

**Global Nonkilling Working Papers**  
ISSN 2077-141X (Print); ISSN 2077-1428 (Online)

# **The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science**

Clayton K. Edwards

# 10 • 2013



**Center *for* Global Nonkilling**

*Global Nonkilling Working Papers*  
ISSN 2077-141X (Print); ISSN 2077-1428 (Online)

*Edited by Joám Evans Pim*

### Nonkilling Research Committees (partial list)

Douglas P. Fry (Anthropology) <i>Abo Akademi University</i>	Noam Chomsky (Linguistics) <i>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</i>
Olivier Urbain (Arts) <i>Toda Institute</i>	Ubiratan D'Ambrosio (Mathematics) <i>State University of Campinas</i>
Johan Galtung (Economics) <i>TRANSCEND Peace University</i>	Jake Lynch (Media Studies) <i>University of Sydney</i>
George Psacharopoulos (Education) <i>University of Athens</i>	James W. Prescott (Neuroscience) <i>Institute of Humanistic Science</i>
Caroline Baillie (Engineering) <i>Queens University</i>	Jan Narveson (Philosophy) <i>University of Waterloo</i>
James A. Dator (Futures Studies) <i>University of Hawai'i</i>	William V. Smirnov (Political Science) <i>Russian Academy of Sciences</i>
James Tyner (Geography) <i>Kent State University</i>	Daniel J. Christie (Psychology) <i>Ohio State University</i>
James A. Mercy (Health) <i>Centers for Disease Control</i>	Burton M. Sapin (Security) <i>George Washington University</i>
Jacques Semelin (History) <i>CERI-CNRS</i>	Kathryn Feltey (Sociology) <i>University of Akron</i>
Richard A. Falk (Law) <i>Princeton University</i>	Daniel Smith-Christopher (Spiritual Traditions) <i>Loyola Marymount University</i>



You are free to share, copy, distribute and transmit this work\*

Under the following conditions:

- Ⓐ **Attribution.** You must attribute this work in the manner specified by the author/licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Ⓑ **Noncommercial.** You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- Ⓒ **No Derivative Works.** You may not alter, transform or build upon this work.

\* For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.

\* Any of the above conditions can be waived if you gain permission from the copyright holders.

Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the Authors' moral and legal rights.

© The Authors, 2013

© Center for Global Nonkilling, 2013 (for this edition)

Disclaimer: Views expressed are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect those of CGNK.



Center for Global Nonkilling

3653 Tantalus Drive  
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822-5033  
United States of America  
Email: [info@nonkilling.org](mailto:info@nonkilling.org)  
<http://www.nonkilling.org>





# Contents # 10

## **The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science**

*Clayton K. Edwards*

### **PART I. THEORETICAL AND APPLIED POLITICAL SCIENCE: PROPOSITION OF THE NONKILLING PARADIGM**

<i>Introduction.....</i>	10
<i>Theory of Movement and Immobility in Political Science.....</i>	11
<i>The Art of Understanding Good Art in Movement and Bad Art.....</i>	16
<i>Nonkilling Global Political Science is created on principle of movement .....</i>	22
<i>Knowing what to observe in Analytics .....</i>	27
<i>The Theory of Movement .....</i>	28
<i>Theory of Movement in the subject of Attired and Cooked Politics and Religion.....</i>	33

### **PART II. UNDERSTANDING DISSEMBLY**

<i>From knowledge of nothing to the existence of nothing .....</i>	34
<i>Creating a Nonkilling Global Society through Political Art and Science.....</i>	36
<i>The World as Good or Bad: Philosophy and the Problem of Virtue in Flattery.....</i>	40
<i>Nonkilling Epistemology: Nature of Nonkilling Knowledge Science.....</i>	45

### **PART III. THE POLITICS OF GHOSTS – KILLING AS PART OF COUNTERFEIT POLITICAL ART AND SCIENCE .....**

<i>The Four Political Arts in Birth/Generation Cosmogony and Origination in Ontology.....</i>	51
---	----

### **PART IV. TOWARD A CERTAINTY IN THEORETICAL AND APPLIED NONKILLING POLITICAL SCIENCE .....**

<i>Conclusion.....</i>	53
------------------------	----

<b>References.....</b>	<b>60</b>
------------------------	-----------

**Clayton K. Edwards** is a contract legal researcher as well as a special education technician employed by the San Diego Unified School District with an interest in political philosophy, law, education, and information technology. Mr. Edwards has an M.A. in Education from Alliant International University; B.A. in Political Science and Communication from the University of Hawaii; and graduate certificates in paralegal studies (University of San Diego) and geographic information systems (San Diego State University).

# The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science

Clayton K. Edwards  
*Independent Researcher*

## Summary

*All too often, what we call politics in art and political science describes a different subject entirely, of ignorance of politics in philosophy, art and science. Humanity has long recognized that a proposition, the act of offering or suggesting something to be considered, accepted, adopted or done, may be false as well as true, in the content or meaning that we give it. The proposition that killing and threats to kill are done as a part of politics in art and science is increasingly recognized by scholars as a false proposition, one that Glenn Paige's work suggests moved into political science unchallenged and wormed its way into the tapestry of political art as a counterfeit. It is the purpose of this paper to demonstrate philosophically and scientifically that the inclusion of killing and threats to kill as part of the scientific enterprise is a false proposition that must be explicitly rejected by political scientists to aid the public and practitioners of the political arts to recognize and reject killing and threats to kill as competent human behavior, from the most local to the most global of polities, individual to family, clan, town, village, city, state, country, world community.*

## PART I. THEORETICAL AND APPLIED POLITICAL SCIENCE: PROPOSITION OF THE NONKILLING PARADIGM

### Introduction

Political Science is a conglomeration of the Science and Art of Politics and refers to statesmanship in the temperance and courage of a discipline in philosophy, natural philosophy coupled with the arts as religiously practiced. Plato's *Politicus* or *Statesman* spoke of Political Science as the Royal Science implicating beauty in human leadership. In *Timaeus*, Plato wrote of scaling the heights of philosophy in the simultaneous discussion of politics and philosophy and in characterizing the accomplishments of the astronomer Timaeus as a political leader and natural philosopher and scientist from Italy.

Indeed, Beauty in aesthetics seems to have been the centerpiece of ancient Greek scholarship in philosophy and political understanding, in art, which we understand typically as the *creation* of beautiful things. It involves what he describes, through his character Timaeus, as "right feeling", of any degree, which marks success at the beginning of every enterprise. This "right feeling" is characterized by a call invoking God, because it is through God that the divine comes to assist anyone who seeks in art to make beautiful things. Understood in philosophy as described by Plato in dialogue, the pantheon of gods in the lives of the ancient Greeks symbolized the various arts personified in character of behavior and answers to God, in obedience to God, which is the specific call of scripture itself.

Plato in dialogue observes in expressing the aesthetic sentiment that all men desire beauty but not all men are in love, indicating that pursuit of beauty in art implicates what is in love, so as to have knowledge in right feeling. Sue Asscher and David Widger observed in evaluating the message of Plato's dialogue of *Theaetetus* on the subject of knowledge:

Knowledge has been described as the mind conversing with itself, discourse of reason; the hymn of dialectic, the science of relations, of ideas, of the so-called arts and sciences, of the one, of the good, of the all. In its higher signification it was the knowledge, not of men, but of gods, perfect and all



sufficing – like other ideals always passing out of sight, and nevertheless present in mind. (Asscher and Widger, 2008)

## Theory of Movement and Immobility in Political Science

The theory of movement describes reality in truth as the state of things *as* they actually exist and suggests “nature” as a synonym, as equivalent to the natural, physical or material world, in its intrinsic character developing of its own accord. This is the principle that the Greek word *physis* (φύσις) refers to. The nature of knowledge is what is developing of its own accord, as reality, truth and nature as they actually exist. The nature of knowledge is in the abstract - intelligent – spiritual in meaning, divine, rational or agreeable to reason, in sound judgment or good sense, mystical in nature – *developing of its own accord*, inseparable, as one. This development is in movement and the movement is reflected in forms in formation. Reality describes “right feeling” (movement) in any degree, in a condition of accordance with what is good, proper, or just: right conduct in the management of one’s affairs, in what Plato’s *Timaeus* described as a theory of generation, which in classical philosophy corresponds with the theory of cosmogony, to be born, to be created, as a general coherent proposition, commonly regarded as correct, that can be used as a principle of explanation and prediction for a class of phenomena.

To go against nature is nothing more than living without a theory of life in generation. Such is rebellion against reality in truth – *as* the state of things as they actually exist, a futile still-born irrationality that makes for no enterprise. Both rationality and irrationality narrate in art through character (ethos), a person in acting out according to guiding beliefs or ideals that characterize a community, nation, or ideology, as a matter of accustomed place or habit in habitant. Thus, in disobedience or discord, we are moved, obeying false things unwillingly, developing of their own accord in nature, and without knowledge. One may exercise wisdom, according to good judgment or sense in so doing or exercise ignorance – act as the fool, without good judgment or sense. The former is to act in love in pursuit of beauty in knowledge and the latter is to act outside of love desiring beauty but impoverished of its knowledge in ignorance and failing to pursue. Art is about doing and doing wrong is not doing.

## The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science

Violence and killing are a result of not doing, and thus, have not, do not and will not do anything or everything.

Whether one plays the role of an aggressor or one is defending, there is only unwillingness and no will, people doing only what they think best, if they think about what they are doing at all. Indeed, in the archaic sense of the word pragmatic, as set forth in the Free Merriam-Webster online dictionary, one is (1) busy (doing nothing in bustling full activity to the point of foolishness or intrusiveness in meddling without right or propriety and all mixed up); (2) officious in kind nature as a matter of tradition, obliging, dutiful according to nature volunteering where no help is needed to the point of being opinionated to the exclusion of intellectual or artistic matters, without time or inclination to deal with social morality. (K. B. Clark). If political science is a social science and political art is the doing of management of the souls of humanity that moves things, then violence and killing are no part of science or art or philosophy (natural or otherwise), but rhetoric in habit built on flattery as we will discuss and describe a moral impossibility. One can make no more true description of troublemaking, in concert.

As Plato argued in Socrates' discourse with the Master rhetorician Gorgias, there is only true knowledge but there is both true and false belief. Right feels right and wrong feels wrong and ignorance ignores the function or the power of perceiving the right. Ignorance is indeed powerlessness imitating movement, not caring about the subject of movement, pretending to be movement and in function of movement, in nature, fools people with the counterfeit of movement – *of its own accord*.

The Bible in Genesis describes this “pre-existence” state of affairs as a formless earth to which God, not described in figure or form of existence creates forms. The Greeks referred to this formless condition in mythology as Chaos, dealing with a yawning gap. One must generate or let something happen, by power, to make things happen to fill this yawning gap. This implies knowledge and does not implicate claims of origination as something being or belonging to something else. Indeed, Plato In Theaetetus, in his discourse on the subject of knowledge, urged that the word *being* be abolished, knowing that unbeing was its contradiction in The Sophist and the two concepts cancel each other out. In philosophical and scientific terms, *being* and *unbeing* are a description of “void” and in Gorgias the effect was to make an undifferentiated and undis-

tinguished and incoherent mass of competence and incompetence in how people conduct their affairs, obliterating art in rhetoric. Thus, generation and creation and causation implicate bringing things into an aspect of state or condition in reality through what we recognize as “existence”. Yet the pre-existence<sup>1</sup> provides a sophism of existence before existence, getting people locked into a theist – atheistic Shakespearean “much ado about nothing”, the making of unnecessary religious and political and social strife, a blatant misuse of ontological thought with physical and natural disaster.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Do we exist as spirits before we came into the world? Clear evidence from scripture that we did!! Pre-existence before life, pre-mortal existence referring to the belief that each individual human soul existed before conception, and at some point before birth enters or is placed by God into the body, to exist beforehand, to exist in a previous state. The Bible - 1 Corinthians 15:46 - rejects this notion. Our beginning is at our conception. Yet ‘I came from the Father and entered the world; now I am leaving the world and going back to the Father,’ he said (John 16: 28). Thus, the term “exist” gives people no end of trouble as they seek advantages of interpretation of scripture in the old chicken and egg origination question which supports an eristic over obedience or disobedience of the divine.

Human on human killing relates to an undesired human intervention in the affairs of God when in truth everything comes from God and must be managed, in art of doing or in divine art, we allow killing to happen, to come into existence. In the end, all things come from a cosmogony and not ontology and a scientific cosmogony cannot be a theory of origination but only of generation. It must assume the divine, rather than try to discover the divine. Craft does not invent itself. It is truly divine, operating of its own accord, without permission and is never possessed. There is no other way to describe state or condition, except in theory of movement. We come to politics as art and science to manage ourselves into that desired aspect of the state or condition that says, No More Killing, and as Socrates and Christ suggest in the form of hemlock and cross, manage what we don’t like or we allow the bad to happen and keep happening in risk and certainty. The Quran, like the Bible and Torah before them, hammers at this theme, over and over and over and over again, in the most elegant verse of futility, poetically, in God’s art, describing what is without art, impoverished and needing enrichment. Creation or generation is everything and anything, while origination is like pinning the tail on a donkey that already has a tail.

<sup>2</sup> The 1911 Classic Encyclopedia (See <[http://www.1911encyclopedia.org/Doctrine\\_of\\_pre-existence](http://www.1911encyclopedia.org/Doctrine_of_pre-existence)>), refers to the “Doctrine of Pre-existence”. This doctrine has interpreted existence in dualistic sense. On the one hand, Dr. Watts referred to what might be recognizable as a Pre-Socratic/Socratic/Platonic Christian theology whereby Jesus Christ had a human soul which existed before the creation of the world – the first and most perfect of created things- and subsisted, prior to his human birth, in union with the second person of the Godhead and it was this human soul which suffered the pain and sorrow described in the Gospels. Yet by placing existence in origination, we have a Christianized sophistic twist of Plato’s dialogues that amounts to a doctrine that Plato would not subscribe to, as

## The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science

Politics implicates management generating movement, moving souls that move bodies while it's counterfeit or ghost does not create or form things, but pretends to create by habit (clothing) and cooking or making things up to imitate reality without caring for reality. Right feeling about things helps us discern the difference and in political science allows us to conceive of politics in true knowledge, a redundancy. From this fountainhead of politics interlaced with philosophy, two ideas – politics and philosophy- are in reality one.

Our object here is to link killing to the counterfeit or ghost of politics in the argument that nonkilling global political science, as conceptualized by Political Scientist Glenn Paige is a redundancy and nothing new in political science. Paige proposes to political scientists what amounts to in philosophy and

---

a simple matter of creation and generation. The dualism of existences, making one thing two things in division is not a cosmogony but an ontology suggestive of advantage – seeking in overreach by theologians or priests in habit, seeking not politics in art but control of others to some material or soul profit, and explains a counterfeit in theology analogous to counterfeit science and philosophy as explained in Plato's Sophist.

A second twist of this existenceism, for want of a better name, in redundancy, is that in the beginning of creation God created the souls of all men, which were subsequently as a punishment for ill-doing incarnated in physical bodies till discipline should render them fit for spiritual existence, found in a Pre-existans or Pre-existans doctrine found as early as the Second Century, including Justin Martyr and Origen. The idea was also part of two other "movements" named metempsychosis (transmigration of the soul, especially its reincarnation after death) and mysticism (pursuit of communion with, identity with, or conscious awareness of an ultimate reality, divinity, spiritual truth, or God through direct experience) and widely prevalent in Oriental thought. It was condemned by the Council of Constantinople in 540, but has frequently occurred in modern thought, for example, in Wordsworth's Intimations of Immortality as the natural correlative of a belief in immortality. Here, in an evil produces good in punishment comes the tempered steel of goodness in perfection by the perfect putting the perfect on an ontological par with perfection. There truly is no chaos, no politics, no philosophy and no science – simply hell on steroids that fails to teach the perfect the art of perfection but assumes both in division, a true no-brainer. It beats the perfect into shape and fires it like a ceramic piece. The personal advantage is obvious – if I can tell someone else he is being punished on earth, like the salesman describing a problem, I can only have the solution, like the sophist retailing virtue to impressionable youth and their parents in 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Century BC Athens. It is difficult to separate the rhetoric from the sophistry but the thread is in origination using generation as a tool of what is originated and tempered into immortality, in the art of the invisible or magic of the dark arts in counterfeit imitation. Is it any wonder that wandering sophists were often run out of town and killed in ancient Greece, but as Plato observed in The Sophist, many of these people came in the guises of politicians / political operatives and Statesman.

political art and science that they recognize killing as in the nature of rebellion that imitates movement that is only supplied through politics itself, as divine creation. If Clausewitz could describe war (lethal war perhaps) as politics by another means, he can only be describing a contradiction that imitates politics in movement and philosophy itself in movement and by nature moves nothing and is therefore ignorant, in contradiction and therefore cannot, in art and science, be recognized, in classical philosophy, as art or science, philosophy or politics.

To move bodies without moving what makes bodies move is juggling, by thought, word and deed. This counterfeit of movement gains nothing and politics in subject is about having something precious in interest – recognition by others of our own individual humanity, our natural right to live out our lives as given by cause itself, manifested in art that does things or makes things happen. Humans by nature move. Humans killing humans ignores nature and a natural right to live- of and from divine cause – the only cause. We humans play out the recognition of this right in politics. When we fail politics, we fail ourselves and imitate ourselves without caring for ourselves.

The reader may be suspicious that the above rhetoric is to hector and preach about nothing, but the nature of rhetoric is simply to remind in a world that so easily forgets its roots and its creator while absorbed in the daily problems of life, with an eye to reconnecting the tree to what nourishes the tree and what is cut off and plowed over as we bull around, making things and making things up.

Indeed, Asscher and Widger (2008) propose that a profusion of words and ideas has obscured rather than enlightened mental science and therefore it tends to follow that accumulations of words and ideas can dull the sense of connectedness with reason in faith, knowledge and the divine, with unreason in faithlessness, ignorance and the undivine, as clutter, noticeably in the political art and political science. If Paige's notion of a Nonkilling Global Political Science is true to its word, it is the art and science of clutter and clutter removal in contradiction of a contradiction, fighting fire with a fire as part of creating a firebreak. We can then remove the words Nonkilling Global from Political Science and recognize that killing is not recognizable as art or science. Freed of this clutter, Political Science is the art and science of God, in nature with the name "God" as a moniker of the maker who is not discovered or found out, but

is known, even if covered in unholy rhetoric of disputations about God's existence in sophistic rhetorical battles over whether God has a particular virtue called "existence".

## The Art of Understanding Good Art in Movement and Bad Art: The Science of Everything and Nothing

Aristotle in *Metaphysics* A.987a.29-b.14 and M1078b9-32 wrote that Plato devised the Forms to answer a weakness in the doctrine of Heraclitus, who claimed that nothing exists, while everything is in a state of flow (1933, 1989).<sup>3</sup> If nothing exists then nothing can be known. From this perspective, we can begin to recognize immobility and impotence in disobedience to movement, in discord, in falsity, in irrationality and in reality, developing of its own accord, inseparable as one, and therefore what flows as never flows, and cannot be anything or everything – and in this contradiction, deals with the subject of ignorance, as the nature of knowledge, reality in truth as the state of things as they actually exist. One ignores anything and everything, so as to bring what doesn't exist into existence, as a creation.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Flow is understood as complete absorption in what one is doing, perhaps to the point that nothing really does exist, though it may be countered that nothing truly does not exist. In such understanding, flow suggests a contradiction in which what is being done actually does the person, and therefore supports the notion of habit and cookery or in Shakespeare's *Much Ado about Nothing* or *Nothing*. We really don't do anything in this state. What flows is nothing and speaking, writing and doing nothing.

<sup>4</sup> The word "fake" or "feigned" refer to the subject matter of mistrust. In science such creations in the making of data are treated as dishonesty and may be a cause of professional discipline. Here it seems, nothing was made up, dressed up, as something and it is here in science and philosophy that western science, philosophy and theology appear to be stumbling and off balance. Where the foundation is not recognized – the principle of generation in this case, and overtaken by concern about origination, the source of a thing, a fabrication that calls into existence a contradiction has serious etymological consequences of misnaming, as suggested in Plato's *Cratylus*. Technically, a contradiction is understood as having the qualities of existence and non-existence, an open invitation to madness, a fake creation in explicit contradiction. Plato in the *Sophist* suggests a fabrication of this notion to be named "unbeing" indicating it really does not exist though it professes to exist and this relates to the notion of a misrepresentation. A misrepresentation simply refers to a false statement of fact made by one to another and not in accord with the facts. Arguably, metaphysics was misrepresented and this misrepresentation appears to have persisted into the scholastic studies of Middle Ages Christendom and Islam. Scholars from both entities relied very heavily on Greek phi-

Thus, in rebellion or disobedience to nature, what exists is always in the same state and what does not exist moves in state of mind and thereby exists. If we say “nothing” does not exist, all we are saying is that it is of no regard and should not be a subject. Yet try as we might, mere declarations pronouncing “nothing” as what is the subject of no regard, must be regarded, in politics, in art, as the counterfeit of everything and anything, imitating both without caring for everything and anything and nothing. Plato wrote of nothing in dialogue, as what does not explain itself, and therefore is irrational and not art, but as a subject of creation, what becomes and perishes and never really is, as a thing of beauty. By making the irrational into something of beauty, in aesthetics, we deal with it in art and science, as a matter of political art and the political science. We make “nothing” capable of being studied, theorizing and hypothesizing for use in creation of good, healthful things – beautiful things.

Here we recognize the problem of being and unbeing as always in the same state, immobilized, but which is moved by knowledge into its place in nature. The tediousness of such a discussion, in state, is terribly boring, but to any social person, wanting to discourse about things deemed important, the idea of “nothing” has to be handled patiently, as if a human creation and not a divine creation, so as to appreciate the problem of violence and the problem of killing, in discourse to make natural philosophy or science work in the public interest, in the political art and science.

After all, it seems arguable that violence and killing are the production of nothing and a matter for humans to equip themselves to deal with “nothing” in art (See Plato’s *The Sophist*) and in Science (*Protagoras*, *Theaetetus*, *Politicus/Statesman* and *Gorgias*) as rhetoric that fails, in the words of Plato’s Socrates, to explain the nature of its own applications and must be held up to examination and explanation. That which fails to explain itself, he opined, is not art but an artifice, a habit of wit that cooks trouble ignoring the nature of what it creates. Consequently, political scientists and philosophers and theologians must do their best to

---

losophy through the aperture of Aristotle’s commentaries without a comprehensive review and reconciliation of Aristotle’s thinking and of Plato’s dialogues. That Al Ghazali could contemplate a fatwah against Muslim philosophers who had to work with Aristotle as prototype read together with Averroes criticisms of Al Ghazali’s work arguably led to political repression and killings in both Christian and Muslim civilization. We face an academic institutional problem.

explain it, in discourse that implicates all the divisions of art and science for the institutional, governmental and public good – for the sake of enterprise, of love and human health and safety.

When one is out of love, one is “out of one’s wits”, alienated from the divine, unintelligible, in soulful neglect and without care or competence in enterprise, in term of the aspect of things as they actually are, as they actually exist in state. This ignorance indicates the nature of what is against reality, against truth of things as they actually exist and against nature, without spirit, not divine, irrational and not agreeable to reason, outside of sound judgment or good sense, and in no way mystical in nature, evil developed of its own accord in ethos or character.

We again refer to reality, truth, nature, knowledge and do so when we are in love and within our wits, as they develop of their own accord. That is, we understand what is irrational and commune with it as a matter of art and science, in right feeling that is in love and thereby pursues beauty, as an aesthetic – indeed rational matter and truly divine - using tragedy (bad things perhaps) to promote the good, that which is not lethal to the pursuit of beauty, which is what everyone truly wants.

It follows that it would seem wisdom in judicious study and application of knowledge is inextricably bound to knowledge itself and to describe a person out of love is to describe an aspect of the human condition we know is outside of wisdom and out of knowledge, irrational, ungodly and not divine – what does not exist, what does not move, and is of human creation, which is to say it is not creation, but a contradiction, nothing, ineffectual word juggling, false – importantly false, in art and science and a subject worthy of study, nay mandatory study, the subject of ignorance.<sup>5</sup>

The stakes are high for humanity. Science and particularly political science is of scientists and not of uncaring charlatans hustling teaching jobs and research dollars, as what happened to philosophy distinguished from uncaring sophism in ancient Greece as documented by Plato. We see this same problem in alchemy when it had to be recast into chemistry for the pro-

---

<sup>5</sup> There appears to be agreement among sophists that there are true and false beliefs, but there is no false knowledge. (Gorgias) Thus one may profitably treat the subject of false knowledge as false belief about the nature of knowledge as part of the subject matter of ignorance of knowledge in the knowledge business, as a matter of philosophy, of art and science.



tection of legitimate scientific research in the middle ages. Theology studies suffered terribly from confusion about ancient Greek philosophy as torn from its intellectual moorings supporting and invoking the divine, as explained in Plato's Apology. Plato's concerns were later documented in the New Testament of the Bible where Christ was cast as a dangerous heretic to the Pharisees and nailed to a cross.

This problem carried over into repression of the Greek philosophical schools in Greco-Roman Byzantium by the Christian religious and political establishment, neglect of the systematic study of Plato's dialogues in Medieval Byzantium, their limited availability to Muslim medieval scholars such as Political Scientist Al Farabi and the Polymath Avicenna, despite the tremendous efforts of the Arab Muslim translators of Greek works led by philosopher Al Kindi in the 8<sup>th</sup> Century. It has been suggested that Al Kindi's work confused the subject of metaphysics for the study of God as a name, rather than the study of cause in investigation of the nature of the maker as an artisan of reality. My research suggests so far that only 4 of Plato's many dialogues were available to later Muslim scholars because they did not know Greek. Likewise, there was a similar linguistic problem in Christian Europe of the Middle Ages outside of Byzantium and the bulk of Plato's dialogues appear to have reposed in Byzantium, perhaps in anonymity. Arguably the study of Aristotle, a secondary source of Plato's work without Plato hampered medieval philosophical inquiry in the Medieval Islamic Caliphates. I can only speculate that the Gorgias, one of Plato's most important political works went untranslated, unavailable to unknown by scholars seeking after an idealism that arguably could keep them safe and insulated from political mistreatment as Christianity and Islam became the two major competitors for religious and political power in the medieval world.

The evidence of this terrible handicap is found in the Polemic "The Incoherence of the Philosophers" by the brilliant 12<sup>th</sup> Century Persian jurist and Philosopher Al Ghazali, considered in Islam second in influence only to the Prophet Mohammad in the Muslim world. He found himself in total mistrust of Al Farabi and Avicenna on the subject of cause in metaphysics, blamed Aristotle as their misleader and while recognizing that Plato may have been on to something misleading with their metaphysics, distrusted and misunderstood Plato himself in criticizing the theory of movement. Yet Al Ghazali

did recognize while not forgiving, the struggles Muslim scholars had in translations of Greek philosophical works and perhaps in frustration made ruminations at the end of his polemic suggesting the possibility of death fatwas against the followers of Al Farabi and Avicenna. Still worse, it appears that he may have compounded this problem in his own ignorance of Plato's work by dual tracking God and humanity in separating and dividing them in a misuse of correlations, confusing correlations with cause. It appears Al Ghazali was so frustrated by the inadequate state of metaphysics in study that he gave up philosophy and politics and became an ascetic Sufi intellectual.

The great Spanish Muslim Jurist and Philosopher Averroes a century later warned of the misuse of scholarly theoretical inquiry the polemic of philosopher Al Ghazali by theologians to label philosophers such as Avicenna and Al Farabi as dangerous heretics and imposters. He argued that this dispute among philosophers over causal theory in metaphysics threatened the political health of the greater Muslim community in the middle ages. This same disputation between followers of St. Thomas Aquinas and of Duns Scotus tore the 13<sup>th</sup> Century Christian Scholastic movement apart. I suspect that the unavailability of critical dialogues of Plato in metaphysics to put Aristotle's work in perspective blew up in the faces of the most influential scholars and political leaders and intellectuals. The fallout is politically and philosophically and scientifically and artistically profound, reverberating through political systems worldwide to this day. Unless it is corrected, I fear that violence and killing will continue unabated as a pathology ill understood and inadequately treated in political art and political science continually threatening physical and medical disaster, by individual and governmental tyrannies.

Academics need to understand this matter in terms of their compelling need to do legitimate research, even that research and thinking which leads down trails later discovered as false. This problem manifested itself from merely unconventional thinking (heresy) in ancient Greece into fear of discourse itself, not only in the tyrannies of the Greek city state system but by Judaic, Christian and Muslim theologians among other faith institutions together with other interested people including politicians, economists, political scientists, philosophers, artists and scientists as a whole, law enforcement and the military/industrial/business community. This fear of heresy morphed into the suppression of all

Greek philosophical schools in the Eastern Roman Empire, to political persecution of Islamic philosophers as explained by Averroes and the disintegration of the Thirteenth Century Christian Scholastic movement in Western Europe.

One gets the sense that while Plato, Socrates and the Pre-Socratic philosophers and scientists were given lip service as creative intellectuals while scholars chased Aristotle, Plato's student, their work has long suffered from neglect, left unknown and unattended to by scholars or otherwise unappreciated in natural philosophy and science. If indeed, Bertrand Russell could recognize in this philosophy or natural philosophy, the beginnings of Western philosophy, we may have an imperfect and incomplete picture of their thinking and in political science, their insights may have escaped mainstream political thought. Therefore, careful study of their thinking may reveal valuable contributions to political science as geared into research design and study of art and science in Nonkilling Global Political Science. The public interest requires this thinking to be systematized for movement into mainstream applications in human health and public safety arts and science. If indeed government itself is justified in keeping the peace and public safety, political scientists should leave no stone unturned in this quest or enterprise.

Sophism and rhetoric are difficult and dangerous to handle and this problem must be specifically addressed in primary and secondary education systems, the churches, synagogues, mosques, monasteries, by business, law enforcement, health care professionals, theologians, legislation and justice related institutions and executives charged with carrying out public policy.

By implication, wisdom involves finding acceptability in the words we use to what is divine in describing and discussing the subject of political science in movement and form, particularly that subject that Glenn Paige has nested within the subject of political science called "Nonkilling Global Political Science". Just what is the acceptable meaning of Paige's terminology? Is he truly describing political science or some subdivision of the subject of political science? It is an exhortation of my own, rhetorically, to describe Nonkilling Global Political Science in such manner as will be intelligible to the reader, which is my own intent.

## Nonkilling Global Political Science is created on principle of movement

At the beginning of any inquiry about anything, including the subject of nonkilling global political science, one should ask the question, was nonkilling global political science always in existence and without a beginning, or was it created and had it a beginning. The answer I submit is that which follows the opinion of Timaeus in Plato's dialogue of that name: nonkilling global political science is created as visible and tangible, has a body and is therefore sensible, and all sensible things are apprehended by opinion and sense and are in a process of creation and created by a cause. The maker we may label as cause or God or any other name is past finding out and even if we were able to find this maker, to tell of this maker to all people would be impossible.

To name God or gods or authors of books on the subject is no solution to this problem. Likewise, to call Plato or Karl Marx the creator of Communism, Platonism or Marxism and create a statue naming them as creators is nothing more than naming names for fame in flattery or infamy in poetry, prose calculated for rhetoric in eristic, for what is formed in opinion is to implicate good or bad creations in movement and form. These are opinions correlated with names and describe ghosts or secondary images in the analogy of an analogue TV set. There is no analogy between the name we give to a cause and the cause to create in cognitive process a transfer of information or meaning from a particular subject to another subject. Rather a correlation is attempted that suggests a connection between two random variables or two sets of data to manufacture a responsibility in relationship. If one speaks of this as proximate cause, we are not speaking of cause at all, but what is next to cause, an intermediary, for which we exact accountability for a happening or creation.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> When we speak of responsibility we think in laws related to responsibility or accountability in compensating a relationship gone bad, with specie lost and found, in rhetoric that reminds us to do right in legislating, managing bodies in knowledge of their good or evil condition, in medicine providing cures or palliatives for illness, in the interest of making good out of injustice or what we call justice, implicating Plato's four arts attending on the body and soul of humanity. Prosser and Keaton, in writing about Francis Bacon's creation in law called proximate cause borrowed from Aristotle lamented that somehow the concept of proximate as "next to" and "cause" obfuscated in their elegance the simple notion of responsible or legal cause. This means that the general pub-

This problem is illustrated in Plato's dialogue, *Cratylus*, where Plato's Socrates concluded that name-making does not implicate the source from where knowledge comes from and indeed name-making tends to impede the learning process. He urged that reality should be directly studied in its own light, such that names should not be studied in the pursuit of knowledge, but understood in a different way from knowledge of cause itself and understood in knowledge as intermediaries, mediators, agency, go-between, medium or means, an intermediate form or stage, or between, a conduit. An example from physical science is the moon reflecting sunlight or moonshine describing home-made whiskey or an imitation of whiskey – imitation sunshine. Like counterfeit in imitation, it operates on a dual track with reality to those learned in genuine and counterfeit goods. Where there is no learning, the distinction is dulled and in ignorance and chaos we blunder around.

As a redundancy, the names are to be treated as intermediaries in a separate subject from cause, so as to know why the names were created. Such an approach to inquiry allows us to contemplate some form of stability throughout any change we perceive. Without such thinking, particularly about nonkilling

---

lic including highly educated people may not know what the ancients meant by "cause" and "proximate" thrown together by Aristotle and Bacon and imitated by scholars, lawyers, theologians and scientists up to the present. If the public understands cause as many, rather than one, as the lawyer and pragmatist philosopher St. John-Green (1872) proposed, it is because of sophistic divisions by scholars that chop up the meaning of cause and graft other meanings onto this unfortunate word, for the sake of individual or other unique forms of material advantage by intrinsic and extrinsic fraud or mistake. What we mean to say by "proximate cause" is a corruption of cause itself. Proximate cause is only a correlation to which we may assign in metric of the body, metric- in- nature things to things, making things something or belonging to something else. In *Theaetetus*, Plato seems to propose that great philosophers do not in discourse about politics and philosophy make things something or belonging to something else. We refer to *Timaeus* in understanding that cause is what never is found out or discovered, but which we know makes all things including the no thing or nothing dubbed by Democritus happen. See also *Genesis*, which assumes that God is the author of meaning in creation, in nature and the name of God itself is a handle for expressing this concept in body and form. Thales himself, one of the Pre-Socratic philosophers and arguably the first claimed Western scientist reportedly remarked that the earth is full of gods. Political Science needs to be concerned with its roots and to treat and handle these sophistic divisions of cause with care, so as to filter out violence and killing from political method, in art and science, religiously, for the sake of a coherent philosophy useful to practicing politicians and a public so much in need of truthful, honest and nonkilling art and science in habit of rhetoric.

global political science, everything is in flux, preventing something referred to by name from being utterable unless the form referred to endured long enough for the predicate to be attached to say the sentence, "The Beautiful itself is beautiful." Knowledge would not be possible if while we learn about the object, it is already changing into something else.

Thus Political Science is political science gains nothing if we don't recognize the movement of political science as killing or nonkilling in the mind. What is unchanging about political science is not the name we give it but its nature as doing and getting things done and done well, in human on human affairs, as social art and social science, with implications dealt with by the other arts and sciences including the hard sciences we know as physics, chemistry and biology in the language of words, variables and discrete numbers we call mathematics.

On this understanding, learning about nonkilling global political science, like anything else, should be a matter not of its name but of reality itself, with the name as intermediary, in the knowledge of cause. What caused Glenn Paige to create the name for the subject he seeks to know and educate others about? It is not that Glenn Paige is Glenn Paige, but an intermediary bringing forth the notion that the nature of Nonkilling Global Political Science is of the art and science of human beings living together in stable unchanging form named nonkilling, the absence of killing and threats to kill, in a reality of fluxing things that in reality do not flux because nature in state or condition never really changes, even in a world of changing appearances. The name he uses allows us to view in creation a nonkilling society, a society implicating a divine knowledge as the intermediary, perfect and all sufficing, an ideal always passing out of sight, but always in mind, in focus on the subject of politics as science and as art, in beautiful abstraction.

This enterprise, implicating religion itself, is necessary to preserve and protect political science as an art and science of creation so that it does not become a tool for the creation of ugly things that habit and clothe in the beauty of a political body and cook cynical manipulation to personal advantage at individual and public expense. Politics have long been correlated with eristic making it difficult for people to discourse politics linked with philosophy that identifies politics as life promoting but only with a kind of Lebensraum of living space procured at the peril of humans. Ignorant political and religious discussions often break

out in acrimony of disputation and at times culminate in violence, threats to kill and killing. They bore to death and boredom is hated. Some hosts of parties even proscribe political and religious discussions at their parties for fear of breaches of the peace. I remember a story related to me by a Taiwanese friend of a political discussion he, a member of the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) had with his brother, a member of the rival Kuomintang Party (KMT) that culminated in his brother pulling a knife on him. Such is the recourse we make to lethal combat and its threats when we seek beauty without being in love.

To understand the cause of killing, we should consider not the personification of the killer or victim for flattery or eristic purposes in a stillborn argument but to understand that name-calling is a sophistic exercise that juggles words around to the purpose of a storyteller, which does not implicate philosophy or science in itself, but something irrational that does not in itself explain the nature of its applications. At such ugliness, we understand (a) sophisticated eristic of public oratory or private reprove, a scolding; (b) barbaric rhetoric of what only believes in what it can feel in touch, see, smell, taste and hear – seeing by the senses rather than sight through the senses. One must see through the clouds of dust kicked up by word juggling to get at and stay on the subject of interest which is once again the nature of political science in its actual calling.

Classical philosophy seems to equate eristic politics with what has been described by Fox Network's talk show host Bill O'Reilly as the left-wing/right-wing culture wars. It consists of the dabbling in forensic controversy in sensational philosophy, which is to say it is no enterprise at all worthy of the name of enterprise but only habit and routine and refers to what is spurious or counterfeit to philosophy itself. At the conclusion of Plato's *The Sophist*, the Stranger sums up the subject of naming things without regard for subject:

He, then, who traces the pedigree of his art as follows—who, belonging to the conscious or dissembling section of the art of causing self-contradiction, is an imitator of appearance, and is separated from the class of phantastic which is a branch of image-making into that further division of creation, the juggling of words, a creation human, and not divine—any one who affirms the real Sophist to be of this blood and lineage will say the very truth.

## The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science

Implicit in this description of the sophist is the recognition of the distinction between the origination of things in pedigree (I am born) and the plain fact of generation as the grounding principle of things originated (to be born). If the philosopher focuses on the former (origination) and calls it cause, then one speaks of an imitation, a secondary image in ghost and counterfeit of cause itself and can be identified as first and foremost a real Sophist. If the philosopher recognizes in speech the underlying principle of generation, one recognizes in art and craft that we make things up, create them and deal with both genuine and counterfeit explicitly, which is what science is all about in the doing, in art. To deal with things in ontology, we need to think in cosmogony to recognize art (doings) when we see it, so that we can do art ourselves and therefore embark on enterprise.

Political leadership is an enterprise of science in the element of episteme (knowledge) in epistemology (theory of knowledge) that assembles and marshals observations in what Edgar Allan Poe in his "Murders in the Rue Morgue" called genius for purposes of calculation with analytics as its purpose (Political Science). Poe, a poet, West Point trained engineer and pioneer in detective/who dunnit stories indicated that for the analyst, knowing what to observe implicates knowing the range from which viewing a problem morphs into observation of relevant movement. He distinguished analytics in art from the irrelevant movement of things and ingeniously building in an indiscriminate mass that obliterates all meaning in chaos. From his writing on the subject of ingenuity in calculation as distinguished from analytics, we begin to appreciate Plato's understanding of the knowledge business as Divine in Royal Science of Gods, Emperors and Kings as Philosophers and Pilots that navigate the ship of state through troubled land, waters and skies.

The academic and scientific communities have a special charge here – to lead politics and politicians, as well as the public, to the truth of existence as it really is or become irrelevant. The genuine and imitation events must be put in their place, in analytics, requiring the scientist to in Plato's words in *Theaetetus*, flit from place to place, measuring things, even without knowledge of where to go, but only what to observe. This leadership helps others lead in their own way, in personal and physical safety, in life's diverse journeys. Plato's Socrates in the *Republic* analogized philosophers to pilots and these pilots, there when needed as a resource answering need afford all of us, as captains of our ship



of state or condition of life, to live in perfection – the art of doing things imperfectly, but within the margin of life. This is why the Nonkilling Global Political Scientist can justly claim that everyone can be a center of nonkilling, in science.

## Knowing what to observe in Analytics: Movement in Sophism and Rhetoric in Theoretical and Applied Political Art and Science

In the *Gorgias*, Plato's Socrates observed that rhetoric itself is difficult to separate from sophistry because its nature, standing alone in isolation is the habit of a bold and ready wit, which knows how to manage humanity. He described rhetoric as a habit as artifice of the art of flattery, which he described as the art of making things pleasant. Flattery makes things pleasant by means of creating experience or routine for people to follow along with. He included rhetoric as one of four branches of this art in the theory of movement, which includes attiring, sophistry and cookery.

Treating these branches as separate subjects in analogy, Plato's character Socrates described Flattery in art, operating in rhetoric. He explained that attiring in habit is clothing something in attractive lines, colors and enamels and cookery creates an experience of taste and sophistry in habit juggles words to create an experience without an image, manufacturing ghosts (secondary images that reveal nothing) that counterfeit the subject of true interest and are therefore false subjects. Indeed, lethal war is built on flattery because lethal war is an experience and routine built on habiting, cooking, juggling words without creating an image, working in sophistry to juggle words into deadly position, like the old, boringly repetitive Greek war dances of clashing spear and shield (Pyrrhic)<sup>7</sup>. Lethal war among humans is a human

---

<sup>7</sup> Wikipedia's description of the Pyrrhichios dance (Pyrrhic dance) (Ancient Greek: πυρρικός or πυρρική, is a great example of an exercise in art of flattery in futility of clothing reality and cooking emotions. The Great Greek military leader Xenophon reported that in a dance celebrating the arrival of his forces in a city, two Thracian women, dressed as men, fought with knives in circular dance to the sound of a lyra. They struggled with one another for victory and the opponent's death. One of the dancers stabbed the other to the shock and amazement of the crowd. Blood flowed and the stricken dancer collapsed causing the crowd to cry out in horror. The victor danced around the defeated opponent. Suddenly recognizing her deed, she knelt by the victim in anguish and stabbed herself. This further shocked the crowd some of whom rushed to abate this deed. When doing so, they realized that the entire proceeding was

creation built on the art of flattery that distributes sham through habit and cookery and not of divine creation.

Thus, political art and political science must address the problem of killing or be relegated an ignoble status of managing humanity by killing and threats to kill, operating by the art of flattery that makes things pleasant, as habit and routine associated with the art of creating self-contradiction. These arts combine as uniquely human and not divine creations of perhaps an art of creating “Nothing”. Rhetoric supplies the ghost (habit) and counterfeit (routine) we often mistake for politics in art and politics in science.

For the purpose of identifying political science correctly, we are then required, as Glenn Paige suggests, to clarify for the professionals and public alike, what political science is in truth as nonkilling global political science, or embrace a demoralizing sham of human and not divine creation. Lethal war is the subject of “Nothing” that counterfeits and ghosts politics and political science in art and science.

### **The Theory of Movement: stillness of habit in the delivery of cooked bodies**

The subject of political science in principle is politics itself and what is not politics but an imitation of politics (movement and immobility in turn). By treating movement and immobility together as real and imitation politics, in theory of movement,

---

fake as the blood was thickened dye. The two dancers then arose to the amusement of all present. Also Homer refers to Pyrrhios and describes how Achilles danced it around the burning funeral of Patroclus in the Greek/Trojan War. The dance was loved in all of Greece and especially the Spartans considered it a kind of light war training and so they taught the dance to their children while still young. One begins to comprehend lethal war in the art of making the most horrific and shockingly ugly of things pleasant. If one replicates or imitates this individual combat in large scale group activities we call battles on a battlefield, we can dream of this flattery in heroic sacrifice as habited and cooked to the public, in shockwaves generated by high art. Nuclear weapon dances in test explosions of bigger and bigger weapons or miniaturized for delivery by rocket or suitcase make this excitement palatable as a national security dance, with today's players North Korea and Iran and possibly Al Qaida learning this highest of arts in demonstrating slaughter, by faking it and hoping it never really is created, in officiousness and meddling. In sophistry, we recognize this in division from the fantastic in imagery, as the juggling of words in rhetoric to create nothing.

nonkilling global political science recognizes competent political science explicitly as a life preserver useful in turbulent waters, as a safety belt and tow line, as a pilot/navigator of a ship we call state or condition of the polity. We have the power to make and use safety devices. To fail to make and use them in dangerous situations is not good or divine creation but is an abject failure to create as a creation, in art, and science – a creation in counterfeit self-contradiction - uniquely human. The political scientist must recognize the nature of the profession and create according among the public for the sake of students, professors, school teachers and pupils, politicians, theologians, philosophers and statesmen of any gender.

The alternative is for political science to run against its own nature in contradiction, by nonfeasance – where one establishes relationships that convey a moral obligation that one in a position to perform fails to perform. Habit, good or bad is not even its own cause because no one really need do anything, but let nothing happen, as an imitation something, what Plato called an Unbeing or an existence of what does not exist, in the Sophist. It is the art in flattery of the divine- of fools making fools. This nonfeasance in reality is misfeasance (ignobility) because this habit cooks experience, sensation and routine to no purpose, ignoble because it does not care one whit for humanity, taking what it will in pathology, seeing everything but knowing nothing, not even doing what it thinks best, but only doing without knowing or caring what it does. Flattery by nature does “Nothing” and non-feasance or misfeasance is its rhetoric. As art, nonfeasance and misfeasance are not art at all, but an artifice of habit or routine that clothes itself as something in attractive lines, colors and enamels and cooks trouble, by self-contradiction. One is truly without God or gods, alone awaiting exposure in fraud, embarrassment, humiliation and shame, especially in courts of law, equity and the ecclesiastic. No one wants or needs this, in spite of all the efforts of Diogenes the Cynic, to point out and expose himself and all around him to evade shame entirely by shaming all. A student of Diogenes’ life may well understand why Plato might refer to him as Socrates gone mad in self-contradiction.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Diogenes of Sinope together with Antisthenes appears to be one of the twin pillars of a school called by scholars the philosophical school of cynicism in prototype in western philosophy. The word cynic in Greek refers to dogs which by nature function shame-

## The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science

Consequently, misfeasance is only a sophistic division of nonfeasance jumbled together in malfeasance or “Nothing” once again - chaos. A science that does not deal with it cannot engender public confidence and such science will fall, as did alchemy, due to nonfeasance/misfeasance in division in an assumed correlative relationship. What remains after the boiling in terms of cookery is malfunction/defect in sophistic division (word juggling) captured in “Nothing”. Plato explains this problem in the context of rhetoric as an imitation art, for any political scientist who cares to read the *Gorgias*, as the analogy of the cooked body, truly the raw material of nonkilling global political science:

**Gor.** Never mind him (speaking of Gorgias’ student of rhetoric Polus), but explain to me what you mean by saying that rhetoric is the counterfeit of a part of politics.

**Soc.** I will try, then, to explain my notion of rhetoric, and if I am mistaken, my friend Polus shall refute me. We may assume the existence of bodies and of souls?

**Gor.** Of course.

**Soc.** You would further admit that there is a good condition of either of them?

**Gor.** Yes.

**Soc.** Which condition may not be really good, but good only in appearance? I mean to say, that there are many persons who appear to be in good health, and whom only a physician or trainer will discern at first sight not to be in good health.

**Gor.** True.

**Soc.** And this applies not only to the body, but also to the soul: in either there may be that which gives the appearance of health and not the reality?

**Gor.** Yes, certainly.

---

lessly. Diogenes spent much of his life in exile, living in a tub or jar on the streets in Athens hectoring people about their shortcomings and speaking of himself as owning in virtue what is disgraceful, spoiling to be shamed and beaten. Arguably, if he belonged to a school of philosophy called cynicism, it could only be that he was ignorant while professing knowledge of humanity in contradiction. People know things as a virtue of being human, in spite of their attitudes toward what they know, and can be misled into slavish rhetoric as habit and cookery, flattened and flattered by life itself, in the art of God and gods, perhaps to teach love in the art of doing without it, richness in the form of poverty. Our hearts must go out in pathos to such desperately troubled people, or we too play the fool, without pathos and ethos, likewise in poverty of faith and reason.

Soc. And now I will endeavour to explain to you more clearly what I mean: The soul and body being two, have two arts corresponding to them: there is the art of politics attending on the soul; and another art attending on the body, of which I know no single name, but which may be described as having two divisions, one of them gymnastic<sup>9</sup>, and the other medicine<sup>10</sup>. And in politics there is a legislative part, which answers to gymnastic, as justice does to medicine; and the two parts run into one another, justice having to do with the same subject as legislation, and medicine with the same subject as gymnastic, but with a difference. Now, seeing that there are these four arts, two attending on the body and two on the soul for their highest good; flattery knowing, or rather guessing their natures, has distributed herself into four shams or simulations of them; she puts on the likeness of some one or other of them, and pretends to be that which she simulates, and having no regard for men's highest interests, is ever making pleasure the bait of the unwary, and deceiving them into the belief that she is of the highest value to them. Cookery simulates the disguise of medicine, and pretends to know what food is the best for the body; and if the physician and the cook had to enter into a competition in which children were the judges, or men who had no more sense than children, as to which of them best understands the goodness or badness of food, the physician would be starved to death. A flattery I deem this to be and of an ignoble sort, Polus, for to you I am now addressing myself, because it aims at pleasure without any thought of the best. An art I do not call it, but only an ex-

---

<sup>9</sup> As to the arts generally, Plato explains that they are for the most part concerned with doing.....Gymnastic is the art that makes people able to understand and treat the good or evil condition of the body. Trainers and athletic coaches deal with this matter among individuals. Legislation as part of the art of politics makes us understand and treat the good or evil condition of political bodies (polities) or form or system, civil or ecclesiastical, we conglomerate into the concept of State or even condition, to describe what is and what does, in term of art, because again, an art is understood as being concerned with doing. Plato described politics as an art that manages the souls by enabling the soul in art to manage the body to the best condition, by legislation answering to gymnastic (the former attending to the soul and the latter attending to the body.

<sup>10</sup> The art of medicine makes people able to understand and speak about the sick in body. It corresponds to justice in art because justice attends on the soul doing through the soul what is right for what makes a body sick and for which medicine attends on the body. The art of politics consists of all four arts attending to body and soul and suggest both civil and ecclesiastical doings of the state in condition.

## The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science

perience, because it is unable to explain or to give a reason of the nature of its own applications. And I do not call any irrational thing an art; but if you dispute my words, I am prepared to argue in defence of them.

Cookery, then, I maintain to be a flattery which takes the form of medicine; and tiring, in like manner, is a flattery which takes the form of gymnastic, and is knavish, false, ignoble, illiberal, working deceitfully by the help of lines, and colours, and enamels, and garments, and making men affect a spurious beauty to the neglect of the true beauty which is given by gymnastic.

I would rather not be tedious, and therefore I will only say, after the manner of the geometricians (for I think that by this time you will be able to follow)

astiring : gymnastic :: cookery : medicine; or rather,

astiring : gymnastic :: sophistry : legislation; and

as cookery : medicine :: rhetoric : justice.

And this, I say, is the natural difference between the rhetorician and the sophist, but by reason of their near connection, they are apt to be jumbled up together; neither do they know what to make of themselves, nor do other men know what to make of them. For if the body presided over itself, and were not under the guidance of the soul, and the soul did not discern and discriminate between cookery and medicine, but the body was made the judge of them, and the rule of judgment was the bodily delight which was given by them, then the word of Anaxagoras, that word with which you, friend Polus, are so well acquainted, would prevail far and wide: "Chaos" would come again, and cookery, health, and medicine would mingle in an indiscriminate mass. And now I have told you my notion of rhetoric, which is, in relation to the soul, what cookery is to the body. I may have been inconsistent in making a long speech, when I would not allow you to discourse at length. But I think that I may be excused, because you did not understand me, and could make no use of my answer when I spoke shortly, and therefore I had to enter into explanation. And if I show an equal inability to make use of yours, I hope that you will speak at equal length; but if I am able to understand you, let me have the benefit of your brevity, as is only fair: And now you may do what you please with my answer.

Plato argued that to conceive of natural philosophy (any other classification we call philosophy) and science and political art in sophistic imitation is to in sophistry juggle words to describe the ignoble as if it is good and thereby misrepresent

and mislead the public as to the nature of political art, political science (any science/knowledge in bits, bytes and systems) and political philosophy.

We rely on science to detect mistake. Fraud in concept amounts to any circumstance in which people are prevented, deterred or otherwise diverted by mistake from embracing the truth of existence as it really exists. The extrinsic fraud is just mistake extrinsic to a given body or polity etymologically. The intrinsic fraud just refers to what is mistake operating pathologically from within the body or polity. We need to recognize our environment in etiology, in study of causation in generation and origination to focus on our interest, analytically and competently. The notion of generation itself must be recognized distinctly from origination because generation in concept deals only with the cosmogonic – to be born, rather than the ontological – is born. Cause is the former, correlation and analogy deals with the latter and both the cosmogonic and the ontological correspond with each other as does a symphony / musical orchestra, the author of the music and the conductor.

### **Theory of Movement in the subject of Attired and Cooked Politics and Religion**

Indeed, this problem of misrepresentation plagues the religious art and science by making humans and institutions and gods something they are not, flattering and condemning them at the same time in the eye of the general public, a true insult or blasphemy itself. No religion which seeks general public acceptance and seeks to elicit obedience to God or principle can perform its mission under such constraints because its scriptures cannot invite such contempt and still be scriptures. This is the case for philosophy, the arts, the sciences - anything which we propose to hold up as sacred and no less the case for human life itself.

Thus, sophistry and rhetoric, attiring and cookery are subjects that do not explain themselves but must be explained, in art and in science, within the subject we understand as ignorance and as part of that yawning chasm the Greeks understood as chaos, a poverty that must be filled with knowledge. Here we begin to appreciate Nonkilling Global Political Science as a creation of a beautiful thing to which we conjoin ourselves as coordinates in political art, political science, political leadership in statesmanship – a true Politicus.

If Spinoza could posit that the goal of theology is obedience while philosophy aims at understanding rational truth, one can see theology and philosophy, politics and science in union, as faithful and rational for to disobey is only to cause contradiction by juggling words in dissemblance without a real creation, without an image or form – only a human habit of naming things without regard and outside of love. One simply imitates other disobedience by non-conformity in ragged concert – a dis-assembly or dissembly amounting to nothing, which requires propulsion in doing good, by and through reason and faith merged as one. A human creation without divine inspiration is a bad creation manifesting injustice and must be put to work by science in justice, to promote the divine. There is no alternative. Injustice and disease is weak-minded, strong willed futility when there is no legislation or justice that moves the soul to do the best which is good for both body and soul.

In the succeeding section of this essay, I undertake to dissect what takes things apart and bring them together again in faith and reason, so as to describe Nonkilling Global Political Science, in the art of doing nonkilling so as to promote the good of life among the member individuals of the State.

## **PART II. UNDERSTANDING DISSEMBLY**

### **From knowledge of nothing to the existence of nothing: the atomistic dissembly of political art and science**

Dissembling is just a way of taking things apart in division – in a nature associated with humans and not with God in art or science. It is for this reason that Democritus, the Laughing Philosopher, could take on the moniker of the Mocker, who is credited with claiming that “what is not” exists, arguing that the term “nothing” should be paired with what it negates – the one ‘no more’ exists than the other one. Such a claim may destroy the subject distinction between cosmogony and ontology. Thus, if cosmogony is a theory “to be born” and ontology is “/ am born” as what can be sorted and distinguished as the appearance in division, one need not be concerned with the subject of creation of things and content oneself with rhetoric and its use in sophism. Where there is no will, how can there be an “is”, an “am” or an “are”?



By now, it should be clear to anyone the difference between philosophy and sophism. Philosophy considers both in faith and reason by disciplined inquiry, in classical philosophy in discourse by dialectic, in art. Sophism merely juggles the words around to create experience in sensation. Unaided by discourse in dialectic, in art, it juggles and drops balls in unlearning, incompetence and ignorance, as a matter of faith and reason and therefore must be guided by faith and reason in the best interest of each and all.

If this is true, Democritus as a philosopher would exist as a contradiction and even a mockery. To call him the father of science as some claim is just to attribute to him methodology in dissembling nature, a creation in no way divine, but indeed the creation of a human, in nature, as a sophist and rhetorician. These problems were treated separately in Plato's dialogues of *Timaeus*, the *Theaetetus*, the *Sophist* and the *Gorgias*.<sup>11</sup>

Consider for a moment a toddler who pulls a sophisticated toy apart and then gets frustrated and cries because pulling it apart meant it no longer served its original purpose in creation. It takes time to recreate the original connection and the fact that it now requires reverse engineering to figure out how it works. If one atomizes, one cannot reverse engineer because one is looking for nothing. For a toddler, this is terrible for limited patience. He wants it to work. In footnote 6, one sees in atomism a tantrum of eristic, without a focus on science and engineering, but a creation of negation, which is to charitably call non-creation a

---

<sup>11</sup> In supposing that void exists, the atomists deliberately embraced an apparent contradiction, claiming that 'what is not' exists. Apparently addressing an argument by Melissus, a follower of Parmenides, the atomists paired the term for 'nothing' with what it negates, 'thing,' and claimed that—in a phrase typical of the atomists—the one 'no more' exists than the other (DK 67A6). Schofield (2002) argues that this particular phrase originated with Democritus and not his teacher Leucippus. By putting the full (or solid) and the void ontologically on a par, the atomists were apparently denying the impossibility of void. Void they considered to be a necessary condition for local motion: if there were no unoccupied places, where could bodies move into? Melissus had argued from the logical impossibility of void to the impossibility of motion; the atomists apparently reasoned in reverse, arguing from the fact that motion exists to the necessity for void space to exist (DK 67A7). It has been suggested that Democritus' conception of void is that of the (temporarily) unfilled regions between atoms rather than a concept of absolute space (Sedley 1982). Void does not impede the motion of atoms because its essential quality is that of 'yielding,' in contrast to the mutual resistance of atoms. Later atomist accounts attest that this 'yielding' explains the tendency of bodies to drift into emptier spaces, driven out by collision from more densely packed regions (Lucretius *DRN* 6.906–1089). Berryman (2010).

creation, a juggling of words, in sophistry of creating a non-image. It appears that Melissus in saying “No” in so many words somehow drove Greek sophists into hysteria (unmanageable emotional excess) trying to figure out what to do with the word “no” – which seems to denote rebellion, like all the devils in hell fussing over a fire that would not burn – and in true Greek irony, making trouble in dissimulation or deception.<sup>12</sup>

### Creating a Nonkilling Global Society through Political Art and Science

The enterprise herein – of describing Nonkilling Global Political Science is to create the reality in the appearance of a nonkilling global society envisioned by Paige in Nonkilling Global Political Science in Art and Science in image-making. We can imagine the appearance of beautiful people in love in art and science pursuing beauty, which in Timaeus is the story of politics in art and politics in science. We describe explicitly what we want without losing the trust of the reader by juggling words to create ghosts and counterfeits, commonly associated with politics as science and politics as art, in sophistry and rhetoric. There is no wisdom in juggling words because trust is all important to the enterprise. One has to cre-

---

<sup>12</sup> From the Ancient Greek εἰρωνεία *eirōneía*, meaning dissimulation or feigned ignorance. The sense I get from my research on this subject is that in spirit we know something is wrong or bad but we don't know what to do with it or about it. In chaos, we make claims, find no real argument to support the claims and by negation of argument, the philosopher seeks to make a bad thing good by constructing an argument in a state of perfection. The argument is developed by laying a foundation in the use of analogies to establish probability to build agreement and social understanding in political art and out of scientific necessity. The problem is to distinguish cause from correlations so as to establish a legitimate, agreeable consensus on the true subject of interest. This is part of the pursuit of knowledge to be born in cosmogony or generation. It is a misuse of ontology to make claims of origination of things (I am born), things belonging to other things that simply invite disputation by scholars or laypeople without hope of consensus, assuming no need for perfection but belief that we are perfect like the Gods. For creatures devoted to perfection as routine and habit, this is a political disaster and constitutes a devastating argument against sophism. The complaint against sophism is that it misappropriates scientific method and art itself by ghosting and imitating them and in simulating wisdom in ignorance, appropriates their likeness to selfish purpose, in ignorance, inexperience. The object is to seek to reduce hostility, violence and killing, in pursuit of love in friendship. What we are doing is describing sincere discourse in truth. It is also the argument that Socrates killed himself trying to get people to think for themselves.

ate an agreed upon appearance of the subject in abstract image so as to portray the reality, that Nonkilling Global Political Science is Political Science itself in concept, in image, in appearance – a rational aspect of the human condition, a subject of desire, pursued in love, recognized in wisdom and known in knowledge as love itself in the pursuit of beauty.

In *Timaeus*, Plato suggests that the reader view political art and science as a creation, in Socrates' analogy of the State in politics as the art of the painter of beautiful animals suited for conflict and his desire to appreciate both the artist creator and the creations that came into conflict, understanding both in magnanimity – as what is great in good, again in aesthetics of natural philosophy in art and science.

Accordingly, as a creation, Nonkilling Global Political Science is conceived by opinion with the help of sensation and without reason and therefore is always in the process of becoming and perishing and never really is. It is an interest in keeping ourselves alive and not making ourselves dead in art and science. Therefore, it must be created by some cause, for without a cause, in reason it cannot be created. Opinion is a belief or judgment that rests on grounds insufficient to produce complete certainty, but is an appraisal, a personal view, an attitude, in formal expression. One perceives, as did Paige, a sensation, a stimulation or specific aspect of a general condition, that killing and threats to kill are fundamentally bad things that appear giving rise to a need to reduce or eliminate their appearance from life in politics and to substitute for this appearance a political life that enables or empowers politics itself as a living enterprise with continued life as its primary value in art and science.

Paige's work suggests political science in opinion and sensation as institutionally sanctioning destructive and ruinous opinions and sensations without reason creating a becoming and perishing unreality, created by spurious unguided human-only cause, mistaken for a permanent aspect of the human condition, of politics, all without substantial justification in opinion or sensational aid. His gentleness in broaching this subject indicates a keen recognition that magnanimity in temperance in dealing with this professional problem and courage to raise awareness of the problem of killing and its intellectual supports is necessary to bring about an institutional change in the discipline's habits and routine which provide unwitting support to dangerous and destructive human on human activity called killing. He speaks of a bad aspect of the condition of

human thinking about the subject of killing while arguing that change is desirable and possible, using what we know as bad to promote the good, in political scientists, for the benefit of academics and scientists, professionals in practice of politics and the public which also artisans politics as a matter of art and science.

Paige recognized the profound pain and agony, perhaps sensed by all who recognize human inflicted pain and degradation as spurious science, art and natural philosophy, based on the juggling of words - has been associated with politics in art and science. He conceived a notion, shared by many laypeople that political science had become a haven for trouble-making itself, mistaking dangerous to life behaviors as part of science and art. He and other scientists have sought to build a movement of intellect – a paradigm shift – away from the killing tool utility idea that he perceived had been made a part of political science in professional and academic understanding.

This paradigm of nonkilling is patterned on the unchangeable and fashioned to be fair and perfect philosophy and politics in art and the scientific method. If as Timaeus suggests, one looks only to the created for a pattern, one imitates what is already not fair or perfect. Hence there is no point in imitating a paradigm that accepts the unfair or imperfect as a model of practice in science, particularly political science or nonkilling global political science. Paige's work suggests there is a flaw in the nature of human understanding of political science and political art that adversely affects the human temperament and intimidates professionals in their courage to challenge long held bad habits in thinking about killing behavior in the political science. To deal with this problem, it is suggested here that we begin our inquiry with the heavens and earth whether in universe or multiverse, all that we consider matter and material.

We have already considered the problem of cosmogony and ontology as two different subjects that bedeviled scholars in Plato's time and continue to hamstring public thinking about the real and the unreal. The Persian philosopher Al Ghazali touched on this problem in his eristic essay, *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*, a long polemic against 12<sup>th</sup> Century Muslims who practiced sophism under the influence of Polymath Avicenna and political scientist Al Farabi. Al Ghazali, also known as Alcatel in western Christendom specifically criticized a practice of thought he called "heresy" where the world was thought by educated Muslim philosophers follow-

ing Aristotle to be with no beginning and no end and not created and labeled it the thinking of stupid idiots, intimating that Muslim philosophers who imitated this thinking could be subjects of a fatwah sentencing them to death. Averoes later came to the defense of these philosophers arguing that they were not imposters but true philosophers who may have made honest mistakes in their thinking and that a group of theologians were using these mistakes to improper advantage politically harming the Muslim community. If these philosophers were running into the dark, it could only be, that they were misled and Al Ghazali called out Aristotle as their ultimate misleader, imitated by Al Farabi and Avicenna.

In fact it appears that Al Ghazali was carrying on a fight among intellectuals that seems to have embroiled Plato's Academy after the death of Plato suggesting the eristic into which Greek philosophy was struggling with in a kind of naming inflation and which may have motivated Plato's efforts in his dialogues to discourse matters in dialectic. This fight seems to have embroiled theologians as well and may explain Byzantine Emperor Justinian I in the Sixth Century AD ordering the closure of all Greek schools of philosophy as somehow subversive to Christianity and the Eastern Roman Empire.

This same problem plagued the 13<sup>th</sup> Century Scholastic movement which degenerated with charges and counter-charges among the community of European Christian scholars handling elements of Greek philosophy primarily in the works of Aristotle, with one faction being labeled Dunces led by an accused Sophist John Duns Scotus. Known perhaps derisively as Dr. Subtilus, Duns Scotus argued elaborate proofs of the existence of God on a dual track reality with humans on another track similarly to Al Ghazali. The essence of Averoes' criticism, it seems is that those pursuing Godly or Divine Beauty in love were being castigated as self-serving ignorant sophists imitating philosophy in bad faith. Their accusers desired beauty without being in love and knew not their love because the subject of love in aesthetics was unspoken / unwritten and unknown and therefore without effective pursuers.

Essentially, the dispute, long lasting from at least the atomistic notions of nothing as an ontological creation and Hericlitus' notion that nothing exists and can be made known, was about "nothing". The fallout affects scholastic thinking today in the infighting between science and religion that turns the study

of evolution into an eristic “nothing” contest between organized science and organized religion that invades high school biological science classrooms in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Creationism vs. Evolution) and causes infighting in school boards and congressional science committees that takes on the appearance of O’Reilly’s right wing/left wing culture wars (rhetoric as habit cooking poison). God is Great or God is not great in flattery of both humans and gods with dangerous to life consequences is the political reality of education gone bad in public education and a vague collegiate education in philosophy and science that allows eristic to take hold of public life in the juggling of words and the habiting and cooking of ignorant or void imitation politics in Political Art and Political Science. For Nonkilling Global Political Science, this is no small matter, of a spurious creation called “nothing” puffed into disputation in eristic, morphing into charges of bad faith escalating into human on human killing. The need, as Plato recognized it in his dialogues, is to use this dispute to true political advantage, so as to promote the public good of a nonkilling global society.

To promote the good is to recognize and credit the bad appropriately in the creation of the good, in aesthetics of political science, in the interest of saving time and lives. Without knowing the nature of good and bad, we do nothing, create nothing and have nothing of value and political science cannot exist or justify its own existence as a public resource or trust. The following sections are designed to in aesthetic identify real and natural political science in subject of nonkilling global political science and to propose its inclusion as discipline and method in college curriculum, well connected with scripture, introduced in primary education adaptable to church environments – to a public starved in the methodology of human safety by undeveloped raw philosophy and science.

### **The World as Good or Bad: Philosophy and the Problem of Virtue in Flattery**

In the previous section, we have seen virtue in the sense we bring to living – the idea that there are good and bad virtues of things, where good is substantial and bad is insubstantial. Both the substantial and the insubstantial are of creation and the problem comes down to the nature of the creator of the good and bad. Plato’s *Timaeus* argued, consistent with Genesis, that the creator and the created are good in truth of

good and bad things happening, with the bad being resolved in good. In Genesis, God brought things into existence, created things and saw that they were good. The Bible never intimated that God was created but provided a moniker to give believers a coordinate by which they could speak intelligibly of this non-metric maker's activity. In this, Plato's understanding agrees with the Judeo-Christian scripture in its handling of cosmogonical and ontological matters. The question Plato now sought to explain through Timaeus is foundational for scientists and academics doing theoretical and applied science – how do we explain things that happen or come into creation ontologically as having been born in ontology, rather than to be born cosmogonically? The answer suggested by Plato is that we ask the impossible of ourselves if we insist on using ontology unaided by cosmogony. In rhetoric we are compelled, for the sake of a competent political science to come back to the same point patiently again and again or run away from it in sophism and be crushed in an ontological compactor, creatures of habit cooking ourselves in violence or killing.

Which of the patterns had the artificer in view when he made the world—the pattern of the unchangeable, or of that which is created? If the world be indeed fair and the artificer good, it is manifest that he must have looked to that which is eternal; but if what cannot be said without blasphemy is true, then to the created pattern. Every one will see that he must have looked to, the eternal; for the world is the fairest of creations and he is the best of causes. And having been created in this way, the world has been framed in the likeness of that which is apprehended by reason and mind and is unchangeable, and must therefore of necessity, if this is admitted, be a copy of something.

For the Political Scientist and those teaching Political Science in Science and Art, and for scientists and artists in general, Plato invites theology and all faiths to join as one, monistically to be able to speak intelligibly and lovingly of the divine that makes us truly conscious of creator and created as subjects requiring specific treatment in philosophy. We should consider the intimate connection between flattery and blasphemy so as to recognize the distortions that build eristic into social interactions and impede learning.

## The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science

Now it is all-important that the beginning of everything should be according to nature. And in speaking of the copy and the original we may assume that words are akin to the matter which they describe; when they relate to the lasting and permanent and intelligible, they ought to be lasting and unalterable, and, as far as their nature allows, irrefutable and immovable-nothing less.

The word *nature* is derived from the Latin word *natura*, or “essential qualities, innate disposition”, and in ancient times, literally meant “birth”. (KooPos) of Cosmogony was in translation to be born and refers to the source of creation itself. Taking this early understanding, we can recognize the outline of scripture in Genesis with the name of the creator as assumed, and therefore divine, referencing a divine subject given a name simply as a coordinate for discussing the nature of the creator as cause of all things, as a trusted and reliable topic, the maker who is past finding out.

Here we begin to recognize creation itself as the “I am born” introducing ontological subject matter as a topic of discussion in science and philosophy. When things go into feature or appearance, they represent what occurs in accord with the maker representing the maker in agreeing or letting things happen or come into existence, the so-called forms. Thus, it is understandable that in speaking truth, Timaeus urges us to speak according to the nature of things, as lasting and permanent and intelligible, lasting and unalterable by humans, except as nature allows or agrees, developing of their own accord, monistically. In this way, science including political science can explain phenomena of interest. When we think of names, etymologically, we need to find terms held in common to keep on subject. Thus when we speak ontologically, in science, we recognize names correlated with forms while recognizing cause as divine, using cosmogony as describing divine will as what the divine thinks best. If we are fooled, we merely think what is best, and fail to distinguish between the original (genuine) and the copy (imitation) and believe the copy is the original.

At this point, we can begin to discuss human creations in a reasonable manner, dealing with them as an explicit subject on their own terms, to express probability or likelihood of a given thing coming into existence and here we can speak in truth of what is in accord with our beliefs, from the heart.



But when they express only the copy or likeness and not the eternal things themselves, they need only be likely and analogous to the real words. As being is to becoming, so is truth to belief. If then, Socrates, amid the many opinions about the gods and the generation of the universe, we are not able to give notions which are altogether and in every respect exact and consistent with one another, do not be surprised. Enough, if we adduce probabilities as likely as any others; for we must remember that I who am the speaker, and you who are the judges, are only mortal men, and we ought to accept the tale which is probable and enquire no further.

Thus, the calling of political science in the wisdom of good scholarship, good art, good science is that which is within the common interest, the public interest. Blasphemy (from Greek βλασφημέω, from βλάπτω = "I injure" and φήμη = "reputation") is always a hot topic because it uses copy improperly to insult the original, particularly when it comes to divine and human creations. Blasphemy in the eristic imitates without caring for the subject and in rhetoric is guided by the art of flattery into producing sham on politics, gymnastic/medicine and justice. We must deal with the truth as it is, or risk injuring the reputation of truth itself, invoking God as the core of human discourse in truth of its nature and character as art and science, philosophy and natural philosophy. To capture this spirit of enterprise, we might turn to Plato's Socrates in *Timaeus* who laid the underpinning motivation for the study of politics as art:

I should like, before proceeding further, to tell you how I feel about the State which we have described. I might compare myself to a person who, on beholding beautiful animals either created by the painter's art, or, better still, alive but at rest, is seized with a desire of seeing them in motion or engaged in some struggle or conflict to which their forms appear suited; this is my feeling about the State which we have been describing. There are conflicts which all cities undergo, and I should like to hear some one tell of our own city carrying on a struggle against her neighbours, and how she went out to war in a becoming manner, and when at war showed by the greatness of her actions and the magnanimity of her words in dealing with other cities a result worthy of her training and education.

In this, Plato suggests we understand political science including the arts of politics captured in philosophy, natural phi-

osophy and science in theory and method of application as a thing of beauty, in the unrelenting pursuit of it as knowing it in intercourse, as part of life conjoined, as one monistically in practice – what poets might describe as love-making. If as Plato has observed, all men desire beauty but not all men are in love is true, then it would appear that Plato speaks to that spirit in us that wants the good but is halting and struggling and flagging in pursuit because of some fear of ignorance expressed by running away from ignorance rather than to know and use ignorance in pursuit of what we desire. It is like a would-be lover who does not act in love and thereby fails to embrace the subject of desire to be one with it.

Thus it seems reasonable that Plato would understand nature as craft in artisanship, an expression of love intertwined in beautiful works of something fundamentally beautiful – of beauty. It is in this aesthetic spirit that arguably Plato crafted his dialogues some 2,400 years ago. These dialogues form the founding concepts of philosophy and science, whether we term them hard science or soft science, theoretical or applied science or art including mathematics and music. We are called, mobilized to pursue, choosing in action peculiar aspects of the State or Condition we all are in as humans. We are drafted and use and are used for the sake of demonstrating the rational and irrational, that which explains the nature of its applications and that which does not explain anything and which therefore must be explained by something else. Plato therefore speaks of fairness as a thing of beauty in form is explained as a matter of simple justice correcting injustice, best for the body, best in medicine, best in legislation and best and highest good in form:

Tim. Let me tell you then why the creator made this world of generation. He was good, and the good can never have any jealousy of anything. And being free from jealousy, he desired that all things should be as like himself as they could be. This is in the truest sense the origin of creation and of the world, as we shall do well in believing on the testimony of wise men: God desired that all things should be good and nothing bad, so far as this was attainable. Wherefore also finding the whole visible sphere not at rest, but moving in an irregular and disorderly fashion, out of disorder he brought order, considering that this was in every way better than the other. Now the deeds of the best could never be or have been other than the fairest; and the creator, re-

flecting on the things which are by nature visible, found that no unintelligent creature taken as a whole was fairer than the intelligent taken as a whole; and that intelligence could not be present in anything which was devoid of soul. For which reason, when he was framing the universe, he put intelligence in soul, and soul in body, that he might be the creator of a work which was by nature fairest and best. Wherefore, using the language of probability, we may say that the world became a living creature truly endowed with soul and intelligence by the providence of God.

## **Nonkilling Epistemology: Nature of Nonkilling Knowledge Science**

Artisanship and craftsmanship is the purpose of things, of episteme, or ornaments that we use to explain or account for ourselves and our doings – in epistemology. Together we need to organize an explanation for what we are and what we do in the language of things as ornaments, making and decorating our lives as artisans in love – in our profound and shallow desires for beauty, in and out of love but needing love as that critical element. Poverty and ignorance refer to what must be filled. Love and hate are the fill and the spade that turns the fill. Love of knowledge and hatred of that yawning gap of chaos are the elements of perfection as enterprise turning a gap of knowledge into the fill of knowledge. This is true in political science as it is in all other science, religion and art. We make knowledge to fill ignorance or we run away from ignorance into ignorance's dark recesses in a vain attempt to hide from what we all profoundly loathe and fear. We can understand this in genuine political philosophy, art and science and in their counterfeits or ghosts that imitate the genuine without caring for the genuine and bathe humanity in deadly sham – sham of lawmaking, sham of justice, sham of a well-functioning political system and sham of the medicine that would cure or manage the system's debilitating ailments and lead to human on human inflicted injury and premature death.

The notion that Glenn Paige, a political scientist brings to the subject of politics as nonkilling global political science, is that old desire for beauty in the pursuit of love that is expressed in the Platonic dialogues that calls us to pursue political science including politics in art, in philosophy as a love interest of the dilettante, a patron of the finest of art and science, a

spirit of discovery in dialectic of discourse and intercourse. It implies competence as scientists, as artists and explains our divisions of scholarship as fields of art and science. It explains technologies and methods reflecting what-is and what-does competent and incompetent to our purpose.

### **PART III. THE POLITICS OF GHOSTS – KILLING AS PART OF COUNTERFEIT POLITICAL ART AND SCIENCE**

Nonkilling Global Political Science is explainable in terms of the notion that killing is incompetent political science and political art, an ugly thing and no one truly wants ugliness. It explains itself by setting forth the notion that love is the critical element that is so often missing from what people see as labeled “politics” and “political science”. People in love do not seek to kill their subject but this is what happens so often that hosts at dinner parties often fear political discussions because these conversations so often devolve into dangerous incompetent rhetoric.

People want to have fun at parties and celebrations, as the Boston Marathon so explicitly teaches us and they truly hate, with substantial justification flattery in rhetoric that would use these occasions as a stage upon which they can detonate futility in the form of Improvised Explosive Devices that institutionalize violence and killing as the imposed order of the day. Osama Bin Laden, reputed leader of the jihadi movement was so hated in the United States that the US spent more than ten years unceasingly hunting for this man to put a bullet in his brain or otherwise “bring him to justice”. Indeed, Bin Laden seems to have understood that as time went by, jihadism as he understood it in violence, bloodshed and killing was not a future he wanted his children to share, according to his family who presumably knew him best. If ignorance is poverty and knowledge in love is riches, a nonkilling human society has much to recommend it as a natural state of human affairs. One is rich when one is in love and impoverished without it, so why would anyone knowingly choose to live without it?

It has long been observed that forgiveness for error is truly divine because no one does evil voluntarily. Plato’s Socrates in exploring the nature of rhetoric observed that a fool does not do what he wills, but only what he thinks best. Would that not be

true of anyone, for if we confess ignorance of something, we are indeed recognizing the power of explanation for bad things happening. Storytellers such as Shakespeare (a man who knew Greek) continually work with ignorance to represent tragedy and comedy in rhetoric, built on flattery which acts through rhetoric to distribute sham, a compounding and re-compounded ignorance.

Plato in his dialogues *The Sophist* and *Gorgias* defined Flattery as the art of making things pleasant. The focus is on pleasing and in ignorant understanding of interest as habit or routine. Indeed a flatter is a coloring specialist within the comic book industry that prepares the inked or sketched comic book page for the colorist with digital art software. It also refers to a type of set tool used by blacksmiths and refers to someone who flattens things purposely or accidentally. It refers to something habitual as routine that cooks things up without care for what is cooked. Synonyms including adulate, beslaver (to defile with slaver; to beslobber), to besmear, brownnose, build up, blandish, bootlick in leveling and smoothing out, collapsing, complanate (level/smooth), decumbent, deflated, belaud (praise usually to excess), blarney, butter up, hero-worship, honey, massage, overpraise, puff, soft-soap, stroke, court, cajole, cater to, charm, con, fawn, get next to, glorify, grovel, humor, inveigle, jolly, lay it on thick, massage, oil, overpraise, play up to, praise, rub the right way, salve, sell, snow, soft-soap, soften, spread it on, sweet-talk, sweeten up, toady, wheedle, work on, work over, Beryl (a mineral that is the principle component in several gemstones, including emerald, aquamarine andmorganite, used in alloys to strengthen metals, colorless and impurities give the gemstones their particular colors) Truly flattery is understood as “art”. In Dante’s *Divine Comedy* of *Paradise*, *Purgatory* and *Hell*, flatterers are consigned to the ninth circle of *Hell* closest to the devil himself. All this is part of bad copy, imitation, counterfeit ghosting.

The ancient Greeks were accomplished metallurgists. Many worked as mercenaries and were paid in coin with alloys that provided an agreed upon value. Diogenes of Sinope, perhaps the ultimate cynic rivaling Antisthenes in focusing ignorantly on virtue at the expense of knowledge, was associated by scholars with a family history of defacing coinage and in exile. Plato is written to have said Diogenes was a Socrates gone mad. He despised everything and altogether acted disagreeable even to people such as Alexander the Great who was tutored by Aristotle and arguably a cynic himself. Diogenes lived in a bathtub

and reputedly told someone who asked him how to dispose of his body at death to throw it to the dogs. Arguably, all this encompasses the art of flattery, the art of the impure in habit, attiring and cooking in shameless ignorance the ancients associated with the behavior of street dogs (cynics). We again refer to the Sophist and the Gorgias.

Altogether, if we understand killing as rhetoric, incompetent as politics in philosophy, we begin to get a grasp of the meaning of nonkilling global political science in philosophy, in natural philosophy, in politics as art and in statesmanship in science of managing life in temperance and courage. Killing is indeed the work of people who are not in love, but who desire beauty, as we all do.

It is in the context of Nonkilling Global Political Science that we can begin to comprehend what the Norman French brought in law to England and which permeates the common law of English speaking areas of the world, of the chose – chose in action, which is nothing more than a preference for things. Where the law comprehends such a preference as interest, it seeks to protect such as preference, as interest, as chose, as chosen. Choosing to live is choosing love and the law is designed to protect the chose or love interest. To protect the chose, it must protect life itself and not just selected samples we find as individuals in a group of people.

Indeed, the modern common law of torts and contracts and property reflects an ongoing development in legal systems to recognize the polity (people) as the sovereign rather than an individual as opposed to the group or society. Thus the law of politics is that politics is science, art, philosophy, natural philosophy, religion and the Divine, inseparable yet distinct as individual things, monistically, a divine law, a thing of beauty, protected in science and in art as law.

Politics and law in legislative art translates into justice, as suggested by the English jurist and philosopher Sir Francis Bacon. Bacon for all the shortcomings his critics see in him, including an alleged appearance of corruption in receiving judicial gifts, for all the criticism his proximate cause theory inherited from Aristotle is blamed for bringing complexity into the common law of torts, recognized that law needed science and scholarship to dispense justice where flattery could sham both law and justice with the rhetoric of misguided personal interest in false subjects, habiting and cooking rhetoric in breach of the peace. If common people

on juries did not recognize proximate cause as the nearest cause embodied in an intermediary, It is only because Prosser recognized that people did not equate cause with responsibility to govern one's own actions according to reasoned consideration of the public interest in the safety of its interests – failure or nonfeasance in recognizing and respecting that interest. Tort law struggled with the difference between misfeasance and nonfeasance, which in reality are two sides of the same spurious coin – disregard of the human interest in public health and safety in ignorance.

To kill Diogenes, to defile Diogenes, as it was for Christ and Barabas, is nothing more than to flatter them, by protecting the interest, the chose, however extreme in the creation of destruction and ruin of the body. To protect life has nothing to do with flattering it, but only in protecting it from disease in medicine, cultivating its capability in articulation, legislating its primary value and doing justice to it in soul and in body. This is why flattery, the art of making things pleasant and misleadingly convenient fails to distinguish the best and fails in Poe's words to analyze while ingeniously calculating without regard for the trouble it causes by making routine and habit so dangerous to humanity, by distorting focus on the subject at interest away from the best interest.

To think of this notion of Nonkilling Global Political Science as “western philosophy” as opposed to some Eastern philosophy would be a mistake, because in cosmogony, a theory of birth of things, the concern is not with where things originate from but simply that they occur. This strain of thought is evident in the *Timaeus*, in the notion of invoking God prior to political and philosophic discourse about the birth or generation of things and thence to speak of a father or maker of all who is not found out. We use the name God as a handle to get a grip on this formidable subject of taking personal and divine responsibility for ourselves and our actions, without discovery of divine existence and nonexistence. If everything including nothing exists, we can stay on subject of interest, which is our own chose individually and in common, interacting politically, in the agora (Greek) or forum (Roman/Latin) of ideas in transaction, in cosmogony.

Origination, in contrast to birth or generation in cosmogony, deals in organized religion – Catholicism for example, as “I have begun”, a subtle but important distinction which deals with ontological matters which are subjects of dispute and formal disputation among faiths. “I have begun” is tantamount to the subject of

how people are arranged for example, around a dinner table. This subject does not explain itself but must be explained by something else, which deals with the subject of the rational vs. the irrational way of things. It is in this subject field that we usually dwell and dine and it is here that we confuse cosmogony with ontology and thereby fail to recognize that we are makers AND we make and distribute competent and incompetent things as subject matter in rhetoric.

The nature of rhetoric is that its subject matter is of imitation creation as routine or habit and therefore does not deal with the problem of things happening (to be born), but with the subject or origination (I have begun or been born) related to origination of things that happen. Here, I am trying to explain the same thing I explained above, from the perspective of ghostmaking, perhaps at the risk of creating hell in redundancy for the reader in the rhetoric of Nonkilling Global Political Science and for which I am truly sorry. Yet our complex academic/scientific/industrial/political/philosophical/artistic cultural understanding in habit seem to create an evil itself, in tediousness. We have had thousands of years to build killing into habit and cooking it in rhetoric and I have little time and the reader presumably has little enough time to grasp it. Thus, we remind over and over again, as did Goebbels.

It is here, in origination, that in unacknowledged and unconfessed ignorance we make things up, dressing them up and ornamenting them in appearance as imitations that are made without caring for the real thing or subject we truly want to discourse about and cook incompetent and even deadly brews in imitation discussion. This discussion anticipates the problem of managing discourse for the sake of effective teaching of Political Science as a subject. If one considers that virtue is both what is (knowledge) and can be taught, then political science as a subject embraces ignorance as a virtue and knowledge as virtue in science and as art that can be practiced and learned in the development of craft.

In Protagoras, Socrates argues that the reason people act harmfully, to others or themselves, is because they only see the short term gains while ignoring the long term losses which might outweigh them, just like one makes errors in judging the size of objects that are far away. He says that if men were taught the art of calculating these things correctly, have a more exact knowledge that is, they would not act harmfully



(357c-358d). Same goes for bravery. A brave swimmer is one who knows how to swim better and therefore, in a way, all virtues are essentially knowledge and can be considered one and the same, more like parts of golden objects rather than the parts of a face. If all virtue is knowledge, it *can* in fact be taught. If the argument is to be found in discourse, it must be argued and in this frame, nonkilling global political science as a subject in science is nonkilling global political art in practice. If all virtues are one monistically, it is arguable that wisdom itself is nothing more than a proposal to mutually exchange positions by arguing all sides in dispute to a harmonious conclusion that embraces all into a single subject that can be known to all.

### **The Four Political Arts in Birth/Generation Cosmogony and Origination in Ontology**

Political art, as discussed above is practice of Political Science as temperance and courage to do things, to make things, by interacting with things, caring about things in competence to create beauty, rationally. The object is to explain how people live together competently and incompetently, which makes the difference between life and death in the dealings of individuals and groups with each other. If we produce death, the suggestion is that of political incompetence. If we produce and maintain (give birth to and originate) life in the community, we practice art in political competence. These are the hallmark of Nonkilling Political Science and the idea is to create a global nonlethal aspect of the state, at the risk of tedium. To the extent that this practice goes global, as conceived in Nonkilling Global Political Science, in art and in scientific method, we may be said to be institutionalizing Political Science, Political Art in philosophy across the global community, religiously as the artisans who craft beautiful things, care for them in husbandry, and fiercely guard them from sham imitations. It is to this purpose that we clearly identify, define and describe our subject, which is political art in context of birth and origination/generation in cosmogony and theogony, ontology and cosmology, expressed in the metaphysics and physics of cause in bio-chemical terms of art in science and scientific method. We recognize birth and what we originate aesthetically in beauty and ugliness, competence and incompetence, as does a master craftsperson.

Plato's *Gorgias* provides a handy guide as we travel through the rhetorical minefield that manufactures incompetent tyranny studded with human on human violence and death. This dialogue takes on rhetoric as a subject of its own, where we discuss politics as artistic competence and its imitations, ghosts and counterfeits that divert us from the subject we so earnestly need to know to practice political science as academics, as students, as dilettantes, as practitioners in and out of public office. The *Theaetetus*, *Sophist* and *Protagoras* among other dialogues describe the problems of management of thought and discourse that allows us to direct and govern ourselves and learn from and teach others such subjects as Political Science.

### **PART IV. TOWARD A CERTAINTY IN THEORETICAL AND APPLIED NONKILLING POLITICAL SCIENCE**

The discussion above dealt with the subject of killing as part of the political art related to the political science, using the glue of aesthetics in philosophy including natural philosophy. It sought to tie the religion implicated in method to the art and science of politics. It dealt with the subjects of religion, philosophy and politics. The idea was to make classical thinking serve the Political Science by tying the subjects of philosophy, religion and science together showing the interchangeability of words and thoughts we view separately in contemporary society to deflate the subject of nonkilling to the lowest possible denominator in the political science. This shrinkage of hyper-inflated verbiage is necessary to bring science off its high horse and put it on a Shetland that the public can ride, that which can be made intelligible to young school children, college students and professors, researchers and the practitioners of the political arts we call politicians, statesmen and a catchall political operative category. Once it tumbles out of its ivory tower of word juggling, the notion is simple and the sophist is trapped in the web of his creation, forced to disgorge his ownership of the subject for personal gain or advantage over others. The chose is identified and the subject explored as theoretical science mobilized into the applied science of human safety, in art of practice.

The organization of this Nonkilling Global Political Science or better yet, Political Science is the closest thing to generic possible to manage the subject of nonkilling. Focusing on the ideal state does not require this author to dissect the Republic or use isms and polemic, but to ask the single - how to -using the theoretical political science of movement to operationalize the applied science that moves political art in scientific method. Despite the use of Greek classical thought, which has been justly criticized from Socrates/Plato to the present as “Greek to Me” and therefore not broadly understandable, the argument here is that this philosophy can be understood in simple terms, organizing thought systematically, efficiently and without tediousness, though my work up to this point probably stretches the mental and physical stamina. Good thinking requires hard work and good explanation requires hard work to be made simple and acceptable in words, as Timaeus explained, of created things using analogies and refraining from unsupported correlations with names that impedes learning.

Science by necessity must deal with the genuine and counterfeit or its nature as science is sham. Course design/ curriculum must implicate the ability to recognize a legitimate goal of reducing and eliminating killing and provide identifiable objectives that measure progress toward the goal. This implicates ontological knowledge explicitly distinguished from the cosmogony, so as to describe the field of operations (cosmology). In this field lie the etymology, the etiology and the pathology that in movement describe the political aspect of the human condition. Upon this foundation is built the epistemology which is the nature of knowledge of the subject of killing in political science, reduced to the needs of a given audience.

### **Conclusion: The Paradigm Shift in Action: Outline of a Curriculum of Political Science**

Political Science as a nonkilling subject summarizes all the arguments made above. Cosmogony deals with it as a fact to be created in political art and science in artisanship, husbandry and guardianship of the subject. Cosmogony must be understood as a virtue that is of state or condition and must be taught to all students of the subject, for to be born is its virtue and this virtue must operate to guide the detail of study and underlie research and scholarship. Cosmogony allows us to

## The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science

recognize what always happens as truth and falsity (nature itself) so as to prepare the ground for study (generate the ground upon which the political science functions).

Ontology, the theory of having been born simply recognizes what comes into existence and perishes. Archer-Butler proposed in lectures at Trinity College in Ireland the following working definition of the subject:

The science of ontology comprehends investigations of every real existence, either beyond the sphere of the present world or in any other way incapable of being the direct object of consciousness, which can be deduced immediately from the possession of certain feelings or principles and faculties of the human soul

In short, Ontology is nothing other than the subject matter that has been born and perishes in state and rests upon the use of analogies that allow us to tie disparate things together as happenings in common and establish probabilities in admixture. If the subject of nonkilling global political science is the creation of a nonkilling aspect of political state in cosmogony, its ontology is in the appearance of the image in abstract to investigate in ontology the condition or state that brings things into existence and makes them perish. We recognize the intermediaries of the maker who is never found out by science and ascribe to them responsibility as proximate or necessary to bring creation into existence, next to the maker. This combination of cosmogony and ontology allows us to access our consciousness of a thing as objects which in turn allow us to create, know or learn about beauty and ugliness.

It is here that political science begins to create a global nonkilling society, by recognizing the beautifulness of politics and the ugliness of its counterfeit imitation. We recognize statesmanship in temperance and courage as the hallmarks of learning that allows us to navigate politically in spacetime, to pilot the ship of state in theoretical and applied science (artisanship, husbandry and guardianship). In the public schools, these qualities are implicitly recognized in what the schools call "citizenship" in curriculum. To organize this subject matter in curriculum is to learn and teach appreciation in art and science the subject of truth and falsity in nature, including character and appearance.

It is here that truth and falsity can be recognized and understood in the language arts, the sciences and the arts. Our children desperately need to learn these matters in the schools. Parents need to be involved because they must work with these issues nonstop as adults. Teachers, administrators, college professors and college students are no less in need. Word juggling is a sure sign of political trouble in any society where we get mixed up in our subjects, crafting trouble, failing to conserve meaning to the words which provide meaning and thereby fail to competently guard civil society from probabilities that we construct in the retrospect in the law and equity and ecclesiastical settings where justice is supposed to be dispensed after the fact. In the sophism of “Nothing”, we make the unnecessary to our grief and sorrow.

The remaining subjects of interest in the paradigm shift include etymology, etiology, pathology in the epistemology that allows us a moral and political philosophy and generate science in the public interest or chose. Etymology is the study of words, the subject matter of Plato’s *Cratylus* to deal with the study of the history of words, their origins, and how their form and meaning have changed over time. The application seeks to explain how our subjects get mixed up in word juggling, implicating the language arts, as described in *The Sophist* and *Gorgias* and unleash unlearning in rhetoric in habit and cookery to create political disaster.

As an etiological matter (etiology) we study causation by assuming cause. In assuming cause, we give a reason for what is originated in copy, in probability, because the maker or artificer to whom we attribute cause in nature cannot be discovered but only recognized as “what is”. We are only concerned with explaining how things happen built on a recognition of cause and a recognition of responsibility for things created through the intermediary called a human being. This is our chose of interest. To explore the why of the originator is only to describe what is necessary to account for the how. The maker or originator or generator has to be assumed or we go out of our wits.

The analogy is to the art of politics which deals with legislation, gymnastic/medicine in division and justice. Legislation and justice attend on the soul and gymnastic/medicine attend on the body and run together (*The Gorgias*). In gymnastic/medicine, etiology as subject refers to the many factors coming together to cause an illness, for which we focus epidemiological studies. If sailors go to sea for long periods without fresh vegetables, we

correlate incidents of scurvy, as did Captain Cook, in discovering that requiring his crew to regularly eat sauerkraut the incidents of scurvy went down, he recognized this coming together of things in a way that corresponded to his chose in interest, which required keeping a healthy crew on his long sea voyages of discovery. Later it was recognized that the sauerkraut contained vitamin c, which had been lacking in sailor's diets that was correlated with the scurvy.

It would be inaccurate to refer to vitamin C or its lack as a cause because this would tend to mislead in etymology. It would be precise to recognize correlation rather than the cause used loosely, as an etymological matter. Yet cause and blame have become mixed in an etymological chaos by scholars seeking to imitate Aristotle and Francis Bacon. Blame is about fixing responsibility and liability for things gone wrong so to blame the absence of vitamin C for scurvy is to fix responsibility on an intermediary of an intermediary called ignorance, caused by a maker of things who is past finding out. How cause became misused is perhaps less important, given the difficulty of recreating the past, than recognizing and fixing the problem. Thus, etiology and etymology play a role in understanding the problem faced by nonkilling global political science, of recognizing and focusing attention on precision in the use of words by scientists and scholars to maximize global understanding and trust.

In this way, we can recognize that pathology does not cause itself. Pathology is the precise study and diagnosis of disease – how bad changes in the body (disease) happen. The focus is on the experience or suffering (how) and not the why, which is the subject of the maker in cosmogony of what is to be born. Instead, in the manner of ontology, we deal with what has been created and what has perished. We recognize correlations and this is the business of science which Bacon analogized to the law, using the inflated term, proximate cause, when he explicitly sought to fix responsibility on an intermediary of cause itself. Thus, I am born is the birth of personal responsibility for the creator's works, in the interest of peacemaking and peacekeeping.

From here we move to the cosmological field or interest of political science, the agora or forum in which people conduct business with each other. This is environmental science in epistemology of the nature of knowledge from which we generate moral and political philosophy.

In this way, correlation allows us to draw analogies or similarities between like features of two things. When cause is used in such loose manner, it facilitates blaming and pinning responsibility. How can the lack of vitamin C be blamed on lack of vitamin C when it is the maker of people that is the cause and blaming is all about tagging someone or something with responsibility as an intermediary we fix our interest on. In medicine, etiology refers to the many factors coming together to cause an illness. It is normally the focus of epidemiological studies.

Through this structured understanding, we can put moral and political philosophy on track for use by political science in the nonkilling art of doing things without lethal recourse in rhetoric, habit and cookery. In moral philosophy, the subject matter of concern is ethics, with how we ought to live our lives.

Somehow, moral philosophy became distinct from natural philosophy where human relationships were stored in social science and natural philosophy became the province of what we might call scientism ( the so-called hard sciences we associate with the white lab coats and mechanical technologies). This may be explained again, as a failure to recognize Plato's approach to philosophy as theological and scientific and artistic. Moral philosophy is now a sophistic division recognizing only ideas in a kind of idealism inherited from theologians. The confusion may have been recognized in the effort by colonial Massachusetts to introduce the bible in public schools as a means of teaching ethics and reading at the same time, as analogous to the ability Plato referred to of discourse on philosophy and politics contemporaneously in the *Timaeus*.

Today, the Bible, the Torah and Quran are feared in public education in the United States, precisely because of the history of their misuse in political systems to mandate a particular religion. Discourse is not indoctrination but in dialectic, permits open and free discussion of important matters implicating academic, scientific, philosophical and political importance in classrooms. Thus, one has to handle scripture in public schools much as alchemy is practiced by chemical scientists today, to avoid charlatans destroying ethics and science and bringing chaos to an educational setting, for selfish gain. Given the history of religious wars in Europe and Asia, a legitimate concern is often criticized as going too far, kicking God out of classrooms and squirreling it into churches and families. The problem is keeping discourse in its nature in dialectic.

## The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science

Political philosophy has been similarly dried out and cooked into the study of such topics as politics, liberty, justice, property, rights, law, and the enforcement of a legal code by authority. In ethics, it is just another way of urging personal responsibility and accountability in conduct, the same as in moral philosophy and once again implicates what the schools call citizenship, for which grades are awarded. The scriptural component of both moral and political philosophy becomes more and more apparent and to treat them as political science becomes a matter of personal and societal freedom from ignorance as an enforced aspect of the state or condition. Idealism without a rational grounding is like taking the nourishing ingredients out of food, dressing up what is not nutritious to those not knowing what nutritious food truly is and expecting healthy souls and bodies to arise without knowing what they need. Without good nutrition in philosophy, what is served up fails to help the body grow in gymnastic, denies it needed medicine, legislates the soul in such way as to stunt the growth of the body making it vulnerable to injustice because it is ignorant of the knowledge of justice and fairness.

The true ingredients of a Nonkilling Global Society as a matter of political science in art, philosophy and hard sciences and social sciences is a good philosophical education grounded in elementary curriculum.

To conclude, a nonkilling global political society is possible, as Paige urges. It is really up to us to choose this rational alternative to the very poor choices that have been offered up in the divided scholarship that enforces overspecialization in sophistic divisions. The implementation of this political aspect of the human condition is a joint-and-several responsibility we continue to avoid at our peril.

Moral philosophy cannot reasonably be distinguished from natural philosophy because humans are part of the systematic study of the natural world. To divide philosophy in this way is nothing more than a sophistic convenience promoting a dual track existence of considered thought, making metaphysics unintelligible. Likewise is the separation of moral philosophy as human disciplines into politics, economics, historical sociology, grammar, rhetoric, poetry and history in the humanities. They all point in one direction, the science or knowledge in theory and application. If we separate them, we need to recognize that they are human creations for the sake of convenience of



specialists. All of them are about art in doing and the distinction between doing and not doing runs a dual track.

We either do something in art to make the specialties work for the sake of humanity and the life of the polity, local to global or we massage reality to narrow purposes that may appear convenient over the short term while risking the loss of public credibility. Moral is about life and life is about doing. For example, it is foolhardy to separate economics from politics when in design, political economy was defined by the ancient Greeks as the management of the souls of the household. If souls lose out in economics to a body without consideration of its soul, simply to avoid politics, economics loses art altogether and is no better in concept than a political science that thinks politics is about shoving bodies around and making them dead. For all the sciences, humanities and philosophy, we need only address one thing before we move apart again in all professional specialties – recognition of a grant of life, a mandate for doing in support of life, so as to distinguish genuine living from its counterfeit, which is the habit and cookery of nothing for nothing, with only the pretense of doing. Political Science needs to lead the effort or become irrelevant. Political Science needs partners or all the academic fields risk becoming an indistinguishable mass in quack philosophy and science, bodies judging bodies instead of what the bodies at the instigation of the soul do. Morality and politics, as a matter of science and philosophy cannot work without distinguishing the difference between genuine morality and politics and their counterfeit.

The conclusion – the only reasonable conclusion we can make is that political science is the same thing as nonkilling global political science, a science seeking to protect that precious gift of the divine, the right and privilege and honor of doing, in art and science, in knowledge, pursuing life in love of a true thing of beauty. No one can reasonably have any faith, belief or reason in being able to do anything else because anything else truly is “nothing”.

Nonkilling global political science is of doing politics, recognizing the need to do something to relieve the world of a scourge of political life, local to global called killing. Because NKGPS does, it can never fail as the genuine political science..

## References

- Asscher, Sue and Widger, David (2008) *Theaetetus*. Project Gutenberg EBook. Available at: < <http://www.gutenberg.org/1/7/2/1726/>>.
- Aristotle (1989 [1933]). *Aristotle in 23 Volumes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann.
- Paige, Glenn D. (2009). *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <<http://www.nonkilling.org>>.
- Berryman, Sylvia (2010). "Democritus," in Zalta, Edward N., Ed., *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available online at: <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2010/entries/democritus/>>.

# Guidelines for Contributions

Following the Center for Global Nonkilling's mission of "promoting change toward the measurable goal of a killing-free world", the *Global Nonkilling Working Papers* are dedicated to theory and research incorporating original scientific works that tackle issues related to the construction of nonkilling societies, where killing, threats to kill and conditions conducive to killing are absent. The series have a multidisciplinary perspective, open both to theoretical and empirical works on topics such as:

- Nonkilling and neuro-bioscience
- Nonkilling and gender relations
- Nonkilling and education
- Nonkilling and economics
- Nonkilling and the environment
- Nonkilling and the media
- Nonkilling, science, and technology
- Nonkilling in spiritual and philosophical traditions
- Nonkilling and the arts
- Nonkilling and sports
- Nonkilling and the professions
- Role of the military and police in nonkilling social transformation
- Nonkilling futures
- Nonkilling and leadership

A wider list of possible research topics can be found in the two following publications: *Nonkilling Global Political Science* (2002; 2009) by Glenn D. Paige and *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm* (2009), edited by Joám Evans Pim, both available for free download.

The series are published on an occasional basis as texts are delivered by authors and reviewed by the Nonkilling Research Committees. Every issue will be distributed both on print and on-line, and will be available for free download through the Center's website. Authors will remain as sole holders of the legal copyright for their texts, but a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 will be applied through the series to guarantee wide distribution and fair educational use.

Authors must submit a title, a 100 word summary and a 80 word biographical sketch, prior to acceptance of the complete proposal. After approval, authors will have four months to complete the final text, with an extension between 10,000 and 20,000 words. The Chicago Manual of Style should be used for reference.

For additional information contact Editor Joám Evans Pim at [jevans@nonkilling.org](mailto:jevans@nonkilling.org)



## Published Issues

1. **Are Humans Inherently Killers? A Critique** by Robert Sussman and Joshua Marshack Followed by a Response by Richard Wrangham (2010).
2. **Examining Domestic Violence as a State Crime: Nonkilling Implications.** By Laura L. Finley (2010).
3. **Nonkilling Political Science: A Critical Evaluation.** By Balwant Bhaneja, Joám Evans Pim, Piki Ish-Shalom, Chaiwat Satha-Anand and Yoon-Jae Chung (2010).
4. **Socioeconomic Democracy: A Nonkilling, Life-Affirming and Enhancing Psycho-Political-Socio-Economic System.** By Robley E. George (2010).
5. **The Mark of Cain A Depth Psychology Commentary on the Nonkilling Paradigm.** By Ramon Lopez-Reyes, Lt.Col. (2013).
6. **Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's "Software" for a Nonkilling Society.** By Maorong Jiang (2013).
7. **Political Art and Craft: The Story of Nonkilling Global Political Science.** By Clayton K. Edwards (2013).
8. **Nonkilling Political Leadership.** By Oseremen Irene (2013).
9. **Ethnicity and Nation Building in Contemporary Africa: A Perspective for Nonkilling.** By Emmy Irobi (2013).
10. **The Nature and Character of Nonkilling Global Political Science.** By Clayton K. Edwards (2013).