

A Soldier of Democracy

Preventing Insurgency through Democracy-Building

Dennis Dickson



Close-up of the Lincoln Bust at the
Gettysburg Address/Abraham Lincoln Memorial,
Gettysburg National Cemetery¹
(Photo use permission granted by Joseph McKenna.)²

Abstract

“It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us . . . that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion . . . that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain . . . that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom . . . and that government of the people . . . by the people . . . for the people . . . shall not perish from the earth.”

Closing lines from Abraham Lincoln’s “Gettysburg Address”³

You are a soldier of democracy. You belong to a military force for one of the world’s 89 functioning democracies.⁴ You are male or female, a commissioned or non-commissioned officer, a technical expert or private soldier.

During your training, you were taught to apply military force in the service of your country. You have used weapons under orders for peace-making, peace-keeping; and according to different rules of engagement.

At a personal level, you experienced the profound rewards of your profession. You learned about the passion of combat and the brotherhood of arms. Someone once described American football as chess with an ambulance at the sidelines. Military combat is chess with ambulances and hearses in the rear. Because death is so near, combat generates an adrenaline rush that is like no other. The danger of combat, combined with the comradeship of arms,

creates friendships that are like no other. The loss of friends will remain with you always.

As you matured, you learned there are good and bad officers, soldiers units and equipment. To your discomfort, you also discovered that every military operation has flaws. There is friction. You learned that the World War II acronym SNAFU, "Situation Normal; All Fucked-Up", is a regular part of military life. Therefore, you experienced first hand, or by word of mouth, the tragedy of military operations when they take civilian lives as an unfortunate and unplanned by-product. Because no democratic soldier intends to kill civilians, when it happens every soldier is seriously affected.

Finally, there are times when you question the morality of war and even the purpose of democracy. If you are presently in the field, you may find yourself asking, "What am I doing here?" These self-doubts arise because the democracy you serve has made you an individual. The democratizing process has given you freedom of thought and conscience. You are not part of a mindless, war machine. You are a soldier of democracy.

Democide and Democracy

If you are questioning your role as a democratic soldier, there is one key word that should answer your nagging doubts. The word is "democide".

Democide is a term invented by the political scientist Rudolph J. Rummel to describe all types of civilian murders by governments.⁵ It includes killings through genocide, politicide, mass murder, death squads and terrorism. By combining all types of civilian mass murder by governments through the concept of democide, he was able to discover some interesting research findings.

For example, Rummel estimates that between 1900 and 1987 there have been roughly 170 million democides in the world, the vast majority occurring within non-democratic states.⁶ That is his mid-range estimate. His high-range estimate is 360 million democides.⁷

To a very significant degree democracies have avoided the tragedy of democide, which is one of the most important factors establishing their political legitimacy. Although democracy has many failings, it works where it counts. In the memorable words of Abraham Lincoln, because democracies are "of the people, by the people, and for the people" they do not murder their own.



Raphael Lemkin

Because the purposeful killing of civilians by governments is a tragic part of human history, individual democides have been documented for hundreds of years.⁸ However, the study of democide as a general subject only began in 1933, when a paper written by Raphael Lemkin attempted to outlaw "barbarity" and "vandalism" through international law.⁹ The term "barbarity" referred to national, racial and religious murders while "vandalism" referred to non-lethal cultural crimes against humanity. In 1944, Lemkin purposely invented the term "genocide" to describe what was happening in Nazi-occupied countries.¹⁰

By his death in 1959, Lemkin had completed an unpublished four-volume study of genocide/democide. Although he failed to publish the book because of a lack of interest, the theme of democide was taken up by many writers afterwards. One example is Gil Elliot's *Twentieth Century Book of the Dead* published in 1972.¹¹ According to Elliot's statistics, 110 million persons had been killed between 1900 and 1968.¹² Sixty-five per cent (72 million) were civilian murders, which is much less than Rummel's figure of 170 million. A 2003 study by Barbaba Harff reported a range of 9 to 17 million civilian murders between 1955 and 1997.¹³ Finally, a 2006 article by Lewis M. Simons reported about 91 million civilian murders between 1900 and 2005.¹⁴

Although there are a wide range of statistical findings concerning democide, there is no doubt that Rummel's invention of the term is proving to be useful. The number of purposeful civilian killings by governments is much larger than expected. This leads to another of Rummel's discoveries, which is that over a comparable period of time democides have killed five times more civilians (170 million) than wars have killed soldiers (34 million).¹⁵ Furthermore, the ratio of five to one is a conservative estimate. If Rummel's higher estimate of 360 million democides is accepted, the ratio could be as high as ten to one. By comparison, Elliot's estimate of the ratio of civilian to military deaths was only 1.9 (72 million/38 million). As Raphael Lemkin grimly commented, "Genocide is not war! It is more dangerous than war!"¹⁶

The above findings help to explain the most significant event during the previous century, which has been the dramatic growth of democracies.¹⁷ In 1900 there were only 10 democracies.¹⁸ By 1972 there were 45 democracies. By 2008 there were 89 democracies.¹⁹

Why is the annual growth rate for new democracies increasing from 0.49 to 1.2? The answer is very simple. For a variety of reasons democracies do not kill their own citizens. During the twentieth century, citizens were creating democracies from the ruins of monarchies, dictatorships and totalitarian regimes because they want themselves, their children and grandchildren, to live. This primitive reality is often forgotten when evaluating modern democracy with all its faults.

Unfortunately, democratic soldiers do not have the luxury of forgetting. They must know the facts about democide. Most people are well aware of the dangers of war. In fact, they assume that war is the greatest made-made killer on earth. That is not the case. According to Rummel's conservative estimate, and other supporting estimates, democides far outnumber military deaths.

The U.S. Vietnam War Viewed within the Larger Context of Communist Democides

The subject of democide is crucial to understanding the history of the Cold War from 1945 to 1991. There were at least three obstacles which hid the larger picture of communist democides from Western society.

First, Western society was slow to discern the difference between communism as utopian ideal and political reality. Communism sounds great on paper. The historical reality was a different matter.

Second, Western society was slow to place the nationalistic aspirations of post-colonial countries within the larger context of the Cold War. In the case of Vietnam, people in the West saw an isolated former colony in double jeopardy, first shaking off the chains from one colonial master (France) only to face interference from another imperial power (the USA). On its part, communism was very successful in co-opting post-colonial nationalist aspirations for its own imperialist and expansionist ends. People tend to view the particular--that is Vietnam and other post-colonial states in isolation--and miss the general--that is, the co-opting ideology of communist imperialism.

Third, for a variety of reasons Western society was responsible for delaying the collection and dissemination of information about communist democides. The problem of denial and/or obstruction started as early as the Spanish Civil War (1936-39) when George Orwell witnessed the ruthless actions of mainstream (Bolshevik) communism against its revisionist (Menshevik) forms. From then on, Orwell focused several of his books on the dangers of totalitarianism in *Homage to Catalonia* (1938), *Animal Farm* (1945) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949).²⁰ Although other timely condemnations of communist democides were published on a regular basis,²¹ they did not arouse public interest. For example, Samantha Power notes that in the United States public recognition of genocide/democide did not occur until after 1970.²² Furthermore, this delay in public recognition relates only to the Second World War Holocaust. Recognition of democides in general, and communist democides in particular, did not take place until two decades later.

In the West, full recognition of the horror of communist democides did not occur until 1997, when former French communists estimated that communist regimes had killed about 100 million civilian victims.²³ On one hand, this figure supports Rummel's conservative estimate of 170 million total democides between 1900 and 1987. On the other hand, and much more importantly, the figure of 100 million communist democide victims reveals the real meaning of the Cold War that the West had been waging since 1945.

The contrast between how Western society responded during the U.S. Vietnam War then, and what it knows now, is dramatic proof that hindsight is indeed perfect.

Then, there was wide-spread public opposition to the Vietnam War throughout the West. Significant was the Pentagon anti-war demonstration on October 21st, 1967, documented by Norman Mailer in his Pulitzer-prize winning non-fiction book *Armies of the Night*.²⁴ Following the My Lai Massacre in 1968, anti-war demonstrations occurred in many U.S. universities, including Kent State, where, on May 4th, 1970, the Ohio National Guard killed 4 persons and wounded 9 others. This resulted in a national strike involving 900 colleges and 4 million students. American citizens vilified returning American soldiers by calling them "pigs" and "baby-killers". Without a doubt, the social consequences of the Vietnam War created tremendous negative influences on the morale of the American military which lasted decades. The Vietnam War Memorial in Washington, D.C., which was completed in 1982, has done much to continue the general mood of failure and condemnation.

Now, what was at stake during the Vietnam War becomes much clearer. With the sudden collapse of communism in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and the subsequent revelation of communist democides, the Vietnam War can be placed within a larger and more objective context. The real context was never a question of military victory or defeat, or even Cold War geopolitical strategy. What was at stake was a world-wide ideological conflict between democracy and communism.

Democracy offered freedom and effective protection of human rights. Granted, democracy was not then, and is not now, a perfected political system. Nevertheless, democracy's one great legitimacy is that it does not kill its own citizens.

Communism offered a totalitarian system which failed to protect human rights. This defect became evident after the Helsinki Accords (1973-75) when NGO groups such as Freedom House (est. 1941) and Helsinki Watch (est. 1978) began to monitor the violation of human rights within the Soviet Union and its satellites. In 1988 Helsinki Watch became Human Rights Watch.

As the revelation of democides became more generally reported and acknowledged, this also led directly to the second most significant development during the twentieth century which was the human rights revolution.²⁵ Following are only several of the many significant international developments to protect human rights:

- a) UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment for the Crime of Genocide (9 December 1948),
- b) UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights (10 December 1948),
- c) UN Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (28 July 1951, 1967 Protocol),
- d) UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (9 December 1966),
- e) UN International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (16 December 1966),
- f) Helsinki Accords (1973-75),
- g) UN War Crimes Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia (1993) and Rwanda (1994),
- h) Coalition military forces intervening in Afghanistan (2001),
- i) International Criminal Court (2002),
- j) Coalition military forces intervening in Iraq (2003).

Starting with Raphael Lemkin's obscure 1933 paper, it took 69 years (1933-2002) for the international legal community to implement his vision of "universal jurisdiction" where international law would protect the rights of citizens within their own countries. This creates another problem that will take decades to resolve, which is the loss of state sovereignty in the area of human rights.

Meanwhile, from 1970 to the present many organizations were established to promote democracy and safeguard human rights. There are now over 200 governmental and non-governmental organizations protecting human rights at international and national levels.²⁶ The International Association of Holocaust Organizations established in 1985 now has 271 members (194 in the United States and 77 elsewhere).

Unfortunately, the larger context of the democracy and human rights revolutions discussed above is rarely applied to the Vietnam War. Its greater

significance is almost completely forgotten. The U.S. Vietnam casualty figures are still interpreted as signs of an embarrassing military defeat rather than as an integral part of a wider and completely successful ideological Cold War.²⁷ Even more recent positive interpretations of the Vietnam War focus mainly on military complexities and avoid the larger ideological context.²⁸ Perhaps one can forgive the average Western citizen for failing to make the connection. However, a soldier of democracy must not forget. Every military training program should incorporate a democracy studies course to make sure that these important lessons are never forgotten.

Preventing Insurgency

What are the lessons that should be learned by every soldier of democracy? The subjects of democracy and human rights are so large that there are too many lessons to summarize. However, based on the contents of this article there are four key lessons.

1. Democracy's Legitimacy. The first lesson for democratic soldiers concerns democracy's legitimacy. The ongoing study of democide demonstrates that democracy and human rights are matters of life and death. From a negative perspective, democracies do not kill their own citizens. From a positive perspective, the democratic principle of freedom creates a culture of acceptance and cooperation amongst the many different stakeholders within a country.

The only practical way to handle many of the world's pressing problems, including democides, is to teach people to govern themselves through democracy. After spending many years collecting democide statistics, this was the conclusion reached by Rudolph Rummel.

I have never been so happy to conclude a project. I have not found it easy to read time and time again about the horrors innocent people have been forced to suffer. What has kept me at this was the belief, as preliminary research seemed to suggest, that there was a positive solution to all this killing and a clear course of political action and policy to end it. And the results verify this. The problem is Power. The solution is democracy. The course of action is to foster freedom.²⁹

* * *

2. The Defense of Democracy. The second lesson for democratic soldiers concerns the legitimate defense of democracy.

Within any state, the military provides a significant source of what Michael Mann calls "social power".³⁰ As described in a previous article,³¹ civilization is a complex organism--a "Gordian Knot" which literally cannot be untied or oversimplified. Although society contains many other important elements, Mann suggests that the modern state requires four main sources of social power. These are: (a) a religious/ideological center, (b) an economic center, (c) a military center, and (d) a political center. To use a limited analogy, they are the

vital organs without which the body (state) quickly dies. They are the heart, stomach, liver/immune system and brains of civilization, respectively. Without an effective military force, national sovereignty can neither be established nor maintained.

* * *

3. *The Promotion of Democracy.* The third lesson for democratic soldiers is the legitimate promotion of democracy in the international arena.

Just as Western civilization recognizes the legitimacy of modern police forces to protect citizens from murder and other internal crimes, so it now allows military intervention to protect human rights at an international level. The involvement of United Nations forces in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, the creation of the International Criminal Court, and the military coalitions presently rebuilding Afghanistan and Iraq, represent a significant shift in international law where human rights trump the older concept of national sovereignty. As retired general Tommy Franks noted in his biography, the coalitions that developed following 9/11 represent a fundamental change in democratic policy and military strategy. He labeled this important change a “crease in history”.

The world did indeed move through a crease in history in September 2001. Never again will democracies fight alone. The Coalition represents the way of war for the future.³²

At the center of this historical change is the soldier of democracy. International law has no authority until it can be applied by military force. Soldiers are essential for the defense and promotion of democracy.

* * *

4. *Insurgency Prevention.* The fourth reason why this article is addressed to “a soldier of democracy,” is to explain the future of democracy-building in terms of its insurgency prevention capability. Today’s democratic soldiers realize that a purely military response to insurgency is often ineffective. In Michael Mann’s terms, a more holistic response to insurgency requires that attention be paid to (1) the religious/ideological center, (2) the economic center, (3) the military center, and (4) the political center. A holistic response to military and insurgency problems was what made the Marshall Plan work after World War II. Search and destroy is not enough. Military victory is not enough. Even humanitarian aid is not enough. What is required is the creation of a “culture of democracy” that may have to be applied at the point of bayonets.³³

After spending years as co-chair of the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, this was the conclusion of David Hamburg. His 2002 book *No More Killing Fields* summarizes his study of 75 books and reports published by the Carnegie Commission during the 1990s.³⁴

Internally, democracies do not kill their own citizens.

Internationally, democracies do not go to war with other democracies.

Internally and internationally, democracies prevent military insurgencies by promoting diversity. This political strategy of inclusion heals the root causes of many insurgencies.

Because it heals the sources of social dissent, Hamburg concludes that democratization provides the most effective solution to all forms of violent conflict including insurgency.

* * *

In summary, this article properly addresses democratic soldiers because they put their lives on the line daily to defend democracy, to promote democracy, and to prevent insurgencies against democracies. Within the context of the democratic and human rights revolutions under way, soldiers of democracy are making a tremendous difference around the world.

Another purpose of this article is to introduce the concept of insurgency prevention through democracy-building. According to Rudolph Rummel and David Hamburg, promoting democracy is the most effective long-term policy to prevent future insurgencies. The question is: *Can democratically elected legislators see this?* Can they apply the policy of democratization to transition states such as Afghanistan and Iraq for the long term? Can they stay the course?

The difficulty in arguing for insurgency prevention through the method of democracy-building, is that the argument is very complex. To understand the concept of insurgency prevention, one must wade through the history of democide, the debate over democracy's legitimacy, and the current democratic and human rights revolutions. Because of these complexities, and the lengthy time period required for democracy-building, and its expense in terms of money and military deaths, insurgency prevention is always a hard sell. Nevertheless, preventing insurgency through democratization is the high road for long-term government policy. It works.

Conclusion: A Soldier of Democracy

When Abraham Lincoln gave his "Gettysburg Address", the fledgling American democracy had been in existence only 87 years. The Union was not only incomplete, but also it was in serious peril because of political conflict over its founding principle that all men are created equal. In the past was the growing European human rights tradition which included Magna Carta (1215), the Peace of Westphalia (1648), the English Bill of Rights (1688), the French "Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen" (1789), and the ending of European slavery (1815).³⁵ In the future were the democratic and human rights revolutions discussed earlier.

Therefore, Lincoln's talk of "a great civil war", and his appeal for dedication to a "new birth of freedom" and "unfinished work", were not empty rhetorical gestures. They were visionary words that are more easily understood now rather than during Lincoln's time. When viewed from within the larger context of the democratic and human rights revolutions currently underway, the American Civil War gains a more profound interpretation. For exactly the same reason, World War II, the Korean War, the Cold War, and the U.S. Vietnam War also assume a greater importance and legitimacy than public opinion has granted heretofore.

If you are a soldier of democracy, then you may learn one more valuable lesson that can be taken directly from Lincoln's speech.

The "great civil war" of which he spoke is now worldwide in scope.

The "new birth of freedom" is currently being undertaken by 62 transition democracies around the world including Afghanistan and Iraq.

Finally, our "unfinished work" and "increased devotion" refer to the noble cause for which many soldiers of democracy "gave their last full measure of devotion"--that government of, by, and for the people "shall not perish from the earth".

Notes

¹ The Lincoln bust in the photo was created by Henry Kirke Bush-Brown (1857-1935). It was dedicated at Gettysburg on 22 January 1922.

² Web source: www.flickr.com/photos/jpmckenna/247592594/.

³ During the American Civil War the Battle of Gettysburg was fought over three days, 1-3 July, 1863; leaving 51,000 dead, wounded or missing on both sides. President Abraham Lincoln gave his famous address during the dedication ceremony for the Soldiers' National Cemetery at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, on 19 November, 1863.

⁴ Since 1973, Freedom House has conducted annual reports on democracy by rating countries as "Free", "Partly Free", and "Not Free". Its ratings for 193 countries during 2008, reported in 2009, were as follows: Free = 89; Partly Free = 62; Not Free = 42. Other annual studies show quite different democracy ratings. For example, "The Economist Unit's Index of Democracy 2008" uses a four-category system as follows: "full democracy" = 30; "flawed democracies" = 50; "hybrid regimes" = 36; "authoritarian regimes" = 51. The total number of countries rated was 167. The present article's definition of "89 functioning democracies" uses the Freedom House ratings.

⁵ Rudolph J Rummel, *Death by Government* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1994).

⁶ Rudolph J. Rummel, *Statistics of Democide: Genocide and Mass Murder Since 1900* (Munster: LIT; Piscatway, NJ: Interaction, 1997).

⁷ Rummel, *Death by Government*, 9.

⁸ E.g., Ben Kiernan's *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 2007).

⁹ The paper drafted by Raphael Lemkin was titled "Acts Constituting a General (Transnational) Danger Considered as Offences against the Law of Nations". It was presented by another person to the fifth conference of the International Bureau for Unification of Criminal Law, October 14, 1933 (Fifth Committee of the League of Nations).

¹⁰ Raphael Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944).

¹¹ Gil Elliot, *Twentieth Century Book of the Dead* (London, UK: Allen Lane, 1972).

¹² *Ibid.*, 151.

¹³ Barbara Harff, "No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder Since 1955" (*American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 1, February 2003).

¹⁴ Lewis M. Simons, "Genocide and the Science of Proof" (*National Geographic*, January 2006), 30.

¹⁵ In *Death by Government* Rummel presents his comparison of democides and military war deaths in Table 1.6, page 15. Statistics for democides were compiled for the period 1900-1987. Rummel's figure of 170 million democide victims during that period represents a "prudent or conservative mid-range estimate" between low and high estimates (pages xix and xx). His statistical methodology for determining democide estimates is carefully explained in *Statistics of Democide* (Note 6 above). Statistics for military war dead were compiled for the period 1900-1980.

¹⁶ Raphael Lemkin, public papers. New York Public Library Collection. Quoted in Samantha Power's *"A Problem from Hell": America and the Age of Genocide* (New York, Perennial, 2002), 51.

¹⁷ Seymour Martin Lippsett and Jason M. Lakin, *The Democratic Century* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004).

¹⁸ Two references cite this number: James Bryce, *Modern Democracies* (NY:Macmillan, 1921), Vol. I, 4,22; Vol. II, 602; Bingham Powel, "Social Progress and Liberal Democracy," in Gabriel Almond et al (Eds.) *Progress and Its Discontents* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1982), 375-402; note 8, 378. Using different criteria other sources cite different figures for 1900 ranging from zero to 25 democracies.

¹⁹ The 1972 figure of 45 democracies is taken from the Freedom House 1973 rating for "Free" states. The 2008 figure of 89 democracies is taken from the Freedom House 2009 rating for "Free" states.

²⁰ George Orwell's real name was Eric Arthur Blair (1903-1950). The last two books mentioned had difficulty in finding English publishers because of their obviously anti-communistic content. This opposition is mentioned in standard Orwell biographies.

²¹ Following are a few examples. George Backer, *The Deadly Parallel: Stalin and Ivan the Terrible* (NY, USA: Random House, 1950). Raymond J. de Jaegher and Irene Corbally Kuhn, *The Enemy Within: An Eyewitness Account of the Communist Conquest of China* (NY, USA: Doubleday, 1952). Volodymyr Kosyk, *Concentration Camps in the USSR* (London, UK: Ukrainian Publishers, 1962). Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror: Stalin's Purge of the Thirties* (NY, USA: Macmillan, 1968).

²² Samantha Power, *"A Problem from Hell": America and the Age of Genocide* (NY, USA: Perennial, 2002), 73.

²³ Stephane Courtois (Ed.), *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression* (Translated by Jonathan Murphy and Mark Kramer) (Cambridge, NY: Harvard University Press, 1999).

²⁴ Norman Mailer, *Armies of the Night: History as a Novel, the Novel as History* NY: New American Library, 1968).

²⁵ Michael Ignatieff, *The Rights Revolution* (Toronto, ON: Anansi, 2000).

²⁶ Internet source of information: "List of Human Rights Organizations" www.wikipedia.org.

²⁷ Published U.S. casualty figures as reported in the www.wikipedia.org article "Vietnam War casualties": killed = 58,228; wounded = 153,452; missing = 1,740.

²⁸ Following are three recent examples of a positive interpretation of the U.S. Vietnam War. Lewis Sorley's *A Better War: The Unexamined Victories and Final Tragedy of America's Last Years in Vietnam* (NY: Harcourt & Brace Co., 1999). Michael Lind's *Vietnam: The Necessary War* (NY: Free Press, 1999). Richard Botkin's *Ride the Thunder: A Vietnam War Story of Honor and Triumph* (Malibu, CA: WND Books, 2009). To its credit, Michael Lind's book does discuss the larger ideological context of the Vietnam War.

²⁹ Rummel op. cit., xxi.

³⁰ Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power: A History of Power from the Beginning to 1760 A.D.* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1986); *The Sources of Social Power: The Rise of Classes and Nation States 1760-1914* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993). In Volumes I and II, Mann presents the thesis that "social power" arises out of four independent centers: (1) a religious/ideological center, (2) an economic center, (3) a military center, and (4) a political center.

³¹ Dennis Dickson, "Counterinsurgency's Gordian Knot" (*Alexandrian Defense Chronicles*, September 2009).

³² Tommy Franks, *American Soldier* (NY: Regan Books, 2004), 539.

³³ Mark Peceny, *Democracy at the Point of Bayonets* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999).

³⁴ David Hamburg, *No More Killing Fields: Preventing Deadly Conflict* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002). The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict operated between 1994 and 1997. Its co-chairs were David Hamburg and Cyrus Vance.

³⁵ European slavery was abolished during the Congress of Vienna 1814-15. On February 8th, 1815, the Congress passed the following act, "Declaration of the Powers, on the Abolition of the Slave Trade" (Act Number XV of the Final Act of the Congress). In its opening statement, the act recognized the concept of the "principles of humanity and universal morality". Because the Congress recognized the principle of human dignity, slavery was viewed as being "odious in its continuance".