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Abstract

“A nonkilling shift simultaneously introduces concern for the whole and for the individual in international politics. The basic unit of nonkilling political analysis is the individual human being.”

Glenn D. Paige

The genesis of this research in setting up a nonkilling global index has its roots in the Nonkilling paradigm, a unique approach to universal nonviolence and peace so well elaborated by Late Dr. Glenn D. Paige in his seminal work Nonkilling Global Political Science (2009). The idea of nonkilling is very simple. It aims to create a society where no human gets killed or even gets threatened to kill. For centuries killing was accepted as a natural phenomenon and as a result the killings have evolved today by getting more brutal. In the ancient days killings occurred in the name of war and revolution only now we can see killings in the form of terrorism, genocides, homicides and suicides. Even historically speaking wars were not fought as much as people believe (Antony Adolf, 2009). Happiness and peace become farfetched goals when one witnesses the horrifying deaths around them caused by killings. Technologically humans have evolved but not spiritually, mostly people believe spiritualism cannot be seen or measured but a concept like nonkilling is exactly the thing that can measure it. Previous attempts on a Global Nonkilling Index (GNI) to carry forward the ideas of Glenn D. Paige was made by researchers. To cite Jose V Abueva (2011) is being proposed here as a measure for nonviolent peace across countries as it is measurable and achievable. Paige had developed the theory and conceptual framework of nonkilling, while Abueva had proposed a Nonkilling Index for Philippines. According to his proposal the index would study the incidences of killings by provinces, city, and municipality and for Philippines as a whole. He also had proposed to identify the persons killed and those who kill. It may be important to draw a distinction with the Global Peace Index, the Happiness Index and Global Terrorism Index which are broad indexes that aim to measure
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terror, peace and happiness on a large scale. Nonkilling on the other hand is more focused as a direct measure of societal well-being, also being achievable and measurable. It is the first step or rather the foundational step towards peace and happiness. One cannot overlook it while talking about peace and happiness.

The Nonkilling Index would include certain parameters from the Global Peace Index while there are certain other parameters which we are proposing through this paper. So far the Peace Index is only focused on homicides and war related or conflict related death. The practice of genocide and suicide is something that does not find place in the index. However, it is the intensity of the crime of genocide that marks it out from homicide. Suicide on the other hand reflects not just the failure of the person but of the society and state itself. A person who kills others or even himself does reflects a psychological failure that translates into a societal distress. Civilizational duress is evident if individuals cannot control their emotions rather emotions lead them to extreme actions. Peace and happiness are intrinsic qualities, of a person and perhaps one who is not spiritual can neither be at peace with himself nor with others. It is a surmise of the research paper that when humans are controlled through emotional coercion through socio-psychological conditioning, by a particular ideological following or religion or a sect or even the state much of the behavioral stress may translate into a tendency to kill or even commit suicide or an act of violence.