

You are deceiving yourselves
placing hope in History, because it
does not absolutely deserve it

Dear friend,

Excuse me, please; if the following can seem boring, then I beg your patience.
I am sure it will be of interest.

It is evident that the objective and purpose of arms is to harm. In this regard, we should consider the elimination of this purpose. However, the question of total disarmament is not considered by us merely from a military perspective, but mainly from the economic, religious, socio-political, ethical perspectives. We are told that once the foregoing issues are resolved, then prosperous societies at peace with themselves may not even find it necessary to carry out disarmament; it may well be good enough for us to all live together peacefully!

This is just wrong. Disarmament is the crucial issue for peace because the very existence of arms inexorably places us in an unavoidable and immediate situation of confrontation and war. Cervantes puts it in Don Quixote this way: "they are one and the same, arms and war".

Actually this way of thinking is nothing peculiar; the states secret services, meaningfully called INTELLIGENCE, employ it. They do not consider if a religion or ideology is true, they are not interested in the other world, but in this one. This means for them just what people might be mobilized/ manipulated by an ideology, a religion.... I will not get deeper into it now. Indeed I feel myself Humanity INTELLIGENCE, and most of all, also, brought to be Secret Service too. I wonder if somebody is out there, if there is somebody out there with independence, if there is somebody out there with consciousness, if there is somebody out there with some lights...You will see.

No doubt, the intention of a weapon is to destroy and to kill. While a kitchen knife is intended for cutting and carving and, therefore, we are not anxious, alarmed, by its existence because we know that although it is capable of killing, this is not its purpose. Moreover, kitchen knives and all other objects, weapons excluded, are meant to serve and benefit us... but weapons are only meant to harm us.

This destructive use of weapons is secondary to its primary objective, namely, the purpose of threatening people and forcing their submission. We know that a weapon can be used to kill an animal but cannot be used to intimidate or threaten it for the purpose of forcing its submission (though domestic animals are also beaten or recompensed depending on their compliance or otherwise

with people's instructions). While weapons destroy at any point in time, they nonetheless have a constant intimidating affect which ultimately is taking away our freedom. **The simple arm existence means that one has to prevail and the other one has to submit or surrender because the arm is by default preventing all the time one side will.** This constant and persistent threat is the pure form of violence; therefore, **a common and agreed disarmament purpose will provide the basis for building the human community.**

Due to the intrinsic purpose of armaments (threatening, and forcing submission of the will), they can never be shared; this must be ineludibly disputed. While any object can be shared (a glass, a table, a computer, etc.), they satisfy our needs or desires and, therefore, hold certain criteria about when, how, by whom...they can be best used in a common sense way. This is not the arm case because it is denying one side will. We can not only share arms but we are ineludibly divided by them.

On the other side, whatever serves for something is subordinated to the arm, to the concrete Arm or armed unit, the state, and this is because actually to submit or to defy is what is at stake in all our relations as a consequence of the mentioned determination arm existence in nature generates on us. Rousseau says that once the first society was created (he characterizes such society as mainly unequal where one is submitted by the other); "all other people have to organize in the same way in order to keep independence, in order to exist; otherwise they would be swallowed, absorbed by the first one". Rousseau does not think that such event took really place in history, he is actually referring about the logical meaning and determination such "society" holds for human relation and that everyone of us can recognize in it by common sense.

That society, the state, is (or it is necessarily based in) an "armed unit". Rousseau does not get that deep into it as to understand that the mere arm existence is the cause of inequality. We can actually say much more about it: every armed unit implies a leader and a command chain. And the leader basically "serves" to deny all other people freedom. Only in this sense it can be assumed and explained that some kings or presidents might be silly, or crazy, or corrupt, or degenerated.... the leader does not require any skills as it would be required for any other task or work. The leader mere "existence" is here enough because it holds and represents a legitimate violence. And the real sense of it, in absence of a violence sense, is to be unique in front of any other possible violence that in this way is declared illegal, illegitimate, and delinquent. Most times state leadership is something people just inherit.

We understand any object meaning by its use and therefore its best use and we also understand objects are subordinated one to another and the supreme one is the Arm, this is to say; its enhancement, its improvement. Arms are indeed humanity top production anytime and anywhere -and we know this is our condition in the future because this is an *a priori* knowledge; this is,

deduced from its own meaning. For that reason also most civil technology is military development residua.

The difficulty to expose all what it is said above is that the Arm makes us also to believe or, at least, to confess what reality is; the way we represent and figure out the world. Whoever has power has the best argument. It only depends on which Arm won the last war. Now people fight for Democracy, for Islam, in the near past people fought for Communism and before for Christendom, etc. and always, logically, each one for his respective armed unit or state. Therefore, that what we are brought to believe is what suits the Arm intention; "that, which can serve to increase its power, this is; deeper control inside and bigger expansion and influence outside" -this is the shared understanding by both, Rousseau and Kant, of any state intrinsic purpose.

Now, when disarmament is under question in the UN, necessarily sponsored by the armed units, they consider a specific weapon destructive potential and they might negotiate its limitation or reduction and, above all, they might agree about dismantling obsolete weapons. But this disarmament questioning is self-defeating because arms development is, and is always looking for, being superior to its actual potential. This means in practice: resources that could be liberated by this partial disarmament agreement are invested in a new and more powerful weapons generation.

Official disarmament talk ignore or disregard the arm immediate and constant threatening effect of depriving us of freedom, and the possibility of common sense, of rationality (we do not care or consider that we are bringing people in other countries to starvation, etc). If we try to use common sense considering us each other as equals just by the virtue of that common sense it would practically be to defy the Arm, first of all our own Arm, our state -the Arm that submit us and let us go on living, consuming.

Yes, arms are imposing a world view, our figuration of it. But arms cannot actually deprive us of rationality and of common sense which let us understand, as it is here exposed, the use and meaning of things and, therefore, the "use" or rather, "effect" of the Arm on all us. This analysis shows that arms are actually the Arm. And that the Arm is acting now and ever in the same way and manner on all of us, dividing us. Therefore, the question is not longer to discuss, argue about any other issue but about to cancel that "effect", about putting it in brackets. And stopping the arm effect is exactly what the white flag service provides us.

It is not a question here of showing or waging the white flag to get rid at once of the state "structure", it goes about putting the white flag of humanity above all the other flags of the armed units and its anarchical and

contradictory supremacy on the world and on our fate for humanity evil. We will keep our linking and commitment with our respective states. But at the same time we all together are giving them, imposing them, the task we want them to carry out; disarmament, which on the other side is the way and mean to a new society; the Human Community.

Thank you for your time. I would very much appreciate if you can correct my English or if you let me know any question you might have about the writing.

At your service!

Manuel