

Preface to the Italian Edition

by Antonio Papisca

Translation by Luciano Minerbi

Glenn D. Page has the courage to launch the challenge of ethics to the heart of contemporary political science: are you able to reply to the question “is it possible a non-lethal society” in which there is no killing? Are you able to charge of the change of the paradigm in the direction of non-killing and thus focusing on a coherent logic of non-lethal political analysis?

The author invites political scientists to become familiar with the unusual terms of non-killing, non-lethal—the semantic analogy with the paradigm of non-violence of Gandhian origin is evident—and to respond positively to his call for the development of a political science in fact non-lethal, proposing a model, actually a “non-lethal strategy of scientific revolution” articulated in what he calls the seven sub-revolutions: normative, factual, theoretical, educative and formative, applied, institutional, and methodological.

It entails to turn upside down one of the most potent dogma of ancient knowledge and of contemporary political opinions, namely that “killing is inevitable and positive for the well-being of humanity”. Difficult task, if we consider that, given every possible exception, political scientists recognized as such by the respective academic bodies, monitored by inexorable international evaluative centers from which judgment depend careers and research funds, manifest a paranoid syndrome, are afraid to contaminate themselves with ethical values and to make scientific their actions. Their iron deontological code establishes that we make science if we adhere to a reality made of behaviors, relationships, institutions and processes in which the game is question is conquest, increase of power to make laws and judgments, impose taxes, distribute material resources, maintain public order, inflict and carry out capital punishment and use arms inside and outside the own country. Political science should limit itself to collect data and explain behaviors and events, but should stop at the threshold of prescribing and of planning, because that would entail the choice of values to translate in objectives for political action. Political science of so-called scientific-empiric direction offloads on the official operators of governance every creative responsibility and every thaumaturgic virtue. In front of the challenge of values, or better, in front of the challenge of the truth of universal ethics, many political scientists wash their hands. In addition to be Pilates, a large part of academic political scientists is conservative and squint, busy as is to photograph the status quo, focusing the lens onto those politicians who most count in term of power, leaving alone the democratic paradigm that gives importance to those elements so called of the minority.

In his work of epistemological re-foundation, Glenn Paige shows how to restructure the field of political science as far as contents, methods and relationships with other disciplines. At the base of his ambitious task, is the passionate research of a irenic sense for a science that should be useful to the cause of life and of peace operating as with what happens in the medical field with double objective to diagnose the pathology of lethality and to discover prescriptions and cures to eliminate the killing of the global way.

From this direction it is not difficult to see that not only the war is pain of death, but also economic politics contrary to the dictate of social justice feed the pathology that is pervasive of the social and political life of the planet with imminent risk of metastasis. The political scientist, who would like to help manage and develop the non-lethal governance in a planet always more unbalanced, interdependent and globalized should find the signs of the times, among them, above all, the establishment of the international Law of the human rights, to which base is the right to life and to peace, inseparable binomial, radically antinomic in relation to the warlike attributes of the sovereignty of states. The political scientist, who delays in theorizing around the refrain “peace and war for me are the same” on the basis of the assumption that political science, if it wants to be such, should remain non-evaluative, he is not only out of legality but also of the new history

that urges life and peace. The above refrain is consonant with that of those who in the pedagogic field assert that the school must impart *instructions* and not *education*, protected from value based contamination.

A new language for new horizons of common good is expressly legitimized by the "new" international Law, in particular the United Nations Declaration of December 7, 1998 on the "rights and the responsibility of individuals, groups, and societal organizations to promote and protect the fundamental freedom and human rights universally recognized", known as the Magna Charta of the defenders of human rights, particularly in the sphere of non profit and voluntary associationism.

"Toward liberation from lethality": with this prospective Paige takes the theme of education and development in the last chapter. His pedagogic instruction, of value also to the "new" political scientists is summarized in a formula, the elements of which have origins that are at the same time scientific and meta-scientific: spirit, science, ability, song, leadership, competence, institutions, resources. It is the formula of creativity, proper of integral humanism.

The lesson for who works with science in the academic field is to remember that the fruit of your quest, of your theorizing, is destined primarily to your *docere*, a task that you have to share with the teachers-educators who work in the schools of every level and grade, in the consciousness that to educate means to transfer knowledge data consistent with a more ample design in which the essential content is expressed in the article 26, second subsection of the Universal Declaration of human rights: "The education should be addressed to the full development of human personality and at the strengthening of the respect of human rights and fundamental liberties. It must promote the understanding, tolerance, friendship from all nations, racial and religious groups, and must favor the work of the United Nations to maintain peace".

The ponderous work of Page can be read by resting on the individual page: in each one there is a complete part of meaning. In this journey of stages, which does not make you loose the thread of the whole, we encounter many ideas and also many people who wrote and acted so that the "best" of the cultural vein of respective origins converge to foster the holistic knowledge centered on the value of life and on the correlated moral and juridical imperative do-not-kill.

It is the theme of the charismatic leadership for the pedagogy of the example. The provocation of "do not kills" of Paige recalls that of Don Primo Mazzolari, who in his an-resigned "You-do-not-kill" had the prophetic courage to argue that for the Christian to act violently means to dis-baptize oneself.