

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

# **Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's "Software" for a Nonkilling Society**

By Maorong Jiang

# 6 • 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 # 6

**Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's  
"Software" for a Nonkilling Society**  
*Maorong Jiang*

Introduction .....	7
Gandhi's "Soul Force" for Nonviolence.....	13
Paige's "Software" for Nonkilling Society .....	17
References .....	23

**Maorong Jiang** is Director of the Asian World Center and Assistant Professor of Political Science at Creighton University in 2003. He specializes in Asian politics and International Relations.

Born and raised in China, Dr. Jiang started his teaching career at 18. After receiving his B.A., he became a regular faculty in the Department of International Relations at the Military College of International Relations in China. Dr. Jiang pursued his graduate studies in Beijing Foreign Affairs College and the University of Hawaii at Manoa. He also studied at the Catholic University of Leuven in Belgium, Munich University in Germany and the University of Hawaii at Hilo.

His varied academic training reflects his interests in history, religion, philosophy, diplomacy, international relations and political science. In addition to having been a military officer and a university professor, Dr. Jiang has served as a university administrator and government official in Beijing. He was a visiting scholar to the USIA, East-West Center, China-Europe Institute and the University of Hawaii at Manoa, where he earned his Master's degree in Asian religion and doctoral degree in Political Science.

During his tenure in college and government administrative positions, Dr. Jiang published articles on international relations, military relations, religion, and English studies. He has presented papers at many professional conferences. His current research projects include China/North Korea relations, and studies on ethics in Asian/international relations.

# Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's "Software" for a Nonkilling Society

Maorong Jiang  
Creighton University

## Summary

*This paper aims to study the core value of Gandhi's "soul force" and Paige's "software" as to promote nonkilling at both state and individual levels. This action is perceived as a transformation of power shifting from the State to individuals. Despite its distance from our reality, it represents an emerging phenomenon based on the State's loss of authority.*

*While it is going to be an emerging issue if one looks into any problems of a society in which the State has less authority than individual human beings, it is certain that the State action of the murderous nature will first become much less dangerous to humanity. This is a huge progress for a nonkilling society we envision. Paige's dream of that society relies on his first condition that "governments do not legitimize" killing, one of the major components of a nonkilling software for a peaceful humanity.*

## Introduction

History often glorifies victories and victors in wars or mass killings in the name of justice. Humanity has suffered violent death from deliberate killings on an unimaginable scale. When killing is legitimized by the state as part of war and conflict, we pay a price for keeping peace on an individual level.

Given the lessons of history, seriously thinking of a nonkilling society, no less maintaining one, seems almost impossible; in other words, it is difficult to pursue a nonkilling world based on patterns of the past and acting according to our current

## Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's "Software" for a Nonkilling Society

political norms. It is a dead-end to advocate nonkilling when human beings continue to worship warriors and celebrate victories over dead bodies of the so called "enemies of the state." History in general, albeit intentionally distorted in numerous cases, presents several common themes. One of the major common themes across the globe is that history education remains within a framework of warrior-worshipping and state-glorification. The learners are inspired to follow virtues of those who fought and died in wars for the sake of the state. In addressing war, mass killings and genocides, the murderous action of the state is rationalized in the name of the people in abstract terms. The state apparatus often remains intact even while individuals are punished for the crimes that they committed in their "heroic" actions inspired by the state. History seldom renders its justice upon the state proper, and shamefully ignores the vital roles that the state plays as the "sole source of the 'right' to use violence."<sup>1</sup> The absence of justice visited upon the state is immoral and unethical; worse yet, when it survives scrutiny the result is still more killings.

One may argue that Japan and Germany, both as States, were subject to punishment at the end of the World War II that both States will forever renounce their sovereign rights to engage themselves in any act of wars. Specifically, one can cite that the Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution prohibits any act of war by the Japanese State.<sup>2</sup> However, the Japanese Constitution does not delegitimize Japanese's ability to kill in any act as self-defense. Furthermore, a brief analysis of this American-imposed constitution reflects a cruel reality that power kills. As a defeated nation, Japan losses its sovereign right to engage itself in any act of war, but this renouncement, on the contrary, enables other parties to maintain their armed forces with war potential, and can engage in war affairs in the position of either offensive or defensive nature. In other words, if of a self defensive nature, Japan can be at war with those who are not entitled to renounce their sovereign right

---

<sup>1</sup> Max Weber, "Politics as a Vocation," an essay originated from Weber's lecture he gave to the Free Students Union of Munich University during the German Revolution in January 1919.

<sup>2</sup> In the context of the Article 9, Japan formally renounces war as a sovereign right and bans settlement of armed forces with war potential will not be maintained, although, the Constitution states, Japan should maintain Self-Defense forces, which serve as *de facto* armed forces.

as to conduct any act of war. The Japanese position, albeit of a defensive nature due to the lack of the sovereign right to initiate a war, does not result in any illegitimacy of wars in which it may be entitled to get involved. Considering the cold-war factor, Japan's institutional war crimes in the vast Pacific area were intentionally ignored. While the winning Allied Powers made it known to the world of the crimes committed by the Nazis, such as death camps, gas chambers and many forms of human medical experimentations, and yet many more people remain uninformed of the atrocities committed by the Japanese. The extent of Japan's inhumanity during World War II continues to remain incalculable (Lelley, 2010). As a matter of fact, since the end of WWII, Japanese right-wing proponents insist that "...Japan was not responsible for the war, their actions were not lawless by the standards of the day, and that human rights were denied to all under wartime conditions." (Robert, 1996.) The slow response and denial by the Japanese government towards making amends and apologizing for these war crimes continue to be the sources of current conflicts at the State level between Japan and its Asian neighboring countries.

It may be still true that nonkilling is a word incomprehensible in our daily vocabulary. As a matter of fact, killing is socially taught and culturally reinforced in many different ways (Paige, 2009: 29). The vast majority of people are influenced by a culture that teaches violent killing. In other words, people are taught to kill formally, informally, legally and illegally. Within and beyond academic settings, the term "kill" has taken on so many different meanings and the definition of it no longer refers simply to the act of taking a life; rather "kill" has evolved its way to Americans' everyday vocabulary. Killing has contributed to the understanding of human origins, man's nature, ancestral and modern territorial expansion, national sovereignty, and global power politics. Hypothetically, one may argue that, without human killing among each other, global slave trade would have not been abolished, the horrific Holocaust in both Europe and Asia wouldn't have ended, Nazism and fascism would not have been defeated, and democracy, despite different styles, couldn't have been embraced by Japanese and Poles alike. Take America for example: its opinion on killing does not seem so odd. The country was born in an armed revolt, expanding its borders by killing millions of indigenous natives. In his *Nonkilling Global Political Science*, Glenn Paige brings out the fact

## Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's "Software" for a Nonkilling Society

that politics has always been a relatively violent aspect of the United States. This is illustrated by references to the Revolutionary War, specifically the Battle at Lexington, New Hampshire's battle cry "Live Free or Die," and, most importantly, the signing of the *Declaration of Independence* against the King's will. Paige talks about century after century, generation after generation, and one political leader to the next, how the act of killing gains more and more credibility. Killing not only serves as a necessity of gaining political power or overcoming something bad, more so killing is depicted as a way of life. Using statistics, Paige seems to penetrate the social fabric in which killing is an inseparable part of our cultural and social life. To no one's shock, there exists a dynamic and many types of killings manifested in genocide, murder, rape, abortion, suicide and so on.

In retrospect, neither pioneering revolutionaries in the discourse of America's 237 years of history nor modern day politicians in the United States would shy away from the fact that America is born to kill, to fight and to lead the world with the largest military power. Americans kill globally and they also kill domestically. Observing today's American wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, despite its declining overall economic power, the will to inspire killing and winning the victory remains high. Retreating from overseas' war on global terrorism, Americans kill each other inside its own boundary on a daily basis. Many weapons are easily acquired both legally and illegally. American society is lethal to the core. Jim Dator once painfully argued that killing can be part of our typical Americana heritage. "If the state can kill and maim the helpless children of Grenada, Panama, Libya, and Iraq for no good reason whatsoever, then why can't you and I slap around our kids when they annoy us too? Indeed, it often seems that killing seems to be the American way to show that you really care about somebody or something."<sup>3</sup>

Without feeling any sense of guilt, some historians make it clear that history, either of nations, of wars, of revolts, or of human life, prove that mankind is socially, psychologically, culturally and politically, based on killings. Furthermore, music, news, movies, games – virtually all forms of media – instill killings into human communities around the globe. Even human languages, with euphemisms and slangs, reflect lethality.

---

<sup>3</sup> Dator spoke at the 46<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference, "Honor the Past, Look toward the Future," of the Hawaii Association for the Family & Community Education, Hawaii, October 21, 1994.



Is it not true that almost everything in our human society was, and continues to be, formed around the consumption, adoption and inspiration of killings? Even at this moment of writing, millions of people, including Americans, Britons, Chinese and Vietnamese, are still finding and negotiating different ways to justify the malicious act of killing. We employ the death penalty as a punishment for certain crimes and to help secure our internal social order. Although murder is frowned upon by society, however, when someone is convicted of murder, he/she is given the death penalty as punishment for his/her crime. It is the most paradoxical logic that we punish killing with killing, thus leads to the survival of our society. This paradox parallels the infamous maxim of the defunct Roman Empire, "If you want peace, prepare for war." (Dator, 1994.)

Three major reasons to kill, among others, at both individual level and the State level are, as Paige mentions in his *Nonkilling Global Political Science*, the human instinct to defend loved ones, scarce resources, and the human inclination to kill. In looking into the past that was flooded with killings, primarily as the result of the above three reasons, Paige raises the question again and again: "Is a nonkilling society possible?" He presents a number of preliminary obstacles that most believe challenge the existence of such a society. Paige includes the thoughts of several ancient philosophers on the subject of violence and killing. Plato, Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Max Weber and Karl Marx are all shown to have given justifications for humans killing others. Tradition in China, India and the United States all support this conclusion that political rule necessitates killing.

As far back as 427 B.E., great philosophers such as Plato were contributing to defending the act of killing. His *Republic* philosopher rulers of the warrior class ruled over producers and slaves. Aristotle believed that a lethal military would permanently be present. Machiavelli justified killing to maintain power. Thomas Hobbes justified killing by the government to secure the social order and to be victorious in war. Locke, Marx, Rousseau, all justified human killings in society in some forms. Max Weber, a twentieth century political economist, wrote that the "decisive means for politics is violence." While the viewpoints of Plato and Machiavelli point more towards these justifications in terms of leaders ordering killings so as to preserve and demonstrate their power, all others' justifications for killing stay more along the lines of the common man under

## Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's "Software" for a Nonkilling Society

a government or a tyrant having legitimate reason to kill at certain times. Paige, in his book, mentions that he once asked 20 American political scientists in a summer seminar about the possibility of a killing-free society, the overwhelming conclusion reached by this group was that humans are naturally violent and able (as well as willing) to kill if necessary. In a recent interview by the author, Paige does not believe that people have come to realize a basic fact that a nonkilling society can be possible.<sup>4</sup> On the contrary, by giving specific numbers associated with wars in our modern history, including the September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 attacks at the hands of Al-Qaeda terrorists in American soil, Paige confronts the reality which justifies "necessary" killings at the State level. The author believes that Paige uses all these examples of killing to demonstrate a contradiction that so much loss and pain is the result of killings, yet we continue to wage war and facilitate a killing-rampant society on a regular basis.

In his elaboration on the Hobbesian-Weberian state as the central role of force in political life, Paige chooses to emphasize the role of the State projected by the great political thinkers who have literally laid the foundation of human "civil" societies. In retrospect, these thinkers provided all the principle and theoretic framework as the guidance of human political life.

Instead of a lengthy description on the establishment of the original political circumstance, Paige (2009: 23-4) provides the following history to the readers; in so doing, he demands no admiration of these ancient giants whose words were taken by their followers in killing millions and millions of people:

The much admired Machiavelli (1469-1527) in *The Prince* contributes explicit justification for rulers to kill to maintain their positions of power and to advance the virtue, fame, and honor of their states. It is better to rule by craftiness of a 'fox,' but when necessary rulers should not shrink from the bold lethality of a 'lion.' He prescribes citizen militias to strengthen the power of the republican state.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) in *Leviathan* provides further justification for killing by governments to secure social order and victory in war.

---

<sup>4</sup> Author's five hour long interview with Glenn Paige on June 6, 2011 in Paige's residence in Oahu, Hawaii.

Since humans are killers, unorganized life in a state of nature results in murderous chaos. But since humans are also survival-seekers, they must consent to obey a central authority empowered to kill for their security, while reserving to themselves the inalienable right to kill in self-defense. Hobbes stops short of justifying armed rebellion.

The Hobbes-Locke double justification for ruler-ruled lethality is extended into economic class warfare by Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) in *The Communist Manifesto*. Propertied classes can be expected to defend and extend their interests by lethal force. But when material and social relations reach a critical stage, exploited classes can be expected to rise in violent rebellion to change the economic and political structure of society. In a few special cases of modern electoral democracy peaceful change might be possible. Sometime in the future when economic exploitation ends, the class-based lethal state will disappear. But in the period of transition economic factors will predispose to killing.

In his introduction to Glenn Paige's *Nonkilling Global Political Sciences*, James Robinson (2009: 5) necessarily makes known of Paige's understanding of the State power in human society. Robinson says that Paige's "fundamental postulate became that prevailing conceptions of the state, notwithstanding occasional contrary voices, and scientific studies of the state are grounded in assumptions that emphasize killing over nonkilling." Paige comes to this understanding after a long observation of the power processes in various arenas at local, State, and national community levels in the United States and at varying levels in several other countries. It is no exaggeration, as Paige (2009: 16) said about himself, that he is more familiar with institutions of enlightenment and power than any others, having lived, studied, taught, and administered in a variety of American colleges and universities for half a century."

### **Gandhi's "Soul Force" for Nonviolence**

On the other side of the gloomy history of killing, one should also cherish the bright side of the history of humankind, which demonstrates the fact that human beings have the ability not to kill. Human beings have thrived generations after generations, and continue to prosper. After all, organizations, ranging from social communities, to working units, to States, are made up of human beings.

The essence of political realism is to balance fear among States. The neo-realist approaches personified by Waltz and

Mearsheimer emphasize the need not only to entertain the traditional fear factor among the western countries, but also between the West and the East in a new era. As Waltz and Mearsheimer made clear that it is for the survival of the State that it has reasons to be fearful of others before taking action to balance the power. In her paper "Oil and Water? The Philosophical Commitments of International Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution," Elizabeth Dahl (2012) points out that "When it comes to considerations of power, meanwhile, many in mainstream PS and conflict management are influenced by the realism's primary focus on threats and use of force. Others in PS and CR, however, are more likely to subscribe to an alternative interpretation of political power, most particularly one that is based upon the power of cooperation. Even authoritarian regimes are dependent upon maintaining the consent of the governed. Nonviolent theorists such as Mohandas Gandhi as well as thinkers dating back to Socrates and Jesus have indicated that violence's power is short lived."

Jost Delbrück, in his "Multi-Ethnicity Challenges to the Concept of the Nation-State," defines the State as the dominant form of political organization and the nation state as the universally realized form of political organization of societies (people). After reviewing the history and development of the nation-state, Delbrück concludes that our modern political and social environments have altered the traditional notion of the nation-state. Delbrück acknowledges that there is a "growing concern about the future of the traditional concept of the nation state," and "there are indications that could suggest that the nation state may become obsolete." In the midst of this change, Delbrück (1994) points out that "Politicians are becoming concerned about a serious loss of State authority and power, both externally and internally."

To echo Delbrück's point about politicians' concern, French futurist Fabienne Goux-Baudiment suggests a promising trend of compromise, i.e., the state authority shrinks while the role of individual people increases. Goux-Baudiment states that "In the beginning of the twenty-first century, two strong trends are manifesting themselves: the empowerment of individuals and the weakening of the nation-state as the best representative of a democratic regime. As a way perhaps to escape the State-octopus and the old institutions that are linked to, individuals have built new clans, bringing them together whatever the geographic

scale (from the smallest area to the world diasporas) and giving them more power (through NGOs) and the feeling of more freedom. On the fate of the nation-state, Goux-Baudiment points out:

The nation-state is indeed challenged by globalization and the related interdependence. With, on the one hand, expanding diasporas and, on the other, an increasing number of foreign populations inside the country, the notions of nation and state are less clear. Between devolution to local authorities and a less explicit, but equally restrictive devolution to regional (e.g. European Commission) and global (WTO, UNO) authorities, nation-states have entered a slow but real process of weakening. They are probably no longer the most efficient place to govern in an increasingly complex and interconnected world (2006).

It is obvious that nation-state concept is moving into crisis while our societies are losing authoritative figures. This action should be perceived as a transformation of power shifting from the State to individuals. Despite its distance from our reality, it represents a phenomenon that can be emerging from the action that the State is undertaking, with the underlying loss of authority.

Mahatma Gandhi was an advocate for nonviolence at an individual level. He understood that one's needs and interests are the core of the conflict among people. Gandhi strongly believed in the idea of social communication and personal engagement with others. He thought that any forms of violent interactions among people would not allow a broader view of the truth by opening our personal perspectives and appreciating others' points of view (Juergensmeyer, 2005). It was not necessary, as Gandhi pointed out, that people must choose violence to overcome or avoid cowardice, weakness, differences and opposing viewpoints. "An eye for an eye will only make the world blind." Gandhi claimed that "we, as individual human beings, are violent because of life in our bodies, so that is why we should aim to be rid of it or at least train ourselves to become imperious to its needs." The essence of Gandhian approach to conflict is called Satyagraha, an idea of "grasping onto principles," or the "truth force." Satyagraha can pose challenges as many people struggle to step outside of narrow mindedness and see a dispute or disagreement from the viewpoint of others, but this challenge is indeed the effective tactic behind Gandhi's approach. Satyagraha is the idea of finding a new position more inclusive than the old one and moving to it through three steps (Juergensmeyer, 2005: 9-10).

## Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's "Software" for a Nonkilling Society

- 1) Examining the other conflicting side in search of valid principles, then creating a resolution plan that might also satisfy the interests of the other party as well as one's own.
- 2) Sorting through all imaginable options in looking at a mutually beneficial alternative that fits both sides.
- 3) Moving forward by taking alternative actions that avoid violence for the sake of both sides.

The Gandhian approach emphasize alternatives to avoid violence among people. Gandhi had reasons to do that as he feared the power of the state. He believed that the state "does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress." Gandhi wished "each individual is (her) own ruler," and that "government is the best that governs the least." Gandhi claimed that "India had been a country right from ancient time," and India was unified centuries before the British built railways that the British assumed were what had made India a nation (Gier, 1996). Considering building India as a village-based republicanism, Gandhi encouraged Indians to "study (their) Eastern institutions in (a) spirit of scientific inquiry...(to) evolve a truer socialism and a truer communism." Gandhi wished that his village republicanism would not act like a modern state which, in his belief, would swallow up individual persons. However, Gandhi came to realize the fact that many Indians were losing their moral autonomy in a dehumanizing state. Gandhi's vision of nationhood was based on decentralized local control, assimilation and tolerance of cultural differences and above all, nonviolence. Gandhi's position did not go with what Parekh puts that the state abstracts "power from the people, concentrates it in the state and then return it to them in their new (abstract roles) as citizens." This was Gandhi's principle fear as to see that individual people would not have enough self-determination, under the state monopoly, to perform acts of civil disobedience. From Gandhi's five distinctive human powers, self-determination, autonomy, self-knowledge, self-discipline and social cooperation, one realizes that Gandhi's "soul force" is from the individual, not from the State. From basic logical sense, killing at state level will be limited, if not eliminated, since individual human being is unable to master massive scale of killing. Without state authority to legitimize killing, a nonkilling society is no illusion, but can be a living reality.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Partial content of the section "Gandhi's 'soul force' for Nonviolence" is from Author's early work on Paige's nonkilling global political science approach.

## Paige's "Software" for Nonkilling Society

While it is going to be an emerging issue if one looks into any problems of a society in which the State has less authority than individual human beings, it is certain that the State action of the murderous nature will first become much less dangerous to humanity. This is a huge progress for a nonkilling society we envision. Paige's dream of that society relies on his first condition that "governments do not legitimize" the killing.

Although human civilization still consists of killing societies, greater focus on individual power may increase the likelihood of a nonkilling future. Paige (2009: 21) manifests his nonkilling philosophy in the actions he prescribes:

Governments do not legitimize it; patriotism does not require it; revolutionaries do not prescribe it. Intellectuals do not apologize for it; artists do not celebrate it; folk wisdom does not perpetuate it; common sense does not commend it. In computer terms of this age, society provides neither the 'hardware' nor the 'software' for killing.

Kai Hong, a philosophical humanist, points out that new technology, once thought applicable to create a utopia for humanity, was "hijacked into one of the greediest Capitalists-Financiers' profit-generating games and it hasn't particularly benefited human lives so far." He continues in his 2009 article "Zero-Zone Theory and Its Implication in Our Civilization: A Summary" that "The new communication technologies, both hardware and software, were tools for moving virtual funds all over the world in order to generate virtual profits, breaking the back (of the very system) in the course of doing it. That leads to the current economic and financial downturn in a nutshell." Hong bluntly states that "the 3rd Wave Civilization may not be ecologically sustainable" because the technological innovations that enabled Tofflerian 3rd Wave civilization were premised upon the Logic and Grammar of what is peculiarly Western Thinking." Hong assumes, in explaining the broader relevance of the Zero-Zone theory, that "The new theory can potentially usher in new technological and scientific innovations" and that we shall "expect such changes and the underlying philosophical premises to be something quite different from what we're familiar with at present. It will enable us to imagine a world quite different from what the windows of Western Paradigms enable us to see and envision." Perhaps the most important point in

## Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's "Software" for a Nonkilling Society

Hong's work is that he draws our attention to the missed opportunity of the 1<sup>st</sup> Moment of Modernity that Steven Toulmin decries for the Renaissance Humanism which was discarded "in favor of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Moment of the Newtonian-Cartesian kind a century later, which brought modern civilization in war with nature, earth and themselves." (Kai, 2009: 179.)

It is worth noting that Hong's views seem to be well reflected on a different perspective of civilization in the words of George Salzman, a physicist and political activist, as quoted by Joe Bageant in his online essay "Our Plunder of Nature Will End Up Killing Capitalism and Our Obscene Lifestyles,"

Everyone in these 'professional' institutions dealing in money lives a fundamentally dishonest life. Never mind 'regulating' interest rates...We must do away with interest, with the very idea of 'money making money'. We must recognize that what is termed 'Western Civilization' is in fact an anti-civilization, a global social structure of death and destruction. However, the charade of ever-increasing debt can be kept up only as long as the public remains ignorant. Once ecological limits have been reached the capitalist political game is up (Bageant, 2010).

As early as in 1991, Dator provided the reason, albeit three decades ago, for what Gorge Salzman talked about. "For almost three decades now," Dator said that "government has failed miserably to perform its basic functions, from preserving order in public spaces to dispensing justice to providing decent education in its schools. But the reasonableness of the motives does not diminish the danger of the potential consequences." Joe Bageant, in his two essays, "Our Plunder of Nature Will End up Killing capitalism and Our Obscene Lifestyle," and "The Battle for the American Soul is Over and Jay Leno Won," provides some of the reality-show consequences that Dator described in his remarks in 1991. For a meaningful understanding, the author quotes lengthily from Bageant's two essays:

- If you have watched any old mob movies, you know that any racket needs a front. In America the front is called democracy. Like the term populism, the people have no idea what democracy really is, but has something to do with the free market capitalism



that issues forth such things as bass boats. And certainly it has to do with every citizen having a small piece in the determination of national matters. Clearly untrue as that is, nevertheless it is one helluva a sales point, revered by the proles and not to be fucked with if you are to maintain the illusion of the consent of the people among the people. The front;

- No great trick really, given that the corporate people at the top own all the media and information distribution and make the first cut. And there's something for everybody's political stocking. When the issue is not wrapped up in religion or blood-in-the-face patriotism by corporate managed conservative elves, it is packaged as a moral or social justice issue for liberals;
- After twelve generations of lavish living at the expense of the rest of the world, it is understandable that citizens of the so-called developed countries have come to consider it quite normal. In fact, Americans expect it to become plusher in the future, increasingly chocked with techno gadgetry, whiz bang processed foodstuffs, automobiles, entertainments, inordinately large living spaces—forever;
- Yet, not one in a thousand economists takes nature into account. Nature has no place in contemporary economics, or the economic policy of today's industrial nations. Again, like the general American public, these economists are not in denial. They simply don't know it's there. Historically, nature has never been considered even momentarily because economists, like the public, never figured they would run out of it. With the Gulf oil "spill" at full throttle, the terrible destruction of nature is becoming obvious. But no economist who values his or her career wants to start figuring the cost of eco-cide into pricing analysis;
- With industrial society chewing the ass out of Mama Nature for three centuries, something had to give, and it has. Capitalists, however, remain unimpressed by global warming, or melting polar ice caps, or Southwestern desert armadillos showing up in Canada, or hurricanes getting bigger and more

- numerous every year. They are impressed by the potential dough in the so-called green economy;
- When the U.S., and then the world's money economy started to crumble, the first thing capitalist economists could think of to do was to monkey with the paper. That's all they knew how to do. It was unthinkable that the tertiary virtual economy, that great backroom fraud of debt manipulation and fiat money, might have finally reached the limits of the material earth to support. That the money economy's gaming of workers and Mother Nature might itself be the problem never occurred to the world's economic movers and shakers;
  - The main feature of capitalism is the seductive assertion that you can get something for nothing in this world. That you can manufacture wealth through money manipulation, and that it is OK to steal and hold captive the people's medium of exchange, then charge them out the ass for access. That you can do so with a clear conscience. Which you can, if you are the kind of sleazy prick who has inherited or stolen enough wealth to get into the game;
  - Not that most Americans can see the big picture. They were blinded at birth, so as not to view the monstrous system that has taken on a life of its own. One that rules their lives through the small elite class it created and governs. Blame it on water fluoridation, lousy education or degraded breeding stock, but not one in a hundred Americans can grasp that monolithic ideo-economic systems can become intelligent entities of their own sort (although capitalist state indoctrination has conditioned Americans to readily accept that Soviet Communism did just that).

Despite his concerns over seemingly American political lives, Joe Bageant also ponders a Hi-Tech question. He asks "Is the 'Digital Hive' Turning into a Soft Totalitarian State?" and at the same time, he pessimistically warns that "Most days I feel it is too late" for any change, although he does not specifically refer to what change he is talking about the same day.

Bageant's scenario of a dual face of the "digital hive"<sup>6</sup> and the "soft totalitarian state" is a direct and unavoidable consequence of technology development in the hands of human beings. American novelist Tom Robbins once said it well: "Humanity has advanced, when it has advanced, not because it has been sober, responsible, and cautious, but it has been playful, rebellious, and immature." Robbins showed us how humanity has gone through internally from antiquity to modernity, but he failed to touch something external, either as the byproduct or the side effect along the human development. Back in 1964, Marshall McLuhan (1964) ably put a foot note to that picture depicting our human past. McLuhan stated that "We shape our tools, and thereafter our tools shape us." While Robbins called up the past, McLuhan does remain influential in a futuristic sense. However, his message gets lost when the audiences are future blinded. People in any society seem to still embrace the old saying, such as: "Those who forget history are doomed to repeat it," and so on. Marshall McLuhan is right again with the following words: "When faced with a totally new situation, we tend always to attach ourselves to the objects, to the flavor of the most recent past. We look at the present through a rear-view mirror. We march backwards into the future." Human beings are doing exactly what McLuhan said many years ago. Futures studies remains off the chart as a mainstream academic discipline is a shameful disgrace to the humanity. Our man-made human sufferings triumph all the wishes and dreams, for which all the past murderous behaviors on the part of various states, as the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force, were justified. Looking into the past without delegitimizing the state power only reinforce the arrogance of the populace and empower the state in further injustice of humanity. While few people cry out as to right the wrongs of the past 500 years of human history, it is high time to look forward to the future. Dator said it right in 1994, "When all else fails, call a futurist."

It is an optimistic moment when our human society comes to this stage where changes happen, despite these changes vary. However, the new development of the technology provides us an option as not to look into our past for answers. Dator holds the view on high-tech as coming tsunami towards us from the

---

<sup>6</sup> In technological term, hive is the highest level of organization in the MS Windows registry, a hierarchical database that stores configuration settings and options.

future. He says, "This version is 'high tech' because it takes seriously the assumption that technological change is a major agent of social change; that, in the words of Marshall McLuhan, 'we shape our tools, and thereafter our tools shape us;' that social institutions, as well as social values, are strongly conditioned by the technology prevalent in a given society; that as new technologies are developed and widely used, old institutions and values are challenged—and often destroyed" (Dator, 1991). He also emphasizes that "(A)ll values, beliefs, institutions, laws, and mores are enabled and limited in part by our biology, in part by our culture, in part by our environment, and in part by our technologies. When any of those changes, our behavior changes, and our prior values, beliefs, and institutions are challenged" (Dator, 2002: 20).

The new technology has brought us the alternative to look into the future where humanity should triumph the power of the necessary evil, a horrendously credited metaphor for the past form of governance in the name of the people. In sharp contrast to the human mind, technology does not, and will never, focus on the past. It only moves forward. Therefore, it is not an accident that futures studies embrace its moment. Dator (2009: 136) shares with Alfred North Whitehead that "it is the duty of the future to be dangerous. It is the duty of futurists to support and provide an audience for those who have 'stupid' ideas in the sure expectation that some of them will turn out to be revolutionary truths while others will not."

Dator's Second Law of the Futures, in his own word, "proudly proclaims that any useful idea about the futures should appear to be ridiculous." Glenn Paige's pursue of a nonkilling society is a case in point. Numerous interviews and millions of publications prove that Paige's wish to achieve a nonkilling world is but a ridiculous utopian dream. However, according to Dator's law, Paige's idea may turn out to be a revolutionary truth from an optimistic point of view. The author believes that any hopeful view on Paige's idea for a nonkilling world is desired and should be pursued. This is the bright side of human nature. With the technology innovation on a global scale and the change of the governance at the state level, can we build our political conscience for the future generations and invent both hardware and software for the future where nonkilling is possible? The answer is promising either from our unknown possibility or the known impossibility that

the future leads us to. On the foundation of Gandhi's "soul force" for nonviolence, and applying Paige's "software" into our daily political life at individual level and the state level, a nonkilling society is not un-reachable.

## References

Bageant, Joe (2010). "Our Plunder of Nature Will End up Killing capitalism and Our Obscene Lifestyle". Available online at: <<http://www.alternet.org/story/147501/>>.

Elizabeth S. Dahl, "Oil and Water? The Philosophical Commitments of International Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution." *International Studies Review*, article first published online: June 19, 2012. Accessible at: <<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2012.01111.x/full>>.

D'Mello, Maurice (2008). "Paralleling Switchgear," Available online at: <<http://www.geindustrial.com/Newsletter/parallel.pdf>>.

Dator, Jim (1991). "When Crime Doesn't Pay—Enough," Available online at: <<http://www.futures.hawaii.edu/publications/courts/CrimeDontPay1991.pdf>>.

Dator, Jim (1993). "American State Courts, Five Tsunamis, and Four Alternative Futures," *Futures*, 9(4): 9-30.

Dator, Jim (1993). "Futures Studies As Applied Knowledge," Paper prepared for the First World Futures-Creating Seminar "Renewing Community as Sustainable Global Village," August 16-19, 1993, Goshiki-cho, Awaji Island, Japan.

Dator, Jim (1997). "As If I Virtually Said This to Pepsi Executives during a Futures Discussion at their Headquarters," Available online at: <<http://www.futures.hawaii.edu/publications/futures-visions/ToPepsiExs1997pdf.pdf>>.

Dator, Jim (1997). "From Tsunamis to Long Waves and Back," *Futures*, 31(1): 361-372.

Dator, Jim (1999). "Future Generations: They Are Our Conscience," in Kim, Tae-Chang and Dator, Jim, Ed., *Co-Creating a*

## Gandhi's "Soul Force" and Paige's "Software" for a Nonkilling Society

*Public Philosophy for Future Feneration*. London: Adamantine Press.

Delbrück, Jost (1994). "Global Migration-Immigration-Multiethnicity: Challenges to the Concept of the Nation-State," *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 2(1): 45-64.

Dian, Natalie (2009). "Foresight Styles Assessment: A Theory Based Study in Competency and Change," *Journal of Futures Studies*, 13(3): 59-74.

Gier, Nicholas F. (1996). "Gandhi's Philosophy: Premodern, Modern, or Postmodern?" *Gandhi Marg*, 17:3: 261-281.

Goux-Baudiment, Fabienne (2006). "Beyond dreaming of democracy. How do we face the reality of democracy?" in Mannermaa, Mike; Dator, Jim and Tiihoner, Paula, Eds., *Democracy and Futures*. Helsinki: Parliament of Finland, Committee for the Future., pp. 77-88. Available online at: <[http://www.eduskunta.fi/fakta/vk/tuv/democracy\\_and\\_futures.pdf](http://www.eduskunta.fi/fakta/vk/tuv/democracy_and_futures.pdf)>.

Halal, Willim E. (2009). "The Future Has Arrived—Forecast of the 2015 Economic Boom," *Journal of Futures Studies*, 14(1): 103-108.

Kai Hong, "Zero-Zone Theory and Its Implication in Our Civilization: A Summary," *Journal of Futures Studies*, November 2009, 14 (2), p. 179.

Hammarlund, Per A. (2005). *Liberal Internationalism and the Decline of the State*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Jiang, Maorong (2009). "Divided China Stands: The Two Half Chinas Alternative," *Journal of Futures Studies*, 14(2): 41-54.

Juergensmeyer, Mark (2005). *Gandhi's Way: A Handbook of Conflict Resolution*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Mike Mannermaa, Jim Dator and Paula Tiihoner, *Democracy and Futures*, accessible at: <<http://web.eduskunta.fi/dman/Document.phx?documentId=ki11307102558376&cmd=download>>.

Maguire, Keith (1998). *The Rise of Modern Taiwan*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing.

Mannermaa, Mike; Dator, Jim and Tiihoner, Paula, Eds. (2006). *Democracy and Futures*. Helsinki: Parliament of Finland, Committee for the Future. Available online at:

<<http://web.eduskunta.fi/dman/Document.phx?documentId=ki11307102558376&cmd=download>>.

Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding media: the extensions of man*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Paige, Glenn D. (2009). *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at:

<<http://www.nonkilling.org/>>.

Jeff Robert, "Review Of George Hicks, The Comfort Women: Japan's Brutal Regime of Enforced Prostitution in the Second World War." October 1996, accessible at: <<http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=629>>.

Robinson, James (2009). "The Policy Sciences of Nonkilling," in Paige, Glenn D., *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling, pp.13-18. Available online at: <<http://www.nonkilling.org/pdf/nkgps.pdf>>.

Tasha Lelley, "Failure to Punish Japanese Following World War II," *SE Asian History*. September 30, 2010.

Max Weber, "Politics as a Vocation," an essay originated from Weber's lecture he gave to the Free Students Union of Munich University during the German Revolution in January 1919.





# 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-Político-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).