



Speak Truth to Power



a Quaker search for an alternative to violence

a study of international conflict

prepared for the American Friends Service Committee

SPEAK TRUTH TO POWER

*A Quaker Search for an Alternative
to Violence*



A STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT
PREPARED FOR THE
AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

A NOTE TO THE READER

For more than thirty-five years the American Friends Service Committee has worked among those who suffer, recognizing no enemies, and seeking only to give expression to the love of God in service. Out of this experience, gained under all kinds of governments and amidst all kinds of people, has come some appreciation of the problems of peacemaking in the modern world. This has led the Committee to issue over the past five years a series of studies on possible ways to ease tension and move toward international peace. The series began in 1949 with the publication of *The United States and the Soviet Union*. It was continued in 1951 with *Steps to Peace* and in 1952 with *Toward Security through Disarmament*. This is the fourth of the series, while a fifth, dealing with the future of the United Nations, is now in preparation.

All of these reports have been prepared for the American Friends Service Committee by study groups convened especially for the purpose. They have been approved for publication by the Committee's Executive Board—not as official pronouncements, but in the interest of stimulating public discussion of the issues raised, and in the hope that such discussion will contribute to the formation of policies that will bring peace.

The other studies have been developed on the assumption that reliance on military power is so integral in the policy of every major nation, that the most practical approach to peacemaking is to suggest specific next steps to reduce tension and thereby move gradually away from the reliance on force. Many other individuals and organizations have made similar suggestions, so that discussion of such alternatives to present policy has been fairly widespread. A large area of agreement has indeed been reached, and many Americans both in and out of government concur on the kind of constructive measures needed.

Yet American policy has continued to develop in the opposite direction. This study attempts to discover why this should be so. It finds its answer not in the inadequacy of statesmanship or in the machinations of evil men, but in what seem to the drafters of this report to be the unsound premises upon which policy is based. Most

Americans accept without question the assumption that winning the peace depends upon a simultaneous reliance upon military strength and long-range programs of a positive and constructive character. They accept also the assumption that totalitarian communism is the greatest evil that now threatens men and that this evil can be met only by violence, or at least by the threat of violence. We believe these assumptions cannot be sustained, and therefore that the policies based on them are built upon sand. We have here attempted to analyze our reasons, and without denying the value of proposals that might ease present tensions, to suggest another and less widely considered alternative built on a different assumption, namely, that military power in today's world is incompatible with freedom, incapable of providing security, and ineffective in dealing with evil.

Our title, *Speak Truth to Power*, taken from a charge given to Eighteenth Century Friends, suggests the effort that is made to speak from the deepest insight of the Quaker faith, as this faith is understood by those who prepared this study. We speak to *power* in three senses:

To those who hold high places in our national life and bear the terrible responsibility of making decisions for war or peace.

To the American people who are the final reservoir of power in this country and whose values and expectations set the limits for those who exercise authority.

To the idea of Power itself, and its impact on Twentieth Century life.

Our *truth* is an ancient one: that love endures and overcomes; that hatred destroys; that what is obtained by love is retained, but what is obtained by hatred proves a burden. This truth, fundamental to the position which rejects reliance on the method of war, is ultimately a religious perception, a belief that stands outside of history. Because of this we could not end this study without discussing the relationship between the politics of time with which men are daily concerned and the politics of eternity which they too easily ignore.

But our main purpose is not to restate the many prophetic expositions of the pacifist position. Beginning with *The Sermon on the Mount*, the Christian tradition alone has produced a library of enduring religious statements, and the same can be said for the literature of other great faiths. The urgent need is not to preach religious truth, but to show how it is possible and why it is reason-

able to give practical expression to it in the great conflict that now divides the world.

In recent years, outside of theological circles, and infrequently there, there has been little able discussion of the pacifist point of view. Pacifism has been catalogued as the private witness of a small but useful minority, or as the irresponsible action of men who are so overwhelmed with the horror of war that they fail to see that greater evil sometimes exists and that the sacrifices of war may be necessary to turn it back. Whether condemned or in a sense valued, pacifism has been considered irrelevant to the concrete problems of international relations.

This study attempts to show its relevance. It is focused on the current international crisis. It begins with a survey of the same concrete problems with which any discussion of world affairs must deal. It is concerned with problems of security, the growth of Russian and American power, the challenge to American interests presented by Soviet Communism. It recognizes the existence of evil and the need to resist it actively. It does not see peacemaking as the attempt to reconcile evil with good. It speaks to the problem of inevitable conflict.

We believe it is time for thoughtful men to look behind the label "pacifist," to deal fairly with the ideas and beliefs which sustain those whose approach to foreign policy begins with the rejection of reliance upon military power. We speak to the great majority of Americans who still stand opposed to war, who expect no good of armies and H-bombs. Their reluctant acceptance of a dominantly military policy has been based on the belief that military power provides the necessary security without which the constructive work that builds peace cannot be undertaken. They are for a military program because they feel they must be. "There is no alternative."

We have tried to present an alternative and to set forth our reasons for believing that it offers far greater hope and involves no greater risk than our present military policy. Our effort is incomplete, but we believe it is a step toward the serious examination of a non-violent approach to world problems. Is there a method for dealing with conflict which does not involve us in the betrayal of our own beliefs, either through acquiescence to our opponent's will or through resorting to evil means to resist him? Is there a way to meet that which threatens us, without relying on our ability to cause pain to the human being who embodies the threat?

We believe there is a way, and that it lies in the attempt to give practical demonstration to the effectiveness of love in human relations. We believe able men, pacifist and non-pacifist alike, have taken this initial insight, developed it, demonstrated it, and built understanding and support for it in field after field of human relations. In view of this, it is strange that almost no one has made a serious attempt to explore its implications in international affairs. There is now almost no place in our great universities, few lines in the budgets of our great foundations, and little space in scholarly journals, for thought and experimentation that begin with the unconditional rejection of organized mass violence and seek to think through the concrete problems of present international relations in new terms. It is time there was.

New conditions demand new responses. We have tried here to suggest a new response. We hope the reader will bring to it an open mind, and if in any way challenged, will join in a serious effort to explore farther the lines of thought we have suggested.

Submitted to the Executive Board and approved for publication March 2, 1955.

STEPHEN G. CARY, *Chairman*

JAMES E. BRISTOL	CECIL E. HINSHAW
AMIYA CHAKRAVARTY	MILTON MAYER
A. BURNS CHALMERS	A. J. MUSTE
WILLIAM B. EDGERTON	CLARENCE E. PICKETT
HARROP A. FREEMAN	ROBERT PICKUS
ROBERT GILMORE	NORMAN J. WHITNEY
BAYARD RUSTIN*	

* In September, 2010, the Board of Directors of the American Friends Service Committee approved a minute restoring the name of Bayard Rustin as one of the principal authors of *Speak Truth to Power* (see historical note at the end).

AFSC regrets the failure to acknowledge Bayard Rustin's co-authorship of this pamphlet in 1955. Our records now include his name in the list of authors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A NOTE TO THE READER	iii
I. FACING THE PARADOX	1
A description of the world scene. America's dominantly military response and its recognized inadequacy. Constructive proposals which many agree would strengthen American foreign policy. Our failure to put them into practice.	
II. THE PRICE OF POWER	14
Why we fail to implement these hopeful constructive policies on which there is widespread agreement: an analysis of the nature and meaning of a Twentieth Century commitment to organized mass violence.	
III. THE ENEMY REDEFINED	26
First essential in a pacifist analysis of the present power struggles: a redefinition of the situation we face.	
IV. ALTERNATIVE TO VIOLENCE	35
Second part of a pacifist analysis: the perception of alternate methods for dealing with the situation. An introduction to the idea of "non-violence" as a way to resolve conflict and overcome evil.	
V. A CHOICE WITH HOPE	49
The choice between a policy based on military power and one which attempts to give practical expression to the idea of love and understanding among men. Reasons for accepting the latter choice. The risk. Rejection of "anti-warism" and utopianism.	
VI. THE POLITICS OF NON-VIOLENCE	55
The practical meaning of an acceptance of the non-violent approach. Immediate and long-range implications: for the individual, for the state.	
VII. AN AFFIRMATION	67
The politics of time and the politics of eternity.	
FOOTNOTES	71

*“For perhaps the first time in history
reflective men have had to grapple with the
pacifists’ question: Can national interests and
human values really be served by waging a
war with atomic and hydrogen weapons?”*

—*The New York Times* column of non-pacifist James Reston,
director of the *Times* Washington Bureau.

I

FACING THE PARADOX

*"An endless pressing, pressing, pressing on the nerve of power . . . if you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face—forever."*¹

—GEORGE ORWELL

*" . . . our age will be remembered chiefly neither for its horrifying crimes nor for its astonishing inventions but for its having been the first age . . . in which people dared to think it practicable to make the benefits of civilization available for the whole human race."*²

—ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE

The World Scene

We are all engaged in the fulfillment of prophecy. Little less than a century ago the Swiss historian, Jacob Burckhardt, prophesied the coming of a new order of barbarians whom he called the Terrible Simplifiers, who would govern Western society by applications of force and terror on a scale no one had ever used before. And just after the opening of this century, Henry Adams, observing the same social factors at a later stage of development, predicted that in less than half a century "law would disappear as a theory or a *priori* principle and give place to force; morality would become police; explosives would reach cosmic violence; disintegration would overcome integration."³

But the worlds of Burckhardt and Adams, swept up in a blind confidence in material progress, ignored their warnings. We had but to conquer nature, and the Golden Age would be upon us. Now we have succeeded. Man has in large measure mastered the instruments of physical power. He has probed the secrets of the atom. He knows how to manipulate money and markets, machines, and other men to his own advantage. He can fly in the air and sail under the sea. But he has not yet learned how to walk on the earth in peace. Far from giving him mastery over his world, man's triumph

has apparently brought with it only the fulfillment of terrifying prophecy.

More men tremble under the shadow of cosmic violence than ever before. Coercive systems or military demands are, in fact, driving states to replace morality with police. Explosives have become totally destructive. Acceptance of the doctrine of violence is so widespread that man is becoming hardened to mass extermination, and indifferent to mass human suffering. Indeed, man's indifference to violence is almost as disturbing a symptom of our time as his readiness to practice it. This is an age of violence.

It is also an age in which individual personality is being crushed by the spread of totalitarian doctrines. The growth of centralized authority, whether it stems from ideological concepts, from military necessity, or simply from the complexity of industrialized life, is producing a depersonalized society in which men are pressed into a common mold and made to conform to accepted standards of thought and behavior. The noble concept of the supremacy of the individual, so deeply rooted in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, is rapidly losing ground to various forms of totalitarianism. Centralized authority, rather than individual conscience, is the dominant force in large segments of East and West alike.

But this is also an age of revolution. Never before has the door to abundant life, in the physical sense of the word, been so near to opening. We now have the means to supply food, clothing, shelter, health and education to all mankind on a scale never before dreamed. We could abolish at least the more degrading forms of poverty. Moreover, the larger and less privileged portion of the human family now *knows* that this is possible. Such knowledge gives fresh impetus everywhere to man's eternal aspiration for recognition and human dignity. This, in itself, is a new situation and lies at the root of the revolution of the common man.

But the great industrialized nations who are keepers of the door to abundance do not open it; indeed, they even resist its opening. Why? Because they concentrate on satisfying their own desires; and so, on the very threshold of liberation from want and of emergence into freedom, millions of people tremble under the shadow of power struggles between nation states armed with the weapons of cosmic violence. The new technology has been perverted to the deification of the state at the expense of the individual, and for the millions there is neither bread nor freedom.

Whether we will or not, we are all involved. To the United States the central issue appears to be the struggle against coercive communism; yet there exists the paradox that men who long for freedom are willing to accept so easily the doctrines of political totalitarianism. The truth is that the real paradox inherent in our age is more deeply rooted and more widely spread, for it grows out of the very mastery of the instruments of power that man so confidently sought. Poverty and wealth, hunger and food, insecurity and power, bondage and freedom, war and peace—these are the real paradoxes that bewilder men in the middle of the Twentieth Century. Still, hope remains inherent in change. Man was born for freedom, and he struggles in constant conflict with himself to understand and escape the paradoxes that confuse him.

The Response of the United States

Violence, totalitarianism, and social revolution—these are the salient characteristics of our world. They must be dealt with, not only by governments which represent, more or less well, the collective will of geographical groups of individuals, but also by individual men in ordering their own lives and their own governments. One of the most profound problems that man must face arises from the conflict between his individual response to his world environment and the political response of the group of which he is a part. As Americans, we are both individual children of God with deep commitments to the supremacy of conscience, and citizens of a nation that plays a major role in shaping and meeting the issues that surround us. We are the state, but we are also free men. How can we contribute to the solution of the key problems of our day: the peaceful resolution of conflict, the liberation of the human spirit, and the conquest of physical poverty? This is the question with which this study deals. It begins by summarizing the policies this country has actually followed in the years since the war and assessing their results.

During the latter part of World War II large numbers of Americans shared the widespread hope that an era of lasting peace could arise out of the final defeat of fascism. American planning for the post-war period reflected this idealism, and for perhaps the first time in history, government leaders weighed seriously the requirements of peace in global terms. Traditional great power preoccupation with

national self-interest was tempered by altruism. The United Nations was born in San Francisco, and plans were laid for a world-wide and internationally administered program of relief and rehabilitation. Hopes were high that the war-time partnership of great powers could be carried over into the post-war era.

Unfortunately, these hopes were not realized. The melancholy history of twenty years of pre-war hostility had produced in both Russia and the West mutual suspicions too profound to be broken down by an uneasy war-time alliance. As far as the United States was concerned, national interest required that we balance altruism with a military policy designed to safeguard the nation and protect American property, American standards of living, American privileges, and American ideas. Naval and air power was maintained and atomic weapons development pursued with undiminished vigor so that even before the so-called "cold war" began, the military budget of the United States never fell below ten billion dollars. In charting this course American motivation was clearly selfish in part, but it also was generous in part, for we count ourselves trustees and guardians of man's noblest concept of social organization. Moreover, in so far as possible we have tried to achieve our aims without either interfering in the affairs of other nations or rousing their antagonism; but those have been secondary considerations to be sacrificed when national interest seemed to dictate.

This policy quickly brought us into conflict with the Soviet Union. It, too, was projecting a policy based upon the same powerful combination of self-interest and devotion to a social philosophy; and in addition, its policy was marked by the fanaticism and aggressiveness that often accompany newly won power seeking to make itself felt. Thus it was all but inevitable that these two dynamic power centers should clash, when both existed in a world made one by the discoveries of science and rendered explosively unstable by social revolutions of continental proportions. Almost immediately after World War II, therefore, the conflict of interest between the United States and the Soviet Union took the center of the world stage.

The American people, led by their government, came rapidly to see in this new colossus the ultimate threat to both their existence and their democratic philosophy. Soviet leadership, fanatically devoted to communist doctrines and wielding its power through propaganda and armed force, seemed determined to spread its philosophy and its control through all the world. For the United States

to resist this new aggressor, our leaders insisted that it was necessary to build up military power sufficient to deter the Soviet Union from further expansion. Thus driven by the spectre of communist imperialism, American policy makers came early to focus their attention on military alliances, on establishing control over strategic areas, expanding our network of military bases, searching for new and more powerful weapons and exploiting every other means to secure the national interest and safety.

As for the Soviet Union, it obviously harbored from the beginning even deeper suspicions of the United States because, in its case, historical experience was backed up by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of capitalist aggression. The Soviet Union emerged from the war still distrustful of the West, still confident of its world mission, and now vested with new power and new prestige. It apparently determined to exploit its new position through a dynamic foreign policy designed to advance Soviet interests at every point. In any event, the facts are clear. The Soviet Union continued to maintain its army at an inflated level. It announced a series of three five-year plans that focused strongly on heavy industry and arms production. It interfered in the affairs of neighboring states to insure the establishment and maintenance in power of governments friendly to its point of view. In short, it exploited every possible means to secure *its* national interest and safety.

In this situation there is little to be gained by determining which nation displayed the first ill will. Much more important is the fact that hostility has bred hostility until the clash between the two giants has come to dominate the international scene. Military security, rather than concern for the world's ills, has become the principal factor in the planning and execution of our national policy, and its demands have produced ever more stringent measures to counter the moves of the Soviet Union. Military aid to Greece and Turkey was proposed in 1947 shortly before the formal enunciation of the containment plan, which became the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy. The idealistic economic program associated with the name of Secretary Marshall was unfortunately advanced almost simultaneously with the policy to contain the Soviet state and communism by force. Thus it foundered on the rock of mounting hostility, and gradually was subverted into a powerful weapon in the cold war. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization followed in 1949, the Korean war and U.S. rearmament in 1950, the South Pacific Pact (ANZUS) in 1952,

proposals to rearm Germany and Japan in 1953, announcement of the hydrogen bomb and massive retaliation in 1954, and even in 1955 there are few promising signs of any end to the hostility.

Recognized Inadequacy of the Response

This situation has troubled many who sense that a policy oriented predominantly around the military containment of a single rival cannot deal adequately with global problems. Is it possible with this concentration of material power, they ask, to take sufficient notice of the underlying ways through which ideas are spread and influence exerted? How can this American response meet the needs of Asians, whose great social revolutions are now treated in terms of their strategic relationship to the cold war? How can we speak to the world-wide longing for the liberation of the human spirit, when our own spirits are infected with fear? When we arm ourselves, are we not also provoking others to arm, and has not this process in the past ended in war? What reason do we have for believing it will be different this time? Is it possible for us to wield such power without ourselves becoming corrupted by it and falling victim to the same evils we deplore in others?

These are profound and disturbing questions—profound because of their far-reaching implications and disturbing because we believe the answer in each case must be, on the basis of the evidence, other than what we might hope. It should be clear that in reaching this judgment we are aware of other more positive aspects of American policy that are aimed directly at meeting underlying problems and building understanding among peoples. But these other measures have had less attention and less emphasis than that which has been given to military preparedness. It is the latter which has come to dominate American policy formation, and because most men make their judgments only on what is most obvious, it is our military policy that is the basis for much of the world's judgment of the United States. This is the impact we want to examine, and without at this point questioning the necessity for the policies themselves, we suggest that the following are facts that need to be recognized:

1. *The influence of the Soviet Union, and the appeal of its communist doctrines, have grown steadily since the end of World War II.* While there has been some holding back of the tide, notably in Iran, Greece, and Latin America, the world balance is clearly in the other

direction. United States military policy did not keep China from falling into the hands of the communists. The influence of the communist parties in Italy and France continues strong, and conditions favoring the growth of communism in Latin America and Africa remain unchanged. In Southeast Asia communist influence has increased steadily, despite American arms and a developing bulwark of military alliances. Most tragic of all is the example of Korea where the climate of cold war first erupted into bloody violence. Here, after disastrous attempts by both sides to reunite Korea by military force, all that is left is a devastated nation, more bitterly divided than ever, and at least as far from democracy and freedom as it was in 1945.

Moreover, the way we have responded has led to a weakening of our own position in the world. American prestige abroad has declined seriously, and we have lost much of the good will that was formerly ours. Our preoccupation with anti-communism, our insistence on dealing from military power, our determination to rearm the very nations that millions fought and died to disarm, our hydrogen bomb experiments—these have not cemented our relations even with those nations whom we call allies. Thus, at the very time when we are confronted with the fact of communist expansion, we find ourselves with fewer friends.

Many thoughtful men insist that Soviet expansion has at least been deterred by the weight of American power. A case can indeed be built to support such a thesis by pointing to isolated fronts at given moments of time, but we believe the world-wide scene is still one of growing communist influence. Moreover, the history of attempts to keep peace by amassing fearful weapons has not been encouraging. Their deterrent value has been real, but it has been temporary, for sooner or later resentment and anger have outstripped fear, and war has broken out. It may be that the ultimate horror of atomic weapons will prevent history from repeating itself, but no such outcome can be assured, and we feel little confidence in any policy that rests on such an uncertain hope.

2. *Our policy has confirmed Marxist doctrine and hardened attitudes within communist countries.* Suspicion of the capitalist world is inherent in communist doctrine, and it would undoubtedly have existed in great measure in Soviet Russia and China regardless of external developments. Unfortunately, our American response to the

world situation has tended more and more to give them material for the confirmation of their attitudes. Repression and absolute authority are made easier to institute and maintain when a dictator can point to a hostile outside world. Encirclement, inflammatory speeches and maneuvers may be necessary aspects of military preparedness, but they serve to harden the attitudes and fortify the tyrannies of dictators.

3. *The principles for which the United States stands have been seriously undermined at home and abroad.* Since 1945 there has been a steady erosion of the values that were formerly considered the very foundation stones of American democracy. Proceeding from the false assumption that whatever is anti-communist is therefore democratic, many Americans have supported or acquiesced in measures that have generally been considered central characteristics of totalitarianism: spying on fellow citizens; anonymous denunciations; restrictions on freedom of movement, speech, and press; prosecution for beliefs rather than acts; the reversal of the traditional presumption of innocence until proof of guilt; the gradual militarization of our minds and our society; and the growing confusion of our thought and language until we no longer feel any astonishment at the use of a phrase like "the free world" to include all nations, however dictatorial, and colonies, however exploited, that are not under Soviet control.

Moreover, this impact on democratic values at home has led to a weakened respect for democratic values abroad. When a great democracy cynically enters into alliances with totalitarian governments, when it supports openly a corrupt *status quo*, or when it displays a thinly disguised contempt for those who resist taking sides, the result is to undermine confidence in the philosophy that permits these things to happen. We believe that anti-communist hysteria, whether reflected in foreign policy or in domestic policy, is exacting a heavy toll on the standing of American democracy at home and abroad.

4. *Far from making us more secure, our policy is increasing the insecurity of the United States and of the rest of the world.* Military weapons have been developed to the point of such absolute power that the entire world is now approaching absolute insecurity. Even before the advent of the hydrogen bomb, some military experts had reached the conclusion that progress in the development of super-weapons made war no longer a feasible instrument of national policy.

The production of the hydrogen bomb, which makes it clear that man has within his hands the power to destroy all life on our planet, marks the end of a road. The nuclear physicist has now written, in letters so large that none can fail to read them, the Twentieth Century corroboration of Jesus' assurance that all who take the sword will perish by the sword. It has been truly said that as our strength approaches infinity, our security approaches zero. The H-bomb gives us, not power to secure ourselves, but only the power to destroy the world.

5. *Our moral standards have been debased.* Here we come to a final and most terrifying result of the use of military power as our chief instrument of international policy. Though it is as yet hardly perceived, it is the spiritual price that man pays for his willingness to resort to violence that is its most tragic aspect. We ask our fellow citizens to consider what has happened to the soul of America in less than two decades.

In 1936 the Italians bombed the Abyssinians, and a sense of shock swept over an America outraged by such barbarism. In 1940 came the Nazi bombardment of Rotterdam, and again we cried out against wanton destruction and the needless loss of Dutch lives. But this was war in which our own interests and later our own men were involved, and somewhere in between the attack on Rotterdam and the utterly unjustifiable destruction of Dresden four years later, we experienced the ultimate horror that there was no horror. Dresden perished almost unnoticed, and we were ready for Hiroshima. Today our strategists suggest that, under our policy of massive and instant retaliation, it may be necessary to loose our atomic arsenal on China, and few voices cry out in the moral wilderness. We pride ourselves on our Judaeo-Christian heritage, and all that it represents in moral and spiritual achievement, yet one must go far back into the history of man's search for truth in the Book of Genesis to find in the story of Lamech the counterpart of the doctrine of massive retaliation. Have we really advanced so little in these countless centuries of search?

Nor is cheapening of life the only price. Moral values everywhere have been debased by the strategies of national interest. In 1953, needing an election victory in Germany and a propaganda victory in the cold war, the United States government invited hungry East Germans to cross the border into West Berlin to receive free American food in a well publicized and well conducted distribution

that lasted until the elections were safely over and won. In connection with this operation, the words of Dean Grueber from the pulpit of the Berlin Cathedral should be carefully pondered by all Americans: "Verily, when the members of the church help each other it is like the miracle of the loaves and fishes. . . . But when a charitable project is undertaken without the true spirit of love, the blessing turns into a curse. . . . We absolutely refuse to cooperate with those persons or powers who use works of charity to disguise their political and propaganda warfare."⁴

We find other sobering examples in the American offer to pay \$100,000 for the delivery into our hands of a Russian jet plane, and in our cool decision not to allow Chinese students to return to their homes and families on grounds that their talents might be exploited to the ultimate detriment of the United States. What is happening to our whole standard of values? It is true that money will buy the allegiance of some men, just as food will buy that of others, and atomic power that of still others, but none will purchase their respect, which is beyond price. America must take care, lest its growing insensitivity to suffering and its faith in dollars and explosives rob it of its moral strength. This is what resort to violence must eventually do to a people, whether in the name of fascism, nazism, communism, or democracy. This is what militarization is doing to America.

Positive Alternatives

While not everyone assesses the results of present policy in the sharp terms that we do, we believe there is no longer any doubt in the minds of concerned men that the American response to its world responsibility in the years since 1945 has been inadequate. Our leaders have stated time and again that the real hope of peace lies in disarmament, in developing world organization, in fundamental attacks on poverty. President Truman lifted the hopes of the world in his 1949 inaugural address with the "bold new program" that became known as Point Four. President Eisenhower followed with his celebrated disarmament speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors and his atoms for peace address at the U. N. The note struck in these presidential utterances has been warmly echoed by the American people. Resolutions on the positive requirements of peace have poured in a steady stream from church conferences, labor and farm conventions, academic associations, women's clubs, civic and

veterans' groups, and from many other points where concerned Americans assemble.

The almost forgotten art of pamphleteering has been revived in the serious effort to assert ideas and put forth constructive suggestions as to how our country could more adequately meet the responsibilities with which it is confronted. This Committee itself has issued three such pamphlets* analyzing problems of world order and suggesting approaches to peace. One of the striking factors about all this concern and effort is the relatively high degree of agreement among these diverse groups as to what should be done.

In the first place, almost all of them suggest the need for an expanded program of economic assistance to help underdeveloped countries help themselves. We know that peace ultimately depends on raising the level of life of sick and hungry millions, and many point out that beyond the desire for peace lies the responsibility to minister to those in need. Proposals for technical assistance or economic aid are often linked with suggestions regarding free trade and capital development, but in any event, there is wide agreement that the United States could make an important contribution to peace by more vigorous support of programs of an economic nature aimed at raising world living standards.

A second series of proposals focuses on the need to renounce colonialism. Exploitation and white domination of Asian and African peoples must be finally eliminated if peace is to emerge and national aspirations are to find their legitimate fulfillment. Suggestions in this general area have found particularly strong support because the United States has always been relatively free of colonial involvements abroad, and is making notable progress in eliminating its own internal colonialism, in the growing emancipation of the Negro.

A third series of proposals relates to the general field of disarmament. These range all the way from suggestions endorsing simple standstill agreements to elaborate plans detailing the steps, the safeguards, and the timetable of a universal disarmament program. Others deal with specialized problems of atomic arms control or with suggestions for breaking the immediate deadlock in great power discussions of the problem. All urge renewed efforts to achieve progress, and nearly all envisage as the goal a complete, enforceable

* See *A Note to the Reader*.

and universal disarmament down to the level necessary for the maintenance of internal policing.

A fourth series relates to the United Nations and the growth of world government. There is wide agreement that the U.N. needs to be "strengthened" to become a more effective world organization. Some propose that this will require revision of the Charter in the direction of real world government, others that the U.N. must be made into an agency for collective military action, and still others that the best hope lies in its operating agencies and in developing its functions of peacemaking and mediation. The various proposals all serve to emphasize the wide recognition given the United Nations as the best organizational instrument we have, and one which somehow has been too little considered in the rapid pace of world developments.

These are among the main threads that run through the proposals for peace that have been made in recent years. However, suggestions of other kinds are legion. Studies of mediation problems, critiques of post-war negotiation, proposals for creating a united, independent, and neutral Germany and for aiding in the economic rehabilitation of Japan, suggestions for the building of a United Europe—all these have been brought forward through the period.

Our Failure to Act Constructively

Americans have not been lacking in ideas or in interest, but the results of their efforts are meager. The world continues to drift uncertainly on the edge of war, with each new crisis threatening to topple it over. The conditions that breed violence and the hatreds that divide men continue unchecked, despite the ebb and flow of tension at high political levels. Economic assistance programs grow smaller rather than larger and are more and more designed to meet strategic considerations instead of human need. The arms race continues unchecked and even in the midst of disarmament discussions, we proceed with vigor to plan the rearmament of Germany and Japan. The United Nations continues to languish, used too often as a cat's paw in the implementation of cold war strategy, and too little in the important moves of the great powers. Many millions of the world's people remain beyond its influence either because they live under colonial rule or because their governments are deemed non-admissible. The tragedy of this decline is only heightened by the

reality of United Nations' accomplishment. The work of its specialized agencies and its notable success in international mediation are indications of what might be, were we but able to alter the world climate.

The tragedy of this situation is all too apparent. Though we try to congratulate ourselves on our economic prosperity, our welfare programs, and our great ideals, we are forever haunted by the spectre of nuclear power. The people of the United States are uneasily aware that carefully nurtured international hatreds and the fear that flows from bomb tests and arms races must some day erupt in violence, and that when they do, all that we love and cherish will surely be swept away. They are aware, too, that something other than military preparedness is needed to prevent disaster, and there is a sense of urgency about the search for a more adequate policy.

Why?

What is it that blocks our efforts? Men of good will both in and out of government ought to be able to arrest this spiraling pattern of futility. Why is it that hopeful proposals have so often remained only idle, intellectual exercises printed in pamphlets or embodied in Congressional resolutions or enunciated from lecture platforms? We believe the principal cause lies in a crucial factor that has either not been recognized or has been rejected as too unpleasant to face.

II

THE PRICE OF POWER

*"Only he who has measured the dominion of force, and knows how not to respect it, is capable of love and justice."*⁵

—SIMONE WEIL

The Basic Assumption of Present Policy

The basic reason for our failure lies in the nature of our present commitment to violence. The basic assumption upon which United States foreign policy rests is that our national interest can best be served by military preparedness against a Soviet threat on the one hand, and by constructive and world-wide economic, political, and social programs on the other. The most common image used to suggest an adequate American policy is that of a wall of military power as a shield against communism, behind which the work of democracy, in raising the level of life and educating the minds of men, can be carried on. Our material strength must provide the basis of security so that men may have a chance to grow and develop.

This is an appealing image, reflecting both our peaceful intentions and our high aspirations, but we believe it is false and illusory. We believe that whatever may have been true in the past, it is now impossible for a great nation to commit itself both to military preparedness and to carrying forward a constructive and positive program of peacemaking. We believe these two aims have become mutually exclusive, and that a willingness to resort to organized mass violence under any circumstances requires a commitment that condemns all other desires and considerations to relative ineffectiveness. We propose first to explain why we believe this to be so, leaving for other chapters the question whether there is any way out of the dilemma thus created.

The rationale for the military, or containment, part of American policy is that the cool, logical, limited use of force to hold Soviet military power in check will provide the United States with the opportunity to employ other methods and resources to deal with the

problems that are the causes of communist totalitarianism and its growth in the world. We believe that this conception of a "limited" commitment to power is unrealistic in terms of the requirements of present day military planning. Today war has its own logic, its own direction. No social institution is firmly enough based to contain it. It bends all to its needs. This is the nature of modern war. It is necessarily also the nature of preparation for war.

We suggest that American experience over the past dozen years bears out this conclusion regarding the all-engulfing nature of a commitment to military preparedness. We are not at this point in our discussion challenging the necessity for the commitment itself. We seek only to establish that it is in its nature an open-ended rather than a limited endeavor, and that it has in fact prevented us from moving in those other directions that so many agree are necessary if peace is to be won.

What then has been our experience in applying this limited restraining power? Has it been possible to act rationally and coolly to balance negative military requirements against the need for more positive and far reaching measures necessary to win the peace?

The Impact of Military Requirements on our Military Establishment

Even in a simple military sense the idea of a limited commitment to material power appears unrealistic. For it is in the nature of the situation that the limits to an armaments race are set for us by our enemy and for him by us. Here is a clear illustration of the familiar insight that by arming ourselves we do but arm our enemy. Thus in 1948 we were assured that forty-eight air wings were adequate to contain Soviet power. In July 1952 it was ninety-five; three months later, one hundred twenty-four. Recent discussion has centered around the goal of one hundred forty-three wings. It is clear that it is not what we possess, but what we fear others possess that sets the limits. Since this is also true for others, the attempt to find security in military power cannot be a matter of "thus far and no farther," but is a road that, once entered, has no end.

We have said that we would "contain" Soviet power. We have in fact *tried* to contain it. But since this would require a preponderance of force, which it has not been possible to achieve, we have failed. We have succeeded only in diverting large proportions of the economic, political, and psychological energy of both sides to non-

productive and inflammatory purposes. Neither history nor our own recent experience supports the hope that the United States can make a limited commitment to military security in a world where power is concentrated in two blocs, both commanding vast resources.

The Impact of Military Requirements on our Democratic Structure

Organization for modern warfare is no longer the problem of the military establishment alone. Just as the burden of war itself must now be borne by every citizen as well as by every soldier, so the preparation for war must necessarily be the responsibility of the whole nation. This fact has been brought home to Americans in almost every phase of their lives. The requirements of a military posture in terms of internal security, national unity, and basic values are literally changing the character of American life.

In the first place, preparing ourselves for the eventuality of total war demands that we adopt stringent measures to insure internal security. Traditional American liberties must be sacrificed in the relentless search for subversives in our midst. Where loyalty oaths must be demanded, dissent becomes confused with disloyalty, and orthodoxy is made the badge of patriotism. Individual rights must be submerged in the interest of national security, and we have a widespread and irrational hysteria abroad in the land that strikes at the very heart of our democracy. It destroys our trust in one another, and without trust a free society cannot exist.

Nor does this situation reflect only a passing crisis that will largely disappear with the correction of those excesses that have been introduced by political exploitation of the subversion fear. Excesses can be corrected, but the basic threat to individual liberty will remain, for underneath the present hysteria lies a problem that has been widely recognized by responsible leaders and by a great many other Americans. In an age when a single bomb can destroy a city, and where secrecy may be the price of continued national existence, the pervasiveness of the subversion danger is apparent, and many a thoughtful citizen has been forced to accept the necessity of rigid security precautions. How can our old concepts of individual liberty survive under these circumstances? How indeed can a nation caught up in an atomic arms race find the calm judgment necessary to strike even a reasonable balance between freedom and security?

Secondly, as this suggests, organization for war demands the highest possible degree of national unity. If we are to be ready to act quickly and decisively in any crisis, the nation must be as nearly of one mind as possible. This need has led to the new science of "emotional engineering," the planned development of the mass mind. Though originally a technique employed by totalitarian regimes, it has now been adopted by the democratic West as a necessity of the perilous post-war era. A great nation of one hundred sixty million people, fundamentally anti-war in its values, content with its living standards, and relatively unconcerned with the problems of far-away people, cannot be persuaded to send its young men to fight a war on the other side of the world simply on the grounds that a rational application of power demands it. Something more stirring is needed, something more akin to the "Two Minute Hate" that George Orwell describes in *1984*, in which deep fear and moral outrage are combined to induce a kind of mass hysteria. It seems clear to us that our government, acting from the best motives, and in the interests of national security, has consciously tried to build a mass mind in America, a mind outraged by our enemies and convinced of the moral justification of our own position.

This does not suggest that interaction between government agencies and private groups in the process of policy formation has been lacking, but only that once policy is set every instrument of communication is utilized to sell it to the American people. The government has developed a public relations program, and has at its disposal an advertising budget that dwarfs private operations of the same type. It may be argued that this kind of salesmanship is necessary, but it has its price. In the first place, it further inhibits the free interchange of ideas, already undermined by the security program; and in the second, it soon achieves its own momentum and renders impossible the very rational manipulative use of power it was designed to implement. For public opinion once set in motion is not a cool moderating force. Mass media are all too easily utilized by irresponsible individuals or groups to fan the mass emotions that supersede rational analysis. Fear and hatred may be necessary to sustain a nation fighting far-off battles, but they are not emotions that can continue to be controlled. Just how far we have already lost control is suggested by the shocking extent to which the appeal to hatred has become commercially and legislatively profitable in America.

Thirdly, military requirements have caused profound changes in the basic values by which America has lived. We have already noted the impact on individual freedom and on independence of thought. Now we turn to the demands of military preparation in the spiritual realm. There is strong evidence that our traditional American culture does not produce the kind of man best equipped to meet the needs of combat. This was first indicated when military research in World War II uncovered the startling fact that when faced with an enemy target only twelve to twenty-five per cent of American soldiers were pulling their triggers. This discovery has produced drastic changes in the army's training methods.⁶

In World War II combat training, great emphasis was placed on maintaining complete silence, and it was popular to consider the "Banzai" shouts of the Japanese as evidence of his bestial nature. Now, we, too, are building a jabbering, talking Army. Our soldiers no longer occupy single foxholes, but two-man foxholes, and emphasis is placed on finding and developing "father-like" leaders who can command complete dependence and unthinking obedience. All of these steps develop group loyalty, and help submerge those traditional inhibitions and beliefs that might interfere with army duties. Apparently they are proving successful; military men claim that the performance of American troops in Korea showed substantially greater participation averages than the troops of World War II. But this effort to take advantage of mob psychology and create unquestioning loyalty to a leader is not likely to strengthen the spiritual roots of democracy, which require exactly opposite attitudes for their healthy development. We feel little confidence in the counsel of those persons, including clergymen, who suggest that the brute in man can be unleashed in an emergency, and then, when the crisis is past, he will automatically become a civilized being again and exercise full moral self-restraint.

Nor does the spiritual deterioration stop at army training methods. Military leadership recognizes, and rightly, that the making of effective combat soldiers depends in the last analysis on the moral values of the society from which they come. As long as militarism remains alien to our culture, it will be difficult to convert young Americans into front line fighters. Since we must be militarily strong we must take steps to change our social pattern. It is no accident that our government, in conflict with a totalitarian opponent, has found it necessary to set up an independent agency, the

Rand Corporation, to study problems of social control. Methods of propaganda, social organization, and control of movement are studied and evaluated by sociologists and psychologists for their usefulness in the stress of war. For the first time in United States history, we have a continuing peacetime draft, as well as unprecedented pressure for permanent universal military training for all eighteen-year-olds. We must build military assumptions into the very warp of our culture. ROTC for high school youngsters must be expanded. Film series—such as “Are You Ready for Service?”—are designed to prepare young people for conscription, and establish military points of view in the minds of thirteen-year-olds. Shall we discover, as Hitler did, that thirteen is also too late, and that we must begin our drilling and shaping with five-year-olds?

All of this suggests the background out of which an Asian visitor was led to sum up his reaction to six months in the United States: while the most powerful *feeling* in the United States is hatred of the Russian totalitarian system, the most powerful *process* in the United States is its imitation. Such a reaction may be overstated, but it dramatizes the fact that organization for modern war demands fundamental changes in the values of our society. The organizational, cultural, and spiritual framework of a society prepared to wage modern mass warfare is incompatible with the framework of a society that sustains democratic and human values. War preparation now requires organizing society itself as an army, with information and control wholly in the hands of the wielders of power. Obviously, this is incompatible with democracy. We believe therefore that the commitment to violence inherent in our containment policy can only be carried out at the expense of the very democracy we seek to protect.

The Impact of Military Requirements on our Foreign Policy

If it could be shown that the price that must be paid internally, in terms of vast economic outlays and the sacrifice of democratic principles, would make possible the implementation of constructive foreign policies that attack the causes of conflict, perhaps the sacrifices would be worth making. Unfortunately, the same insatiable demands of military security that dominate the domestic scene operate to inhibit constructive programs in the foreign field. Whatever we may wish to do as a nation, politically, economically, or diplomatically,

must inevitably be measured in terms of its impact on national security. We believe therefore that, in the field of foreign policy, an examination of the record over the past ten years will support the conclusion that the effective implementation of constructive, long-range policies is, in fact, impossible as long as military security must also be sought. This we believe to be true in various spheres regardless of how earnestly the American people desire to move toward the positive policies that many have suggested.

1. *The impact on political policies.* One of the cornerstones of American political philosophy has always been an insistence on the right of people to choose their own governments. In pre-war years we generally supported this right of self-determination, and later set an example for the world in granting independence to the Philippines. This position stems from our revolutionary tradition, and was an important factor in building for the United States a great reservoir of good will among exploited and colonial peoples the world over. They regarded us as their champion, and their friendship gave us a position of strength and a loyalty more potent than any that could be purchased with guns. What has happened to this tradition since military containment became the central plank of our foreign policy?

A case in point is Morocco, whose demands for freedom from France have become more and more insistent in the years since 1945. But this colonial unrest has been met with repression, its leaders have been jailed, and the United Nations has been blocked from any investigation, despite the pleas of Asian and African countries. Through all this discussion and crisis, the United States has stood by, either supporting France or remaining silent. This is not because our government has been unsympathetic to the cause of Moroccan independence, but because we have other commitments which must take precedence. Our first responsibility is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Western European rearmament, and we could not afford to antagonize a key military partner in these enterprises. It may be that France will now move toward a solution of the Moroccan problem, and that the United States will be able to assist, but the fact remains that we have felt powerless to act as long as the French government opposed action. We may have been convinced of the rightness of Moroccan demands, and even of the political wisdom of acceding to them, but we have found it mandatory to sacrifice these considerations on the altar of military necessity.

The same situation exists in other areas where men strive for liberation, either from colonial rule or from outworn forms of indigenous tyranny. Our sympathies are still with the oppressed. Most Americans have always wanted independence for the Indo-Chinese, self-determination for African peoples, and liberation of Latin Americans and Asians from the economic bondage in which many millions live. Yet in country after country we find ourselves allied with those forces which stand in the way of the revolutionary changes that are demanded. This is usually not because of selfish economic interests or because we believe in the present ruling powers, but simply because of our belief that the prime danger comes from Soviet military expansion and our reluctant conclusion that we either ally ourselves with those who hold power now, and thus strengthen ourselves militarily, or we sacrifice strategic considerations in allying ourselves with the demand for change. It may be tragic that the United States is coming to be regarded as the guardian of the *status quo* instead of the champion of the oppressed, but it appears to have no choice. Our commitment to containment requires that the price be paid. Is there any evidence of a limited commitment here? Is there any example of moral or political considerations prevailing on colonial questions except as military considerations permit? In theory, the containment concept allows for it; in practice, it has proved impossible.

Nor are colonial and underdeveloped regions the only areas in which political policy is dictated by military necessity. They are only the most striking, since it is around them that much of the discussion centers concerning the basic requirements of peace. Our German policy, for example, is almost wholly oriented around strategic considerations. Moral and political questions involved in German rearmament, or in reconstituting a united Germany, or in ending military occupation, or in dealing adequately with the refugee problem—all must be subordinated to the military role of West Germany in the containment program. The same thing is true with regard to Japan. Whether the question is one of rearmament, foreign trade, or international labor relations, the American position is determined finally on the basis of military considerations rather than on what seems right for Japan from a total view of the situation. How else can our policy of discouraging Japanese trade with China be interpreted, when it is clear that such trade is of vital importance to a self-sustaining Japan?

American policy toward the United Nations provides a further example of the impact of military requirements in the political arena.

The United Nations was originally conceived of as a world forum for the peaceful settlement of disputes, with eventual forces of its own to back its decisions. As the power struggle has developed, the United States has sought to convert it into a collective military instrument for use against the communist bloc of nations. Although undertaken in the name of collective security, the move has been basically dictated by the demands of the power struggle, and too little thought has been given to the impact of United Nations military action on its crucial role of mediation and peaceful settlement. Moreover, the collective security concept has been applied only when it conformed to the demands of national military policy. Korea and Guatemala provide contrasting examples. In the former, collective action was invoked, in the latter it was discouraged, though in both cases aggression had taken place. Similarly, the whole question of United Nations membership has become tangled up in strategic considerations. Entrance applications are weighed more on the basis of their impact on the cold war than their impact on world organization. We are not here questioning the wisdom of particular policies but only pointing to the fact that in the United Nations, as elsewhere, the commitment to a military containment policy overrides other considerations in the formulation of political decisions.

2. *The impact on economic policies.* Another area in which there is practically unanimous agreement among those who have studied the requirements of peace is in the field of economic policy. Underdeveloped countries must be built up. Trade barriers must be broken down. These are important ways in which poverty, disease, and unemployment can be attacked, and the basic sources of discontent and strife eliminated. But how far have we been able to move toward these goals?

United States participation in UNRRA and its sponsorship of the Marshall Plan provided a fine start, and it is unfortunate that the good effects were in both instances vitiated by the developing demands of the cold war. The international cooperative character of UNRRA, already weakened by a lack of Russian cooperation, was further damaged by the American decision in 1947 to stress bilateral arrangements, while the Marshall Plan came admittedly to be considered by both sides as an anti-communist weapon in the later years of its effective operation. Since the time of these two major recovery efforts, the first test for American economic aid has been whether

or not it would strengthen the power position of the United States: Is the prospective recipient prepared to help win a possible war? Need has become a secondary criterion. Even technical assistance, once envisaged as a bold new program to lift the level of life in underdeveloped areas, has become so enmeshed in American military planning that one nation (Burma) rejected aid for fear that it would involve a commitment to American military policy, and others have been troubled by the same implication.

Fully as serious is the generally smaller size of the appropriations that Congress makes available for economic aid and technical assistance. The demands of the military are so great and the pressure against higher taxes so strong, that there are only marginal funds left over for purposes of economic development. Our national leaders frankly admit that until some way can be found to reduce military requirements, large-scale American participation in economic assistance will not be possible. This is to be regretted, of course, but military needs come first, and as long as they are reckoned in the tens of billions, economic assistance will continue to be reckoned in the tens of millions.

The tragedy of this situation is pointed up by the contrast between China and India. Both have recently gone through revolutions, both have new governments, both are determined to develop themselves industrially and raise the living standards of their people. One is communist, the other democratic, and all Asia watches to see which solves its problems more successfully. China is meeting its problems of primary capital accumulation through the totalitarian methods of communism. India's democratic philosophy rules out this approach, but she looks in vain for substantial outside assistance, and in its absence taxes her own resources to the limit without matching her neighbor's pace. The United States is concerned with the problem, and yet when the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) was proposed as a means of meeting this kind of need, the American representative, James D. Zellerbach, explained that we would not be able to support it. "The present obstacle to providing large additional resources for economic development is the heavy defense obligations of the major capital exporting countries. There are simply not the funds available for greatly increased external assistance, until present arms budgets can be significantly reduced . . ."⁸ Moreover, whenever adequate direct aid

from the United States is suggested, it is ruled out on grounds that neutral India is not a reliable military partner.

The same situation exists in the field of world trade. Our government is well aware of the long-range benefits that would accrue from expanded trade—benefits that have direct bearing on world peace and stability. But again, military considerations intervene, and we are obliged to adopt a rigid policy of barring trade between East and West. Thus at many points where economic steps might be taken to correct the basic conditions that lead to violence, we find ourselves blocked by the military demands of containment.

3. *The impact on diplomacy.* Post-war diplomacy has become more and more directly related to military power. Negotiation is carried forward not to discover a *modus vivendi*, but to force acceptance of a position through the demonstration of superior power. Where one party yields, it is only because the concession is forced by either internal or external pressures. Under these conditions, international conferences are too often turned into sounding boards for diplomats speaking for home consumption. As long as a primary requisite of military preparedness is a public convinced of the total depravity of the prospective enemy, and the total values of the stakes, rational attempts at peaceful settlement have small chance of success. Under these conditions, great power conferences become only milestones in the cold war, and even proposals for disarmament are perverted until they become a façade behind which the great powers continue to stockpile armaments. Similarly, though committed to working through the United Nations for peaceful settlement, we find ourselves caught in the web of our own power diplomacy, unable to consider admitting to the forum the very party we must deal with if settlement is to be achieved. We may *want* to reach peaceful settlement. We may *want* to remain in touch with the thinking of the other side. But our dominant military and strategic emphasis so colors our attempts at peaceful settlement as to render them futile. This failure is not an accident, nor is it the result of inadequate political or military leadership. Rather it is the logical outcome of the total endeavor necessary for preparedness for modern war.

4. *The impact on psychological processes.* Even if it were possible, economically, for a nation to support both an expanding military budget and an adequate assistance program, it would be psychologically impossible for the American people to support both. This is

not merely because a mounting tax burden and an inflexible diplomatic position require a steadily stimulated attitude of fear or suspicion; it is because, by its very nature, the human will cannot without disaster commit itself at one and the same time to contradictory values and opposed actions. It is psychologically impossible to be devoted at once to the attitudes that alone make possible the destruction of one's fellow men and to the generous and creative relief of their necessities. Man cannot make peace and prepare for war at the same time any more than he can simultaneously support and oppose revolutions. These basic impossibilities have long been recognized in the spiritual realm. Jesus said: "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other." We believe the words apply also in the present day political realm.

* * *

In conclusion, it seems clear to us that we cannot ultimately follow the constructive policies we voice because of the nature of our commitment to violence. Military power is as corrupting to the man who possesses it as it is pitiless to its victims. It is just as devastating to its employer as it is to those who suffer under it.

*"Its power of converting a man into a thing is a double one, and its application is double-edged. To the same degree, though in different fashions, those who use it and those who endure it are turned to stone."*⁵

We have gone wrong here in America. We close our eyes to the meaning of the subjection of the human spirit to violence. We deceive ourselves even in our practical political judgments.

On the one hand, we want to resolve our difficulties with the Soviet Union peacefully. We want to aid the underprivileged of the world in their demand for a decent standard of life. We want to develop the United Nations as an agency of peaceful settlement and as a nascent center of world law. We want to be free of the burden of an arms race and of the terrible fear of an atomic war. We want to be free to live our lives in a manner befitting our conception of the dignity and worth of individual men.

On the other hand, we want also to find security through our ability to cause pain to others and through the phenomenal development of our nation as a society prepared to wage war.

We cannot do both.

III

THE ENEMY REDEFINED

*"To consider mankind otherwise than brethren, to think favors are peculiar to one nation and exclude others, plainly supposes a darkness in the understanding."*⁹

—JOHN WOOLMAN

The Devil Theory

If the United States has not been able to translate its desire for peace into policies that will actually achieve it, and if, as we have suggested, the underlying cause of the failure is our commitment to violence, is there any other policy that could be pursued which would offer more hope? A considerable number of our fellow Americans insist there is not. When it is suggested that reliance upon military might may well bring about our national ruin, they respond: "Perhaps you are right about that, but we have no other choice. The Soviet Union and communism are trying to impose upon us an evil so inhuman that under it life would not be worth living at all. To submit to this evil is to condemn our children to a degraded existence, and this is something which Americans cannot in honor accept. And since the Soviet Union will not be deterred by anything but force, we must be prepared to meet force with force, even though the process may end by destroying us."

We are not insensitive to this dilemma in which so many Americans find themselves. It arises at least in part from the conviction that for nations, as for individuals, there are values greater than physical survival. Moreover, we cannot brush aside the extent of evil within the Soviet orbit. The police state, government by terrorism and thought control, slave labor, mass deportations, and a monolithic party that demands unconditional obedience and denies the right of private conscience—all these are characteristics of any totalitarian system of government. In the face of such facts, it is understandable that most Americans have concluded that Soviet communism is the great evil abroad in the world, and that it is the prime responsibility

of the United States to wield its vast power to protect mankind from its destructive influence.

This is the point where we believe many Americans misread the problem. Without overlooking the evils of communism, we must still reject the devil theory in history. It is an easy theory to accept, for men have made devils out of those they feared since the dawn of time. Indeed, in all the great conflicts of history, each belligerent has tended uniformly and insistently to attribute a monopoly of evil to the other. So in the struggles between Athens and Sparta, Rome and Carthage, Christian and Moslem, Catholic and Protestant. So in our own time in two world wars, and now finally in the growing conflict with the Soviet Union.

It should be a sobering thought to recall that in every case the verdict of history has been to reject or modify drastically the heated judgments of the moment. Frequently these judgments have not even been shared by contemporary opinion outside the area of immediate belligerency, as is indeed clearly the case in the present conflict. We believe there could be no better antidote for the hysteria of our times than for every American and every Russian to read the speeches of the Athenian and Spartan leaders to their respective peoples in Thucydides' *The History of the Peloponnesian War* or the utterances of Martin Luther and Pope Pius V on the subject of coexistence between Protestants and Catholics in the Sixteenth Century. It is man's tragedy that he cannot see himself as others see him, nor judge others when he and they are in dispute. "Our antiquarians," Edward Gibbon wrote in *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, "would spare themselves and us much exertion if they would but observe that similar conditions will produce similar manners." When men are afraid, they make devils out of those they fear. And as men are, so also are states. For, as Plato pointed out long ago, states are not made "of oak and rock," but of men, and as the men are, so will the states be.

Like primitive people attacking the problem of disease by amputating the affected part, the world has tried to rid itself of the evil that plagued it by cutting off whatever member of the body politic seemed most virulently affected. Should we not learn, as medicine has, that when disease is in the organism itself, it cannot be localized? We believe it is appropriate for all Americans to consider afresh whether the evil that must be overcome resides in Spartan man or in Soviet man, or whether it resides in Man.

Men tried to make the world safe for democracy by destroying Imperial Germany. But the devil reappeared in the Germany of Hitler, and so that Germany, too, was destroyed. Now once again the devil comes to life, and this time Americans are told his nationality is Russian, while Russians are told he is American. We think both are guilty of tragic oversimplification. We think the basic assumption of many of our fellow Americans as to the location of evil is wrong. We think, therefore, that the simple moral dilemma to which they point is false.

Our Real Enemy

The real evils that have driven the world to the present impasse, and which we must struggle to overcome, spring from the false values by which man has lived in East and West alike. Man's curse lies in his worship of the work of his hands, in his glorification of material things, in his failure to set any limit on his material needs. This idolatry leads him to lust for power, to disregard human personality, to ignore God, and to accept violence or any other means of achieving his ends. It is not an idolatry of which the communists alone are guilty. All men share it, and when it is examined, the global power struggle is given a new perspective. Let us be specific.

1. *Lust for power.* One of the things that the United States fears most about the Soviet Union is its expansionism. The communist revolution proclaims itself as a global revolution, and in its seemingly insatiable lust for power has already brought much of the world within its orbit. Americans see this expansionism as something that must be halted at any cost and by whatever means.

But no less an historian than Arnold Toynbee has pointed out that a dominant factor in world history from about 1450 on was *the expansionism of the West*.¹⁰ It was the peoples of Western Europe, driven by their lust for power and possessions, who pushed out in all directions, subjugating or exterminating those who blocked the path, and resorting in their colonial operations to bloodshed and slavery and humiliation whenever it appeared necessary. Nor can the United States escape responsibility. Our history has also been marked by a dynamic, persistent, and seldom interrupted expansionism.

Less than two centuries ago the nation was a string of colonies along the Atlantic seaboard. Now it straddles the continent, and its military bastions are found in over half of all the nations in the world. Its navies cruise the coasts of Russia and China, and its bomb-

ers are based in Germany and Japan. It is easy for Americans to regard this as normal, though they would be outraged and terrified if Russian warships cruised our coasts and Russian bombers were based on Canada or Guatemala. It is also easy for Americans to forget that this expansionism was often as ruthless as that which we fear in others. The Indian was almost exterminated, the Negro and later the flood of European immigrants were cruelly exploited; violence was threatened or provoked with Mexico, with Spain, with Colombia, with Nicaragua—all in the name of expanding the power and influence of the United States.

To point out such things is not to justify either Russian or Western expansionism, nor is it to underestimate the human suffering and the social cost that are involved in new embodiments and contests of power. But it suggests that the disease is not geographical and that to build ever greater instruments of power is not to end the disease but to spread it until it destroys the whole organism of civilization.

2. *Denial of human dignity.* Another of the fundamental evils in modern totalitarian regimes that is often cited is the degradation of the human being into an impersonal object to be manipulated in the interests of the state. Men become mere cogs in the machinery of a monolithic party which recognizes no higher authority than its own. The concept of man as a child of God, possessing dignity and worth, and vested with inalienable rights, is patently denied.

It is clear on the other hand that this noble concept of man, and the limits it imposes on the power of government, still has vitality in the West. But the West has been quick to ignore it when the situation demanded. The tendency toward centralization of power, toward subjugation of men to the demands of an impersonal technology, did not originate in modern Russia or the Orient, or in the minds of Marxist theoreticians. It was, and is, a part of the process of industrialization and technical development of the West. The tragedy of material progress is that nowhere in the world, any more than in Russia today, has enough original capital been accumulated for both industrial development and military expansion without subjecting men to some degree of exploitation and indignity. Indeed, the process of Western industrialization made virtual slaves of vast multitudes of peasants and laborers in undeveloped countries and often imposed on them in addition the humiliation of "white supremacy." There is obviously room for much freedom and material well-

being to flourish in the more highly developed countries, but as we noted in the preceding chapter, even these blessings are endangered as the demands of military preparedness make inroads on liberty and accelerate the drive toward centralized authority.

Again, this is in no sense to condone the invasion of human personality wherever it may occur, but only to indicate that the virus is not localized. The elimination of communism would not eliminate the evil we see in communism. Indeed, it may safely be predicted that the waging of atomic war against the Soviet Union, far from providing a cure, would itself be a virulent, if not final, instrument for the destruction of liberty and the dehumanizing of men.

3. *Atheism.* A third charge against Soviet communism is its atheism. Religion is rejected as the "opiate of the people" and in its place is put the Marxist doctrine of materialism. However tragic and blasphemous this denial may seem to us, it is relevant to remember that it, too, is a product of the West. Karl Marx denounced religion on the basis of his observation of Western, not Russian, society. Arnold Toynbee, in *The World and the West*, points out that Western culture has become in recent centuries ever more materialistic and secular, and has moved steadily away from its Christian or spiritual origin. More recently the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches recognized the "practical atheism" of much of life in the so-called Christian countries.

Communism has simply carried to its logical conclusion, and expressed in theoretical form, what the West has practiced. "It seems in many ways," says William Hordern, in his *Christianity, Communism, and History*, "to be nothing but one particularly unruly expression of the modern view of life. While condemning communist 'materialism' in theory, the rest of the world has lived by materialistic motives. The communists have been hated primarily because they have dragged the skeleton from the closet of Western culture."¹¹ This is a harsh judgment, but we believe it is an accurate one, for the power of Hydrogen is clearly trusted among us more than the power of Love. Like the communist East, therefore, the Christian West is secular, and the secularism that unites all men in its bondage will not be ended by the simple expedient of destroying those nations where the disease is most virulent at the moment.

4. *The cult of violence.* Finally, we come to the acceptance of violence as the essential means of social revolution, and the corollary

doctrine that the end justifies the means. Here again for many Americans are decisive reasons for citing Soviet communism as an absolute evil, which must at all costs be destroyed.

Violence has, indeed, reached unsurpassed proportions in our time. The outbreak of the first World War marked the beginning of this modern orgy of uncontrolled violence, and it has continued ever since. But no reputable historian has ventured the idea that either the first or the second World War was spawned by communism. Nor are the Russians responsible for the concept of blitzkrieg, or obliteration bombing, or for the first use of atomic weapons. These have all been loosed upon the world by the very nations which now profess outrage at the cynical Soviet concept of the role of violence and the validity of *any* means. Western theory is indeed outraged, but Western practice has in this area, too, belied Western theory. We have, in fact, been prepared to use any means to achieve *our* ends. Here again, as in so many other points in the exposure of the devil theory, we are reminded of the words Shakespeare put into the mouth of Shylock: "The villainy you teach me, I will execute, and it shall go hard, but I will better the instruction."¹²

Moreover, military leaders are apparently ready now to use any means, even the ultimate immorality of hydrogen bombs, to stop communism. Is it not clear that to resort to immoral means in order to resist what is immoral is not to preserve or vindicate moral values, but only to become collaborators in destroying all moral life among men? Especially if the issue is a moral one, we must renounce modern war. If we say that any means are justified, we adopt a completely amoral position, for there is then no ethical line that can be drawn anywhere. All morality has been discarded. Only if we ourselves completely reject the doctrine that the achievement of *our* ends justifies any means is there any hope that we may be able to bring healing to a world caught in the fearful dilemma of our time.

The conclusion seems to us to be clear that the real evils at the root of the tragic conflicts which threaten to destroy mankind are those that flow from man's idolatry: lust for power and the inability of power to set limits to itself; the violation of human personality and infringements on its freedom and dignity; the "practical atheism" of a pervading materialism and secularism; the spreading cult and practice of violence and the poisonous doctrine that *our* ends justify any means. These evils will not be rooted out, or so much as disturbed, even if we succeed in cutting off all their heads in one geo-

graphical area or another. On the contrary, the recent experience of two victorious world wars for democracy, with the subsequent decline of the democratic spirit in the world, is evidence which all who run may read that resistance to evil, when evil is attributed exclusively to the occupants of this or that geographical or ideological area, is futile.

The Moral Basis of East-West Conflict

The result of this redefinition of the situation is to recast our problem. No longer can it be discussed in simplified terms of good and evil, and no longer can the military approach be regarded as a way of challenging evil. This is not to say that the conflict between the democratic and communist worlds has no moral content. We have insisted that judgments cannot be drawn between geographical groups of men, but if the focus is shifted from men to the social institutions they have created, the situation is altered. Here, in two radically different forms of social organization, lies the moral basis for conflict between the democratic and communist worlds.

Through certain fortunate accidents of history and geography and through the sacrifice of individuals who have lived before us, Americans are the heirs of a political and cultural tradition that is profoundly colored by the Judaeo-Christian philosophy of man's innate worth and dignity. From this has emerged a gradually developing concept of government based on law and justice that protects us from the arbitrary use of power, and insists that the state is the servant and not the master of men.

Communism, on the other hand, has been perverted by other accidents of history and geography into a totalitarian framework that denies this concept and substitutes for it the rule of force. Man is treated as essentially an instrument of the state, which demands unquestioning obedience and limits individual rights to those it may see fit to grant. The military code is applied to *all* of life, and this necessarily makes regimentation and authoritarianism the characteristics of communist society.

Thus it is precisely the factor of Judaeo-Christian philosophy that lifts the conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union to the moral plane. In so far as we deny it by ourselves falling victim to the doctrine of force, just so far is the conflict stripped of its moral quality. Now, as for centuries past, the philosophy of violence and the Judaeo-Christian ethic exist side by side in Western culture. The

Society of Friends has always insisted on the basic contradiction inherent in this dualism, but as long as war and preparation for war made only partial demands it was possible for both philosophies to exist within the same society. It was even possible at the time of the first World War for nations to believe that the world was to be made safe for democracy by means of war. In any event it has been true that a state could pursue its search for power and possessions, and employ violence to gain its ends, while at the same time giving at least partial allegiance to the Judaeo-Christian ethic. That time is drawing to a close, for war and preparation for war now require total effort and involve total destruction, not only of life and property, but of spiritual integrity as well. It is clear, therefore, that we must seek some other method than violence to resolve the conflict that besets us.

It may be suggested that a way out is to attempt to coexist without war and without resolving the conflict. This course envisages an indefinite armed truce in the hope that time will produce changed conditions under which a more fundamental solution will be possible. To many thoughtful persons this is the most that can be hoped for, and certainly it is preferable to an attempt at violent resolution, but we believe no one should regard it as more than a temporary expedient. The dynamic nature of the principal contending powers and the basic conflict in their social philosophies promise continuing crises unless a more fundamental solution is found. Moreover, with each succeeding crisis will come new impatience and new temptation to resort to violence. Coexistence under such circumstances is possible only as long as one side or the other is prepared to make concessions, and the record of history offers little encouragement that this flexibility can be indefinitely maintained.

A First Requirement for Solution

This emphasizes the importance of continuing to search for a more fundamental solution. We have insisted that violence is not the answer, but violence will persist until men rid themselves of the attitudes that justify it. As long as they remain blinded by self-righteousness, clinging to the dogmatic assumption that we-are-right-and-they-are-wrong or we-may-not-be-perfect-but-we're-better-than-they-are, so long will they justify a resort to violence. We believe, therefore, that any proposal to resolve the conflict without violence

must begin with a recognition of the humbling fact of man's common guilt and common nobility. Without this recognition, the diplomatic representatives of the major contending powers, even if they can be persuaded to talk to one another, are bound when they negotiate to try to negotiate one another *out of* something which, ultimately, neither is willing to surrender. Negotiation on the assumption of moral superiority may succeed in marginal conflicts, but in central conflicts it is self-defeating. Self-righteousness is a rock on which negotiation always founders.

As the conflict between our country and the Soviet Union can in no case be resolved by might, so in no case can it be resolved by any method chained to self-righteousness. We who write this statement maintain that the only realistic hope left is to find a new basis for the resolution of the USA-USSR conflict, a basis that will free us for the truly creative action our times demand. The recognition that the evil is in Man is the basis and the only basis upon which efforts to reach a peaceful settlement can be saved from the fatal corruption of self-righteousness.

We are aware that the very urgency and bitterness of the power conflict may discourage many from serious consideration of a radically new and different approach to its resolution. The cold war is, indeed, a fact with which we must daily reckon. But Quakers, who through their history have clung to the conviction that evil can only be overcome by good, are not without experience in dealing with conflict in a creative and non-violent way. This experience leads us to be hopeful that such an approach is practical even in the present critical situation.

To an attempt to explain and illustrate these non-violent ways of overcoming evil and dealing with human conflicts we now turn. We do so aware of the danger that those who profess non-violence may be tempted to self-righteousness. No one can be more wrong than those who are complacent about their own virtue or believe they have a simple and painless solution for the crisis of our age.

IV

ALTERNATIVE TO VIOLENCE

*"I have embraced the non-violent . . . resistance technique in fighting for freedom because I am convinced it is the only legitimate and humane way . . ."*¹³

—Chief ALBERT LUTHULI

The Method of Non-Violence

What is this non-violent method that we suggest offers new hope? Its simplest and most obvious statement is found in the religious literature of many faiths, most familiarly to Christians in the Sermon on the Mount. At its heart, it is the effort to maintain unity among men. It seeks to knit the break in the sense of community whose fracture is both a cause and a result of human conflict. It relies upon love rather than hate, and though it involves a willingness to accept rather than inflict suffering, it is neither passive nor cowardly. It offers a way of meeting evil without relying on the ability to cause pain to the human being through whom evil is expressed. It seeks to change the attitude of the opponent rather than to force his submission through violence. It is, in short, the practical effort to overcome evil with good.

Most Americans reject as impractical the suggestion that it might offer a creative way out of our present international crisis. Much as they wish to end the scourge of war, and as frequently as they have observed violence compounded by violence, they still cast aside as irrelevant the alternative which calls for renunciation of present methods in favor of the attempt to resolve conflict through the imaginative development of non-violence. "It's a nice idea," we are often told, "but it has no meaning in the brutal struggles of the present world. Men may dream of the day when nations will renounce violence, but in the meantime, international relations must be left to the realist."

They have been left to the "realist," and the results are written large and clear across the face of the world. The plain fact is that the "realists" have brought us to our greatest crisis. An arms race rages

unchecked. Irrational hatred and massive retaliation are the established policies of great nations. Fear of atomic war grips the hearts of men, and paralyzes their intellect. Truly mankind stands at the edge of the precipice. Is the "realist" to be allowed to push us over? In his blind fury, is he now, like Samson, to pull the temple of civilization down upon himself and upon all men? Is it not time, while hope yet remains, to reconsider our easy rejection of the central perceptions of non-violence?

It appears to us tragic that even though the present violent method of resolving conflict is widely acknowledged to be bankrupt, so many of the most creative people of our time still direct their total energies to the preparation of weapons for war and the development of policies of intimidation. The urgent need for a new response is all but ignored. Even the pacifist has too often been satisfied to paint the horrors of war without facing frankly the problem of resisting evil. He has tended to shy away from the difficult task of making his religious belief relevant and applicable to the immediate problem with which men must deal. As a result he has failed to investigate seriously the non-violent approach, even though he has known of the success that both pacifists and non-pacifists alike have had in applying the method to ever widening areas of life. Indeed, one of the striking developments of the current century is the growth in understanding and application of non-violent insights.

In this chapter we want to survey some of these applications, and in the process to point up the essential characteristics of the non-violent method, leaving to a later chapter the specific applications of this approach to the present world scene. Our first purpose is to illustrate the wide and expanding area in which men have already accepted the perceptions of non-violence. Our second purpose it to show that in spite of the initial hostility with which society frequently greets revolutionary ideas, it has many times come eventually to accept them. Yesterday's madness has often become today's wisdom.

Quaker Experience

Each reader of this pamphlet could provide examples of the operation of non-violent insights in his own life. We begin with examples out of Quaker experience because we have found in past attempts to speak out on matters of concern that we speak best from that which we know best. Moreover, the reference to Quaker experi-

ence in the past three centuries will indicate one basis for our optimism about the practical nature of seemingly impractical concepts.¹⁴

a. *Treatment of prisoners.* It was less than two centuries ago that Englishmen scoffed at the notion that if prisoners were to be reformed, they had to be treated with respect and accorded the same inalienable rights that belong to all men. Prisoners of any sort were offenders against society, and society was entitled to its revenge. Every realist knew that unless prison conditions were kept distasteful, and punishment made sufficiently cruel and severe, men could not be deterred from lawbreaking. Prisoners were housed in squalor and filth. All were crammed together—the sick with the well, the young with the old, murderer with debtor, guilty with innocent. Prisoners had to pay for their lodging and their food, and if they had no money, they starved. Kangaroo courts prevailed. Hanging was the penalty for more than 200 types of offenses. Misery and suffering inside prison walls were beyond human imagination.

Friends and others insisted that kindness and a justice tempered with mercy would prove more effective than harsh and violent methods in treating the evildoer. Their religious faith insisted that all men, even prisoners, were children of God, and should be treated as such. Moreover, their own experience in prison supported their faith, for they had themselves been victims of the system, and they could testify that the popular notion of the deterring effect of brutality was false. Such ideas were greeted with derision, and Quakers were accused of wanting to coddle criminals, and of being soft toward evildoers. But they persisted. William Penn dared to replace revenge with reform in establishing the Pennsylvania Prison Code, and later Elizabeth Fry amazed the Corporation of London with her demonstration of the power of loving concern in the treatment of prisoners in the infamous Newgate Gaol.

These and many other practical demonstrations eventually led to revolutionary changes in the theory of penology, with reform and rehabilitation replacing punishment as the purpose of imprisonment. Unfortunately, in many prisons these concepts have been accepted only in theory, while in others officials are handicapped by public apathy and inadequate budgets, so that we still have far to go before enlightened penal practices become universal in the United States. Our failure to practice what we know to be valid, however, does not detract from the demonstration and practical acceptance of the insights of non-violence in a real and complex situation.

b. *Treatment of the mentally ill.* The history of mental care parallels closely the history of prison reform. Men had always thought that mental illness was evidence that the victim was possessed of devils which could only be exorcised by mockery and brutality. The universal practice was, therefore, to beat and torture the victim. Here again, Quakers were among the first to think that the law of love was relevant and that kindness would have more practical results than harshness. They developed a concern to experiment with hospital care that replaced the usual chains and whips with loving attention, a peaceful atmosphere, and interesting work. The York Retreat in England, established by Quakers, and the Bicêtre in France established by the non-Quaker Pinel, were founded on this revolutionary principle, and it was in these institutions that occupational therapy was born, and the first real attempts made to cure the mentally diseased. These ideas are now the accepted standard, and the intuitive insights of religious faith have been proved relevant to a real problem in a real world.

c. *Slavery.* Perhaps in no area has the faith of Quakers in the relevance of an essential non-violent insight been more thoroughly vindicated than in the area of slavery. The custom of holding men in bondage was deeply rooted in Eighteenth Century America, and the disapproval of a few pioneer Quakers found at first few sympathizers, even among Quakers themselves. Men and nations had an economic stake in slavery, and it was widely assumed that the Negro slave was but a savage in any event, happiest in a state of servitude and untroubled by the sensitivities of other men. Society could hardly tolerate the idea that master and slave were actually equals before God and should be equals among men. It was in 1671 that some Quakers in England began to insist that slaves must be freed, and in 1688 Germantown Friends, barely released from their struggle for religious freedom in Europe, observed, "There is a liberty of conscience here, which is right and reasonable, and there ought to be likewise liberty of the body."

More than a century was required to win over the Society of Friends itself to such a view, but once won, it became vigorous in its insistence that the social evil of slavery must be wiped away. Quakers became active in abolition societies and founded newspapers and magazines devoted to the principle of emancipation. Believing in justice for oppressed and oppressor alike, they called not only for emancipation, but for the remuneration of the slaveholder for his

ence in the past three centuries will indicate one basis for our optimism about the practical nature of seemingly impractical concepts.¹⁴

a. *Treatment of prisoners.* It was less than two centuries ago that Englishmen scoffed at the notion that if prisoners were to be reformed, they had to be treated with respect and accorded the same inalienable rights that belong to all men. Prisoners of any sort were offenders against society, and society was entitled to its revenge. Every realist knew that unless prison conditions were kept distasteful, and punishment made sufficiently cruel and severe, men could not be deterred from lawbreaking. Prisoners were housed in squalor and filth. All were crammed together—the sick with the well, the young with the old, murderer with debtor, guilty with innocent. Prisoners had to pay for their lodging and their food, and if they had no money, they starved. Kangaroo courts prevailed. Hanging was the penalty for more than 200 types of offenses. Misery and suffering inside prison walls were beyond human imagination.

Friends and others insisted that kindness and a justice tempered with mercy would prove more effective than harsh and violent methods in treating the evildoer. Their religious faith insisted that all men, even prisoners, were children of God, and should be treated as such. Moreover, their own experience in prison supported their faith, for they had themselves been victims of the system, and they could testify that the popular notion of the deterring effect of brutality was false. Such ideas were greeted with derision, and Quakers were accused of wanting to coddle criminals, and of being soft toward evildoers. But they persisted. William Penn dared to replace revenge with reform in establishing the Pennsylvania Prison Code, and later Elizabeth Fry amazed the Corporation of London with her demonstration of the power of loving concern in the treatment of prisoners in the infamous Newgate Gaol.

These and many other practical demonstrations eventually led to revolutionary changes in the theory of penology, with reform and rehabilitation replacing punishment as the purpose of imprisonment. Unfortunately, in many prisons these concepts have been accepted only in theory, while in others officials are handicapped by public apathy and inadequate budgets, so that we still have far to go before enlightened penal practices become universal in the United States. Our failure to practice what we know to be valid, however, does not detract from the demonstration and practical acceptance of the insights of non-violence in a real and complex situation.

losses, where hardship would be involved. This part of the Quaker program was ignored by the more impulsive men who finally took over the abolition movement in America and the consequences were tragic. Perhaps if justice to slaveholders had been realized, and pacific methods followed, the bitterness that erupted in civil war and endured for a century, might have been avoided.

In any event, men are now coming finally, and through suffering, to recognize that all men are equal in the sight of God, and that they deserve equality of opportunity and status. The view voiced in America by a Quaker Meeting in 1688 still goes forward, and society has moved a long and improbable way from the scorn with which it greeted that feeble protest to the enthusiastic response with which it welcomed the Supreme Court decision against school segregation in 1954. The lesson is now clear: religious insight has been proved relevant in a real situation; society is widening its acceptance and its application of the doctrine of human worth and dignity.

More examples might be cited from Quaker history. The work of Lucretia Mott in the struggle for women's rights; the concern of the more conscientious Eighteenth Century Quaker iron-masters for protection of workers in an industrialized society; the well-known efforts of Penn for justice to the Indians—all these provide further examples of various insights of non-violence being turned to practical account. But enough has been said to suggest the basis for Quaker optimism regarding the practical relevance of these perceptions, and our faith in their ultimate acceptance by a reluctant society. We are, of course, aware that Quakers have failed to suggest the relevance of their non-violent philosophy in many areas of life. As with all men, the history of Friends has been a history of failure as well as a history of success. But we are convinced that our failures are due to our own unreadiness to live boldly by the faith we hold, rather than to any irrelevance or inadequacy of the faith itself. Conversely, we are confident from such limited success as we have achieved that the "impossible" ideal of a world community of men is, in fact, both relevant and possible.

The Meaning of Quaker Experience

Indeed, it is precisely this concept of a universal community that forms the common thread in all the examples we have cited. It was the refusal to break this unity, to see the prisoner, the insane man, the slave, the Indian as an "other" that made possible the fruitful

use of the method of non-violence. The method itself builds community, because respect for all men and loving concern practically expressed tend to heal the breach that hatred and fear and indifference create. Moreover, it is just this sense of unity that is required to sustain the system of law and justice upon which the hope of peace rests. Should not a world drifting toward disaster because it has no sense of community explore with utmost earnestness a method for resolving conflict that builds community in its very operation?

Non-Violence and the Social Sciences

Up until the last fifty years, the high concept of human relations that expresses itself in the non-violent approach to conflict could only be sustained by intuitive faith or by pragmatic test. Scientific evidence was not available, and in the scientifically oriented Western civilization of the Nineteenth Century, this was an imposing barrier. With the opening of the Twentieth Century, however, the dynamics of human behavior became a field for intensive scientific research, and even though the field is still young and only partially explored, its initial findings may be recorded historically as one of the significant developments of the century. For the research of the social scientist is beginning to make explicit, and to establish by experiment, the validity of insights that were previously held only by faith. Today an increasing amount of research is focused on the problem of individual and group conflict, and non-violent insights are being established as valid for the successful treatment of specific situations. What are these insights, and what are the findings of social science with regard to them?

a. *The oneness of man.* An essential component of the non-violent philosophy, and indeed of most religious tradition, is the belief that in the sight of God, all men are one. Without this sense of oneness, real community is not possible. Anthropologists have now produced scientific evidence in support of the concept by establishing that man, wherever he is found, has essentially the same physical and mental make-up. Moreover, psychologists are suggesting that individuals from widely different societies, given like conditions, will respond in similar ways. Recent experimentation has established that in so simple and yet so basic a response as color preference, individuals from widely different cultures react alike. Even more important, the psychologist is discovering that in his response to other men, man is

essentially one. Fears, provocations and pressures tend to produce a hateful response. Forgiveness, trust and gentleness tend to produce a loving response. This has long been a fundamental religious insight, central to the Christian ethic. What is significant here is that science, far from being in conflict with religion, is instead validating it through experimentation.

b. *The sacredness of human personality.* This is the religious perception from which springs the belief in the innate worth and dignity of every human being. It sustains also the insistence on loving treatment of all men that is a second element of the non-violent philosophy. Here again, the psychologist and the psychiatrist lend scientific support in suggesting that antisocial behavior may be explained in terms of the warping of personality, the denial of personal dignity, and the crushing of human aspirations. Indeed, every psychiatric clinic provides evidence of the importance of this religious perception in the number of damaged personalities that must be treated as a result of its violation. A basic step toward cure lies in the ability of the therapist to communicate his sense of respect for the patient, for in this rests a fresh recognition of personality and begins the re-creation of the whole man. The new field of human relations in industry, although sometimes merely manipulative, has nevertheless arisen from the recognition that efficient operation requires that this concept of individual dignity and worth must somehow be kept alive even in the stultifying setting of modern industrial organization.

c. *The creative nature of love.* If belief in man's divine quality has been the foundation of much religious witness, faith in the positive power of love has been its dynamic. Indeed, the whole public case for the non-violent method of resolving conflict rests ultimately on demonstrating the power of love. Unless love proves itself by overcoming fear and vanquishing evil, it will be rejected, for men are bound to resist evil.

Fortunately, there is no area where scientific evidence is accumulating so rapidly in support of religious perception as here. In discipline after discipline, science has discovered that love is the central factor in either creating or recovering healthy patterns of behavior. Relations between teacher and student, parent and child, employer and employee, doctor and patient, warden and prisoner, all these are undergoing re-evaluation. Love has been discovered to facil-

itate learning more effectively than the rod. Harsh discipline is giving way to gentleness and respect for developing personality in relations between parent and child. Mutual confidence produces a more successful business than weapons of power and fear in the hands of either management or labor. The doctor and the psychiatrist are aware that their first aim, and their patient's first step toward recovery, is the establishment of a relationship of trust. The warden who is interested in reform knows that his first task is to establish an institution where feelings of hatred and resentment will not develop, for regression is directly related to the desire for revenge. In all of these human relationships, and in so many others where conflict may arise, the research of science and the results of experience attest to the creative power of love and to the destructive character of violence.

d. *The necessity for self-examination.* Still another insight inherent in every religious tradition and integral to the non-violent method is the importance of honest and candid self-examination whenever conflict arises. Unless each party to a dispute is prepared to search himself first to discover his own measure of responsibility, the chance of peaceful resolution will be diminished. This insight, too, is now finding scientific support, particularly in the field of psychiatry, where it has been established that effective work in any delicate human inter-relationship necessitates beginning with one's self. All therapists and psychoanalysts must undergo for this reason a long period of intensive self-examination and training to aid them in understanding themselves. They must deal with their own insecurities. They must recognize the limits of their own insights, and face their own prejudices and delusions. In short, they must attempt first to heal themselves, if they are to be effective in healing others.

There are other components of non-violence that need to be listed, and for which at least some measure of scientific support can be introduced. The doctrine of right means to achieve right ends has clearly been accorded major support by research and experiment in various fields for many years. Considerably less evidence is available to sustain the belief involving the voluntary acceptance of suffering, which is an important part of the non-violent philosophy. Even here, however, recent experience in the field of race relations has demonstrated the effectiveness of this kind of voluntary action as a means of focusing attention on an unjust situation and enlisting public concern for correction.

In any event, it is clear that practical experience and sound social theorizing have been leading men to accept and apply various non-violent insights in a great and growing area of human relations. We are aware that not all social scientists will agree as to either the extent of these applications or the degree to which their effectiveness has been established by experiment and research. This is not the point. The point is that at a time when the world is relying more and more on violence to defend human values, there is widespread recognition that in most areas of human relationships, it is a tragically inappropriate and fruitless method. It is a fact that under various names, more and more serious attention is being given by men of science to the study of non-violent approaches, and their research is providing independent confirmation of the basic religious insights underlying our Quaker experience recounted earlier in this chapter. Just how important this confirmation may be is suggested by recalling the lapse of time that historically has intervened between the introduction of an idea and its acceptance by society. Because in a hydrogen age there may not be time for time to work, it may be that the reinforcing impact of scientific research and historic experience will lead men to a more rapid examination of the seemingly impractical ideal of non-violence.

Non-Violence in International and Intercultural Conflicts

Despite the impressive support that can be cited to suggest the practical value of the non-violent method, however, the skeptic can still claim that it has operated largely within the framework of an ordered community. The data may provide evidence that non-violence is valid within a society, but it does not demonstrate that it is valid between societies. This is to a large extent true. The lack of contact between members of the international community, and the absence of any but a tenuous diplomatic framework within which international relations are conducted, create a different situation. There is, however, some historical precedent to provide evidence that non-violence can be applied practically under circumstances involving millions of people and carrying great international implications. We are aware that an analogy between these precedents and the present international conflict has severe limitations, but we believe there are still lessons and encouragement that can be drawn from

them. Moreover, since international conflict arises from the same human causes as internal conflict, it is worth considering whether an approach which has been so widely and successfully applied in one sphere might not be applicable in a broader sphere.

The Pennsylvania Experiment

Mention has already been made of Quaker experience with the American Indian. Here was an example of two diverse cultures in deadly conflict. Each presented such a profound challenge to the other that most people ruled out the possibility of peaceful co-existence. Yet Quakers, establishing their colony in the midst of this hostile climate, succeeded in being friends with the Indian. How?

Even before coming to America, William Penn wrote the Indians concerning his colony, "I desire to enjoy it with your consent, that we may always live together as neighbors and friends," and he promised to "live justly, peaceably, and friendly" with them. On reaching America, unlike most other colonists, Penn paid the Indians for the land before, not after, the settlers had moved in. Instead of looking upon the Indians as savage or inferior, he studied their habits, their likes and dislikes, and admonished the commissioner who carried his first letter to "be grave. They love not to be smiled on."

Against the "prayerful and considered advice" of earlier colonists who insisted that the Indian was "filled with treacheries," Penn and his followers went unarmed. The Pennsylvanians and the Indians visited one another's houses and wigwams. There are records of white children being lost in the woods and returned by Indians, and of Quaker families in the country leaving their children with Indian neighbors while they went to Yearly Meeting in Philadelphia. For seventy years, while sporadic wars and frightful massacres occurred to both North and South, Penn's people and the Red Man lived in peace and mutual security.

As Pennsylvania welcomed other persecuted people who did not believe in "coddling Indians," the policy of trust and friendship gradually changed. During the French and Indian War of 1755 there were border raids and scalping parties. When, in 1756, the Pennsylvania Council, no longer under Quaker control, declared war on the Indians, Friends withdrew from the provincial government for two reasons: they did not believe in war; they still believed in their policy of non-violence based on respect and justice for the Indians. But they did not give up their friendship and concern for the Indians. Instead,

they opposed the war, refused to pay taxes for its support, and formed the "Friendly Association for Gaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures." In 1758, at the cost of five thousand pounds, voluntarily subscribed, the Association achieved its end, and peace was restored.

Here was a seventy-year international demonstration that the way of love and non-violence is the way to peace. Quakers discovered that the response of the savage was precisely the same as the response of the Englishman: when loved, he returned love; when trusted, he proved worthy of the trust; when he was deceived, he became deceitful; and when he was hated, he was hateful.

But all this was in a different age under different conditions. There are two more recent applications of non-violence in international struggles that are perhaps more significant for the Twentieth Century. The first is the Indian independence movement, and the second, the struggle against racism in South Africa.

Non-Violent Revolution in India

Never in history has there been such a revolution as that which produced an independent India. The Indians were freed; yet there was neither victor nor vanquished. England and India were in conflict for thirty years; yet the English and the Indians remained friends. On the very day of triumph, with Britain relinquishing the richest prizes of its empire, and India finally rid of its master, the two leaders, Mountbatten and Nehru, stood arm in arm on the same platform. There could hardly be a more stirring and glorious scene to a world grown sick of violence and hatred.

One factor above all others was responsible—the non-violent philosophy and program of Mahatma Gandhi. None more passionately wanted freedom than Gandhi; yet he ordered his followers not to harm "one hair of one head of one Englishman." It mattered not that the English met his campaign in the same way that those who have power have always done. Violence, imprisonment, and death were inflicted on the Indians, but when they yielded to the temptation to retaliate in kind, Gandhi suspended the whole struggle. His aim was to change the hearts of the British, not defeat them, and his concern was more for freedom of the spirit than for political independence. Indians could be given independence, but they had to free themselves.

He was certain that before this could really happen, they would have to root out their own injustice, and he therefore fought untouchability, and religious intolerance, and economic exploitation as vigorously as he fought the British. His was a war against the evil in man, but not against men as evil. This was one key to Gandhi's strength. But there was also another: he knew how to organize ordinary men and to direct their energies against established institutionalized evils. Thus non-violence was for Gandhi both a way of life and a technique. The secret of his power lay in his knowledge that both were necessary, just as the measure of his genius was his ability to integrate them.

South African Campaign of Non-Violence

Even more recently, the creative non-violent method of meeting evil has been at the center of the campaign against the unjust racial laws of the South African government. Indeed, it is this struggle which provides at least a partial answer to those who argue that Gandhi's non-violence could only have been successful against the "civilized" British, and that it could not hope to prevail against the brutality of a more ruthless opponent. In South Africa the non-European faces a higher degree of brutality and a more developed system of oppression than was the case in India, however keenly many Indians may have suffered under the lash of British power. Yet even in this more difficult situation, the colored peoples of South Africa organized and carried out a non-violent program of resistance aimed at changing the hearts of their opponents.

This initial Campaign for Defiance of Unjust Laws lasted for about six months. In its course thousands were arrested and scores beaten. More than nine thousand men and women were imprisoned for their deliberate violation of apartheid legislation. Finally, the government passed a series of stringent laws separating the leadership from the people and imposing such extreme punishment for assembling that the campaign was suspended until the people could be better trained in the discipline of non-violence.

The results of initial effort in terms of modifying the position of the ruling Nationalist Party have been slight, and this increases the danger of impatient and violent elements seizing control of the African National Congress. However, the results in other directions have been more than even the most optimistic supporters predicted.

For the first time, all the non-European groups in South Africa were brought together into a cooperative, determined unit, where they had previously been divided and torn by frictions. Their campaign was carried on openly, and they found new poise and dignity in the act of accepting suffering without retaliation. Finally, non-violence opened up cooperation between non-Europeans and Europeans in a way that would have been impossible under conditions of violence. The actual participation of several white men had a profound impact, for it served to raise the struggle from one between black and white to one between justice and injustice. A political result was the emergence for the first time of a party that stands for integration.

The whole spirit of this South African effort is best reflected in the words of Chief Luthuli in accepting the presidency of the African National Congress: "I have joined my people in the new spirit that moves them today . . . Laws that tend to debase the God-given force of human personality . . . must be relentlessly opposed. I have embraced the non-violent . . . resistance technique in fighting for freedom because I am convinced it is the only legitimate and humane way that can be used by people denied, as we are, effective constitutional means to further [their] aspirations. The wisdom or foolishness of this decision I place in the hands of the Almighty. What the future has in store for me I do not know. It might be ridicule, imprisonment, concentration camp, flogging, banishment — even death. I only pray the Almighty to strengthen my resolve so that none of these grim possibilities may deter me from striving to [make] our beloved country, the Union of South Africa, a true democracy and a true union. . . . It is inevitable that in working for freedom some individuals and some families must take the lead and suffer: the road to freedom is via the Cross."

We ask the reader to compare this attitude with that which has been taken by other Africans in Kenya, who are faced with the same kind of exploitative evil. There men have taken the traditional way of resistance, and as a result acts of arson, murder and terrorism have catapulted the word Mau Mau into world headlines. The British in their turn have in large measure reacted as men do who are afraid: they have acted as if the truth were not true. The just demands of the people are forgotten in a wave of repression. Even the moderate among the native leaders have been imprisoned. The death penalty has been liberally imposed, and scores have been hanged or shot.

Europeans carry guns even to church. Mau Mau has succeeded in focusing attention on the problems of the Kenya African, and won promises of basic reform, but the country remains in a state of virtual war, with deepening fear and hatred dividing white and black.

There could, indeed, hardly be a more striking contrast in men's method of resisting injustice than that which exists between Kenya and South Africa today. In Kenya, they fall back on the age-old weapons of ruthless power, unrestrained violence, hatred; in South Africa, there are at least stirrings of a new approach with new weapons—non-cooperation, non-violence, love. If our goal is a community of men living in justice and peace, which of these methods is more hopeful?

Need for a New Dimension

We find, therefore, in both South Africa and India evidence of the practical nature of the non-violent approach to major contemporary conflicts involving millions of people. Such evidence, added to that which has already been accumulated historically and through scientific research, convinces us that more serious study needs to be given to the whole idea. We are well aware that many cogent and important questions can be raised in respect to our observations, particularly in regard to the application of the non-violent method in international conflicts. This is just our point. More able minds need to be put to work exploring what non-violence could mean internationally. It has been explored in so many other areas of life, and found so valid that it surely merits attention in this most difficult and urgent problem of all.

A new dimension must be added to the discussion of world conflict, the dimension of non-violence. We believe it offers new hope. We know it is relevant.

V

A CHOICE WITH HOPE

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, love your enemies . . ."

—MATTHEW 5: 43-44

The False Assumptions of Present Policy

Surely no American, when faced with the choice between war and peace with honor, would choose war. The United States, despite unfair charges to the contrary, has been trying to choose peace with honor since 1945, and Americans are still ready today to sacrifice their blood and their treasure in the effort to obtain it. Foreign policy decisions have been the subject of widespread discussion in Congress and across the country. A great national debate preceded approval of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In 1954, the nation was aroused to weigh the merits of intervention in Indo-China. The American people considered carefully the question of relative priority between Europe and Asia in defense plans. They have debated whether to commit the nation to resist aggression when it occurs, or to attempt to prevent it by threatening instant and massive retaliation against the Soviet Union itself. They have argued the wisdom of relying primarily upon air power as against maintaining a balance between all the military forces. Questions of collective or unilateral action, of neutralism, of United Nations memberships—all these have been discussed, and each time the choice is determined by what the majority feels is the most likely to produce peace. Through this period of crisis, American choices have been made as choices for peace.

Yet they have not produced peace. We believe the reason is that they have been content to deal with problems at the level of strategy. Rarely have they examined the assumptions upon which strategy is based, and in our opinion it is here that the difficulty lies. We have

suggested that in at least three major respects, the fundamental assumptions of the American people are in error. First, we challenged the assumption that under present circumstances power could be applied rationally, and a constructive program for peace carried on simultaneously with a program for military defense. Second, we challenged the assumption that the Soviet Union is the source of our problems, and that by achieving its disintegration or even its containment we would move toward a peaceful world. Finally, we challenged the assumption that force is the only realistic means of dealing with international problems.

The Real Choice

Obviously, our analysis suggests that America's discussion of peace, however sincere, has been carried forward on too shallow a basis. If the underlying presuppositions of policy are false, discussion of the policies themselves is idle business. We believe the real choice lies between continuing to deal with international problems on the old basis of military power and attempting to deal with them on the new and revolutionary basis of non-violence.

Faced with such a choice, and cognizant of the dangers of moving into a largely unknown and unexplored area, we must still choose, and urge others to choose, the second alternative.

1. We make this choice for moral reasons. Our faith insists that God did not create men to hate, nor establish His law so that peace could emerge from fury. Man is answerable for his actions, and can neither violate his faith on pleas of urgency nor escape his moral responsibility by the simple device of turning it over to others. The United States government itself insisted on this principle at the Nürnberg war crime trials; we believe it applies equally at home, for we do not recognize the existence anywhere of a double standard of morality that justifies conduct in the name of the state that would be reprehensible in the name of God.

2. We make the choice because we believe that democracy is the noblest philosophy of social organization that man has yet developed, and we are convinced that under modern conditions democracy and militarism are incompatible. Thus, we would rather give up our military strength and accept the risks that this involves, than keep our guns and lose our democracy. Gandhi, who understood the nature of power as well as any man in our time, put it explicitly:

*"There is no escape from the impending doom save through a bold unconditional acceptance of the non-violent method. Democracy and violence go ill together. The States that today are nominally democratic have either to become frankly totalitarian or, if they are to become truly democratic, they must become courageously non-violent."*¹⁵

3. We make this choice because we believe that modern conditions have brought us to the end of the military road. The heavy polarization of power into two world centers, the development of ultimate weapons, and the miracles of communication and transportation are new factors in history that demand new attitudes toward conflict. If men continue to hold on to an old rehearsed response in the presence of these new elements, they will not grow, but die. This is the crisis that all living things periodically have faced. To try to cling to outworn patterns of security rather than face the risks of striving for a new approach, has always meant death. We believe it will again mean death.

The Choice—Untried

The choice we propose is a radical one, requiring new attitudes, new risks, and it may be, new suffering. It is not a choice that the United States has ever made before. It has no relation whatever to what military leaders and patriotic groups like to refer to as the "pacifist virus that undermined America" in the years after the first World War. Campaigns to demobilize and "bring the boys home," pressures for a quick "return to normalcy," insistence on lower taxes and smaller military budgets, and drifts toward isolationism, may be sincere expressions of a war-weary people, but they are not pacifism. These attitudes, stemming as they did from selfish motives, and unaccompanied by concern for the welfare of others, may, indeed, have hastened war in a world where power is necessary to retain privilege and protect position. It does not follow, however, that peace is only for the militarily strong, as Americans are being so insistently advised. Indeed, even if military superiority once did insure a kind of enforced peace, it can do so no longer now that cosmic weapons place cosmic power at the disposal of more than one nation.

We suggest that from now on, peace will not be for the strong, but for the just, and further, that there will neither be peace until men learn to be just, nor justice until men determine to renounce violence.

The Choice—Not Utopian

Thus, we dissociate ourselves from the basically selfish attitude that has been miscalled pacifism, but that might be more accurately described as a kind of irresponsible anti-militarism. We dissociate ourselves also from utopianism. Though the choice of non-violence involves a radical change in men, it does not require perfection.

The renunciation of violence and the creation of a new climate in the world community will certainly be difficult, but we believe human nature, illumined and ennobled by divine power, can bear effective witness in the direction of world community. Man's character is a strange mixture of the petty, the self-centered, the fearful, and the complacent on the one hand, and the compassionate, the patient, the forgiving, and the noble on the other. The redemptive working of God in human lives, perhaps through the person of an inspired leader, can invoke on a large scale the qualities of sacrifice and service which are evidenced daily in common living, and which make up the heart of the non-violent alternative. Man *can* rise to noble heights, but he must first free himself from the compulsions of fear and the pressures of conformity.

Nor is this assertion of man's capacity to rise to noble heights only a philosophical conjecture. A concrete demonstration exists in the Indian campaign for independence, in which multitudes of men and women, without being raised to individual sainthood, were able to make an entirely new response to injustice and humiliation. In this situation, under the stimulus of a beloved cause and inspired leadership, ordinary people were enabled to find new courage and self-respect, were able to overcome hostility toward an enemy, and to endure physical suffering, imprisonment and other outrages without resorting to violence in return. The failure of Indians always to live up to Gandhi's exacting standards only underscores their humanity, and establishes the very point we are here making: it is not necessary to wait until a nation is made of saints to call forth other attitudes and responses than those which have for so long held men in the bondage of hatred and violence.

Thus we believe that while man's nature makes war possible, it does not make war inevitable. Under the inspiration of a great cause and with great leadership, human nature can be made adequate to achieve creative solutions to whatever problems confront it. Moreover, man's struggle to control himself has been marked by a continuing

*“There is no escape from the impending doom save through a bold unconditional acceptance of the non-violent method. Democracy and violence go ill together. The States that today are nominally democratic have either to become frankly totalitarian or, if they are to become truly democratic, they must become courageously non-violent.”*¹⁵

3. We make this choice because we believe that modern conditions have brought us to the end of the military road. The heavy polarization of power into two world centers, the development of ultimate weapons, and the miracles of communication and transportation are new factors in history that demand new attitudes toward conflict. If men continue to hold on to an old rehearsed response in the presence of these new elements, they will not grow, but die. This is the crisis that all living things periodically have faced. To try to cling to outworn patterns of security rather than face the risks of striving for a new approach, has always meant death. We believe it will again mean death.

The Choice—Untried

The choice we propose is a radical one, requiring new attitudes, new risks, and it may be, new suffering. It is not a choice that the United States has ever made before. It has no relation whatever to what military leaders and patriotic groups like to refer to as the “pacifist virus that undermined America” in the years after the first World War. Campaigns to demobilize and “bring the boys home,” pressures for a quick “return to normalcy,” insistence on lower taxes and smaller military budgets, and drifts toward isolationism, may be sincere expressions of a war-weary people, but they are not pacifism. These attitudes, stemming as they did from selfish motives, and unaccompanied by concern for the welfare of others, may, indeed, have hastened war in a world where power is necessary to retain privilege and protect position. It does not follow, however, that peace is only for the militarily strong, as Americans are being so insistently advised. Indeed, even if military superiority once did insure a kind of enforced peace, it can do so no longer now that cosmic weapons place cosmic power at the disposal of more than one nation.

We suggest that from now on, peace will not be for the strong, but for the just, and further, that there will neither be peace until men learn to be just, nor justice until men determine to renounce violence.

The Choice—Not Utopian

Thus, we dissociate ourselves from the basically selfish attitude that has been miscalled pacifism, but that might be more accurately described as a kind of irresponsible anti-militarism. We dissociate ourselves also from utopianism. Though the choice of non-violence involves a radical change in men, it does not require perfection.

The renunciation of violence and the creation of a new climate in the world community will certainly be difficult, but we believe human nature, illumined and ennobled by divine power, can bear effective witness in the direction of world community. Man's character is a strange mixture of the petty, the self-centered, the fearful, and the complacent on the one hand, and the compassionate, the patient, the forgiving, and the noble on the other. The redemptive working of God in human lives, perhaps through the person of an inspired leader, can invoke on a large scale the qualities of sacrifice and service which are evidenced daily in common living, and which make up the heart of the non-violent alternative. Man *can* rise to noble heights, but he must first free himself from the compulsions of fear and the pressures of conformity.

Nor is this assertion of man's capacity to rise to noble heights only a philosophical conjecture. A concrete demonstration exists in the Indian campaign for independence, in which multitudes of men and women, without being raised to individual sainthood, were able to make an entirely new response to injustice and humiliation. In this situation, under the stimulus of a beloved cause and inspired leadership, ordinary people were enabled to find new courage and self-respect, were able to overcome hostility toward an enemy, and to endure physical suffering, imprisonment and other outrages without resorting to violence in return. The failure of Indians always to live up to Gandhi's exacting standards only underscores their humanity, and establishes the very point we are here making: it is not necessary to wait until a nation is made of saints to call forth other attitudes and responses than those which have for so long held men in the bondage of hatred and violence.

Thus we believe that while man's nature makes war possible, it does not make war inevitable. Under the inspiration of a great cause and with great leadership, human nature can be made adequate to achieve creative solutions to whatever problems confront it. Moreover, man's struggle to control himself has been marked by a continuing

series of successes. In the course of history he has gradually learned how to live peacefully in larger and larger units, and consequently to push his savage qualities farther and farther away. His concept of community has grown from a narrow tribal basis to one which embraces half the world. It must now be pushed further, for in our age there can be no stopping short of a global community. We will either find a way to replace savagery with law and government on this last frontier, or there will soon be no community left at all.

The Choice—Necessary

Thus, we insist that if Americans want to live and not die, if they want to lead the way toward a world where peace prevails and the miracles of science are put to work for man's benefit, and not his destruction, they must face individually the need for an ultimate and fundamental break with violence. There is, we believe, no other way to eliminate the scourge of war. Man must put aside his barren militarism and dare to embark courageously on the search for non-violent solutions to his problems. Moreover, the choice is inescapable. It will be made, either deliberately or by default.

In thus insisting on the rejection of violence as a method, we do not imply that all men must become pacifist. Rather our reading of history indicates that without the *unconditional* acceptance of an ideal by a minority, the vision and perseverance required to move the world in the direction of that ideal will be lacking. Specifically in the present situation, we believe the unconditional acceptance of non-violence by a growing number of committed men and women is necessary to provide the dynamic, and create the atmosphere, in which order can replace anarchy in the international community.

Nor do we imply in stressing the importance of a pacifist commitment, that the devoted work of non-pacifist individuals and agencies on behalf of peace is unimportant. The great number of concerned people who labor for constructive policies, but who refrain from challenging the need for military power, make a major contribution in checking the growth of tension and preventing the outbreak of hostilities. We have shared in many of their past undertakings, and expect to share in future efforts. Campaigns for universal disarmament keep public interest alive in a crucial area of public policy. Efforts to suggest formulas for truce agreements in peripheral conflicts introduce a rational note into irrational situations. Public education on the important role and practical achievements of the United

Nations is the best means of counteracting the corrosive effect of political attacks on the only world organization we have. Support for international exchange programs and technical assistance keeps attention focused on the need for a constructive peace program. All these efforts, and many more, have provided a climate of patience, and facilitated agreements in marginal areas that have kept down international temperatures.

But we believe something more is needed if men are to find the inspiration and the wisdom finally to banish war from the international scene. Leadership at a new and deeper level is required; leadership that rejects violence and calls men to a new and revolutionary commitment to practice love in every area of life. Such a commitment will demand a high price, but we believe that those who would lead must be ready to pay it. Great goals are always costly, and we doubt there is any road to peace save that which for many leads through suffering and sacrifice. Indeed, we go further and say that paying this price is the most relevant political and spiritual act of our day. In order that others may judge its relevance, we therefore turn to a consideration of its meaning, in personal and in political terms. Since no superhuman demand is made, it should be possible to learn peace by practicing peace. What does this involve?

VI

THE POLITICS OF NON-VIOLENCE

"The best politics is right action."—GANDHI

We believe it is practical, and politically relevant, for men and women to move the world toward peace by individually practicing peace themselves, here and now. As was indicated at the beginning of this study, each of us is both a part of the state and an individual child of God, and we are obligated to act responsibly in both capacities. Since we have now asserted that acting responsibly in this day involves the rejection of militarism, what is the meaning of this for us as individuals, and what is its political relevance, immediately and for the future? This chapter will deal with these questions. It begins with the individual implications, takes up the political impact of a minority, speculates on a period of transition, and finally outlines the content of a pacifist policy.

Implications for the Individual

A personal commitment to practice peace begins with the effort to live affirmatively. Here is no simple decision to say "No" to military power and carry on business as usual in every other department of life. If we are to be respected of God and men, we cannot invoke the law of love when it comes to war if we ignore it in our relations with family, friends, and community. It is, indeed, a contradiction in terms to renounce mass violence and retain the seeds of it in our conduct toward others, for war grows directly from the accumulated prejudices, selfishness, greed, and arrogance of individual men. A commitment to practice peace thus requires first a commitment to rid ourselves of those qualities that destroy it. That is why John Woolman was constantly advising his fellow Quakers "to look upon our treasures, the furniture of our houses, and our garments, and try whether the seeds of war have nourishment in these our possessions."¹⁶ We must be concerned about the injustices of racial discrimination and economic exploitation. We must be sensitive to the needs and

aspirations of individuals in less fortunate parts of our communities and of the world. We must live simply, that we may share generously. We must, in short, so live that men will know that our faith is in man's divine potential to live nobly when nobility is expected of him.

It is, of course, impossible to express this faith, and at the same time deny it by supporting war and preparation for war. If our faith is to be in men, we cannot prepare to destroy men. Thus, we believe that the man who would practice peace must refuse to participate in war. In so far as he can, he must also refuse to profit from war, or prepare for war. A demonstration of faith in the capacity of men to respond nobly to the expectation of nobility is valid only to the extent that no limits are set on the demonstration. As long as we keep a gun within easy reach, our protestations of good will are empty. We must either have enough faith in the overcoming power of love to stake our lives and our fortunes on it, or we must seek some other basis for ultimate personal security.

These personal affirmations thus have a profound bearing on attitudes within the sphere of daily community life. They also carry implications for international attitudes. The man who dares to reject violence in his own life—unilaterally and regardless of what others do—must also be prepared to have his nation reject violence—unilaterally and regardless of what others do. Similarly, he must be prepared to see his nation share its resources just as he must share his own as part of his personal commitment. He must press for substantial assistance to needy peoples everywhere, regardless of its effect on his own living standards at home.

It takes faith for an individual to live this way—faith in the “impossible” ideal of a world community. We can expect some to scoff at this kind of personal commitment, on the grounds that it has no practical, political relevance to the world of today. We respond to this skepticism by recalling the history of Thomas Garrett, a Delaware Quaker who dared to practice brotherhood in a world of slavery. Haled into court and so heavily fined for his activity in the underground railway that he was left financially ruined, Garrett stood before the Court and uttered these words, “Judge, thou hast left me not a dollar, but I wish to say to thee and to all in this courtroom that if any one knows a fugitive who wants a shelter and a friend, send him to Thomas Garrett and he will befriend him.”

Such defiance was regarded then, as it would be regarded today, as a foolish and impractical gesture, calculated only to have its perpetrator held in contempt. But men's judgment was in error then, as we believe it to be in error today, for it neglected to calculate the impact of stirring example. It is precisely the demonstration of this kind of unlimited faith that shakes men's souls, and when this happens, the impossible moves nearer to the possible. Garrett's act was politically relevant in the most profound sense because it opened up new dimensions, new power, and new life beyond man's capacity to predict, and the forces thus released served to burst the bonds of practical politics. This is what has always made relevant acts of civil disobedience and the conscientious refusal to take loyalty oaths, to do military service, to inform against others, or to suppress opinion. And so we say to the skeptic of our time: Just as there could be no release from the scourge of slavery, there will be no release from the scourge of war until men's souls are shaken, and this cannot be done save by practicing our faith in men with the same unlimited commitment as did Garrett in his day, and Gandhi in ours.

The Practical Meaning of Commitment

We have said enough to make clear that the commitment to practice peace is an absolute commitment. The individual must be ready to trust all the way and unreservedly in man's capacity for goodness. But it does not mean that he will necessarily be called upon tomorrow or next month or next year to pay the ultimate price. For this absolute, like all other absolutes, is never wholly realized in action. The man who relies on force as his ultimate refuge and security is driven to produce a hydrogen bomb, but his absolute does not require him to drop the bomb tomorrow, or next month, or next year. Indeed, he hopes that he will never have to inflict such suffering on an enemy, just as the man who relies on non-violence hopes that he will never have to accept suffering from an enemy.

However, although daily living does not usually require us to demonstrate our ultimate faith, *our daily choices are made on the basis of it*. Thus, an ultimate willingness to resort to violence determines the day to day policy decisions of Americans on the national level. In certain colonial situations, for example, though we often struggle to do otherwise, in the end we support the *status quo*,

because we have made an ultimate commitment to force. Only as military strategy permits are we free to advocate change. The same commitment undermines our search for a disarmament formula, for we are blocked on one side by our faith in force, and on the other by a hostile world. We have no freedom of movement, and no recourse but to pile up more arms even as we talk of disarming. We hope some day to reach agreements for universal, enforceable disarmament that will involve no risk for ourselves and no changes in our values, but the hope is dim, for the very process of rearming so poisons the climate that agreement is made ever more difficult.

The writers of this pamphlet, therefore, believe that the immediate impact of a commitment to non-violence is to liberate *individuals* to act morally and responsibly on these daily problems of the world community. Herein lies its immediate political relevance. The man who has renounced his faith in force is freed to support the cause of colonial independence, and by just so much frees America to express her concern for self-determination. What would it mean, politically, to the cause of democracy, if the world's depressed and dependent people could feel again as they once felt that they had a champion in the United States? What new loyalties would be forged, new energies released, and new "situations of strength" created! This cannot happen save as Americans, individually, give up their faith in violence, liberate themselves from the crushing demands of strategy, and add their voices to the cause of freedom.

The same moral liberation and political relevance awaits the one who practices peace in the realm of disarmament. His new commitment does *not* mean that the United States unilaterally disarms tomorrow, nor that he should expect it to do so against the majority opinion of his fellow citizens. It means that another individual is freed from the demands of an arms race, and that he adds his weight to the political balance favoring serious negotiation, the end of recrimination, and a positive attack on the causes of violence.

Thus in individual terms, a commitment to non-violence frees men from the painful dilemma that otherwise arises whenever the demands of justice conflict with the demands of power. This dilemma is a real one for those who must make national policy decisions in a power-centered world, and their task in any given situation is not made easier by pressures on behalf of justice from those who have not measured the cost in terms of "security." It is only when

material power has been rejected as the basis for security that men can give both unreserved and responsible support to the claims of justice. We believe that such support is needed if a climate favorable to peace is to be created, and, therefore, that the individual commitment to practice peace means much more than adding to the useful witness of a permanent minority. It is rather the essential moral and political act of our time, the initial impetus for the pioneering effort that man must make to escape disaster.

Implications for the State

It is manifestly impossible for a democratic state to change its standard of values until a substantial number of its people first change theirs. The government of the United States could not now begin to practice peace in the revolutionary terms of this pamphlet, for there is not the substantial support among the American people that would be required to sustain it.

This does not mean that men in government should not be challenged with the full weight of a program for peace. On the contrary, Quakers have always believed it was necessary to speak truth to power. Our concern is to reach all men, the great and the humble, and though power in America ultimately rests with the humble, the great wield it, and must, therefore, carry peculiar responsibility. Quakers have tried to be sensitive to the special problems of those in high places, avoiding harsh criticism, and offering counsel out of whatever insight was given. But the burden of the Quaker message has always been the power of redemptive love as applied in real situations, and never was it so pertinent and so urgent as it is today, and never so important for individuals to be committed to it. Obviously, if any man in government is led to accept the philosophy of non-violence, he has an obligation to assert his convictions publicly, and use his position of leadership to persuade others. We believe that government officials in a democracy have a responsibility to lead as well as to serve, and as long as they are subject to removal by the electorate, there is little danger of tyranny. In the event that resignation becomes necessary because of a direct conflict between an official's convictions and his duties in connection with power policies or military preparations, the resignation itself would have great political meaning. The voluntary surrender of power for the sake of principle could have the same impact as Thomas Garrett's courageous statement: it would challenge men to re-think their own values.

The Political Relevance of a Minority

Further implications for the state will appear as the minority of its citizens who resolve to practice peace begins to grow. The larger the minority, and the less self-centered and self-righteous it is, the greater the impact and the greater the accommodation that will be made to it. A government which reflects the will of the people must modify and adjust its policies in accord with the growth of opinion, and this is precisely the reason why a minority view has political relevance. Indeed, the presence of vigorous, pioneering minorities has been generally recognized as essential to a healthy democracy. In the first World War the United States government originally made no provision for the rights of conscience, but the fact that it was confronted with a minority that refused military service was a political reality that could not be ignored. As a result, some recognition of conscience was embodied in executive regulations, and conscience was recognized explicitly by Congress in World War II. The act of conscientious objection in 1917 was, in fact, politically relevant. Or, to cite a current example, we point to the political impact of extremist leadership in the fields of anti-communism and Asian intervention. Although it seems clear that senatorial spokesmen in both these areas represent no more than small minority viewpoints, their positions actually set the poles and pull the whole range of public discussion toward them. In short, we believe a vocal minority has an important polarizing effect that makes it politically relevant in a very practical way.

The Content of a National Non-Violent Policy

A growing pacifist minority, and the gradual modifications of national policy that it produced, would also make an impact on the international scene. Our world is a dynamic world, with men and nations altering their habits, their attitudes, and their responses as the international climate shifts and changes. The pacifist wants to recognize this fact, and build policy around its existence. He suggests, therefore, that the more a minority could succeed in modifying belligerency and encouraging restraint, the more striking and unpredictable would be the resulting mutation in international relations. We have referred to the new power and new life that is released by the example of individual commitment, and which is also its political

justification. We now suggest that the more a nation focused on reconciling differences, the more creative would be the power and the life that would flow from it. A whole new dimension would be introduced into the world community just as elementary experiments have sometimes introduced whole new dimensions into the scientific community. Who could have predicted, for example, that Benjamin Franklin's early experiments with electricity would end by revolutionizing man's whole way of life? It is a long jump from Franklin's kite to television, too long for the human imagination to have fully encompassed. Similarly, it is a long jump from our present expressions of international good will, such as the Fulbright program for student exchange, to its fullest possible expression in world affairs. Is this, also, too difficult for the imagination of our generation to encompass? We are certain only that its impact on the world would be fully as profound in the sphere of human relations as the impact of electricity has been in the sphere of science. Beyond that is speculation, but we can venture suggestions of the broad outlines of such a full policy of international good will.

1. *There would be revolutionary changes within the United States itself.* Since the non-violent insight underlines the necessity of first attacking our own evils, it is clear that the American people would be obligated to move farther in overcoming racial discrimination and religious intolerance. We would insist on maximum freedom of thought and expression, as demanded by our democratic philosophy, and would not tolerate tendencies toward transforming the nation into a police state. We would be more sensitive to the deadening impact of our industrial life, and to the inadequacy of prison systems, medical care, and housing. Instead of thinking of our democracy as something which is final and complete, and therefore belonging essentially to the past, we would think of it as a growing and developing vision, belonging essentially to the future. We would know that it cannot be guarded behind a radar screen, but must be shared freely and dangerously with all men, whose contribution is also needed for the realization of the vision. We would discover again the wisdom of Jefferson that error may be tolerated, as long as truth remains free to combat it. Any nation which, in this fear-ridden age, had the courage to trust the democratic process instead of bartering democracy for the illusory security of an atomic stockpile would speak with undreamed power to enslaved men the world over.

2. *The United States would give its support to the great social revolutions, which are both a major problem and a major hope of our time.* Regardless of whether men strive to overthrow domination from without or outworn feudalism from within, their determination is to achieve new dignity and status as human beings and to banish the physical poverty that has so long condemned them to misery. They deserve the support of every democratic society, and they would receive the support of this country if it were freed from its preoccupation with defense and the military power struggle. If this took place, men who seek freedom would no longer conclude, as many already have, that the only source of support is from communist nations, and they would cease to be available for communist armies. American support, moreover, would make it more possible for these revolutions themselves to be non-violent.

3. *The United States would devote its skills and resources to great programs of technical and economic assistance, carried on under United Nations auspices and with full participation in planning and administration by the receiving peoples.* The resources needed for these operations are so large that our own standard of living might be seriously affected, but the dividends would also be large. The mere fact of reducing the great economic imbalance between the United States and the poverty-stricken masses of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, would itself remove one of the major sources of embitterment and strife. Our willingness to share our material blessings, without ulterior motives and to an extent well beyond our unused surpluses, would bring men to us as friends and cooperators, rather than alienate them as does present policy.

4. *The United States would get rid of its military establishment.* Various avenues might be taken to achieve this result. Many suggest that the most probable and most practical approach would be through the simple transfer of the security function to a world organization. The United Nations would assume the responsibility for defense, and might well be converted in the process into a federal instrument in much the same manner as the thirteen American colonies substituted a federal government for the unsatisfactory Articles of Confederation.

Others less insistent on the importance of world federation suggest that disarmament would occur as the result of multilateral agreement: universal in character, enforceable in practice, and complete down to the level needed for internal policing. Both of these

approaches are valid, and both could be supported by the United States in the era about which we speculate, but in the last analysis a pacifist policy would require unilateral action if agreement could not be achieved. There is no escaping the necessity to be willing to act first ourselves if we are to have solid ground for getting others to act with us.

It will be said that for a nation to consider disarming alone in an armed world is madness; but the fact that obviously stares men in the face today is that *an armed world in this age is itself madness*. To refuse any longer to labor under the delusion that it is anything else is the beginning of common sense, as it is the counsel of divine wisdom. Moreover, it is quite possible that the Soviet Union, confronted with such a change in American behavior, might startle us with a new response. At the very least, the example of a people living without the burden of militarism and offering friendship to all, would call forth the impulses to freedom that exist in all men. What might have happened, for example, if the remarkable East German uprising of June 1953 had had as its inspiration a United States free from involvement in the effort to rearm Western Germany and in the tragic perpetuation of an impossible division? As it was, the United States' position was a discouraging one. We welcomed the revolt, but could only stand idly by, unwilling to risk unleashing war, and yet unable to offer any other kind of encouragement. Moreover, we were so preoccupied with power concepts that one of the most striking aspects of the uprising was largely overlooked: *the fact that a group of Russian soldiers refused to fire on the unarmed and non-violent demonstrators.*¹⁷ Not only were the demonstrators spared violence, but a number of their grievances were recognized and corrected. How can this outcome be squared with the familiar argument that only naked power is respected by the Russians?

Nor must it be forgotten how this whole non-violent era, about which we are speculating, would be brought about. Under our democratic philosophy, as we have already pointed out, it would not be created by fiat, but as the result of insistence on reconciling measures by a gradually growing pacifist minority. The writers are convinced that this process in itself would so change the climate of world opinion that no power on earth could oppose it effectively. The influence of growing programs of economic assistance, freed from the compulsions of strategy and carried forward by dedicated men and women through the operating agencies of the United Nations, would

lift the heart of the world. Increasing support of the United Nations itself, as a world forum for peaceful settlement, universal in membership and inviolate of selfish national pressure, would create a new basis for an emerging world community of law. The earnest desire to negotiate differences, backed by a gradually increasing willingness to abandon our military posture, could open the way for the relaxation of tension and the achievement of disarmament. Nations which are at present hostile and threatening, would be relieved of any reason for being hostile and threatening, and would face a world opinion so warmly approving of the United States that continued hostility would be difficult to maintain.

Non-Violent Resistance

We must, however, face the possibility that hatred has gone so far, and injustice penetrated so deeply, that even a revolutionary policy of peace could not prevent international aggression. A nation which had disarmed would not in that event abjectly surrender and let an invader run over and enslave it as is often alleged. On the contrary, it would have open to it possibilities of non-violent resistance that offer more prospects of a creative and genuinely victorious outcome than is the case with violent resistance under modern conditions. It is the nation whose reliance is upon arms that now faces the bleakest prospect in the event of international aggression; for victory in any ensuing holocaust is clearly impossible for anyone. Both "victor" and "vanquished" would dwell together in a brutalized and devastated world in which the values of democratic civilization would have been largely swept away.

Non-violent resistance, as has been demonstrated on a large scale in India, and on a smaller scale in many other places, offers greater promise of confounding and overcoming an enemy without destroying our values or our world. While there are limits to the extent to which a program of non-violent resistance can be spelled out for a nation which is quite unready to adopt it, and for a future situation whose character cannot be predicted, it is nevertheless possible to suggest the broad pattern that it would follow. The first necessity is *non-cooperation*. The population must resolutely refuse to carry out the orders of the invader. They would not run trains to transport troops. They would not operate factories to provide the invader with military supplies. They would not unload his ships. They would perform no services of any kind for him. At the same time, they

would try through their words and their lives to show the meaning of a free and democratic society. Second, the population must maintain *good will* toward the individual soldier of the invading forces. However difficult this is in practice, it is clear that the effective use of non-violent resistance has always demanded that a clear distinction be drawn between hatred of an evil policy and respect for the human instrument who is caught up in its execution. Good will is the spiritual weapon of non-violence just as civil disobedience is its physical weapon. Finally, the population must be well enough disciplined to *refrain from individual acts of violence* no matter what the provocation. The whole success of the resistance depends on meeting the enemy on a level and in a manner against which he cannot retaliate effectively. He understands violence, and he is prepared to cope with it ruthlessly and drastically. He must be given no excuse to do so.

* * *

In summary, it is certain that whatever circumstances exist in a specific instance, any campaign of non-violent resistance will include these three elements of non-cooperation, good will, and non-violence. The technique is effective because it undermines the morale of the enemy and removes his will to conquer. When a soldier is received kindly, it is hard for him to continue to hate. When he faces no threat, it is hard for him to continue to kill. Moreover, he has no way to compel cooperation when faced with civil disobedience, and without cooperation the enemy will find his existence difficult indeed.

All of this is not to suggest that everything would proceed in idyllic fashion and that no suffering would occur in a non-violent resistance campaign. We have tried to make it clear that readiness to accept suffering—rather than inflict it on others—is the essence of the non-violent life, and that we must be prepared if called upon to pay the ultimate price. Obviously, if men are willing to spend billions of treasure and countless lives in war, they cannot dismiss the case for non-violence by saying that in a non-violent struggle people might be killed! It is equally clear that where commitment and the readiness to sacrifice are lacking, non-violent resistance cannot be effective. On the contrary, it demands greater discipline, more arduous training, and more courage than its violent counterpart. Without preparation, non-violent resistance will fail just as surely as an untrained and undisciplined army would fail in war. Not even a beginning can be made in assessing the potential of non-violent

resistance as a means of national defense until a people ready to pour billions into military preparations are prepared to put some effort into research and training of a different nature. This in turn can happen only as we make a new commitment to practice peace, and recognize that the freedom worth saving is the freedom of the spirit, which can neither be protected by guns nor enslaved by tyrants.

Such is the program we would chart for the individual and for the state of which he is a part. We have not denied that it involves risk, but no policy can be formulated that does not involve risk. We have not suggested it will be easy, but only that no policy that aims at achieving peace can be easy. Finally, we have made no sweeping claims that it would work, but only that it appears to us more workable and more relevant than the barren doctrines of violence that now enslave us. We believe that it merits the consideration of thoughtful men.

VII

AN AFFIRMATION

*"... there is only one thing that has power completely, and that is love; because when a man loves, he seeks no power, and therefore he has power."*¹⁸

—ALAN PATON, *Cry, the Beloved Country*

There is a politics of time, but there is also a politics of eternity that man would ignore, but cannot. He plays with the politics of time, sees it, manipulates it, imagines it is of himself alone; but both the politics of time and of eternity are of God. Only the eye of faith perceives the relationship, for it alone glimpses the dimension of eternity. Man sees but dimly, yet enough to know the overarching Power that moves in the affairs of men. Because we are first men of faith, and only secondarily political analysts, we would speak now, finally, of the politics of eternity which has undergirded the whole.

An American living in France during the agonizing months of the Nazi advance saw with the clarity of vision sometimes given to those who face last things that the world is not saved by discoveries or inventions, by the trample of iron hoofs nor the thunder of bombing planes, but by the quiet pervasive influence of the small company of people who in all lands and in all times, in spite of all that has happened or may come to pass, steadfastly continue to say, "Nevertheless . . . I believe." Faith is relevant, and in an Age of Anxiety, we affirm ours.

The American Friends Service Committee is deeply rooted in the faith that there is that of God in every man which gives him inalienable worth and dignity. He may not therefore be exploited or expended by any man for any purpose. We have been and we continue to be opposed to all wars, but we are not among those who deny the reality of evil, or assume that peace is merely the absence of war. Rather, believing that peace-making in the nuclear age has become not only the central but the most complex issue for mankind, we are constrained to make peace. Mankind, we believe, has a higher destiny than self-destruction.

Years ago, Rufus Jones wrote: "It takes immense faith to swing out thus from the main social current of the world on a unique venture, to make an experiment in the practice of Love when everybody else insists that nothing will work but force. It means flying in the face of 'hard facts.' It is a course of action which 'common sense' at once refuses."

We have tried to face the hard facts; to put the case for non-violence in terms of common sense. Yet, we are aware that the man who chooses in these terms alone cannot sustain himself against the mass pressures of an age of violence. If ever truth reaches power, if ever it speaks to the individual citizen, it will not be the argument that convinces. Rather it will be his own inner sense of integrity that impels him to say, "Here I stand. Regardless of relevance or consequence, I can do no other."

This is not "reasonable": the politics of eternity is not ruled by reason alone, but by reason ennobled by right. Indeed "faith is reason grown courageous." Reason alone may dictate destroying an enemy who would destroy liberty, but conscience balks, and conscience must be heeded, for nothing in our reading of history, or in our experience of religion, persuades us that at this point conscience is wrong. We do not end violence by compounding violence, nor conquer evil by destroying the evildoer. Evil cannot overcome evil, and the end does not justify the means. Rather, we are convinced that evil means corrupt good ends; and we know with a terrible certainty demonstrated by two world wars in our time, that when we undertake to overcome evil with evil, we ourselves tend to become the evil that we seek to overcome. We believe that the editors of *Life* reached a sound conclusion when, on August 20, 1945, following Hiroshima, they wrote: "Our sole safeguard against the very real danger of a reversion to barbarism is the kind of morality which compels the individual conscience, be the group right or wrong. The individual conscience against the atomic bomb? Yes. There is no other way."

We know of but one way to meet the forces of disintegration that threaten us. The first step is to release into society integrated men and women, whose lives are at one with God, with themselves and with their fellow men. But even this is not enough. If there is to be a religious solution to the social problem there must also be renewed in a disintegrating society the sense of community, of mutuality, of responsible brotherhood for all men everywhere. Such community is built on trust and confidence, which some will say is

not possible now because the communist cannot be trusted. The politics of eternity does not require that we trust him. They require us to love him and to trust God. Our affirmation in this day is that of John Woolman in his: "I have no cause to promote but the cause of pure universal love." We call for no calculated risk on behalf of national interest or preservation; rather for an uncalculated risk in living by the claims of the Kingdom, on behalf of the whole family of man conceived as a divine-human society.

The politics of eternity works not by might but by spirit; a Spirit whose redemptive power is released among men through suffering endured on behalf of the evildoer, and in obedience to the divine command to love all men. Such love is worlds apart from the expedient of loving those who love us, of doing good to those who have done good to us. It is the essence of such love that it does not require an advance guarantee that it will succeed, will prove easy or cheap, or that it will be met with swift answering love. Whether practiced by men or nations, it well may encounter opposition, hate, humiliation, utter defeat. In the familiar words of the epistle, such love suffers long, is always kind, never fails. It is a principle deeply grounded in the years of Quaker sufferings, imprisonments and death. From the dungeons of Lancaster Castle Friends spoke this Truth to Power: "But if . . . not . . . then shall wee lye downe in the peace of our God and patiently Suffer under you."¹⁹ This is the Spirit that overcomes the world.

To act on such a faith, the politics of eternity demand of us, first, repentance. As individuals and as a nation we must literally turn about. We must turn from our self-righteousness and arrogance and confess that we do that which is evil in the sight of the Lord. We must turn from the substitution of material for spiritual values; we must turn not only from our use of mass violence but from what is worse, our readiness to use this violence whenever it suits our purpose, regardless of the pain it inflicts on others. We must turn about.

The race is on; it may be almost run. Man plays with the politics of time, thinking to be master of his own destiny. But God is not mocked: His politics still govern, for the human soul is perplexed and afflicted by the pervading pressure of power exercised by men and nations in their pursuit of the politics of time alone. The weak are impotent, the strong dictate. Claims of national interest or group loyalty are made to justify the crushing of human personality. There is an arrogance that identifies self-interest with virtue, and deafens

men to the needs and voices of others outside their own group or nation. Men strive for security in a world where security cannot exist. The more we cling to security the less secure we feel; the more we cling to armaments and economic privilege the more frightened we become. How shall man be released from his besetting fears, and from his prevailing sense of futility?

To risk all may be to gain all. We do not fear death, but we want to live and we want our children to live and fulfill their lives. Men have ventured all and cheerfully risked death and starvation for many causes. There can hardly be a greater cause than the release of man from the terror and hate that now enslave him. Each man has the source of freedom within himself. He can say "No" whenever he sees himself compromised. We call on all men to say "No" to the war machine and to immoral claims of power wherever they exist and whatever the consequences may be. We call on all men to say "Yes" to courageous non-violence, which alone can overcome injustice, persecution, and tyranny.

Such acts of revolutionary love involve putting into action the laws of the Kingdom before the Kingdom has really come. The early Friends realized only too clearly that the Kingdom of God had not come, but they had an inward sense that it *would never come* until somebody believed in its principles enough to try them in actual operation. They resolved to go forward then, and make the experimental trial, and take the consequences.

So we believe and so we advise.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ORWELL, GEORGE, 1984. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1949.
- ²TOYNBEE, ARNOLD J., "Not the Age of Atoms, but of Welfare for All," *The New York Times Magazine*, October 21, 1951.
- ³MUMFORD, LEWIS, "Kindling for Global Gehenna," *The Saturday Review*, June 26, 1948.
- ⁴FINUCANE, JAMES, "Lightning Over Germany," *Peace Action*, October, 1953.
- ⁵WEIL, SIMONE, "The Iliad or a Poem of Force," *Politics*, Pamphlet #1.
- ⁶One discussion of this subject may be found in *Men Against Fire* by S. L. A. MARSHALL published by William Morrow and Company, New York, 1947.
- ⁷Produced by Coronet Films in consultation with the Department of Defense and other organizations, 1951.
- ⁸ZELLERBACH, JAMES D., *The New York Times*, October 15, 1953.
- ⁹WOOLMAN, JOHN, "Consideration on Keeping Negroes," an essay printed in 1762.
- ¹⁰TOYNBEE, ARNOLD J., *The World and the West*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- ¹¹HORDERN, WILLIAM, *Christianity, Communism and History*. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- ¹²SHAKESPEARE, WILLIAM, *The Merchant of Venice*, Act III, Scene 1.
- ¹³LUTHULI, CHIEF ALBERT, President of the African National Congress, *Bulletin of Americans for South African Resistance*, No. 12, February 27, 1953.
- ¹⁴Material on Quaker experience in treatment of prisoners, mentally ill and slaves; also on Quaker relationship to Indians, 1756-58, taken from *The Contributions of the Quakers* by ELIZABETH JANET GRAY. Wallingford, Pennsylvania: F. A. Davis Company, 1947.
- ¹⁵GANDHI, MOHANDAS K., *Harijan*, November 12, 1938. Permission of Navajivan Trust.
- ¹⁶WOOLMAN, JOHN, "A Word of Remembrance and Caution to the Rich," Section IX of an essay printed in 1793.
- ¹⁷SWOMLEY, JOHN M., JR., *The Peace Offensive and the Cold War*. New York, National Council Against Conscription, 1954.
- ¹⁸PATON, ALAN, *Cry, the Beloved Country*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.
- ¹⁹FOULDS, ELFRIDA VIPONT, "Let Your Lives Speak," Pendle Hill pamphlet #71, May, 1953.

HISTORICAL NOTE ABOUT BAYARD RUSTIN

In September, 2010, the Board of Directors of the American Friends Service Committee approved a minute restoring the name of Bayard Rustin as one of the principal authors of *Speak Truth to Power*.

Following objections to the inclusion of Bayard Rustin's name in the list of authors of *Speak Truth to Power*, his name was deleted from the document. The concerns raised were in the context of his arrest and jail time the previous year on a "morals charge." He was openly gay at a time when the atmosphere regarding homosexuality was oppressive. In the wider world, Bayard had been harassed for his race, his politics, and his pacifism. Bayard had supporters within AFSC and the Quaker community. His "final and considered judgment" to have his name removed for "largely personal" reasons was accepted. Regretfully, *Speak Truth to Power* was distributed without listing Bayard Rustin as one of the authors, until the AFSC board restored his name to its rightful place.

Bayard's life included service and commitment to AFSC, to Quakerism, and to the Quaker Testimonies. In 2012, during the 100th anniversary of his birth and the annual meeting of the AFSC Corporation, we acknowledge Bayard's life as an inspiration for us to speak truth today.

For those wishing to learn more about Bayard Rustin, please go to <http://rustin.org/>.

March 2, 2012

Copies of this report may be obtained from bookstores or from any of the following listed offices of the American Friends Service Committee, Incorporated:

AUSTIN 5, Texas—2106 Nueces Street
CAMBRIDGE 38, Massachusetts—130 Brattle Street
CHICAGO 2, Illinois—59 East Madison Street
COLUMBUS 9, Ohio—2268 East Main Street
DES MOINES 12, Iowa—4211 Grand Avenue
GREENSBORO, North Carolina—617 West Market Street
NEW YORK 3, New York—144 East 20th Street
PASADENA 20, California—P. O. Box 966-M
PHILADELPHIA 7, Pennsylvania—20 South 12th Street
PORTLAND 14, Oregon—1108 S. E. Grand Avenue
RICHMOND, Indiana—8 Quaker Hill Drive
SAN FRANCISCO 15, California—1830 Sutter Street
SEATTLE 5, Washington—3959 15th Avenue, N.E.

Board binding—\$1.00

Paper binding— 25¢