

RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP, ANTI-MILITARISM AND DISOBEDIENCE TO THE STATE

THOM HOLTERMAN

Dordrecht

If we consider civil disobedience to be established on moral grounds, it implies that before adopting it as a form of protest all the available means of the current political system (which is being disputed) must have already been used, that it must involve open and non-violent action and the acceptance of punishment. The term »disobedience to the state« is preferred because it implies universality as its essential dimension. The criterion of immorality, against which the protest is directed, are crimes against humanity and nature. The right to resist to actions performed by the state (the basis of disobedience to the state) ensues from the existence of parliamentary democracy, as well as does the duty of obedience towards democratically enacted laws. By disobedience one can dispute those laws and acts which although laid down in a correct formal procedure, function contrary to the supposed social contract. In order to prevent actions of disobedience from becoming confined to the promotion of individual advantage or particular interest, the additional responsibility to be fitted into an overall plan of creating a new order (based on the abolition of the current hierarchical society) must be accepted. Therefore, the act of disobedience, apart from anticipating the elements of a new society must ensure that the alternative plan also be desired by other citizens. Responsible citizenship opposes the dominant cultural model (of ensuring social peace by preventive intimidation) on the grounds of a competing model (based on a community independent of those in power and on unauthoritarian human dignity). Responsible citizenship necessarily implies antimilitarism.

1. Introduction

Militarism is understood here to mean a system for the preparation and waging of war. As a corollary, the system requires obedience on the part of those subject to it. Obedience is a psychological and/or socio-psychological precondition for the preparation and waging of war. War is regarded here not only as morally reprehensible also as what the Dutch economist Tinbergen has called »the most blatant example of conterproduction«. Conterproduction is the destructive effect of certain forms of production (which also include vandalism and environmental pollution).

Efforts to combat militarism are expressed among other things in antimilitarism. This resistance is directed not only against the destructive urge which militarism elevates to a norm for human conduct. It also rejects the disciplinary model which forms the basis for all kinds of social norms and standards designed to inculcate obedience in the general public and to produce model citizens anxious to discharge their duties as »voter«, »employee«, »taxpayer« and »soldier«. Antimilitarism is not therefore simply the expression of moral indignation at the destruction of life. It is also concerned to denounce the role of the state in organising destruction on a systematic basis. In this sense, antimilitarism can also be regarded as a form of anarchism and disobedience to the state as an act of responsible citizenship.

I should like to warn here against a possible misunderstanding, especially in view of the subject matter with which I shall be dealing. Even if we imagine a situation in which the state has been replaced by an anarchist society, this would not necessarily imply the complete absence of any system of rights and duties. It goes without saying, for instance, that a society in which everyone would have sufficient for his or her would inevitably require a production system, otherwise there would be no means of satisfying these needs.

To put it another way, the duty »to produce according to ability« should be recognized as an absolute precondition of being able to enjoy the advantages of a social system modelled on the lines of »to each according to his needs«. I can see absolutely no reason why a system of rights and duties of this kind should not be classified as a legal system. It is after all a system of social cooperation, which gives rise to certain rights and duties. These duties are not imposed from above by the state but are inherent in the way in which the society in question is organised. Mechanisms to create and enforce rules can therefore exist even in systems where there is no state. These mechanisms are then rooted in the very social groups which are bound by the rules in question.

Antimilitarism in the Netherlands has at least two different roots, namely the labour movement and Christianity in its original form. One of the best known pioneers of antimilitarism was Domel Nieuwenhuis (1846—1919), ex-clergyman and later anarchist. He became an antimilitarist in 1872.

The doctrine of liberal pacifism was preached in those days by the Dutch Peace League, a far from radical organisation which existed from 1871 to 1901. The true radicals were the people and groups of (christian-) anarchist or syndicalist persuasion.

One individual whose background combined various of these facets was Bart de Ligt (1883—1938), an ex-clergyman. He was one of those who ensured that the peace movement devoted itself to the cause of developing a new pattern of conduct. This was to be characterised by a high degree of maturity, of what De Ligt termed »mental resilience«. This resilience was to be a state of mind, which would enable them to espouse the cause of non-violent action and to continue to regard their opponents as fellow human beings.

General community interest

It may at first sight seem strange to introduce a discussion of civil disobedience and responsible citizenship with a reference to the development of Dutch antimilitarism. Nowadays, after all, the term civil disobedience is used indiscriminately to cover everything from garage proprietors closing off a road to the masters of inland waterways vessels blocking shipping in a lock. What these acts have in common is that they are intended to promote the special interests of a given individual or group. De Ligt's point was precisely that civil disobedience involves matters of much wider import, and involves actions based for instance on the realisation that modern political and economic policy is essentially anti-Christian (see his speech on this subject in 1915).

One of the criteria for civil disobedience is that it should be in the interests of the community at large. Bart de Ligt made this distinction in 1916 when he was tried among other things for sedition. The charge was brought because he had taken an active part in a demonstration against national service. He maintained that refusing to take service in the armed forces as a matter of conscience is an act of the highest moral principle. In this way he implicitly introduced the idea of responsible citizenship. He described the act of refusal as a representative act: a conscientious objector sets an example which must ultimately be followed by people in general. De Ligt did not mince his words: he acknowledged that he was engaged in a struggle against the state as an instrument of violence. This is one reason why I prefer to speak of disobedience to the state rather than of civil disobedience. I shall deal with this point in section II.

One of the people who was involved, briefly but very intensely, in disseminating these ideas was the libertarian lawyer and social philosopher Clara Wichmann (1855—1922). Contemporaries marvelled at the way in which she could expound ideas of a radically antimilitarist nature in the most soft but compelling terms. She met Bart de Ligt in 1917 at the International School for Philosophy where she had lectured since 1916. With De Ligt and others she established the »League for Revolutionary Socialist Intellectuals« in 1919. In the same year she co-founded the »Committee for Action against the Existing Concepts of Crime and Punishment«. She was thus concerned with the defence of humanity in all its aspects.

De Ligt, Wichmann and others hoped to achieve their antimilitaristic aims through taking an active part in organisations such as the International Anti-Militaristic Association and the International Anti-Militaristic Bur-

eau. The function of the latter, for instance, was to convince the members of the working population that they possessed the decisive economic force and to encourage both individuals and the public at large to refuse to take service in the armed forces and to cease forthwith all war work of both a direct and an indirect nature.

New pattern of conduct

The world is today faced with the horrors of war on a scale hitherto unimaginable. Hardly anyone needs to be convinced nowadays of the dangers threatening us. What is now even more relevant, therefore, is to show that the new pattern of conduct to which De Ligt referred must be »lived« if we are to have a chance of survival. In other words, resistance is necessary. In the remainder of this article I shall expound various arguments in support of resistance.

To support my thesis I shall use texts produced by people of a similar persuasion both recently and in the more distant past. I shall not quote them individually in the normal way but shall instead list them at the end.

Section II deals with the subject of »Civil disobedience and the state«. Here I shall indicate the problems that arise in the use of the term »civil disobedience«, and propose instead to classify the various elements of resistance as »disobedience to the state«. A duty to obey clashes with a duty to resist, the two duties being derived from opposing views of life. I indicate how and why the two are interrelated, in some respects in a positive way.

In section III I shed more light on this by examining in some detail the idea of responsible citizenship. This involves a certain unit of style developed within a competing cultural model. At certain times responsible citizenship necessitates disobedience to the state, if only because of the fact that the state is an institute of violence and argues in defence of its own interests. As a responsible citizen the duty one owes to one's fellow man takes precedence over the duty one owes to the state.

People have no prior commitment to the system but only to their fellow citizens. Finally, I urge that we should continue to build upon the tradition of antimilitarism and serve notice that we resist.

2. Civil Disobedience and the State

Non-violent resistance, refusal to take service in the armed forces, responsible production, defence of humanity; all are acts of opposition which may be covered by the use of the term civil disobedience. The extent to which there covered depends, of course, on the definition one uses. If one accepts the definition given by a Dutch ethicist such as G. Manenschijn in his detailed study of the term, hardly any grounds can be advanced to justify acts of civil disobedience. I would have to disagree with him. Everywhere we look, nations are manufacturing nuclear weapons and other instruments of war on a scale which makes the word »overkill« completely inadequate, and

the survival of entire species of animals and plants is being threatened by wasteful and destructive methods of production and consumption. And all the while the people who work to produce the goods have little or no say in what they produce. Such situations (and I could give many more examples) can only be described as immoral. People who generate resistance to them and press for change do not act out of self-interest or in the interest of a limited group. On the contrary, they act to safeguard universal interests, to resist crimes against humanity and against nature.

Civil Disobedience

The resistance to which I have referred above can take many forms. One of them is civil disobedience. What kind of acts constitute civil disobedience? To answer this, many writers in Holland refer to the dissertation on »Law, Order and Civil Disobedience« by the legal sociologist C.J.M. Schuyt (Rotterdam, 1972). Ten years after publishing this dissertation, however, the same author indicated in a new study that there are a great many kinds of action and resistance (he lists around a thousand examples) which are not covered by the term civil disobedience as originally defined by him. His modified definition of civil disobedience is »in principle non-violent infringement of the law whereby a moral protest is made against some act or omission by political or administrative bodies«. It is therefore a form of protest on moral grounds or, as the English anarchist, activist and political scientist April Carter has said, »a refusal to act in accordance with a law which is intrinsically immoral or which unjustifiably infringes a person's rights«. The problem then becomes to define what one means by immoral and what constitutes an unjustifiable infringement of a person's rights. To answer these questions, people often have recourse to moral judgements based on their own personal conscience. Claiming exemption for oneself on these grounds as in the case of refusal to take service in the armed forces is one thing. It is quite another, however, to use one's personal convictions as the basis for action to compel other people to take a decision which they would not otherwise take. Whatever the case, the term civil disobedience necessarily implies open and non-violent action. Its purpose after all is to convince others of the justness of a cause.

To achieve this goal, it is necessary to work on many fronts; this means that before adopting a policy of civil disobedience all the legal and political means available to bring about the necessary change or to display resistance must have been used. It follows from the above that civil disobedience constitutes an infringement of the law which is out of the »ordinary«, particularly since it involves acceptance of the punishment (an extra factor included in most definitions of civil disobedience).

Disobedience to the state

In view of the above I prefer to speak not of civil disobedience but of disobedience to the state, because the open and non-violent resistance is

directed against the immorality of the state. The next problem, therefore, is to define what we mean by immorality. Economists of a given ilk may find the creation of national debt to be immoral, but even if they were to resist they could hardly be said to be guilty of civil disobedience. Needless to say, I am thinking here more particularly of crimes against humanity and nature (far-reaching disruption or destruction of the social and natural ecology), of the subjection of man and his natural environment to a destructive technology.

The state, seen here as a collection of agencies which have a multi-functional coercive monopoly in a given territory, is understood in this connection to be an organisational platform for the preparation and conduct of these forms of immorality. I would not of course suggest that the state was set up exclusively for this purpose or that the »state« cannot be defined in other ways. What I am concerned with here are the different facets of what I would call the »dominant state«.

Duty of obedience

One of the justifications usually advanced in the Netherlands for actions performed by or on behalf of the state is the existence of parliamentary democracy. The idea is that the individual members of society have agreed with one another that they will stand by the results of certain parliamentary procedures. These results are often referred to as laws or acts. Anyone who fails to observe the rules laid down in them is then said to violate the principles of the parliamentary democracy, i.e. to act »undemocratically«. It follows that the existence of parliamentary democracy is interpreted as entailing a duty of obedience. Parliamentary democracy is thus said to be the product of a kind of social contract.

Since the concept of a social contract has been criticised strongly in anarchist and other circles, I need not go into this here. The concept of the social contract can, however, be used to prove the opposite of what its advocates intend, namely to buttress resistance to the state rather than on legitimate enforcement of obedience. Furthermore, it is very much open to doubt whether every form of disobedience is undemocratic. Under some circumstances, there may perhaps be a duty to ignore rules. This is implicit in a maxim such as: »where justice becomes injustice, resistance becomes a duty!« The Dutch legal sociologist Bruinsma, for instance, said in this connection that the right to resist entails the moral defence of actions to disrupt public order, in principle on a non-violent and open basis, as a protest against official decisions or the lack of them. It is this right to resist of which I speak.

Right to resist

The right to resist is not in fact a new phenomenon. In ancient Greece there were »monarchomachs« who resisted the autocrats, and in the 15th

and 16th centuries a number of legal philosophers described themselves by the same term in relativising the power of the king. One of their theories, for instance, was the king should be obeyed insofar as he respected the agreements, but that he could be deposed if he disregarded them. The theories of the »monarchomachs« formed the basis of Dutch resistance to the Spanish king and eventually led to the Act of Abjuration, whereby the end of Philip's II rule was proclaimed in 1581. A similar argument can be advanced today. If it is alleged that there is a duty of obedience, then it can be argued that such a duty reviews the theory of the supposed social contract between the state and the subject.

This contractual element relativises the absolute duty of obedience. A contract rests, after all, on a mutual obligation. If the consideration provided by the state is inadequate or unacceptable (i.e. immoral), the citizen cannot be expected to obey the state **in this particular respect**. In other words, it is a question of selective obedience. Responsible citizenship may therefore necessitate disobedience, for instance if the state requires its subjects to be party to the violation of international rules of law. A good example is the »crime against peace« (as formulated at the Nuremberg Trial).

Two matters are central to a discussion of the principle of selective obedience. The first is that the concept of a legal order should not be dismissed out of hand. Instead it is the objectionable by-products of such orders which should be rejected. The second is the idea that there may be grounds for resistance if inadequate consideration is given to certain arguments in a decision-making process or if a given procedure fails to function properly.

The legal order

The following can be said with regard to the idea that the concept of the legal order should not be dismissed out of hand. Every legal order protects certain interests and fails to protect others. The question is: who or what is to decide what these interests should be? This is in fact another way of asking who has the power of appointment. An »étatistic« approach to the question would yield the answer that it was the government, parliament (the law). An anti-étatistic reply would be the individual or society.

The differences in the replies to question as to the source of the power to appoint may lead to a diversity of definitions of the content of the above-mentioned interests which can be protected within a legal order, but which do not necessarily have to lead to the rejection of every form of legal order. The maxim »your legal order is not ours« does not necessarily imply a rejection of every form of legal order. If the maxim is not interpreted as requiring the termination of the existing legal order, it still does not mean this order should be considered as not susceptible to any form of change whatsoever. I am convinced that it is possible both to work for a different social system (and in consequence for a different legal order as well) and at the same time to challenge the existing legal order to show whether it is capable of change.

Situations occur in which changing social norms become completely at odds with the standards of behaviour permitted by law. In such cases people who act in accordance with these new social norms are committing an offence under the law. What is challenged in this connection is not the legal order as a whole but the relevant element in the legal order. By legal order I mean here the entire body of mechanisms which are anchored in a conglomerate of social groups and are created for the purpose of creating and enforcing rules. In some cases the court is willing to pardon a person who has infringed the law by acting in accordance with the changing norms of society. Such actions should then be seen as carefully considered and morally justified infringements of outdated legislation. By outdated I mean in relation to the changing social norms. The court then rules that the offender has acted within the legal order, but in this case the law is formed by society itself. This is recognised by the court. People can also resist in other ways but at the same remain within the bounds of the legal order. This occurs for instance when principles such as »equal treatment« and »respect« are invoked. A society which permits buildings to remain empty at a time of great homelessness should be prepared for squatters to invoke »the right to accommodation« as a principle taking precedence over positive law. A similar situation occurs when people press for recognition of the right to refuse military service on the grounds of conscience and openly adopt an attitude of defiance to the relevant legislation. Such an attitude on the one hand involves the strategic use of the law, and on the other makes it crystal clear that the acts in question are not civil disobedience but disobedience to the state. In resisting the persons concerned are exercising their rights as responsible citizens, which they consider are being frustrated by the state.

This in fact represents not the end but the start of the discussion, because the next question is what is the source of the principles by which a person is guided in discharging his duties as a citizen. Does not (lead) living to those principles lead to what other sections of the population would term fanaticism? Examples abound of conduct based on the highest principles which may be derided or rejected by others. We all know of cases of members of religious communities who refuse to allow vaccination or insurance on religious grounds. I shall not go into this here. What I am concerned with is to say something about a possible link-up with disobedience to the state and non-cooperation. Non-cooperation is therefore based on a refusal to cooperate with instructions given by the state, which would make the individual concerned an accessory to a violation of international law. An example of this is the siting of cruise missiles, which constitutes a crime against peace.

Parliamentary decision-making

I now turn to the second aspect of the discussion on the right to resist. I posited that there may be a right to resist if certain arguments are not given due consideration in decision-making processes or if a given procedure has not functioned properly. By way of example I would refer to two pos-

sible scenarios which can occur at any level of legislative decision-making, i.e. even at the level of the local council. Both scenarios result in a »parliamentary decision«, but it is extremely doubtful whether they have the same effect in terms of their ability to legitimate actions and to compel individuals to obey them. If a decision is taken by a legislative body after mature consideration and without the imposition of a government whip, the procedure would seem to confer a reasonable measure of legitimacy on the decision, particularly if account is taken of the interests of minorities. It would be very different, however, if the decision were forced through by party whip with only a small majority, frequently after emotional and confused debates, lobbying and all sorts of other tactical devices. Although a resolution taken in this way would also be a majority decision, its legitimating effect would be nil. In a pluriform society minorities (some of them relatively large) may feel pushed aside, sometimes to such an extent that they feel compelled to resort to disobedience to the state. Many people have already pointed out that in such cases disobedience to the state does not endanger parliamentary democracy but is, on the contrary, a signal that the actions of the authorities are no longer democratic. And this is indeed, therefore, what happens. Needless to say, the people in power, i.e. those who are officially invested with power, do not see it like that. They see their power being undermined.

Double responsibility

It is hardly strange that people in power should feel threatened, because all kinds of action are indeed intended to bring about a radical change in the status quo in society. If a factory is occupied by the employees, this ought to be interpreted as a takeover of the management by the workers; squatting ought to be interpreted as a move to nationalise the housing stock; refusal to take service in the armed forces for reasons of conscience and the exercise of the right to resist ought to be seen as undermining the authority of the state to impose discipline and as constituting a political attack on the concept of state sovereignty. These inferred objectives point in the direction of the establishment of a society organised along horizontal lines, i.e. an anarchist society, or at least the abolition of a hierarchical society organised along vertical lines. If there is no overall alternative social plan into which these objectives fit systematically, such actions will very soon become confined to achieving an individual advantage or furthering a particular interest. Such action should always therefore fulfil two objectives: the immediate one of resistance and the more distant one of bringing about a new society. It is not sufficient simply to confront those in power.

In short, disobedience to the state does not relieve the persons in question of responsibility for contributing to the success of introducing a different social plan, on a step-by-step basis. This entails a double responsibility. First, there is the responsibility which is derived from citizenship, i.e. the duty to anticipate the elements of the new society. Resistance should never become blind resistance, however, because this often proves counterproduct-

ive. Second, it is necessary to realise that this alternative social plan must also be desired and accepted by others. The person taking action is therefore responsible for ensuring that this is the case. The maxim »your legal order isn't ours« can also have a boomerang effect in cases where the resistance is not directed exclusively against people in positions of power. Persons other than the rulers may justifiably say to those taking action: »Your social plan isn't ours«. The ever-present danger is that history will repeat itself. People may be so convinced that their social plan is superior to all others that they resort to political terror or become fundamentalist fanatics to achieve their finite objective.

3. Responsible Citizenship and Antimilitarism

The first question to be asked here is how are we to find criteria for a definition of responsible citizenship. The answer is that it is necessary to look at the history of our society. I think it would be useful to speak here of cultural models. I believe that we can identify two, a dominant model and a competing or alternative model. People adhering to the dominant cultural model are accustomed to thinking that if one wishes to have peace one must prepare oneself for total war. Their cultural style is based on the idea of deterrence, which is achieved primarily through the sheer quantity and gigantism. The underlying idea is to make people »subservient«, one of the first steps being to deter children from asking questions. Once children have had it drummed in to them that their father knows better, they will be more receptive to the idea that others in positions of authority over them such as their teacher, and later their employer, vicar, doctor, etc. know better. The ultimate step is to believe the politicians. The kind of state which such attitudes breed is a fascist state, for instance Mussolini's Italy. Seen in a given light, it is the result of what we may term a »disciplining« model, which can lead to all kinds of subjection and repression. Ideas of this kind have recurred throughout history, and because they are always identifiable by the same common denominators, I would describe them in a general sense as a dominant cultural model. I shall not go into this further.

Competing cultural model

Given the fact that the same denominators of dominance occur throughout the centuries, it is not so strange that the denominators of resistance to dominance have been the same down the ages. These denominators can be grouped together under the term »competing cultural model«.

A very early author who adhered to the competing cultural model was the French academic Jean Gerson (1362—1428), who taught in Paris. He believed that the socio-political community should be seen as an independent, autonomous corporation which arranges its own affairs without outside interference. Since the highest power is vested in the community, the person in the position of highest authority is merely the servant of that community.

Gerson concluded from this that a monarch who places himself above the law also places himself outside the community. In such circumstances, Gerson considered it completely legal for the subjects of the king to depose him. Gerson proclaimed that Christians were just as much subjects to a duty to promote universal peace as were kings. In this respect Gerson can be seen as a forerunner of pacifist humanists such as Erasmus.

The idea of a link between the holding of alternative views on the preferred form of political organisation and on people and how they should function within that organisation was apparent even in Gerson's writings. It was no more coincidence, therefore, that I came across Gerson in my search for the constant factors in a competing cultural model. Both Manenschijs, who sought ideas for his study of civil disobedience, and Bart de Ligt, who attempted to make a science of peace irenology, searched implicitly for constants. It will come as no surprise, therefore, if I say that I derived the information about Gerson from these two authors. Although there was a gap of six centuries between their work, all three writers clearly spoke the same »language«. It is the »language« which requires that the »honnête homme« should be used as the yardstick for assessing values. It is the language in which human dignity is displayed. Its primary purpose (to quote the Dutch polemicist Ter Braak (1902—1940) is to resist human beings who dedicate their lives to cheapening and betraying our values. At one point Ter Braak stated that he would assume the name of Don Quijote, not in order to tilt at windmills, but rather to be spend longer ambling at his leisure through what he described as the settled continent of Europe. A careful listener may detect the voice of Bakunin here: »I will continue to be an impossible person as long as those who are now 'possible' remain as they are«. Ter Braak knew how to preserve human dignity.

Responsible citizenship

The moral principles such as honesty, decency, justness and universality which underlie full and responsible citizenship, in other words the principles by which a decent person is guided, can be classified as the competing cultural model. A person who adheres to this model is guided not only by moral imperatives such as »do not kill, do not steal and do not lie« but also by the principles of equality and reciprocity which serve to legitimate our actions. These rules of legitimation refer to a given institutional form. Reciprocity and equality are such important ingredients of communal life that they can be classified as a public form of an LAT relationship (Living Apart Together). The reciprocity is given such great emphasis in order to express the fact that no one may demand something as his right which another is not entitled to by law.

This can be seen as a means of preventing people pursuing their own interests at the expense of other people's interests. The institutional form in which this reciprocity and equality is expressed is characterised by horizontal relationships. The citizen is no longer a subject (and as such subordinate to governments), but is a full and equal participant in the decision-making proc-

esses. This imposes special demands on the way in which the political decision-making processes are organised. If they are not already optimal, they should be improved by a process of what I would term »top reduction«, in other words decentralisation to promote levelling and ensure that the decisions are taken at lower levels, in short »anarchisation«.

Here too we can see again the twin concepts of an alternative political organisation and alternative ideas on people and their functioning within the organisation. Against the background of what I have here termed the competing cultural model, Manenschijn rightly submits that the rational realisation that these basic rules of morality are necessary if we wish to be able to live together and survive, compels us to give greater social effect to these rules. And this greater social effect will be obtained only when all the members of a society are able to take part on an equal and reciprocal basis in decisions on the institutional form which such basic rules of morality must take. Any government or political organisation which blocks or opposes this is in fact knowingly throwing down a challenge. As Bart de Ligt said in 1925, this concept puts us firmly in the opposition camp. »And it may perhaps remain the opposition standpoint . . . until the end of time. Nevertheless, it is the only standpoint worthy of a human being« (De Ligt, Geestelijk Weerbaar, 1925).

Antimilitarism

However one defines terms such as responsible citizenship, human dignity and human standpoint, they in any event imply renunciation of any part in war or preparations for war. Responsible citizenship includes antimilitarism. The rational realisation that leads to the acknowledgement of the necessity of rules in order to guarantee everyone's safety and means of existence, also results in the realisation that there is a moral duty to obey such rules as are in the interests of society as a whole and are intended to produce an ordered and non-violent society. Yet it is the same rational grounds that provide the basis for the argument in favour of a right to resist then the measures taken to preserve a given social structure are at odds with our dignity and values as human beings. Militarism is one such measure, if only because of the basic principle »do not kill«. Responsible citizenship thus provides both the moral duty to obey in order to preserve an ordered and non-violent society and the duty to resist anything which may endanger or undermine this moral duty.

The efforts to combat militarism and thus to defend humanity have been pursued in the Netherlands in a systematic manner by the two organisations referred to in the introduction namely the Anti-Militaristic Association and the Anti-Militaristic Bureau. One of the founders of the latter was Bart de Ligt (in 1921). He, together with Clara Wichmann (at that time an executive member of the organisation) and others both criticised systems which can support militarism and advocated the fostering of rational thought along the lines already indicated. At the same time they tried to arouse people's consciences and foster new thinking and to promote a totally different form

of education. De Ligt listed these three points as the weapons at the disposal of the antimilitarists. He also advocated non-violent resistance and responsible production. People should not only actively combat antimilitarism but also refuse to produce the means of destruction. Through his commitment and his analysis of the problem, De Ligt contributed to what he described as the »science of peace« (irenology).

He continued his educational work by establishing a Peace Academy in Paris, where the first summer course started in 1938. His work was later taken over by many others, in the Netherlands for instance by the centre for Non-Violent Resistance. The antimilitaristic movement has a long tradition. People who aspire to be responsible citizens can draw on the knowledge and strength of this movement to support them in their struggle. Now more than ever.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The arguments on which this article was based were drawn in part from the following literature:

P.H. Bakker Schut, T. Prakken and T. de Ross, »Politiek protest in de rechtszaals elementen van een politieke verdediging in openbare orde-zaken« (Political protest in the courtroom; elements of a political defence in public order trials) in **Recht en Kritiek**, 1984, no. 1; pp. 33—62.

»Bevrijding, een keuze uit het werk van Clara Meijer-Wichmann« (Liberation, a selection from the work of Clara Meijer-Wichmann); compiled and introduced by T. Holterman and H. Ramaer, Amsterdam (1979).

H. van den Brink, »Burgerlijke en bestuurlijke ongehoorzaamheid« (Civil and local disobedience); in **Tvo** 1983, no. 20; pp. 519—521.

H. van den Brink, »Burgerlijke en politieke ongehoorzaamheid« (Civil and political disobedience); in **Tvo** 1984, no. 7; pp. 143—145.

F. Bruinsma, »Ongehoorzaamheid binnen en buiten de rechtsorde« (Disobedience inside and outside the legal order), in **NJB**, 1983, no. 4, pp. 125—128.

F. Bruinsma, »Het recht op verzet« (The right to resist), Leyden, 1983 (brochure).

A. Carter, **Direct action and liberal democracy**, London, 1973.

»Geweldloos actief« (Non-violent action), published by the Foundation for the promotion of study and training in non-violent resistance, September 1966.

H.T.J.F. van Maarseveen, »Juridische vormgeving aan sociale actie« (Legal shaping of social action), report for the Belgian/Dutch Association for the Comparative Study of Law, Zwolle, 1974.

G. Manenschijn, »Burgerlijke ongehoorzaamheid; over grenzen aan politieke gehoorzaamheid in een democratische rechts- en verzorgingsstaat« (Civil disobedience: over the frontiers of political obedience in a democratic and welfare state), Baarn, 1984.

For various historical data I consulted the following:

J. Giesen »Nieuwe geshiedenis: het antimilitarisme van de daad in Nederland« (New history: the antimilitarism of the act in the Netherlands), Utrecht, 1925.

Fon Bart de Ligt, see:

B. de Ligt, »Nieuwe vormen van oorlog en hoe die te bestrijden« (New forms of war and how to combat them), Huister Heide, 1927.

»Naar een vrije orde; bloemlezing uit de werken van Bart de Ligt« (Towards a free order: anthology of the works of Bart de Ligt), Arnhem, 1951.

»Bart de Ligt, 1883—1938«, Arnhem, 1939; with an extensive bibliography.

With regard to »competing cultural models«, see:

A. Godfroy, »Netwerken van organisaties, strategieën, spelen, structuren« (Networks of organisations, strategies, games, structures), The Hague, 1981 (dissertation).

Th. Holterman, »Staatssoevereiniteit, democratie en domicillebeginsel« (State sovereignty, democracy and the principle of domicile) in the collection of essays »Gelijk geregeld; over de rechtspositie van duurzaam in Nederland verblijvende vreemdelingen«, Nijmegen, 1984; pp. 53—63.

I derived the problem of the »honnête homme« from:

M. Ter Braak, »Van oude en nieuwe christenen« (Of old and new Christians) 1937, Amsterdam, 1968.

M. Ter Braak, »Over waardigheid en macht; politiek-culturele kroniek« (On dignity and power; a politico-cultural chronicle), Amsterdam, 1945 (reprint).

I could also have referred in this connection to the socio-political works of Paul Goodman.

For a sound study of antimilitarism in the Netherlands and other countries, see:

G. Jochheim, **»Antimilitaristische Aktionstheorie, soziale Revolution und soziale Verteidigung; zur Entwicklung der Gewaltfreiheitslehre in der europäischen antimilitaristischen und sozialistischen Bewegung 1890—1940, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Niederlande«**; Frankfurt/Assen, 1977; dissertation.

For the same subject, but with particular reference to Arthur Lehning, see:

G. Jochheim, **»Arthur Lehnings Beitrag zur Theorie einer gewaltlosen Verteidigung von revolutionären Gesellschaftsprozessen«**, in the collection of essays H. Baumann, F. Bulhof, G. Mergner (eds.), **»Anarchismus in Kunst und Politik; zum 85. Geburtstag von Arthur Lehning«**, Oldenburg, 1984, pp. 27—40.

In addition to the above literature, I also referred to:

A. Carter, **»The political theory of anarchism«**, London, 1971.

J. Tinbergen, **»De economie van de oorlog«** (The economy of war), in **ESB**, 20. 2. 1985.

M. Walther, **»Anarchismus und Gewaltlosigkeit«**, Berlin, 1979.

ODGOVORNO DRŽAVLJANSTVO, ANTIMILITARIZAM I NEPOSLUŠNOST PREMA DRŽAVI

THOM HOLTERMAN

Dordrecht

Ukoliko građanska neposlušnost ima moralno utemeljenje, ona podrazumijeva da se prethodno pokušalo sve što se moglo učiniti unutar važećeg sistema (koji se osporava), da je akcija otvorena i nenasilna, te da podrazumijeva i spremnost da se prihvati kazna. Daje se prednost terminu »neposlušnost prema državi«, jer ukazuje na općenitost kao njenu bitnu dimenziju. Kriterij nemoralnosti kojoj se suprotstavlja jest zločin protiv ljudskosti i prirode. Pravo na otpor državnim aktima (temelj neposlušnosti prema državi) proizlazi iz demokratske konstitucije, kao što iz nje proizlazi i obveza poslušnosti demokratski donesenim zakonima. Neposlušnošću se može osporavati ona akta koji, mada doneseni korektnom formalnom procedurom, djeluju suprotno prešutnom društvenom ugovoru. Kako akcije neposlušnosti ne bi bile svedene na promociju individualnih prednosti i posebnih interesa, one moraju prihvatiti i dodatnu odgovornost da budu uklopljene u cjelovit plan stvaranja novog društva (na osnovi dokidanja hijerarhijske organizacije postojećeg društva). Odatle slijedi da akcija neposlušnosti, osim što anticipira elemente novog društva, mora osigurati da i drugi državljani žele taj alternativni plan. Odgovorno državljanstvo suprotstavlja se dominantnom kulturnom modelu (osiguravanja društvenog mira preventivnim zastrašivanjem) na temelju konkurentnog modela (koji polazi od zajednice neovisne o vlastima i neautoritarnog dostojanstva čovjeka), i nužno implicira antimilitarizam.

(sa engleskog prevela: Sanja **Vrhovec-Vučemilović**)