CHAPTER FOUR

Principles of Global Community

The paradigm for global citizenship presented in this book is based on the connection between personal and social psychology, between self-actualization and the health of the global community. Like the practice of medicine, it identifies as pathological that which undermines human well-being. It seeks to understand that pathology in terms conducive to effective therapy and prevention.

Effective global citizenship requires familiarity with fundamentals, a set of basic skills, persistent practice in applying the skills toward clearly defined goals, and often intense concentration. Even a familiarity with fundamentals in the practice of global citizenship can itself be a huge step forward, and this book can help with that. Knowing “how things work” that affect your life is an asset as important as your bank account. The ability that some people have to see the relationship between events in their personal lives and events in their society has been called the “sociological imagination.” Having this ability can prevent you from being a prisoner of social forces that influence your life (see Shepard 1987, xxxv).
Knowledge of the ways you can affect your society is just as liberating as knowledge of how your society affects you. If you live and work to promote human well-being at the personal, local, and global levels, you can gradually free yourself and others of pessimism. If your experience is like mine, doors will open for you. You will learn to use successes and setbacks in making moment-to-moment changes. Surprising advances, opportunities, and transformations are part of this experience. Again and again, you will transcend what you thought were your limits.

I have used the analogy of medicine in referring to the practice of global citizenship. The ABCs of Human Survival is written with the concept of a text on principles of medicine in mind. The important thing, however, is to find the analogy that is most effective for you.

Even the analogy of war can be useful for this purpose. It is often used for sustained effort toward an envisioned goal, as in the phrases “war on poverty” or “war on cancer.” Scott Ritter has written a useful book for those who like this analogy: Waging Peace: The Art of War for the Anti-War Movement (2007).

The analogy of a game can also be useful because so many people enjoy games of all kinds and because many have been involved in competitive athletics. Skill in playing the game of citizenship can give the satisfaction of skill in a sport.

The principles of global community (in this chapter) and of global citizenship (chapter 6) have evolved over more than a decade from my thinking and experience. This chapter emphasizes how things work in the global community, while chapter 6 emphasizes practice — how individuals change the global community. The separation is somewhat arbitrary: all the principles are relevant both to understanding and to practice.
PRINCIPLE 1

We are in the process of choosing between a healthy global community under a rule of international law (Option A) or ongoing violent contests for power driven by militant nationalism (Option B).

In our society, we consider human sacrifice ceremonies a savage affront to morality, but we consider our own maintenance of the warfare system quite acceptable. As a society, we ignore, obscure, or rationalize the fact that our policies were largely responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians well before the invasion of Iraq in 2003, as well as the carnage of the invasion itself. Historically, we have always rationalized, obscured, or ignored the atrocities for which we have been responsible.

As individuals, however, we do not have to accept this way of thinking (or not thinking) about our savagery. We have the option of rejecting destructive and self-destructive patterns of thinking and behavior that are officially condoned and promoted. It’s a choice. Consciously or unconsciously, we in fact make this choice. Remaining silent or “neutral,” and paying taxes, supports the savagery. We not only make these choices, but we are also responsible for the predictable consequences of our choice.

If we choose to believe that Option B is the only option and behave accordingly, then we will continue down the road to Option B. We will be blind to the alternative because our thinking has made us blind.

By rejecting militant nationalism and affirming the necessity of law, we align ourselves with progress toward Option A. We assume responsibility for learning to live together as human beings. The government cannot claim to represent a person or a constituency that explicitly rejects its militarism and its violations of international law. If the person or the constituency is silent, the government can pursue its path unimpeded down the road to Option B.

Rejecting militant nationalism and affirming the necessity of law are essential if we are to learn to live together as human beings, but
they are not sufficient. We must also deal with other weaknesses in our society if we want to re-direct the global community toward Option A. One of these weaknesses is social atomization — our isolation from each other, both within our local communities and within the global community.

What are the causes of this social atomization? Certainly one significant factor is the material conditions of our society. The rich and the poor have but limited tendency to dialogue across the chasm created by discrepancies of wealth. But even within neighborhood communities, we often do not take time to talk with our neighbors. This isolation occurs despite, and to some extent because of, the widespread availability of personal computers and email. Electronic communication can be a great asset if used wisely, but it is no substitute for direct, healthy human interaction.

We have imposed this social atomization on ourselves. We do this by our daily choices. We can make different choices. Poorer and less technologically advanced societies have achieved much greater social cohesion than ours, and people in them are generally less isolated from one another than we are in our so-called advanced society. And yet we are quite capable of enhanced social cohesion, as may become apparent during a national crisis. It happened during World War II within the states that were at war; there are those who still remember it.

This social cohesion — the reverse of social atomization — can have measurable and surprising effects on personal well-being. Richard Wilkinson has examined the data on increases in life expectancy that occurred in Great Britain in the twentieth century. For civilians, those increases were greater during the decades of the two world wars (1910–20 and 1940–50) than in any other decade of that century.

During the First and Second World Wars, British government policy was designed to foster national unity and a sense that the burden of war was shared equally across
the whole society.... Not only did income differences narrow dramatically among those in employment, but unemployment almost disappeared, and income tax became much more progressive. The policy seemed to have its desired effect: people talked of a strong sense of camaraderie, social cohesion, and common purpose. A remarkable result was that civilian death rates fell two or three times as fast as in other periods during the twentieth century. (Wilkinson 2005, 39–40)

As Richard Wilkinson’s extensive work makes clear, however, it is not warfare but human cooperation (social cohesion) that is the essential ingredient in a healthy society. Growing disparities of wealth in a society correlate with reductions in life expectancy and other indices of declining health. Countries with modest economic indices may be healthier and happier than “rich countries” if their level of social capital is high.

Definitions and uses of the term social capital vary, but I use it here similarly to how Robert Putnam uses it in Bowling Alone (2000): it is value created by social networks and the tendency within such networks for people to do things for each other and for the common good. As such, social capital is an essential asset for effective democracy, and benefits from the participation of individuals with high self-esteem, respect for life, and a creative approach to community.

Wilkinson’s finding that indicators of physical and psychological well-being improved as a function of social equality has an important parallel in findings by Amartya Sen and others that famines are not so much the result of food shortages as of a lack of democracy. Frances Moore Lappé has extended this thesis in her books and — along with countless other exemplary individuals in civil society — given it vitality in her life and work.

Social and political atomization makes democracy impossible and places society at risk. Conversely, social cohesion enables a society to address a variety of challenges more effectively. By our
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choices, we evolve daily toward more cooperative or more atomized communities. By our choices, we accept or reject militarism and its corrosive effects on the local and global communities.

Consciously or unconsciously, each of us is personally involved in this choice-process. It operates at every level from the personal to the global. It involves the influences of individuals on society and the influences of society on individuals. This choice-process has largely determined the course of world events in the past, and it has also determined the current conditions of human security. It diminishes or expands our ability to envision possibilities and to explore the farther reaches of the human spirit. It creates opportunities or challenges for the generations who will follow us. It will continue to determine the course of world events, the conditions of human existence, and the chances of human survival in the future.

**PRINCIPLE 2**

_We cannot be part of the solution until we understand that we are part of the problem._

Perhaps self-righteousness is the basic driving force in the familiar trajectory of empires: their rise, decline, and ultimate collapse. As a species, we human beings have depended on social cooperation. Yet we have also been catastrophically self-destructive. Careful observers have pointed out that our destructive behavior depends on self-righteousness and a lack of introspection. Hannah Arendt emphasized the “banality of evil,” the widespread support given to political leaders who impose savage policies on the global community (1963a). She understood how easily individuals are recruited into support for destruction, and how difficult it can be for them to resist even if they understand what is happening.

We fail the test of introspection when we assume that we are powerless to influence conditions and events in the global community and that we have no responsibility for those events and conditions. Erich Fromm (1941) reminds us that we human beings
have a strong tendency to escape from freedom, from responsibility, and from self-knowledge.

Responsible global citizenship requires not only understanding that we are contributing to the problem but also ongoing inquiry into how we are contributing. As we pursue this understanding and inquiry, we progressively enhance our ability to help solve the problem. This concept is well expressed in the New Testament: “first take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your brother’s eye” (Matthew 7:5).

You and I must develop this understanding, but governments must also develop it. Governments cannot become part of the solution until they understand that they are part of the problem. This process involves acknowledging their violations of international law, recognizing that their lawlessness is a major part of the problem, and then bringing their policies and actions into compliance.

**PRINCIPLE 3**

*Warfare is pathological.*

Warfare is pathological in the same sense that HIV/AIDS or cancer is pathological. It kills people, including children, and devastates the lives of the people afflicted. Because we are part of the global community affected by warfare, it ravages the resources of our communities.

The diverse causes of war include economic, environmental, and political factors. This book emphasizes a cultural and ideological factor in the cause of warfare — militant nationalism, a pattern of thinking that makes warfare more likely, more frequent, and more deadly.

The causes of warfare might be explored in many venues: the behavior of other species (the “territorial imperative”); human competition for various natural resources (oil, water, food); economic considerations (capitalist competition, the current “profitability” of weapons production); political maneuvering and decision-making.
in the particular geopolitical context (e.g., historicist or political realist perspectives); or the social and psychological milieu (with deteriorating socio-economic conditions leading to hopelessness and public acceptance of warfare as inevitable).

Most of these ways of understanding the causes of warfare can be applied either in old-paradigm frameworks (which lead toward Option B) or in new-paradigm frameworks (which lead toward Option A). They can be used to serve the purposes of Option A thinkers or Option B thinkers.

Take so-called political realism as an example. Political realists are interested in power relationships among states and coalitions of states. Obviously some understanding of such power relationships is essential to efforts at preventing warfare and promoting a healthy global community. With remarkable frequency, however, political realists have placed themselves at the service of state power in its virulent rivalries (old paradigm, Option B). As a working hypothesis, I suggest that they do so because there are more lucrative jobs available in that line of work. Be that as it may, the fact that the political realist line of thinking has often served militant nationalism (Option B) does not change the fact that political realism, if honestly pursued and applied, can equally well serve a healthier purpose (Option A).

Essentially the same applies to the other ways of understanding the causes of warfare. The old-paradigm thinker can cite the “territorial imperative,” or human competition for various natural resources, or economic determinants, or whatever, as the reasons why warfare is inevitable. The new-paradigm thinker takes a very different approach. In new-paradigm thinking, all these causes of warfare are factors that need to be understood and addressed in the process of finding effective therapy and prevention of war.

Whether we can bring warfare under control is an empirical question. If we want to achieve that outcome, we will have to develop a way of thinking that increases the chances of producing it. We will have to make the shift to the new paradigm proposed in this and
countless other books, the paradigm that produced major advances of human consciousness through the centuries. The new paradigm recognizes warfare as pathological and aims to do to warfare what we long ago did to smallpox.

**PRINCIPLE 4**

*Militant nationalism drives the global community toward Option B.*

Option B extinguishes a largely unexplored world of human options. Every year, and with every payment we make into the warfare system, we relinquish constructive possibilities — in fact, luminous opportunities — for realizing what the human spirit might achieve. The world and our lives might have been incomparably richer and more productive than we have made them. We have failed because we lacked the wisdom, the love, the courage, and the imagination to do better.

We undermine our strength because we permit an ongoing hemorrhage of public resources and human talent into developing, producing, maintaining, and supporting the means of human self-destruction. Of the colossal sums recently approved by the U.S. House of Representatives to support the U.S. military presence in Afghanistan and Iraq, one small part of the bill designated more than seven hundred million dollars for procurement of missiles for the U.S. Army. Missiles are Option B technology.

In militarizing the global community, we have become highly destructive of the natural environment and wasteful of resources. The example we have set as “leaders of the civilized world” gives other states not only a self-destructive model to follow but also plenty of excuses for following it.

“We support our troops” is a popular assertion of militant nationalist sentiment. This phrase seamlessly blends support for human beings with support for militarism: “our troops” are human beings, and “our troops” are carrying out violence against other human beings.
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Now is the time for us to support human beings. Support our troops as human beings. Bring them home. Work for a world in which they and others like them have respect and self-respect, and can contribute to the well-being of others. Work for a world in which all of us, including those now in uniform, will end our slavish obedience to militant nationalist authority. Work for a world in which those in uniform and others like them will become responsible citizens rather than obedient and incomplete human beings.

At every level, from the personal to the international, militant nationalism is using our economic, political, social, and cultural capital to drive all of us toward Option B. The Option A priority is human well-being. The Option B priority is political power and, in organized states, state power. Militant nationalist culture denies, obscures, rationalizes, or ignores the conflict between these two priorities.

**PRINCIPLE 5**

*Power must be constrained by law.*

There is an obsolete concept of law in which a “lawmaker” or “lawgiver” (such as an emperor or monarch or dictator) promulgates the law but is himself above the law. That concept is diametrically opposed to modern concepts of law. Modern concepts of law are illustrated by the ideas underlying the U.S. Constitution, which is the source of whatever legitimate authority the U.S. government may have, and by the ideas underlying the UN Charter, which is the source of whatever legitimate authority the UN Security Council may have.

Prime ministers, presidents, government officials, judges, and legislators are all subject to law. To the extent they violate the law, they lose their legitimacy. In their violations of international law, they threaten the global community, which includes the rest of us.

Of the many astute observers of power and its consequences for good or ill, Norman Cousins is one of the most eloquent. A careful
reading of history, he suggests, can give us useful insights into the pathology of power:

- The tendency of power to drive intelligence underground;
- The tendency of power to become a theology, admitting no other gods before it;
- The tendency of power to distort and damage the traditions and institutions it was designed to protect;
- The tendency of power to create a language of its own, making other forms of communication incoherent and irrelevant;
- The tendency of power to spawn imitators, leading to volatile competition;
- The tendency of power to set the stage for its own use.

(1987, 23–24)

The exercise of power must be constrained by law. Reliable progress in human security can be made only within a framework of law protecting human rights. In the twentieth century, international law has increasingly emphasized basic human rights. Violent contests for state power were recognized as a central threat to human security.

With the breakdown in order that is inherent in war, all basic requirements of human security are threatened. For that reason, one of the fundamental requirements of international law is that governments must refrain from the international threat or use of force.

Under the UN Charter, the international threat or use of force is permissible only against an armed attack, or under auspices of the United Nations and in accord with the principles and purposes of the UN Charter. Advances in human rights must take place within the framework of this law of non-aggression (Article 2). Louis Henkin, former editor of the American Journal of International Law
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and advisor to the State Department on international law, expresses the relationship as follows:

Peace was the paramount value. The Charter and the [United Nations] were dedicated to realizing other values as well — self determination, respect for human rights, economic and social development, justice, and a just international order. But those purposes could not justify the use of force between states to achieve them; they would have to be pursued by other means.... The purposes of the United Nations could not in fact be achieved by war. War inflicted the greatest injustice, the most serious violations of human rights, and the most violence to self-determination and to economic and social development. (1991, 38–39)

Far from being an obstacle to control of dictators and tyrants, as has been claimed at times, international law is the only reliable framework within which such tyranny can be controlled and democracy promoted. Dictatorship and tyranny arise precisely under conditions of lawlessness in a dysfunctional global community. Powerful states, driven by militant nationalism, *promote* those conditions. They support dictatorship and tyranny to serve their own purposes, then use dictatorship and tyranny as pretext for war.

The “responsibility to protect” is an emerging concept in international law, with potential for considerable benefit or harm. Under current conditions, this concept can too easily be invoked to cover military intervention with a humanitarian mask. The given reasons for militarism have always been in some sense humanitarian, and there seems little to gain by expanding the wardrobe of disguises for aggression. In conflicts degenerating toward violence and oppression, the international community will usually have abundant signals of the developing crisis and abundant opportunity to assist
in resolving it, to intervene, well before the arrival of catastrophe. Instead, powerful states themselves are often promoting policies that exacerbate such crises.

It is these issues that need primary emphasis and attention. They have received inadequate attention in the original document on the responsibility to protect (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty [ICISS] 2001). This is a deficiency that is being redressed in a Canadian initiative, the “responsibility to care,” led by Dr. Mary-Wynne Ashford. The use of military intervention as prescribed by the ICISS is fraught with danger until we change the international context, and that change should rapidly obviate the need for military intervention, through international action before the catastrophe has arrived.

This is, of course, a complex issue. The Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice in the 21st Century (Agenda 21), which provides an essential conceptual framework for the promotion of peace and justice in the twenty-first century, has endorsed the concept of the responsibility to protect. But without a responsibility to care, and without acceptance by the most powerful states of their responsibility to abide by international law, the responsibility to protect will rapidly become worse than useless.

A rule of law can enhance trust across the global community and reliably diminish the use and threat of force. It can constrain the pathological aspects of power and channel power in more constructive directions. It can free up resources from weapons expenditures and allow those resources to be used for public health, education, and other programs that foster human creative potential. Compliance with international law is in the best interests of all states, including the most powerful.

By contrast, lawlessness encourages criminality and irresponsibility among the most powerful. It diminishes trust, increases the costs of transactions, devastates the global community, and leaves the future to military adventurism and the hazards of chance. Richard Falk, Albert G. Milbank Professor of International Law and
Practice, Princeton, asserts that lawlessness has undermined the best interests of Americans:

I think that if we re-examine the “lawless” initiatives of the past half-century, we find that few, if any, have benefited the United States or its people. I believe that as an American citizen I would be better served by a government that accepted the constraints of law as surely in international affairs as in domestic. Indeed, I would even contend that the next leap forward in legitimate governance will be giving citizens an enforceable, constitutional right to a “lawful foreign policy.” (Falk 1999)

Based on a recent opinion poll, U.S. and world public opinion is in accord with these views. In the United States, 69 percent of respondents concurred with the statement: “Our nation should consistently follow international laws. It is wrong to violate international laws, just as it is wrong to violate laws within a country.” The response in most countries surveyed was similar to that in the United States, with well over half of the respondents in agreement. The website www.worldpublicopinion.org carries background and details of this poll.

Law can be used to serve illegitimate power rather than as a constraint on such power, and it is often used for this purpose. Hence the uses of international law today are often contrary to the fifth principle put forward here — and contrary to the purposes of this book. Perhaps schools and universities should have introductory courses in international law in which the Option A and Option B uses of international law are clearly distinguished, so that students can make an informed choice.
PRINCIPLE 6

A rule of law depends on respect for the inherent justice of the law and for justice in its implementation.

International law offers advantages that can make the difference between life and death for our future. To achieve a rule of law, however, certain basic requirements will have to be met. A rule of law must be respected for its inherent justice or it will not endure. Jonathan Schell’s *The Unconquerable World* (2003) and Mark Kurlansky’s *Nonviolence* (2006) give historical overviews of how non-violent resistance and the rejection of unjust law and illegitimate power played a definitive role in twentieth-century history. No police force or army can long maintain a law that is self-negating.

The law as written must be conducive to healthy community: locally, regionally, and globally. International law recognizes, as it must, the principle of sovereign equality of states, just as municipal or national law recognizes the principle of equality of citizens before the law. Small states such as Guatemala under Jacobo Arbenz, or twentieth-century Costa Rica, or Sweden may provide better role models for the global community of the future than more powerful states such as China or the United States. Protection of smaller states from the bullying of larger states is a *sine qua non* for our future security.

Despite its imperfections, international law, with its increasing emphasis on basic human rights, has evolved in the right direction (toward Option A). Its prescriptions for progress are based on sound principles and long experience. But the most powerful states refuse to take the medicine.

The work of the UN Security Council has been obstructed and contaminated by the veto power of its permanent members, particularly of the Soviet Union (1950–70) and the United States (1970–90). As Austrian jurist Hans Köchler (1995) describes it, the veto power is a “normative contradiction” to the UN Charter’s
principle of sovereign equality of states. It needs to be changed. In
the meantime, however, no one forces the UN Security Council
members to use, or threaten to use, their veto. It is not the law itself
but the subversion and rejection of law, particularly by powerful
states, that is chiefly responsible for the ongoing failures.

In particular, two requirements for implementing international
law will have to be met in order for us to move toward Option A:

1. The law must be applied equitably. If there is a law against
murder but it is applied selectively, and not applied when someone
rich and powerful commits murder, then there can be no rule of
law. If there is a law against aggression but that law is not applied
when a powerful state commits aggression, then there can be no
rule of law.

2. The law must be applied consistently in accord with its most
fundamental purposes and principles. If the law against murder is
invoked when three people have been murdered, as pretext for
the slaughter of three hundred people, there can be no rule of law.
If the law against aggression is invoked as pretext for a massive
escalation of violence and further acts of aggression, it repudiates
the international legal system’s most fundamental purposes and
principles. There can be no rule of law until treachery of this
kind is ended.

Both these requirements were violated immediately after the
end of the Cold War, thus aborting progress toward Option A. An
object lesson from this part of our history is provided in chapter 5,
“The Case of Iraq.” We now live in an increasingly dangerous time
because the rule of law has been rejected by the most powerful
states. Something better is possible.

PRINCIPLE 7
Democracy and law are interdependent.

“The price of freedom is eternal vigilance.” This statement,
attributed to Thomas Jefferson, is of course open to more than one
interpretation and usage. It might be used to persuade a population to support their troops, for example, or to place absolute trust in their government as the “guardian of their liberty.” Jefferson certainly had something very different in mind.

Thomas Jefferson was one of many who have thought carefully about the meaning of democracy. Another is Hans Köchler, a contemporary Austrian jurist who has written extensively on democracy, international law, and the relationship between the two. Both Jefferson and Köchler arrive at the same conclusion: that direct citizen participation in governance is the cornerstone of viable democracy.

The dignity of every individual as an active (not merely passive) subject … allows for a more precise formulation of the idea of human rights as a basis for a genuine democratic system. It will be demonstrated that democracy in the sense of direct (that is to say, unmediated) participation of the individual in the decision-making process in a community is the only form of political organization concurring with human rights. (Köchler 1995, 7; emphasis original)

Eternal vigilance — that means your eternal vigilance — is the price of creating and maintaining a world that is in your best interests. In practice, of course, “your best interests” means the best interests not only of you personally, but also of your children and other members of your family. It also means the best interests of others in your community. Pushed to the wall, human beings are quite capable of making things unpleasant for each other. So it is in your best interests not to contribute to a world that pushes a lot of people to the wall and instead to envision and work to implement conditions (a global community) that encourage active contributions for the common good from every person.

This line of reasoning leads inevitably to a framework of human
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rights as a basic necessity, and to the necessity for governments to comply with that framework. And that means that your eternal vigilance must include watching your own government for any deviations from the most important purposes, principles, and prescriptions of law.

In opposition to this line of reasoning is the theme, familiar to all of us, that your government and its military forces will protect your interests and provide for your security against threats arising from other states, and that your primary responsibility is therefore loyalty to your country, not vigilance with regard to your country’s violation of international law. The state in which you hold citizenship, according to this map, is your protector; and it is your government, not the requirements of international law, that deserve your primary allegiance.

A comparison of these opposing concepts, along with evidence from the real world, leads to the insight that your government best serves your interests and best provides for your security by complying with international law. Furthermore, when we allow our government to violate international law and threaten the well-being of others in other parts of the global community, it is a critical failure of vigilance on our part.

If we understand *democracy* as it is defined in a standard dictionary and with the emphasis added in the foregoing paragraphs, then it is necessarily intertwined with international law, and both are dependent upon a fundamental acceptance of the primacy of human rights over state power. This understanding helps clarify why some standard ways of conducting foreign policy are illegitimate. Power politics means contempt for human life. It leads to the outrageous statements of a government official (Madeleine Albright) explaining why the lives of half a million children were a reasonable price to pay for this or that objective of the government. It leads, in fact, to fascism, and the road to that destination is not particularly long or winding.

Fascism, as we have all been instructed, is the negation of
democracy. But isn’t law emphasized in a fascist state? Obsession with crime and punishment has been cited as one of the characteristics of a fascist state, and police in such a state are given almost limitless power to enforce laws. Isn’t that a more robust commitment to law than we have in our “democratic” society?

What passes for law in fascist societies is that atavistic notion of law in which the supreme power in the state is above the law. Fascism is the negation not only of democracy, but also of law. Law means a framework for controlling power in the interest of human well-being. The law is to serve human beings and not the other way around. If it does not mean this, then law means something very dangerous indeed.

The characteristics of fascism include powerful and continuing nationalism, disdain for the recognition of human rights, identification of enemies and scapegoats as a unifying cause, controlled mass media, and obsession with national security, among others (see Britt 2003). The use of the spectacle in fascist states serves the purpose of impressing on the individual how impotent they are in the face of large aggregates of power, a very useful doctrine when your purpose is to destroy any vestige of democracy. In a fascist state, the individual is interpreted as a consumer and an object for manipulation, not as a vigilant, competent, responsible citizen. When we look at the list of characteristics of fascism, based on studies of fascist states such as Italy under Mussolini, Spain under Franco, and Germany under Hitler, we find features familiar to us in our own society.

A system that claims to protect the interests of any group of people, and on that basis claims the right to conduct foreign policy in ways that violate international law and threaten the well-being of other groups of people, is making a fraudulent claim. Such a system is in fact a threat to those whose interest it claims to protect.

An effective democracy is the only reliable enforcer for international law. International law is the guarantor and guideline
of effective democracy. Both are essential for protection and promotion of our best interests, and both are our responsibility.

**PRINCIPLE 8**

*Democracy and law are evolving.*

Neither democracy nor international law is static. And neither is currently in a robust state of health. They must grow and change into something different from what they are now. In what direction do we want them to change, toward Option A or Option B? And what are we going to do about it?

Hans Köchler is one of those who have recognized the grotesque perversion of international law that took place in response to Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990. It was a point at which the uses and concepts of international law underwent a change toward Option B. He refers to that travesty as he alerts us to the potential treachery behind words like “democracy” and “a rule of law.” Hearing the words can so easily catch us off guard as the reality to which the words refer moves, step by step, down the road to hell.

In its management of the Gulf Crisis, the USA factually had its power monopoly recognized by the other members of the Security Council, and it used this *fait accompli* in the spirit of the traditional doctrine of international law based on power politics for a reinterpretation of the UN Charter … in a manner which effectively undermined the Charter itself….

It is self-evident that “democracy” and the “rule of law” become instruments of cynical *realpolitik* when used under such circumstances. They degenerate into mere ideological phrases. (Köchler 1995, 46–47)

At the same time, Köchler understands very well the need for change in a different direction.
Therefore, if one actually propagates democracy as the new paradigm for international order — in distinction to the power-political maxims of classical international law — then such an idealistic program has to be followed by action. In particular, those provisions in the UN Charter that secure the privileged position of the post-war powers must be eliminated because they express nothing more than a power-political immunization which legally allows the respectively strongest power to turn the other states into hostages of its veto right and to initiate aggression itself without fear of instigating legal sanctions. (44)

Democracy and international law are on the move. Where do we want to take them, and where do we want them to take us? They can become more effective in promoting human security and a healthy global community, or they can mask and exacerbate a growing threat to human security and the global community. It’s a choice that we must make and that future generations must live with.

**PRINCIPLE 9**

*Nationalism has both creative and destructive effects on the state itself.*

An *inclusive nationalism* can mitigate conflicts among ethnic communities and promote cooperative effort for the public good. This potential accounts for much of the historical success of nationalism. But nationalism has a strong tendency to become malignant: to make political power (state power) an end unto itself, and in serving that priority, to become exclusive, setting “us” against “them.” This is *militant nationalism*, and it is the dominant form of nationalism today. It is pervasive in the culture of militarily powerful states, and it influences the culture of their allies. This is apparent even in so simple an observation as the difference between the
attention that our mass media pays to deaths of “our troops” (who happen to be agents of our violations of international law in Iraq and Afghanistan) and the lack of attention that same mass media pays to civilian deaths in the countries with which we are at war.

Nationalism would not have survived and flourished if it had not been associated with impressive benefits for millions of people. Nationalism sometimes arises as a response to aggression or murderous oppression. The rise of Zionism in response to murderous oppression of Jews and the rise of various nationalisms in response to imperialism are familiar examples from the twentieth century.

Nationalism often promotes community. Because that community tends to be exclusive (“us” against “them”), it is a long-term threat to those in the community, but that does not prevent the nationalist social bond from being heartfelt and widely shared. It can be a very positive human experience accompanied by overwhelming emotions. The sense of national community may be strongest in a time of warfare if there is a real external threat to the nation. Veterans may remember their war years as the most positive time of their lives because of the sense of mission, community, and effectiveness.

Nationalist enthusiasms can also be intense in a powerful and secure state in times of peace, perhaps especially so, for their new home, among immigrants and refugees from the ravages of violent nationalism in other parts of the world. Nationalism promotes human rights for some even as it threatens human rights for others.

Anyone who has lived in a powerful state is familiar, not only from propaganda but from personal experience, with the benefits of nationalism. Consider the late twentieth-century differences between life in the United States and life in Colombia, where death threats, civil war, and kidnapping have for many years ravaged the fabric of society. Colombia is an “ownership society” in which wealthy individuals and groups refused to relinquish sufficient power to form an effective central government. It is a state threatened by one of the worst forms of anarchism. Militant
nationalism is the lesser of two evils if we put it in the dock with a state that is disintegrating or tearing itself apart from within.

The irony is that militant nationalism itself leads the state toward self-destruction. The trajectories of Germany under Adolf Hitler and of Iraq under Saddam Hussein provide dramatic examples. And what happened quickly for Iraq and Germany is happening more slowly for the world’s superpower. As public resources are squandered on the negative capital invested in militarism, as the global community turns away from the United States as a model for the future, the United States looks more and more like an empire in decline.

PRINCIPLE 10

Every powerful state has both conveyed significant benefits and committed major atrocities.

Without exception, every powerful militant nationalist state in history has facilitated major achievements that benefited the citizens of that state. And without exception, every powerful militant nationalist state in history has been responsible for murderous atrocities.

Under conditions of militant nationalism, the growth of state power requires the deployment of public resources not only in international contests for power but also to maintain popular support. Having lived the first four decades of my life in the United States and the more recent two decades in Canada, I can attest to enormous benefits conveyed by each of those two states. I assume readers are familiar with many of these benefits from personal experience, so they need no elaboration here.

Readers will also be familiar with the fate of earlier inhabitants of North America after arrival of the Europeans at the end of the fifteenth century. Historically we Europeans have shown that we are capable not only of extinguishing entire populations but also of feeling quite proud of ourselves for doing it. Trafficking
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in slaves, murderous civil wars, aggression, torture, the use of weapons of mass destruction against civilian populations, and a long list of other atrocities characterize the history of Europe and its diaspora. European governments and their offshoots (including the governments of the United States, Canada, and Latin America) are far from unique in their barbarity, but most readers will be particularly familiar with the European and North American part of world history.

The atrocities a state commits are often associated with a relative increase in military power and with militant nationalism. But the state must simultaneously promote benefits for its citizens to ensure public support for its atrocities. And the militant nationalism itself can be deeply gratifying to the public in some situations, as exemplified in Germany before World War II.

By the early 1930s, many Germans had become impatient with their situation. There was the humiliation to which Germany had been subjected at Versailles in 1919 and the failure of a liberal government to solve the ensuing problems: hyperinflation in 1923, discrimination against German minorities in various parts of Europe in the 1920s, and the catastrophic effects of the world economic depression after 1929.

By 1933 unemployment in Germany had reached 40 percent. After Hitler’s accession to power that same year, Germans witnessed a rise in national fervor, a dramatic fall in the unemployment rate, and Hitler’s firm challenge to any further humiliation of Germany in the international arena. The trains ran on time, Germany won the 1936 Olympics, and the German army advanced its reputation as a fighting machine, much admired to this day for its military excellence. In films and photographs taken at the time of Germany’s annexation of Austria (1938), there is jubilation on the faces of young Austrians about reunion with the fatherland.

Who could argue with success like that? The world was taking notice, and there was widespread admiration for the achievements of German nationalism.
Germany was a rising world power in the 1930s; Iraq was a rising regional power in the 1970s. The government of Iraq was murderously repressive, but there were significant advances in health, education, and other programs for public benefit. The government promoted a secular society and a vision of a powerful modern state. The role of women in public life and in professional fields such as medicine was expanding. Iraq was seen by many as an example for other Arab states to follow.

The atrocities committed by the government of Iraq under Saddam Hussein and by the government of Germany under Adolf Hitler will need no repetition for a reader of this book. We often congratulate ourselves on not being quite as bad as they were. And of course, that self-congratulation is part of the pathology.

Can we rationalize our own atrocities? You bet. Can we find a way of thinking that lets us sleep at night and continue feeling that we are quite okay? Obviously. Will intellectuals and experts and best-selling authors in our culture help us with that process? Of course. Will such commentators be well paid for their efforts? Sometimes handsomely.

These are not serious questions or serious challenges for our time. A serious question for our time is whether we can get ourselves out of the trap of self-destructive behavior that our culture has shared with defunct states and empires of the past. That serious challenge for the future provides a reference point for any serious and responsible discussion of world affairs.

PRINCIPLE 11

Nationalism is legitimate only when it serves human well-being within the constraints of international law.

It is essential to understand the difference between a culture that takes state power as priority (old paradigm, Option B) and a culture that takes human well-being as priority (new paradigm, Option A). The values in the old-paradigm culture have evolved,
and continue to evolve. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there was a strong association with notions of self-sacrifice (for the fatherland or some other idea) and heroism. As the twentieth century picked itself up from the ashes of war, there was less and less patience for that particular kind of heroism. Following a centuries-old pattern, the old paradigm was forced to pretend it was the new paradigm. Militant nationalism took on phrases such as “making the world safe for democracy” in order to pursue its agenda of dominance through military power and avoid public recognition.

The early twentieth-century version of glorious patriotism persists to some extent, and it must here be emphasized that its basic value of willingness to sacrifice for the good of others is a feature of healthy human psychology, and very much in accord with new-paradigm thinking. Its fatal flaw is that the “service to others” has been subverted to the service of illegitimate political power. Propaganda for war promotes a corrupted version of healthy human psychology. It is not so much the soldiers who are indoctrinated in this madness who are chiefly to blame but all of us who tolerate this malignancy in our culture.

This distinction — between devoting one’s life to the service of others following the precepts of international law and devoting one’s life to the service of state power following the precepts of militant nationalism — is one that makes a difference between life and death in human history. A positive nationalism is theoretically possible, but in a state that maintains a military-industrial-ideological-political complex, positive nationalism remains largely illusory, constantly undermined by the destructive foreign policy of the state.

The limits of legitimate nationalism are defined in part by international human rights law and the closely related law of non-aggression. International law recognizes both state sovereignty, with the associated right to self-defense against armed attack, and the responsibility of the state to respect and foster basic human rights.
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The limits of legitimate nationalism are further defined by concepts in social psychology such as those that emerge from the work of Erich Fromm (see the section in chapter 1 titled “Pathogenesis: Nationalism and Warfare”).

By its constant preparations for war, a state undermines whatever positive contributions it makes anywhere in the world, including within the state itself. Individuals who serve this self-destructive process likewise undermine whatever positive contributions their lives may make. That does not mean that the positive contributions of a militant nationalist state or a professional soldier should be ignored. It means that doing the math of the long-term positive or negative effects of that state or that individual’s life must take into account both positive and negative elements of the equation. A militant nationalist culture severely undermines the positive contributions that countless lives of individuals brought up in that culture could otherwise have made.

PRINCIPLE 12
Violence begets violence. Militant nationalism sustains that dynamic in the global community.

Violence begets violence. This is well and widely understood, and easily forgotten. A cycle of violence and threats will tend to be sustained if one of the perpetrators refuses to acknowledge responsibility for the downward spiral. Warfare is intentionally sustained by a warfare system; militant nationalism is its ideology.

Fascism is a particular form of nationalism. Fascism was defeated in World War II, but the victors were also nationalists and, like the fascist states they had defeated, they pursued power through violence and threats of violence. They continue to do so, in flagrant violation of international law. Nationalism has passed the point of diminishing returns. It currently represents a real and present danger to our future.

Militant nationalism provokes endless cycles of violence. This
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The fact that I am a human being is more basic than the fact that I am a citizen of the United States. Militant nationalism threatens the global community of which I am a part, and therefore it threatens me. It also threatens “our troops,” as well as women and children in Baghdad and Beijing and Boston, and anyone else who is a human being. *The choice to support militant nationalism is a choice to continue that threat.*

PRINCIPLE 13

*Militant nationalism begets militant nationalism.*

It has been a while since I saw the film *Cabaret*, but if my memory is on target, a scene in that film, set in the early years of the Nazi movement in Germany, portrays both the seduction of resurgent nationalism and the distaste for that resurgence among a few of the older and wiser Germans at the time. A young man at a German *Wirtschaft* sings an inspiring song about the fatherland, “Tomorrow Belongs to Me,” while an older German at one of the tables witnesses this with much less enthusiasm than the singer. The young man is wearing an armband with the Nazi swastika. The old man’s expression seems to say, “Oh no, here we go again.”

There was already a strong tradition of militant nationalism in Germany well before the 1930s. That nationalism was driven not only by a sense of superiority but also by a sense of victimization. In the 1920s, many Germans believed that they had been dominated
and deprived of their rights; that they had been humiliated, particularly by France, at Versailles in 1919; and that their soldiers had been betrayed by citizens of Germany itself during World War I. Other nations had extensive empires; Germany had never had the empire it deserved. The German people deserved far better than this, said the National Socialists, who were determined to restore Germany’s national honor and establish a German empire to last a thousand years.

“Tomorrow” belonged to the Nazis for less than twenty-five years, but their militant nationalism triggered other militant nationalisms. The virus spread. It destroyed Germany, boosted the militant nationalism of the major victors of World War II, and exacerbated militant nationalism in the Middle East and elsewhere.

In a sense, Germany and Japan were lucky because their militant nationalism was so overheated that it quickly showed its inherently self-destructive nature. Germany and Japan learned from the disaster, and their subsequent behavior as states shows a considerable advance in worldly wisdom. The victors, and various other states infested with militant nationalism by the events of 1930–1945, would take longer to learn the lesson. One of the iron laws of history appears to be that victory plants seeds of the victor’s subsequent defeat. Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan had early victories that encouraged their march down the road to Option B.

Militant nationalism in one state or ethnic group tends to trigger militant nationalist responses in other states and ethnic groups. Remarkably, it does this even when the catastrophic effects of militant nationalism on states such as Germany and Japan of the 1930s are so glaringly apparent.
The ABCs of Human Survival

PRINCIPLE 14

The warfare system sustains and is sustained by a culture of cynicism.

Our culture is characterized by cynicism (self-centeredness). This has economic, social, cultural, and political consequences. We tend to emphasize competition (social Darwinism) over cooperation. We have chosen consumerism, careerism, ego-worship, and polarization of wealth over the alternatives.

In fact, human society depends on cooperation. Robert Axelrod’s *The Evolution of Cooperation* (1984), a useful book on this necessity, summarizes information from computer models in which cooperative strategies were found to have an “evolutionary” advantage over cutthroat strategies. The author uses examples from history and politics to illustrate the same concepts.

Competition has its usefulness, but should be kept in perspective. A healthy society would intentionally direct human competitive-ness toward healthy outcomes for all members of that society. In sports, commerce, and social encounters, competition can enrich community and evoke extraordinary achievement from individuals and groups, who characteristically compete in producing individual and social benefits of various kinds. However, competition can easily be misdirected or driven beyond the point of diminishing returns. Regulatory mechanisms must play a part in discouraging such misdirection and excess. The same principle applies to a healthy global community; hence the need for international law such as the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the UN Charter, and other instruments of human rights law and humanitarian law.

Richard Wilkinson has long studied the effect of economic and social inequality on advanced industrial states such as the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Sweden, and Japan. His observations are immediately relevant to the concept of a healthy society or a healthy global community. Option A and Option B
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are well expressed in the following passage from The Impact of Inequality: How to Make Sick Societies Healthier:

There are two contrasting ways of dealing with the potential for conflict, and the extent of inequality is a fairly good indicator of where we are on the spectrum between them. At one extreme are the dominance hierarchies, based on power and coercion, in which the lion’s share goes to the strongest and social relations are ordered according to differentials in power as a reflection of the potential for conflict [Option B]. At the other extreme is the egalitarian solution, based on fairness and a recognition of each other’s needs [Option A].... The contrast is between relationships based on power and fear and those based on social obligations, equality, and cooperation. The extent of inequality in any society tells us a lot about where on this continuum the society lies. (Wilkinson 2005, 22)

The relationships connecting human well-being, wealth, and conflict have been a subject of interest for centuries. In the first letter of Paul to Timothy (New Testament), the writer contrasts the peace that comes from contentment with the ruin and destruction that come from avarice, concluding that “the love of money is the root of all evils.” In Hindu tradition, the Bhagavad Gita depicts life as a battle, with a choice of adversaries. One option is to oppose your ego, to subdue the short-sighted selfish desires within you, and live your life in service to others. By engaging in that battle against your ego, you can discover your true self, which is at one with the Creator. To do battle with your ego and transcend your very human limitations is to actualize your uniquely human potential. It is to move beyond the Darwinian constraints affecting animals, to become increasingly at one with God. Self-fulfillment and abiding joy are the rewards of victory in that warfare. The
other option is to submit to your ego, which will put you endlessly in conflict with fellow human beings as you pursue personal prestige, pleasures, profit, and ephemeral power. If you choose that battle, it will lead repeatedly and at last to disappointment and abiding sorrow.

These are profound insights into human psychology, and similar themes are extensively developed by twentieth-century social psychologists such as Erich Fromm and Abraham Maslow. This body of literature is encouraging because it points directly to a major cause of contemporary malaise and describes a way by which each of us can counteract it.

Contemporary Western culture is in opposition to such insights into human nature. Its pervasive cynicism is an ideology, of course, however vague or scholarly the formulation of it may be. One of its central doctrines is that acquisitiveness is sublime.

The choice of serving the ego leads to endless strife with others: interpersonally and internationally. To sustain that strife, we have the military-industrial-ideological-political complex. Advertising lures the consumer into an incessant restlessness, to be stilled only by incessant consumption. Wealth is polarized, ensuring that our house will be divided against itself.

The profits in the arms industry, sustained with public resources, help keep the cultural and political institutions inside the old paradigm, working toward Option B. Maintaining these profits becomes an end in itself for some parts of this military-industrial complex. Profits for the arms industry become more important than the life of a six-year-old child in Iraq, and more important than functional democracy, which would threaten the profits system.

Since the public are paying for all this, it is essential to recruit their support for it. In a powerful state, that is particularly easy to do. Since every powerful state is conveying significant benefits to the public and has much in its history to be proud of, the maps provided by the state have only to emphasize those benefits
and reasons for pride. The atrocities committed by the state are ignored, obscured, or rationalized. For targeted adversaries, the emphasis is reversed. This leads to ways of thinking such as:

- Our weapons of mass destruction are okay; our adversaries’ weapons of mass destruction are not okay.
- When we kill tens of thousands of people, it is an unfortunate necessity in pursuit of a noble goal; when our adversary kills tens of thousands of people, it is an atrocity.
- When we invade another country and overthrow its government, it is an act of liberation; when our adversary does the same, it is an act of aggression.

And so on and so forth.

The impoverishment of large parts of society and of the global community — and the sense of need for consumer goods, acceptance, and security — ensures an unending flow of recruits to military organizations. In Hubert Sauper’s brilliant documentary film *Darwin’s Nightmare* (2004) about events in Tanzania, two of the individuals interviewed make clear that they are willing to be agents of death to others because their economic straits make it necessary. One of them is a middle-aged Tanzanian man working as a night watchman, who explains why Tanzania needs a war. If there were a war, he says, the government would need soldiers, and they would pay the soldiers well, and that would give Tanzanian men brighter prospects for the future.

That’s in Africa. Where we live, the major newspapers and news magazines provide the intellectual framework, broadcast media and parades promote the popular versions of militant nationalism, politicians in Congress ensure the continuation of public funding, and the financially disadvantaged provide the hands-on dirty work that serves the system. The ideology ensures that soldiers have an
identity (an immortality system); the public funding ensures they get a paycheck. And so the sickness continues.

Beyond a certain point (diminishing returns), investments in “defense” become negative capital. Public resources are diverted from education, health care, and other programs that could have promoted human creative potential. This diversion occurs not only within the superpower state but also within states that feel threatened by the growing aggressiveness of the superpower, and by other states naïve enough to follow the example set by the superpower. By militarizing and destabilizing the international community, this use of public resources also undermines the security of citizens in the militant nationalist state itself.

Karl Marx and a good many modern economists have argued that people tend to think the way they do because of the material conditions of their existence. In other words, the reality they have to deal with influences their paradigms; the territory influences the map. Of course, this must be true. A friend of mine whose earlier life was spent in Eastern Europe once told me that in his opinion, none of the inter-ethnic violence in that part of the world would have taken place if everyone had had a job and a secure future.

It is also true that the map influences the territory: the way people think influences the reality they have to deal with. Public relations experts, the advertising industry, philosophers, historians, and parents who are trying to persuade their child to eat his spinach — in short, most of us — understand this pretty well. If you are trying to persuade people to buy your product, you give them a sales pitch. Both ideology and polarized wealth sustain the warfare system.

Recall that the world’s major spiritual traditions have often created Option A challenges to the Option B status quo, but were then co-opted back into Option B. Historically, cultures that adopted Christianity rationalized their warfare and their polarized wealth and power in various ways. In a medieval society, the poor
would always be with us, but each part of society had obligations to the other parts, and all were included in God’s plan for the world. And of course the essential transition from Option A to Option B Christianity involved the concept that war could be used to promote God’s purpose in the world. How convenient!

There was little support for a rise from rags to riches in such a world. Each individual had his or her place, and being a good person meant knowing your place and staying there. A little later, after the Industrial Revolution, it became possible to eliminate poverty, and many people thought that’s exactly what would happen. Thorstein Veblen didn’t think so and presented his reasons in his 1899 book, *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. With increasing wealth, he said, any barbarian would be attracted to the possibility of seizing as much as possible for himself. And since barbarians were still very much with us, said Veblen, poverty was likely to persist. Writing in the late nineteenth century, Veblen gave us memorable phrases such as “conspicuous consumption.” Many of his readers thought he was just a humorist.

It turned out that his prediction was exactly right. Making a lot of money had already become quite acceptable after the Reformation in Europe and was all the rage by the 1920s in North America. The association of greed and virtue happened in societies of people who considered themselves Christians. In *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, originally written in 1904–05, Max Weber provides an account of how a religion that had emphasized the virtues of poverty began to accommodate the entrepreneur. It was connected with the wonderful idea that as the entrepreneur became richer and richer, he would give more and more to society, and that his increasing wealth was a sign that he was on good terms with the Lord.

The history of thinking about economics and rich and poor is vast. Adam Smith and many other contributors to economic paradigms were concerned not only with wealth production but also with human well-being. This tradition has become in-
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creasingly marginalized in contemporary mainstream economic thought. A pragmatic guide that puts some of that history into perspective is *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy toward Community, the Environment, and a Sustainable Future* (1994) by Herman E. Daly and John B. Cobb, Jr. The book represents a collaboration of an economist (Daly) with a theologian (Cobb) and provides the kind of binocular vision that other works on economics so often lack.

The rationalizations for warfare and for helping the rich get richer have often made reference to human rights. Thus, in Charles Krauthammer’s (2005) map of (way of thinking about) the invasion of Iraq, we find emphasis on the “democracy” that U.S. armed forces brought to Iraq (see chapter 5.) And in Milton Friedman’s (1999) map of “capitalism” in the global community, we find an emphasis on its positive relationship to “freedom.” The destructive effects of an invasion supported by Krauthammer or of the international economic order favored by Friedman are ignored, denied, obscured, or rationalized. A skilled mapmaker must be aware of his purpose and design his maps accordingly.

Here again, it is important to refer to the navigation system provided by Martin Luther King Jr. We can orient ourselves with reference to our priorities. The priority of the public relations experts and old-paradigm intellectuals who work for the warfare system is power. My priority is different from theirs, and so the map you are reading here is different from their maps.

The fact that the poor are particularly vulnerable to military recruitment raises a related question. How can we create alternatives — new-paradigm careers that will assure capable young people of food, clothing, shelter, and a promising future for their families? How can we redirect the economy to give them Option A as a realistic choice for their lives and their work? That’s a problem we are going to have to solve, and the sooner the better.

Understanding the reciprocal support connecting militarism with our economic, cultural, and political institutions is an essen-
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tial part of the curriculum for global citizenship (Option A). It is essential to political, economic, social, and cultural self-awareness. In the paragraphs that follow, I make reference to three writers on globalization—Thomas Friedman, Naomi Klein, and Joseph Stiglitz. For further reading relevant to the practice of global citizenship, I recommend David C. Korten’s book When Corporations Rule the World (2001) and related work found at www.pcdf.org.

British military power was an essential enforcer for British imperialism in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Today, U.S. armed forces play an analogous role as enforcers of globalization, free markets, and neo-liberalism. Thomas Friedman, who is somewhat enthusiastic about these economic paradigms, expresses it this way:

The most powerful agent pressuring other countries to open their markets for free trade and free investment is Uncle Sam, and America’s global armed forces keep these markets and sea lanes open for this era of globalization, just as the British navy did for the era of globalization in the nineteenth century. (1999, 381)

Friedman refers to a “winner-take-all world,” in which America currently has “the winner-take-a-lot system.” He is aware of globalization’s “downsides,” but does not emphasize them; he prefers to look on the bright side. By contrast, Naomi Klein does emphasize them and sees them as being inherent in the system of globalization in its contemporary form. She refers to the system driving globalization as “corporatist.”

A more accurate term for a system that erases the boundaries between Big Government and Big Business is not liberal, conservative, or capitalist but corporatist. Its main characteristics are huge transfers of public wealth to private hands, often accompanied by exploding debt,
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an ever-widening chasm between the dazzling rich and the disposable poor, and an aggressive nationalism that justifies bottomless spending on security. For those inside the bubble of extreme wealth created by such an arrangement, there can be no more profitable way to organize a society....

This book is a challenge to the central and most cherished claim in the official story — that the triumph of deregulated capitalism has been born of freedom, that unfettered free markets go hand in hand with democracy. Instead, I will show that this fundamentalist form of capitalism has consistently been midwifed by the most brutal forms of coercion, inflicted on the collective body politic as well as on countless individual bodies. (2007, 18)

Providing detailed analyses of specific cases, Klein shows that it is exactly in the context of disasters that the rich often have opportunities to become richer and gain increasing control of goods and services. For example, when the democratically elected government of Chile, headed by Allende, was overthrown in 1973 and replaced by the dictatorship of Pinochet, the dictator imposed policies that had been conceived by Milton Friedman and his disciples at the Chicago School of economics. Milton Friedman was one of the enthusiasts of economics as a science, with “laws” that were as inescapable as the law of gravity. In Chile, apparently, the Chicago School of economists was trying to find experimental conditions optimal for testing their economic theories. It was only in the context of the political shock of the violent events in Chile in 1973 and subsequent years that the policies favored by the Chicago School could be imposed. These policies had devastating effects on the lives of many Chileans.

In the overthrow of Allende, U.S. covert operations had been instrumental; in the case of Iraq, U.S. policies played a much more
public and dominating role. Naomi Klein provides her analysis of events, particularly those following the invasion of Iraq by U.S. armed forces in 2003. Here the point made by Thomas Friedman, that “Uncle Sam” is the most powerful agent pressuring other countries to open their markets for trade and investment, is illustrated with a specific and detailed case study.

Using Klein’s analysis along with those of other authors, it is possible to see with much greater clarity some absolutely essential features of the real world. In particular, it becomes clear that concepts inherent in international human rights law, such as a duty of states to use their resources for the benefit of all their citizens, become marginalized or swept off the table in the corporatist paradigm for globalization.

Based on her experience and attention to conditions and events, Naomi Klein insists not on the elimination of market systems but on the necessity of applying some well-recognized ways of improving outcomes. Klein makes specific reference to a mixed, regulated economy that has had some well-documented successes in the twentieth century, with John Maynard Keynes as one of its architects.

An economist who has been directly involved in decision-making in the U.S. government and at the World Bank, Joseph Stiglitz shared the 2001 Nobel Prize in Economics. Like Friedman and Klein, he is aware of the detrimental effects of globalization, but in his book Globalization and Its Discontents, he contributes his own perspective to the literature on globalization.

I have written this book because while I was at the World Bank, I saw firsthand the devastating effect that globalization can have on developing countries, and especially the poor within those countries. I believe that globalization — the removal of barriers to free trade and the closer integration of national economies — can be a force for good and that it has the potential to enrich
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everyone in the world, particularly the poor. But I also believe that if this is to be the case, the way globalization has been managed, including the international trade agreements that have played such a large role in removing those barriers and the policies that have been imposed on developing countries in the process of globalization, need to be radically rethought. (2002, ix-x)

Stiglitz emphasizes misguided policies of the International Monetary Fund in his analysis. His perspective differs somewhat from that of Klein, but he reaches conclusions that are in many ways complementary to hers.

The IMF’s policies, in part based on the outworn presumption, that markets, by themselves, lead to efficient outcomes, failed to allow for desirable government interventions in the market, measures which can guide economic growth and make *everyone* better off. What was at issue, then, in many of the disputes that I describe in the following pages, is a matter of *ideas*, and conceptions of the role of government that derive from those ideas. (2002, xii)

The same policies that polarize wealth and create a dysfunctional global community can bring down even those who are doing relatively well. The history of the 1929 stock market crash and the subsequent worldwide depression is accessible to every well-informed person. Financial setbacks that affect rich folks like me have received considerable attention in the major media recently, and in the work of contemporary economists. The wiser economists are certainly conscious of the need for attention to the public space and the common good if we are to have a healthy economy.

One of my acquaintances is a young man from Oklahoma, Joshua Key, whose limited economic prospects were part of the
reason he enlisted in the U.S. Army. Contrary to what he had been led to expect, he was posted to Iraq, where his experience included participating in raids on homes of Iraqis. Returning to the United States, he faced a crisis when he was supposed to report for another tour of duty in Iraq. He chose not to report, and he and his family fled to Canada, joining a growing number of war resisters. He also chose not to remain silent about his experience and co-authored a book about it, from which the following testimony is an excerpt:

I had always seen my fellow Americans as upholders of justice in the world, but now I had come face to face with the indecency of our actions in Iraq…. We had become a force for evil, and I could not escape the fact that I was part of the machine. (Key 2007, 108, 110)

My own tour of duty with the US Army Medical Corps (two years, of which I spent a little over one year in South Korea during the Vietnam war and the rest in the United States) was much more comfortable that Joshua Key’s, but I learned similar things. I also learned how much personal courage it takes to resist the warfare system. Joshua Key showed a fortitude that I did not have.

Two other young men I know are from middle-class backgrounds in New York and were among the dinner table guests one night in Schenectady when I asked: “Why are we so impotent as citizens?” Jeff answered that we think of ourselves as consumers, not as citizens, while Andrew responded that we think there is nothing we can do that will make a difference, so we prefer not to think about it.

A great deal of public policy is based on unrealistic and naïve assumptions that relegate citizens to the role of spectators. “You can’t change the world” is one of the mottoes for this ideology of impotence (or “cult of impotence,” to use Canadian journalist Linda McQuaig’s term). Linked to this fallacy is the concept that you need to be a certified “expert” on world affairs to participate
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substantively in the decisions and actions that shape history. The idea that citizens have no substantive role to play in the conduct of public and world affairs is insolent and arrogant, of course, and it is also false on the evidence. Yet the idea somehow manages to maintain its credibility in our culture.

It would be a mistake to underestimate the magnitude of the problems we will face in the century ahead. It would be a bigger mistake to assume they cannot be solved. And perhaps the greatest mistake is to assume that as citizens we are not competent or responsible for the work of identifying these problems and finding solutions.

Many people seem to think they elect a political representative to be a scapegoat for their own failure of responsibility as citizens. The limits of possibility for the organization of power are — by their nature — such that, if mature and wise and loving human beings who respect human potential and human rights do not engage in the public space, then it will be dominated by people who are something less. The culture that will create or solve the major problems we will face, and create or extinguish the brightest possibilities for our future, is the one to which we contribute by our ways of thinking — including our assumptions about our own power, humanity, and responsibility.

**PRINCIPLE 15**

*Militant nationalism is associated with contempt for law, democracy, and human rights. It is associated with the pathology of power.*

In *The Pathology of Power*, Norman Cousins notes that power tends to “distort and damage the traditions and institutions it was designed to protect” (1987, 23). In a democracy, all legitimate political power is based in law and constrained by law. The United States has made important contributions to the concept of the rule of law, and the evolution of the law in the United States was instrumental in
some of its landmark advances of the twentieth century, such as enfranchisement of women and advances in civil rights.

Undermining that very positive tradition have been the pathological tendencies associated with power in the United States. It is easy to recall the contempt for law and democracy in many other states, such as the erstwhile German Democratic Republic or USSR, but that knowledge is not nearly so important in practice as knowledge of how this pathology is manifest within our own government and its allies. Critical attention to the history of U.S. foreign policy, and a reading of many of the sources cited in this book, can provide the relevant background for this fifteenth principle. An even quicker way is to pay attention to the pronouncements of various intellectuals who support the pathology, some of whom have held prominent positions in the U.S. government themselves. That quip by Henry Kissinger captures the concept memorably and concisely: “The illegal we do immediately; the unconstitutional takes a little longer.”

In the international arena, Kissinger was well aware of the disregard for international law among powerful states:

Empires have no interest in operating within an international system; they aspire to be the international system…. That is how the United States has conducted its affairs in the Americas, and China throughout most of its history in Asia. (1994, 21)

More recently John Bolton (U.S. ambassador to the United Nations with the George W. Bush administration) had this to say about international law:

It is a big mistake for us to grant any validity to international law even when it may seem in our short-term interest to do so — because, over the long term the goal of those who think that international law really means
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anything are those who want to constrict the United States. (As told to Insight magazine February 28, 1999.)

International law (interpreted to mean what it says) and a functional democracy (meaning active citizen engagement in governance) are threats to the “national interest,” as nicely stated here:

Since the Cold War’s end, a number of international organizations, human rights activists, and states have worked to transform the traditional law of nations … into something akin to an international regulatory code. This “new” international law purports to govern the relationship of citizens to their governments, affecting such domestic issues as environmental protection and the rights of children. Among other things, it would: nearly eliminate the international use of military force…. Recast as such, international law constitutes a real and immediate threat to U.S. national interests. (Rivkin and Casey 2000)

Old-paradigm legal experts sometimes argue that international law must simply accommodate the paradigm of power politics (with its murderous effects on human beings). One such expert, writing on the failure of the UN Charter and the UN Security Council to deter the United States from its 2003 invasion of Iraq, had this to say:

A second, related lesson from the UN’s failure is thus that rules must flow from the way states actually behave, not how they ought to behave. (Glennon 2003)

Militant nationalism is associated with contempt for law, democracy, and human life. The foregoing quotations are a small sample of intellectual support for this pestilence.
PRINCIPLE 16

Militant nationalism has destructive effects on individuals, families, and communities.

At its core, militant nationalism is a profoundly pessimistic ideology. It assumes that the global community will always be dysfunctional and that individuals must subordinate themselves to state power, accepting cycles of violence in the contests for power among states.

It should not be surprising to find such attitudes associated with personal unhappiness. The pessimism of the ideology has profoundly destructive psychological effects on individuals within the militant nationalist state. Post-traumatic stress disorder and violence in military families are familiar problems. The family violence includes violence of husbands against wives and children, and violence of individuals against themselves. A recent study in Australia revealed that the children of Australian veterans of the Vietnam War were committing suicide three times as often as other Australians their age. Suicide is but one indicator of profound personal unhappiness. (For background on the Australian study, see http://www.aihw.gov.au/publications/index.cfm/title/5861).

One of militant nationalism’s destructive effects on individuals is the psychopathology of domination and subordination. This relationship is explicit policy in the military and in political hierarchies. Much of the important progress in the history of the past two centuries has been related to the rejection of various forms of domination: monarchical power, slavery, the subjugation of women, and so on. That progress is incomplete, and militant nationalism is part of the next major barrier.

It is easy for me to recognize many signs of the psychological and physical damage that militant nationalism and warfare impose on individuals, families, and communities. It is much more difficult for me to estimate the extent to which militant nationalism encourages criminal behavior among returning veterans or the general public. The violence in which he participated as a U.S.
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soldier in the Middle East may have played a role in Timothy McVeigh’s act of violence in Oklahoma. The extent of this kind of corrosive effect on our society remains largely unknown, but it is not unheralded. Decades ago, Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis pointed out that when the government becomes a criminal, it sets an example for its citizens.

Decency, security and liberty alike demand that government officials shall be subjected to the same rules of conduct that are commands to the citizen. In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our Government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the Government becomes a law-breaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy. (Olmstead v. United States 277 U.S. 438 [1928])

Brandeis was referring to national laws; the same principle applies to the law of nations. If senators and presidents and Harvard intellectuals have contempt for the law, why should anyone expect higher standards in the streets?

Militant nationalism is a deeply pessimistic ideology based on the false premise that we have no choice but to continue destroying each other. If we confine ourselves within the prison of this premise, we will never be able to explore the possibilities of a healthy global community.
PRINCIPLE 17

*A militant nationalist government is a threat to its own citizens.*

Militant nationalism takes as the first priority the power of the state; human well-being is relegated to a lower priority. At its peak in the first half of the twentieth century, the ideology of militant nationalism was a major part of the pathogenesis of two world wars.

In *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (1987), Paul Kennedy examines the economic dimensions of this connection between power rivalries of states and their subsequent decline. Any government that decided to enter the contest for “the grandest tiger in the jungle” had to raise money to pay for its participation in the contest. Taxes were one source of such funding; borrowing was another. Either route, or any combination thereof, gradually or swiftly led toward bankruptcy of the state. The “winners” could be expected to drift toward bankruptcy a little more slowly than the “losers.”

If we examine the financing involved for the world’s last remaining superpower, we find both financing devices in place. Public funding provides several hundred billion dollars a year in support of the warfare system in the United States. As anyone paying attention to the U.S. economy will understand, the United States is in a very unstable financial position, with an enormous national debt, and is possibly at the threshold of a major economic setback.

Predictably, after the publication of Paul Kennedy’s book, there were sustained efforts from the old-paradigm intellectual community to provide reasons why the United States was an exception to the rule. Such efforts reappeared at intervals after economic disasters in other parts of the world. Economic disasters in East Asia and Argentina were followed by articles in the North American press about why it would not happen here. Not long
before the watershed events of September 11, 2001, we find Thomas Friedman commenting on Paul Kennedy’s thesis in the following way:

Kennedy traced (quite brilliantly) the decline of the Spanish, French and British empires, but he concluded by suggesting that the American empire would be the next to fall because of its own imperial overreaching…. I believe Kennedy did not appreciate enough that the relative decline of the United States in the 1980s, when he was writing, was part of America’s preparing itself for and adjusting to the new globalization system — a process that much of the rest of the world is going through only now. Kennedy did not anticipate that under the pressure of globalization America would slash its defense budget, shrink its government and shift more and more powers to the free market in ways that would prolong its status as a Great Power, not diminish it. (1999, xx)

In the corridors of power, delusion springs eternal. The enormous investment in the negative capital of warfare is one aspect of the threat that militant nationalist governments pose to their citizens. Another is the intuitively obvious fact that the creation of a monstrous military apparatus in any state — by its very existence — will quickly be perceived as a threat to other states, forcing them to develop some response in kind. Threats provoke counter-threats.

Any government that threatens another government thereby constitutes a threat to the global community. Since citizens of the militant nationalist state are part of the global community, every militant nationalist government is a threat to the citizens of its own state. The militarily most powerful state in the global community, the United States, is no exception to this rule. In the political culture of the United States, there is contempt for the UN Charter, for other basic principles of international law, and for the
United Nations itself. The consequences of that lawlessness will be visited upon all of us for a long time to come.

PRINCIPLE 18

*Militant nationalism is particularly toxic to the global community when it dominates the culture and politics of a powerful state. Powerful states are the major violators of international law and the major threats to global community and human survival.*

Weak or fractured states such as Colombia, the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Sudan have committed murderous atrocities and violations of international law, but the criminality of such states does not have the global reach of a superpower and cannot corrupt and obstruct the UN Security Council and other institutions designed to advance the purposes of international law. Only powerful states are capable of that kind of obstruction and perversion of international law and its institutions.

The essence of any atrocity is the outrage against human well-being. Somehow when the perpetrator of such an outrage is a powerful state, the culture of that state makes it okay. A truly powerful state can impose policies, with international collusion, that lead to the deaths of half a million children. A suicide bomber cannot kill so many. In the minds of those who have succumbed to the anesthesia of the powerful state’s culture, the obscenity perpetrated by the superpower that kills half a million is unfortunate but sort of acceptable, while the obscenity perpetrated by a suicide bomber that kills a few is an intolerable outrage. And that perception is part of the pathology that keeps both kinds of atrocity going.

Nationalism can become particularly virulent in a powerful state. That insight is essential. If we face the identity of warfare as a disease, militant nationalism can be seen as an ideological pathogen. The ideological pathogen cannot cause the disease by itself, but it
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contaminates the political process and persuades politicians to funnel the state’s economy, its metabolic capacity, into fuel for the fire. The pathogen also infects the major cultural institutions and the public.

“The Case of Iraq” (chapter 5) illustrates these disease mechanisms for both Iraq and the United States. Saddam Hussein was a murderous violator of international law, and his violent nationalism arose within a context of murderous violations by states far more powerful than Iraq. From those states, the government of Iraq first received support, then savage reprisal, for its violations. Both phases of Western policy toward Iraq radically betrayed the fundamental purposes and principles of international law.

The treachery and violence of governments have historically been tolerated or supported by citizens and allies. A standard way of achieving that toleration and support is the argument that “our” treachery and violence are necessary to overcome the treachery and violence of our adversary. In 2003 the government of the United States carried this to a *reductio ad absurdum*. Its invasion of Iraq killed tens of thousands of people and was conducted on the basis of the argument that the government of Iraq might do something similar in the future. Violence and treachery were promoted on the pretext of preventing violence and treachery.

To the extent that these perfectly obvious insights are understood and begin to influence the culture and the policies within the most powerful states and their allies, the global community can begin to move toward Option A.
PRINCIPLE 19

*International power politics provoke internal repression, dictatorships, and civil wars.*

The U.S. government does not routinely place its Japanese citizens in concentration camps, but it did so during World War II. It does not ordinarily threaten to end the livelihood of intellectuals who would write a book like this one, but it did so during the McCarthy era, and earlier, through activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee in response to perceived threats from “international communism.” It does not ordinarily slaughter its citizens, but it did slaughter tens of thousands of them during the Civil War (1861–1865) for reasons of nationalism. It does not ordinarily carry out ethnic cleansing, but in its early days the United States carried out acts of ethnic cleansing against parts of the indigenous North American population. It can be safely assumed that if there were serious efforts in progress to overthrow the government of the United States, the government would increase its internal repression.

Internal repression is part of a pathological process, typically in response to some threat, real or perceived, legitimate or illegitimate. The threat is almost invariably related to militant nationalism and violent contests for power among states. The principle holds true for states far more repressive than the United States. In 1954 the elected government of Guatemala under Jacobo Arbenz was overthrown with the help of the American CIA. The series of dictatorships that followed quickly made Guatemala one of the world’s most notorious charnel houses. This murderously repressive government enjoyed the support of the U.S. government for years. The arguments for supporting the atrocities were based on threats from “international communism.”

The history of Guatemala from 1954 onward had many consequences, including an early lesson for Fidel Castro and others involved in planning the Cuban revolution. The Cuban revolution
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was of course a response to repression from the pre-revolutionary government of Cuba. The revolutionaries learned this from Guatemala (and previous examples of U.S. intervention in Latin America): any government with a vision challenging U.S. hegemony runs the danger of being overthrown through internal subversion supported by CIA covert operations. Open governments such as that of Jacobo Arbenz are particularly vulnerable to internal subversion. Some measures to preserve state security are necessary to survival. Under existing circumstances, there will have to be a fairly pervasive internal security apparatus to ward off threats to the state. That was the lesson. The governments of many states throughout the world have understood one or another version of the lesson. The support for subversion might come from China or the United States or Russia or some other source, but subversion will provoke measures to counteract it.

Were these threats real? Did the United States really face any significant threat from its Japanese citizens during World War II, at a level sufficient to justify internment? Did the dictatorship of Guatemala really face a significant threat from citizens of Guatemala sufficient to justify imposing a reign of terror? Did the post-revolutionary Cuban government really face a significant threat from U.S. subversion? These questions, as well as whether (assuming they were real) the threats were *legitimate* (whether for example the overthrow of the Guatemalan dictatorship by citizens of Guatemala could be justified), can be examined for each individual case. For present purposes, the point is that internal repression and violence do not occur in isolation. They occur in the context of other problems that have global dimensions. *They occur as part of the pathology associated with militant nationalism in the global community.*

Departures from fundamental human rights standards will predispose a state or region to cycles of violence and repression. When people have been deprived of power and basic rights beyond some critical point, the resulting crisis may lead to infighting,
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even to the point of genocide, or the development of a defense mechanism — one or another form of militant nationalism. Like militant nationalism, civil war and internal repression are elements of a pathology that must be understood to be effectively treated or prevented.

To end the cycles of violence and repression, a series of changes are necessary, of which two are emphasized here: 1) reliable progress in a rule of law protecting human rights worldwide, and 2) an end to the threats of governments against other governments, including covert actions. To bring all dictatorships to an end, we must abandon Option B and make the paradigm shift. Failing this, it can reasonably be expected that dictatorships and internal repression will persist.

PRINCIPLE 20

Militant nationalism is an ideology whose time has passed.

Any ideology is a fraud if it claims to be humanitarian, yet dismisses the constraints of international humanitarian and human rights law. It is recognizable, for example, by the primary importance it places on support for “our troops” and the lesser importance it places on the lives of civilians endangered by “our troops.” That is the ideology of militant nationalism. It is currently the dominant ideology in our culture, but its time has passed. Militant nationalism is a toxic remnant, a dangerous anachronism from a time in human history when we did not have nuclear weapons. In our time, it is an ongoing threat to the conditions of human existence and the chances of human survival.

The corruption, waste, and hypocrisy necessary to sustain militant nationalism have critically undermined its credibility. Enormous resources are currently being squandered to maintain this ideology, making our current options and our future very dark indeed. The sooner those resources are redirected toward Option A, the sooner we will see the light of dawn.

[133]
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The evidence is in. Militant nationalism is an ongoing and perhaps terminal danger to our security. With time and the sustained level of risk inherent in the militant nationalist paradigm, disasters such as the destruction of Iraq and the incineration of the World Trade Center will recur, in various forms. This raving insanity will continue until militant nationalism is brought under control and governments are brought into compliance with the rule of law — or until, having squandered our resources together as fools, we have eliminated the possibility of continuing. Option B, the choice to continue violent contests for power in contempt of law, may lead, in this century or the next, to the end of the game. At the very least it will continue the profligate waste of human life and human potential that has been its ignominious legacy in our time. The hundreds of billions of dollars spent on militarism each year by the U.S. government and by other governments are steadily undermining the human security of Americans and others in the global community. In a democracy, citizens are ultimately responsible for solving such problems.

Each of us leaves a record of some part of what the human spirit can be. For each of us, our life will be our legacy. Each era, each generation, also leaves its legacy. This time, our time, is our chance, and it will not come again. We face our share of danger and opportunity. Complacency will increase the danger and waste the opportunity. Militant nationalism is an ideology that has robbed humanity of its potential. The sooner we put it behind us as a global community, the sooner and better we can explore the farther reaches of human potential.