

# **G.D. PAIGE'S NONKILLING THESIS: A VISION OF NEW POLITICS**

by

Balwant (Bill) Bhaneja, Senior Fellow,  
Program for Research in Innovation Management and Economy (PRIME),  
University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, Canada. Email: [billbhaneja@rogers.com](mailto:billbhaneja@rogers.com)

An Overview Paper for the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) Conference  
Budapest, Hungary, September 08-10, 2005. *Section 17-3: Peace and Nonkilling Political  
Science Research Panel in The Future of Political Science Section.*

**We** are now into the fifth year of the new millennium, and war and terrorism are becoming the norm to resolve international conflicts. All the experience of bloody wars of the previous century and the wisdom thereby gained seems to have been wasted.

The legacy of the past century about the use of the modern technology in the service of ideologies of hate and supremacy continues on. One reality is that mighty nations still consider that they can assert pre-emptive wars, last experienced during the Third Reich and the Soviet period, without qualms. Another reality is that “terrorists” and “freedom fighters” continue to indiscriminately kill innocent men, women and children in their zeal to fulfill anachronistic nationalistic and religious goals.

Glenn D. Paige, the author of *Nonkilling Global Political Science (2002)*,<sup>1</sup> is a veteran of the Korean War and a professor emeritus of political science. He argues if political scientists, scholars who dedicate their lives to the study of political power in its multi-faceted manifestations, do not challenge seriously the assumption of lethality, then why would one expect political leaders and citizens of the world to do so. His vision for new politics is to dedicate itself to a diagnosis of the pathology of lethality, and to discover both prescriptions and treatments that can be shared with all who seek to remove killing from global life.

Paige in his seminal work points out that at most less than five percent of human beings have ever killed. Perhaps less than two or one percent of all homo sapiens have been killers of fellow humans (p.27). Interestingly, a pioneering World Health Organization (WHO) global study on violence and health affirms that among ten leading

causes of 1.6 million violent deaths in 2002, war ranked third behind suicide and homicide.<sup>2</sup> Paige's position is that with such nonkilling human disposition, why not then, educate and train people and nations globally to strengthen their nonkilling capabilities?

### **Evidence-based Research Method**

For evidence of non-killing tendencies in societies, Paige provides interesting data. At least, 47 societies around the world demonstrate human capacities for nonviolent peacefulness (p.47). Even in the realm of public policy, nonkilling has been a salient feature. By May 2005, 85 countries and territories had abolished the death penalty for all crimes and 120 for various crimes (<http://web.amnesty.org>). Some 27 countries in 2001 did not have standing armies (pp.43-44), and there is a larger number of countries, 47 in 1998, that do have standing armies, yet have recognized conscientious objection to military conscription (pp.46-47).<sup>3</sup> Paige uses life-affirming medical science as a model. Medicine, through its continual research and training programs on prevention, intervention, and post-traumatic transformation strategies have proven successful in producing both knowledge and practitioners for the moral interest of preservation of life. He considers that same rigor and commitment to non-lethality can be made equally applicable to social sciences, in particular the study of political behaviour (p.104, pp.146-47).

### **Problematic Political Theory**

Paige calls into question the Weberian dogma that acceptance of violence is imperative for the practice and science of politics. On this bias of political science, he writes that unlike natural sciences that encourage development of pure theory as a contribution to practical applications, political science has tended to be unreceptive to theoretical imagination. This is especially true with regard to non-violence creativity. By dismissing it in professional training as “utopian,” “idealistic,” and “unrealistic,” political science is condemned to support perpetual lethality.

Consequently, killing that has been expected to liberate, protect, and enrich has become instead a source of insecurity, impoverishment, and threat to human and planetary survival. This “pathology of defense” is such that what is intended to defend

becomes itself the source of self-destruction. Bodyguards kill their own heads of state, armies violate and impoverish their own people, and nuclear weapons proliferate to threaten their inventors and possessors. Both violence-accepting politics and political science, as such, in the last century largely failed to suppress violence by violent means. The study of government and international politics ultimately has been unable to lay the groundwork and methodology for policy advice that goes to the roots of the causality of global violence. The current idea that political democracies and free markets will create societies in which people do not kill each other or kill or threaten to kill people in other societies, is in need of fundamental re-examination.

Should the role of social sciences, particularly political science, in transition to non-lethal security be to develop theory and practice to provide credible alternatives to threat or use of lethal force -- including preventive non-lethal transformation of the will to kill among potential adversaries? Paige points to a growing body of literature and experience on the subject providing a basis from which to advance (pp.189-216).

More knowledge of “post-killing stress” is waiting to be developed. Such knowledge, for example, could lead to policy changes in society to reduce murders, support for war, genocide, and mass killing by certain population segments and individuals. Again, in this sphere, there is a need for studying the psychological consequences of killing both within and without a war situation. Pioneering research on post-killing stress by Rachel M. MacNair suggests its relevance for policies to reduce murders, support for war, and mass killing.<sup>4</sup>

Koenigsberg in his study of two World Wars written from a soldier’s perspective states that as in tribal societies of the past, societies continue to conceive the purpose of warfare to be sacrificial.<sup>5</sup> Unlike offering individuals to supernatural deities in the past, modern wars are imagined to be fought for "real" reasons or purposes. A soldier’s delusion is encouraged by calling him a hero luring him to become a sacrificial victim. Old tribal tendencies today are replaced by patriotism and nationalism. In this, the killings are justified by labeling the other side as an “enemy” whereas it is politicians on one’s own side who are responsible for taking lethal decisions without seriously having

thought through the consequences. New research in this area resulting from public interest in 9/11 and the Iraq war has been that of Jerrold M. Post, Rachel M. MacNair, Chalmers Johnson, and James Waller.<sup>6</sup>

A recent important work in this field is by Jerrold M. Post, an academic political psychiatrist who is a consultant to the US government and the CIA.<sup>7</sup> As a pioneer in political personality-profiling his work points out that faulty images are a source of misperceptions and miscalculations that have often led to major errors in policy, avoidable catastrophes and missed opportunities. In a chapter on “The Mind of a Terrorist,” several types are identified. But there is no single psychological profile. Post states that a great challenge today is to have nonkilling theory, research, and action.<sup>8</sup> His surprising basic finding is that “the outstanding common characteristic of terrorists is their normality,” and that terrorists do not show any striking psychopathology. He gives penetrating analysis with examples of several types of terrorism: state terrorism, state-supported terrorism, sub-state terrorism, social revolutionary terrorism, nationalist-separatist terrorism, religious extremist terrorism, right wing terrorism, and single-issue terrorism.

Post has two principal recommendations to reduce terrorism, but these will not end it. First, since terrorism will always be with us, he maintains that killing terrorists and threatening them with killing and oppression will not solve the problem; nor will smart bombs and missiles. Instead, since terrorism is essentially psychological warfare it must be countered with psychological warfare. Second, democratic processes are the best hope. Once democratic processes are in play, through competitive participatory processes, most groups will disintegrate. Post’s study, discussing many leaders, is an essential contribution to the first step in the logic of nonkilling political analysis. That is, to understand the causes of killing, both individual and collective. Post’s conclusion is that to kill or threaten to kill them creates more terrorists. Therefore non-lethal alternatives are needed to diminish their actions and organizations.<sup>9</sup> This is the task facing Nonkilling Global Political Science in every area of human lethality.

## **The Nonkilling Paradigm**

The word “nonkilling” is not in everyday use and is not found in the Oxford English Dictionary. It is a term coined by Paige. He defines a “nonkilling society” as (italics mine): *“a human community, smallest to largest, local to global, in which there is no killing of humans, and no threats to kill; no weapons designed to kill humans and no justifications for using them; and no conditions of society that depend for maintenance or change upon the threat or use of lethal force. There is neither killing of humans nor threats to kill. This may extend to animals and other forms of life, but nonkilling of humans is a minimum characteristic”* (p.1). He adds that the essential characteristic of a nonkilling society is that the structure of such a society does not depend upon lethality. There are no social relationships that require actual or threatened killing to maintain or change them. No relations of dominance or exclusion—boundaries, forms of government, property, gender, race, ethnicity, class, or systems of spiritual or secular belief—require killing to support or challenge them.

Paige points out that *“This does not imply that such a society is unbounded, undifferentiated, or conflict-free, but only that its structure and processes do not depend upon killing. There are no vocations, legitimate or illegitimate, whose purpose is to kill. Thus life in a nonkilling society is characterized by no killing of humans and no threats to kill; neither technologies nor justifications for killing; and no social conditions that rely upon the threat or use of lethal force”* (p.2).

Ultimately he raises the question: “Is such a society possible? If no, why not? If yes, why?”

Paige does not hesitate from laying out a road map for a large-scale reconstruction of a global society, albeit a nonkilling one. In a chapter on “Implications for Political Science,” the author proposes changes that might accompany a shift towards non-lethality in the areas of political philosophy, political theory, leadership and polity, policy studies, comparative politics, and international politics. It especially calls for the comparative study of nonviolent versus violent political leadership.<sup>10</sup> One may ask, why has there not been more study of successful leadership in conflict resolution without military

intervention? For example, there is a long list of Nobel Peace Prize recipients over the past fifty years who dared to take the non-violent route for complex problem-solving in their respective countries. These leaders among others include names like Mikhail Gorbachev, Jimmy Carter, Václav Havel, Shimon Peres, Lech Wałęsa, Anwar Sadat, Nelson Mandela, Desmond Tutu and Aung San Suu Kyi. Their accomplishments, leadership styles, strategies, ideologies, and skills are needful of being examined and analyzed.<sup>11</sup>

### **WHO World Report on Violence and Health**

Interestingly, a strong vindication of Paige's thesis comes from an unusual source, the World Health Organization (WHO) and its *World Report on Violence and Health* (2002). It was published in the same year as Paige's *Nonkilling Global Political Science* (though Paige's thesis was completed in 1999). Both use essentially a similar model, that of medical sciences and public health. The WHO report for the first time provides global data on impact of violence on health in a society.

Because it is so pervasive, violence is often seen as an inevitable part of the human condition - a fact of life to respond to, rather than to prevent. Similar to Paige's work, the WHO report indicates that violence is not an intractable social problem or an inevitable part of the human condition. ***It is preventable.*** Both works recognize that violence, be it of individual or of collective nature, it is a complex phenomenon that needs to be addressed in a holistic manner.

WHO reports that in the year 2000, more than 1.6 million people worldwide lost their lives to violence. Nearly half of these violence-related deaths were suicides, almost one third were homicides, and about one fifth were war-related.<sup>12</sup> For everyone who dies as a result of violence, many more are injured and suffer from a range of physical, sexual, reproductive and mental health problems. The report states that violence is among the leading causes of death for people aged 15-44 years worldwide, accounting for 14% of deaths among males and 7% of deaths among females.

While Paige's institutional implications describe possibilities at all levels of governance -- for example, the need to establish Public Service Departments of Non-

violence with cabinet responsibilities --the WHO study through its multi-disciplinary public health approach highlights the need for micro-level interventions to confront both individual and collective violence. Such interventions can include means such as providing professional training for prevention and post-lethal rehabilitation, providing space for encouraging creative public policies for nonviolent community well-being, and working on measures to promote local to global security.

There is an interesting example given by Paige of an anthropological study by Clayton and Carole Robarchek which records the remarkable 90 per cent reduction in homicides by the Waorani people of Ecuador in the short period of 30 years after 1958. It indicates that humans are capable of rapid nonkilling change (pp.160-61). In Waorani society, which until the 1950s was considered to be “the most violent society known to anthropology,” the homicide rate was 1,000 per 100,000 persons (as compared with 10 or less per 100,000 for the United States). In three decades, in just over a generation, it dropped to 60 per 100,000. The main contributors to change were two Christian missionary widows whose husbands had been killed in their attempts to contact the Waorani tribes. They introduced an alternative nonviolent Christian value system. Change was assisted by introduction of new cognitive information. For example, that outsiders were not cannibals, news brought back by some Waorani women who had seen the outside world. To this was added the desire of the Waorani themselves to end the endless cycle of fearful vendettas in which whole families were speared to death. This combination of factors eventually led to transition from a culture of violence toward a culture of peace.

The WHO document through global reporting from member states raises the discussion of nonkilling to a new level of engagement with researchers, statisticians, policy makers, decision-makers, and political leadership. It offers unique opportunities to develop innovative approaches to alleviate violence worldwide. The statistical annex to the WHO report has three types of unique baseline data: global and regional estimates of mortality; ten leading causes of death and disability by WHO member-states; and rates of mortality for each of the WHO regions and countries. The member state populations are categorized into age groups, sex, income level and geographic region.

Three levels of intervention are suggested,<sup>13</sup> these are:

Primary prevention - approaches that aim to prevent violence before it occurs;

Secondary prevention - approaches that focus on the more immediate responses to violence; such as pre-hospital care, emergency services or treatment for sexually transmitted diseases following a rape; and

Tertiary prevention - approaches that focus on long-term care in the wake of violence such as rehabilitation and reintegration, and attempts to lessen trauma or reduce the long-term disability associated with violence.

It is obvious that priority needs to be given, through much greater investment, to primary prevention of violence; that is, measures to stop violence from occurring in the first place, rather than dealing with the immediate consequences of violence - providing support to victims and punishing offenders. One of the key problems of modern warfare, starting from the two World Wars to Korea and Vietnam Wars of the last century, and the present Iraq War, is preoccupation with scenarios by governments on how to engage in violent conflicts and assumed positive results, without serious thought given to exorbitant human, material, and moral costs of a military intervention. What is required from academic and policy research institutions the systematic disengagement (nonkilling) decision- making studies that will help us liberate from engagement (killing) decisions.

According to the WHO study, while these levels of prevention have been applied traditionally to victims of violence and within healthcare settings, they are also relevant to the perpetrators of violence and have to be used to characterize judicial responses to violence. Another way of defining violence prevention is suggested through the focus on the target group of interest.

### **Institutional Implications**

Discussing the institutional implications of a nonkilling approach, Paige asserts that needed at all levels of governance are public service Departments/Ministries of Nonviolence with cabinet responsibilities. Their tasks can be to monitor community conditions related to the logic of nonkilling political analysis, to support professional

training for prevention and post-lethal transformative rehabilitation, and to advise on public policies that will facilitate community well-being. Such a Department will aggregate violent statistics and recommendations for violence-eliminating actions from all public and private sources, and will make periodic status reports together with nonkilling policy recommendations to governmental decision-makers and to the public.<sup>14</sup> In addition to Public Service Departments of Nonviolence, the principal elements proposed by Paige that need to be established for a nonkilling transformation would include: Nonkilling Common Security Institutions, Nonkilling Political Parties, Nonkilling Universities, Nonkilling Civil Society Institutions, Nonkilling Training Institutions etc. The novel thinking in such listing is the nonkilling focus of these institutions.

Conventional thinking holds that readiness to kill is the only effective way to cope with violence from rape to holocaust. A. Richard Konrad cited in Paige's work argues that the thesis of the single violent problem-solving alternative rests upon three assumptions: that all non-violent alternatives have been identified; that all have been tried; and that all have failed. But these assumptions are untenable: non-violent problem-solving alternatives are hypothetically infinite; practical constraints of time, resources, and other factors prevent testing even those that are identified; therefore we cannot be certain that single violent alternative is the only one that can succeed. Thus Konrad argues the need to shift from a philosophical predisposition to accept violence to one that seeks to create and test nonviolent alternatives (p.30). Such an approach if seriously pursued can lead to scientific discoveries that question the inescapability of human lethality.

Through this "Nonkilling" societal construct, Paige takes us a step beyond Non-violence. Nonkilling is not just a feel good spiritual-religious hypothesis aimed at individual transformation or uplift. It is an actionable policy tool to review, evaluate, and develop a civilized response to prevention of violence. The thesis is grounded in behavioral sciences and is open-ended, measurable, and doable.

In a recent paper for UNESCO on "Nonkilling Global Society," Paige elaborates

an over-arching definition of the concept of nonkilling, making a distinction between nonkilling and other terms commonly used in research such as peace, non-violence, and *ahimsa*:

“**Nonkilling**: This refers to the absence of killing, threats to kill, and conditions conducive to killing in human society. The concept focuses primarily upon killing of human beings although it may be extended to killing of animals and other forms of life. In analysis of its causes, nonkilling encompasses the concepts of *peace* (absence of war and conditions conducive to war), *nonviolence* (psychological, physical and structural), and *ahimsa* (non-injury in thought, word and deed). In relation to killing of humans by socioeconomic structural conditions that are the product of direct lethal reinforcement as well as the result of diversion of resources for purposes of lethality, nonkilling implies removal of lethality-linked deprivations. In relation to threats to the viability of the biosphere, nonkilling implies absence of direct attacks upon life-sustaining resources as well as cessation of indirect degradation associated with lethality. In relation to forms of accidental killing, nonkilling implies creation of social and technological conditions conducive to their elimination”.<sup>15</sup>

### **Seven Grounds for Nonkilling Global Society**

To summarize, the thesis presented by Paige is that a nonkilling global society is possible and that changes in the social sciences, especially in political science and its social role, can help to bring it about. The case for the reliability of nonkilling society, according to Paige, rests upon seven grounds:

1. Most humans do not kill.
2. Powerful nonkilling potentials reside in the spiritual heritage of humankind.
3. Science demonstrates and forecasts nonkilling human capabilities.
4. Transitional nonkilling public policies such as abolition of the death penalty and recognition of conscientious objection to military service have been adopted by even violence-created nation states.
5. Various social institutions based upon nonkilling principles exist that in combination already constitute functional equivalents of nonkilling societies. Nonviolent popular

struggles for political and socioeconomic change demonstrate increasingly powerful alternatives to revolutionary lethality.

6. Roots of nonkilling inspiration and experience can be discovered in historical traditions throughout the world.
7. Ultimately the promise of nonkilling transition rests upon examples of nonkilling individuals, men and women, celebrated and unknown, whose courageous lives testify to its achievability.

Paige not only opposes the “lethal philosophical tradition” (p.6) of Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Marx and Engels, Rousseau, and Weber, but implicitly also the lethal positivist tradition which deals with material and “factual” things, for example, the terror phenomenon.<sup>16</sup> He contrasts this tradition in a supplementing way with the examination of the possibilities of nonkilling societies, the possibilities of nonkilling, i.e. something only partly present in a positivist sense. There definitively are and have been nonkilling features in all aspects of science and society.

### **Logic of Nonkilling Political Analysis**

Paige formulates the questions of the science of nonkilling like this: “A nonkilling political science paradigm shift implies need for *a four-part logic of nonkilling political analysis*. We need to know the causes of killing; the causes of nonkilling; the causes of transition between killing and nonkilling; and the characteristics of completely killing-free societies” (p.72).

He points out that acceptance of inescapable lethality as an assumption upon which to base the academic discipline and social role of political science is at the very least problematical. Therefore to question the assumption of killing and its implications throughout what might be called the “deadly discipline” of political science - among others - is appropriate. Political science, along with other disciplines and vocations, must recover non-violent experiences of the past, recognize present non-violent capabilities, project non-violent potentials for the future, and cooperate in advancing this knowledge in research, teaching, and public service for nonkilling social transformation.

Prototypical components of a nonkilling society, as his work shows, already exist

in past and present global experience. It is supported by continual scientific evidence of what unites us rather than what divides us, e.g., Earth as a planet, common DNA, exceedingly shrinking global village through the communications revolution, creation of cross-national institutions, etc. These are not the product of hypothetical imagination. Today's issues of poverty, disease, environment, and even war -- all ultimately constitute world issues, whether we want them or not.

Paige concludes: "If any people decided to combine, adapt, and creatively add to the components that already exist in global human experience, a reasonable approximation of a nonkilling society is even now within reach." He is realistic enough to add that, "to assert possibility, of course, is not to guarantee certainty but to make problematical the previously unthinkable and to strengthen confidence that we humans are capable of nonkilling global transformation"(p.69).

He asks that the role of political science in transition to non-lethal security is to develop theory and practice to provide credible alternatives to threat or use of lethal force - including preventive non-lethal transformation of the will to kill among potential adversaries. He points to the growing body of literature and experience on the subject that provides a basis from which to advance; especially the classic work of Gene Sharp and the contributions of John Burton and Johan Galtung.<sup>17</sup>

Paige concludes that the time has come for a major paradigm-shift: "If tradition has taught that we must kill to be free, equal and secure—the present teaches that unless we stop killing not only freedom and equality are in jeopardy but our very survival—individual, social, and ecological—is imperiled. We have reached a point where the science and practice of politics must be aligned with the life-supporting forces of society and nature. It (nonkilling) is not only good morality, and good practically, but it is also this era's imperative for good political science" (p.155).

Worldwide interest in Paige's thesis is reflected in the fact that in 2005 *Nonkilling Global Political Science* is being translated in 22 languages including Arabic, Chinese, French, Hindi, Italian, Japanese, Russian, Sinhala, Spanish, Turkish, and Urdu. All of these translations have emerged from spontaneous global interest in taking the nonkilling

thesis into serious critical consideration.

### **Feasibility of a Nonkilling Global Society: An Open Question**

Paige maintains that a nonkilling society is thinkable and possible, given the unprecedented threat to human survival. But he is practical in accepting that there is not likely to be complete unanimity in support of the nonkilling thesis. Global diversity within and across societies is to be expected as the result of many factors, such as individual socialization, professional training, vocations, values, ideologies, gender, class, ethnicity, and national political cultures.<sup>18</sup> He has continued with testing his hypothesis. Paige's nonkilling paradigm has received responses in different communities that have ranged from completely negative to completely positive. Some examples:

- It's completely unthinkable because of: human nature, scarce resources, and need to defend against sexual assault and other forms of aggression.

- I've never thought about the question before. I need time to think it over.

- It's thinkable, but what about Hitler and the Holocaust.

- We know that human beings are not violent by nature; but we must kill in self-defence.

- It's not possible but it's possible to become possible.

- It's completely possible.

Transition to a nonkilling society is feasible. It will take a 21st century commitment of creativity, vision, and perseverance similar to that of the 20th century Apollo program to land a Man on the Moon. We have yet to make a similar concerted effort toward creating a nonkilling human society. Paige is optimistic that ultimately spirit, science, skills, the arts and our need for self-preservation will move us in that direction through global emergence of transformative leadership and constructive life respecting fellowship. This will require launching transitional nonkilling institutions to chart new ways of preventing individual and collective violence in local, national, international, transnational, regional, and global circles.

Amidst continuing global killing and threats to kill, Paige recognizes that there are ample grounds for people to conclude that nonkilling societies are unthinkable. But also there are enormously significant signs of creative willingness to give the question serious consideration. *It's thinkable and maybe it's possible*. Despite unprecedented threats to human survival there are countervailing global resources of spirit, science, institutions, and experience to strengthen confidence that ultimately we human beings can stop killing each other.

---

Word count: 5,028 (with endnotes)

03/08/05

---

#### ENDNOTES:

<sup>1</sup> Paige, Glenn D., *Nonkilling Global Political Science*, Xlibris: Philadelphia, 2002. 239pp. ISBN# Hardcover 0-7388-5744-0, Paperback 0-7388-5745-9 Publisher: Xlibris Corporation, 436 Walnut Street, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19106-3703 .The text is also available on direct link for download at: [www.globalnonviolence.org](http://www.globalnonviolence.org)

<sup>2</sup> The WHO report is the first comprehensive review of the problem of violence on a global scale - what it is, who it affects, and what can be done about it. It seeks to dispel the hopelessness that often accompanies any discussion on violence. Violence is preventable - it is not an intractable social problem or an inevitable part of the human condition. It is a multifaceted problem with biological, psychological, social and environmental roots. There is no simple or single solution to the problem. Violence must therefore be addressed simultaneously on multiple levels and in multiple sectors of society. WHO, *World Report on Violence and Health* (Foreword by Nelson Mandela). Geneva, 2002.

<sup>3</sup> Paige, *Nonkilling*, Ibid., pp.75-182. A Selective Service System report lists 11, 996 Religious Denominations of Conscientious Objectors in US World War II Civilian Public Service Camps.

<sup>4</sup> MacNair, Rachel M. *Perpetration-Induced Traumatic Stress: the Psychological Consequences of Killing*, Westport: Praeger Publications, 2002.

<sup>5</sup> Koenigsberg, Richard A. "Aztec Warfare, Western Warfare: The Soldier as Sacrificial Victim," *Studies In War, Genocide and Terrorism*. Library of Social Science, Vol.10, Nov 2004. <http://home.earthlink.net/~libraryofsocialscience/>

---

<sup>6</sup> Other recent relevant works include: Post, Jerrold M. *Leaders and their Followers in a Dangerous World: The Psychology of Political Behavior*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004--a prize-winning book. Post, a CIA and US Government consulting psychiatrist, teaches Psychiatry, Political Psychology, and International Affairs at George Washington University; Johnson, Chalmers. *Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy, and the End of the Republic*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2004; and Waller, James. *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

<sup>7</sup> Post, *Leaders and their Followers in a Dangerous World: The Psychology of Political Behavior*.

<sup>8</sup> Post, pp.123-161.

<sup>9</sup> Post, pp.160-61.

<sup>10</sup> Paige, Glenn D. *The Scientific Study of Political Leadership*. New York: Free Press, 1977.

<sup>11</sup> Bhaneja, Balwant, "Non-violent World Order: Human Values Paradigm", *Philosophy and Social Action*, Vol.25, No.3, July-Sept 1999, pp.31-39.

<sup>12</sup> WHO, *World Report on Violence and Health*. p.10.

<sup>13</sup> WHO, p.13.

<sup>14</sup> Bhaneja, Bill. "Towards a Proposal for a Federal Department for Peace" prepared for Nonviolent Peaceforce Canada for presentation at 'Consultations on a Civilian Peace Service for Canada' at St. Paul University, Ottawa. February 07-09, 2005. The paper while developing policy, organizational and funding imperatives for such a Department, provides a model of detailed Legislative Bill for Peace Department/Ministry. Papers presented at Consultation available at CPSC site: [<http://www.peaceservice.ca>]

<sup>15</sup> Paige, Glenn D. [2005], "Nonkilling Global Society", in *Peace Building*, edited by Ada Aharoni, in *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS)*, Developed under the auspices of the UNESCO, Eolss Publishers, Oxford, U.K., [ [http:// www.eolss.net](http://www.eolss.net) ].

<sup>16</sup> A summary and analysis of terror as a subject of social science research by Hamadeh, Anis, "Terror as an object of science," November 2004 (Translated from German) PDF file (6 pp.) for download [[http://www.anis-online.de/pages/ text3/Terror-e.pdf](http://www.anis-online.de/pages/text3/Terror-e.pdf)].

<sup>17</sup> Notable works include: Sharp, Gene. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. Boston: Porter Sargent, 1973. Burton, John. *Deviance, Terrorism & War: The Process of Solving Unsolved Social and Political Problems*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979. Galtung, Johan. *Peace by Peaceful Means*. London: SAGE Publications, 1996.

<sup>18</sup> A pioneering national exploration of Paige's hypothesis was undertaken in the Philippines in 2004. See Abueva, Jose V. *Towards a Nonkilling Filipino Society: Developing an Agenda for Research, Policy and Action*, Manila: Aurora Aragon Quezon Peace Foundation & Kalayaan College, February 2005. The book with its 17 authors reports on four University Forums convened on the theme "Is a Nonkilling Society Possible in the Philippines?" held during February 19-25, 2004 at the University of the Philippines,

---

Ateneo de Manila University, Kalayaan College, and Ateneo de Davao University. The Forums and the publication of the book were organized under the leadership of political scientist Dr. Jose V. Abueva, former President of the University of the Philippines, now President of Kalayaan [Freedom College] ([www.kalayaan.edu.ph](http://www.kalayaan.edu.ph)).