

DISOBEDIENT PEACE: NON-COOPERATION WITH INHUMAN ORDERS

To Lito Marín, an outstanding epistemologist and a great human being

The act of living in Latin America, particularly in Mexico, in the midst of so much social injustice and violence, has led us to constant reflection on what “building peace” really means. This entails approaching the issue from individual as well as collective and mass viewpoints, respecting different identities and cultural histories, and assessing how to do it and on which scale this is possible in the short and medium perspectives in terms of active nonviolence. We begin these reflections examining the pertinence of using the word “peace” as a concept which embraces that which society, in its vast majorities, aspires to as the ideal form of social, human, political and productive relationships, as governments have abused and manipulated this idea continually depriving it of content or associating it to militarized and repressive systems.

The incumbent Mexican government asserts as its primary aim “Mexico in Peace”¹, stated as something which already exists. However, every year—at least in the past decade—“acts of war” have intensified, with all their attending human costs. At present, this country is riddled—affecting all social classes—by this type of actions under many different forms and characteristics, but with the common denominator of the high incidence of deaths, forced disappearances, or displaced persons, kidnappings, extortions, and many other diverse crimes.

Official policy promotes a model of “armed peace”² which is a big international business deal that has prevailed historically in our species, and which implies permanent forms of militarization of public security as well as the local, state and federal security organizations. These entail violent tactics and strategies, and ignore human rights in combatting organized crime. To achieve this, they have *installed insecurity and social terror* on a permanent basis, with the pretext of a “war against drugs”, which overrides the means as long as it achieves the grand social end of this type of peace: security. They have managed to subordinate—subsume might be a better word—the idea of Peace to the notion of Security, which is a category and conceptualization originated in military parlance.

In real terms, it is a transnational inter-capitalist war over the monopoly of an illegal commodity, and many other crimes. In each opposing band we observe similar social identities in different bodies: authorities of all levels,

businesspersons, legal and illegal armed forces, organized crime and a sector of civilian society employed by these criminal forces (Bourbaki, 2011).

It is, therefore, an excellent business, based on the exploitation of the bodies and natural resources in all the national territory. A disorganized population, surrounded, confined, terrorized (which is not the same as frightened³), tamely surrender their bodies and reflections to an authority—even at the price of waiving rights that have cost decades to obtain—in “anticipated obedience to exert a punishment when authority demands it”, where the so-called punishment really involves a confrontation made to appear as an “act of justice” (Marin, 2009; Ameglio, 2002: 129). All this is exacted under the pretext of guaranteeing minimal conditions for human survival, posing the dramatic paradox that “peace with security” is being provided precisely by the same band which disseminates and reproduces “war with insecurity”.

There is a certain similarity between the idea of nonviolence and the notion of peace in terms of the paradox we have described, but it is harder to approach. This term—which encompasses a style of life, philosophy, struggle and spirituality—is not easily understood in Mexico, as we have experienced for years, and is prone to false controversies, debates and prejudices. Something similar has also happened in other countries, where social movements have defined culturally their form of nonviolent struggle under different names: “Strength of Truth” (the Gandhian quest for the independence of India); “Force of Love” (the struggle for human and political rights by the Afro-American population of the U.S.); “People Power” (resistance in Philippines against the dictatorship of Ferdinand Marcos); “Power of the Powerless” (struggle in Czechoslovakia against USSR rule); “Permanent Firmness (social actions in Brazil)... In Mexico, we use concepts such as “Civil Resistance” and “Civil and Peaceful” struggle.

In this paper, we attempt to share and *think aloud* on some considerations and experiences—in the hope of transmuting them into knowledge—culled from the last three decades of individual and collective work in the fields of culture, education and construction of peace. These three areas are intimately linked, although different in terms of the work toward peace, according to the priority of each type of action undertaken, by the nonviolent civil resistance.

We will also share part of the theoretical base on which we have built these experiences, and we will add new theoretical conceptualizations which we have developed. This last point is important, as the authors we draw from did not always conceive the greater part of their theories in terms of peace and nonviolent civil resistance. Our *adjustments* are our own responsibility, and we hope they do not affect the essence of those basic theoretical inquiries.

What we wish to stress is that the following assertions are born from practical experience –many times repeated in concrete actions—not from speculations on abstract theory. We believe that this confers a certain value –and enables us to provide examples constantly—to this exercise of sharing. It comprises a theoretical reflection based on long practice and “experimenting”.⁴ It is drawn from Mexican actions and experiences in the fields of social struggle for human rights, against war, for justice and in defense of the environment, as well as on the issue of autonomous, popular and formal education. In most of these actions we have been apprentices of the people, their social movements and social activists.

Considering reflection as a weapon in social struggle –the main one, alongside the body—we have reached the conclusion, from the viewpoint of the epistemology of peace and nonviolence, that the guiding concept to follow in the construction of or education for peace based on nonviolence, at least in our humble experience, is the construction of a corpus of knowledge with moral and action plans based on “Due Disobedience to Inhuman Orders”⁵. Initially, and as a proposal for collective discussion designed to enrich in some way the already fertile conceptualizations on the subject, we will name this a “Disobedient Peace”. In other words, “To disobey an inhuman order, an order that produces damage on *the other* and on oneself, is a moral weapon and the major challenge of a nonviolent action” (Fracchia, 2014:11).

The next question is:

How can we build this humanizing knowledge of disobedient and nonviolent peace, and from what logical mindset and mode of action can we operate it?

1. EPISTEMOLOGY OF DISOBEDIENT PEACE

We feel it is important to specify that, when we talk about peace, we do so initially from a perspective of what Braudel called “long duration history”, in the sense of a history which builds on social processes of “humanization of the species”. Konrad Lorenz was right in pointing out that the present human species is still the “missing link” (1994).

In biological terms, we could define ourselves as a relatively rounded and evolved species during the last hundreds of thousands of years. But from a cultural point of view, we are more like a *hope* than a reality: two out of five individuals do not know if they will eat tomorrow; there are genocides –the most inhuman act of our species—televised worldwide... In view of this, being

“fully human” seems to be more like an “endpoint” than a “starting point” as we would like to presume.

“For human beings as a whole, it is not yet clear that they constitute a species; that’s why there are still massive killings, and an organizational social relationship for the procurement of food which is hugely unfair, which means that we have not yet achieved the phase in which any human being is a human being for any other human being” (Marin, 2014:45-46).

Thus, peace is still a distant reality for a major part of our species, and it is in this struggle of long historical duration in which all those who strive for a fairer and more human world are now involved. This perspective enables us to achieve an awareness of our work in a broader sense, because it compels us from the beginning to define clearly and objectively the “starting points” and the “endpoints” in our own processes and in the social, cultural and educational endeavors in which we are involved. Superimposing, inverting or confusing these points is a permanent cause of frustration and disappointment, or erroneous assessments of actions undertaken, as we lose sight of processes and scales.

On the other hand, as Gandhi said: “We can’t wait thirty years for the adversary to change, so we must resort to nonviolent direct action”.

Fortunately, as from the second half of the twentieth century, “Peace studies” have developed in a big way, linked to those on violence, as these realities are indivisible, systemic and intertwined in a complex way, so it is imperative to be familiar both with one and the other. Multiple approaches to peace have been explored, from the viewpoints of many cultures and experiences: peace as “positive” and “negative” (J. Galtung and J. P. Lederach); as “imperfect” (F. Muñoz); as “neutral” (F. Jimenez); as “intercultural” (R. Pannikar); as “*lekil kuxlejal*-Good Living” (Tseltal Maya peoples from Chiapas, Mexico); as “transpersonal” (Dietrich); as “spiritual” (Thich Nhat Hanh); as “holistic” (C. Martinez); as “engendered” (U. Oswald); as “structural” (Economic Council for Latin America) or “sustainable”...

Associating the idea of peace with that of nonviolence⁶, we have been able to observe in recent years –with the purpose of developing reflections and actions which are really “operable” in individual and collective situations involving “social change”—some principles (to be built from certain epistemic axes, that we will share as we go along), that we believe synthesize the essence of this culture and practice:

1. We need to build an “original way of thinking” (Fromm, 2005: 231-245) –this is one of the most difficult tasks--, embracing personal and collective autonomy, enabling us to “disobey any inhuman order”.
2. It is necessary to attempt to “humanize the other and the adversary”. A starting point would be to become familiar, with the greatest possible depth and complexity, with the constituent process of his/her identity and interests. Thus, it is possible to “disarm” his/her reality principle we consider dehumanizing, by means of reflection, not prejudice, stigma or actions that seek to destroy him/her. Comprehension of history is central to this process.
3. We must prioritize the “search for truth”, with a lower case “t”, as Gandhi used to say, but with clear parameters concerning “absence of injustice”, rather than “absence of conflict”, procuring the benefit and reparation for victims, regardless of differences.
4. Avoid exacerbating the “spiral of violence” with our reflections, words or actions; seek, at all times, to de-process it and make it regress as much as possible to levels of dialogue and negotiation.
5. Maintain coherence in the proportion between means and ends: social order is constructed –in almost all its aspects—according to the principle so well expressed by Machiavelli: “the end justifies the means”. Gandhi used to say: “The means are like the seed, and the end is like the tree... There is an unbreakable relationship (between them). A good tree will never grow from a rotten seed” (Gandhi, 1985: 114).

1.1 Start from a “Reality Principle”

The epistemic axis which relates these five central principles in any work based on disobedient peace governed by nonviolence –which is the point where, for years, we have initiated our reflections and actions—is the construction of a “reality principle”⁷, as objective and empirical as possible. To face a social event or actor, according to the form of obedience or disobedience, it is necessary to be familiar with it in all its complexity; therefore, the initial phase is the integration of an appropriate knowledge. If this initial approach to the observable factors of the social event which affects us is not grounded in some form of empirical “recording” which reflects hard facts, all the process of actions and reflections that follows will probably be rooted in some kind of “logical empiricism” in which reality is described more in terms of the “relationships between discourses on that reality”⁸ than on the recording of real facts. This causes the perception of reality to be grounded more in fantasy or wishful thinking than in its true material base.

We have observed this repeatedly in social struggles and in the construction of individual and collective peace, and this results in actions that do not respond directly to the targeted conflict, and thus do not transform it. In some cases, they can even exacerbate it further towards violence.

Social order –imperceptibly—sets the “epistemic trap” that its “reality principle” is the only one which is valid and feasible, because it is not “utopian”, and with this device it sets in place a dominant hegemonic culture. This culture frequently is transmitted by a static vision of history, that feeds on a vast variety of social stigma and prejudices –which mask multiple forms of social confrontation and discipline—disseminated and multiplied by the media, laws and regulations, pulpits and many sorts of orders and instructions in institutions, schools and families. There cannot be actions for peace without clashing with social order in some of its degrees of “accepting as normal” (presenting as normal an anomalous situation) of its reality principle. For this reason, we have to know the mechanisms involved in the construction and reproduction of social order from a double point of view: history and the recording of present events.

In this sense, we feel it is necessary to establish a distinction between “information” and “knowledge”: the construction of the latter leads us to reflection, while information on its own can never achieve this; information must be transformed into knowledge –not a straightforward and easy process—registering it as some form of fact, a fundamental epistemic unit in the field of thought⁹ which, when it is analyzed –measured and compared— becomes some type of knowledge that can be “installed”¹⁰ in the identity of the person who builds or receives it. Furthermore, it is important to develop the awareness that it is possible to acquire a certain degree of knowledge concerning a social event, but that not necessarily this knowledge will lead to an adequate reflection.

Finally, it is also possible to ponder in an acute and complex way, but still not necessarily build an action in accordance with that moral identity which is being transformed. In other words, the path from information to knowledge, from knowledge to reflection, and from reflection to action is not a series of mechanical operations but an “epistemic art”, which grows from the principle that, from greater knowledge, reflection and action a greater moral, individual and social identity develops. Thus, the construction of “moral judgment”, according to Piaget and Marin, is an epistemic process rather than an intellectual one, although there is plenty of feedback between the two. It follows that, to influence social order and individual identities, the principal educational task resides in building knowledge which is as close to reality as possible, and from

there create new conceptualizations which enable us to reinforce reflection and action.

1.2 “Becoming aware” of Concepts and Processes

The epistemology of disobedient peace that we share here, centered on the construction of autonomous identities, is based upon –apart from a reality principle— “becoming aware”: “...an action pattern transforms the former into a concept, and this becoming aware essentially comprises a conceptualization” (Piaget, 1976: 254). In this sense, it is indispensable that the conceptualization should be complex and transdisciplinary, because it must enable us to pass from less to more knowledge concerning those social events which intersect, simultaneously and in parallel, several aspects of each human identity as parts of a social process, at the same time as they reproduce social order.

The “becoming aware” –centered on its “relation with” and not on some generic abstraction—will move forward in each social identity, on the base of new conceptualizations that enable us to discover new social “observables”, “unobserved” and “unobservables”¹¹, which will help us to learn more, and more deeply, about the social event in question and its indispensable contextualization in the social order under study. To know, in a complex manner, means therefore to approach a social event or identity successively with a broader range of concepts and “epistemic perceptions”.

We consider it is essential for the epistemic construction OF peace and nonviolent action –either from a strategic or tactical point of view—to always bear in mind this aspect concerning the social observables, unobserved and unobservables in their different dimensions, which we could associate respectively with the intellectual, epistemic and moral areas of identity, in that ascending order in terms of depth.

Resorting to a more graphic form of explanation, we could liken this epistemic process to a flower: the “observables” would be the flower we see above the ground; the “unobserved” would be the roots; and the “unobservables” would be the soil below the roots. The flower cannot be explained in itself; neither is it sufficient to add the roots, as it would not grow without the soil that harbors them. This is somewhat similar to an epistemology –of complex and autonomous thought—which seeks to go beyond the flower –the tip of the iceberg—as Galtung would say in his definition of “direct violence”, to explore what allows the emergence of this dynamic, thus to build reflections and actions which would enable us to increase our influence on real changes aimed at processes of peace, nonviolence, autonomy and humanization. At bottom, it is also a more realistic way of working towards the construction of “hope” and

not on an “illusion” of reality, which is so damaging to cultural and educational processes, and social struggle.

This process of achieving awareness will support the construction of personal “rupture principles”¹², in the intellectual, epistemic and moral levels, which could –although not automatically—lead to new actions, both individually and socially. These ruptures, caused by the increasing awareness of something in particular, such as the “rearrangement” of some previous knowledge (either erroneous or prejudiced) towards a new conceptualization –on the strength of empirical evidence—which allows us to correct that “peripheral factor” that generates ignorance, are for Piaget: “maladaptation factors which... enable the achievement of awareness, which would be useless if individual functioning... were normally adapted” (1976: 255).

The epistemology of disobedient peace, then, faces the constituent processes of actions –or beliefs—from the point of view of “how” rather than “why”, bearing in mind that the historical experience of knowledge in our species indicates that the most adequate way to stop suffering something, or to exacerbate it, is not by means of voluntarism or catechistic-dogmatic-absolute transference of information, but rather by means of greater knowledge and reflection.

Finally, a central tenet in every order of our lives is that the achievement of awareness “travels from the periphery to the center”, where the initial two “peripheral observables” are “the awareness of the objective to be accomplished” and “the awareness of its resolution either as success or failure” (Piaget, 1976: 256). This is how the culture in which we live operates most of the time, in which it evaluates and judges people and social events principally on the merits of its most external peripheral: the final result, without much consideration for the constituent process of the event involved.

Consequently, a complex approach to the areas of peace we mentioned above points towards the construction of a greater conceptualization of the processes involved in social change, and not only to “change the final actions”, even when these might be positive but as a consequence of greater “observance of discipline” or “advanced obedience to authority”. We seek, therefore, the construction of autonomous and reflective subjects and forms of disobedience –not any form of disobedience for its own sake—and not “disobedient obedient subjects”, even when the peripheral factor may seem just and legitimate. This is one reason why we must build knowledge and actions aimed, not at the periphery of the problem, but at deciphering its constituent process. This is why the achievement of awareness “...should be directed towards the central regions of the action when it proposes to reach its internal workings:

recognizing the means employed, the reasons for choosing them, or their modification during the exercise, etc.” (Piaget, 1976: 256).

1.3 From “Social Infantilism” to “Co-operation”

Another central point we wish to share, which we have observed permanently in this epistemology of disobedient peace that we propose, is linked to what we have to decipher in the actors and actions of violence and nonviolence: their “logic and construction of thought”, because they are the building blocks of moral identity and consequent actions. This helps to exhibit that which is unjust or inhuman as, chiefly, a process of “ignorance”¹³ rather than (almost) “inherent evil”, and thus strive to change, but not destroy, what we are up against. For this reason, we insist upon the epistemic approach, and not simply on the increase in information and compliance with certain catechistic-voluntaristic-absolute values, or *good* leaders. In this sense, Piaget himself proposes, based on studies on “moral criteria” in children—in terms of practice and awareness of rules in games—but referring also to adults¹⁴, that the superior moral phase is “co-operation” (1985: 36-90), rooted in two fundamental traits that should be encouraged: the “equalization principle” and “mutual respect”, both emerging from consensus among equals, and not from the asymmetry of power of authority (“older adult”). This is the great initial task leading to any substantial change in the culture of peace that could enable “disobedience of inhuman orders” with reflection and autonomy.

It is necessary to start from a basic achievement of awareness: social order is specialized in the massive construction of an “egocentric stadium”: hierarchical power and legality, sacralized and born “outside historic time and with no human origin”, unidirectional, with “unilateral respect” and “asymmetry of power”. Any attempt to “equalize power” or establish “mutual respect” will be inhibited, punished or annihilated in whatever field it appears. These efforts – incommensurables, perennials—in the sense of their logical, epistemic and moral construction, launched from all the fields and forms of social order (hierarchic authoritarian institutions of all types, media in blind obedience to power, systematic spreading of fear and terror, schooling without education, corporal imposition of discipline rather than real discipline¹⁵, authoritarianism without authority...) comprise what we have proposed to call “social infantilism or infantilization”, without any negative connotations of that which is infantile; on the contrary, we are trying to point out that, under the form of “the logic of thought”, we suffer a great adult regression in comparison with the evolutionary process of the child¹⁶. This is not “natural”. It is, to the contrary, a highly sophisticated construction of the whole apparatus regulating

social order. It is the effort of the mechanisms and power of social order to obstruct, deliberately or not, any attempt—in whatever degree—by social or individual bodies to evolve from the “egocentric” stadium to that of “cooperation”, the only way in which it is possible to autonomously disobey inhuman orders. Social order tries to impose the “authority principle”, built upon “submission”, “mystic sacrality” and “timelessness”, in detriment of the “consensus among equals principle”.

For autonomy to succeed heteronomy, and for laws to lose their sacred nature, being the results of consensus processes, it is important to remember that “cooperation between equals... will make the mystic nature of authority disappear” (Piaget, 1985: 51-53). Therefore, the construction of disobedience in the face of inhuman orders should generate “processes of social equalization” and autonomy, so that individuals or social movements might feel empowered to challenge and face authority.

The other process which must be built, with the objective of breaking “the asymmetry of power” and “unilateral respect” is that of becoming aware of one’s own power and its proportion with that of the adversary. Gandhi and the theory of civil resistance see cooperation from the point of view of the relationship between each individual and power, based on the given that social reproduction of injustice is enabled by the cooperation, voluntary or not, with subjects or actions that build it or benefit from it.

This form of nonviolent struggle and construction of peace is based on the principle that all of us have some type of power which we can exert against unjust or inhuman situations, reflected upon by our autonomous thought that determines our moral identity, and if we do not exert this power, inhumanity will reproduce, but if we disobey, then we humanize ourselves, as well as many more who suffer the consequences of that order, and the social order in its long historical process.

Gandhi correctly pointed out in his *Constructive Program for India* that:

“We have become accustomed, over a long time, to think that power should come only from legislative assemblies. I have come to consider that this belief is a serious mistake, caused by inertia or by a sort of hypnosis. A superficial study of history, of English history, makes us think that all power reaches the people through parliaments. The truth is that power rests in the people, and is entrusted provisionally to those whom the people choose as their representatives. Parliaments have no power, not even existence, independently from the people. Civilian disobedience is the repository of power” (Ameglio, 2002: 305-306).

In other words, the logic of thought referred to co-operation is an action that confers power to those who apply it, because it triggers the degree of power an individual actually possesses, but which social order renders invisible, and expropriates it in the name of the social value involved in obeying authority.

2. DUE DISOBEDIENCE TO INHUMAN ORDERS

2.1 Indignation in the face of what is inhuman

Taking into account the axes stated in relation with social order and its compulsory reality principle, authority and its sacralized hierarchization, power and its exercise of unilateral respect, the achievement of awareness and its emphasis on peripheral results, we consider that the disobedient peace we need to build –not only in response to our war in Mexico which makes it indispensable—and which many groups and individuals, nationally and internationally, have termed “with justice and dignity”, contains in its basic epistemology, as we stated at the beginning, the imperative to build individually and collectively a “due disobedience to any inhuman order”.

What do we disobey?

The inhumanity of social order, in terms of actions, reflections, values, laws, regulations and orders.

Adding depth to this definition of an epistemology of disobedient peace and nonviolence, there are various elements and different operators which should be conceptualized: inhuman-order-duty-disobedience.

The social order which pervades us is a machine for creating the orders and processes of inhumanity, injustice or social violence –as well as those of humanization—regulated according to set phrases such as: “it’s for your own good”, “it’s always been that way”, “everybody does it”... According to this, violence, abuse of power, depredation, or negation of the identity or resources of enormous sectors of humanity, excessive punishment without any proportion to the offense, are the operators that expropriate the humanity of others, in the name of the dominant heteronomy of “order” and, many times, of peace too.

Harold Laski points out that: “Civilization consists, above anything else, of a lack of disposition to inflict unnecessary suffering... It is our duty, if we do not want to live a life totally bereft of sense and meaning, to not accept anything in contradiction with our basic experience for the simple reason that it represents tradition, convention or authority” (2011: 1-10). To face this inhumanity, or to de-process the inhumanity within us, demands, first, getting to know it and

making it observable; this is why the degree and the actions of inhumanity we observe and face, depend on the awareness we have of the social order.

There is, likewise, a link between the installation of that which is inhuman and terrifying: “The first principle of humanization (is)... to begin to de-process that mechanism of terror on which the authority principle has been grounded, not because all authority terrorizes us, but because the mechanism of the given order (inhuman) is based on that force”. (Marin, 2014: 42) We must be familiar with this mechanism (authority principle-punishment-terror) and how it is set up, to be able to begin to disobey. However, it is possible to be aware of certain inhuman orders, without necessarily being able to face them. These are two different actions and epistemologies.

Simultaneously, to be able to advance towards the disobedience of inhuman orders, it is fundamental to build, not only knowledge of the inhuman content in social order, but also the capacity for “indignation” (Hessel, 2010), “rage”, “anger”, “rebelliousness” towards this social fact. Hannah Arendt said correctly that: “...the clearest sign of dehumanization is not rage nor violence, but the notable absence of both. Rage is not in the slightest a reaction against poverty and suffering as such; nobody reacts with rage in the face of an incurable illness, an earthquake or, in what concerns us, social conditions that seem to be unchangeable. Rage emerges where there are reasons to suspect that those conditions could change, but are not changing”. (2005: 85) Indignation or rage, then, are a complex construction stemming from experience transformed into knowledge, achievement of awareness and ruptures; they are not some mechanical result of knowledge; they need a particular type of reflection for peace to become disobedient.

2.2 The Order and the Duty to Obey it

“Order(s)” and “punishment(s)”¹⁷ based on threat are the great operators of social order for the enforcement of obedience to authority. Therefore, we must make the set of orders we have accepted as normal and obeyed as observable as possible, and decide which of them are dehumanizing us and dehumanizing others around us, with or without them being aware, and thus to disobey them. Many of these orders are accepted due to ignorance, others to affection or emotions, or to fear of punishment, according to their infinite social forms.

It is of central importance, then, to grasp this “epistemic unit” which operates so strongly within us. Order is associated with heteronomy, with that which is imposed from outside, and consequently “...in each order with which we comply, we are renewing an ancient victory... The power of whoever is in

charge grows incessantly... Power issues orders as a cloud of magic arrows". (Canetti, 1983: 301). Canetti enriches the description of the mechanism for installing "egocentrism" or "social infantilism", which operates within us by means of a permanent stream of orders that reinforce sacralized authority, unilateral respect, and the necessary asymmetry of power.

Orders are also linked to the dehumanization process: "Any order comprises an *impulse* and a *barb*... But the barb sinks deep into the individual who has complied with an order, and there it stays, unalterably... Any individual, with the passage of time, finally accumulates a huge amount of barbs... It can happen that somebody is so filled with barbs that he is no longer sensitive to anything else: beyond that, he feels nothing". (Canetti, 1983: 302, 318).¹⁸ That sort of regulation dehumanizes us, and this is precisely the reason why we must practice disobedience to certain orders as a sort of *daily workout* which humanizes us.

Orders, with the passage of time, have become more remote from their biological origins, associated with flight, and have been used in multiple social relationships, pervading a mode of "domestication" rooted in certain forms of "bribe", "submission", "reward" and "voluntary captivity" (Canetti, 1983: 303-34), by he who holds the greater power and gives something to the person who complies with the order. This shows that, at least in part, there is a relationship of convenience, reciprocal interests, and voluntary captivity in exchange for obedience.

The most complete and transparent model of obedience to authority and its orders is the soldier: "A soldier on duty only acts according to orders... A good soldier is always in a state of conscious *wait for orders*" (Canetti, 1983: 308). Also, at another level, but following a similar logic, he is also the model for the "good citizen", the "good student", or even the "good son/daughter"?

For Canetti, "(orders) are the singular, most dangerous element in the society of humans. We must have the courage to oppose them" (1983: 329), because, being heteronomous, they remove the responsibility from the person who executes them and transfers it to an authority which generally is diffuse²⁰, and for this very reason activates another great operator of inhumanity: "duty". It is activated thus: "... (bringing into play) something much more dangerous, the human being's capacity to set aside his humanity, or even worse, the inevitability of behaving in this way when he subsumes his unique personality in broader institutional structures". The individual is coopted in his autonomy "without the hindrances of individual morality, free from any human inhibition, only paying attention to the penalties imposed by authority (Milgram, 1980: 174).

In her study on the “banality of evil”, Arendt states that: “He (Eichmann) was performing his duty: he not only followed *orders*, but he also complied with the *law*... a strange notion very prevalent in Germany, in the sense that complying with the law was not limited simply to obeying it, but it was required that one should act as if one were the author of the law being obeyed” (2003: 83-84). She demonstrated, by means of a very detailed study of the behavior of this high-ranking nazi official, charged with operating a considerable part of the Jewish genocide, that he was not a sadist or a madman, nor was he an “inhuman exception of our species”, but rather a simple bureaucrat who strictly and proudly did his duty by following orders from a higher sacred authority, regardless of the consequences of his acts. He simply separated his actions from their effects.

According to Milgram, “...Hannah Arendt’s conception of the *banality of evil* is much closer to the truth than anybody would dare to imagine... The most ordinary people... can become agents of a terribly destructive process. A very large percentage of people do what they are told, regardless of the contents of their actions, and without obstacles provided by their conscience, as long as they perceive that the order originated in some legitimate authority”.²¹ (1980:19, 175)

So obedience is the great “epistemic-moral obstacle” to building disobedient peace. To become aware of this component of inhumanity which pervades part of our identity and body, in which we have probably been built by the regulation and violence of the social order, implemented by “orders”, “duties” and “*a priori* obedience to authority”, becomes a central pre-requisite.

2.3 The Difficult Mission of Disobeying

Finally, how do we achieve the most difficult part: the action of “disobeying” those orders which dehumanize us and others, that is, how do we face authority?

This is something that nobody –that is, nobody who is close to authority, imposition of discipline, or reproduction of social order--will want to make observable nor share with us, because it would place them and us in a sort of co-operation towards the “equalization of power”, “mutual respect”, and “peace with justice and dignity” for all. Social order is not built so that somebody –or some groups or movements-- can say: “No!” or “Enough!” to one or many of authority’s inhuman orders, and carry this “conscientious objection” to the extreme of disobeying the order in question.

Our experience coincides well with what Marin posits about authority: “one of the hardest things for a person is to defy authority, because from the very moment he/she is born, it begins to be implanted, it becomes part of his/her corporal anatomy. It suffices that somebody imbued with some sort of authority should look at us, for that mandate of authority to be exerted on our bodies” (2014: 38). And Milgram adds: “Disobedience is the ultimate means with which to end a tension. It is an act which is anything but easy... A totally unknown perspective of the relationship which follows after the rupture. For many individuals there is a certain apprehension concerning what is going to happen as a result of the act of disobedience... The price of disobedience is a sentiment that gnaws at us from within, a notion that we have not been faithful. Even when one has chosen the morally correct act, the individual remains dazed by the upheaval in the social order he/she has caused... It is he/she, not the obedient subject, who experiences the impact of his/her action” (1980: 152-153). It is also true that in many inhuman historic situations “...moral voices were raised against concrete actions, but the usual reaction of the man in the street was to submit to orders” (Milgram, 1980: 167).

Disobedience is, therefore, one of the most difficult human acts to carry out, because it pits us against the social order, against our own identity, past and present, and against a sacralized authority. It is, therefore, an endpoint and not a starting point—as in all social actions—and must be viewed as a construction process, and not considering its “peripheral” (final action) as the principal thing to observe, which will lead inevitably to frustration and discouragement. We have noted this many times.

The first element in this construction process—in each one of us and collectively—in intellectual, epistemic and moral terms, is a “Tension” (some order which is not completely assimilated to one’s own epistemological and moral identity), a “Rupture”, a “Discomfort” or a “Maladaptation”.²² We have attempted to reflect on the construction of this tension or rupture, which is indispensable for carrying out actions under the form of autonomous disobedience—on the base of very concrete experiences—in the first part of this article from an epistemic point of view, which we consider basic, stating the following theoretical observables: the objectivable empirical reality principle; the achievement of awareness that observes processes and new conceptualizations; the social infantilization as a consequence of the logic of egocentrism, instead of co-operation among equals; the construction of what is inhuman and moral indignation; *a priori* obedience to authority and to any form of punishment it may decree.

Let us move forward now in our reflection on the step from tension to disobedience, which would be the final phase of disobedient peace. To start with, we must take into account that: “Tension leads, if it is strong enough, to disobedience. But initially it causes lack of agreement... Many dissenting individuals, capable of expressing their disagreement with authority, continue recognizing the right of authority to override the opinion they have expressed”. (Milgram 1980: 151). As we stated earlier, I can be aware of an inhuman order, but it does not necessarily follow that the reflection or reality principle that comes after will lead me to oppose it with action. This is very important. A tension or a rupture does not lead mechanically to the disobedience of that order. For this to happen another turn of the screw is necessary: the achievement of moral and epistemic awareness, personally or collectively.

Milgram attempts the description and analysis, from the data culled during his experiment, of the passage from tension to active disobedience. Starting with the construction of this tension, a process is triggered where the sequence of disobedience which initiates with “internal doubt” (as a result of the tension) which begins as something private but rapidly becomes something “external” when it is socialized or shared with another, to whom we confide our doubt concerning the legitimacy of the order issued. If the other does not agree or correct, the relationship becomes one of dissent, resulting in “a gradual transition towards rupture”. If there is no agreement, then dissent becomes “threat” in which the individual will refuse to comply with the order. “Finally, the individual, having tried all other measures, comes to the conclusion that he must go to the very root of the relationship... (and) disobeys” (1980: 152-153).

“Internal doubt (as a result of the tension or rupture), externalization of doubt, dissent, threat, disobedience: this is a hard road to take, which only a minority is capable of following it to its conclusion... Swim deliberately against the current... The psychological cost of this road is considerable” (Milgram, 1980: 153). So the epistemic process of building a disobedient peace and individuals to put it into practice, comprises the construction of tensions and ruptures, which evolve from individual to social phases until they reach disobedience. This sequence must be achieved by increasing the knowledge of the inhumanity of social order, and the awareness of greater autonomy, and not by issuing other “orders”, even if their content is more humanizing and just, but in the logic of their thought are still heteronomous and “infantilizing”.

It follows that to disobey is intimately linked with “resistance”, active or passive, individual or social. It is a resistance against inhuman orders, against the heteronomy that seeks to annul our autonomy. For Canetti, “...The ‘free’ man is only he who has learned to dodge orders, and not he who only rids himself

of them after (passing the arrow/barb to somebody else)” (1983: 304, 302). Disobedience is linked, then, to liberty, autonomy and humanization.

How can we “dodge” orders and free ourselves?

In the shooter of the arrow/order, “...There is always something like the perception of a counterattack; what has been done has also become imprinted on oneself, not only on the victim. Many of these counterattacks are accumulated and they generate fear, *fear of ruling*, a conception of the risk (for the shooter) if the many victims were to rise up against him” (Canetti, 1983: 305).

One of the key elements is in the mass which unites to face and resist authority, as we will see in coming paragraphs. An order to the mass is lost in abstract generality, “...because there is a liberation from all the barbs, even the most monstrous ones, but this liberation is in the mass... The turnaround mass is made up of many individuals who unite and turn against another group, in which they see the cause of all the orders they have had to endure for such a long time...” (Canetti, 1983: 325). Concerning these mass processes of disobedience and resistance, I feel that Canetti and Arendt seem to be rather more optimistic than reality has shown us, at least in the short term, when they say: “The general process of a liberation from barbs, once it is initiated, continues unstoppably” (Canetti, 1983: 326), and “Where orders are no longer obeyed, the means of violence are rendered useless” (Arendt, 2005: 67).

3. DISOBEDIENT PEACE IN ACTION

Considering the social perspective, we still must ask ourselves: how do we build social struggle actions for this “disobedient peace”?

As we stated earlier when considering the empirical reality principle, experience has taught us that, within the strategic reflection on a social struggle, it is essential to develop some type of measurement and categorization not only of one’s own forms of action (tactics), but also, with equal precision, those of the adversary(ies), who also struggles with all its (their) resources. This is of critical importance because, in different forms and fields, a certain proportionality in the scale of the actions must be planned²³ between both dynamics in conflict, considering of course one’s own forces and resources. If not, there will be no real possibilities of advancing one’s own claims, with the attendant risk of sliding into some type of simulation or self-delusion.

At this point it is important not only to concentrate our attention on the peripheral of the action, its endpoint, but also on the different variables that

comprise it: time, space, actors, context, which could contribute greater or lesser intensity, beyond the action itself. For example, certain actions carried out by bodies with a certain “social power” or “moral strength” can also contribute their indignation, determination to the cause, although if they are not actions that go “beyond the law and cooperation”, they can face power with considerable force, as they can “unmask the truth publicly”, as Gandhi would say, and this creates a public moral fracture in the legitimacy of power. Another central element in this construct of actions towards disobedient peace is the site of the action, which radicalizes its effects when it pinpoints exactly where power resides: a demo-march to a central square is not the same as a march to a military barracks, although both are demos and comprise the same number of people.

In this sense, and bearing in mind the proportional relationship between actions, in the present Mexican situation riddled with warlike social events, we cannot abstain from encouraging actions involving non-cooperation and civil disobedience. The former is within the bounds of law, but we are seeking to “withdraw any form of cooperation”, be it economic, political or social, in which our bodies or resources might be used for the reproduction of this injustice against individuals, activities, institutions, regimes, or countries with which we are in conflict.

One of our starting points is that the adversary remains in power due to some sort of consent of our own, explicit or not. Non-cooperation keeps within the limits of the law, but the usual forms of cooperation are withdrawn. In other words, from the point of view of the epistemology of non-violent civil resistance, we no longer “operate in favor” of the sources which reproduce or provide legitimacy to injustice. We start from the principle and achievement of awareness of how our own bodies, material resources and social identities are the base of “consent” (explicit, silent or not) by means of which the adversary maintains him/herself in power (Sharp, 1986: 72, 101-102, 162).

Gandhi continuously encouraged this form of life and struggle; his best known action is the boycott against English clothing (to the extent of burning it in great bonfires in public squares), simultaneously with the promotion of homespun textiles (*khadi*) as a symbol of the Hindu struggle for autonomy and self-government (*swaraj*). But he also asked Hindus to refuse to work for the British government, return their titles and honors of any type, and refuse to serve in the police or the army. His “equation for active resistance or *satyagraha*” was: “How is it possible that 100,000 English can control 300 million Hindus? They didn’t take India from us, we gave it to them. Their control depends on Hindu collaboration, not on British control”. And he added: “If all of us were to withdraw our cooperation, the English would have nothing left to do in India”.

In consequence, his strategy for increasing confrontation was: “We must stop doing what the English want us to do” (Ackerman and Duvall, 2000: 61-102; York, 2000).

At the same time, civil disobedience is one of the major instruments for the advancement of the human species. Without it we would still be stuck in a “moral Stone Age”. We propose to violate openly and publicly a law that is considered illegitimate and immoral. Thus, civilian disobedience is not a “destructive” act resulting in “social chaos” but, rather, is profoundly “creative” and “ordered” in terms of humanity.

For Gandhi, who was an important systematizer and contemporary actor in the conceptualization and practice of civilian disobedience –which could be individual or collective, offensive or defensive—this “...is a stimulus for those who struggle and a challenge for the adversary. It should be clear that civilian disobedience in terms of Independence, without the cooperation of the masses by means of constructive efforts, is purely and simply bravado and worse than useless” (Ameglio, 2002: 328).

In terms of contents, he sustained that “the civilian violation of oppressive moral laws ... the disobedience of these laws as a matter of conscience, not from fear of punishment... is an unalienable right of every citizen. To renounce this right means we stop being human” (Ameglio, 2002: 155).

Both types of action –noncooperation and civil disobedience—which are central to the construction of disobedient peace, imply a much deeper comprehension of the relationship between legality and legitimacy or, in Gandhi’s words: What comes first? The law or conscience?²⁴ To face this epistemic and moral dilemma, it is fundamental to know the historical processes which led to the enactment of the legal instrument, and how the dominant sectors have always striven to reinforce socially the “sacred nature” of the law (Ameglio, 2018), masking the processes involved in its construction which, in many cases, were the result of a “victory of some over others”, and even more so in its application which frequently represents, directly or indirectly, an “armed device” of those who exercise power.

The relationship between people and the law-regulations-institutions is one of the most complex issues we face in the construction of due disobedience to inhuman orders, because it represents a great “epistemic obstacle” which later becomes reflected in moral identity. Social order, as we stated while describing “social infantilism”, builds the sacred character and the timelessness of the law, and whatever may emerge from them, as pillars to uphold “obedience to authority”. This is why, when we become aware of this, we face it and challenge

it, it is perceived as a very strong “rupture”, whether individually or collectively. So the construction of civil disobedience acts is an endpoint and never a starting point, because it is necessary, previously, to build all these epistemic reflections on rupture with the egocentric stadium, to move on to that of cooperation, in which the law and its application are the fruit of consensus among equals. On many historic occasions, civil disobedience (as well as non-cooperation)—the principal radical actions in the non-violent civil resistance struggle—have lost effectiveness and have fallen in public disrepute as simple acts of violent provocation. This has come about because the actors and public opinion have not been adequately prepared by means of reflection on cooperation designed to undermine the sacralized character of the law. Omitting consideration of this massive epistemic obstacle has been the central reason for not being able to advance in the magnitude of necessary actions to build a disobedient peace capable of curbing at least part of the war in our country.

We also believe that the so-called “disobedient” or “globaliphobic” movements, initiated at least partially with the Zapatista uprising on January 1, 1994, have been important in terms of the search of updates on the meaning and practice of civil disobedience against neoliberalism in this century and within a non-Gandhian culture. Zapatismo has undertaken to build a human experience on a social scale which strives to rule itself according to non-capitalist principles. This is what they call “autonomy” in which all “good government” decisions are arrived at by consensus and community cooperation, according to the principle of “ruling while obeying”.²⁵

The movements born in Seattle to oppose the WTO (November 29 – December 3, 1999) predicate “active disobedience”, bringing together “direct action” and “civil disobedience” to counteract dominant economic powers. By means of these acts, they proposed to undertake “public challenges conceived to show growing social support for our rebellion and the justice of our cause... Break the halo of naturalness that envelops the existing order, its institutions and results”.²⁶ (Iglesias, 2011: 16, 247)

3.1 Non-Cooperation and Civil Disobedience in Mexico Today

We feel it is important to conclude this work with a couple of powerful examples of social struggles in present day Mexico –which we have followed— in the field of disobedient peace, to avoid incurring simply in the same logical empiricism we have criticized. This is our most updated reality principle, and the experiences of three decades form the total context of these reflections which are, at once, theoretical and practical. I will stress, then, two examples of

non-cooperation in the sense of not obeying inhuman orders, which, I believe, could show the way to stop in part this war that pervades us, and build a disobedient peace.

The first case concerns 3,360 teachers, belonging to the National Coordination of Education Workers (CNTE in Spanish); they are tenured teachers and live and work in 28 states in this country. In 2015 they refused to sit for the Evaluation Exam and the Reposition Test in a clear conscientious objection against the inappropriately named “Educational Reform” violently forced by the government and for this reason, were fired on March 1, 2016. This repressive governmental act was a totally disproportionate punishment and without any direct link with the transgression committed, to which the dissident teachers responded by convening a “national strike” from May 15 to September 19, 2016. Conscientious objections, boycotts and strikes are actions historically representative of non-cooperation. “Conscientious objection”, particularly, is a type of action originated in reflection concerning an injustice and subsequent public construction of a “moral frontier” which is not susceptible to be *moved or crossed*. It is one of the central virtues of the education for and the epistemology of peace: to say “Enough!” and to be capable of building an action which makes this challenge openly observable.

A second action of exemplary non-cooperation in Mexico has been that of the National Brigades for the Search of Disappeared Persons²⁷ in clandestine graves since 2016, organized by their families in all the north of the country, and in the states of Morelos, Veracruz, Jalisco, Sinaloa, Coahuila, Tamaulipas... After years of formal, legal efforts, the family organizations and their allies decided to “go their own way”, without waiting for the authorities –in many cases with a certain degree of involvement in the inhuman event under investigation—to provide the action and support that never seemed to arrive. They decided to exercise *their power*, as Gandhi would say, and in the words of Zapatista commander David, in Oventic, during the creation of the *Juntas* for Good Government: “without asking for permission” (August, 2003). This is a very important form of “autonomous non-cooperation”.

Concerning actions of civil disobedience in Mexico, we feel that the “highway blockades” carried out by the dissident teachers –between May and September, 2016—represented an indispensable form of struggle given the level of official violence against them.²⁸ Particularly, they enabled civilian society and government to measure the level of support their struggle garnered in different communities –especially rural communities in the Southeast—based on the solidary support of students and their parents. This moral force “placed its

bodies” on the highways, thus expressing their radicalization, indignation and moral determination.

Another form of civil disobedience in Mexico is represented by what we know as “duality of power”, or “parallel power” (Sharp, 1986: 281-290), exercised openly in the Zapatista communities since 2003, in the fields of “good government”, health, education and production. It is one of the most radical forms. This mode of action has been followed in some other communities, especially in indigenous and rural populations in the South, with particular emphasis on issues related to public security and community guards or police forces which have been created (Horta and Aburto, 2016; Fernandez, 2014).

The challenge to non-violent civil resistance in the construction of a real disobedient peace involves:

How to activate the spiral of non-violent civil resistance without increasing the spiral of violence?

One important “non-violent weapon” is the “moral reserve” (Ameglio, 2011; Ameglio, 2016) that resides in a given society, and gives this society the strength to draw a “moral frontier”²⁹. This social moral reserve can comprise very diverse social identities –even when some are at odds with each other—capable of mobilizing in determined historic situations in which they consider that, in some sense, a certain moral line of given social order has been crossed. This “shifting of the moral frontier” in the face of situations of gross inhumanity which they are not willing to accept as normal, has historically caused in many societies that great masses of people take to the streets, or individuals whose bodies and identities (academic and religious leaders, peasant, indigenous or labor leaders, intellectuals, artists) concentrate a considerable “social power” also emerge to pressure authority, or the rest of the population to express their Massive Cry of Moral and Material Indignation: “Enough!” (January 1, 1994), “We are fed up!” (April 13, 2011), “I am #132” (May 11, 2012), “It was the State!” (September 2014), and “Stop gasoline hikes!” (January 2017). These five have been Cries of Moral and Material Indignation by Mexican society in recent years, in the face of highly inhuman situations, like the condition of the indigenous peoples of Chiapas, the victims of the war of extermination, the violations of democracy, the 43 students who disappeared during a “genocidal action” in Iguala (State of Guerrero), on the night between September 26 and 27, 2014, and the serial increases in the price of gasoline. These events triggered an important and radical set of reactions conceived from non-violence, and created conditions for the construction of a disobedient peace.

It is also true that another factor which partly explains how the spiral of war and social violence in Mexico has grown during the past decade has been that—in the face of other social events revealing brutal inhumanity which, in our view, “pushed back the moral frontier” towards a greater acceptance of barbarianism and impunity—a considerable part of the national moral reserve did not take to the streets with their bodies in nonviolent actions (non-cooperation and civil disobedience) proportional to the level of violence. These actions should exhibit an important trait of disobedient peace and non-violence which could be termed “permanent firmness” (Barbé, 1977): “We are not going to move until there is truth, justice and reparation”. In other words, “put our bodies on the street for an undetermined time”, which would transform these social subjects into a powerful “moral weapon”³⁰.

I will mention only the events I consider of “exceptional inhumanity” and which should not be allowed to happen without radical consequences (truth, justice, reparation, resignations, jail...) for power and its representatives: massacre of 49 infants at the ABC Daycare Center in Hermosillo (State of Sonora) on June 5, 2010); massacre of 16 young people at a party in Villas de Salvárcar, Ciudad Juárez (State of Chihuahua) on January 31, 2010); massacre of 72 migrants in San Fernando (State of Tamaulipas) on August 22, 2010; massacre of 52 people at the Casino Royale in Monterrey (State of Nuevo Leon) on August 26, 2011; execution of 22 people in Tlatlaya (State of Mexico) on June 30, 2014 by government forces; disappearance of 43 students from the Ayotzinapa Rural School in Iguala (State of Guerrero) on September 26-27, 2014. Of course, the list of inhumanities in this country in the past decade is unfortunately much longer, but we wished to highlight the previous examples as significant cases of levels and quantities that a society cannot accept as normal in their impunity without consequent changes in the power structure, without truth, justice and reparation.

Thus, we observe how, apart from the epistemology of disobedience we shared at the beginning of this article, also the individual and collective conceptions and construction of force, reserve, frontier, rupture and moral weapons are central issues for building, reflecting and taking action for disobedient peace, based on the principles of non-violent civil resistance. It is a task for millennia, as is the improvement of the human species, but there are also multiple events in the short and medium term which provide opportunities to start building it. This is the quest of many more than we think, and it is my hope that we can increasingly *think aloud*, and *think together*. This is our hope, which stems from a reality principle, humble but real.

Pietro Ameglio Patella, Tenured Professor, Chair of “Culture of Peace and Non-Violence”, Faculty of Philosophy and Letters, Mexican National Autonomous University (UNAM)

serpajc@lanet.apc.org

IPRA-Congress, India, November 2018

REFERENCES

Ackerman, P. and J. Duvall. (2000) *A Force more Powerful. A century of nonviolent conflict*. N. York: St. Martin's Press

Ameglio, P. (2018). “México: la Ley como arma del poder y la Guerra” (Mexico: The Law as Weapon of Power and War). Article online, accessible at <https://desinformemonos.org/mexico-la-ley-arma-del-poder-la-guerra/>, February 9, 2018

Ameglio, P. and T. Ramírez (editors) (2016). *¿Cómo construir la paz en el México actual? Textos, autores y preguntas sobre construcción, educación y cultura para la paz* (How to Build Peace in Mexico today? Texts, Authors and Questions on Construction, Education and Culture for Peace). México: Plaza & Valdés

Ameglio, P. (2016). “¿Cómo construir la paz y reflexionar sobre ella en medio de la guerra en México?” (How to Build Peace and Reflect upon it in the Midst of War in Mexico?). In: Sicilia, J. and Vázquez, E. *El movimiento por la paz con justicia y dignidad*. (The Movement for Peace with Justice and Dignity). México: Edics. Era

Ameglio, P. (2011). “La reserva moral mexicana sale a la calle”. (Mexican Moral Reserve Takes to the Streets). Article online, accessible at: <http://elperiodicodemexico.com/nota.php?id=472627>, April 18, 2011

Ameglio, P. (2002). *Gandhi y la desobediencia civil. México hoy*. (Gandhi and Civil Disobedience. Mexico Today). México: Plaza & Valdés

Antón, G *et al* (2010). *El cuerpo, territorio del poder*. (The Body as a Territory of Power). Buenos.Aires: P.I.Ca.So

Arendt, H. (2005). *Sobre la violencia*. (On Violence). Madrid: Alianza Edit.

Arendt, H. (2005). *Eichmann en Jerusalén. Un estudio acerca de la banalidad del mal*. (Eichmann in Jerusalem. A Study on the Banality of Evil). Barcelona: Ed. Lumen

Bourbaki Team (2011). “El costo humano de la guerra por la construcción del monopolio del narcotráfico en Mexico (2008-2009)”. (The human cost of the war for the monopoly of drug trafficking in Mexico (2008-2009)). Online article accesible at <http://publicaciones.sociales.uba.ar/index.php/cuadernosdemarte/article/view/2043/1744>

Barbé, D. (1977). *A firmeza Permanente. A Forca da Nao-Violencia* (Permanent Firmness. The Strength of Nonviolence). Sao Paulo: Edit. Loyola-Vega

Bleichmar, S. (1995). *Pensar en voz alta* (Thinking Aloud). Bs. As.: P.I.Ca.So

Canetti, E. (1983). *Masa y poder*. (The Masses and Power). Madrid: Alianza Editores

Fernández, P. (2014). *Justicia autónoma zapatista. Zona Selva Tzeltal* (Autonomous Zapatista Justice. Tzeltal Jungle Zone). México: Edics. Autónomas

Foucault, M. (1976). *Vigilar y castigar. Nacimiento de la prisión* (Guard and Punish. Birth of Prisons). México: Siglo XXI Edits.

Fracchia, M. (2018). “Propuesta de un enfoque basado en aportes socio-psicogenéticos para la formación en investigación-intervención sobre la relación entre violencia escolar y violencia social” (Proposal for an approach based on socio-psychogenetic contributions on the relationship between school violence and social violence). In: Velázquez G. *El paradigma de la complejidad y la investigación de los problemas sociales, educativos y culturales del siglo xxi* (The complexity Paradigm and Research on Social, Educational and Cultural Problems in the Twenty first Century). Mexico: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional

Fracchia, M. (2014). “Juan Carlos ‘Lito’ Marin y la desobediencia debida a toda orden inhumana” (Juan Carlos “Lito” Marin and Due Disobedience to any Inhuman Order). Prologue to: Marin, J.C. (2014) *Conocimiento y desobediencia a toda orden inhumana* (Knowledge and Disobedience of Any Inhuman Order). Cuernavaca: Morelos State Autonomous University

Fromm, E. (2006). *El miedo a la libertad* (Fear of Liberty). Buenos Aires: Ed. Paidós

Gandhi, M (1985). *En lo que yo creo* (What I believe in). México: Dante

Hessel, S. (2010). “¡Indignaos!” (Indignez-vous!). Article online accesible at: <http://www.eldamoneo.com/indignate.pdf>

Horta, J. and Aburto, S. (2016). *CRAC-PC. El origen de la Policía Comunitaria. Montaña y Costa Chica de Guerrero* (CRAC-PC. The origin of Community Police. Mountains and Costa Chica regions in (the state of) Guerrero). México

- Iglesias, P. (2011). *Desobedientes. De Chiapas a Madrid* (Disobedient. From Chiapas to Madrid). Madrid: Editorial Popular
- Laski, H. (2011). *Los peligros de la obediencia* (The dangers of obedience). Madrid: Edics. Sequitur
- Lederach, J. P. (1986). *Educación para la paz* (Education for peace). Barcelona: Fontamara
- Marín, J. C. (2014). *Conocimiento y desobediencia a toda orden inhumana* (Knowledge and disobedience to any inhuman order). Cuernavaca: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos
- Marín, J. C. (2009). *Cuaderno 8. Leyendo a Clausewitz* (Copybook 8. Reading Clausewitz). Buenos Aires: Buenos Aires University
- Marín, J. C. (1995). *Conversaciones sobre el poder. Una experiencia colectiva* (Conversations on power. A collective experience). Buenos Aires: Buenos Aires University
- Martínez, C. (2012). *De nuevo la Vida. El poder de la Noviolencia y las transformaciones culturales* (Life again. The power of nonviolence and cultural transformations). Bogotá: Uniminuto
- Milgram, S. (1980). *Obediencia a la autoridad. Un punto de vista experimental*. (Obedience to authority. An experimental point of view). Bilbao: Desclée de Brouwer
- Moore, B. (1989). *La injusticia: bases sociales de la obediencia y la rebelión* (Injustice: social bases of obedience and rebellion). México: UNAM
- Negri, A. (2006). *Goodbye Mr. Socialism*. Milán: Feltrinelli
- Piaget, J. (1985). *El criterio moral del niño* (Moral criterium in children). México: Rocas Edics.
- Piaget, J. (1976). *La toma de conciencia* (Becoming aware). Madrid: Edics. Morata
- Rabinovich, E. et al (Editors) (2011). *“Vamos a portarnos mal” (Protesta social y libertad de expresión en América Latina)* (“Let’s misbehave”. (Social protest and freedom of speech in Latin America). Bogotá: Centro de Competencia en Comunicación para AL
- Randle, M. (1998). *Resistencia civil* (Civilian resistance). Barcelona: Paidós
- Sharp, G. (1986). *Política dell’ Azione Nonviolenta. 2. Le tecniche* (Policy of nonviolent action. 2. Techniques). Turín: Edizione Gruppo Abele

Thoreau, H. (1997). *Del deber de la desobediencia civil* (On the duty to civilian disobedience). Buenos Aires: Dissur Edics.

York, S. (2000). “A Force more Powerful. Marcha de la Sal”. Online video accessible at:
<file:///C:/Users/W10x64/Desktop/Gandhi%20y%20la%20marcha%20de%20la%20sal%20-%20youTube.html>

SUMMARY

DISOBEDIENT PEACE: NON-COOPERATION WITH INHUMAN ORDERS

We present a practical theory of formal and informal education, and of direct action, based on three decades experience in nonviolent civil resistance. It represents an attempt to conceptualize and systematize the reflection and action processes which have enabled us –and many others—to build forms, on different scales, of “due disobedience to inhuman orders”. We consider this to be a key concept and practice for building something we call “disobedient peace”, within the broader objective of contributing a new conceptualization to enrich the already ample panoply of similar input to be found in studies on peace.

The complexity involved in “disobedience” in the social order has enabled us to develop a comparable epistemology, which we share in this article.

FOOTNOTES

1

http://www.snieg.mx/contenidos/espanol/normatividad/MarcoJuriduco/PND_2013-2018.pdf

² This categorization is linked to the idea of “negative peace”, in the sense that it “ascribes a dynamic and important role to war”, (Lederach, 1986: 21) and is the one which the Mexican government has favored, putting all its emphasis and power behind the national construction of a militarized peace imposed by the armed forces and the police, including legal recognition to do so, a unique clause of the recently enacted Internal Security Law.

³ “While fear is the form in which subjectivity organizes its defenses for self-preservation, terror knows what it fears but has no way of protecting itself from what it fears”. (Bleichmar, 1995)

⁴ The title of Gandhi's autobiography—a fundamental book to read, along with Mandela's *Autobiography*—has been a lifelong guide for us to understand the construction of a social identity as well as our own: "My Experiences with Truth" (some colleagues have translated experiences as "experiments"). We believe that approaching actions of peace and nonviolence from the logic of an experiment is very helpful in building without fear of being mistaken ("peripheral").

⁵ This idea was coined initially by Dr. Juan Carlos Marín, noted Argentine epistemologist and social activist, (Marin, 1995:25-26) and taken up in the Final Declaration of the XXII Congress of the Latin American Association of Sociology (ALAS in Spanish), carried out in Concepcion, Chile, in October 1999: "...We unanimously express that, in the ethical practice of our profession, social scientists cannot restrict themselves to diagnosing their societies, without knowing and facing the multiple dimensions in which the legal monopoly of violence is inhumanly and arbitrarily practiced in our Continent. We therefore propose urgent collaboration in the construction of a moral judgment capable of enabling the rupture of all forms of uncritical obedience to authority, making observable and promoting lifelong a due disobedience to any inhuman order".

⁶ Clearly, nonviolence is not the only way to build peace; we respect and have supported many others, but we believe that this culture is a millenarian tradition which has contributed to the long process of humanization of our species. However, we repeat, it is fundamental to distinguish between the "endpoints" and the "starting points", to avoid prejudice, stigmas or "anticipated defeats".

⁷ This concept was adapted to sociology by Juan Carlos Marín, taking it from Freud, and others; we have applied it and enriched it with new experiences and conceptualizations. In this case, for example, we apply it to the culture of peace, education and civil resistance.

⁸ The important part here is the logic within and without the discourse, not the empirical-experimental correlation according to some type of objectivated register of the material reality observed. Power constructs "discourses on reality" permanently, and "operates" them on bodies with enormous strength, as if they were "truthful" or "real", because whoever accepts them does not observe reality, but limits his/her attention to who pronounces the discourse, before whom he/she has been constructed in obedience by the "authority principle".

⁹ "...discussion and reflection, that is cooperation in the field of thought, increasingly override unsupported statements and intellectual egocentrism".

(Piaget, 1985: 37). “Proof” and “data” are what really enable co-operation, or really “operate” with others in the intellectual and epistemic spheres.

¹⁰ The “installation” of knowledge is one of the most complex, unobservable and accepted as normal arts in epistemic work, and it is also a core task in any process of construction of peace and autonomy.

¹¹ The “social observables”, according to J.C. Marín, are qualities and traits of social events and actors which can be observed at first glance; the “unobserved” can be discerned with the help of some adequate theory or conceptualization; on the other hand, the “unobservables” cannot be observed directly and require the application of indirect observation instruments to bring them to the surface. An example of this could be “fear” which, to be observed, require us to ask the individual about certain behaviors and practices.

¹² “Rupture” is a fundamental epistemic and moral category, which must be built permanently in ourselves and in others, both individually and collectively. It is indispensable for casting doubt on previous knowledge with the aim of creating a new one concerning a determined social event, based on an increase of awareness. This text is based, to a great extent, on how we have been able to *advance* along this epistemic axis, from theory –acquired and built upon—to experiences-experiments in which we participated. Returning to Fracchia (2018), we see how, for Bachelard, scientific rupture is that which “contradicts common experience”, and in which, as Bourdieu points out, “familiarity with the social universe is the primary epistemological obstacle”. In other words, for a rupture to exist, it is necessary to cast doubt upon accepting as normal much knowledge drawn from “common experience” which, as we will see, is really the installation of part of the dominant heteronomy in social order, based on some “authority principle”. Thus, wherever knowledge is catechistic, voluntaristic and dependent on absolute values, there cannot be “fissures” or autonomous ruptures. A rupture is, therefore, a prerequisite –an end in itself— for the construction of acts of disobedience, because it is an “opening towards what is new”.

¹³ “Ignorance” –which is among the principal causes of violence—is associated with lack of knowledge concerning a fact or a trait of some social identity, and not intelligence or intellectual identity. It is counteracted by building and installing greater knowledge.

¹⁴ “The whole adult can be found in the child, and all the child survives in the adult”. (Piaget, 1985: 70)

¹⁵ Foucault adroitly describes the effect of what is inadequately termed discipline on the body, precisely in terms of forms of disciplining: “. . .the more obedient

he is, all the more useful... Thus, discipline makes submissive and well trained bodies, 'docile' bodies. Discipline increases the strength of the body (in terms of economic usefulness) and diminishes that same strength (in terms of political obedience)". (Foucault, 1976: 160) Anton and Damiano round off the idea: "Thus it seems to be the "target" of power: to correct bodies to obtain more docile and useful individuals, incapable of reflecting on their own actions". (Antón *et al*, 2010:24)

¹⁶ "How is it possible that the practice of democracy is so advanced in a game of marbles between boys from 11 to 13 years old, and is so unfamiliar to adults in many fields?" (Piaget, 1985: 62)

¹⁷ The whole social order... (is built), in Juan Carlos Marín's words, on "Anticipated obedience to exert a punishment when an authority demands it, where the punishment, in reality, masks a confrontation and is presented as an act of justice" (Ameglio, 2002: 129). More in Piaget, 1985: 167-272; Martínez, 2012: 109-118; Glover, 2013: 448-561.

¹⁸ In his research, Milgram claims that, for a soldier in Vietnam, "It is enough hard work to get through the present day alive; there's no time to think about moral problems" (1980: 169). The aim is to transform individuals into "a pure state of agency (in which) moral judgments are to a great extent suspended" (1980: 146). For different reasons, but this construction of the "soldier" and "beings in agency state", is in some ways similar to the "muslim" described by Giorgio Agamben in *Homo Sacer*.

¹⁹ "...the historic construction of what is called a citizen, and if we wanted greater precision we would call it a soldier-citizen. Because we must not forget that before being a citizen, one must be a soldier" (Marín, 2009:68).

²⁰ Among the causes of obedience, Milgram pinpoints a fundamental one: "...to be able to consider oneself as not responsible for one's actions. The individual is free from any responsibility when he ascribes the initiative to the experimenter" (1980: 20), who gave the order.

²¹ Moore analyzes this issue when he compares the experiments of Milgram and Asch. (1989: 97)

²² For Piaget "...the factors of maladaptation would be the triggers of the achievement of awareness... what triggers the achievement of awareness ... is the fact that automatic regulation... are no longer enough... and it becomes important to seek new means for a more active adjustment". (1976: 255) For Marín, "discomfort" is something from previous knowledge that does not agree with the new action we are being asked to perform.

²³ “*Civil resistance* is a method of collective political struggle based on the primary idea that governments depend ultimately on the collaboration, or at least the obedience, of the majority of the population”. (Randle, 1998: 25) Some profiles of civil resistance actions can be found in Randle (1998:25-32); Sharp (1986); and Ameglio (2002:117-18).

²⁴ Thoreau is very clear on this point: “The only obligation I have the right to shoulder is to do at all times what I consider proper”, and he adds: “Thus, in the name of order and civilian government, we are made to honor our own baseness, and even to uphold it” (1997: 25, 31).

²⁵ <https://es.wikisource.org/wiki/Discurso-del-subcomandante-Marcos-%22Mandar-obedeciendo%22>

<http://www.huizache.org/posts/7-principios-del-mandar-obedeciendo>

²⁶ More in Negri, 2006: 40-82 and Rabinovich *et al*, 2011.

²⁷ These were reinforced in 2017 (May 12-22) by an International Caravan for the Search of Disappeared Persons. More in <https://aristeguinoticias.com/0709/mexico/suman-1307-las-fosas-clandestinas-halladas-de-2007-a-la-actualidad-cndh/>

²⁸ Nochixtlán massacre, which involved murder of teachers during demos, jailing of leaders, mass firings.

²⁹ The construction of epistemic and moral “frontiers” in a dynamic, collective or individual way, and in permanent evolution according to new knowledge and reflection acquired, is fundamental for defining one’s own identity and the degrees of “disobedience” or “obedience” one is prepared to face. In preparation for peace (which includes education, culture and construction) this is one of the most complex tasks to install, in oneself and in others. The difficulty is directly related with the degree of knowledge available concerning inhumanity –establishment of violence as a normal state of affairs—contained in the social order. More on this in Ameglio, 2002: 197-210.

³⁰ “The way to fully interpose a body is to make it a *thinking* body, so that the strength of this body is multiplied, because each part of it is going to behave according to what the environment, as defined by reflection, requires. It will be hugely consistent: the moment of reflection and action coincide... Everything works. This is a *moral weapon*”. (Marín, 1995: 26).