**Democratizing Democracy Education**

 Bill Puka

**In A Nutshell**

 I offer a variety of unusual hypotheses for on democracy and citizenship education for your consideration. Their summary story goes like this.

 The conception of democracy and citizenship common among democratic societies is far off track. In large measure it is led off track by public education and by the academic literature in political science, history and philosophy. This conception is based on a fatal compounding of social organization with political organization under nation-states. As a result of this confused target, education in democracy, in citizenship, in social responsibility and civic engagement is far off course as well. Students are not taught democratic reasoning nor social-democratic skills for the most part. They are taught undemocratic and authoritarian ones—politically enforceable and nationalistic ones. Put one way, the notion of democracy itself that is taught here is anti-democratic. Put another, the defining features of democracy taught are remarkably inconsistent with most of the features supposedly derived from them. It would be a complete mystery that generations of students, and even teachers do not recognize these inconsistencies, if the same phenomena did not occur in religious socialization well before and ongoing.

 The same trend shows itself in moral education, especially in the Deweyan and Kohlbergian tradition. Here the most competent post-conventional reasoning attributes to natural human development, of all things, a mixing up of (a) voluntary social cooperation based on mutual respect with (b) the legal reasoning of political states, wielding police powers. Not since the Divine Right of Kings has such a powerful rationalization been offered for political or state power over democratic process.

 Education in democracy requires that students learn the skills of social organizing, social entrepreneurship, and social self-reliance quite apart from government. They should learn these lessons not as citizens of a state, but as social partners in cooperation, acting also as co-directors of the state. Such education also requires nurturing a primarily skeptical, challenging and generally hostile attitude toward (central) government—toward republics, their constitutions, and their bureaucracies. This is the attitude that civil rights are designed to convey and crystallize. Our first lessons as citizens should be how to effectively pre-empt and neutralize government power over society, and to function as joint supervisors of public servants and policies. The authority of each rests with us, after all. The legitimate power of a Republic and its officials is only to serve society and its will, not lord over it. Thus the last thing students should be taught is how to be compliant citizens fulfilling the civil responsibilities that government has laid out for them. Compliance should be to principles of voluntary respect alone, either directly or when well-represented justly in legal guidelines.

**Appearance and Reality**

 The proposals above are unlikely to be adopted, especially in so-called “public,” but really “government” schools. (Public should mean social, not civic in a democracy.) But they might be introduced for consideration and discussion as critical alternatives alongside the standard story of democracy and citizenship.

 To most of us today, and certainly to most teachers, these proposals have a radical leftist sound, reminiscent of what used to be termed Marxist ideology and Friere-ism. But they derive from mainstream, patriotic sources such as the US Constitution. I cite two founding father of the United States, the first modern, society-wide democracy from which most western democracies originally took their lead. The first is from the widely read pamphlet called Common Sense by Thomas Paine, more influential than the Declaration of Independence in turning the American colonies from monarchy toward democracy. The second is from the first and most powerful chief executive of the US Republic, George Washington.

From Common Sense:***Some writers have so confounded society with government, as to leave little or no distinction between them; whereas they are not only different, but have different origins. Society is produced by our wants, and government by our wickedness; the former promotes our happiness positively by uniting our affections, the latter negatively by restraining our vices. The one encourages intercourse, the other creates distinctions. The first is a patron, the last a punisher. Society in every state is a blessing, but government even in its best state is but a necessary evil, in its worst state an intolerable one***

 From Washington**: *Government is not reason, it is not eloquent; it is force. Like fire it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master.***

Here now are the propositions themselves, or at least a few handfuls of them.

 ***PROPOSALS***

 ***Standard Stories***: We are all taught that democracy is a form of government, comparable to comparable monarchy, oligarchy, autocracy and theocracy. Virtually every book used in schools and written by experts conveys this message. Democracy is the one non-dictatorial form of government. It is the one provided authority by the grace of its citizens in mutual consent. Definitionally, democracy constitutes self-rule, self-government, government of, by and for the people. Democracy is social self-determination, formed by voluntary social cooperation based on mutual respect. In history courses on democracy, as in programs of civic engagement, education for democracy and citizenship education, students are taught the constitution and functions of government branches, the rights of all citizens, the due process of law that provides social justice, and the civic responsibilities of citizenship. These include obeying laws, conforming to majority interest and rule, voting for political candidates, the right to make our voices heard to our representatives and in some cases voicing dissent in protest of policies opposed to the social will. In the US there is mention of the right to petition government to redress grievances, even if not of how to exercise them.

 ***Standard Education and Just Community:*** Programs in moral education promote the same sense of fair government and social responsibility. These include the “just community” approach that let students practice in their classroom, the civic responsibilities they will bring to their community and society. Here Students are taught how to run their joint affairs by creating a social contract written down as a constitution. Under this constitution they are taught to conduct their behavior using the principles and procedures of government legislatures, making proposals, discussing and debating them respectfully, each having a say, then voting them up or down under majority rule. Students also create trial procedures, based on legal courts, to hear charges against offenders and sentence them for misbehavior. A notable absence is any training in exercising their rights to, let’s say, mount a protest movement against school authorities for unfair or authoritarian practices. By focusing on the moral principles that underlie democracy, students also become competent in dealing with informal or private interactions, outside the public sphere of citizenship. (I witnesses just community primarily in a prison unit, run by Kohlbergians.)

 ***Moral Education:*** In most Deweyan and Kohlbergian approaches to moral reasoning, the most competent, post-conventional cognition features the same principles for informal relations and for citizen relations. In Kohlberg, this is the so-called law-maintaining and law-creating perspectives of fairness at stage 5, plus the universal golden rule posited at stage six to guide all social accord and cooperation. At the highest levels, reasoners see morality itself explicitly as social contract, almost identical to the social contract posited to explain how democratic government must be created. The so-called moral musical chairs method for decision making at stage six is this social contract model put into motion for all moral decisions.

 ***Democracy vs. Political “Democracy:”*** Such educational programs and stage theories are misguided because their official and pervasive conception of democracy is misguided. Democracy can not be a political form. Its defining features imply a social phenomenon and are inconsistent with a political one. Democracy can only be a voluntary form of social cooperation, based on mutual respect. Its only coercive feature is self-defense against imminent threat. By contrast, political institutions are primarily mechanisms of imposed control, not voluntary cooperation. They operate by the imposition of laws and the coercive enforcement of those laws. They are designed not to constitute democracy but to protect, standardize, regulate and administer democracy by threat and force. Even in regulation and administration a government’s methods are coercive meaning that it is an inherently undemocratic or anti-democratic institution. Laws are designed to force people to do things, and do them a certain way, whether they agree with them or not, and especially when not. That’s what it means to say, “We are a country of laws.” A country of laws is a country of enforcements, whether criminal, civil or economic.

 ***Benevolent Dictatorship:*** Whether a legislature decides, by debating and voting, or an oligarchy decides based on their sense of social interest, they perform the same function. Political institutions do the dirty work of a democracy even when trying to do good and show social kindness such as in social security and welfare programs. Any form of government is at most justifiable, but never just. Students are not taught this, nor is it even raised as an outlook. They should be. This is what democracy implies. Because government is anti-democratic, education regarding it should focus on its dangers, abuse, and illegitimate use of power. It should also focus on the difference between authority and authoritarianism. Education in democracy should teach a highly skeptical, challenging and close to insurrectionist orientation to government. This in fact was the outlook of the original Americans who founded the first modern democracy, later featuring a Republic. The fact that some democratic government policies and policymakers see eye to eye with public opinion, especially politically socialized opinion, does not indicate voluntariness of consent. This match is consistent with benevolent dictatorship or oligarchy as well. The wise dictator keeps his subjects happy. But that doesn’t make the style of government involved anymore democratic. Government need not actually, physically coerce society to be undemocratic. It just must be ready to, and claim authority to, if the people step out of (its) line. When groups actually step out of line, they get a surprising taste of political coercion, especially when they are straight-arrow patriots used to always being on the law’s and government’s side.

 ***Flimsy Justifications:*** Some hold government to be democratic because it was established democratically, by joint consent. Even if it was, which it wasn’t, this would not government or the state democratic. It would simply make the establishing of it democratic. A legislature agreeing on a declaration of war does not make the war itself democratic. If we supposedly consent to laws, based on our willingness to conform so long as others do, then we’re conspiring in mutual coercion. We’re agreeing democratically not to be democratic. That’s why Kant’s notion of mutual self-imposed principles is a moral not legal notion. We should, but need not abide by these principles. Some have argued that because a Republic features a legislature that debates and votes, it is democratic. But likewise, a vote to coerce is not democratic, a vote using majority rule (which all legislatures do) is not democratic (since those represented voices in the minority are not represented) and a vote limited by a chief executive is certain not democratic—not to mention a Republic that gives any power to a chief executive. Why would a democracy have a chief executive as compared to a representative legislature alone? Put these three factors together and the Republic is overwhelmingly undemocratic. (I’ll get to majority voting below.) Last, some hold that government has the authority to coerce because people have a right of self-defense which they transfer to government. But almost none of the policies and regulations of government represent a form of self-defense—social security, taxation for roads and bridges, grants to humanists or scientific researchers, healthcare programs and public housing.

 ***Constitutional Undemocracy***: It is notable that virtually every political constitution of a democratic society says just what I have said. It holds that the People or society establishes the state and government, constituting its structure, to perform a small number of highly restricted functions. These include, first, protection of social members and their rights , the enforced standardization and protection of justice institutions, and the regulation of socio-economic functions toward mutual welfare by enforceable law. The US Constitution states exactly this in its first lines. And it was the first so-called democratic constitution, used as a model for most later ones. No doubt this is why the word “democracy” does not appear in the US Constitution—not even once. And to be ratified, it had to include ten sweeping sets of right of the citizenry against the government, along with any related rights it failed to explicitly specify. Students are not taught constitutionalism in this way, related to democracy. This reality is not even pointed out to students when they read it in the constitution and discuss the document. It should most definitely be pointed out.

 ***Republican DeCentralization***: There is a certain genius in the structure of a political Republic that makes it especially apt as a political tool for democratic society. This makes it seem less directly coercive and keeps its threat of legal coercion or enforcement low key. Instead of allowing a single autocrat or elite oligarchy work their joint interest, it splits authority among many individuals (legislators and executives) each looking out for their individual career interests primarily. Career success is tied to re-election which means keeping constituents (customers) happy. The original founders of constitutional republics termed the arrangement the election of dedicated public servants of high moral character who would heed to the public will, representing the negotiations of the whole society in microcosm. But we have every indication that it has not worked out this way and forseeably so. In the US, the central government was established in large measure “to mitigate the excesses of democracy” which included actual citizens have strong influence over their local representatives. Dropping that pretense then, what does the set up of a Republic most represent? My suggestion is that of a business in which citizens are both directors (employers) and customers and elected representatives actually employees. Government coercion is rarely used directly because the employees are in competition, each having to keep at least a majority of its defined customer base satisfied, even if by deluding them effectively. It’s harder to band together for anti-social policy. In addition, government sustains certain myths of consent which make customers feel that they must compromise for society as a whole, usually not actually getting what they want. Rarely is it mentioned that virtually no one gets what they want, including the majority—so who are we compromising for exactly?

 ***The Social-Political Disconnect:*** To further support the social nature of democracy, note that in dictatorial regimes the people of society still enjoy a good deal of democracy. It occurs where it always occurs, in their private, social and economic lives. The People here do not conduct their home-life at gunpoint, nor trade in the marketplace that way. Their friendships and many of their organizations are neither controlled nor regulated by law enforcement or a militia. Instead, they build their own voluntary traditions, conventions, and practices which govern almost all of their lives. Football or soccer leagues are often among the most democratic institutions of public life in these nations. Students are not taught this, but they should be. Most tribal societies have their policies set by chiefs or councils of elders. This is called oligarchy by political scientists. However most of these societies they have no institutions of coercion—no “have tos or forced tos” as many native American tribes put it. Chiefs and elders must convince their tribes to act as they recommend, at the risk of a no-confidence verdict and loss of chief status. Alternatively, factions break away into sub-tribes. If democracy means government by the consent of the governed, then such oligarchy is democracy. But actually, such governance has no government, politically or legally. It is anarchist democracy—communitarian anarchism. This is likely the only type of democracy there is. Still, such a democracy still may devise a government justifiably, if what results is not democratic. They may have no choice but to create a necessary evil to preserve what good and justice they can. Students are not taught this, but they should be. (Come on, say it with me now.) This is what democracy implies.

 ***Re-Targetting Democracy Education***: Therefore, democracy education should not key on so-called political democracy or good political citizenship as compliant participation in the political system. It should focus on social participation in democratic social institutions, practices and functions. These are defining of democracy because they show social self-determination and self-rule. They show mutually respectful and voluntary cooperation based on mutual and fair negotiation, consensus seeking (not voting under majority rule), social compromise accompanied by compensation to those least accommodated by compromising, de-centralization to avoid uncompensatable compromise, and so forth. These defining features of democracy are certainly mentioned in class, but never traced out in their implications nor their inconsistencies with everything else students are taught about democracy.

 ***State and Government as Social Tool***: Students also should learn to see and treat the government as merely one of the social service institutions society constructs to do its bidding—and in certain limited ways. Government is part of the private sector. It is the whole-society or public’s part of the private sector. (Either that, or there is no such thing as the public sector.) Consider how odd it is that when members of the public are chosen to be government officials they are said to leave private life? When fired, they’re said to reenter private life, becoming part of the public again. Students are not taught to think about these things, as they should be. Students should be taught to regard all government officials literally as public servants, as hired hands, never as leaders. This is what democracy implies. The proper relation of social members to government officials is that of dictatorship—we dictate, they take dictation—or at least as employer and employee. Students should at least be led to consider how a servant can be a leader or what the concept of servant leadership implies. We the People lead, through out social wills, the government follows or services our will. It would help to elect officials who can also consult, coach, inform and advise us on public policy. But in the end, we decide all major issues directly (as in California). Representatives make their case, we accept it or send them back to the drawing board. This is the only status that constitutions give political officials relative to society. The rest is relative to government. This is the only status they could have in a social democracy.

 ***Majority Tyranny***: Neither representation nor policy choice should ever be based on majority rule since this is merely majority tyranny. And democracy is opposed to tyranny. Every significant social faction must be represented in public policy proportional to size, if no better proportion can be found. Thus students should not be taught to vote except to take straw votes to chart how close they are to consensus. Majority rule should never be resorted to though as last resorts 2/3 or ¾ majorities can be accepted so long as compensation is provided to disagreeing minorities for going along. A better alternative is to split the group into two or three semi-autonomous groups that work in tandem. This provides every group self-determination which is necessary to democracy. The evils of majority rule are derivable from the very definition of democracy, yet this rule is typically identified with democratic process in education.

 ***More Than a Say***: Democracy never involves people having a say, or even being heard by government. It requires that people be heeded. It requires that their interests be reflected by public policy enacted into law. They cannot be said to be self-determining if they don’t determine. And democracy is a form of social self-determination. This is why majority rule is tyranny. Everyone having a say does not equal social self-determination. Those who aren’t heeded are treated as if they had no say at all. We feel that this treatment isn’t tyranny because, after all, they had a chance to convince people to their side, they had a chance at having their stated view accepted by all. But in democracy one needn’t convince the majority of one’s view to be heeded. Netiher need one convince others that one is respectworthy morally to be respected. Democracy is not government of the majority for the majority and by the majority. Obviously, some groups can be predicted beforehand to oppose virtually every policy proposal any group makes in society. The fact that a group is interested in that view is enough to validate it for policy influence unless it disrespects others. Students are misled on this point, to their great disadvantage as full social members.

 ***Backwards Dissent***: Government has no voice in a democracy. It can only sing the song of the public will. This is why social members need never, and should never dissent with a government policy, nor plead their case to their representatives. Only fellow social members constitute a relevant audience. In democracy, it is the representative’s responsibility to solicit their constituent’s views and get those views into policy and law. The government has no say at all, only society does. So there is nothing to dissent from in democratic governmental policy. There is merely tyranny to fight against. Children are taught dissent backwards. It’s the government, as consultant, that should warn us of seemingly taking the wrong direction. Then it should shut up. Students should be taught to demand that government shut up, or to shut government up by any means necessary. A government or any official of government that stays a policy course against the social will is committing tyranny and treason against democracy. This is much worse than treason against the state, which is the only treason recognized by government or the legal system. (Have you ever noticed that?) Students and citizens, at least in America, are taught the opposite, especially by prominent historians, who present this stance of presidents as a mark of courage and true greatness. It may be so in an undemocratic leader, but not in a public servant. In a democracy, the people sink or swim based on their own intelligence or stupidity. It is a system preserving the right to decide, not guaranteeing the best decision.

 ***Social Entrepreneurship***: To teach democracy, teachers must nurture student self-determination, cooperative and contributing group self-determination as social members quite independent of anything governmental. Students must be trained in social initiative, social entrepreneurship, and social and teamwork, not just social responsibility. And the skills needed here must apply to all social levels, very local and very broad. Regional groups trying to accomplish certain tasks must also negotiate with regional groups nearby that will be impacted. And they must consider whether their way of doing things is fair across society. Students must learn these skills, perhaps by interacting with other schools. This is democratic process and democracy in action. This is not civic engagement, as it is not tailored to so-called civil society. It is community or social organizing. As far as I know, no program in citizenship or democracy teaches these sorts of skills systematically or directly.

 ***What not Who and Economic Balloting***: The key to social democracy is doing things for ourselves by fair and mutually respectful means, establishing our own practices and conventions and ignoring government except where its few services are needed. Where they are it is the government’s job, primarily, to see this and partner with us, facilitating our efforts. This is true socially as it is economically in exchange and production. In fact the two must be linked. In dealing with government, the taxes we pay are the votes we cast. The availability of funds to government is what allows public servants to enact policies and programs into law. So as citizens we must demand the right to channel tax dollars where we see fit. This is self-determination with regard to policy. The idea that voting for candidates is democratic is absurd on its face. It is not the ***who*** that matters, but the ***what*** of government policy. For an owner, it is not who one hires in particular that counts, but what they do, what projects are chosen and purposes set for them to work on. Hiring is just to find anyone who can do the job open, and do it well. A democratic public must vote on major policy decisions, not who merely administers them or protects them. Voting on tax funding is one of the best ways to do that . Voting on candidates is a hiring and firing decision that should be based on performance evaluation, before, during and after taking the job. This might be left to government itself, working internally, as in no confidence votes among prime ministers.

 ***Militant Citizenship; Fighting Disempowerment***: The hostile and suspicious attitude toward government tyranny portrayed in American revolutionaries earlier can seem paranoid to those living in stable western democracies of today. Fragile democracies in both southern hemispheres are plagued by military coups and the rise of dictators. But European and Scandinavian governments at present are hardly overawing monoliths of oppression and coercion requiring a citizenship ever poised for militant revolt. The emphasis I’ve now unveiled on social self-empowerment and democratic self-reliance, independent of government, should suggest an additional ground for political hostility. A chief threat of government, parallel to social oppression, is social disempowerment and the submissive authoritarianism or follower syndrome it engenders toward political leadership. This submissiveness not only breeds acquiescence to the military adventurism of political leaders. It produces nations of sheep. Democracy, by contrast, is for societies of self-reliant sovereigns, pro-active in the leading their lives as individuals and groups. When I gave talks on democratic morality in W. German in the past, I was always amazed by the degree to which audiences saw government as their provider—holding it properly responsible for a great range of social and pension services. To me this sounded like overdependence on a questionably beneficent caretaker, just as my attitude sounded like typical American over-individualism to these listeners. Then when W. Germans found themselves partnering with or “absorbing” East Germany, all I heard were complaints that East Germans had become dependent weaklings, unable to do anything for themselves—to work hard and show initiative or creativity even in intellectual work. Why? Because their attitude was that government should do everything for them. Dare I suggest that government should do nothing for society that society can do for itself. It is not designed to do virtually anything well, including the few tasks for which it was created. And it especially not well-designed to be our mommy and daddy.

 ***UNUSUAL PERSPECTIVES***

 ***A Tip of The Flag***: Teaching such an understanding of democracy to students would promote a whole range of additional perceptions, attitudes and outlooks that reverse our current ones. Here are a few examples, getting increasingly outlandish. In the US, students are taught to pledge allegiance to the US flag and republic, when it is the republic and its officials that should be pledging allegiance to them. They are taught to treat the flag as sacred and the president as elevated and deserving superior respect, along with our military troops. Locally police are to get the same elevated respect. But they could be taught instead that the flag is a company logo, nothing more. The flag should bow when we walk by, not prompt us to jump to our feet and sing to it when it is raised. (“Oh, Coca-Cola, may you fizz from coast to coast—from sea to shining sea.”) The authorities have no authority or special status but to serve, and should be ordered around—if politely. This is the democratic order of things. (I spend much of my time ordering police around when they interfere with my driving.) Citizenship is for nothing but direct contact with the government. We are not our nation-state’s citizens. The nation state is society’s social tool. This is what democracy implies. Civic engagement is ONLY engagement with government, and it should be generally uncivil. At national events, the government should sing to the public, thanking us for the opportunity to serve and bear out trust.

 ***War is The Enemy***: Students in a democracy should be taught to focus on war--not on the details of battle, but on war as the chief enemy of democracy. War is likely the most anti-democratic thing on earth. Therefore war or peace studies can not be a separate optional study, but must be a central focus of democracy education. Students should be challenged to explain why full-scale war by nations is any different from purposeful and systematic mass murder. They should be asked to explain why terrorism by the militias of a puny military power is worse than full-scale invasions by a military super-power. Most important, the factual case should be presented to them that war is almost the exclusive province of governments and political states. Wars are quarrels between one state or government and another, dubbed their political enemies, normally at the behest of each state’s economic elite. Societies generally have no quarrels with each other until they are brainwashed by political propaganda into thinking erroneously that they do. Wars of liberation are wars of the people against government tyranny, or more accurately wars of government on social democracies in their presumed jurisdictions. This is not a difficult case to prove historically whatsoever. No sort of critical theory need be brought in to make the case. It is partially referred to in most history books of western democracies already. The exception to this story is ethnic rivalries and cleansing phenomena. All governments should be most feared, held suspect and challenged for their propensity to cause war. Declaring war should be seen as a near impeachable offense since it reigns down the worst injustice and harm on those one is serving and since it shows a failure of diplomacy at the governmental level—a failure of the main function of democracy, to protect its citizens. As the bumper sticker puts it, “Government: causing more violence than it prevents since 10,000BC.”

 ***“Supporting The Troops:”*** If war were unavoidable between states, but restrictable by populations and militaries supporting social democracy, what might they be like? Many alternative conceptions of war should be raised for students. Here’s one. If Government officials declare war, they should lead and fight. Indeed, if social members are expected to soldier, fight and die for their country, presidents who are top social **servants** should be expected to die first. War-mongering presidents or prime ministers should be seen as the most dispensable employees of society in this context. First, they are a clear and present danger to democracy and society. Second, there are so many politicians aching to replace them after all. Given their jobs as CEO of certain social service agencies, we should barely know their names as they circulate in and out of office, much less accord them celebrity status. If wars can not be prevented, they should be conducted in unoccupied deserts, where they belong, not trampling the members of any society of their homes. This is the way to prevent a completely intolerable consequence—the murder of innocents or military collateral damage. And war should be conducted among officials only if possible, unless corporate CEOs and defense contractors are voluntarily willing to join them. However, assassination should always be on the table as a happy alternative to war. This practice would lead to less hawkish officials willing to run for high office, and vastly fewer deaths. Moreover, since democracies are based on principles such as “might doesn’t make right,” war teams for each country should be in equal number with comparable weaponry. There is no other way to insure the justice that all governments claim to establish and protect.

 ***The Revolution WILL Be Televised***: Likewise, the only consequences of war should be to governments and corporations. Societies should remain just as they are, perhaps celebrating the end of wars with a huge international internet party. Perhaps the battle could be watched internationally on TV first—like a world cup or superbowl event. The bare-hand fighting skills of each contestant, and the training regimen they went through could be presented in a pre-game show, analyzed by sports announcers. If a certain government elite simply won’t abide by such ground rules, as is likely at present, it would be the responsibility of all members of all societies of the world to see to their demise, War-mongering presidents or dictators should be seen as wearing a bulls-eye on their forehead, for any member of any society to try to hit. But, in general, enforcing these groundrules will be the primary duty of military forces, especially international ones.

 ***Who’s Army Is It?*** *For the above reasons, and others, SOCIETIES SHOULD HAVE DIRECT, CLOSE, AND LONGTERM RELATIONSHIPS WITH ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS--POLICE AND MILITARY, AND SHOULD HAVE QUASI-AUTONOMOUS AUTHORITY OVER THEM. STUDENTS SHOULD OBSERVE AND PARTICIPATE IN THEIR TRAINING AND DISCUSS THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO SOCIETY AS PUBLIC SERVANTS. THE MILITARY SHOULD NOT PLEDGE ALLEGIEANCE TO THE CONSTITUTION AND ITS PROTECTION, BUT TO SOCIETY AND ITS PROTECTION. GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS SHOULD DO THE SAME, NOT PLEDGING TO DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION BUT THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY WITHIN THEIR SOCIAL CREATED NARROW CONSTITUTIONAL CONSTAINTS.* Notice that most democracy-minded citizens have poor relations with the military and with police. And why not? They serve the undemocratic functions of government. But what if they also served the democratic functions of the people against government as they do in certain countries, most recently Hondorus, previously the Soviet Union? How could they be helped to do that? The military is the ultimate power of a state in wielding police powers. Therefore the People must have strong alliances to the military to counter misuses of that power.

 ***Citizen Diplomacy***: The bulk of all foreign or international relations, among democratic societies—which virtually all societies are--should be conducted by “citizen”-diplomat corps. These would actually be social-member corps that build close personal ties with the “nationals” or social members of all other societies, promoting strong economic ties as well. That way, war would be mutual disaster for everyone and democratization would be impossible. The European Union is a perfect example of how this seemingly laughable and utopian prospect has been realized to an extent already. So is the United States, among its own separate states. Since war is the most anti-democratic threat on earth, and since governments only increase the threat of it, it is the responsibility of all democratic social members to work against it. Students must be trained in every skill needed to do so. This means that a normal part of education should be in foreign “citizenship” diplomacy. And a normal part of every student’s or graduates life should be participation in a citizen-diplomatic corps in several other countries. (Incidentally, if “citizen”-diplomats become excessively patriotic, which means nationalistic, threatening international understanding and cooperation, they might automatically be considered for the pool of available presidents and prime ministers, the future martyred heroes of the countries involved.)

**Radical Appearances**

 Once again, these last proposals have a very leftist ring to them, reminiscent of many socialist doctrines. What can I say? In our current European and American climate what used to be termed moderate, mainstream or middle of the road, is now seen as leftist. And not all socialism is undemocratic state socialism. Power to the people only sounds radically leftist where the idea of We The People having power is considered unthinkable. And that’s about as far right and undemocratic as one can think.

 ***Even Theory Can Do:*** And if I may offer a last proposal that few will like*, m*oral education should focus not on moral competence at reasoning but on moral motivation and on motivating cooperative enterprise—the skills of community organizing. The morally more competent in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Bush-Cheney America either conspired or did nothing but complain about their leaders and policies in society. The moral problems with these regimes took almost no reasoning power to see. And those who followed blindly recognized that, saying the typical things like “America right or wrong,” which allies with wrong. The most serious moral problems of human starvation, poverty and disease do not raise a dispute over good and evil, fair or unfair. The problem is a will to see, and to do the slightest thing about them.