacted, positive laws must be formed

that maximize the freedom of each person (and hence enable autonomy) insofar as this is consistent with the freedom (and autonomy) of every other person.

Nation-states and local governments may legislate for their localities, but if they claim a sovereignty that allows recognition of no law above themselves then they are in violation of the universality of the societal categorical imperative (the kingdom of ends) that commands universal legislation applying equally to all persons everywhere. Only democratic world government can universalize the principle that all persons are ends in themselves and end the absurdity that protection of human dignity ends at some arbitrarily drawn political border that asserts "Over this line persons are no longer protected by our democratic constitution." There is no such legitimate line for the absolute social imperative is the command that all persons be subject to universally legislated democratic laws and have their rights equally protected before that law.

9.2. Military Service Is Both Contradictory and Immoral

Military service involves training in blind obedience. This training is the core of military service and secondary to training in working with others to kill those designated as "the enemy" and destroy their homes, properties, and life-support systems. Human beings in civilian life are ordinarily somewhat slack in their personal habits. In the military they receive training in "discipline." But the core of this disciplinary training is the absolute, blind obedience to the orders of commanders. In the military form of social organization, training must necessarily be this way, for the military must (1) maximize efficiency in the destruction of people and property and (2) condition its soldiers to do things and endure hardships they would not ordinarily dream of doing or enduring in civilian life.

We have seen above that the fundamental principle of morality is the universalization of the maxim of one's proposed action (a maxim that includes a reasonable estimate of the likely consequences of the action). The ability to do this is the fundamental source of our dignity as human beings. This ability is called "autonomy," the capacity to distinguish my needs, interests, and inclinations from what is right. Human beings are human because they are an ends in themselves through participating in this moral dimension of human life. To use someone, to treat them solely as a means, is to dehumanize them. To turn them into a thing, rather than respect them as persons with dignity.

Military service violates every principle in this paragraph and therefore is an utterly immoral occupation, set of activities, or way of life. First, it violates the principle of autonomy. If my dignity as a person derives from my ability to legislate (or affirm) universal moral principles and act on them, the military makes this nearly impossible. If I am trained and constrained to blindly obey orders, then I have given up my moral autonomy as a human being. I am dehumanized and demeaned.

Secondly, the blind obedience to orders is necessarily within a context in which only the few on top in the military know the strategy and intent behind the conflict. Soldiers are denied the ability to estimate

the likely consequences of their actions. They are trained simply to do what they are told (kill and destroy or aid and abet those who kill and destroy) in the dark, so to speak. Their ability to rationally assess their actions both in terms of universalizing principles and estimating the likely consequences of actions is removed from participants in military organizations. Hence, they are dehumanized and debased as human beings.

Third, soldiers are reduced to being used solely as a means for other people's (the commanders and those who command the commanders) purposes. To live a life under the command of others, where one blindly obeys orders, is to allow someone else to turn you into a thing, a mere instrument of someone else's purposes. This is a moral impossibility for human beings. The principle of autonomy demands first and foremost that we take responsibility for ourselves. Each of us is a morally responsible center of action and our very humanity demands that we focus on our duties (our self-legislated moral obligations) in contradistinction to our inclinations. Military life makes this impossible. Moral decision-making is taken out of the hands of soldiers who must blindly obey orders. Soldiers are dehumanized as mere things. They have abdicated their dignity as human beings.

Fourth, the principle of morality (the categorical imperative) allows us to recognize that all persons are ends in themselves. All persons have an immeasurable dignity in virtue of being persons. To be part of an organization which has as its effective goal the destruction of persons and their life-support systems is to make every aspect of one's life immoral. Every statement of inalienable human rights includes the principles of Article 3 of the U.N. Universal Declaration: "every person has the inalienable right to life, liberty, and security of person."

One might attempt to make arguments for the death penalty or for the right to take a life in immediate self-defense if one is attacked. Under very limited and special circumstances, one might argue, individual persons can give up their inherent dignity by their actions. But there can be no argument for dropping bombs from airplanes, for launching missiles against some "target" that one does not see, or for destroying the life-support systems of entire groups of people. Similarly there can be no argument for being a non-combatant military person aiding and abetting those who do kill. Obviously, among groups targeted by any military action there may be one or some (such as children) who have not given up their right to be treated as ends in themselves by their actions. If there is even a chance of there being such persons at the other end of one's lethal actions (and in war this is always the case), then all military actions and involvement with military organizations is immoral.

Even supposing one could make the case that a human life could be taken, for example, by the state in the case of the death penalty, the argument would logically require a description of due process of law to which accused persons are entitled. Because the taking of the life of someone considered an end in themselves is so serious, a rigorous process of trial by jury, careful weighing of evidence, and right of the person to counsel, access to medical care and family, and other aspects reflecting the seriousness of the proposed action (taking of a human life) must be required.

But war and the military dispense with all of this. In the military, commanders have expertise precisely

in eliminating due process and respect for the intrinsic dignity of persons considered "the enemy" in favor of strategy and tactics for killing people and destroying their life-support systems. In the military, the object is to cause pain and suffering to a perceived enemy until that enemy (in virtue of many deaths and much destruction) capitulates. Military training and organization necessarily ignores human beings as ends in themselves. It could not be any other way. This is the reason Kant referred to the de facto state of war among sovereign nations "barbaric" and "savage." War and military organization, that supports it or engages in it, are necessarily immoral, that is, "barbaric" and "savage."

On these four grounds, then, at the very least, military service is both contradictory and immoral. In terms of the arguments in this book for democratic world law, it should be clear that one absolutely serious imperative behind the demand for democratic world law is the need to eliminate war and militarism from human affairs entirely. It is not only the survival of the human race in the face of possible nuclear war or other weapons of mass destruction that is the basis of the argument. It is the simple fact that war and militarism constitute a moral scourge in human existence that commands all of us to work for a democratic world government in which these become legally impossible.

That the *Earth Constitution* abolishes war and all military is not a contingent matter. All design, production, testing, possession, transport, and use of weapons of war is illegal under the Provisional World Parliament and will be the same under the Earth Federation. The abolition of war and the securing of disarmament is one of the six broad functions for which the Earth Federation is created as specified in Article 1 of the *Earth Constitution*. War is logically and morally remiss. Neither war nor military preparation and service should exist. Both are institutionalized violations of human dignity and personhood.

The Earth Federation rightly makes all activities related to war and militarism illegal with stiff penalties, under due process of law, assigned to those convicted of violating these statutes. In doing so it raises the human project into a higher order of existence, into a new era in human history. The barbarism and savagery of military institutions is abolished from the Earth forever. Human institutions are premised for the first time on universal moral foundations.

One of the greatest 20th century philosophers, Ludwig Wittgenstein, agrees with the insight at Kant is attempting to evoke in his readers. Wittgenstein writes:

I can only describe my feeling by the metaphor, that, if a man could write a book on Ethics which really was a book on Ethics, this book would, with an explosion, destroy all the other books in the world. Our words used as we use them in science, are vessels capable only of containing and conveying meaning and sense, natural meaning and sense. Ethics, if it is anything, is supernatural and our words will only express facts; as a teacup will only hold a teacup full of water and if I were to pour out a gallon over it.

[http://www.galilean•library.org/witt_ethics.html]

9.3. The Nation-state System as Inherently Terrorist

(This subsection was first published in *Culture and Quest: Issue on Violence, Nonviolence, and World Peace*, Kolkata, India: ISISAR, 5 January 05, pp. 53-58)

The deeper assumptions behind our institutions and world order remain unquestioned and unthought by even highly educated people. If humankind is to survive much longer we must examine these unquestioned assumptions. The basic presuppositions guiding our institutions thwart the best intentioned actions and efforts to achieve a peaceful and just world order. People commit their life-energies to peace and the result is violence, war, and terror. People work to eradicate poverty, misery, and disease and the result is ever deepening poverty, misery and disease.

Nearly all people wish to eradicate terrorism, yet terrorism continues to grow and flourish within and between nations and groups. Without a deeper level of thought, without deep insight and understanding into what one thinker called “the perversity of what is perverted,” we continue to rush headlong toward ever greater planetary disaster. What are the deeper assumptions behind our present world order that foment the terrorist mentality and terrorist forms of organization?

Today books and articles pour forth about terrorism, its causes and consequences. Conferences are held, governmental agencies formulate definitions, systems of monitoring and investigation are formed. Yet terrorism continues to increase. People in general lack a sense of security, peace, and well-being. They live in terror, in fear, regardless of whether they have had any direct experience of terrorism. Yet we will see that the foundations of a peaceful and secure world order are entirely within our grasp if we correctly diagnose the causes and remedies for world terrorism.

The 1999 FBI definition of terrorism can serve as a working definition for understanding this phenomenon. Terrorism, according to the FBI, is “the unlawful use of force or violence committed by a group or individual, who has some connection to a foreign power or whose activities transcend national boundaries, against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population or any segment thereof, in furtherance or political or social objectives.” The essential points of this definition are that terrorism is (1) connected with violence or the threat of violence that transcends national boundaries and (2) it is the “unlawful” use of violence to achieve political or social objectives.

One important principle that astute thinkers have pointed out repeatedly in our time is the distinction between non-governmental forms of terrorism and state-sponsored terrorism. We have come to understand that nation-states also engage in terrorism. It becomes more and more difficult to distinguish between private terrorism and terrorism routinely engaged in by nation-states. Military violence or the threat of violence by nation-states fits this FBI definition perfectly. The use of military power to achieve international political objectives in a world of isolated “sovereign” nation-states is inevitable in a world where there is no true, enforceable world law.

As the issue of terrorism continues to be discussed, the history of interventions by the imperialist powers has come to light. One discovers a history of interventions, surprise bombings, assassinations, support for death squads, overthrowing of small nations, subversion of democracy, mining of harbors, blowing up of facilities, covert actions, drug smuggling, torture, arbitrary execution of political enemies, and outright warfare.

Under the world system of the past five centuries, all imperial nations have engaged in such terrorism. Author William Blum describes this process with respect to the United States: “From 1945 to the end of the century, the United States attempted to overthrow more than 40 foreign governments, and to crush more than 30 populist-nationalist movements struggling against intolerable regimes. In the process the U.S. caused the end to life for several million people, and condemned many millions more to a life of agony and despair” (2000, p. 2). The selling of weapons to foreign regimes, the training and equipping of foreign military machines, and outright military interventions in foreign countries, all of which have been major policies of the U.S. throughout this period in order to politically manipulate or control the world order in its own interests, fit perfectly this FBI definition of terrorism.

Indeed, since the advent of the United Nations there have been some 150 wars resulting in some 25 million deaths. Most of these deaths were civilians. Compared to this, the number of people killed by non-governmental terrorists through car bombings, suicide bombings, assassinations, etc., is minuscule. Why is it that the vast preponderance of the terror of our world throughout the past fifty years has come from state terrorism, not private terrorism?

The majority of countries in the U.N. have called for study of the basic causes of terrorism, convene conferences on terrorism to define it and differentiate it from the [legitimate] struggles of people for national liberation. The U.S. has vetoed such actions by the U.N. for the obvious reason that its own unlawful and violent foreign policy to achieve global political objectives would be exposed and condemned by such conferences. Nevertheless, much excellent work has been done on the causes and conditions that foster terrorism.

The causes of private terrorism are often identified as extreme poverty, exploitation, imperial domination, and the humiliation that nations, groups, or religions impose on others. The terrorists think of themselves as being in a war against such forces. State terrorism is often understood in the literature as being the mirror of private terrorism, since it is the use of state military power to enforce a system resulting in extreme poverty for the majority, exploitation, domination, and humiliation. However, despite the important insights presented here, the real sources of terrorism lie deeper than this.

The real source of terrorism is the nation-state system itself, structured, as it is, to be inseparable from global monopoly capitalism. The modern system of nation-states first developed during the Renaissance at the same time the capitalist economic system developed in 15th century Italy. Some scholars define the “sovereign” nation-state as a political entity that has complete control over its internal affairs and complete independence with regard to other nation-states in its external affairs. The world today has about 190 of these territorial entities, all claiming to be “sovereign” and independent of all

the others. A moment's reflection reveals this system as not only extremely irrational but morally perverse as well.

None of these "sovereign" entities lives under the rule of law. None of them lives under democracy. None of them in effect recognizes the equality, rights, and sovereignty of peoples outside their borders, since any such principles can only be enforced within nations. So-called "international law" is not law but a misnomer, since it is not democratically legislated, it is not enforceable, and compliance with it is merely voluntary. Relations between "sovereign" nation-states are mere treaties, that is, voluntary, unenforceable agreements that can be renounced or subverted at any time the nations party to these treaties feel it is in their self-interest to do so.

Hence, even though some nations claim to be "democracies" within their borders, and to believe in "democracy" as the only legitimate form of government, their defense of this bizarre concept of "national sovereignty" shows this to be false. They do not want to live under the rule of democratically legislated law but want to be entirely "independent" in a lawless, chaotic world of "international relations." If we redefine "Sovereignty" to mean integrity and independence with respect to the internal affairs of a particular national territory under the rule of world law, then the concept becomes harmless. But "sovereignty" as external independence from any world law is the main root of our present terroristic world order.

With modern weapons systems the absurdity of this system has been underlined over and over again as intercontinental ballistic missiles have been developed capable of bringing nuclear weapons to any city on earth in the space of twenty minutes. Today, U.S. Trident nuclear submarines patrol the bottom of the oceans of the world, each submarine capable of launching nuclear warheads sufficient to destroy 123 cities worldwide, upon being given the order to do so. The criminal nature of this system, the consequence of the absurd system of sovereign nation-states, is surely apparent to anyone who cares to think objectively.

Under this system every nation is thought to have the right to militarize itself for "self-defense" purposes. Nearly all of these 190 entities, living in a lawless world, arm themselves to the utmost, costing their citizens a large portion of the wealth they produce and causing other nations to perpetually renew their armaments to keep up with the possible threat from other sovereign nations, all independent and claiming the right to operate as they please in their foreign affairs and internal affairs.

Under this system a nation can violate human rights within its borders with impunity. Indeed, the imperial nations, led by the U.S., have supported brutal, repressive regimes around the world in the interest of both international political struggles (e.g. against Communism) and creating, as they put it, "a stable investment climate." World private arms dealing and official government "military aid" to regimes perceived to be "friendly" amounts to many billions of dollars per year. All told, the world spends close to a trillion U.S. dollars per year on militarism and weapons, while less than half of this amount could provide clean water and sanitation for every person on the planet. This entire system of militarization amounts to violence or the threat of violence.

On the rare occasion that the nations of the world claim they perceive massive human rights violations within some sovereign nation, the only option in a world of sovereign nations is to attack the entire nation by sanctions, military, or both. Individuals within these nations who may be responsible cannot be arrested because so called “international law” is a collection of treaties among “sovereign” nations, not law enforceable over individuals. Hence, economic sanctions causing starvation and misery or outright war are integral to the system of sovereign nations defined as independence from all external world law.

For example, when the claim was made in 1998 that Yugoslavia was committing massive human rights violations (a claim never made against the official client states of the imperial powers whose human rights records were equally as bad or worse), the supposed suffering of the Yugoslav people from their government had to be compounded by militarily attacking them with cruise missiles and cluster bombs, destroying their factories, homes, and hospitals. In the FBI definition of terrorism, this was clearly the “unlawful” (between nations there is no genuine law) use of violence to achieve political or social objectives. Whether these objectives are thought to be noble is irrelevant, since all terrorists believe their objectives are noble. The nation-state system is nothing if not terrorist in its very foundations.

The international system of militarized violence is based on a false analogy that the propaganda machines of the imperial powers do not wish us to examine too closely. It is an analogy with the individual’s right of self-defense under the rule of law. Under democratically legislated law within nations, individuals and groups are prohibited from using violence against one another to achieve political or social objectives. Mechanisms such as arbitration, courts, the right of political participation, and freedom of expression are created by law to allow for the nonviolent adjudication of differences and the achieving of political or social goals.

If one is threatened or attacked, the law requires that citizens call the police or otherwise handle the provocation nonviolently. On the rare occasion that one’s bodily integrity, property, or life is threatened and it is impossible to call the police, then the law provides for “the right of self-defense.” Under these narrowly defined circumstances, it is legal to use violence or the threat of violence to protect oneself, one’s property, or family.

But to project this “right of self-defense” to the system of nation-states is entirely fallacious. For under the world system of “sovereign” nations, there is no rule of law, no democracy, and no police protection of nations, groups, or individuals. Without the rule of enforceable law in the world, we have nothing left but what the philosopher Immanuel Kant (1957) called the “savage” and “barbaric” condition of the world without the rule of law. Under the system of “sovereign” nations, the big nations do what they please and the weaker nations suffer. For under this system, each nation may decide for itself what constitutes legitimate self-defense and act accordingly.

Under the rule of law within nations, I may not machine-gun all the people in the next neighborhood, claiming self-defense, because I surmise they might some day attack or threaten me. The courts and enforceable laws decide what is legitimate self-defense and what is not. However, in

international affairs, there is no superior force (government and law) that can decide the legitimacy of any particular nation's claim to self-defense. The powerful do what they please and use the "self-defense" argument to justify whatever they perceive to be in their self-interest. That is why Kant called this an immoral system of "barbarism" and "savagery."

Even the very existence of a military organization within nations is a terrorist consequence of the present world system as the FBI definition quoted above makes clear. Nations create a military for self-defense. The very existence of these military organizations constitutes a "threat of violence" to other nations, saying that if you attack us we will use violence to defend ourselves. In a world without genuine law (which is inevitable under the system of "sovereign" nation-states) the existence of such militaries constitutes the threat of the use of violence to achieve political or social objectives, namely, the protection and preservation of this government vis-a-vis all other "sovereign" governments.

A world order without democratically legislated, enforceable law over everyone is inherently terrorist, that is, the use of violence or threat of violence to achieve political or social objectives is built into the system itself. As long as nations claim there that there can be no world law above themselves (because they are "sovereign") and as long as they claim the "right of self-defense" in a world without law, then the use of violence or the threat of violence to achieve political or social objectives is inevitable. It is built into the very system of lawlessness itself.

For several decades the World Constitution and Parliament Association has offered the world a practical alternative – the creation of nonmilitary, democratic world government under the *Constitution for the Federation of Earth*. The ascent to democratically legislated world law under this *Constitution* is not just another arbitrary possibility among the many peace proposals offered today by the U.N. and NGOs. For only democratic world government can move us beyond the "barbaric" and "savage" condition of international lawlessness and terrorism to a morally legitimate world of peace and security. There is no other option. Without the rule of democratically legislated enforceable law over all nations and individuals, we continue in the immoral mode of the rule of violence and the threat of violence to achieve political or social objectives.

Sentimental appeals to peace and respect for human rights like the Hague Appeal to Peace will not make a substantial difference. Neither will attempts to reform the U.N. achieve peace or put an end to terrorism. The U.N. charter is explicitly premised on the preservation of the system of sovereign nation-states. Treaties among sovereign nations controlling weapons of mass destruction or other militarized systems will not be successful. For none of these addresses the root cause of terrorism which is the system of "sovereign" nations itself. Only nonmilitary world government under the *Constitution for the Federation of Earth* can give us a world of peace.

For only democratic world government creates enforceable rights for all people and nations under the rule of law. We move out of the barbaric world system of the past four centuries which was predicated on the use of violence or the threat of violence in international affairs. We move forward to a new world order that is the only morally legitimate order. For the use of violence for reasons of self-defense is

only justifiable in extreme circumstances under the rule of democratically legislated laws with guaranteed due process, freedom of expression, and equal rights for all peoples and nations. No longer will there be the rule of power in world affairs but the rule of right, law, and due process.

There is no other way beyond terrorism, since terrorism is predicated on the lawlessness of a world order that abjures democracy, law, and universal human rights in favor of the rule of violence and the threat of violence. The present system of so-called “sovereign” nation-states is inherently terroristic. Terrorism can only be overcome through democracy and a democratic world order. Terrorism can only be overcome through ratification of the *Constitution for the Federation of Earth*.

9.4 Terrorism: a ‘Criminal’ Act or an Act of War?

One of the debates that the September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon engendered in the United States was whether a military response was appropriate to a criminal act. The government of the U.S. tended to treat these attacks as an act of war and correspondingly assumed it had a right to invade Afghanistan and latter Iraq as an act of self-defense on the grounds that the governments of these countries were connected in some way with the attacks. However, no nation-state had attacked the World Trade Center and Pentagon, and, even then, it was extremely doubtful that the governments of Afghanistan or Iraq had anything to do with the attacks. (I am discussing the dynamics of the nation-state system here and leave aside the important question of whether the government of the United States had secretly engineered and orchestrated these attacks for its own political purposes.)(foot)

Critics of this policy claimed that the attacks were a criminal act, not an act of war. They argued that a military response was both useless and ill-conceived. The proper response, they said, was for many national governments to work together to investigate, arrest, and prosecute those responsible for these terrible attacks. They argued that going to war would not only obscure the real issue, it might well create the emotional and political grounds for more such terrorist attacks in the future.

However, neither side pointed out that the grounds for attacks by nation-states (war) and the grounds for attacks by criminals (usually called terrorism) are built into the chaos of a world without democratic law applying to everyone. When there are disagreements among nation-states, there is no binding legal framework from which to adjudicate these disagreements. And there is no binding legal framework for holding national leaders legally accountable for their actions if they initiate war. For this reason, war is simply one option that autonomous nation-states have in their repertoire of strategies for pursuing their national interests in a lawless world vis-à-vis all other autonomous nation-states. War is normalized and built into the system of lawlessness that constitutes the present world order.

Groups within nations having the rule of law cannot go to war with other groups within these nations. The enforceable legal framework prevents this and if violence (even militarized violence) is perpetrated by some group, this is treated properly as a criminal act, as a violation of the legitimate rule of law within

the nation. War is only possible where the rule of law is lacking, that is in the legal vacuum between “sovereign” nation-states.

However, on these same grounds, the international forms of violence called “terrorism” cannot be readily labeled as “criminal acts.” A criminal act is a violation of the legitimate rule of law. But in the legal vacuum between “sovereign” nations there is no such thing as the legitimate rule of law. So-called international law has only the status of treaties among sovereign nations, that is voluntary agreements and promises that the signatories to the treaties will abide by what the treaties say. But voluntary promises, unenforceable and non-judicable, have little resemblance to law.

Morally, of course, both acts of terrorism by private groups and acts of war by national groups are reprehensible. So-called “just war theory” is an attempt to morally justify savagery and barbarism in the light of the absence of enforceable world law. Just-war theory, therefore, assumes as one of its premises the legitimacy of the system of sovereign nation-states and then argues about the conditions in which military action within the legal vacuum between these states is morally justifiable. It therefore fails to recognize that the nation-state system itself is morally reprehensible; that is, the nation-state system is a violation of the universal obligation of human beings to live under the rule of democratically legislated, enforceable laws.

Just war theory assumes a morally reprehensible framework (sovereign nation-states) and works from there to try to justify the savagery and barbarism of human beings slaughtering one another in defense of this system (e.g., one sovereign nation has attacked another and morally the victims have the right to self-defense). The hypocrisy of the nation-states in their use of this theory to justify any and all acts of war is testimony to its uselessness and lack of viability as a moral theory. A legal vacuum such as exists between sovereign nation-states, tends to engender immoral and morally criminal behavior. Just-war theory gives the moral criminals governing nations a justification and a cover for their criminal activities.

Similarly, international terrorism cannot readily be labeled as a “criminal act” in any legal sense of this term, for between the nation-states there is no democratically legislated, enforceable world law. Those who perpetrate organized violent attacks face no laws by which they can be defined as criminals, investigated, arrested, and brought to justice with due process of law. That is why international terrorism and war are not clearly distinguishable from one another and that most acts of war are simply a form of international terrorism: state terrorism.

Within nation-states, if violent attacks occur and the perpetrators are identified, they cannot easily be arrested by national civilian police (the only legitimate form of police in today’s world). However, for internationally organized attacks, national police have to be working with other national police from other countries (the victim countries) who have no jurisdiction outside their home country. Hence, there must be voluntary cooperation to investigate and arrest foreign nationals who are said to have violated the laws of some other country. In practice such investigation and arrest is often done by militarized security forces who are not legitimate police (Mossad, MIA, CIA, Special Forces, etc.) and who are not bound by canons of due process that are due all suspects in criminal cases.

Rather, in practice (since such practice is inevitable in the face of the lawlessness between nation-states) suspects are simply killed, illegally arrested, kidnapped, secretly tortured, or otherwise subjected to the same barbarism and savagery of which they are suspected. The rule of civilized law requires that fundamental human rights to proper arrest, investigation, and due process of law be applied to every suspect does not apply in this legal no-man's land. The perpetrators of terrorist violence are no more criminal than those who pursue them beyond the law in the international arena.

The lawlessness of the international arena not only spawns morally reprehensible criminal behavior with regard to political violence (terrorism). It fosters a host of horrendous activities that would be criminal under any system of democratically legislated law. The world sex-trade, a major component of which is sex-slavery, is a multi-billion dollar activity.(foot) The sale, exploitation, and slavery, of children is similarly a huge activity flourishing in legal vacuum between nations.

In *When Corporations Rule the World*, David Korten writes:

There are an estimated 500,000 child prostitutes in Thailand, Sri Lanka, and the Philippines alone. Millions migrate from their homes and families in search of opportunity and a means of survival. In addition to the 25 to 30 million people working outside their own countries as legal migrants, an estimated 20 to 40 million are undocumented migrant workers, economic refugees without legal rights and with little access to basic services. Some, especially women, are confined and subjected to outrageous forms of sexual, physical, and psychological abuse. (p. 29)

In addition, the world-wide drug trade also flourishes in this vacuum and is approached by those fighting "wars on drugs" in militaristic ways (poisoning people's crops, disappearing people, paramilitary attacks on suspected processing centers, etc.) that are just as morally criminal as those producing lethal drugs for international sale. The multi-billion dollar trade in black-market weapons similarly flourishes within this international legal vacuum, as does money-laundering, illegal off-shore banking, and other corrupt practices. Multi-national corporations capitalize on this chaos through destroying the environment, bribing local officials, violating the human rights of their employees, and employing their own criminalized security forces in the pursuit of profit maximization.

The modern world has globalized in communications, travel, trade, and many other ways. Yet it has not globalized in terms of law, of a legitimate legal order applying to all persons guaranteeing due process and based on a regulative ideal of universal justice. In the legal vacuum created between nations created by this antiquated system, a huge panoply of morally criminal practices flourish. The rule of legitimate law is mocked and its legitimate ideal of civilized living is debunked and demeaned as citizens see before them a world of lawlessness and corruption acting with relative impunity.

This disastrous situation is a direct consequence of our collective failure to question the nation-state as the legitimate locus of the rule of civilized law. The nation-state is only legitimate as a bearer of the rule of law when it is federated with all other nations under democratic world law. Otherwise, the consequences of the monumental conceptual error is the morally reprehensive world of international criminal activity that we see before us today. Even the belief in the rule of law among decent men and women within

nations is undermined by this absurd system.

Law as we have seen in dozens of ways throughout this book is inherently universal. To voluntarily support fragmentation of the rule of law into dozens of sovereign entities with a yawning, abysmal legal vacuum among them spawning war, terrorism, drugs, sex-slavery, child-slavery, black market weapons sales, and the corruption of legitimate work and business through manipulation of this system is to wear the darkest intellectual and moral blinders. At this point in the twenty-first century there is little philosophical reason to continue to support this out-dated system that has its origins in a very different world of five centuries or more ago.

The self-determination of peoples is perfectly compatible with the universal rule of law. Indeed, it can be protected and legalized by an Earth Federation based on the principle of unity in diversity. Under the present system of fragmentation, self-determination is only for the militarily stronger peoples. The weaker succumb in a world of violent struggle and endless destruction. The inherently universal rule of law is only legitimately formulated when it protects individuals and groups who are smaller or weaker through rigorous systems of due process and justice. Such protection is manifestly impossible under the system of sovereign nation-states.

9.5. The Nation-state System as Institutionalized Violence

The relationship that exists between the wealthy imperial centers of the world (Japan, Western Europe, under the leadership of the United States) can be accurately described as one of imperialist plunder and institutionalized violence. We have seen that the system of sovereign nation-states is inherently a war system and a terror system. War and terror are not an incidental feature of the system but at its very core as explained above.

A large portion of the war and terror arising from the nation-state system involves the use of military forces and other forms of coercion to keep in place a global system of institutionalized violence connected with global economic domination and exploitation of poor peoples and nations by wealthy peoples and nations. We have seen that historically the capitalist classes in nation-states have worked to maintain their political power over the law-making process in order to ensure the laws and cooperation of sovereign nation-states in the process of global accumulation.

Social scientists Terry Boswell and Christopher Chase-Dunn describe the origins of this relationship between capital and the nation state:

The European interstate system was born in the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) in which massive bloodletting and destruction forced imperial dynasties to become states sovereign over nations in order to survive.... Class relations expanded beyond the labor process to become institutionalized in state, colonial, and interstate structures. A system of sovereign states (i.e., with an overarching definition of sovereignty) is fundamental to the origins and reproduction of the capitalist world economy.... In the interstate system, unequally powerful states compete for resources by

supporting profitable commodity production and by engaging in geopolitical and military competition.... Capital accumulation has always involved political power and coercion. (Boswell and Chase-Dunn, pp. 23-24)

Since the dawn of the modern world with the Spanish conquests of parts of the Caribbean and Central America, the nation-state has worked hand in hand with the drive for capital accumulation on the part of ruling classes. The system of unequal exchange, resulting in the poverty of the weaker nations and peoples, must necessarily be kept in place through coercion. For the very system that deprives people of their basic needs is a system of institutionalized violence. Boswell and Chase-Dunn write:

Capitalism is the accumulation of resources by means of exploitation in the production and sale of commodities for profit. Capitalist exploitation is an unequal exchange wherein capitalists extract income from economic exchanges solely because they hold legal title to productive assets. There are two types of exploitation – primary and secondary. Primary exploitation, which takes the form of profit, is an unequal exchange with labor wherein capitalists appropriate all the “value added” in production, net of wages, because they own the business in which production takes place....

Secondary exploitation, which takes the form of rent and interest, is an unequal exchange between the capital-rich and the capital-poor, including between wealthy and poor countries....

As a result, at all points of exchange in production, capitalists have institutionalized *coercive power* as employers, bosses, lenders, and landlords. Both Adam Smith and Karl Marx considered exploitation to be the application of coercive power in markets to obtain an unequal exchange. (pp. 20-21)

Coercive power in markets is a result of domination for the sake of exploitation. The social-scientific definition of this relationship is not difficult. John Roemer, in *A General Theory of Exploitation and Class*, argues that one class (S) can be said to be exploited by another class (S') whenever “(1) There is a feasible alternative state in which coalition S would be better off than in its present situation; (2) Under this alternative, coalition S' would be worse off than at present; (3) Coalition S' is in relationship of dominance to S. This dominance enables it to prevent coalition S from realizing the alternative” (1989, pp. 194-195).

“Dominance” means one group is in a position to prevent the second group from realizing alternative conditions. When nations have made a break for independence from the system of domination and exploitation (for example, Guatemala before 1954, Cuba in 1959, Chile in 1973, and Nicaragua in 1979), the governments leading this break have been overthrown, blockaded, or otherwise neutralized by the United States. Overt violence ensures the continuation of institutionalized violence. A similar process has been in place with every past hegemon, from Spain to Great Britain. Powerful sovereign nations work in tandem with their capitalist ruling classes to ensure the global system of exploitation remains in place.

The result is a world of immense poverty and suffering, kept in place both by coercive economic and political forces and by overt military interventions. In *When Corporations Rule the World*, former World Bank economist David Korten writes:

In 1950, about the time the commitment was made to globalize the development process, the average income of the 20

percent of people living in the wealthiest countries was about thirty times that of the 20 percent living in the poorest countries. But 1989, this ratio had doubled to sixty times.

Based on national averages, these figures represent disparities among countries and substantially understate the disparity among people. For example, all Americans are placed in the world's top income category, including the homeless, the rural poor, and the urban slum dwellers. When the UNDP estimated the global distribution based on individual incomes rather than on national averages, the average income of the top 20 percent was 150 times that of the lowest 20 percent. (p. 111)

In *Millennium Dawn*, I described this world situation drawing on the thought of Samir Amin:

Economist Samir Amin has identified five features or “monopolies” that characterized today’s capitalism, whose financial, commercial and productive markets now have a global reach: (1) monopoly over technology, chiefly through military research, (2) monetary control of worldwide financial markets, unprecedented in world history, (3) monopolistic access to the planet’s natural resources, (4) media and communication monopolies that have led to the “erosion of democratic practices in the West,” and (5) monopolies over weapons of mass destruction....

“Advanced” capitalism is not only the neoliberal economic doctrine that forces “structural adjustment” on people who already have next to nothing, privatizing, into the hands of global capital, the few remaining public services to which the poor have access. It is not only the doctrine of third-world debt that forces billions of dollars in debt on ordinary citizens of third-world countries who never borrowed the money in the first place. It is also these five global monopolies, described by Amin, in which control of the fate of our planet and its resources has passed into fewer and fewer hands in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. (MD, p. 228)

Brazilian theologian Dominique Barbe asserts with reference to the international debt that poor countries have been forced to incur to the wealthy lending institutions of first-world countries: “Yes! It is institutional violence. The cheap sale of raw materials, our natural wealth, has paid for the debt. We have enriched the countries of the First-world through financial groups operating in Brazil. This type of institutional violence kills millions of persons, many more than a world war.” (1989, p. 167) And Peter Marcuse writes:

Capital that has extended its influence over these new territories knows its own interests, works together in its common interests even while individual capitals compete [and] coordinates its goals and its strategies in its common interest.... There will always be social inequality, because that increases profits; winners win more because losers lose more. Keeping the Third World in dependence and poverty is not an accident or failure of the world capitalist system, but part of its formula for success. (“Letter from the German Democratic Republic,” *Monthly Review*, July/August 1990, p. 61, quoted in *Smith Economic Democracy*, pp. 20-21)

The point here is very important, since the ideology of capitalism in alliance with the nation-states claims the immense poverty in the world is the result of not enough capitalism, and that the well-known horror stories of entire societies economically collapsing are only incidental failures of the capitalist system. As economist J. W. Smith affirms:

Developed countries claim to be financing the developing world, but actually the poor countries are financing the rich through the wealthy world underpaying equally-productive developing world labor, paying far less than full value for natural resources, and through primarily investing in commodity production for the wealthy world. In this process,

between 1980 and 1990 – when measured against the dollar...”wage levels in Mexico declined by sixty percent...in Argentina by fifty percent and in Peru by seventy percent” and again that was before the 1997-98 collapse of developing world currencies reduced wages on the periphery of empire by half. The above appears to list IMF/World Bank/GATT/NAFTA/WTO/MAI/GATS/FTAA failures. However, they are not failures; they are the successes of financial and economic warfare. The prices of developing world commodities are lowered while the prices of developed world products are retained, siphoning every more wealth to the corporate imperialists. (2002, p. 20)

The “corporate imperialists” work hand in globe with imperial governments to create what the U. S. State Department refers to as a “stable investment climate,” often by supporting brutal dictatorships in third-world countries. Political and military violence is used to protect the massive institutionalized violence of enforce poverty and deprivation for the majority of humanity. The world system under sovereign nation-states is “financial and economic warfare.” The result before us constitutes its success, not failure.

Jurgen Moltmann describes this “structural violence” in the following way:

There are political and economic structures which are unjust because they are used to enforce the domination of human beings over human beings, the exploitation of human beings by human beings, and the alienation of human beings from one another. Within these structures, violence is practiced, not directly and personally, but indirectly, by way of laws and prices. Through structures of this kind, violence is legitimated. Through them, violent death is spread. Today impoverishment, debt and exploitation spread misery, disease and epidemics, an hence premature death, among the weakest of the weak in the Third-world. The mass death of children in Africa is just the beginning. There, the number of people dying a violent death through structural violence is greater than the number of soldiers killed by military violence in the great world wars. (1996, p. 95)

Just as the nation-state system is inherently terrorist and inherently a war-system, so the nation-state system as we have known it for four centuries is inherently structurally violent. Absolute fragmentation under the concept of sovereign territories can have no other result, since, as we saw above, such fragmentation places the nations in “a state of nature,” a condition in which there is no law but only the rule of the most powerful and a perpetual competition for power with its spoils in the form of controlling the sources of wealth in one’s own interests.

However unlike Hobbes, Kant, and other thinkers who think of this state of nature as the system of war between sovereign nations, it is now clear that it is much more than that. The primary competition among sovereign nations is over wealth, as J.W. Smith has demonstrated at length in *Economic Democracy*. Nations and their corporations vie for control of the wealth-producing process in relation to weaker countries (including control of production, services, natural resources, trade relations, and financial interactions). The modern world system has always had a periphery of poverty organized around several successive imperial centers, the last, since World War Two, has been the United States.

Only democratic world law, enforceable over individuals, can bring us out of this system of “savagery” and “barbarism.” It is not only war that is savage and barbaric, but the system of domination and exploitation marginalizing and impoverishing vast portions of the world’s population. Only world law can legislate an economic system that will ensure the welfare of all: a system directed

toward universal equity and prosperity instead of the present system of absolute winners and losers. This legislation by a World Parliament must be enforceable by civilian controlled world police and attorney generals. Only through genuine unification in relation to diversity can we free our planet from these disastrous consequences of fragmentation.

“Enforceable world law” here by no means connotes a new regime of violence to be substituted for the old. For a system of world laws, democratically legislated for the true welfare and common good of all persons on Earth, can be effectively enforced through non-violent methods. To see how this can be the case, we must first briefly examine the basic premises of the philosophy of nonviolence.

9.6 The Philosophy of Nonviolence and the Rule of Law

(This subsection was first published as part of Chapter Six of *World Revolution Through World Law*, IED Press, 2005.)

The philosophy of nonviolence that has been developed through much of the twentieth century has made an indispensable contribution to all theories of legitimate revolutionary 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.

Neither Mahatma Gandhi nor most of the subsequent philosophers of nonviolent revolutionary 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, p. 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 spirit of humanity that is within us all. He affirms that nonviolence is the activation in us 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 (on *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 is a pragmatic and common sense understanding directed toward breaking the infamous "cycle of violence" that has characterized most human history to date. 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 dangerous people. The task is to deal practically with all these dangers without ourselves sinking into the cycle of violence and the corruption it entails. The task placed upon all of us is to deal with these dangers pragmatically while moving human civilization forward beyond the present nightmare of violence and corruption.

Legitimate social change within truly democratic societies, of course, is always necessarily nonviolent. Truly 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 as is explained in detail elsewhere in this volume) institutionalize empty forms of citizen participation as a propaganda mechanism for legitimating their power while in reality relegating decision-making to special power 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 democratically legislated 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 American philosopher John Dewey who argued that progress in democracy necessarily required a democratization of the sphere of economic decision-making as well as the sphere of politics (see Martin, 2004). 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 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, p. 118).

Nonviolence is the activation of universal moral values in every sphere of life, since it is premised on the foundation of all moral values that is the inviolable dignity of the human person. Those moral values that claim to respect this 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 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, p. 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, p. 112).

All militarism under the world system, like all terrorism, derives from the same undemocratic root as was explained in the above article "The Roots of Terrorism in the Sovereign Nation-state and a Path to a Secure World Order." Violence permeates nearly all the institutions of today's world as I also argued at length in Chapter Three of *Millennium Dawn* (2005). Most individual violence and private terrorist violence are consequences of, and reactions to, the pervasive institutionalized violence of modern nation-states. This is what is known as "blowback," a term made famous by both Chalmers Johnson (2001) and the CIA.

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 process in 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 world democracy for the first time in history. This necessarily entails not only activating citizen participation in governing but modifying global economics to one 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, p. 111).

The "Great Powers" can only achieve this if they are federated within democratic world government and subject to demilitarization and 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.

They can only achieve this if it is demanded by the people of Earth.

Gandhi introduced a resolution to a national committee in India on 5 August 1942 that read in part:

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, p. 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 and federated democratic government 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, p. 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" (1972, 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 would necessarily be a genuine democracy, since it would have to 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 ones 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, p. 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? Certainly. 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. 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 B 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, p. 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:

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" and that enemy's life-support systems.

But 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 agents of democratic world government "shall be equipped only with such weapons as are appropriate for the apprehension of the individuals responsible for violations."

Since a constitution is 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 they 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.

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 force is inherently undemocratic, since it is only necessary to secure an illusory protection or to enforce a system of imperial exploitation in a profoundly undemocratic world order. Its very existence destroys democracy and freedom both within and without individual nation-states (as we have seen elsewhere in this volume).

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. No democracy can be militarized and remain a democracy. That is why no nation claiming to be a democracy today is legitimate. Democracy within nations can only be realized when democratic world government has dealt with the global problems such as militarism and external threats that are beyond the scope of all nation-states (see Almand and Martin, 2005).

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.

They are required to respect the rights of all citizens and, as the slogan says, 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, which is the antithesis of all military force. A civilian

police force within a genuine democracy is mandated to use the minimum necessary force, and to make every effort to use nonlethal force.

The *Constitution* leaves it open for the World Parliament, after democratic dialogue and debate, to legislate what weapons are acceptable for the World Police. But it makes sense that these weapons would be more and more *nonlethal* as technology in nonlethal weaponry advances. Stun guns, propelled body nets, non-lethal darts, and other technology of nonlethal weaponry yet to be developed will likely become the stock and trade of the World Police.

A civilian police force within a framework of real democratic justice, respect for individual rights, and freedom will be mandated 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.

The *Constitution* also leaves it 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 will serve as guidelines, suggestions, 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 ones self and loved-ones if a person lacked the courage 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. So we may be assured that weapons of war will continue to be illegal everywhere on Earth (as they are now under provisional world law) once the established World Parliament is activated. 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 nonlethal 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 essay, 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.

As Gandhi made clear, if we create real democracy on Earth, and real economic justice and prosperity on Earth, we will have institutionalized nonviolence. With today's system of militarized "sovereign" nation-states and vast disparities between extreme wealth and extreme poverty, we have pervasive 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 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 in Chapter Two 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 they 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 ourselves 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, p. 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, "Dorr'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 revolutionary movements developing an alternative government to replace 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.

The World Police under the Earth Federation will be truly servants and protectors of the people as this passage states. Nonviolence is therefore institutionalized within both the *Constitution* and Provisional World Law. This is practical and common sense 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.

It is action in the service of authentic democracy, which is necessarily nonviolent to every extent possible, and it is 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 revolutionary strategy to realize a truly new and revolutionary goal: a nonviolent world democracy of justice, freedom, equality, and peace.

9.7 Philosophical Principles Behind the Institutionalization of Peace

In sections 1 and 2 of this chapter 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 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.

These principles are also 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 affirmation that makes them valid and is the reason why they cannot come from any heteronomous source. As we say above, it 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 systems of institutionalized violence and war.

It is this inviolability of all human beings that is at the heart of the philosophy and practice of nonviolence. Above we have seen some of the principles that Mahatma Gandhi elaborates the principles behind *satyagraha*: the “clinging to truth” or “soul force” at the heart of nonviolence. 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 spirituality 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.

The second principle of nonviolence action is that it is 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 might well 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 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, not military or some other “victory,” then conflicts can be dealt with effectively rather than repressed or covered up.

Fourth, nonviolence involves voluntary suffering (*tapasya*) whereas military action attempt 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, etc. Although among advocates of the *Earth Constitution* it is controversial whether to recognize a “right” of nonviolent civil disobedience, civil disobedience involving voluntary suffering is certain worthy of respect by government institutions.

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 is necessarily to deny their personhood and their rights to life, liberty, and security of person. 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.”

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 can do this insofar as it recognizes the inviolability of the human person and human rights. An absolute principle is premised in this commitment to inviolability 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. 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. It is that commitment that can be institutionalized. The prologue to the Article 12 Bill of Rights of the Earth Constitution makes this commitment and hence the commitment 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 government to control the wealth-producing process in their own interest at the expenses of the poor worldwide also control, own or influence the mass media in the imperial center. Just as imperial governments spew forth an ideology that justifies and covers up the domination and exploitation 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 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 own media, is not difficult to do. 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

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. These 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;

Conscious that humanity is One despite the existence of diverse nations, races, creeds, ideologies and cultures and that the principle of unity in diversity is the basis for 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 rights and responsibilities shall be shared by all without discrimination...

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.

9.8. 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. This can only be done through enforceable democratic world law. The institutionalization of peace under world government will require solving all the 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 in fact 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 crisis of our day make it clear that poverty can only be solved if the problem of the environment is 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) and consequences of the fragmented system of nation-states, so democratic world government must address all these aspects of the world order simultaneously in order to institutionalize peace.

The *Earth Constitution* founds the Earth Federation on the principle that the federation is “non-military” with ultimate sovereignty residing in the people of Earth. Military weapons and organization is illegal for the Earth Federation. This is and essential, not an incidental, feature of the *Constitution*. For the *Constitution* establishes peace (as Kant would put it). Peace, for the first time in history, is institutionalized. As Robert Holmes, quoted above, says, the aim is not to end conflict but to institutionalize non-destructive ways of dealing with conflict.

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. 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 still be militarized. However, under the *Constitution* it is not possible for the Federation to militarize in response to these threats. 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. 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 created the World Disarmament Agency as World Legislative Act Number 1 (WLA 1). The act criminalizes not only possession of WMDs but 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 progress has been made in this direction under the current world system, despite many attempts and many treaties, is because under the nation-states 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.

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 change 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 poverty is eliminated and the planetary environment also protected.

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, which is premised on the “sovereign integrity of its member nations”). The act also initiates a world-wide minesweeping operation for the millions of mines that plague the civilian populations of the Earth, establishes incentives for conversion of less lethal munitions, and administers the disbanding of military forces.

Similarly, WLA 26, passed at the eighth session of the Provisional World Parliament, 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 receiving 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*, study the development of a quality of life index, study of the requirements for world peace, study the development of a unity-in-diversity index, and similarly

the development of a good government index. In other words, students everywhere will be required to reflect on the *Earth Constitution*, on what unity in diversity means, on what constitutes a real quality of life (certainly not only material wealth), and on 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.

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. One of the provisions of 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 non-violent 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.

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 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 is what a peace system looks like and what a peace system means. It should be clear, in contrast, just how much the current world system is a war system and a system of violence. To institutionalize peace requires changing the premises of the system. The *Earth Constitution* and the Provisional World Parliament have taken many concrete steps to accomplish just that: to eliminate structural violence and found a system that structurally embodies peace.

[Back to Home Page](#)