

# IPSHU RESEARCH REPORT SERIES

RESEARCH REPORT No.4

ON THE POSSIBILITY OF NONVIOLENT  
POLITICAL SCIENCE

Glenn D. PAIGE  
Department of Political Science,  
University of Hawaii



THE INSTITUTE FOR PEACE SCIENCE,  
HIROSHIMA UNIVERSITY

Aug, 1979

Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University

1-1-89 Higashisendamachi, Hiroshima 730 Japan

RESEARCH REPORT No.4

ON THE POSSIBILITY OF NONVIOLENT  
POLITICAL SCIENCE

Glenn D. PAIGE

Department of Political Science,  
University of Hawaii

Si vis pacem, para bellum.  
(If you want peace, prepare for war).  
---Roman Maxim

If you point your cart north  
When you want to go south,  
How will you arrive?  
---Zen Master Ryokan

Science itself is not a liberator.  
It creates means, not goals. . . .  
We should remember that the fate of mankind  
hinges entirely upon man's moral development.  
---Einstein

The author expresses gratitude to the magazine *Shinshiten* and to the Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University, for the encouragement and support to write this essay in the summer of 1978.

## TOWARD A NONVIOLENT 21ST CENTURY

The time has come for global humanity decisively to cast off the chains of violence that have enslaved us mentally and materially since the beginning of history. The generations born after 1945, who will be growing into positions of mature responsibility at the dawn of the 21st century, have a special responsibility for contributing to the nonviolent transformation of global life. The task of every generation not born to war is to further liberate humanity from its horrors. Whereas in the past it might have been "heroic" to kill in obedience to political authority, the heroes of the future will be honored for exactly the opposite behavior. Refusing to kill, they will be commended for demonstrating the greater courage of dedicating their lives nonviolently to serve humanity. Political violence, assassinations, wars, and revolutions, have become too barbarous for victory to be heroic.

When the post-1945 generations pass from the stage of history, let it be said that they arrived in the most violent century in human experience, and departed leaving a legacy of the most nonviolent conditions hitherto created by the physical and mental labor of mankind. Let it be said that they understood violence more clearly than any previous generation, and liberated themselves more bravely from its

terrors than any army of the past.

The nonviolent liberation of global humanity is not a class monopoly. Nor is it the monopoly of any special elite or nation. It is a task in which all can and must share. But some may have greater responsibility. The greater the violence of the individual, group, organization, society, or nation, the greater its responsibility for nonviolent self-transformation to assist the nonviolent development of others. Conversely, the more nonviolent the human consciousness and material conditions, the greater the responsibility to assist others to become more nonviolent.

The central task of nonviolent global transformation at the dawn of the 21st century is not to make the oppressed more nonviolent in demanding political, economic, and social justice, but rather to assist the oppressors to relinquish and share wealth and power peacefully. What the world needs is a "class struggle" led by "Gandhians." We need nonviolent leaders in the forefront of all parties to the great conflicts that torment mankind at the end of the 20th century, including the struggles between "East and West," "North and South." To accomplish this we need to establish nonviolent zones for conflict resolution along class and national frontiers. There violent probabilities must be transformed into workable nonviolent alternatives.

The goal must be not to replace the violent dictatorship

of the oppressors with the violent dictatorship of the formerly oppressed, but to liberate both from fear of the violence of each other. The dialectic of human history must be transformed from the contradiction of violence against violence (+,+), through a transitional stage of nonviolence against violence (-,+), to a higher stage of completely nonviolent conflict resolution (-,-). This is the principal political task both within and between nations in the dark period between the twilight of the 20th century and the dawn of the 21st.

But against the nonviolent aspirations of the overwhelming majority of mankind marches the spectre of Hitler, inspiring dictatorships, glorifying violence, intensifying hatred, and justifying barbarism. In death, Hitler continues to kill. Both revolutionary socialism and counterrevolutionary liberal capitalism prepare to fight each other in the name of Hitler's ghost. We must liberate ourselves from his influence. We cannot kill him because he is already dead. If we insist on killing others because we fear him, we now risk intentional or accidental global genocide. If we kill the Hitler who lives on in us by violence we commit global suicide.

It is better that we liberate ourselves nonviolently. The revolutionary answer to Hitler is not that we should be prepared to be more brutal in retaliation for any manifes-

tation of brutality, but rather that we should become so nonviolent in our behavior that no leader such as Hitler, and no leader invoking the spectre of Hitler to justify violence, could possibly gain our support. Without followership no form of leadership is possible. Therefore the key to nonviolent political power lies in removing support from violence and attaching it to nonviolent alternatives.

Another obstacle to be overcome in the nonviolent transformation of global life is structural violence and the proviolent theory that justifies behavioral violence to change unjust structural relationships. According to this theory economic injustice kills more human beings than revolutions and wars; therefore the latter are justified to rectify the former. The counter-argument is that structural violence cannot be maintained without behavioral violence; therefore an end to behavioral violence will bring an end to economic injustice. Without reinforcement by killing force, unjust structures must change. Therefore, nonviolent politics is incompatible with violent structures, whereas behavioral violence produces structural violence.

With the rise of serious nonviolent political thought a sharp polemical refutation can be expected from spokespersons for the various proviolent political traditions. It will be argued that only violence is "realistic." In the year A.HN. 34 (the 34th year after the atomic bombing of

Hiroshima and Nagasaki), when a nuclear missile can be fired by a single individual from the shoulder like a rifle, it is doubtful that violence is "realistic." Past realism has become unreal. The logic of violence has entered a zone in which the greatest realism is nonviolence as well as the greatest idealism. Politically it has become realistic to be idealistic.

Each of the arguments in favor of human violence and counterviolence must be carefully considered. Nonviolent alternatives must be convincingly demonstrated. If the roots of violence are in human biology, then we must understand and change them. If they are in the psychodynamics of family socialization, we must alter them. If they are in inequitable economic structures, we must rectify them. If in proviolent cultures, we must create nonviolent alternatives. If in proviolent political institutions, we must transform them. Since violence is the product of multiple causation, a multi-causal theory of nonviolent transformation is to be expected.

Nevertheless the basic moral position from which to realize a nonviolent society is a very simple one: I will not kill a fellow human being. I will withdraw material and moral support from those who kill or threaten to kill. I will work positively for the creation and implementation of nonviolent alternatives to satisfy human needs, to resolve conflicts, and to realize human aspirations.

But although the moral basis of nonviolent behavior is very simple, like all great truths, the task of splitting the violent atom to create a nonviolent force of unprecedented global influence will require an extraordinary combination of skills. These include humane imagination, basic science, applied science, resource mobilization, and disciplined human organization, expressed in skillful leadership and followership to translate knowledge into nonviolent action. Gandhi has already observed that although it takes a high degree of intellect to be violent (consider the human intellect mobilized to bomb Hiroshima and Nagasaki), it will require even higher levels of intellect to be nonviolent. For example, consider what combination of nonviolent knowledge and action would have been required to prevent the United States from creating and dropping the first atomic bombs. And how might the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and of Japan as a whole, nonviolently have defended themselves against potential atomic attack?

In attempting to answer such questions we can sense intuitively that the time has come to advance beyond the "random experiments" of the great nonviolent individuals in history such as Buddha, Christ, Tolstoy, Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., and others. It is time to create a large-scale, global "Ahimsa Project" that would combine basic science, engineering, resources, and human organization with the same



dedication and effectiveness as the massive projects that detonated an atomic bomb 1850 feet above Hiroshima and later placed astronauts for the first time in history on the surface of the moon. Both were feats hitherto considered impossible.

The mission of the Ahimsa project would be to split the hate/death atom of political violence, to release unprecedented love/life energy, and to create a global diffusion process that would thoroughly eliminate political violence from the world. Such a project would require the brainpower of all the intellects that make up the modern university (humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, and professions) together with the understanding and support of all whose labor makes the work of universities possible.

A key component of such a project, and therefore of the nonviolent transformation of mankind, will be a nonviolent political science. But in order to cooperate in something like an "Ahimsa Project," political science *must liberate itself from violence.*

TOWARD NONVIOLENT POLITICAL SCIENCE:  
THE NEED FOR A MORAL "PARADIGM SHIFT"

For political science to become truly nonviolent it must undergo a moral "paradigm shift." That is, it must shift

from the assumption that political violence is not only empirically prevalent but morally justified, to a viewpoint that political violence is not morally justified and that even though it is empirically prevalent it is desirable that it be completely eliminated from social life. The question then becomes, "How would a political science that rejects violence differ from a political science that accepts violence?" Would it ask different kinds of theory, and seek different kinds of application and education? The answer to these questions, I believe, is "Yes."

Why should political science undergo such a moral paradigm shift? One answer is that moral evolution or development is possible in political life as well as material evolution. Slavery, once prevalent, is now almost unanimously rejected by mankind. Capital punishment, once widely employed for various crimes, is now being narrowed in its moral acceptability and in some societies already has been completely abolished. Although these value changes have empirical correlates, it is difficult to explain them other than as the result of human moral evolution.

Another reason for a moral shift to nonviolence can be found in the process of "cognitive dissonance reduction" described by the social psychologist Leon Festinger. In this theory, when perceived "fact" clash with our "values" we tend to do three things: (1) we change our values to conform

to the new facts, (2) we reinterpret the facts so as not to require any change in our previously held values, or (3) we escape from the distressful situation by denying or suppressing awareness of the discrepancy.

Let us apply this theory to the present world situation taking "peace," "economic equality," and "freedom," as values, and realities of violent global politics as facts. The empirical theory of conventional political science holds that peace, equality, and freedom can be created and maintained by the wide use of violence. But we observe the world and what do we see? The most violent nations (e.g., the United States, the Soviet Union, China, and other nuclear powers), are actually less secure militarily than at any time in their histories. All are potential victims of intended or accidental nuclear terror. In addition, conventional wars continue. There is greater global militarization than in any previous historical period.

The violence underlying the political systems of liberal capitalism has not produced economic equality, while the violence of revolutionary socialism has not resulted in human freedom. Furthermore, the violence of military developmentalism has produced neither economic equality nor human freedom.

What is the matter? Should we change our values to accept a world that is warlike, inegalitarian, and unfree?

Or should we argue that the world is actually more peaceful, egalitarian and free than ever before? Or should we shift our attention to eating, drinking, sex, and the latest baseball scores? Or, finally, should we begin to fundamentally question the basic violence-accepting premise upon which political science rests? Is it possible, we can ask, that a profoundly different approach based upon the rejection of violence might better enable us to realize our preferred values?

A nonviolent paradigm shift will require far more attention than hitherto to questions of pure theory. Why do we accept the validity and usefulness of pure theory in mathematics and the natural sciences but scorn it in the social sciences? We expect social science theories to have immediate perfect fit with actual conditions. This is why we have created a political science that describes and predicts violence. From violent history we draw violent theory, whereas our real need is for a pure theory of nonviolent politics that will assist us intelligently to transform present conditions into more humane future forms.

In working toward a socially useful nonviolent science of politics we need to proceed both deductively and inductively. We need to combine nonviolent theoretical imagination with a keen sense of both violent and nonviolent human experience.

If a nonviolent paradigm shift occurs in political science, the following results should be expected: (1) sharper clarification of nonviolent and proviolent values, partly through polemical controversy, (2) the creation of a pure nonviolent theory of politics, to be contrasted with pure nonviolent theory, (3) the creation of a new nonviolent empirical theory and the search for new kinds of evidence to satisfy the new nonviolent knowledge requirements, (4) clearer understanding of present violent conditions [nonviolence intensifies awareness of violence], (5) far greater effort to develop causal theories of transition from proviolent to nonviolent conditions, (6) greater emphasis upon applied research and evaluative research designed to make nonviolent knowledge clinically useful, and (7) intensification of efforts to improve political science education and training at all levels so as to break through the constraints of proviolent gravity and violence-accepting inertia.

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR POLITICAL SCIENCE SUBFIELDS

If a nonviolent paradigm shift occurs, based upon a combination of moral and empirical factors, what effects might this have upon the various subfields that constitute the academic social science discipline of political science

wherever it has been permitted to be established? These subfields will differ from country to country, but four may be rather widely investigated: political philosophy and theory (normative and empirical theory); national government and politics (single case analysis); comparative government and politics (comparative case analysis); and international politics (intercase analysis). Within these broad subfields many different subspecialties are possible.

The main concerns of the field of political philosophy and theory are both normative and empirical. Specialists in it regard themselves as raising the most fundamental and comprehensive questions about government and politics, such as "What is the best form of government?" Traditionally this field begins with the study of the classical Western political philosophers, such as Aristotle and Plato, and traces the history of political thought down to the present. Recently there are trends to include non-Western thinkers. Also a few political philosophers are trying to liberate themselves from what they consider an archaic tradition by raising entirely new questions based upon modern philosophy, linguistics, the philosophy of science, and existential experience.

A nonviolent approach to this field would require that the Western philosophical traditions be reviewed by asking simply, "Have political philosophers seriously considered the possibility of a completely nonviolent political socie-

ty?" If not, why not? If so, have they developed ideas as to how to make the transition from violence-based politics to nonviolent politics? Whether or not these theorists have explicitly discussed these questions, their work needs to be reviewed to discover what contributions their most valid insights might make to the creation of nonviolent political theory. Obviously such a review should not be limited to the Western tradition but should include political thinkers in all world cultures.

The review should also not be limited to dominant theorists, whose ideas may have been adopted and perpetuated mainly because they served the interests of violence-based political elites. We should try to rediscover whether there have been nonviolent thinkers in each culture whose ideas may have been suppressed or neglected because of the past predominance and justification of violent politics. This is similar to overlooking both Japanese and American conscientious objectors who refused to kill each other in the Pacific War. As the years pass, their action assumes greater and greater human significance. If we had followed their leadership, there would have been no "Pearl Harbor" and no "Hiroshima and Nagasaki." The experience of these courageous men and women needs to be rediscovered and linked to a general theory of nonviolent political behavior.

According to Bertrand Russell, "Philosophy begins when

someone asks a general question and so does science." Thus nonviolent political science needs to ask, "What is a nonviolent global political community and how can it be realized?" In seeking answers to this question, a thorough review from a nonviolent value position needs to be made of the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist tradition. Some startling discoveries can be expected. Mao Tse-tung, for example, not only made the famous statement that "political power comes out of the barrel of a gun" (Ch'iang-kan-tse li-mien ch'u-fa cheng-ch'üan) but also gave a superb definition of nonviolent politics which is virtually never quoted: "politics is war without bloodshed." (Cheng-chih shih bu-liu hsüeh ti chan-cheng). The former statement is a perfect description of traditional violence-based politics; the latter statement provides a stepping stone toward a nonviolent world political community.

A second field of political science traditionally concerns itself with the study of the political institutions, history, and processes of the country in which the political scientist happens to be working. Such study and teaching is customarily regarded as a patriotic national obligation. A nonviolent approach would ask the following question: "What aspects of national political history, institutions and international relations have been most conducive to violence, and what aspects of national experience are most favorable for non-violent political transformation?" Some startling discoveries



of de-emphasized nonviolent traditions are likely to be made. A superb example is provided by Robert Cooney and Helen Michalowski's recent book *Power of the People: Active Nonviolence in the United States* (1977).

Inquiry into resources for nonviolent political alternatives needs to be made in all world nations, including types of nations where this seems useful to produce scientific insight, such as "First," "Second," and "Third World" nations. When a general behavioral and structural theory of nonviolent politics is developed, it will facilitate nonviolent political analysis in the single national case. A nonviolent political theory eventually ought to permit the political scientist to state with confidence workable alternative political institutions for the world's most violent societies. The study of postwar Japanese government and politics should be especially instructive because of Japan's constitutional prohibition against war, the effort to exclude nuclear weapons from Japanese soil, the attempt to restrict arms exports, and domestic gun controls, as well as relatively low rates of domestic violence, including homicide. This Japanese experience should be used especially by the United States to make itself more nonviolent. For example, the United States Constitution should be revised to renounce war, to prohibit the stationing of nuclear weapons on American soil, to prohibit the manufacture, as well as trade, of military

weapons, and to free Americans from the fear of lethal weapons in the hands of their fellow citizens.

A third major field of political science, to which the above Japanese-American comparison is related, is the study of comparative government and politics. Comparisons may be made both within and between nations. The general purpose is to free political science understanding and imagination from the constraints of the single case.

A nonviolent approach to comparative politics will require much more attention to the comparison of political institutions that rank high and low in violence. Such comparison should be made of pre-industrial, industrial, and post-industrial societies. The search should be for understanding those factors or combinations of factors that are most favorable for the emergence and maintenance of non-violent political behavior. This should be an integrated interdisciplinary effort guided by purposes of nonviolent political analysis, including insights from such disciplines as anthropology, psychology, history, sociology, economics, and futures research.

Through such comparison, and drawing upon the resources of general theory and single case analysis, nonviolent political science should seek to create a theory that predicts high and low levels of violence, that explains the causal processes of historical change in such levels, and that

further posits the causal forces required to make an irreversible future breakthrough to stable conditions of positive political nonviolence on a global scale. Such a theory must eventually be made comprehensible and useful for both ordinary citizens and professional political leaders.

International politics constitutes the fourth major field of contemporary political science. There is a dispute whether it would be better to call this field "intersocietal relations" so as to emphasize the non-governmental aspects of relations among people. Furthermore, in view of contemporary economic interdependence and crossnational economic penetration, the very idea that political scientists should assume the existence of "nations" as independent units for scientific political analysis is being called into question. In this view it is more important to study the relations of multinational corporations with governments than to study the relations among governments. Similarly it can be argued that it is more productive of understanding to study the relationships between and among the world's established military and political intelligence organizations—in conflict with proviolent counterestablishment forces— than it is to take even the "nation" or "society" or "multinational corporations" as the primary units for understanding world politics.

Whatever the subjects that are chosen for interactive analysis, the goal of a nonviolent approach will be to discover the factors that will cause the creation of a global

nonviolent political community through transformation of relationships between proviolent actors, through relationships between nonviolent and proviolent actors, to relationships of an entirely nonviolent character. A comparative and interdisciplinary approach will be essential as will be understanding of historical trends. However, greatest emphasis must be placed upon deliberate transformation of present world politics into future relations of stable nonviolence. While not neglecting history, nonviolent political science inescapably must be predominantly future-oriented.

Comparative study of the international behavior of less-violent nations such as Japan with more violent nations such as the United States will be necessary. Also it will be important to discover ways by which the less violent nations can contribute to lowering the levels of violence of the more violent ones. This raises such questions as, "How can Japan make the United States, the Soviet Union, China, and divided Korea less violent?" And conversely, "How can Japan resist influences from the United States, the Soviet Union, China, and divided Korea that would tend to make Japan more violent?" At an even more fundamental level, we should ask, "How can Japan, the United States, the Soviet Union, China, divided Korea, and other nations mutually assist each other to achieve a completely nonviolent mode of domestic politics and international relations?" To find answers to such questions will

be the main task of nonviolent political science in the field of international politics. This will require a combination of basic research and applied research that will produce intelligent nonviolent alternatives that can be used as the basis of action by the general public and by national political leaders.

In summary, a profound nonviolent paradigm shift in political science would create both intensified awareness of violence and unprecedentedly vigorous attempts to create alternative nonviolent theories and policy applications. It would call for a thorough renovation of existing subfields. In essence it would mean a shift from a science that studies, philosophizes about, and accepts the eternal existence of a disease (e.g., cancer, violent politics) to a science unambiguously committed to the eradication of that disease from the life of mankind (e.g., basic and applied cancer research, nonviolent political science).

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR THE SOCIAL ROLE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

If such a change occurred in the fundamental nature of political science, what changes would have to take place in the relationship of this academic social science discipline to the surrounding society in which it is embedded?

Here again we must come sharply face to face with violence. All modern nation states are the products of violence employed over a historical process of emergence against domestic and foreign enemies. All economic and social inequities within such nations also rest ultimately upon the threat of violent sanctions. All governmental bureaucracies are also based upon and defended by violence. The core institutions of modern political systems, whether conservative or revolutionary, are profoundly violent; armed forces, police, and political intelligence agencies that torture and kill. Almost universally, but with incredibly brave exceptions, intellectuals and universities are the supportive camp followers of these national violent "armies," however skillfully these armies may be disguised. Directly or indirectly, the brains of academic political scientists are predominantly in the service of violence whether the system is liberal capitalism, revolutionary socialism, or military developmentalism.

Political scientists are especially linked to rationalizing and defending the violence-based institutions in which they are imbedded, to glorifying violence-based political systems abroad, and to more or less overtly encouraging violent transformations in political systems they consider obnoxious.

In accepting and legitimizing violence, even while selectively deploring it, conventional academic political

science maintains its own security and serves as a "service station" for violence-accepting institutions. In such a political science "service station" thought is given to how to repair political engines without fundamentally altering their violent principles of basic design. Through teaching and consultancies, apprentice diagnosticians and mechanics are trained, and drivers and owners are advised.

When a shift to nonviolence occurs, political science will play a much more creative, independent, and transforming social role. It will be thoroughly involved in basic research and engineering dedicated to the achievement of a just, free, and nonviolent world political community. In its search for new knowledge to conquer violence, it will be as dedicated and committed to scientific truth as researchers seeking to eradicate cancer. In its dedication to making scientific knowledge socially useful, it will be as active as agricultural extension workers adapting the results of field experiments to the specific needs of individual farmers. In its dedication to societywide and worldwide nonviolent political transformation, it will educate superbly trained workers who can intelligently facilitate change. In its grasp of the magnitude of the problem of violence, and in its recognition of the need for large-scale mobilization of theory, technology, material resources, and human organization, it will be no less imaginative than the atomic bomb

Manhattan Project or the moon-landing Apollo Mission.

In short the social role of political science will shift from the relatively passive, peripheral role of a "proviolent service station" to the more active role of a central institution for the creation and application of nonviolent political knowledge. It will seek to change its environment rather than to "trouble shoot" its defects. One of the principal objectives of nonviolent political science will be the education of nonviolent political leaders and thoroughly skilled and committed nonviolent supporters of such leaders. It will maintain lifelong contact with these "students" so that no gap should open up between knowledge and action, action and knowledge.

To accomplish this shift in its social role, political science will have to detach itself from its present dependent relation to violence-accepting institutions and to create new nonviolent institutions to which its academic support can be wholeheartedly given.

#### TOWARD NONVIOLENT POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

Among such institutions to which serious consideration should be given are a nonviolent world political party, a United Nations agency for nonviolent alternatives with sub-



divisions at local urban and rural areas, and a nonviolent service brigade attached to educational institutions.

The unique feature of a nonviolent world political party in an initial stage would be that it would not aim directly at the seizure of political power but would seek to influence all other parties and governmental institutions in a nonviolent way. A rough analogy for such a party is provided by the work of worldwide human rights organization Amnesty International, which received the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1977. This organization seeks the release of nonviolent "prisoners of conscience," the end of torture, and the abolishment of capital punishment, by coordinating the efforts of approximately 168,000 members in 107 countries organized partly in national sections.

Amnesty International works against direct violence through existing parties, governments, and other institutions. It does not demand mutually exclusive loyalty. A nonviolent world party could do the same. But in addition it would broaden its program to include science-based action to transform all proviolent aspects of life—political, social, economic, and cultural—toward nonviolent conditions. The principal objectives of such a global party would be to clarify nonviolent alternatives for worldwide public discussion, and to influence political opinion and action away from violence.

The Nonviolent World Party should be very flexible in its organizational structure so that specific problems of violence can be addressed in the most concrete terms. Initially party organs will be required at the world, regional, national, and local levels, including special party organizations for types of societies such as First, Second and Third World nations. At a later stage of development the Nonviolent World Party might subdivide itself into three competing orientations (conservative, reformist, and radical) and move more directly toward the joint, non-zero sum assumption of direct political responsibility.

As a predecessor of a Nonviolent World Party and as an administrative focus for its activities, there should be established a United Nations Agency for Nonviolent Alternatives. The goals of this agency, established by and working through UN member states, would be (1) to compile global statistics on behavioral and structural violence, (2) to support research on the causes and nature of contemporary violence, (3) to support research on nonviolent experience and capabilities of all world societies, (4) to facilitate sharing of nonviolent experience through appropriate conferences, publications, training, and other educational activities, (5) to create, critically evaluate, and recommend nonviolent policy alternatives for action by the member states and other global political actors, (6) to plan for the education of

nonviolent public servants, and (7) to plan for the assumption of direct, nonviolent, international peacekeeping operations. The UN Agency for Nonviolent Alternatives would draw upon the work of all other UN agencies for its purposes, but it would differ in its more specialized effort to understand nonviolent behavior, to create nonviolent alternatives, and to assist the implementation of nonviolent policies. Such an agency is needed because it cannot be assumed that merely material and technical solutions to world problems, as profoundly important as these might be, will bring world peace. It should not be forgotten that the world's most well-fed, well-educated, healthy, and economically most advanced societies are also its most violent nations.

At the national level, ministries or departments of nonviolent alternatives should be established to parallel the work of the UNANVA, but with special emphasis upon creating nonviolent alternatives to domestic violence as well as promoting nonviolent international relations. Two proposals currently being considered by the United States Congress suggest that the idea of a national Department of Nonviolence is eventually not beyond the possibility of realization. The first proposal, sponsored by Senator Spark M. Matsunaga of Hawaii and others, and heir to a long line of such proposals going back to at least 1796, is a bill to create a Department of Peace that would operate alongside the existing

departments of State and Defense. Both of these departments presently oppose the idea and the passage of the bill is not foreseeable in the near future. Some leaders active in the American peace movement are also not uncritically enthusiastic about the proposal. They fear that the establishment of a Department of "Peace" might merely serve to camouflage, or divert attention from, a basically proviolent society. Nevertheless the proposal is an interesting and important one from a nonviolent perspective.

A second proposal before the Congress, much more likely to gain some support in the near future than the peace department idea, is a bill to establish a National Academy for Peace and Conflict Resolution. Professor Kenneth Boulding, economist, is taking a very active role in the national campaign to secure passage of this bill, arguing that the time has come to train persons in the constructive use of the considerable social science knowledge about conflict resolution that has been gained in such fields as labor-management relations, race relations, and international relations.

In the future, if established, it may be possible for the Peace Academy to provide talent for a Department of Peace, or a Department of Nonviolent Alternatives. Additionally, thought should be given the creation of an Academy for Nonviolent National Defense assuming responsibilities now assigned to the army, navy and air force

academies. In the national security field, also, serious consideration needs to be given to the creation of non-violent national security planning and analysis groups at the highest levels of national policy making. A testable assumption is that such completely nonviolent policy analysis groups could create a wider range of policy alternatives than is now possible under violence-accepting assumptions, and that among such options would be some that would be quite workable contributions to the nonviolent transformation of world politics. To support such thinking, nonviolent political intelligence agencies need to be established that differ from conventional clandestine intelligence agencies in their complete openness to truth and the rejection of killing force. The motto for nonviolent national security intelligence would be: "Violence divides and conceals. Non-violence unites and reveals."

The above institutional suggestions, as extraordinary as they may seem, are completely testable by a nonviolent political science through further conceptual development, prototyping, simulation, limited field experimentation, evaluative research, and appropriate training.

In the interim before the establishment of international, national, and local nonviolent institutions, and as an eventual source of skilled workers for them, there should be established in every college and university in the world

a Nonviolent Service Brigade. Where training for military service is conducted by colleges and universities, such as in the United States, an alternative opportunity to serve in the Nonviolent Service Brigade should be provided with equal benefits. Eventually nonviolent training should supplant violent training in institutions of higher education.

Where military training is not customary in universities, training for nonviolent public service should be instituted.

A prototype of such academic institution already exists with more than twenty years of experience in the Shanti Sena (Peace Brigade) of Gandhi Rural University, headed by Dr. G. Ramachandran, which is located at Gandhigram in the Madurai District of Tamil Nadu State in South India. The purpose of the Shanti Sena is to prepare students, faculty, and administrators for constructive community service and for non-violent conflict resolution work in times of crisis. All members of the university are members of the Shanti Sena. The Captain is always a woman in respect to Gandhi's belief that women are generally more nonviolent than men. Eight male and eight female students serve as a steering committee. One hundred fifty students out of a total student body of about 700 are engaged in special leadership training activities. A senior faculty member experienced in nonviolent direct action (such as the attempt by Gandhians to quell armed conflict on the Sino-Indian border, or to stop Hindu-

Muslim massacres) serves as advisor, while a dynamic young faculty member serves as chief organizer.

There are daily prayers and hymns from the Hindu, Muslim, Christian, and Buddhist traditions which are intended to promote religious tolerance. (In less religious societies, more secular tolerance-promoting moral education is easily imaginable). Songs of all nations dignifying manual labor and the solidarity of mankind are sung. There are uniforms of handspun cotton *khadi* and drills that prepare for medical aid, disaster relief, fire fighting, and other forms of community service. The students, most of whom are of poor rural origins, do constructive work in 30 surrounding villages, concentrating upon service to the *harijans* and to the most economically and socially disadvantaged villagers. They build roads, dig wells, and assist in building better houses. They teach whatever villagers need to know from kindergarten to adult education. A Research and Extension Division constantly studies the surrounding villages to discover what needs the University might help to fulfill.

The Shanti Sena thus combines both dedicated effort to end structural violence plus readiness to offer lives in nonviolent resistance to end behavioral violence. Every university student, faculty member, and administrator in the world has something to learn from these Indian friends even though there are only about 800 of them. They offer hope

to all the world that the creation of nonviolent institutions is not beyond human capabilities. And they would be the first to recognize, despite their profound respect for him, that one need not be a "Gandhian" to become nonviolent. Every human being has a nonviolent potential. The task of the university should be to evoke it and to prepare it for constructive, lifelong, life-enriching community service.

#### THE CHALLENGES AHEAD

In conclusion, to assist global transformation toward a nonviolent 21st century, political science must liberate itself from its traditional acceptance and legitimization of violence. It must take nonviolence the central theme in its efforts to describe, explain, predict, evaluate, influence, and educate for the political behavior of mankind. It must experience a "moral paradigm shift" akin to the empirical paradigm shift of normal science. This shift will require a transformation in the kinds of knowledge sought in conventional political science subfields such as political philosophy and theory, national politics, comparative politics, and international politics. It will also require the creation of a pure theory of nonviolent politics that will guide applied efforts to split the atom of violent politics into



a nonviolent force of unprecedented magnitude.

Such a transformation in the nature of political science will require a change in its social role from one of a "service station" for a violence-accepting society to a position of nonviolent leadership. To express this leadership effectively will require the creation of new, nonviolent institutions at the global, subglobal, regional, subnational, and local levels, including a nonviolent service brigade in each college and university.

This desirable change in the nature of political science will require enormous improvement in the educational preparation of professional political scientists. They must strive, both as individuals and as coordinated teams of specialists, to achieve such a high state of scientific knowledge and skill in application that when violence erupts they will be called in as professional consultants to assist community action to contain the damage and to restore life-promoting social processes. Until political scientists have achieved at least the level of recognized social usefulness of physicians throughout the world, it is a sign that they have not yet detached themselves from subservience to historical systems of punitive violence. There cannot be public confidence in professionals who seem to reinforce rather than to eradicate unwanted political violence.

The creation and strengthening of nonviolent political

science will be welcomed by the vast majority of the laboring masses of mankind, who bear the main burden of increasing preparations for violence and counterviolence, and who are its principal victims both behaviorally and structurally. Global arms expenditures now stagger the imagination: about 400 billion dollars (some 80,000,000,000 *Yen*) and 23.6 million persons in military service in 1977. This drain upon material and human resources demands that nonviolent political science must play a role in the redirection of violent productive forces and violent productive relations toward the service of basic human needs. The more political science truly commits itself to nonviolence, the stronger must become its mass base, for violence is the root of all political and economic exploitation. In addition, nonviolent political science should attract the strong support of persons from all socioeconomic strata and occupations who are repelled by human killing.

#### WHAT ROLE FOR JAPAN?

What role can Japan play in the emergence and strengthening of nonviolent political science on a global scale? Are there unique features of the historical experience, present capabilities, and future aspirations of the Japanese people

that can encourage, contribute to, and support such a pioneering social science development directed toward the creation of a nonviolent world political community?

### Selected Bibliography

- Cooney, Robert and Helen Michalowski. *Power of the People: Active Nonviolence in the United States*. Culver City: Peace Press, 1977. Superb introduction to nonviolent alternatives in American history from the Revolution to the Vietnam War. Has excellent bibliography of the literature on nonviolence in English.
- Desai, Narayan. *Towards a Nonviolent Revolution*. Rajghat, Varanasi: Sarva Seva Sangh Prakashan, 1972. Theory and case studies of unarmed conflict resolution in India through Shanti Sena (Peace Brigade) intervention.
- Dhawan, Gopinath. *The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1957. 3rd edition. The best introductory explanation.
- Galtung, Johan. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research*, 3 (1969), 167-192. The most important discussion of the concepts of "personal violence" and "structural violence" in the literature of social science. Galtung's work helps us to see the need for constructing two alternative concepts "behavioral nonviolence" and "structural nonviolence" which may be somewhat different than just the "absence of violence" in Galtung's formulations.
- Ishida, Takashi. *Heiwa no Seijigaku (The Political Science of Peace)*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974. 7th edition. Pioneering exploration of concepts of peace and the possibility of unarmed politics by a leading Japanese scholar.
- Iyer, Raghavan N. *The Political and Moral Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975. Brilliant interpretation of Gandhian thought in relation to the Western philosophical tradition.
- Leger, Ruth Sivard. *World Military and Social Expenditures 1978*. Leesburg: WMSE Publications, 1979. A powerful statement of the enormous drain on global human and material resources made by military establishments. Demonstrates how the diversion of even 5% of \$400 million annual military expenditures could significantly relieve human suffering.
- Keyes, Gene. *Strategic Nonviolent Defense in Theory: Denmark in Practice*. Ph.D. dissertation, York University, Canada, October, 1978. Formulation of principles of nonviolent common defense against

(Nazi) aggression, undercoring the importance of "morale".

- Roberts, Adam, ed. *Civilian Resistance as a National Defense*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1969. Theories and case studies of nonviolent resistance to invasion and to repressive political systems, including both Nazi and communist regimes.
- Sibley, Mulford Q., ed. *The Quiet Battle: The Theory and Practice of Non-violent Resistance*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963. Historical, philosophical, and applied writings on nonviolent politics with reflections on their contemporary relevance by the leading American nonviolent political philosopher.
- Sharp, Gene. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Boston: Sargent, 1973. The theoretical statement of the nature of nonviolent political power combined with historical examples to persuade the reader that nonviolent politics are not idealistic nonsense.
- U.N. General Assembly. *Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly*. S-10/2. New York: United Nations, 1978. Unprecedented call by all member states, except Albania, for abolition of nuclear weapons, reduction of conventional armaments, and shift of resources to satisfaction of basic human needs. Includes extraordinary call for private institutions, including universities, to contribute to the research, education, and applied activities that will create the "political will" necessary to achieve global disarmament.
- U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, 95th Congress, 2nd Session. *National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution*. Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Operations of the Committee on International Relations. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978. Testimony for and against a proposal to study the establishment of a National Peace Academy, finally approved by the Congress in October, 1978.

