AFRINDEPENDENT INSTITUTE

The Africonomics Theory of International Relations: A Natural-Moral Framework for Civilized Global Order

Author:
Manuel Tacanho

Published:
17 February 2026

Academic Paper:
No. 003/2026

Editorial Note: *The Africonomics Theory of International Relations: A Natural-Moral Framework for Civilized Global Order* emerges from and expands upon the foundational analysis developed in *Restoring Objective Morality: The Africonomics Refutation of Western Consequentialist Philosophies* (Tacanho, 2025), particularly subsection 5.6, International Relations and Global Order. This paper develops that section into a comprehensive, standalone framework that formalizes Africonomics' natural-moral law approach to international relations and global order. It offers a principled framework for understanding and ordering international human relations not through coercion, rivalry, or power politics, but through truth, justice, and peaceful cooperation.

www.afrindependent.org

The Africonomics Theory of International Relations: A Natural-Moral Framework for Civilized Global Order

Manuel Tacanho*

ABSTRACT

International relations theory is dominated by Western frameworks (realism, liberalism, constructivism, and their variants) that share a common consequentialist, statist, and Darwinian worldview. These frameworks deny the existence of objective moral principles governing human relations and instead treat power, survival, and strategic advantage as the ultimate determinants of global order. As a result, the modern international system has normalized war, coercion, economic domination, sanctions, regime change, and structural violence while presenting itself as civilized, rules-based, and morally progressive. This paper establishes the *Africonomics Theory of International Relations*, an alternative grounded in *natural-moral law*. Drawing on Africonomics' principled anthropology, the paper demonstrates that societies and nations are moral agents subject to the same universal principles of truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity that govern individual conduct. The paper exposes the Western order as fundamentally uncivilized, barbaric, and genocidal in its final logic, showing how its reliance on coercion, deception, and domination produces chronic instability, perpetual conflict, and mass suffering. It articulates a framework for principled international relations and positions Africa, through Africonomics, as uniquely situated to lead the world beyond the mechanistic-animalistic Western paradigm toward a truly civilized global order.

KEYWORDS: Africonomics, international relations, moral philosophy, social philosophy, anthropological philosophy, ontology, human nature, geopolitics, global order, natural-moral law, civilization.

---

* Manuel Tacanho (mt@afrindependent.org) is a social philosopher and economist; and the founder and president of the Afrindependent Institute.

Suggested citation: Tacanho, Manuel. 2026. *The Africonomics Theory of International Relations: A Natural-Moral Framework for Civilized Global Order.* Afrindependent Institute Academic Paper No. 003/2026.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction..... 3

2. The Crisis of the Current Global Order..... 4

3. International Relations as a Moral Domain..... 7

4. The Western Consequentialist, Statist, and Darwinian Paradigm.....13

4.1. Consequentialism in Western International Relations.....13

4.2. Statism and the Primacy of Power.....15

4.3. Darwinian Anthropology and Global Politics.....17

4.4. Why This Paradigm Is Fundamentally Barbaric.....25

5. The Africonomics Ontology of International Relations..... 31

5.1. Human Beings and Societies as Moral Agents.....32

5.2. Nations as Communities, Not Predators.....37

5.3. Moral Agency at the Collective Level.....40

5.4. The Rejection of Mechanistic and Animalistic Anthropology.....45

6. The Africonomics Framework for International Relations.....47

6.1. Natural-Moral Law as the Foundation of Global Order.....47

6.2. The Rejection of Power Politics.....54

6.3. International Institutions Under Africonomics.....57

7. Implications for Global Peace and Prosperity..... 60

8. Africonomics and the Rebirth of Civilized Global Order.....64

9. Conclusion: Toward a Civilized International Order..... 67

References.....71

Appendices..... 74

Appendix A: Contrasting Africonomics IR with Western IR.....74

Appendix B: Methodological Note: Why Africonomics Constitutes a New...../ /.....76

1. Introduction

The modern global order is in a state of crisis—philosophically, ethically, and structurally. International relations, as understood and practiced through dominant Western models such as realism, liberalism, and constructivism, have produced a world marked by perpetual conflict, structural injustice, economic manipulation, systemic corruption, and mass human suffering. Though these theories differ in emphasis—realism in power, liberalism in institutions, and constructivism in norms—they share a common fundamental flaw: none recognize the existence of objective morality, none are grounded in a universal moral law, and all fail to provide a coherent ethical foundation for how nations ought to relate to one another.

The prevailing international system assumes that states must compete for survival in an aggressive, amoral environment, reflecting the Western consequentialist, statist, and Darwinian paradigm. Deception, coercion, exploitation, and war are treated not as moral failings but as strategic necessities. The result is a world in which brute power determines legitimacy, and structural violence is normalized beneath the language of diplomacy, development, and democracy. Despite the promises of order and cooperation, the global status quo remains structurally unjust, chronically unstable, and fundamentally uncivilized.

This paper introduces the *Africonomics Theory of International Relations (ATIR)*, a natural-moral law framework for understanding, evaluating, and restructuring global order. It rejects the Western consequentialist and Darwinian view that reduces international relations to survival struggles, violent domination, and power maximization. Instead, it articulates a principled vision of civilized global relations grounded in moral restraint, voluntary cooperation, peaceful exchange, and sovereign equality rooted in dignity rather than force.

Unlike Western IR models, the ATIR framework views nations not as rivalrous power-maximizers but as moral agents, capable of choosing cooperation over coercion and peace over domination. It envisions a structurally just and fundamentally peaceful global order based on the natural-moral law principles of truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity; in which natural rights are respected, structural justice is fostered, sound money prevails, and political sovereignty is rooted in moral legitimacy, not imperial reach.

Africonomics redefines international relations as a domain of moral responsibility rather than a perpetual power struggle. It posits that the just, peaceful, and civilized ordering of human relations, within and among nations, must be based on natural-moral law (objective, universal ethical principles). These are not ideals to be selectively applied, but immutable foundations upon

which human relations, institutions, and systems must rest.

At a time when the world teeters on the edge of yet another global conflict, economic unraveling, unmasking of the so-called rules-based international order, and deepening fragmentation, Africonomics offers a philosophical and civilizational reorientation. It calls upon Africa, not as a peripheral actor but as a principled leader, to model a new kind of socioeconomic order and international engagement grounded in moral clarity and peaceful coexistence.

This paper exposes the moral bankruptcy of Western IR theory, demonstrating how its consequentialist, statist, and Darwinian assumptions generate violence and domination. It redefines civilization, showing that material advancement, institutional complexity, and geopolitical power cannot compensate for fundamental moral failure and barbarism. It constructs the Africonomics framework for international relations and situates Africa as uniquely positioned to articulate and lead a principled, superior alternative to the Western paradigm.

2. The Crisis of the Current Global Order

The contemporary international system, dominated by Western powers and shaped by consequentialist and Darwinian models, is in profound crisis. While presenting itself as a rules-based global order grounded in diplomacy, liberal norms, and institutional cooperation, its reality is far more coercive, hegemonic, and unstable. Beneath the rhetoric of peace and progress lies a global architecture built on statism, racism, militarism, fiat monetary dominance, and a Darwinian logic of survival and supremacy.

This system is a projection of Western power, forged through centuries of imperialism, colonialism, and economic subjugation. Its institutional pillars—international financial institutions, trade agreements, development agencies, and security alliances—serve not as instruments of justice but as mechanisms of global control. The United Nations, World Bank, IMF, and World Trade Organization operate within frameworks that privilege dominant powers while constraining the sovereignty of weaker states.

Despite unprecedented technological advancement, global institutions, and claims of moral progress, the world remains defined by permanent war, geopolitical instability, economic coercion, sanctions regimes, proxy conflicts, forced migration, institutional corruption, and deepening civilizational decline. Far from converging toward peace, the modern global order has

normalized deception, exploitation, and violence as instruments of governance and domination.

The Western paradigm is fundamentally flawed; it is morally hollow and rotten at its philosophical root. Its guiding theories of international relations fail to account for objective ethical truth and human moral nature. Realism regards power as the only currency of international affairs, reducing nations to amoral actors in a perpetual state of conflict. Liberalism, while professing cooperative ideals, relies on technocratic control and institutional coercion, often serving as a façade for imperial interests. Constructivism, though more flexible, offers no moral anchor, rendering international norms susceptible to manipulation and ideological capture.

What unites these approaches is their rejection of universal moral law. They treat international conduct as a strategic game in which principles like justice and peace are aspirational at best and disposable at worst. As a result, coercion is institutionalized, war is normalized, and domination is rationalized.

This is most evident in economic warfare and monetary imperialism. The global fiat system, centered on the U.S. dollar, grants disproportionate power to the United States and its allies, who wield monetary policy as a geopolitical weapon. Sanctions, debt traps, and currency devaluation schemes are deployed under the guise of economic development but function as tools of coercion, dispossession, and control. This system is underwritten by the threat of military force, as evidenced by the fates of nations that have challenged dollar hegemony.

These dynamics are not isolated events but structural outcomes of a worldview that sees human relations among individuals and nations as racial, rivalrous, Darwinian, and inherently conflictual. As long as the Western worldview dominates, global peace and justice will remain impossible.

The result is a world marked by continuous conflict, chronic instability, and mass human suffering. From ongoing crises in the Middle East to the debt dependency of African nations, from autocratic systems cloaked in democratic formalism to the ever-looming threat of nuclear annihilation, the evidence is overwhelming: the Western paradigm is not only corrupt and dysfunctional; it is fundamentally unjust, violent, and barbaric. This crisis of global governance demands a fundamental philosophical and moral transformation.

Within the Western framework, morality is treated as subjective, instrumental, or secondary to power. War is a policy option. Sanctions that immiserate civilian populations are framed as legitimate tools. Regime change, economic subjugation, and political destabilization are justified

as necessary. Sovereignty is nominally and selectively respected. International law is applied asymmetrically. Human dignity is nominal and subordinated to strategic interest. In effect, the modern international system operates on the animalistic premise that might makes right—that the strong take what they can, and the weak endure what they must.

This worldview is often defended as realism. In truth, it is barbarism.

The Africonomics framework begins from a fundamentally different premise: *human beings are moral agents, and so are the societies and nations they form*. Objective moral principles are not cultural artifacts or ideological preferences; they are universal realities emanating from the Creator (God) and from human nature as beings with an inherent capacity for ethical discernment, logical reasoning, and moral responsibility. Consequently, international relations cannot exist outside morality. A global order that systematically violates the natural-moral law principles of truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity is structurally violent, uncivilized, barbaric, and fundamentally opposed to human flourishing.

The Africonomics Theory of International Relations reveals the fundamental flaws of Western IR theory. It advances a principled alternative: a natural-moral law framework for justice, peace, and dignity in international human relations. This framework rejects materialist, Darwinian, and animalistic assumptions. Africonomics recognizes and affirms that humans are not advanced animals shaped by instinct or random evolution in a perpetual struggle for survival, but moral beings with inherent dignity, ethical discernment, and capacity for peaceful cooperation and structural justice.

At stake is not merely a theoretical debate within international relations scholarship. What is at stake is the moral and civilizational architecture of global governance. A world governed by coercion, domination, and moral relativism cannot be structurally just, peaceful, stable, or civilized. Only by restoring moral clarity—by recognizing that justice, nonaggression, and human dignity bind nations no less than individuals—can humanity move beyond perpetual conflict toward a truly civilized global order.

Africonomics offers this clarity. It does not promise utopia; it provides a natural-moral law approach to human relations and global governance. It does not sanctify power; it restrains it. And it does not accept barbarism masquerading as realism; it names it and rejects it.

3. International Relations as a Moral Domain

The Myth of Value-Free International Relations

The dominant Western frameworks of international relations—realism, liberalism, and constructivism—operate on a false premise that international politics can be studied and conducted in a morally neutral, "value-free" manner. This notion, inherited from positivist social science, treats the conduct of states as empirical phenomena to be observed and predicted, rather than as moral actions subject to ethical evaluation and constraint.

As established in *The Ethical Foundations of Economics: Beyond the Myth of Value-Free Social Science* (Tacanho, 2025), the claim of value-neutrality is neither intellectually coherent nor practically attainable. It is a false and destructive myth in modern social thought. That work challenges the prevailing assertion that economics and other social sciences can or should be "value-free"—a notion rooted in Western positivist, materialist, and utilitarian philosophical models. These frameworks, by excluding ethics from theory and policy formulation, have produced a legacy of dehumanizing, coercive, and often destructive systems. The result is an academic and policy tradition that enables fraud, force, and exploitation under the veneer of scientific neutrality.

The same critique applies with even greater force to international relations. If economics—the social science that studies human action, production, and exchange—cannot be ethically neutral, then international relations—which involves war, conquest, treaty obligations, sovereignty, and the exercise of coercive power across borders—certainly cannot be. The stakes are too high, the consequences too grave, and the moral dimensions too obvious to sustain the pretense of value neutrality.

Yet this pretense persists. Realism explicitly rejects moral considerations as naïve sentimentalism, insisting that states must pursue power and security in an anarchic world regardless of ethical constraints. Liberalism, while employing the language of rights and cooperation, subordinates moral principles to institutional mechanisms and strategic calculations. Constructivism acknowledges the role of norms and ideas but treats them as socially constructed variables rather than objective moral truths, thereby reducing ethics to cultural preferences and power dynamics.

The consequence of this moral abdication is a global order governed not by justice but by force, not by principle but by expediency, not by truth but by deception, and not by natural-moral law but by arbitrary law. International law has been a tool of the powerful rather than a constraint

upon them. Humanitarian intervention serves imperial interests. Economic sanctions devastate civilian populations while claiming moral legitimacy. Regime change is justified through utilitarian calculus. The result is not a stable, peaceful order but a system of permanent conflict, structural violence, and normalized barbarism.

This brutish condition is not accidental; it is the logical outcome of treating international relations as a morally neutral domain in which might makes right and ethical considerations are either referenced rhetorically or dismissed as impediments to strategic calculation.

Western theories of international relations rest on a fundamentally flawed conception of human nature, morality, and social order. Whether articulated through realism's power politics, liberalism's technocratic institutionalism, or constructivism's moral relativist social engineering, Western IR theory shares a common fundamental flaw: the rejection of objective, universal moral principles as binding on states and societies.

The Inescapability of Moral Judgment in International Affairs

International relations are not, and cannot be, morally neutral. Every foreign policy decision, every diplomatic stance, every act of war or peace, every treaty signed or violated, involves moral choices with profound consequences for human lives and dignity. To claim otherwise is not scientific objectivity—it is moral evasion.

Consider the fundamental questions that define international relations:

- *Is war ever justified?* This is not a technical question about military strategy; it is a moral question about when, if ever, the use of lethal force against other human beings is permissible.
- *Do states have obligations to respect the sovereignty of other nations?* This cannot be answered without a theory of political legitimacy, rights, and moral duties.
- *Are economic sanctions that cause mass suffering morally acceptable tools of statecraft?* No amount of technical or strategic analysis can evade the ethical dimensions of this question.
- *What obligations do wealthy nations have toward impoverished ones?* This requires moral reasoning about justice, exploitation, and human solidarity.
- *Is preventive war permissible?* This depends on one's moral framework regarding aggression, self-defense, and proportionality.

Each of these questions, and many others like them, requires moral assessment. They cannot be answered through empirical observation alone, nor through strategic calculation divorced

from ethical principle. The attempt to do so does not eliminate moral considerations; it merely conceals them, allowing unstated and unexamined moral assumptions to operate unchallenged.

When realists claim that states must pursue power to survive, they are making a moral claim that survival justifies aggression, that national interest trumps universal principles, that the strong have no duty to the weak. When liberals advocate for international institutions, they presuppose moral premises about cooperation, law, and collective governance. When constructivists analyze how norms evolve, they implicitly make judgments about which norms are legitimate and which are oppressive.

The question, then, is not whether international relations involve morality; it inescapably does. The question is whether scholars will acknowledge this fact and reason explicitly about moral principles, or continue the self-deception that global politics can be conducted in an ethical vacuum.

Power, Violence, and Legitimacy in Global Affairs

At the heart of international relations lies the question of power: who wields it, how it is exercised, and what legitimizes its use. Western IR theory, in its various forms, treats power as either the sole currency of international affairs (realism) or as something to be managed and channeled through institutions (liberalism). Neither approach adequately addresses the moral dimensions of power.

Power, in itself, is morally neutral—a capacity to act and effect change. However, its exercise is never morally neutral. When a state deploys military force, imposes economic sanctions, or intervenes in another nation's affairs, it engages in acts with profound moral significance. The question is not whether these acts involve power, but whether they are ethically legitimate and just, that is, aligned with natural-moral law.

Violence, particularly state violence in international affairs, poses the starkest moral challenge. War is the most extreme form of collective human action, organized killing on a massive scale. Yet dominant IR theories treat war as a routine feature of international politics, a tool of statecraft subject only to strategic calculation. Realism views war as inevitable in an anarchic system. Liberalism seeks to constrain it through international law and institutions but offers no principled basis for determining when war is legitimate. Constructivism examines how attitudes toward war evolve, but it provides no moral standard by which to evaluate and judge them.

This normalization of violence is morally indefensible. War involves the deliberate destruction

of human life and property, typically on a large-scale. It inflicts suffering on combatants and civilians alike. It destroys communities, displaces populations, and leaves legacies of trauma that persist for generations. To treat such devastation as merely a "policy option" is to abandon any pretense of moral seriousness. Indeed, it demonstrates a fundamental moral bankruptcy.

The legitimacy of state action in international affairs cannot be determined by power alone. A powerful state that invades its neighbor, subjugates populations, imposes monetary imperialism, or exploits weaker nations does not acquire legitimacy through its violent success. Legitimacy must be grounded in justice—in adherence to natural-moral law principles that bind all human actors, whether individuals or states.

This requires rejecting the Hobbesian premise that underlies much of Western IR theory; the notion that in the absence of a global sovereign, states exist in a "state of nature" where no moral constraints apply. This premise is false. Moral principles do not require a central enforcer to be valid. Justice, nonaggression, and respect for human dignity are not created by governments; they precede them. These principles apply to states no less than to individuals, and their violation, whether by powerful or weak nations, remains unjust.

The False Separation of Ethics and International Politics

Western international relations theory rests on a false dichotomy: the notion that ethics belongs to the realm of ideals while politics operates in the realm of reality. This separation is often presented as hard-headed realism, but it is, in fact, philosophical confusion and moral hollowness.

The supposed distinction between *ought* and *is*, between moral ideals and political reality, collapses upon examination. Political actions are always taken for reasons, and those reasons inevitably involve judgments about what is desirable, permissible, or obligatory. Even the most cynical power-maximizing behavior presupposes a normative claim that power is worth pursuing, that state survival justifies aggression, and that national interest overrides other considerations.

Moreover, the claim that ethics has no place in international politics is itself an ethical claim—a claim about what states should do, namely, prioritize power over principle. This claim is not self-evident; it must be argued for, and any such argument necessarily enters the domain of moral reasoning.

The separation of ethics from international politics also rests on a fundamental misunderstanding of ethics. Western IR theorists often treat ethics as synonymous with utopian

idealism, impractical moralism, or naïve sentimentalism. They contrast this with the "hard realities" of power, conflict, and national interest. Yet this caricature bears no resemblance to serious moral philosophy.

Ethics, properly understood, is not about wishful thinking or ignoring constraints. It is about identifying principles of right action and reasoning about their application in concrete circumstances. It is about the recognition of human moral nature itself. A sound ethical framework for international relations does not ignore power; it asks how power should be exercised. It does not deny conflict; it asks how conflicts should be resolved or avoided. It does not pretend that states always act justly; it establishes standards by which their actions can be judged.

The Africonomics framework rejects this false separation. It insists that international politics, like all human action, is inescapably moral. Therefore, states are not autonomous entities with interests independent of the human beings who constitute them. States are human institutions, created and directed by moral agents, not mechanistic or animalistic beings. Their actions—whether war or peace, trade or sanctions, cooperation or coercion—are subject to the same moral principles that govern individual conduct.

This does not mean that international relations are simple or that moral principles yield easy answers to complex geopolitical questions. It means that the difficulty of applying moral principles does not excuse trying. It means that strategic considerations must be evaluated within a moral framework, not elevated above it. It also means that a global order built on the systematic violation of moral principles is animalistic and barbaric, and it cannot be stable, just, or civilized.

Africonomics' Rejection of Value-Free Global Order

Africonomics offers a principled, human-centered alternative to the morally bankrupt models of Western IR theory. It affirms the centrality of truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity in human relations and institutions, not as aspirational ideals, but as binding universal principles.

Instead of treating humans as mechanistic, amoral, or animalistic actors driven by material interests and power calculations, Africonomics recognizes the dignity, agency, and ethical discernment inherent to human nature. Human beings are not advanced animals shaped by instinct or locked in a Darwinian struggle for survival. They are moral beings with the capacity for reason, cooperation, and justice. This objective reality applies no less to nations than to individuals.

As it is only through a principled approach that human relations within nations can become structurally just, peaceful, and civilized, so too can international human relations achieve peace, stability, justice, and civilization only through grounding in natural-moral law.

An ethically grounded approach to international relations, aligned with natural-moral law, fulfills the legitimate purpose of statecraft: to advance justice, security, and peaceful human cooperation within and among societies. Without ethical foundations, international relations degenerate into sophisticated barbarism—an arbitrary and brutish system where the strong dominate the weak, where violence is normalized, and where human dignity is sacrificed to strategic expediency.

The Africonomics Theory of International Relations provides the philosophical and moral foundation for a different path. It does not promise the elimination of all conflict or the creation of a utopian world government. It does insist that international relations be governed by the same moral principles that govern all human conduct: respect for life, property, and dignity; adherence to truth and contractual obligations; and the rejection of aggression and coercion.

This is not naïve idealism; it is *moral realism*—the recognition that a global order built on injustice cannot endure, that violence begets violence, and that only a principled foundation can support structural justice, productive peace, and civilizational flourishing.

The prevailing Western models have failed. They have produced not order but chaos, not peace but perpetual conflict, not justice but systemic exploitation and structural violence. Their claim to value-neutrality and scientific objectivity is exposed as a cover for moral abdication and the rationalization of domination and barbarism.

Africonomics offers a more coherent and constructive alternative. It brings international relations back to its proper foundation, recognizing that it is not concerned with abstractions called "states" but communities of human beings whose lives, dignity, and flourishing matter. It insists that the same moral principles that forbid an individual from murdering, stealing, or defrauding his neighbor also forbid states from waging unjust wars, violating sovereignty, or exploiting weaker nations.

The acknowledgment that international relations are, first and foremost, a moral question is the starting point for any truly civilized global order.

4. The Western Consequentialist, Statist, and Darwinian Paradigm

4.1. Consequentialism in Western International Relations

For centuries, Western intellectual traditions have been shaped by consequentialist philosophies that define morality not by adherence to objective principles, but by the evaluation of outcomes. Rooted in utilitarianism, pragmatism, and materialism, consequentialism assesses the moral worth of actions by their perceived utility, efficiency, or strategic payoff. Within this framework, principles possess no intrinsic authority; they are contingent, negotiable, and ultimately expendable whenever they obstruct a desired result. Moral restraint is treated not as a requirement of justice, but as a variable to be overridden in pursuit of collective advantage or state interest.

This consequentialist logic has profoundly shaped Western international relations theory and practice. Whether expressed through realist calculations of power and national interest, liberal rationalizations of humanitarian intervention, or constructivist appeals to evolving norms and identities, Western IR operates on a shared foundational premise that *outcomes take precedence over principles*, that moral considerations are subordinate to strategic objectives, and that actions are justified by their results rather than by their conformity to universal moral law.

In realist theory, this manifests as the open dismissal of morality as irrelevant to international politics, where survival, power maximization, and strategic advantage define rational action. In liberal internationalism, consequentialism reappears in a moralized form—where coercion, intervention, sanctions, and even war are justified as necessary means to produce ostensibly good outcomes such as democracy, human rights, or global stability. Constructivist approaches, while emphasizing norms and identities, remain consequentialist insofar as they treat moral standards as socially constructed, mutable, and contingent upon historical context rather than grounded in objective truth.

Across these frameworks, a common logic persists: *the ends justify the means*. Human suffering, civilian deaths, economic devastation, political destabilization, and long-term societal collapse are routinely accepted as regrettable but permissible "costs" of achieving strategic or ideological goals. Sovereignty is conditional, human rights are selectively enforced, and peace is pursued through violence, so long as the anticipated outcome aligns with prevailing interests or moral narratives defined by power.

As established in *Restoring Objective Morality: The Africonomics Refutation of Western Consequentialist Philosophies* (Tacanho, 2025), consequentialism is a fundamentally flawed and dehumanizing moral framework. By reducing ethical judgment to outcome-based calculation, it instrumentalizes human beings as means to political ends, denying their inherent dignity, moral agency, and natural rights. It erases the distinction between justice and expediency, replacing moral truth with shifting standards determined by those who wield power.

Africonomics rejects this foundation entirely. It grounds human action, social order, and international relations in natural-moral law—objective, universal, and binding principles that apply regardless of circumstance, interest, or anticipated benefit. From this perspective, no outcome can justify violating truth, justice, nonaggression, or human dignity. Moral principles are not constraints on effective action; they are the conditions of legitimacy for any action or system that claims to be civilized.

Consequentialism's dominance in Western IR has produced what Africonomics identifies as sophisticated barbarism, a global order marked by legal formalism and rhetorical moralism, yet structurally reliant on coercion, deception, militarism, and domination. As Tacanho observes in *Restoring Objective Morality*:

> Sound foundations matter. Moral relativism is no morality at all. Frameworks based on arbitrary ethics inevitably yield arbitrary institutions—economic, legal, and political systems that mirror their own moral instability. Consequentialism, in this sense, enables the sophisticated barbarism of the modern West: a global order built on statism, militarism, and the calculated subordination of moral truth to political and material ends.

In this sense, Western international relations theory does not merely tolerate moral corruption; it institutionalizes it. By rejecting objective morality, it renders restraint irrational, justice optional, and violence administratively acceptable. Africonomics exposes this paradigm not as realism or pragmatism, but as a civilizational regression that mistakes power for legitimacy and confuses domination with order.

The consequentialist foundation inevitably produces systemic aggression, normalized injustice, and perpetual conflict. Thus, a civilized global order requires a complete departure from the Western consequentialist paradigm toward a natural-moral framework grounded in truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity.

The Africonomics Alternative: Objective Morality in International Relations

Africonomics offers a fundamental alternative to consequentialism by affirming the primacy of objective moral principles over expedient outcomes and grounding international relations in

natural-moral law: respect for life, property, and dignity; adherence to truth and contractual obligations; and rejection of aggression and coercion.

Within this framework, the ends do not justify the means; unjust wars remain unjust regardless of victory, sanctions that starve civilians are not legitimized by strategic compliance, and regime change operations are not vindicated by installing preferred governments. Human rights, democracy, and peace are not instrumental values invoked when convenient but reflections of moral principles about human dignity, self-determination, and civilized social order that must be pursued through consistent means, never through their violation. Civilian suffering is never an acceptable "cost" of policy objectives because human beings possess inherent dignity that renders them inviolable ends in themselves, not expendable means to state objectives.

By restoring objective morality as the foundation of international relations, Africonomics charts a path toward a truly civilized global order rooted in respect for human dignity, liberty, and agency rather than power, manipulation, and utilitarian calculation. This is not idealism divorced from reality, but moral realism in recognition that only a principled foundation can support structural justice, productive peace, and civilizational flourishing.

4.2. Statism and the Primacy of Power

What is commonly described as capitalism in the modern world is, in reality, statism. As demonstrated in *The Myth of Modern Capitalism: Why the Western Economic Order Is Statist, Not Free-Market* (Tacanho, 2026), contrary to entrenched academic and popular belief, contemporary Western economies are not free-market capitalist systems but heavily statist orders characterized by extensive state control over economic and social life.

While Western nations retain certain surface elements of capitalism, such as private property titles, consumer markets, and entrepreneurial activity, these features operate within a framework dominated by coercive state power. Governments exercise comprehensive control through confiscatory taxation, chronic deficit spending, debt monetization, regulatory command, fiat monetary manipulation, and centralized management of economic and social relations. Even the United States, widely portrayed as the archetype of capitalism, is a heavily statist system in which market coordination is systematically subordinated to political direction. Structurally, Western economies operate closer to socialism than to true free-market capitalism—with most falling between Stage 3 (mixed economy) and Stage 4 (economic fascism) on the Scale of Statism.

This mischaracterization has profound implications for international relations. The global

order constructed and maintained by Western imperial powers is not an order of voluntary exchange, sound money, and peaceful cooperation—as true free-market capitalism would require—but a statist architecture of control, extraction, and coercion. The widespread belief that Western nations embody free-market capitalism allows interventionist states to posture as defenders of economic freedom while enforcing systems of domination that distort markets, destabilize nations, and systematically impoverish societies at home and abroad.

By conflating statism with capitalism, prevailing discourse obscures the real sources of structural injustice, chronic instability, and systemic inequality. Critics of "capitalism" misidentify the cause of economic and social harm, attributing to markets what are in fact the consequences of state intervention. At the same time, defenders of the status quo invoke the rhetoric of free markets to legitimize a structurally violent system built on political privilege, centralized control, systemic manipulation, and institutionalized coercion. This dual distortion shields statism from accountability while discrediting genuine market order.

Understanding this distinction is essential for any serious analysis of international relations. The contemporary global system is not shaped by the moral coordination of free peoples or voluntary associations, but by the calculated exercise of state power—economic, diplomatic, and military. International relations, as currently practiced, is fundamentally concerned with the projection, preservation, and expansion of state authority rather than the cultivation of peaceful human cooperation across borders.

Within the Western consequentialist and statist paradigm, the state is elevated to the position of supreme moral actor. It claims the authority to override truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity in pursuit of strategic objectives. Coercion, manipulation, repression, and exploitation are normalized and institutionalized as legitimate tools of governance. The result is not a morally ordered system of liberty, dignity, and productive peace but arbitrary rule, institutional corruption, technocratic tyranny, structural violence, and sophisticated barbarism. This system cloaks domination and exploitation in legality, expertise, and moralized rhetoric.

In this consequentialist-statist paradigm, sovereignty is conditional, dignity is subordinate to state power, and human flourishing is sacrificed to hegemonic interests. International law functions selectively and instrumentally, enforced against adversaries while ignored by dominant powers. Global institutions such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization—typically presented as neutral arbiters of peace, stability, and development—function in reality as mechanisms for enforcing Western statist

models, monetary dominance, and political control.

The elevation of the state to near-absolute authority fundamentally shapes how international relations are conceived and practiced. The state has become economic manager, social engineer, arbiter of legitimacy, and director of human relations, both domestically and internationally. In doing so, Western international relations theory replaces moral order with power calculation, voluntary cooperation with coercive governance and arbitrary rule, and civilization with domination.

Africonomics challenges this foundation. It rejects the primacy of power as the organizing principle of global order. Instead, it grounds international relations in natural-moral law, where legitimacy flows from justice, restraint, and respect for human dignity, not from the capacity to coerce. Only by exposing statism for what it is can international relations be reoriented away from perpetual conflict and toward a truly civilized global order.

4.3. Darwinian Anthropology and Global Politics

The Materialist-Darwinian Foundation of Western IR

A defining feature of Western international relations theory is its explicit or implicit reliance on a Darwinian conception of human nature and social relations. Beneath the apparent diversity of schools such as realism, liberalism, and constructivism lies a shared anthropological premise that human beings are fundamentally material, instinct-driven entities whose behavior is governed by competition, survival, and power rather than by moral agency, rational conscience, or objective ethical obligation.

This Darwinian anthropology transposes biological evolutionary mechanisms onto human societies and global politics, treating international relations as an extension of natural selection—a competitive struggle in which strength ensures survival, weakness invites domination, and moral restraint represents either irrational sentimentalism or strategic naïveté. In this worldview, the international system resembles a lawless wilderness governed by predatory instincts rather than a moral order among rational, accountable beings capable of ethical choice.

The Western paradigm is rooted in philosophical materialism, utilitarian consequentialism, and Darwinian determinism. It promotes a view of human nature and relations that is fundamentally animalistic, reducing individuals and nations to competitors engaged in perpetual struggle for survival, power, and dominance. This unprincipled, pseudoscientific, and destructive paradigm denies the central characteristics of humanity—moral agency, rational discernment, and ethical

responsibility—resulting in arbitrary and atrocious systems of institutionalized injustice, racial hierarchy, rivalry, violence, aggression, and domination.

Survival-of-the-Fittest as IR Axiom

Within this paradigm, "survival of the fittest" functions as an unstated but pervasive axiom. States are treated as organisms competing for scarce resources, security, and dominance in an anarchic environment devoid of moral order. Thus, power accumulation is seen not merely as prudent statecraft but as a morally neutral necessity, even as virtuous realism. The relentless pursuit of advantage, preemptive action, coercion, and territorial expansion is rationalized as inevitable behavior in a hostile world where only the strong survive.

This logic pervades Western IR theory across its supposed theoretical divisions. Realism makes it explicit, reducing international politics to power balances, security dilemmas, and perpetual rivalry among amoral state actors. Liberalism retains the same anthropological assumptions while attempting to manage competition through institutions, economic incentives, and interdependence, treating cooperation as a strategic calculation rather than a moral principle. Constructivism, despite emphasizing norms and social identities, frequently analyzes them as evolved adaptive strategies serving group survival rather than as reflections of objective moral truth.

Across these frameworks, morality is systematically instrumentalized—acknowledged as rhetorically useful but valued only insofar as it advances material interests or strategic outcomes. Ethical principles are treated as peripheral tools of statecraft rather than binding constraints on state conduct. The possibility that moral law might be objective, universal, and obligatory regardless of strategic consequence is dismissed as pre-modern superstition incompatible with scientific analysis of international affairs.

The result is a theoretical architecture that treats war, domination, and exploitation not as moral failures that require condemnation and correction, but as natural features of international life that require only strategic management. Within the Western Darwinian paradigm, no act of injustice, destruction, or atrocity is beyond consideration. Violence is treated as a policy tool, and mass human suffering is viewed as an acceptable cost. Injustice becomes an unavoidable reality. This normalization of barbarism stems logically from philosophical premises that deny human moral nature.

Might Makes Right and the Melian Dialogue

The infamous Melian Dialogue from Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War* is often invoked as definitive proof that moral principles are irrelevant in international affairs. Western IR scholars treat the Athenian assertion that "the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must" not as a confession of imperial criminality but as an empirical revelation of a supposed timeless truth about power and international relations.

This interpretation is profoundly mistaken and morally bankrupt. Africonomics rejects it categorically. The Melian Dialogue is not a universal law of human relations but a character confession, a self-incriminating admission by one society operating without moral restraint at a particular moment of imperial corruption. It reveals what happens when power is detached from justice and when strategic calculation displaces ethical obligation. It does not describe what must happen in all human societies, nor does it demonstrate the impossibility of moral international order.

To elevate this episode of Athenian imperial atrocity into a timeless axiom is to universalize barbarism, to mistake one culture's moral failure for human nature itself, and to project Western imperial experience onto all of humanity and all of history. It erases the Melian perspective, a people who chose death rather than submission to unjust domination, thereby affirming that there exist obligations more fundamental than survival and principles worth dying for. This Melian commitment to justice despite mortal danger contradicts everything the Darwinian model claims about human nature and international conduct.

What the Melian Dialogue actually demonstrates is not the absence of moral law but the catastrophic consequences of violating it. The annihilation of Melos did not represent civilizational strength, strategic understanding, or realist sophistication; it marked a profound moral degeneration that contributed to Athens' ultimate downfall. Thucydides himself presents the dialogue as evidence of Athenian hubris and corruption, not as validation of might-makes-right philosophy. Western IR theory's reverence for this atrocity as revelatory insight exposes its ethical bankruptcy and identification with imperial aggression rather than with justice or human dignity.

The fact that Western scholarship views Athenian barbarity as illustrative truth rather than cautionary tragedy reveals the atrocious orientation of the Western paradigm. It identifies with power, asserting its prerogatives over justice, with empire crushing resistance, and with the strong discarding moral constraint. This identification is not accidental but reflects the historical reality that Western IR theory developed to rationalize Western imperial domination, not to establish

principles for just international relations.

From Hobbes to Contemporary Realism: IR as Animal Struggle

This Darwinian worldview traces its philosophical lineage from Thomas Hobbes through Social Darwinism to modern realist thought, creating a continuous tradition that denies human moral nature and reduces international relations to animal-like struggle.

Hobbes' materialist foundation: Though writing before Darwin, Hobbes provided the mechanistic materialist groundwork in Leviathan. His depiction of the state of nature, human life as "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short," characterized by war of all against all, rests on viewing humans as matter in motion driven by appetites and aversions. Crucially, Hobbes argued that sovereign states exist in this state of nature relative to one another, with no transcendent authority to constrain their conduct, thereby establishing the theoretical foundation for approaching international relations as necessarily rivalrous, conflictual, and amoral.

Hobbes' anthropology denies human moral agency by reducing reason to instrumental calculation in pursuit of material desires. There is no natural law in the traditional sense, no objective moral order written into creation by the Creator, only hypothetical imperatives of self-preservation. This materialist reduction provides the philosophical foundation for later Darwinian interpretations of international politics.

Darwin's biological metaphor: Darwinian evolutionary theory supplied the biological imagery and scientific veneer. The mechanisms of variation, competition, and natural selection that operate in biological evolution were transposed onto human societies, with nations viewed as organisms competing for survival. "Survival of the fittest" became an explanatory framework for international hierarchy, imperial conquest, and the violent dominance of powerful nations over weak ones.

This transposition involves fundamental category errors. It confuses biological evolution operating through genetic variation and differential reproductive success with human history shaped by conscious choice, moral reasoning, and cultural transmission. Yet these errors were overlooked because the Darwinian framework served ideological purposes; namely, to justify racial hierarchies and rationalize imperial domination as natural selection among societies.

Modern realism's synthesis: Contemporary realist IR theory synthesizes Hobbesian pessimism and Darwinian naturalism into frameworks that normalize conflict and dismiss morality. From Morgenthau's "animus dominandi" (an innate drive for domination) to Waltz's structural realism

(anarchy that generates security competition regardless of states' internal character) to Mearsheimer's offensive realism (states must maximize power because of the uncertainty inherent in international anarchy), realist theory consistently articulates Hobbesian-Darwinian assumptions.

What unites these perspectives across generations is the foundational assumption that international politics is about power and survival, that moral considerations are either irrelevant or subordinate to security imperatives, and that cooperation is fragile, contingent, and always grounded in strategic calculation rather than genuine moral commitment. They treat this as hard-headed realism, objective analysis of empirical reality. In truth, it is a philosophical commitment to a particular anthropology that views humans as essentially animalistic, driven by fear and material desire, incapable of sustaining a moral order beyond narrow self-interest.

This theoretical tradition treats war as a normal policy instrument, balance-of-power as a natural mechanism, arms races as an inevitable response to anarchy, and domination as a legitimate exercise of superior power. International relations has become an animal struggle dressed in diplomatic protocol, where predators and prey, territorial competition, dominance hierarchies, and survival imperatives displace objective moral law.

The Pseudoscientific Nature and Civilizational Consequences of Darwinian IR

The application of Darwinian evolutionary theory to human societies and international relations is not science but ideology masquerading as science. It commits the naturalistic fallacy (deriving "ought" from "is"), misapplies biological concepts to fundamentally different domains, and serves ideological functions while claiming scientific objectivity.

Pseudoscientific foundations: Social Darwinism and its IR applications involve fundamental errors. Evolutionary fitness means reproductive success, not moral worth, intelligence, or civilizational achievement, yet these are routinely conflated. Evolution operates on populations over generations through genetic mechanisms; human societies develop through cultural transmission, conscious choice, institutional learning and innovation, and moral reasoning. These are fundamentally different processes that cannot be reduced to naturalist evolution. The claim that "survival of the fittest" governs international relations is not an empirical observation but a philosophical assertion that imposes a particular interpretive framework.

Ideological function: Throughout history, Darwinian anthropology has served to justify existing hierarchies and rationalize exploitation. In the 19th century, it legitimized the colonial conquest of

"inferior races" and the "civilizing mission" of European imperialism. In the early 20th century, it rationalized eugenics, forced sterilization, and ultimately genocide. In contemporary IR theory, it justifies great-power domination, dismisses calls for global justice as violations of a supposed natural order, and treats systemic inequality as an inevitable outcome of competitive success.

This ideological stance reveals Social Darwinism as pseudoscience, the deployment of scientific-sounding language and concepts to legitimize predetermined political commitments rather than genuine scientific inquiry subject to empirical verification and potential falsification.

Civilizational destruction: The Darwinian-materialist worldview is not merely intellectually flawed; it is inherently dehumanizing and destructive. By denying human moral agency and objective ethical law, it legitimizes systems of domination, racial hierarchy, and institutionalized violence. It is no historical coincidence that this worldview emerged alongside and provided intellectual justification for scientific racism, colonial genocide, eugenics movements, totalitarian ideologies, and the industrialized mass slaughter of the 20th century.

A framework that reduces humans to animalistic beings competing for survival inevitably enables treating entire populations as expendable obstacles to strategic and hegemonic goals. When moral constraints are dismissed as sentimental impediments to survival, when success in power competition validates the competitor's moral worth, and when international relations are understood as natural selection among civilizations, genocide becomes thinkable, even rational, under certain circumstances.

Western IR theory's recurring barbarism—wars of aggression, regime-change operations, mass starvation through sanctions, proxy conflicts that devastate societies, economic control and extraction disguised as development, and grotesquely selective humanitarianism—is not an aberration from the paradigm's principles. It is the logical outcome of theoretical frameworks that deny moral truth, reduce human relations to strategic competition, and elevate power as the ultimate arbiter of legitimacy.

The track record is unambiguous. The attempt to organize society on Darwinian principles has produced barbarism and atrocity. This is not a coincidence but a logical consequence—Darwinian premises yield Darwinian outcomes. A paradigm that views humans as evolved animals will inevitably treat them as such.

Africonomics' Rejection of Darwinian Anthropology

Africonomics categorically rejects the Western animalistic, materialist conception of human

nature and offers a distinctly principled anthropology grounded in objective truth.

Humans as moral beings: Human beings are not evolved animals driven by instinct and locked in a competitive struggle for survival. They are moral agents, endowed with reason, conscience, free will, and inherent dignity. This grounds human worth as absolute and inalienable, not contingent on social utility, state power, or any other factor.

Humans possess capacities that fundamentally distinguish them from animals and cannot be explained by materialist or Darwinian frameworks. These include rational insight into abstract truth, moral knowledge of right and wrong, creative freedom that transcends deterministic causation, self-reflective consciousness, orientation toward transcendent purposes, and yearning for justice. These capacities point to a spiritual dimension of human nature irreducible to matter or evolutionary adaptation.

Moral agency and international relations: Because human beings are moral agents, the societies and nations they form possess moral character and bear moral responsibility. International relations cannot be ethically neutral or morally empty; they must be evaluated according to objective principles of truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity that bind all human action, including collective action through states.

Nations are communities of moral agents, not organisms competing for evolutionary survival. They can choose justice or injustice, peace or aggression, cooperation or exploitation. These choices have moral significance. International conduct is not determined by material forces or survival imperatives but shaped by human moral choices, for which individuals and collectivities bear responsibility and accountability.

Rejection of inevitability: The Darwinian model treats conflict, domination, and violence as inevitable features of international relations—natural outcomes of competitive dynamics among amoral actors in an anarchic environment. Africonomics rejects this determinism. Conflict is not inevitable; it represents moral failure. Domination is not a natural order; it is a structural injustice. Violence is not a survival necessity; it is a violation of moral law.

Peace based on justice, cooperation grounded in mutual respect, and an international order that serves human flourishing are real possibilities rooted in human moral nature, not utopian fantasies that contradict human nature. The Darwinian paradigm's animalistic conception reflects its false anthropology, not empirical reality about human capacities and possibilities.

True realism: Any framework that treats genocide, coercion, deception, and domination as

natural, inevitable, or strategically necessary is not realistic or scientific; it is uncivilized, atrocious, and fundamentally disconnected from the truth about human nature. True realism begins with an accurate understanding of what human beings actually are: moral agents created for justice, cooperation, and peaceful flourishing, capable of moral reasoning and self-restraint, oriented toward goods that transcend mere survival.

Without this foundation, international relations theory becomes a rationalization of violence and barbarism rather than a guide to a peaceful global order. It describes not the world as it must be, but what the world becomes when natural-moral law is systematically denied, and human moral nature is suppressed by false philosophy and ideological commitment.

Conclusion: Exposing and Rejecting the Darwinian Paradigm

Western IR theory, grounded in Darwinian-materialist anthropology, does not describe universal truths about human nature or necessary features of international relations. It reveals what happens when a culture denies objective morality, reduces humans to animals, and organizes global order on the basis of power rather than principle. It is a confession of Western character and Western choices, not a demonstration of human inevitability.

The catastrophic consequences of this paradigm—perpetual war, systematic exploitation, normalized barbarism, and civilizational decline—prove its bankruptcy. No amount of theoretical sophistication, institutional complexity, or diplomatic refinement can civilize a framework built on fundamentally false and destructive premises about human nature.

Africonomics exposes this denial and offers a principled alternative grounded in natural-moral law and accurate anthropology. It insists that humans are moral beings, that nations are moral communities, that international relations must be governed by objective moral principles, and that structural justice, productive peace, and civilizational flourishing are possible when global order is built on truth rather than lies about human nature.

Without such foundations—without recognition that humans are moral agents, not animalistic beings—no global order can claim legitimacy, achieve stability, or deserve the name of civilization. The choice before humanity is: persist with Darwinian barbarism or embrace the moral truth that makes true civilization possible.

4.4. Why This Paradigm Is Fundamentally Barbaric

The Western consequentialist, statist, and Darwinian paradigm is not merely unprincipled,

flawed, or in need of reform; it is fundamentally barbaric. It rests on an anti-human anthropology, institutionalizes structural violence, reveres domination, and systematically rejects the natural-moral law principles essential for a structurally just, peaceful, and civilized global order. Its fundamental opposition to human dignity and flourishing constitutes a moral and civilizational atrocity—a structural crime against humanity.

This paradigm reduces human societies to competing beasts locked in perpetual struggle for survival and dominance. By denying human moral agency and objective ethical truth, it collapses international relations into an arena of instinct, domination, and power maximization. States are treated as predatory organisms, power as the supreme value, and moral restraint as strategic weakness or irrational sentimentalism. From such premises, war is normalized as a policy instrument, coercion rationalized as necessary statecraft, and mass civilian suffering is rendered morally insignificant as acceptable collateral damage in pursuit of strategic objectives.

Barbarism Defined Precisely

The term *barbaric* is used here deliberately and analytically, not as a rhetorical excess or moral posturing. Barbarism is not defined by the absence of cultural sophistication, technological advancement, or institutional refinement. It is defined by the systematic denial of human dignity, liberty, and agency; the subordination of human beings to arbitrary power; the elevation of force over justice; and the categorical rejection of moral constraints on domination and violence.

A system is barbaric when it treats human life as an expendable means to strategic ends, human dignity as a negotiable variable in cost-benefit calculations, and moral principle as an obstacle to successful policy rather than a binding obligation. By this principled definition, the prevailing Western paradigm qualifies unequivocally as barbaric. It normalizes violence as a legitimate policy tool, treats massive civilian suffering as an acceptable cost of achieving objectives, instrumentalizes human rights and humanitarian values as strategic rhetoric deployed when convenient and discarded when inconvenient, and dissolves ethical restraint into outcome-based consequentialist calculation where ends justify any means.

Under this paradigm, genocide is thinkable, regime change wars are justifiable, economic strangulation of entire populations is reasonable statecraft, and mass dispossession is seen as an unfortunate but necessary consequence of strategic imperatives. Once morality is definitively subordinated to power and strategic advantage, no atrocity is beyond consideration or categorically prohibited; all become potentially rational depending on circumstances and expected outcomes.

The Reduction of Societies to Competing Beasts

At the core of this paradigm's barbarism lies its fundamental anthropological error: the reduction of human beings and human societies to the level of animals engaged in amoral, violent competition for survival. This is not metaphorical language but the explicit theoretical foundation.

When humans are conceived as advanced animals driven by material interests and survival instincts rather than as moral agents endowed with reason, conscience, and dignity, the logical conclusion follows inexorably: human relations, including international human relations, must be governed by the same amoral principles that govern animal behavior—territorial competition, dominance hierarchies, predation of the weak by the strong, and violent elimination of rivals.

This animalistic conception manifests throughout Western IR theory. States are modeled as rational egoists pursuing power and security like organisms responding to environmental threats. International politics can be likened to ecosystems, where predators and prey interact through natural selection. Moral language is regarded either as strategic signaling or as naive sentimentalism, disconnected from the harsh realities of survival competition. The possibility that moral principles might guide and constrain states, that they might sacrifice strategic advantage for justice, or that they might recognize obligations that transcend self-interest is dismissed as unrealistic idealism.

The result is a theoretical and practical framework that legitimizes predatory conduct. Great powers naturally dominate smaller neighbors just as apex predators control territories. Imperial conquest becomes analogous to successful predation, regrettable perhaps to the weak, but natural and morally neutral. Economic exploitation is rationalized as competitive success. Military aggression is normalized as a survival necessity. Moral restraint by the powerful is dismissed as irrational self-limitation that serves no evolutionary or strategic purpose.

This animalistic reduction is not merely an analytical error; it is a moral and civilizational catastrophe that provides intellectual cover for treating human beings as animals to be dominated, exploited, or eliminated when they obstruct the powerful's interests.

War, Domination, and Genocide as Logical Endpoints

The barbaric premises of the Western paradigm lead logically and historically to barbaric outcomes such as perpetual war, systematic domination, and ultimately genocide. These are not aberrations, implementation failures, or violations of the paradigm's principles; they are its

intrinsic and predictable results.

Perpetual war as a systemic feature: If international relations are fundamentally a competitive struggle for power and survival, and if no objective moral principles constrain this competition, then war becomes the normal condition of international affairs. Peace is merely a temporary pause to rebuild strength before the next inevitable conflict. This logic pervades Western IR theory and produces exactly what it predicts: the United States has been at war for the vast majority of its existence, and Europe's peace since 1945 has been maintained only through overwhelming force and nuclear terror, and a global landscape scarred by proxy wars, aggressive interventions, and regional conflicts that serve Western hegemony.

Domination as natural order: If might makes right and survival of the fittest governs relations, then powerful nations logically and legitimately dominate weaker ones. The entire architecture of the current global order reflects this logic through Western control of international institutions, unilateral intervention in weaker nations' affairs, economic repression and extraction disguised as development, and systematic denial of real sovereignty to non-Western peoples. This is the structural logic of a system organized around power rather than principle, not aberrant imperialism.

Genocide as ultimate logic: Most horrifically, genocide emerges as the logical endpoint when human groups are viewed through Darwinian lenses. If peoples are locked in existential competition for survival, if moral constraints are dismissed as weakness, if the strong possess a natural right to dominate or eliminate the weak, and if destroying rivals enhances one's own security and power, then genocide is a rational policy option under sufficiently threatening circumstances. This makes the Western paradigm fundamentally genocidal.

This is not theoretical speculation but historical reality. The colonial genocides of indigenous populations in the Americas, Africa, and Australia were explicitly justified through this logic—the notion that superior European races had a natural right to displace inferior peoples, that survival of the fittest justified elimination of the weak, and that civilizational progress required extermination of savagery. Contemporary genocides and ethnic cleansings continue to flow from such premises that view international and inter-group relations as Darwinian struggle, where eliminating adversarial populations becomes strategically rational.

History confirms this atrocious logic. When human beings are reduced to material units and moral law is denied, violence escalates from competition to domination to elimination. The Western paradigm's theoretical framework cannot consistently condemn this progression because

genocide can be justified through its own logic under sufficiently threatening circumstances.

Sophisticated Barbarism: Violence Concealed by Institutional Complexity

What distinguishes the modern Western order from crude historical barbarism is not the absence of violence but its sophistication. Contemporary barbarism operates through elaborate institutional mechanisms, legal frameworks, technical expertise, and moralized rhetoric that obscure its violent nature and make resistance more difficult.

Violence is no longer primarily crude physical force but structural harm inflicted through:

- Economic sanctions that function as weapons of mass destruction, starving civilian populations while claiming moral high ground of "peaceful" pressure.
- Financial systems that enable systematic extraction of wealth from periphery to core through debt arrangements, currency manipulation, and capital flows.
- Trade architecture structured to benefit powerful nations while constraining weaker nations' development.
- Proxy wars that devastate peripheral societies while allowing great powers to compete without direct confrontation.
- Humanitarian pretexts that disguise imperial intervention and aggression as rescue missions.

This violence is institutionalized through international organizations, legalized through selective application of international law, and rationalized through academic theories that claim scientific objectivity. Aggression is masked by legal language, harm is obscured by technical complexity, and domination is justified through sophisticated consequentialist arguments about net benefits or strategic necessity.

This sophistication does not civilize violence; it makes it more insidious. The deployment of reason, science, law, and institutional authority to justify and execute systemic violence represents more insidious moral corruption than open brutality. Barbarism clothed in legality and academic respectability is harder to recognize and challenge precisely because it is normalized, disguised in bureaucratic procedures, and presented as technical management.

When civilians die from sanctions-induced malnutrition, it appears as an unfortunate side effect of economic pressure rather than deliberate killing. When drone strikes destroy wedding parties, it is characterized as precision targeting with regrettable collateral damage rather than murder. When structural adjustment programs impoverish millions, they are presented as

necessary reforms rather than economic warfare. When coups overthrow elected governments, they are described as popular democratic movements rather than foreign intervention.

This manipulation of language conceals structural violence beneath a technocratic veneer, making genuine constructive discourse nearly impossible. It is not only material violence but also systematic intellectual violence against the moral clarity and vocabulary necessary for civilized human relations.

Structural Violence and the Illusion of Civilization

Defenders of the Western paradigm often argue that the contemporary global order represents civilizational progress, more peaceful than historical alternatives, constrained by institutions, governed by law rather than naked force. This defense fundamentally fails because it overlooks structural violence—continuous, systemic harm inflicted through institutional mechanisms rather than episodic acts of direct violence.

As articulated in *The Structural Violence of Socialist Systems: An Africonomics Refutation of Socialism and Coercive Governance* (Tacanho, 2026):

> Unlike visible or direct violence—such as assault, warfare, or explicit coercion by identifiable actors—structural violence operates indirectly and continuously. It manifests wherever people are harmed, impoverished, repressed, or dispossessed by systems they did not consent to and cannot meaningfully escape. Its defining feature is that aggression is disguised, institutionalized, diffused, normalized, and legitimized through law, policy, and ideology, and thus not recognized as violence.

The current global order inflicts massive structural violence:

- Statist economic systems that condemn billions to preventable poverty while enriching elites.
- Debt arrangements that trap nations in dependency, stagnation, and servitude.
- Fiat monetary systems that allow powerful nations to export inflation, instability, and crisis to vulnerable economies.
- Sanctions regimes that cause mass starvation, medical catastrophe, and social collapse.

This violence kills and harms no less than bombs and bullets; through malnutrition, preventable disease, economic desperation, environmental poisoning, and social disintegration. Yet it is rendered invisible or attributed to natural economic forces, personal failures, or cultural deficiencies rather than recognized as violence for which specific actors and systems bear moral responsibility.

A global order built on such systemic harm cannot legitimately claim to be civilized, regardless of its material wealth, institutional sophistication, or rhetorical commitments to peace and human rights. The sophistication and complexity do not negate the violence; they obscure it, making the system even more difficult to challenge and transform.

Why Systems Built on Violence Cannot Be Civilized

Civilization and violence are fundamentally incompatible. Civilization requires moral restraint—respect for life and dignity, commitment to justice, adherence to truth, and peaceful resolution of conflict through reason and mutual accommodation. Systems built on violence, whether crude physical force or sophisticated structural coercion, negate these foundations and therefore cannot be civilized.

Violence degrades everything it touches. It reduces human beings to objects to be manipulated, harmed, or destroyed. It denies the dignity, moral agency, and inherent worth that define humanity. When violence becomes the foundation of social order, whether domestic or international, it corrupts every institution and relationship, making structural justice and productive peace impossible.

The Western paradigm is built on violence at every level:

- Military force underwrites the entire system through hundreds of billions spent on weapons, global base networks, nuclear arsenals, and permanent readiness for war.
- Economic coercion operates through sanctions, debt dependency, and fiat monetary manipulation.
- Political interference functions through coups, color revolutions, and systematic subversion of sovereignty.
- Cultural domination proceeds through media control, educational influence, and ideological hegemony.

This pervasive violence cannot be reconciled with civilization. The claim that sophisticated institutional mechanisms make the system less violent than historical alternatives misses the point: structural violence is still violence, institutional barbarism is still barbarism, and legalized aggression is still aggression. The sophistication of methods does not transform injustice into justice or barbarism into civilization.

Moreover, violence perpetuates itself through cycles of retaliation, revenge, and escalating harm. A global order built on violence necessarily produces perpetual conflict because violence

inflicted demands a response, which provokes counter-response, generating endless cycles that cannot be escaped within the violent framework. Only by transcending violence through commitment to natural-moral law principles can these cycles be broken.

Conclusion: Naming Barbarism and Rejecting It

The Western consequentialist, statist, and Darwinian paradigm is barbaric in its philosophical foundations, barbaric in its institutional operations, and barbaric in its practical outcomes. It reduces humans to animals, denies objective morality, normalizes violence, institutionalizes injustice, and systematically violates human dignity. It is not a flawed paradigm that requires reform but sophisticated barbarism that requires categorical rejection.

Africonomics refuses to accept this barbarism as inevitable, natural, or realistic. It names it for what it is—organized violence against human dignity and moral truth—and rejects it entirely. In its place, Africonomics offers a framework grounded in natural-moral law, accurate anthropology that recognizes humans as moral beings, and commitment to actual civilization characterized by justice, peace, and respect for human flourishing.

The choice before humanity is: persist with sophisticated barbarism masquerading as civilization while producing perpetual conflict, systemic injustice, and civilizational decline, or embrace the natural-moral law foundations that make genuine civilization possible. Only by recognizing the current paradigm's barbarism and rejecting it can humanity move toward a truly civilized global order.

5. The Africonomics Ontology of International Relations

The Africonomics Theory of International Relations begins with a radically different ontology—a fundamentally different understanding of what human beings, societies, and nations actually are. This ontological foundation determines everything that follows: how international conduct is understood, what principles should govern relations among nations, what constitutes justice in global affairs, and what kind of international order is possible and desirable.

Where the Western paradigm views human beings as advanced animals driven by material interests and survival instincts, Africonomics recognizes humans as moral beings with inherent agency and responsibility. Where Western IR theory treats states as mechanistic rational actors pursuing power in an amoral struggle for survival, Africonomics understands nations as

communities of moral agents capable of justice, cooperation, and peaceful flourishing. Where dominant theories reduce international relations to material forces and strategic Darwinian calculations, Africonomics insists that moral reality is primary and that principles of justice, truth, and human dignity are not optional add-ons to international politics but its proper foundation.

This ontological difference has profound practical implications. The Western paradigm's mechanistic and animalistic anthropology leads logically to perpetual conflict, systemic injustice, and sophisticated barbarism. The Africonomics ontology opens the possibility of structural justice, productive peace, and civilized global order. The difference is not one of degree but of kind; these are incommensurable worldviews that lead to fundamentally different conclusions about human nature, social order, and international relations.

5.1. Human Beings and Societies as Moral Agents

The Reality of Moral Agency

At the foundation of Africonomics ontology lies the fundamental truth that human beings are moral agents. This is not ideological preference, cultural construction, or philosophical speculation. It is an objective and observable reality accessible to reason and confirmed by universal human experience.

A moral agent is a being capable of:

- *Knowing moral truth* - understanding the difference between right and wrong, justice and injustice, good and evil.
- *Making ethical choices* - exercising genuine freedom to choose between alternative courses of action.
- *Being morally responsible* - bearing accountability for one's choices and their consequences.
- *Recognizing moral obligations* - understanding duties and responsibilities that bind regardless of personal preference or advantage.

Human beings possess these capacities uniquely among earthly creatures. Humans can reason about moral principles, deliberate about right action, feel guilt when they violate their conscience, and experience moral outrage at injustice. Humans can sacrifice immediate advantage for moral principle, cooperate with others based on trust and shared values, and build institutions to promote justice and restrain evil.

This moral agency is not learned or socially constructed. Even young children demonstrate an

innate moral sense; they respond to fairness and unfairness, distinguish intentional harm from accident, and show empathy and concern for others. Across all cultures and throughout history, human beings have recognized basic moral principles: that truth-telling is good, and deception is wrong; that unprovoked aggression is unjust; that theft violates another's rights; that promises should be kept, and that innocent life is sacred.

The universality and innateness of moral awareness point to its reality as part of human nature rather than cultural invention. Humans are not taught to be moral beings; they are created as moral beings. Human capacity for ethical discernment and moral agency reflects the image of God in which they are made—rational, conscious, free, inventive, and oriented toward goodness, truth, and justice.

The Denial of Moral Agency in Western Thought

Western philosophical traditions, particularly since the Enlightenment, have systematically denied or undermined moral agency. This demonstrates that the Western Enlightenment is not as enlightened as it claims to be, as it denies the central characteristic of humanity, the most essential feature that distinguishes humans from animals. The Western negation of human moral agency illustrates its fundamental misunderstanding of what it means to be human.

This denial takes multiple forms:

- *Materialist determinism* reduces human beings to matter in motion, complex biological machines whose behavior is determined by physical causes such as genes, neurons, hormones, and environmental stimuli. In this view, what appears to be a moral choice is actually a determined response to material factors. Free will is an illusion, moral responsibility is incoherent, and ethics is reduced to a description of evolved behaviors or subjective preferences.
- *Darwinian naturalism* treats morality as an evolutionary adaptation, a set of behaviors that enhance reproductive success in ancestral environments. Cooperation, altruism, and justice are explained as genetic strategies for survival rather than recognition of objective moral truth. Moral intuitions are mere artifacts of natural selection with no objective validity.
- *Utilitarian consequentialism* reduces moral reasoning to outcomes-based calculations. Right action is whatever produces the greatest happiness or utility, with no intrinsic moral constraints on means. This framework denies that certain actions are wrong in themselves, regardless of consequences, thereby denying the reality of an objective moral

law to which moral agents must adhere.

- *Social constructivism* treats morality as a cultural creation, varying across societies and lacking an objective standard by which to assess different moral systems. This relativism denies universal moral truth and reduces ethics to social conventions or power relations.
- *Postmodern skepticism* rejects the very possibility of moral knowledge, treating moral claims as mere expressions of will to power or linguistic constructions with no reference to objective reality.

These various forms of denial share a common effect: they undermine the possibility of genuine moral agency by denying either that humans are truly free, that objective moral truth exists, or that humans can know it. The result is philosophical frameworks that cannot account for the most fundamental features of human nature and experience—such as the sense of moral obligation, the capacity for moral reasoning, the experience of conscience, and the recognition of injustice.

The Western systematic denial of moral agency is not a trivial or harmless philosophical error. It has devastating practical consequences. If humans are not moral agents, then they cannot be held morally accountable. If there is no objective moral truth, then justice becomes merely opinion or arbitrary power. If moral language is strategic rhetoric rather than description of universal reality, then genuine moral discourse becomes impossible. If humans are advanced animals, then treating them as animals becomes rational.

The Western paradigm's barbarism flows directly from its denial of moral agency. Once this denial is accepted, there is no principled barrier to any aggression, injustice, or atrocity that serves strategic objectives or promised benefits.

Africonomics' Affirmation of Moral Agency

Africonomics categorically rejects the Western denial of moral agency and affirms the reality of human beings as moral agents created with inherent dignity, rationality, and moral capacity.

This affirmation rests on multiple grounds:

- *Theist foundation* - humans are beings created by God, not evolved animals, which entails rationality, moral consciousness, ethical discernment, freedom, and the capacity for peaceful, voluntary relations. This divine creation grounds human dignity as absolute and inalienable, independent of social recognition, individual characteristics, or utilitarian value.

- *Philosophical demonstration* - the reality of moral agency can be demonstrated through rational argument. The experience of moral obligation, the fact of universal moral principles across cultures, the incoherence of moral skepticism (which presupposes the truth it denies), and the impossibility of living as if moral agency were illusory all point to its reality.
- *Empirical observation* - human action consistently demonstrates moral agency. People make genuine choices, experience moral conflict, feel guilt or moral satisfaction, and recognize and resist injustice. These experiences cannot be explained away as illusions without making all human experience suspect, including the experiences of those making the argument.
- *Practical necessity* - the denial of moral agency makes civilization impossible and entrenches barbarism. Law presupposes accountability, which presupposes moral agency. Social cooperation requires trust, which requires the possibility of moral commitment. Justice requires moral evaluation of actions, which requires moral agency. Denying moral agency destroys the foundations of a structurally just, peaceful, and civilized social order. This explains why the Western paradigm is arbitrary, coercive, and structurally violent.

Africonomics insists that any adequate understanding of human beings, human societies, and international relations must begin with the affirmation of moral agency. This is not naive idealism but clear-eyed realism; the recognition of what human beings actually are rather than theoretical constructs that deny obvious reality.

From Individual to Collective Moral Agency

As individual human beings are moral agents, the communities and institutions they form also possess moral character and moral agency, though in a different sense.

A society or nation is not a moral agent in the same way an individual is. It does not possess a single unified consciousness or will. It cannot think, choose, or act as individuals do. Only individuals think, choose, and act. Yet societies do make collective choices through their systems, institutions, establish norms and laws, pursue collective objectives, and bear collective responsibility for actions.

Consider that when one says "the British Empire committed genocide," one is making a moral judgment about collective action. When one says "the United States violated Venezuela's sovereignty," one is attributing moral responsibility to a collective entity. When one demands that nations pay reparations for historical injustices, one is asserting collective moral accountability

across time.

These judgments and assertions make sense only if societies possess some form of moral agency. They can act rightly or wrongly, justly or unjustly, peacefully or violently. They can be praised for noble conduct or condemned for atrocities. They bear moral responsibility for their collective choices and institutional structures.

The mechanism of collective moral agency functions through the individuals who compose and direct social institutions. When government officials make policy decisions, when legislators enact laws, when military forces conduct operations, and when businesses engage in commerce, individuals are exercising moral agency; however, they do so as representatives of and on behalf of collective entities—states, corporations, or organizations.

These collective entities are not mere aggregations of individuals. They have institutional structures, established procedures, cultural traditions, and persistent identities that shape and constrain individual action. When someone acts in an official capacity, their individual moral agency is channeled through and partly determined by the institutional role they occupy.

This creates complex relationships between individual and collective moral responsibility. Individuals bear moral responsibility for their own choices, including their choices to participate in or support unjust collective actions. Collectives bear moral responsibility for systematic patterns of conduct institutionalized in their structures and cultures. Both levels of responsibility are real, and both must be recognized.

The key insight is that moral agency extends beyond isolated individuals to the social dimension of human existence. Humans are inherently social beings who form communities, and these communities reflect the moral character of the individuals who compose and govern them. A nation can be just or unjust in its fundamental structures; an economic system can be exploitative or not; and a culture can promote good or evil. These are moral assessments about collective realities.

Implications for International Relations

Recognizing human beings and societies as moral agents has profound implications for international relations:

- *Nations are morally accountable* - states and their governments can and should be held morally accountable for their actions in international affairs. They are not amoral actors

pursuing survival in a realm beyond morality. They make moral choices and bear moral responsibility.

- *International law must reflect natural-moral law principles* - it cannot be merely a conventional agreement among states or an expression of power dynamics. It must reflect objective moral principles—truth, justice, nonaggression, respect for sovereignty, and protection of innocent life—that bind all nations regardless of their power or interests.
- *Injustice is injustice* - when powerful nations exploit weak ones, when states wage unjust wars of aggression, when governments violate human rights, these are not merely strategic failures or unfortunate outcomes; they are moral evils that deserve condemnation and demand rectification.
- *Moral transformation is possible* - because nations possess moral agency, they can repent of past evils, reform unjust institutions, and pursue structural justice. History is not determined by material forces or evolutionary mechanisms but shaped by human moral choices. Better futures are possible through moral transformation and philosophical reorientation.

Moral reasoning applies to policy - foreign policy decisions should be evaluated through moral reasoning, not merely strategic calculation. Questions such as "Is this war just?" "Does this policy respect human dignity?" and "Is this economic arrangement exploitative?" are not naive moralism; they are practical questions that are essential to civilized human relations.

The recognition of moral agency restores international relations to its proper foundation as the realm of human moral choice and responsibility, ordered by natural-moral law principles, and directed toward peaceful cooperation and human flourishing.

5.2. Nations as Communities, Not Predators

Africonomics fundamentally rejects the Western portrayal of nations as predatory entities locked in perpetual Darwinian competition for power, resources, and dominance. This depiction, embedded in realist IR theory and grounded in materialist anthropology, misunderstands the nature of nations and egregiously distorts the moral reality of human political organization. Nations are not beasts struggling for evolutionary survival in an amoral wilderness; they are moral communities composed of persons bound together by shared territory, governance, culture, history, and mutual responsibilities.

The Nature of Nations as Extended Human Communities

A nation, properly understood, is an organic extension of human sociality—the natural tendency of human beings to form communities beyond the family level for purposes of security, governance, cultural transmission, and collective flourishing. Nations exist to serve their members; namely, to protect fundamental rights, facilitate cooperation, preserve cultural heritage, coordinate collective action, and create conditions that enable human flourishing across generations. They do not possess interests separate from or superior to the common interests of the people who compose them.

This communal nature fundamentally distinguishes nations from the predatory organisms to which Western theory reduces them. Unlike animals driven by biological imperatives and incapable of moral reasoning, nations are composed of moral agents who can recognize obligations, exercise restraint, pursue justice, and build collaborative relations. Unlike predators that must kill to survive, nations can flourish through peaceful cooperation, voluntary exchange, productive enterprise, and mutual respect. Unlike species in Darwinian competition facing evolutionary pressure to eliminate rivals, nations face no existential necessity for conflict; their security and prosperity are enhanced, not threatened, by the flourishing of neighboring peoples.

The Western predatory model projects animal behavior onto human communities and then falsely claims this projection reveals human nature. However, the projection is categorically mistaken. Human communities can form relationships and establish institutional structures that far transcend what is found in nature. These include voluntary cooperation based on mutual benefit, moral recognition of other communities as equal in dignity and deserving of respect, development of institutions for peaceful dispute resolution, cultural enrichment through exchange and learning, and solidarity rooted in the recognition of shared humanity.

Moral Obligations of National Communities

Because *nations are communities of moral agents* rather than communities of mechanistic or animalistic beings, they possess moral obligations analogous to those that govern individual conduct. The same natural-moral law principles that bind individuals also bind the collective entities they form. Nations are obligated to adhere to truth in their communications, practice justice in their internal governance and external relations, uphold nonaggression by refraining from initiating force against others, and honor human dignity by protecting the natural individual rights of all persons.

Within this framework, sovereignty is not unlimited state power unconstrained by moral law or license for governments to oppress their people and aggress against others. It is the legitimate

authority of a community to govern itself according to its traditions and choices—a right grounded in human dignity and the principle of self-determination. Yet this authority is grounded in natural-moral law. No government's sovereignty extends to violating the fundamental rights of its own people or other peoples. Sovereignty is the responsibility to govern justly and relate peacefully with other societies, not a privilege to exercise arbitrary power.

Similarly, power is not self-justifying. The accumulation or successful exercise of power does not validate its use or confer moral legitimacy. Strong nations have no natural right to dominate weak nations. Imperial conquest does not become just through success. Military superiority does not grant exemption from moral constraints. Power must be exercised within moral bounds; otherwise, it becomes mere violence, deserving condemnation and resistance.

Rejecting the Predatory Model

The predatory model of international relations collapses ethics into strategy, reduces diplomacy to tactical maneuvering, and makes genuine peace impossible. It treats cooperation as a temporary expedient, subject to abandonment when strategically advantageous; moral language as mere rhetoric masking power calculations; and international law as a tool wielded by the strong against the weak.

The Western paradigm's framing of nations as predators engaged in perpetual struggle for survival and domination is unethical, flawed, destructive, and genocidal in its final logic. It misconstrues the nature of nations and creates a self-fulfilling prophecy: states prepare for inevitable conflict, thereby generating the very conditions of mutual hostility and insecurity the model claims merely to describe.

By contrast, Africonomics affirms that peaceful coexistence, mutual respect, and voluntary cooperation are not naive aspirations but natural expressions of human moral nature. Just as individuals are capable of ethical restraint, recognition of others' rights, fulfillment of commitments, and cooperation for mutual benefit despite potential advantages from aggression or deception, so too are nations—provided their institutions are grounded in moral law rather than power maximization and their cultures foster integrity rather than normalize domination.

Viewing nations as moral communities instead of predators restores the possibility of a structurally just, peaceful, and civilized international order. Cooperation becomes principled rather than transactional. Treaties become moral commitments rather than temporary conveniences. Conflict resolution prioritizes justice and reconciliation rather than coercion and

humiliation. War, when it occurs, is recognized as a tragic moral failure, not a normal instrument of policy.

In this framework, global order is not maintained through fear, deterrence, or hegemonic domination, but through structural justice and moral legitimacy. Nations that respect their own citizens' dignity are more likely to respect the dignity and sovereignty of others. Societies grounded in natural-moral law internally are capable of peaceful relations externally.

Rehumanizing International Relations

Africonomics thus rehumanizes international relations by rejecting the dehumanizing and atrocious fiction that global politics is an amoral struggle among animalistic communities and restores the objective, civilizational truth that *the world is composed of human communities capable of moral reasoning, rational deliberation, ethical restraint, recognition of universal obligations, and peaceful cooperation grounded in justice and mutual respect.*

This is not sentimental idealism disconnected from reality, but moral realism grounded in an accurate understanding of what nations actually are and what human moral nature makes possible. The predatory paradigm does not describe inevitable features of international relations but reveals what happens when cultures deny moral truth, suppress human ethical capacity through false philosophy, and organize global order based on power rather than principle.

Only by abandoning the barbaric predator paradigm—which legitimizes aggression, normalizes domination, and makes perpetual conflict inevitable—and embracing the reality of nations as moral communities can humanity build a truly civilized global order. This transformation begins with intellectual clarity about the fundamental nature of nations and the moral principles that should govern their relations.

5.3. Moral Agency at the Collective Level

The crucial insight that nations and other collective entities possess moral agency requires further explanation. As noted, collectives do not possess consciousness or will in the same sense as individuals do; only individuals think, choose, and act. How, then, can collectives be moral agents?

The Reality of Collective Moral Agency

Africonomics affirms that moral agency does not disappear when human beings act collectively through institutions, communities, or states. On the contrary, collective action

magnifies moral responsibility rather than dissolving it. Nations, governments, and international institutions are not morally neutral mechanisms; they are intentional human constructions that extend individual moral agency into the collective and therefore remain fully subject to moral evaluation and accountability.

Collective moral agency functions through several mechanisms that connect individual choices to institutional outcomes:

Institutional decision-making: Collectives act through institutions—governments, legislatures, courts, and bureaucracies—that make binding decisions on behalf of the whole community. When executives declare war, when legislatures enact laws, or when courts render judgments, individuals exercising moral agency make these choices in representative capacities that bind entire nations. Their decisions reflect human values, priorities, and moral judgments, not mechanical responses to deterministic forces.

Systemic patterns: When injustice becomes systemic—embedded in laws, economic structures, institutional practices, and cultural norms—the collective bears moral responsibility. Slavery in the antebellum United States was not merely individual slaveholders making wrong choices, but a systemic, collective evil institutionalized across an entire society. Such systemic patterns constitute collective moral agency because they reflect accumulated choices that create and perpetuate unjust structures.

Cultural formation: Collectives shape their members' moral consciousness through education, tradition, social norms, media, and institutional incentives. A culture that celebrates militarism and domination forms individuals differently from one that promotes peace. An economic system based on coercion and exploitation cultivates different moral dispositions than one grounded in voluntary exchange. This cultural formation represents collective moral agency because it reflects choices about what values to transmit and reinforce across generations.

Democratic authorization: In democratic societies particularly, the people collectively authorize their government's actions and bear collective responsibility for them. When elected representatives wage war or enact policy, they do so with popular authorization (at least implicit). The electorate cannot claim complete moral disconnection from actions taken in their name and funded by their taxes.

The Western Paradigm's Denial of Collective Moral Responsibility

Western international relations theory denies or obscures this reality of collective moral

agency. By treating states as amoral rational actors operating in an anarchic system governed by power dynamics and strategic imperatives, it portrays collective conduct as exempt from ethical evaluation and accountability. This theoretical stance serves ideological purposes; it provides intellectual cover for barbarism at scale.

Within this consequentialist framework, atrocities are transformed into "strategic necessities," systematic exploitation becomes "pursuit of national interest," mass civilian suffering is reduced to regrettable "collateral damage," aggressive wars are reframed as "preventive action" or "humanitarian intervention," economic strangulation through sanctions is "peaceful pressure," and violations of sovereignty are justified as "responsibility to protect." The moral vocabulary is perverted to conceal injustice behind technical or legal language.

Africonomics rejects this moral evasion. There is no ethical discontinuity between individual and collective action. What is immoral for individuals—murder, theft, fraud, coercion, aggression—does not become moral when performed by institutions, legitimized through law, or rationalized as serving collective interests. The scale and institutional mediation do not transform injustice into justice. Collective action that systematically violates natural-moral law principles remains morally condemned regardless of how carefully it is justified through legal frameworks, strategic rationales, or technical calculations.

Three Foundations of Collective Moral Agency

Collective moral agency rests on three interrelated realities that Western theory cannot coherently deny:

First, institutions are human creations: Institutions are created by human beings and reflect human values, choices, priorities, and moral commitments—or the lack thereof. Every institutional structure, policy framework, and systemic pattern results from accumulated human choices and can be traced to decisions made by individuals. Therefore, institutions bear the moral character of their creators and the choices embedded in their design and operation.

Second, collective decisions have real consequences: Institutional decisions—such as laws, policies, wars, sanctions, and trade agreements—have profound, often destructive consequences for human lives, dignity, and flourishing. These are not abstract outcomes but concrete harms or benefits experienced by human beings. Where actions produce consequences that affect human welfare, moral evaluation is both possible and necessary.

Third, collective decisions are intentional: Institutional decisions are made deliberately, not

accidentally or through unconscious processes. They reflect choices among alternatives, deliberation about means and ends, and selection of particular courses of action over others. Where there is choice and intention, there is moral responsibility. The complexity of institutional decision-making or the diffusion of responsibility across multiple actors does not eliminate agency; it makes accountability more complex to trace but no less real.

Implications for International Relations

Recognizing collective moral agency has profound implications that fundamentally transform how international relations must be understood and practiced:

Nations are morally accountable: A state that wages aggressive war, enforces unjust economic sanctions that cause mass suffering, manipulates currencies to export harm and impose dependency, violates sovereignty through invasion or subversion, or supports autocratic regimes is morally accountable for those actions. Appeals to "systemic pressures," "geopolitical realities," "balance of power necessities," or "historical inevitability" do not absolve responsibility—they merely obscure it through determinist language that denies moral agency and accountability.

Universal moral principles bind all actors: Cultural differences, power asymmetries, strategic interests, or claims of national sovereignty cannot negate universal moral principles. Truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity apply across all borders and bind all actors—individual and collective, weak and powerful—because they arise from human nature itself. A violation of these principles remains a violation, whether committed by an individual, a corporation, or a government, and whether perpetrated by a city-state or a global superpower.

Moral relativism is exposed as incoherent: The recognition of collective moral agency demolishes moral relativism in international affairs. As nations are moral agents bound by objective moral law, then claims that "different cultures have different values" or "what is right for one nation may be wrong for another" collapse into incoherence. While legitimate cultural diversity exists in morally indifferent matters, fundamental principles that prohibit murder, theft, fraud, and aggression bind universally.

International order requires moral foundations: This recognition transforms how international order must be conceived and constructed. Diplomacy is fundamentally a moral practice that requires honesty, good faith, and a commitment to justice, not merely technical negotiation seeking strategic advantage by any effective means. Sovereignty is understood as moral responsibility and stewardship exercised within moral constraints, not unlimited power or license for domination.

Power is evaluated by how it serves justice and human flourishing, not by how effectively it is accumulated or how successfully it enables domination.

Dismantling the Justification for Modern Barbarism

By restoring recognition of moral agency at the collective level, Africonomics dismantles the central intellectual justification for modern barbarism in global politics: the claim that morality ends where state action begins, that collective entities operate in an amoral realm beyond ethical evaluation, and that strategic necessity or national interest override moral constraints.

This claim is philosophically incoherent and practically catastrophic. Philosophically, it requires believing that moral obligations that bind individuals somehow disappear when those same individuals act through institutions—an absurd proposition with no rational foundation. Practically, it licenses any atrocity that can be rationalized as serving collective interests or strategic objectives, turning international relations into legalized barbarism.

Civilization cannot exist where moral responsibility is structurally suspended. When the most consequential human actions—those that affect millions or billions of lives through war, economic policy, or institutional structures—are declared exempt from moral evaluation, barbarism becomes entrenched. A civilized international order requires acknowledging that nations, like the persons who compose them, are capable of ethical choice, bound by universal moral law, and must be held accountable when they violate it.

Restoring Moral Agency for Civilized Order

Only when collective actors are recognized as moral agents subject to objective moral law can international relations move beyond power worship, strategic amoralism, and sophisticated barbarism toward a fundamentally peaceful global order.

This recognition does not guarantee that all nations will act morally—human freedom includes the capacity for evil at both individual and collective levels. But it establishes the essential precondition for moral improvement, recognizing that moral principles apply, that violations deserve condemnation, and that transformation toward structural justice is possible and necessary.

Africonomics insists that the same moral law that binds individuals also binds the communities they form and the institutions through which they act. This is not an idealistic projection but a recognition of the reality that human moral nature does not disappear in

collective action. Instead, it manifests on a larger scale, with magnified consequences and responsibility.

5.4. The Rejection of Mechanistic and Animalistic Anthropology

At the core of the Africonomics Theory of International Relations is a decisive rejection of the mechanistic and animalistic anthropology that underpins modern Western thought. The prevailing Western paradigm, rooted in philosophical materialism, Darwinian determinism, and utilitarian consequentialism, conceives human beings as advanced biological organisms driven primarily by survival instincts, material incentives, and competitive impulses. In this view, moral considerations are secondary to evolutionary advantage, and cooperation is seen as a strategic adaptation within an environment of perpetual rivalry and conflict.

This anthropological premise profoundly shapes international relations theory. If human beings are essentially competitive animals, then states—conceived as collective extensions of those animalistic beings—are expected to behave as predators in an anarchic ecosystem. Power is regarded as the ultimate currency, security as the primary objective, and domination as a rational strategy. Within this framework, moral language serves an instrumental purpose; it is useful for mobilization or legitimacy but is not inherently binding.

Africonomics rejects this conception as philosophically flawed, morally abhorrent, and civilizationally destructive. Human beings are not merely instinct-driven organisms. They are moral agents endowed with reason, conscience, and the capacity for ethical discernment. They possess intrinsic dignity that cannot be reduced to biological function or material utility. To reduce human nature to an animalistic evolutionary struggle is to deny the very faculties that make civilization possible.

The mechanistic anthropology treats human societies as systems to be engineered, optimized, and managed according to technical formulas. It reduces persons to data points, populations to statistical aggregates, and nations to strategic units in a global game. Moral principles are subordinated to efficiency metrics, growth targets, or security calculations. In international affairs, this reduction legitimizes coercion, manipulation, and violence as "necessary adjustments" within an impersonal system.

The animalistic anthropology goes further. It normalizes aggression by presenting it as natural. The language of "survival of the fittest," "great power competition," and "kill or be killed" is embedded in strategic discourse. The Melian Dialogue is interpreted not as a warning

against moral corruption, but as a timeless truth about geopolitics. Conquest, subjugation, and extermination are seen as intelligible, even inevitable, within this framework.

Africonomics counters that this is not realism but regression. It is not a scientific description of human nature but a philosophical projection that strips humanity of its moral essence—the defining characteristic that distinguishes humans from animals. Civilization emerges precisely because human beings are capable of restraining instinct, honoring principle, and recognizing the dignity of others. To define international order in animalistic terms is to undermine the very foundations of peaceful coexistence.

Rejecting mechanistic and animalistic anthropology does not entail naïve idealism. It entails philosophical accuracy and moral realism. Human beings are capable of selfishness and aggression, but they are equally capable of moral restraint, cooperation, and justice. International systems can reflect either dimension. The Western paradigm institutionalizes the lower impulse and rationalizes it as inevitable. Africonomics insists that the higher moral capacities of human beings must guide institutional design and global governance.

By restoring a human-centered anthropology, Africonomics reorients international relations away from domination and toward principled cooperation. Nations are not beasts competing for territory; they are communities of moral agents capable of ethical choice. Global order need not be structured around fear, rivalry, and perpetual conflict; it can be structured around truth, justice, nonaggression, and mutual respect.

The Africonomics ontology provides the foundation for a principled, civilized approach to international relations and global order. It recognizes the true nature of human beings and human societies, applies objective moral principles to international affairs, and pursues justice and peace as real possibilities grounded in human moral nature.

From this ontological foundation follow the natural-moral law principles that must govern human relations within and among nations, and the vision of a structurally just, peaceful, and civilized global order. Without this foundation, the world remains trapped in the Western paradigm's barbaric assumptions that produce barbaric outcomes.

Only by rejecting the mechanistic, animalistic conception of humans can international relations move beyond the logic of domination and perpetual conflict toward peaceful flourishing.

6. The Africonomics Framework for International Relations

Having discussed the nature of the Western paradigm and established the ontological foundations of the Africonomics approach, this section outlines the principles, structures, and practices that should govern international relations in a truly civilized global order. This framework is a practical application of natural-moral law to international affairs. It does not promise the elimination of all conflict or the creation of perfect harmony, but it does offer the possibility of structural justice, productive peace, and international relations worthy of human vocation.

The Africonomics IR framework rests on a fundamental premise: the same moral principles that govern relations among individuals also govern relations among nations. There is no separate ethics for international affairs, no realm where moral law does not apply, no domain where might makes right. Nations, as communities of moral agents, are bound by the same objective moral principles that bind all human action: truth, justice, nonaggression, respect for life and property, and recognition of human dignity.

This framework rejects power politics in favor of justice-based order. It reveals balance-of-power mechanisms as sources of perpetual conflict. It rebukes existing international institutions as structurally unjust instruments of domination. It calls for a radical transformation of global economic and monetary systems from coercive extraction to voluntary cooperation. And it maintains that peaceful flourishing requires justice, not merely strategic equilibrium or deterrence.

6.1. Natural-Moral Law as the Foundation of Global Order

The Rejection of Moral Neutrality in International Relations

Modern international relations theory treats the global sphere as a morally neutral territory or a morally suspended domain where ethical principles that govern individual conduct somehow cease to apply. Realist doctrines explicitly reduce international conduct to Darwinian power balancing and amoral strategic calculation. Consequentialist frameworks evaluate state actions solely by their outcomes, thereby dissolving intrinsic moral constraints. Statist models treat sovereignty as an ultimate shield against moral scrutiny, creating impenetrable barriers where ethical evaluation is allegedly unable to reach.

Africonomics categorically rejects these assumptions and exposes the moral bankruptcy of the

Western paradigm. The Africonomics framework for international relations begins with a simple yet radical premise: international human relations are not exempt from morality. There exists no realm of human action, including relations among nations, that operates outside moral law or beyond ethical evaluation and accountability.

Nations do not exist in some amoral void beyond good and evil. They are not abstract organisms evolving according to naturalist selection, nor mechanistic actors responding deterministically to structural forces in a lawless arena of power competition. Nations are communities of moral agents—human beings organized through institutional structures for collective purposes—and therefore remain bound, individually and collectively, by the same natural-moral law principles that govern all human conduct and systems.

There is no moral vacuum, no ethical free zone, no suspended accountability between nations. Truth remains absolutely binding across borders. Justice remains universally obligatory. Nonaggression remains categorically required. Human dignity remains inviolably protected. These moral realities transcend artificial constructs such as states and political boundaries; they do not recognize exemptions for collective actors. They constitute the permanent, objective moral standards within which all human relations—including international relations—must be conducted.

A nation cannot rightfully engage in systematic deception, institutional coercion, economic sabotage, monetary manipulation, territorial aggression, sovereignty violation, or proxy destabilization simply because it operates at the international level or claims strategic necessity. The scale of action does not dissolve moral constraints; it magnifies moral responsibility. The institutional infliction of harm does not eliminate culpability; it systematizes and amplifies it. The invocation of national interest does not override moral obligation; it reveals moral corruption when used to justify injustice.

The Content and Application of Natural-Moral Law

Natural-moral law refers to objective moral principles that are universal, knowable through reason, grounded in human nature and divine creation, and binding on all human beings and institutions regardless of time, place, culture, circumstance, or strategic consideration. These principles are not human inventions, social conventions, or strategic preferences subject to negotiation or revision. They are features of moral reality that humans can discover and recognize but cannot create, delete, or legitimately violate.

Natural-moral law constitutes the universal ethical standard for human decision-making, action, interaction, and institutional design at every level—individual, communal, national, and international. It provides objective criteria for evaluating conduct, judging institutions, and holding actors accountable.

These principles apply horizontally across all borders and vertically through all levels of social organization:

Truth requires honesty, transparency, and good faith in all international interactions. It demands accuracy and candor in treaties and diplomatic communications, transparency in monetary systems and financial arrangements, honest representation in trade agreements and economic statistics, and adherence to commitments made through international covenants. Deliberate deception in international finance, fraudulent development lending schemes, false security guarantees designed to manipulate allies, systematic manipulation of economic data, or any form of institutional dishonesty constitutes a grave moral violation and structural injustice.

Justice requires that mutual obligations be honored, that property rights be respected both domestically and internationally, that agreements be entered into voluntarily through consent rather than under coercive leverage or exploitation of weakness, that international law be applied equally to all nations regardless of power, and that systemic exploitation, extraction, or domination be condemned and rectified through restitution. Justice demands fair dealing in economic relations, proportional responses to offenses, and treatment of all nations as possessing equal moral status and deserving equal respect under law.

Nonaggression prohibits the initiation of force or coercion against innocent persons and peaceful communities. This principle extends far beyond the prohibition of overt military invasion to encompass all forms of aggressive violence. It prohibits economic warfare through sanctions designed to starve or immiserate civilian populations, monetary aggression through currency manipulation and debt entrapment schemes, financial coercion through weaponized payment systems and asset freezes, political subversion through coups and color revolutions, and any form of regime manipulation or destabilization. Africonomics thus expands the definition of aggression beyond battlefield violence to include institutional economic coercion—particularly through fiat monetary manipulation, extractive trade structures designed to transfer wealth from weak to powerful nations, and conditionalities that force policy changes under threat of economic strangulation.

Human dignity requires that foreign policy never treat populations as expendable instruments in

geopolitical competition, that civilian suffering never be dismissed as acceptable collateral damage, that economic policies respect the natural rights and basic needs of all affected persons, that cultural autonomy and self-determination be honored within moral boundaries, and that individuals be recognized as possessing inherent worth regardless of nationality, ethnicity, power, or strategic significance. Human dignity establishes absolute moral limits that no strategic objective or national interest can legitimately transgress.

Truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity are not optional guidelines but binding moral obligations that create duties and corresponding rights. Their violation constitutes a real injustice that deserves condemnation, and generates obligations of restitution and potentially justifies resistance.

Sovereignty as Moral Responsibility, Not License for Domination

In prevailing statist doctrine, sovereignty is typically treated as near-absolute authority within territorial borders—unlimited power that the government may exercise however it chooses. Sovereignty has become a shield behind which governments systematically suppress dissent, violate natural individual rights, debase currency through inflationary theft, exploit their own people through extractive taxation and regulation, or engage in comprehensive internal predation without facing external moral accountability or legitimate criticism.

Africonomics redefines sovereignty by grounding it in moral reality rather than arbitrary power. Sovereignty is not the right to dominate, oppress, exploit, or exercise unlimited coercive authority. It is the responsibility and duty to govern justly within natural-moral law; to exercise legitimate authority in ways that protect rights, foster structural justice, and respect human dignity.

A sovereign nation, properly understood, bears specific moral obligations that define and limit its legitimate authority:

- *Respect for natural rights*: The government must protect rather than violate the fundamental rights of its citizens—life, liberty, property, freedom of conscience, association, and peaceful action. Sovereignty does not grant authority to systematically oppress, dispossess, persecute, enslave, or murder the very people the government ostensibly exists to serve.
- *Sound monetary and economic institutions*: The government must maintain honest money that preserves rather than destroys value, operate economic institutions that enable rather than

obstruct productive activity and voluntary exchange, refrain from confiscatory taxation and regulatory extraction that amount to systematic theft, and create conditions that enable genuine prosperity rather than manage poverty through dependency.

- *Voluntary international exchange*: A nation must engage other nations through voluntary exchange based on mutual benefit rather than through coercion, exploitation, or manipulation. It must conduct trade honestly, honor treaty obligations faithfully, and respect the equal sovereignty of other nations.
- *Restraint from external aggression*: The government must categorically refrain from initiating force against other nations, from violating their territorial integrity or political independence, from subverting their governments or interfering in their internal affairs, and from any form of economic or monetary aggression designed to coerce compliance or extract advantage.

Sovereignty divorced from these moral constraints and responsibilities degenerates into mere organized predation—domestic tyranny internally and imperial aggression externally. However, sovereignty grounded in natural-moral law and exercised as moral responsibility becomes a pillar of global stability, enabling communities to govern themselves according to their own traditions while respecting universal moral principles and the equal rights of other nations.

Thus, Africonomics rejects both imperial interventionism (which violates the sovereignty of other nations under various pretexts) and domestic tyranny (which violates the rights of the nation's own people under the claim of sovereign authority). Both are arbitrary, coercive, and structurally violent systems that violate the natural-moral order of human relations. Neither can be legitimized through appeals to sovereignty, strategic necessity, or national interest.

Peace as Moral Condition, Not Strategic Equilibrium

Conventional international relations theory typically defines peace narrowly as the temporary absence of open warfare—a fragile, unstable equilibrium maintained through deterrence, military balance of power, or hegemonic stability imposed by a dominant power. In this mechanistic conception, peace is merely a fortunate strategic configuration sustained by mutual fear of catastrophic consequences, rather than a moral achievement or a stable condition rooted in justice.

Africonomics rejects this impoverished, morally bankrupt understanding of peace. Peace is not merely the absence of active military conflict or visible violence. It is the presence of structural justice, a moral order in which relationships among nations are characterized by mutual respect,

voluntary cooperation, honest exchange, fulfilled obligations, and the protection of human dignity.

Where monetary systems function through systemic fraud and manipulation, where trade structures are deliberately designed to be extractive and exploitative, where political systems institutionalize comprehensive coercion and domination, and where foreign policy systematically manipulates weaker nations through cultivated dependency and threats, the condition may superficially appear stable and may be described as "peaceful" in conventional terms—but it is not true peace. It is suppressed conflict, managed injustice, institutionalized violence wearing a mask of civilization. It is structural violence that kills and harms no less than open warfare but does so through mechanisms that render the violence less visible and more difficult to challenge.

True peace emerges only when institutions operate in truth, exchange is voluntary, agreements are honored, sovereignty is respected, and economic relations are mutually beneficial rather than extractive.

Peace, properly understood, is therefore a moral and civilizational achievement that requires sustained commitment to structural justice, not a strategic accident produced by a fortunate balance of power or a fortunate configuration of material interests. It must be deliberately built through moral transformation, just institutions, and principled relationships. It cannot be engineered through deterrence, enforced through hegemony, or maintained through suppression of justified grievances.

Trade, Exchange, and Diplomacy as Peace Mechanisms

Africonomics recognizes voluntary exchange as among the most powerful civilizing forces in human relations, including international relations. Trade based on free markets and mutual benefit transforms potential rivals into cooperative partners with aligned interests. It creates positive-sum relationships where involved parties gain through exchange, fundamentally altering the logic of interaction from competitive zero-sum struggle to collaborative value creation.

Where coercive power seeks unilateral control and domination, free trade seeks cooperation and shared prosperity. Where imperial systems centralize extraction and concentrate wealth in dominant cores, free markets decentralize economic opportunity and enable prosperity to spread through voluntary networks of productive cooperation. Where power-based order generates resentment and resistance that requires constant suppression, exchange-based order generates voluntary participation and productive peace.

Sound money as a foundation: Sound money—currency that maintains stable value, is resistant to political manipulation, and is accepted voluntarily based on trust rather than legal tender laws—further stabilizes and civilizes international relations by eliminating the profound distortions, systemic injustices, and structural tensions created by fiat monetary manipulation. Sound money prevents powerful nations from exporting inflation and economic instability to weaker economies, eliminates the weaponization of payment systems and reserve currency status, ends competitive currency devaluation races that cause trade conflicts, and removes debt-based dependency relationships that subordinate weaker nations to creditor powers.

Diplomacy as principled dialogue: Within the Africonomics framework, diplomacy is not strategic deception, tactical manipulation, or sophisticated lying in service of national interest. It is principled dialogue grounded in mutual respect, conducted in good faith, oriented toward just solutions, and characterized by honesty about intentions, interests, and constraints. International agreements are not temporary tactical tools for gaining leverage but moral covenants between communities; binding commitments that create obligations and must be honored even when circumstances change or when violation might offer a strategic advantage.

A Vision for Civilized Global Order

In the Africonomics framework for international relations grounded in natural-moral law:

- Free trade based on voluntary exchange and mutual benefit replaces protectionist rivalry, managed trade that serves powerful interests, and extractive economic relationships.
- Sound money replaces fiat monetary manipulation, currency weaponization, systematic dispossession, and inflation export.
- Decentralized sovereignty that respects principled self-governance replaces imperial hierarchy, hegemonic domination, and imposed dependency and centralized control.
- Moral accountability to objective principles replaces geopolitical opportunism, strategic amoralism, and might-makes-right logic.
- Justice-based cooperation replaces power-based competition and perpetual struggle for dominance.

The Africonomics framework proposes a fundamental reorientation of global order—the recovery of moral foundations that the Western paradigm has systematically rejected and destroyed. It replaces Darwinian survival struggle with principled cooperation grounded in recognition of common humanity and a shared moral nature. It replaces coercive statism and imperial domination with natural-moral law that binds all human actors equally. It replaces

strategic manipulation and systemic deception with structural justice and institutional honesty.

This is not utopian fantasy divorced from reality, but moral realism grounded in an accurate understanding of human nature, a recognition of what makes true peace possible, and a clear-eyed acknowledgment that systems built on injustice and violence inevitably collapse.

A fundamentally peaceful, stable, and civilized world cannot be engineered through balance-of-power mechanisms, imposed through hegemonic dominance, or maintained through perpetual threats of devastating violence. It must be built deliberately and patiently upon moral foundations that reflect objective truth about human nature, respect human dignity at all levels, constrain arbitrary power, and enable human flourishing across nations.

Natural-moral law provides these foundations. Only by grounding international relations in these objective moral principles can humanity move beyond the sophisticated barbarism of the Western paradigm toward a structurally just, peaceful, and civilized order worthy of human moral nature.

6.2. The Rejection of Power Politics

The Africonomics framework rejects the premise that global order must be organized around domination, rivalry, racial hierarchy, and strategic containment. Power politics, the doctrine that stability emerges from the competitive balancing of force, is inadequate and self-defeating.

Why Domination Cannot Produce Stability

The Western paradigm assumes that international order requires hierarchy, with dominant powers establishing and maintaining systems that weaker nations must accept. This assumption is fundamentally mistaken. Domination does not produce stability, much less structural peace. It generates perpetual instability, conflict, and mass human suffering.

Domination cannot produce lasting stability because it generates systemic corruption, resentment, legitimacy deficit, and resistance. Coercive hierarchies, whether military, monetary, economic, or institutional, impose compliance without moral legitimacy. An international order built on dominance rests on fear. Yet fear does not eliminate conflict; it suppresses it temporarily. Beneath enforced compliance lies accumulated grievance. Over time, suppressed injustice re-emerges as instability, insurgency, proxy warfare, rival powers, or strategic realignment.

History demonstrates that empires collapse not because power fails, but because coercive order is inherently brittle. When obedience depends on threat, the removal or weakening of that

threat and the enforcement capacity that supports it exposes the absence of moral cohesion. Africonomics asserts a foundational principle: coercion cannot create structural peace. Stability derived from intimidation, force, or fraud is not stability; it is tyranny, and therefore it cannot last.

The choice is not between domination-based order and chaos. It is between unstable domination that masquerades as order and structural stability based on natural-moral law and justice. The Western paradigm has chosen the former. The Africonomics IR framework charts a path to the latter.

Why Balance-of-Power Theory Perpetuates Conflict

Balance-of-power theory—the idea that international stability is achieved when no single power can dominate and states form shifting alliances to check potential hegemons—is central to realist IR theory. This theory is not only descriptively inadequate but normatively pernicious, as it perpetuates the very conflicts it claims to manage.

The balance-of-power theory reflects a worldview of perpetual Darwinian rivalry. In this model, peace is not genuine reconciliation but a temporary strategic equilibrium; an unstable distribution of force that discourages open warfare because the costs outweigh the benefits. Such a framework assumes that nations are inherently adversarial; that moral constraints are secondary to strategic interests; that violent competition for dominance is permanent; and that conflict is inevitable and merely managed, not resolved.

This model views the international arena as an amoral, animalistic battleground. It reduces states to rival organisms in a struggle for survival and power. Peace is seen as a pause between conflicts rather than a durable, civilizational condition.

As noted, the balance-of-power system perpetuates the very insecurity and conflicts it seeks to manage. When states operate under the assumption of inherent rivalry and inevitable confrontation, they act accordingly and arm themselves. Yet defensive measures are often perceived by others as offensive threats. This generates arms races, alliance blocs, proxy conflicts, and deep-seated distrust, leading to endless cycles of conflict.

Deterrence may prevent immediate war, but it institutionalizes distrust and cannot foster true peace. It produces a world permanently preparing for violence. In this sense, the balance-of-power doctrine does not transcend conflict; it entrenches it.

Justice-Based (Not Power-Based) International Order

The fundamental choice in international order is between power-based and justice-based systems. The Western paradigm has chosen a power-based order rooted in racial hierarchy. The Africonomics framework proposes a justice-based order. It rejects the animalistic worldview of perpetual rivalry, conflict, and domination as fundamentally barbaric and proposes a human-centered alternative: a principled international order grounded in natural-moral law and structural justice.

A justice-based order rests on respect for sovereignty as a moral responsibility; truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity as binding principles; honest monetary systems; free enterprise and free trade; truthful diplomacy; and institutional legitimacy and accountability. In such a framework, security does not arise from superior military force but from moral conduct. Nations cooperate not because they fear retaliation, but because justice creates trust.

This does not imply naïveté. It recognizes that moral order requires institutions, enforcement of agreements, and consistent standards. But enforcement must serve justice—not domination. The aim is not to maintain hierarchy and hegemony but to foster a structurally just, peaceful, and civilized global order that reflects human moral nature. Power, in this model, is subordinated to principle. It is constrained by universal moral law, not justified by advantage.

Peace Through Justice, Not Deterrence

The Western paradigm's reliance on deterrence to maintain (nominal) peace is fundamentally flawed and morally bankrupt. True peace requires justice, not mutual threats of annihilation. It views peace as the absence of active warfare sustained by deterrence. This understanding is narrow and dangerous. It conceives human societies as feral entities locked in a perpetual struggle for survival, power, and dominance.

Africonomics affirms an accurate anthropology: human beings are moral agents, not advanced animals. As noted earlier, Africonomics rehumanizes international relations by rejecting the atrocious fiction that global politics is an amoral struggle among animalistic communities and restores the objective, civilizational truth that the world is composed of human communities capable of moral reasoning, rational deliberation, ethical restraint, recognition of universal obligations, and peaceful cooperation grounded in justice and mutual respect.

Peace, therefore, is not an equilibrium of fear. It is a moral and civilizational achievement.

True peace requires moral development at scale; just institutional structures; renunciation of imperial ambition; rejection of economic and monetary exploitation; and commitment to

structural justice and collaborative flourishing rather than hegemonic control.

Without moral foundations, peace remains a fragile deterrence punctuated by recurring war. With moral foundations, peace becomes structural and durable because it rests on objective, shared principles rather than arbitrary power and shifting calculations.

A fundamentally peaceful and stable international order cannot be engineered through the balancing of rival predators. It must be cultivated through the moral transformation of societies, moving from the existing consequentialist, statist, and Darwinian paradigm to a commitment to truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity as binding principles in global affairs.

This transformation will not happen quickly or easily. But the alternative—indefinite continuation of deterrence systems that threaten human extinction—is morally unacceptable and ultimately unsustainable. Justice-based peace is not a utopian fantasy but a practical necessity for a civilized global order.

6.3. International Institutions Under Africonomics

The Africonomics framework does not view global institutions as neutral administrative mechanisms. Institutions embody philosophical and often outright ideological commitments. They reflect assumptions about power, sovereignty, money, and human nature. When those assumptions are flawed, injustice becomes structural. Such is the case under the Western paradigm, an order marked by arbitrary governance, institutional corruption, technocratic tyranny, structural violence, and sophisticated barbarism.

Why Current Institutions Are Structurally Unjust

The major international institutions—the United Nations, International Monetary Fund, World Bank, World Trade Organization, and associated regional organizations—are not merely flawed in their operations but structurally unjust in their design, governance, and purposes. They cannot be reformed into just institutions because their injustice is intrinsic, not incidental. Their design reflects a power-centered, statist, and monetary framework that subordinates justice to geopolitical and financial dominance.

Several structural features reveal this injustice:

- *Power-weighted governance*: Decision-making authority is tied to financial contributions or geopolitical influence rather than moral equality among nations. This entrenches

hierarchy rather than sovereignty.

- *Conditionality and dependency*: Lending and 'assistance' mechanisms frequently impose policy conditions that override domestic autonomy, reshaping national institutions according to externally imposed models based on Western ideological commitments.
- *Fiat monetary integration*: The global financial architecture operates within a system of fiat currency dominance, enabling monetary manipulation, debt dependency, financial leverage, and hegemonic control.
- *Managed trade structures*: Instead of facilitating genuinely free exchange, trade regimes often institutionalize regulatory asymmetries and protectionist carve-outs that preserve advantages for dominant economies.

These are not accidental distortions; they are expressions of an underlying rivalrous and conflictual worldview that approaches global order as a managed hierarchy rather than a community of morally equal nations. Therefore, reform within the existing paradigm cannot produce justice. Adjusting voting weights or modifying program conditions does not address the foundational problem: prevailing models and institutions are designed to manage hierarchy, stabilize power arrangements, and maintain Western hegemony; they are not designed to uphold natural-moral law and foster human flourishing within a structurally just order.

Reimagining Global Cooperation Without Systemic Coercion and Deception

Africonomics does not reject international cooperation. It rejects coercive and deceptive international management. Global order and cooperation should be grounded in voluntary association among sovereign nations; equal moral standing irrespective of economic size; transparent agreements entered into without structural leverage; decentralized and principled institutional design; and strict prohibition of coercive policy imposition.

In such a framework, institutions would function as platforms for coordination rather than instruments of control. Their legitimacy would derive not from power concentration but from adherence to justice.

An Africonomics-aligned international institution would:

- Operate on one-nation, one-vote principles where appropriate.
- Prohibit conditional lending that restructures domestic governance.
- Forbid monetary manipulation and competitive devaluation.
- Facilitate dispute resolution grounded in objective moral standards rather than political

bargaining.

The purpose of institutions would shift from stabilizing global hierarchies to promoting just relations and peaceful human flourishing.

Monetary Sovereignty and Sound Money in Global Relations

The current international monetary order—centered on U.S. dollar hegemony, fiat currency creation, and weaponized financial networks—constitutes one of the most destabilizing and destructive features of global politics. As noted in *The Fiat Dollar Standard: A Global Experiment in Monetary Destruction* (Tacanho, 2025), the fiat dollar system is the central structural injustice of the contemporary statist global order. It redistributes wealth from the many to the few, corrodes social trust, destabilizes economies, and entrenches dependency, inequality, and tyranny worldwide. It constitutes a structural crime against humanity, harming the majority while consolidating Western domination.

Reserve currency dominance enables unilateral punitive sanctions, liquidity manipulation, debt-based leverage over weaker nations, inflationary externalization, financial surveillance and exclusion, and compliance enforcement mechanisms.

When money itself becomes an instrument of power, control, and subjugation, international relations are structurally distorted and severely corrupted. Nations are forced into dependence on imperial systems that systematically undermine their sovereignty and prosperity.

Africonomics insists that monetary reform is indispensable to international justice. The structural violence of the fiat dollar system must be confronted and replaced by sound money grounded in natural-moral law.

A just global order requires monetary sovereignty for all nations, sound money grounded in objective value rather than fiat fraud and political discretion, elimination of inflationary global reserve systems, and decentralization of financial clearing networks.

Without sound money, global stability and peace are illusory. Monetary power has been weaponized in the service of geopolitical power. In this context, the restoration of honest currency systems is not merely economic reform but a moral and civilizational necessity.

True Free Trade, Not Managed Dependency

Trade under Africonomics is not a tool of strategic leverage; it is a voluntary exchange

between productive communities. The current global trade architecture blends protectionism for powerful economies with managed liberalization for weaker ones. This produces dependency structures in which developing nations remain commodity exporters while value-added production remains concentrated elsewhere.

True free trade requires the elimination of coercive trade conditions, removal of asymmetric regulatory barriers, prohibition of debt entrapment disguised as development assistance, and respect for domestic institutional autonomy.

Trade should foster mutual enrichment, not managed dependency. When enterprise and exchange are genuinely free and supported by sound money, trade becomes a powerful mechanism of peace and prosperity. It aligns incentives toward cooperation and productive peace instead of control and rivalry.

Conclusion

The conclusion is unequivocal: current international institutions are structurally unjust because they are grounded in arbitrary governance, power politics, fiat monetary dominance, and managed hierarchy. Their injustice is intrinsic, not incidental. Justice in international relations requires institutional reconstruction from first principles—natural-moral law, sovereign equality, sound money, and voluntary exchange. Only institutions designed from the ground up to serve these principles can sustain a peaceful and civilized global order.

7. Implications for Global Peace and Prosperity

The Africonomics Theory of International Relations does more than expose the moral bankruptcy of the existing global system; it offers a principled blueprint for how the international order can and must be ethically restructured. Grounded in natural-moral law, it fundamentally reframes the structure of diplomacy, trade, monetary systems, and global governance from perpetual rivalry and conflict to objective justice.

If implemented, its implications would be transformative. The shift would not be cosmetic reform but structural reorientation—from domination to dignity, from manipulation to truth, from coercion to voluntary cooperation. The Africonomics framework demonstrates that the current paradigm's perpetual war, systematic economic exploitation, ideological domination, and structural injustice are not inevitable features of international human relations but logical

consequences of morally bankrupt foundations that can and must be replaced.

Ending Permanent War

The present global order is militarist and has normalized war as a routine instrument of statecraft. The United States has been at war for over 90% of its existence as a nation. NATO has expanded from a defensive alliance into an interventionist force conducting operations far beyond its member states' territories. Proxy wars devastate peripheral regions while great powers compete for advantage. Regime change wars, preemptive strikes, humanitarian interventions, and counter-terrorism operations provide endless pretexts for military violence.

The permanent war economy sustains itself through manufactured threats, inflated dangers, and institutional interests divorced from legitimate security needs. Even in times absent from a formal world war, the system remains characterized by continuous proxy conflicts, strategic interventions, arms races, regime manipulation, and security blocs built on mutual suspicion.

This normalization of militarism and war flows directly from the Western paradigm's Darwinian premises, power-based logic, and consequentialist ethics. When international relations are understood as perpetual competition for power and survival, when moral constraints are dismissed as naive sentimentalism, and when strategic goals justify any means, war becomes not a tragic moral failure but a rational policy option that requires only cost-benefit calculation. In other words, under power politics war is not an aberration; it is policy by other means.

Africonomics rejects this unprincipled and atrocious logic. By grounding international conduct in nonaggression and moral accountability, it eliminates the philosophical justification for expansionism, preventive war, and coercive interventionism. War ceases to be a strategic instrument. It becomes what it truly is: a tragic moral failure.

Ending permanent war requires renunciation of imperial ambition, elimination of structural monetary incentives that finance militarism, rejection of deterrence doctrines premised on mutual threat, and institutional commitment to dispute resolution rooted in justice. When nations are no longer incentivized to dominate, and when money cannot be weaponized through fiat expansion, the structural drivers of conflict begin to dissolve.

Ending Economic Imperialism

Modern imperialism typically operates without formal colonies. The contemporary global economic order is a sophisticated statist architecture of imperialism, extracting wealth from the

periphery to the core through interconnected mechanisms that include monetary dominance, debt dependency, extractive trade, capital flows, sanctions regimes, and development conditionalities.

This systemic control and extraction produce and perpetuate global inequality, condemn billions to preventable poverty, and subordinate the development needs of poor nations to the profit maximization of transnational corporations and wealthy nation governments.

Africonomics identifies fiat monetary hegemony and managed trade systems as central instruments of this imperial architecture. Reserve currency dominance allows certain states to externalize inflation, weaponize liquidity, and exert extraterritorial financial control. Trade regimes frequently preserve structural advantage for dominant economies while restricting meaningful industrial development elsewhere.

Ending economic imperialism requires a fundamental reorientation from the existing statist-fiat economic order to a free-market economic order grounded in natural-moral law and sound money. Economic relations must shift from dependency and extraction management to free markets and productive enterprise. Structural justice and genuine prosperity cannot be engineered through coercive control.

Ending Ideological Domination

The Western order imposes not only economic and military control but also comprehensive ideological and cultural domination. Western views and philosophies are presented as scientific, universal truths even though they are often flawed. The Western consequentialist, statist, and Darwinian worldview continues to shape international institutions, legal theory, governance systems, and economic models.

This intellectual hegemony narrows the range of permissible models and suppresses alternative civilizational frameworks. Ideological domination serves to legitimize Western power, prevent the emergence of constructive alternatives, manufacture consent for Western aggression, and psychologically colonize non-Western peoples by teaching them to view their own cultures as inferior.

Africonomics rejects ideological hegemony and restores African intellectual and epistemological sovereignty. It liberates African thought from Western deception and domination. It calls for a principled reexamination of mainstream economics, political theory, and broader social sciences.

Global order must not demand cultural conformity. It must demand moral consistency. Natural-moral principles are universal, but their institutional expressions need not be homogenized. Societies may structure governance, markets, and social institutions differently, provided they consistently align with truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity.

Building a Principled, Peaceful, and Just Global Order

The constructive vision of Africonomics is neither isolationist nor utopian; it is grounded in objective principles and human moral nature. It envisions a global community organized around nonracial human dignity, sovereign equality, sound money, free markets, free trade, principled diplomacy, institutional accountability, and binding nonaggression.

Peace becomes a moral condition sustained by just structures rather than a temporary equilibrium of fear and distrust. Trade becomes mutual enrichment rather than strategic leverage. Diplomacy becomes principled dialogue rather than tactical deception. Prosperity emerges not from resource extraction or geopolitical advantage, but from productivity, trust, and collaborative exchange.

Such an order would reduce structural incentives for war, eliminate debt-based monetary domination, encourage decentralized economic development and genuine prosperity, and stabilize global relations through universal moral standards. It would replace hierarchy with reciprocity and rivalry with cooperation.

From Barbarism to Civilization

The implications of Africonomics for global peace and prosperity are revolutionary and fundamentally transformative. By ending permanent war, economic imperialism, and ideological domination, and by building a principled global order grounded in natural-moral law, humanity can move from the sophisticated barbarism of the current paradigm toward a truly civilized global community.

Every element of the Africonomics vision is practically achievable and grounded in moral reality about human nature and what makes a structurally just, peaceful, and civilized world. The current system's perpetual conflict, systemic exploitation, and structural injustice are not inevitable features of international life but consequences of flawed philosophical foundations that can and must be replaced.

Human beings are capable of justice. Nations are capable of principled conduct. Institutions

can be designed to serve truth and human flourishing rather than power and domination.

The choice before humanity is not between realism and idealism; it is between continued descent into sophisticated barbarism and moral reconstruction. To persist with a paradigm that normalizes exploitation and prepares endlessly for war is a fundamental betrayal of human vocation. To adopt objective moral foundations for international relations is to choose the path of true civilization.

Africonomics provides the intellectual structure, ethical grounding, and institutional direction for this reconstruction. What remains is the moral courage to replace power with principle and domination with justice.

8. Africonomics and the Rebirth of Civilized Global Order

The global order is not fated to remain thuggish, brutish, conflictual, and unjust. The prevailing structure of international human relations—marked by rivalry, deception, and domination—is a product of specific historical choices, philosophical assumptions, and institutional arrangements. It can be changed. The Africonomics Theory of International Relations offers a moral and practical framework for replacing imperial paradigms with principled cooperation and for replacing power politics with a structurally just, peaceful, and civilized order.

From Power to Principle

The first step toward a civilized international order is a philosophical shift from power-based legitimacy to justice-based legitimacy. Nations must no longer be evaluated by their military strength, institutional complexity, or economic dominance, but by the justice of their conduct and their adherence to universal moral principles. This requires a redefinition of national interest, not as the violent pursuit of dominance, but as the pursuit of justice, peaceful coexistence, and mutual respect.

In this framework, the strongest nations are not those that can coerce, exploit, or subjugate others, but those that restrain coercion and align institutional conduct with the natural-moral law principles of truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity. Prestige comes not from imperial control or influence, but from moral leadership. Sovereignty is not the right to violate rights, but the responsibility to protect them. And legitimacy arises from principled and just governance structures, not from arbitrary rule and coercive power.

Structural Justice as the Foundation of Peace and Prosperity

Peace is not a diplomatic artifact; it is the fruit of justice. Africonomics affirms that only structurally just societies and international systems can produce stable, lasting peace. This requires sound money that protects people from inflationary confiscation, debt dependency, and foreign manipulation; genuinely free markets grounded in voluntary exchange rather than extractive trade regimes; and foreign policies governed by nonaggression and respect for sovereignty.

The barbarism that characterizes contemporary international relations is not accidental or independent from domestic social organization. It is fundamentally a reflection and extension of the barbarism that still characterizes human relations within societies. International relations cannot rise above the moral structure of domestic relations. A nation built on coercion, deception, exploitation, and systemic injustice domestically inevitably projects these same principles outward. Power politics abroad is the external expression of structural injustice at home.

Conversely, societies grounded in natural-moral law—respecting human dignity, protecting property rights, and constraining arbitrary power—develop institutions and cultures capable of principled, peaceful relations externally. Thus, achieving a civilized global order presupposes achieving structurally just, peaceful, and civilized socioeconomic systems within nations. In essence: external peace presupposes internal justice, and international order cannot be civilized if domestic order remains coercive and structurally violent.

As articulated in *The Scale of Statism*, *The Myth of Modern Capitalism,* and *The Structural Violence of Socialist Systems*, this transformation requires rejecting statism, consequentialism, and coercive governance in favor of voluntary cooperation, sound money, and institutions that safeguard natural individual rights. Only when nations embody justice internally can they practice it externally. This makes the project of civilizing international relations inseparable from the broader Africonomics project of civilizing human society at every level.

The Africonomics Theory of Structural Justice establishes that economic prosperity depends upon this foundation. Wealth divorced from justice is fragile and illusory. Genuine prosperity emerges where legal and institutional structures are anchored in natural-moral law, prohibit systemic coercion, and respect people's natural rights to life, liberty, and property ownership.

This vision dissolves the artificial hierarchies of imperial and post-colonial world orders,

replacing them with *horizontal relations among nations of equal moral standing*, bound by justice, and capable of sustaining peace and prosperity.

The Imperative for African Moral and Civilizational Leadership

Africonomics positions Africa not as a mere participant in the existing global system, but as the torchbearer of a new civilizational standard. Africa is uniquely positioned to model ethical leadership grounded in natural-moral law and peaceful relations; to reject Western consequentialist, statist, and Darwinian models and instead cultivate principled cooperation; and to inspire a global reawakening to truth, justice, and human dignity.

This is not about historical revenge or ideological rivalry. It is about restoring moral clarity to social order and global affairs, thereby guiding the human family away from the abyss of perpetual war, fiat imperialism, structural violence, and civilizational collapse. Africa's burden is not to imitate the West's destructive legacy, but to lead the world beyond it.

Africa has been treated as a passive recipient of external power—dehumanized, colonized, categorized, indebted, lectured, and repressively controlled. Africonomics restores Africa to its rightful place as a sovereign civilizational actor: intellectually independent, morally grounded, and institutionally innovative. This entails a fundamental transformation. To move from subjection to leadership requires intellectual independence; monetary justice through sound money; institutional integrity through the rule of just law; rejection of statist and dependency frameworks; and commitment to natural-moral law.

A morally reconstructed Africa—governed by just institutions, anchored in sound money, and guided by principled diplomacy—would stand as a living refutation of the power-politics paradigm. Such leadership would not impose ideology; it would invite imitation through demonstrated success. The rebirth of civilized global order will not emerge from further centralization of power, nor from the refinement of deterrence systems. It can only emerge from moral reconstruction. Africa, through Africonomics, possesses both the historical insight and philosophical foundation to initiate this reconstruction.

As Tacanho remarks in *The African Worldview: A Principled and Civilized Vision in Contrast to the Western Aggressive Ethos* (2025):

> For centuries, the West has self-anointed with a "civilizing mission," encapsulated in the myth of the White Man's Burden, while perpetuating barbaric practices and erecting uncivilized systems of coercion, deception, exploitation, and oppression enforced through state aggression. In truth, the burden of civilizing the world does not rest on the shoulders of the Western man, but on the African man. Africa holds the natural capacity to

humanize and civilize the world.

If human flourishing is to truly advance, international relations must be civilized. This means grounding diplomacy, trade, security, and global cooperation in natural-moral law rather than perpetual rivalry and power politics. It means choosing truth over propaganda, justice over force, and peace over power.

The Africonomics Theory of International Relations is a practical and principled response to the failures of the modern consequentialist, statist, and Darwinian world. It offers a coherent alternative for any nation, but especially for Africa, to chart a path that is morally legitimate, structurally just, and fundamentally human. With Africonomics, Africa can liberate itself, restore its sovereignty and dignity, rebuild its institutions on natural-moral law, and demonstrate that peace and prosperity are fruits of justice—not domination.

9. Conclusion: Toward a Civilized International Order

The Fundamental Choice Before Humanity

This paper has exposed the profound moral bankruptcy, philosophical incoherence, and civilizational destructiveness of the Western paradigm of international relations and has presented the Africonomics alternative grounded in natural-moral law as a constructive foundation for a civilized global order. The analysis reveals a fundamental choice confronting humanity: persist with the sophisticated barbarism of the current paradigm—continuing down the path of perpetual war, systemic exploitation, structural violence, and civilizational decline—or embrace the moral transformation necessary to build a structurally just, peaceful, and civilized global community.

This is not a choice between competing academic theories or marginal policy adjustments. It is a civilizational crossroads that requires fundamental decisions about whether human societies, including in their international dimensions, will be organized according to objective moral truth and respect for human dignity, or will continue to be governed by arbitrary power, coercion, and the systematic denial of moral reality. The stakes could not be higher. The continued trajectory of the Western paradigm leads inexorably toward catastrophe—whether through nuclear war, economic collapse, or social disintegration. Only moral reconstruction offers hope for civilizational survival and human flourishing.

Western IR as Organized Barbarism

The Western paradigm stands refuted by this analysis. Its philosophical foundations rest on demonstrably false premises about human nature, morality, and social order. Its theoretical frameworks—whether realist, liberal, or constructivist—share common roots in consequentialism, statism, and Darwinian anthropology that deny human moral agency and objective ethical truth. Its practical applications have produced not peace, prosperity, or justice but perpetual conflict, systematic exploitation, and normalized violence on an unprecedented scale.

Consequentialism reduces morality to outcome-based calculation, subordinating intrinsic moral principles to strategic goals and enabling any atrocity that can be rationalized as serving beneficial ends. This framework turns international relations into a utilitarian calculus where human rights are instrumental rhetoric, civilian suffering is an acceptable cost, and moral constraints dissolve into strategic considerations.

Statism elevates state power to a supreme position, concentrating dangerous levels of coercive authority in centralized institutions that operate beyond genuine accountability, systematically violate natural rights domestically and internationally, and serve elite interests disguised as national or collective welfare. The global order reflects this statist logic through institutions designed to project and maintain Western hegemonic dominance.

Darwinian anthropology reduces human beings to advanced animals driven by material interests and survival instincts, nations to predatory organisms competing in evolutionary struggle, and international relations to an amoral arena where might makes right and moral restraint represents strategic foolishness. This dehumanizing, animalistic framework legitimizes aggression, normalizes domination, and makes genocide a logical endpoint of competitive elimination.

These unprincipled foundations necessarily produce barbaric outcomes. The current global order is characterized by permanent war normalized as policy instrument, economic imperialism extracting wealth systematically from periphery to core, monetary manipulation enabling exploitation through fiat currency hegemony, sovereignty violations justified through various pretexts, collective punishment and mass civilian suffering dismissed as collateral damage, international law applied selectively to serve powerful nations' interests, and human dignity subordinated to centralized control.

This is not a flawed paradigm requiring reform; it is sophisticated barbarism requiring

categorical rejection. The Western paradigm's claim to represent a realistic analysis of international affairs is exposed as ideological mystification. It does not describe inevitable features of human nature or necessary characteristics of international relations, but what happens when societies deny moral truth, suppress human moral capacities, and organize global order according to power rather than principle.

The Africonomics Alternative: Natural-Moral Law as Foundation

Against this comprehensive moral failure, Africonomics offers a principled alternative grounded in objective reality about human nature, moral truth, and the requirements for civilized social order. This framework begins with accurate anthropology that recognizes human beings as moral agents, endowed with reason, conscience, free will, and inherent dignity that grounds inalienable rights and generates binding moral obligations.

Nations, as communities of moral agents organized through institutional structures, possess moral agency and bear moral responsibility for their collective actions. They are bound by the same natural-moral law that governs all human conduct—universal, objective principles knowable through reason and grounded in human nature and divine creation: truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity.

These principles apply with full force to international relations. There is no moral vacuum between nations, no ethical free zone where strategic calculation displaces moral obligation, no realm of human interaction exempt from evaluation according to objective standards of right and wrong. International relations is fundamentally a moral domain where nations can and must be held accountable to universal principles that bind all human actors.

Sovereignty is properly understood not as unlimited state power or license for domination but as moral responsibility to govern justly within natural-moral law principles, to respect the rights of one's own citizens and the sovereignty of other nations, and to conduct international relations according to truth, justice, and peaceful cooperation.

Peace is not merely a strategic equilibrium or temporary absence of war maintained through deterrence and balance of power, but a moral condition characterized by justice, mutual respect, voluntary cooperation, and institutional arrangements that serve human flourishing across all communities. True peace requires moral foundations and structural justice; it cannot be engineered coercively through mechanisms that deny or suppress moral reality.

International order must be grounded in justice rather than power, organized around sovereign equality rather than hierarchy, based on voluntary cooperation rather than coercion, constrained by objective moral principles rather than strategic expediency, and oriented toward serving human dignity and flourishing rather than state aggrandizement or hegemonic control.

The Africonomics IR framework is not utopian idealism but moral realism grounded in an accurate understanding of what human beings are, what moral principles bind human action and institutional design, and what conditions enable productive peace and civilizational flourishing. The Western paradigm's supposed realism is revealed as moral corruption and philosophical confusion, projecting its own false assumptions onto existence and then claiming them to be inevitable truths.

Civilization or Barbarism

Human history presents a recurring choice between civilization and barbarism, between organizing society based on moral truth or based on coercion and violence. Civilization requires sustained commitment to truth, justice, restraint, respect for human dignity, constraint of arbitrary power, and peaceful cooperation. It is a fragile achievement that requires constant renewal and is easily lost when moral foundations erode.

The contemporary global order represents barbarism—sophisticated in its methods, elaborate in its rationalizations, complex in its institutional structures, but barbaric nonetheless in its systematic subordination of human beings to arbitrary power, its denial of objective moral truth, its normalization of violence, and its production of mass suffering and injustice. This barbarism is not sustainable. It will end, either through conscious moral transformation toward structural justice or through catastrophic collapse into even more horrific forms of violence and chaos.

The Africonomics Theory of International Relations provides the intellectual framework, moral principles, and practical guidance necessary for conscious transformation toward civilized global order. Africonomics envisions a decentralized, voluntary, and ethically ordered global system in which nations cooperate through moral choice, not through fear or manipulation. It asserts that economic systems must be just, monetary systems must be sound, and diplomacy must be truthful. It calls for a global shift away from domination and toward peaceful, principled coexistence.

Crucially, Africonomics places Africa at the center of this moral reconstruction and civilizational transformation. Not because Africa is morally superior by default, but because its

worldview, its historical humility, and its philosophical foundations offer the world what the West has long failed to provide: a vision of civilization grounded in ethics, not empire. Therefore, Africa must lead.

The global future will be determined not by who commands the most weapons or fiat currency, but by who upholds the most just and principled vision of human coexistence and peaceful flourishing. It is time to humanize and civilize international relations, and in doing so, lay the moral foundations for a truly peaceful, prosperous, and dignified world.

Africonomics provides the philosophical coherence, ethical grounding, and institutional direction for this transformation. A civilized international order is possible.

References

Tacanho, Manuel. 2025. Restoring Objective Morality: The Africonomics Refutation of Western Consequentialist Philosophies. *Afrindependent Institute Academic Paper No. 012/2025*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/author=5930078.

Tacanho, Manuel. 2025. The Scale of Statism: A Principled Framework for Ranking Socioeconomic Systems. *Afrindependent Institute Paper No. 005/2025*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5392745.

Tacanho, Manuel. 2025. The Africonomics Theory of Structural Justice: A Transformative Framework for Civilized and Prosperous Society. *Afrindependent Institute Academic Paper No. 006/2025*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5404094.

Tacanho, Manuel. 2026. The Myth of Modern Capitalism: Why the Western Economic Order Is Statist, Not Free-Market. *Afrindependent Institute Academic Paper No. 001/2026*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5805072.

Tacanho, Manuel. 2026. The Structural Violence of Socialist Systems: An Africonomics Refutation of Socialism and Coercive Governance. *Afrindependent Institute Academic Paper No. 002/2026*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5734281.

Tacanho, Manuel. 2025. The Philosophical Structure of Africonomics: A Principled Framework for African Sovereignty and Prosperity. *Afrindependent Institute Paper No. 001/2025*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5236633.

Tacanho, Manuel. 2025. The Ethical Foundations of Economics: Beyond the Myth of Value-Free Social Science. *Afrindependent Institute Academic Paper No. 013/2025*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5891122.

Tacanho, Manuel. 2025. The Pseudoscience of Statist Economics: An Africonomics Refutation of Utilitarian and Positivist Models. *Afrindependent Institute Academic Paper No. 014/2025*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5977734.

Tacanho, Manuel. 2025. Africonomics and the Rebirth of Civilization: A Moral Vision for a Truly Civilized World. *Afrindependent Institute Academic Paper No. 010/2025*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5640650.

Tacanho, Manuel. 2025. The African Worldview: A Principled and Civilized Vision in Contrast to the Western Aggressive Ethos. *Afrindependent Institute Academic Paper No. 003/2025*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5346402.

Tacanho, Manuel. 2025. Mineral Fixation by Design: How the West Engineered Africa's Resource Dependency and Economic Underdevelopment. *Afrindependent Institute Policy Paper No. 005/2025*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5365835.

Tacanho, Manuel. 2025. The Fiat Dollar Standard: A Global Experiment in Monetary Destruction. *Afrindependent Institute Academic Paper No. 011/2025*. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=5721282.

Appendices

Appendix A: Contrasting Africonomics IR with Western IR

Africonomics IR Theory vs. Western IR Theory

Comparative Framework

Dimension	Africonomics International Relations Theory	Western International Relations Theory
Foundational Philosophy	Natural-moral law grounded in objective morality and human moral agency	Consequentialism, materialism, positivism, and moral relativism
View of Human Nature	Humans are moral agents endowed with ethical discernment and responsibility	Humans are self- interested, power-seeking, mechanistic or animalistic actors
Moral Ontology	Objective, universal moral principles exist and are discoverable through reason	Morality is subjective, instrumental, or socially constructed
Core Ethical Principles	Truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity	Power, survival, interest maximization, utility, or norms contingent on context
Purpose of International Relations	Establish structurally just, peaceful, and civilized global order	Manage conflict, balance power, or optimize national advantage
Legitimacy of Power	Power is legitimate only when constrained by moral law	Power is legitimate if effective or strategically advantageous
Use of Force	Strictly defensive; aggression is inherently unjust and uncivilized	Instrumental; force justified by interest, necessity, or outcomes
View of War	Moral failure and civilizational breakdown	Normal, inevitable, or necessary feature of international politics
Sovereignty	Moral sovereignty rooted in dignity, self-determination, and nonaggression	Instrumental sovereignty, often conditional or overridden by power

International Law	Moral law precedes and constrains positive law	Law reflects power relations and enforcement capacity
Global Order	Moral order grounded in justice and voluntary cooperation	Hierarchical order maintained through dominance and coercion
Economic Relations Between States	Free, voluntary exchange under sound money and moral restraint	Trade, sanctions, debt, and financial coercion as tools of state power
Role of Institutions	Facilitate cooperation consistent with moral law	Instruments of power projection and control
Colonial / Post-Colonial Analysis	Recognizes structural injustice and imposed institutional violence	Often ignores or normalizes imperial legacies
View of "Might Makes Right"	Explicitly rejected as barbaric and genocidal	Implicitly accepted, especially in realism
Civilization Standard	Measured by justice, peace, and moral integrity	Measured by power, dominance, and material capacity
View of Peace	Peace is a moral condition rooted in justice	Peace is temporary equilibrium of power
Anthropological Assumption	Human relations are capable of moral restraint and cooperation	Human relations are inherently conflictual
Epistemology	Moral-rational inquiry integrated with historical understanding	Positivist, empirical, or constructivist methodologies
Ultimate Outcome	Structurally just, peaceful, and civilized global order	Cycles of domination, war, instability, and fragmentation

AFRINDEPENDENT INSTITUTE

HOME OF AFRICONOMICS

Summary Insight:

- Africonomics IR treats international relations as a *moral domain* governed by objective ethical principles necessary for structurally just, peaceful, and civilized global order.
- Western IR treats international relations as a *power domain* governed by Darwinian logic, survival, and strategic calculation.

Africonomics rejects the Western axiom that violence and domination are inevitable. It demonstrates that uncivilized assumptions produce uncivilized outcomes, while moral clarity enables peaceful human flourishing.

Appendix B: Methodological Note: Why Africonomics Constitutes a New International Relations Paradigm

Africonomics constitutes a distinct and original International Relations (IR) paradigm because it departs fundamentally from the ontological, epistemological, and ethical assumptions that underpin Western IR theories. Instead of modifying or recombining realism, liberalism, or constructivism, Africonomics begins from an entirely different ontological and methodological foundation: natural-moral law and the moral agency of the human person.

Methodologically, Africonomics rejects the Western positivist and consequentialist claim that international relations can be analyzed as a value-neutral domain governed solely by power, interests, or material constraints. Instead, it treats international relations as a moral domain, in which human beings and human societies act as ethical agents accountable to objective moral principles. This constitutes a paradigmatic shift from explaining behavior to evaluating legitimacy.

Africonomics employs a principled methodology rather than an empirical-instrumental one. It evaluates international systems not by their effectiveness in securing dominance or relative stability, but by their conformity to universal moral criteria—truth, justice, nonaggression, and human dignity. These criteria serve as demarcation standards, allowing Africonomics to distinguish civilized from uncivilized systems in a principled, objective manner.

Epistemologically, Africonomics integrates moral reasoning, historical analysis, and institutional critique, rejecting the artificial separation between facts and values that characterizes Western IR. It recognizes that all international systems are grounded in moral assumptions—whether acknowledged, concealed, or denied—and demonstrates that denying objective morality does not eliminate ethics but merely conceals unjust ones behind technical language and power rationalizations.

Ontologically, Africonomics rejects the mechanistic, Darwinian conception of human nature implicit in Western IR theory. It affirms that humans are not animalistic, survival-driven, or power-maximizing entities, but moral agents capable of ethical discernment, responsibility, and peaceful relations. Nations, as communities of individuals, are moral agents who bear moral responsibility for their collective, institutional actions.

This anthropological correction fundamentally alters how war, sovereignty, power, and peace are understood.

For these reasons, Africonomics is neither a variant of existing IR theories nor a postcolonial critique operating within Western conceptual boundaries. It is a paradigm replacement: a natural-moral framework that exposes the barbarism embedded in consequentialist international relations and provides a principled foundation for a truly civilized global order.

PUBLICATION:

The Africonomics Theory of International Relations: A Natural-Moral Framework for Civilized Global Order
Afrindependent Institute Academic Paper No. 003/2026

www.afrindependent.org/publications