
PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements

1-1-1961

The use of force in international affairs

Friends Peace Committee (Philadelphia, Pa.) Working Party on the Use of Force in International Affairs

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Friends Peace Committee (Philadelphia, Pa.) Working Party on the Use of Force in International Affairs, "The use of force in international affairs" (1961). *PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements*. 437.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism/437>

25¢

THE
USE OF FORCE
IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prepared by a Working Party of

FRIENDS PEACE COMMITTEE

1520 RACE STREET

PHILADELPHIA 2, PA.

THE USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I. The Problem

- A. The Origin and Development of the Quaker Peace Testimony
- B. The Twentieth Century Challenge to the Peace Testimony

CHAPTER II. Kinds of Force

- A. Internal and External Force
- B. Kinds of Coercive Force
- C. Nonviolent Direct Action

CHAPTER III. Friends and the Use of Force

- A. Friends and Nonviolent Direct Action
- B. Friends and World Law
- C. Friends and Strengthening the U.N.

CHAPTER IV. Possible Roles for Friends in Working for Political Peace

- A. Advocating Unilateral Disarmament and Nonviolent Resistance
- B. Advocating World Disarmament and World Law
- C. Advocating U. S. Initiative Toward Disarmament

CHAPTER V. What More Can Friends Do?

- A. Stimulate the Will to Abolish War
- B. Stimulate Faith in Nonviolent Solutions for Conflict
- C. Stimulate a Sense of Individual Responsibility for Peace

SUMMARY

GLOSSARY

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION are attached to each Chapter.

THE USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

INTRODUCTION

The Human Family *could* be enjoying unprecedented material progress made possible by modern technology. The Human Family *could* be entering an era of world law and order insuring that international conflicts would be settled peaceably. The Human Family *could* also be on the threshold of an unprecedented intellectual and spiritual flowering made possible by the elimination of distance on this planet and by the opportunity to share the riches of all our diverse cultures now in closer contact than at any time in history. Instead of realizing these possibilities, half the world's people are in physical misery because war preparation diverts material and mental resources from the meeting of their needs. And the other half of the world's people live in mortal fear because they prepare for total self destruction.

Man knows that nuclear war means universal suicide but he has not yet accepted any adequate pattern for international security not based on the war system. Militarism — “A system emphasizing the military spirit and the need for constant preparation for war” (Funk and Wagnall) — remains the foundation policy of the nations though they know that it has ceased to give them security. “Deterrence” consists of threats that injurious policies pursued by other nations will be resisted by using weapons whose use would be manifestly insane. Therefore, such threats indicate either insanity or bluff. And insofar as they are believed to be bluff, they lose their “deterrent” power. Moreover, the very presence of nuclear, biological, chemical and radiological weapons intended to deter attack, tends more and more to *invite* attack due to miscalculation or error in the split second

decisions required by the push-button era. Hence the requirement for mankind's survival is a workable alternative to militarism. The search for such an alternative challenges every human being.

The signers of this document were appointed in 1958 by the Friends Peace Committee of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (called Quakers) as a Working Party to consider alternatives to the present uses of force in international affairs and, if possible, to produce some findings which might be helpful to Friends and others in forming opinions about *desirable or acceptable uses of force in international affairs*. This Working Party was composed of persons who believe ardently in the peace testimony of the Society of Friends but who have widely varying views of their individual vocations as peacemakers and of the role of the Society of Friends in applying this traditional testimony to the current international situation.

The Working Party met regularly for nearly two years, defining its problem; its terms; the many points of agreement and the few points of disagreement among its members. One of our earliest findings was that we, ourselves, were giving widely different meanings to such basic terms as "peace," "force," "police," and "violence." We therefore agree on *certain definitions of these terms for the purpose of this document* in order that we might understand each other and might convey our ideas clearly to our readers. These definitions are italicized where they first appear in the text, and the terms are used consistently throughout. They are also listed in the glossary.

Although not all the signers agree with every detail of this paper, the paper presents the general results of our deliberations. It makes no attempt to dictate any one

interpretation of the peace testimony, but rather attempts to help Friends and others understand the various forms of activity to which they may feel called and the contribution that each of these activities can make to the cause of peace on earth which all of us yearn to serve.

Members of the Working Party on
"THE USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS"

FRIENDS PEACE COMMITTEE

Philadelphia 2, Pa.

GEORGE LEVINGER, *Chairman*

GEORGE C. HARDIN, *Secretary*

BRUCE C. BUSCHING

OLCUTT SANDERS

DOROTHY H. HUTCHINSON

DAVID B. SEAVER

ERNEST KURKJIAN

CHARLES WALKER

DUDLEY M. PRUITT

GEORGE WILLOUGHBY

Issued July, 1961

CHAPTER I.

THE PROBLEM

A. THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUAKER PEACE TESTIMONY

One of the distinctive characteristics of the Society of Friends is its emphasis on the Fatherhood of God, and consequent reverence for human personality. Refusal to destroy human beings and faith in the supreme power of Love in human relationships are natural outgrowths. Thus Quaker pacifism (i.e. opposition to war or the use of military force and conversely, reliance on nonviolent words and acts in dealing with human conflicts) was an early and inevitable expression of Quakerism.

The individual early Friend, accepting the leading of the Inward Light (the Light of Christ within), found himself unable to participate in the organized killing of his brothers, namely war. George Fox, as early as 1651, refused to fight because he had discovered "that life and power" within himself which "took away the occasion for all war."

Friends, by 1660, united in a public declaration that "the Spirit of Christ which leads us into truth will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the Kingdom of Christ nor for the kingdoms of the world . . . Therefore, we cannot learn war any more." Although not all members of the Society of Friends have been able to accept this testimony, no regularly constituted body of Friends has ever repudiated the position that all war is contrary to the will of God, and, therefore, no proper activity for a Friend.

Since all war is thus condemned by Friends as contrary to God's will, it is to be expected that they should seek ways to eliminate the war system and to substitute ways of dealing with conflict which are compatible with belief in the brotherhood of man and the individual's infinite value as a child of God.

George Fox's famous statement of his reason for refusing to fight has often been misinterpreted by Friends and others to mean that peace can be secured only when all men (or, at least, most men) "live in that life and power" which makes human society perfectly harmonious, or that war can be abolished only when so many people develop religious scruples against fighting that war becomes impossible. However, George Fox seems to have been stating the spiritual basis of his personal behavior, rather than making a political analysis of peace and war.

William Penn, Fox's distinguished contemporary, was the first Friend to analyze peace and war from a Quaker point of view. In his "Essay Toward the Present and Future Peace of Europe", Penn described how a non-pacifist secular society could eliminate war by establishing international institutions of law and order. Obviously this kind of peace would not have to wait for the elimination of conflict. Nor would it promise to eliminate conflicts of interest among nations. It would simply substitute a peaceful method for the war method in dealing with the injustices, etc., which cause international conflicts. Thus *PEACE* (in the political sense) *is the renunciation of international violence and the substitution of relatively nonviolent methods for settling international conflicts.*

From the beginning of the Society of Friends to the present, there have persisted within the peace testimony the two strands exemplified by Fox and Penn —

(1) personal renunciation of war, and (2) efforts to establish the political institutions of peace. Both these aspects of the peace testimony are clearly indicated in current Friends queries: "Do you faithfully maintain our testimony against participation in war as inconsistent with the spirit and teaching of Christ?" "What are you doing as individuals or as a Meeting to understand and remove the causes of war and develop the conditions and institutions of peace?"

We are moreover advised that "Friends desire and assist the development of an adequate world organization, even though we know that no human agency is perfect and that difficult moral issues will be raised by the operation of the world organization we desire, just as in the case of national government."

B. THE TWENTIETH CENTURY CHALLENGE TO THE PEACE TESTIMONY

In the 17th century, when Friends made their first public declaration against war, and throughout the subsequent history of the Society of Friends, the most common expression of our peace testimony has been individual refusal to participate in war often coupled with service to war victims (both "friends" and "enemies") and sometimes also accompanied by recommendations for nonviolent solutions to specific conflicts. These reminders to secular society of the wickedness of war seemed to fulfill Friends obligation in this matter. They were the most effective possible testimony in a world which almost unanimously accepted war as the normal means of promoting national interests and even glorified war as the nurse of manly virtues and the noblest expression of patriotism. Friends have frequently

asserted as Penn did that there were practical alternatives to the war system but, in such a social setting, political proposals for the elimination of war were bound to seem academic.

The 20th century poses new challenges to the Friends peace testimony. Mankind finds itself on a shrunken planet where all men and nations must live as close to one another as the inhabitants of one small village. This community, brought into proximity by scientific technology, is socially and politically quite unprepared for the community life which has been forced suddenly upon it, and is now divided into power structures armed with weapons capable of universal destruction. The widespread recognition of the total danger inherent in this situation and of the insanely suicidal possibilities of war, has not moved nations to renounce war and disarm. Instead, in the name of "deterrence", it has greatly stimulated the arms race. Though nuclear weapons would be deliberately used only by a nation ready to accept suicide as the price of their use, the very presence of the weapons induces terror which can easily set off the final war by accident. Every international incident now poses to national leaders the question—Is the opponent insane enough to use his H-bombs or is he bluffing? On the basis of their guess as to the answer to this question, national leaders, at increasingly frequent intervals, gamble — with the survival of all humanity as the stake.

Has the Society of Friends, which for 300 years has had a peace testimony, anything to offer at this fateful moment which can help God's terrified and perplexed children to move away from the brink of annihilation where they are precariously teetering?

As the world has moved step by step to its present terrifying position, men have seemed to become callous to the horrors they are preparing to inflict on each other

and themselves, and hopelessly apathetic about their common danger. However, there is now evidence of more widespread questioning of the practicability, and of the moral acceptability of war than ever before in history. Increasing contacts (through mass media of communication, trade, and travel) between the people of nations formerly isolated from one another are slowly but surely fostering in the human family a sense of unity which presages good, provided it is allowed time to bear fruit. Though fear is numbing man's natural revulsion against the agonies he prepares to inflict on his brothers, the enthusiasm for the moment of hope offered in the Spirit of Camp David and for gestures of mercy such as the White Fleet and the Peace Corps gives evidence that man still pathetically longs to live and help live.

There has, for some years, been general intellectual acceptance of the fact that war is no longer possible as an instrument for achieving any national goal. As the governments of the gigantic power blocs go on preparing for mutual annihilation they seem to be victims of the outmoded terms of reference within which they believe they are required to operate, vainly striving to provide military security for their segments of the human family in a situation where this has become impossible. They are just beginning to toy with ideas of disarmament and world law which their training has predisposed them to shun as "unrealistic."

If we of the Society of Friends are to say anything at this time which may help tip the scales in favor of man's humane and constructive impulses and help set mankind free to start developing a decent common life, we must ask ourselves, with new urgency, two difficult questions. (1) As long as there may be inequities and aggressions among nations, must nations choose between abject surrender to injustice or attack, and the exercise of force

against these? (2) If the use of force is necessary — what kind of force and how shall it be used?

Some questions arising out of Chapter I

1. *Concept of "Just War"?* Does the use of weapons which would destroy all nations involved in a war, plus many people living in neutral countries, make the "just war" out of date?
2. *Patriotic Duties?* Outline specifically the responsibilities you believe an able-bodied male has to his country. (For example: Vote and help elect competent legislators? Pay taxes for legitimate costs of government? Obey laws, conform to social customs? Serve in armed forces? Refuse to serve in armed forces? Pay the prescribed penalties for violations, refusals?)

Do these apply equally to both democratic and totalitarian countries?

3. *Duty to Dissent?* If what your country is doing seems to you practically and morally wrong, is dissent the highest form of patriotism?
4. *Militarism Self-Defeating?* Has the military posture, the reliance on the military for answers to problems, become in itself a liability to finding any answers other than military?
5. *Fallacy of Negotiating From Strength?* "Negotiation from strength" means that your opponent is negotiating from weakness. Therefore, is negotiation possible on this basis?

CHAPTER II.

KINDS OF FORCE

A. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FORCE

FORCE is a general term for that which induces or opposes an action. All behavior, whether of individuals or nations, is the product of forces.

However, forces influencing behavior may arise from within or from without. Every act is the product of internal desires or of external pressures or both. Behavior may be the result of all sorts of combinations of such impulses as love, sense of duty, desire to conform to socially acceptable patterns, desire for reward, or fear of punishment.

It is clear that socially desirable behavior based on internal constraints applied by the individual to himself is the most reliable, and that development of such internal constraint should be one of the objectives of any external restraints imposed by society.

However, it is also clear that there are individuals in whom the self-applied constraints are so poorly developed that society must apply external restraints to them as a protection to its other members. This kind of force may be called "*COERCIVE FORCE*" and is that which attempts to compel a change in behavior by external means involving punishment or the threat of punishment.

Coercive force is sometimes interpreted as force which appeals only to physical fear. Such coercive force includes administering painful corporal punishment to a child in the hope of making him afraid to disobey or inflicting capital punishment on an adult offender in the hope of deterring others from crime.

However, coercive force also includes withholding a child's dessert in order to induce him not to disobey, depriving a man of his driver's license to induce him not to endanger his fellow citizens by his recklessness, or confining a murderer pending his rehabilitation as a person whose freedom will no longer be a threat to others.

Coercive force tends to produce resentment, especially if the legitimacy of its use is unclear. It requires constant surveillance which, in turn, implies lack of confidence in the motivation of the offender. This may delay, rather than promote, the development of the internal constraints needed to replace the external coercion. However, since socially harmful behavior cannot be condoned, coercive force, in spite of its recognized limitations, often seems to be society's only possible recourse in the interest of the safety and welfare of the whole.

The practical problems and moral dilemmas inherent in the exercise of coercion are very evident in the relations of nations. Nations, too, often pursue their goals in ways injurious to others, so that it seems necessary and justifiable to exercise coercive force to modify their anti-social behavior. The question is — what kind of coercion, and administered by whom?

B. KINDS OF COERCIVE FORCE

Let us compare and evaluate two kinds of coercive force available to the international community, namely violence and law.

1. *VIOLENCE IS THE USE OR THREAT OF ACTIVITY WHOSE OBJECTIVE IS DEATH OR PHYSICAL INJURY TO PEOPLE.* When used against nations states, we call this *WAR*. It has, historically, been accepted as the ultimate instrument for settling international disputes.

Friends oppose this use of violence (war) because: —

- (a) Violence is morally abhorrent, since it destroys man, whom God has created in His own image;
- (b) Violence seeks to impose the will of one party to the dispute upon the other, rather than to find a just and mutually acceptable solution. This fact, and the excesses inherent in violence, multiply resentments and produce more acute problems than those “solved” by this method.

While immediate results may appear to be obtained by violence (war), the situation is, in the long run, significantly worsened. This is the practical meaning of the moral judgment that good ends cannot be served by bad means. The bad means themselves destroy the good ends they are supposed to achieve.

2. LAW IS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RULES OF BEHAVIOR DEEMED USEFUL FOR MAINTAINING ORDER AND SAFEGUARDING THE COMMON WELFARE, AND OF MEANS FOR THEIR IMPARTIAL ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT. Law has become the final arbiter at all levels of human society except the international level where effective and enforceable law is still practically non-existent.

The existence of law-by-common-consent does not necessarily preclude the use of some violence in its enforcement. For instance, police may be legally authorized to shoot anyone who with firearms resists arrest. And certain crimes may be legally punishable by a death sentence. The rule of law does, however, tend to reduce the violence of the punitive measures used, because it changes the source of authority for the punishment of offenders. In the absence of law, individual members or

groups within the society not only decide what constitutes a public offense, but they also administer the punishment in their own interest. They often do this with an unbridled excess of violence induced by their emotional need for vengeance or by a calculated desire to acquire the possessions of the vanquished. Under the rule of law, society, through its police and courts, apprehends and deals with offenders. The power to punish is limited and explicit. Laws govern the behavior of the police and courts as well as the behavior of the citizen and protect his rights. His guilt and the nature of his punishment are decided, not by either party to the dispute, but by the court — an impartial third party, administering laws established by common consent as reasonable and just. Such law involves coercion with little or no use of violence.

There is ample historical evidence that just laws are a powerful factor in enabling human societies to settle the dispute among their members peacefully. It seems that an initial incentive to the establishment of government-by-consent at every level of society (from primitive tribe to modern nation) has been the urgent need for a just and reliable method for settling disputes without resort to violence. Conversely, men's renunciation of the use of violence in their own defense (e.g. on the American frontier) has seemed to depend upon the establishment of law.

Law has replaced violence for the settlement of disputes on nearly every level of mature human relationships, from the conflict of a man with his neighbor to the jurisdictional disputes between large communities as the various states of the U. S. Even among nation-states law is already often used by mutual consent, as a convenient and acceptable way of resolving conflict and of making constructive joint action possible.

It seems reasonable, therefore, to believe that world peace can now be fostered by an extension of *world law* to deal with all international conflicts and to facilitate the peaceful changes which are bound to be needed in a dynamic world society seeking to eliminate injustices. In practical terms, world disarmament seems unattainable except accompanied by and under the authority of world law. Historically, men have relinquished their means of self-defense only as they devised other means for guaranteeing their safety.

C. NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION

There is yet another kind of force besides violence and law, which can be used effectively to bring about changes in the behavior of individuals or groups. *NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION IS ACTIVE RESISTANCE TO INJUSTICE, BY NONVIOLENT NON-COOPERATION WITH, OR BY OBSTRUCTION OF, THE PERPETRATION OF INJUSTICE.* This force has been applied by groups in many times and cultures: by Quakers under Cromwell, Gandhi in India, South Africans seeking freedom from racial oppression, Negroes in the American South opposing segregation.

This force is difficult to classify according to our previous definitions of kinds of force. It is force applied externally but its main object is to induce the development of internal consent to the desired change in behavior. Thus it is a sort of bridge between external and internal force. It contains elements of coercion in that it attempts to restrain the wrongdoer by obstructing him or withholding necessary cooperation. It may even inflict some injury on the wrongdoer (e.g., the economic injury inflicted on southern business men by the bus and chain store boycotts). However, coercion, in the sense that it involves punishment or the threat of punishment, is incidental. The main purpose of nonviolent direct action

is to force the wrongdoer to face the injustice of his behavior, to appeal to the good in him, and thus eventually to convert rather than coerce him. Thus it can be both coercion and persuasion. During the process of nonviolent resistance to injustice, the user of this force, whenever possible, accepts suffering willingly rather than inflicting it. He does this to demonstrate his good will towards the wrongdoer as well as his firm intention to resist the wrong which is being done.

Nonviolent resistance is not based on the desire for victory over the perpetrator of injustice, or a desire to force him into the place of the present underdog. It aims at equality and justice which are good for the oppressor as well as for the oppressed. It is based on the belief that injustice harms both the oppressor and the oppressed by destroying their self-respect as well as their mutual respect. Nonviolent direct action is, therefore, a positive expression of love, since its object is to achieve what is advantageous for all, and it assumes innate goodness in the wrong doer to which an appeal can be effectively directed.

Nonviolent direct action is a form of force theoretically available for use in international as well as interpersonal and intergroup relations. It was used with spectacular success by colonial India to throw off British rule. But, so far, nonviolent resistance has been used only by groups relatively deprived of arms who were therefore unable successfully to offer violent resistance to their oppressors.

Even the most heavily armed now find themselves in a similar situation since resort to violence has become wholly impractical.

However, the acceptance of nonviolent resistance as a national policy by a heavily armed nation-state would involve thoroughgoing disarmament and the training of

its citizens in the discipline required for exclusive reliance on nonviolent direct action against possible aggression and even occupation by a foreign power. Nonviolent resistance has actually been proposed by an ex-Commander of the British Navy as the most effective tactic for Britain to prepare to use against possible aggression by the USSR. And more recently the British Labor Party has voted for unilateral nuclear disarmament. However, so far, there has been no instance of the use of *nonviolent direct action* by a nation.

Any nation adopting this policy would have to abandon all national interests outside its own borders of which it could be deprived by violence. In the case of the United States, adoption of his policy would, moreover, involve a moral obligation to consider its effects on the people of West Berlin and the many nations which now consider themselves total or partial military dependents of the United States. These people would be even more likely than we to have to meet aggression by nonviolent resistance and would have to be prepared for this.

The practical arguments in favor of unilateral disarmament and reliance on nonviolent resistance include the following:

1. There is no defense against nuclear attack. Subsequent retaliation would not save the attacked country but would only make the destruction universal, which is cold comfort even to a military strategist.

2. The hope of deterrence on which the arms race is based may be a fatal illusion. The mere existence of totally destructive weapons tends to produce tensions and panic which can lead to war by miscalculation or accident. The possession of such weapons by a nation seems, therefore, more likely to make that nation the target of a sudden attack than to protect it from attack.

3. Reliance on nonviolent noncooperation with an aggressor offers more realistic hope of insuring the survival of a nation and its eventual freedom than does nuclear war.

Some questions arising out of Chapter II.

1. *Role of Coercion in International Affairs?* According to the definitions in this paper, what forms of "force" or of "coercion" should be used in international affairs, and under what circumstances?
2. *Law as Coercion?* Most people believe in restraint of wrongdoing, through law, with police and courts dealing with violators of the law. But some people say that law is nothing but organized violence. What evidence, what facts, can you give, either to support this, or to deny it?
3. *Nonviolence — Tool of the Helpless?* India and the Negroes of the South have used nonviolence as a "tool of the helpless", because they had no other tools. Are even the most powerful nations of the world today in a similar situation because the total destructiveness of nuclear weapons makes their use impractical?
4. *Nonviolence — Tactic or Spiritual Force?* In some situations (such as Norway during the German occupation), nonviolence has been used successfully merely as a tactic. In other cases (such as its use by Gandhi and in the later stages of the desegregation struggle in the South), it has been used as a spiritual power to transform the oppressor, and thus change the circumstances. Discuss the difference between nonviolence as a tactic and nonviolence as a transforming power. Would you recommend non-violent resistance as a tactic for a non-pacifist nation?

CHAPTER III.

FRIENDS AND THE USE OF FORCE

A. FRIENDS AND NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION

Most Friends find nonviolent direct action a type of force compatible with their religious convictions.

Conscientious refusal to participate in war, to register for conscription or to pay taxes for war, all involve this kind of noncooperation with evil. They confront society with a moral challenge in an effort to convert it. Coupled with the challenge is willingness to suffer whatever punishment society may inflict on the conscientious objector as a result of his nonconformity. The conscientious objector recognizes the element of potential coercion in his acts since, if conscientious objectors became sufficiently numerous, the government would be "forced" to change its war policies. On all these counts, it appears that Friends practiced nonviolent direct action against the evil of war for nearly 300 years before the term was coined.

Since Gandhi's effective use of this "soul force", there have been many experiments with vigils, fasts, sit-ins and civil disobedience in protest against racial injustice, H-bomb tests, preparation for germ warfare, etc. As would be expected, Friends have often been in the forefront. Because this kind of force can be applied with great sensitivity to the dignity of the opponent, it is least likely to provoke resentment and violence in him, and most likely to change his behavior permanently by altering his motivation. These considerations, as well as the practical arguments in favor of nonviolent resistance as a substitute for war, incline Friends to recommend it as an effective use of force in international affairs and one in which they could conscientiously cooperate.

B. FRIENDS AND WORLD LAW

Very few Friends are philosophical anarchists. It is noteworthy that Friends have traditionally accepted the necessity of law and law enforcement. They have been a law-abiding people, disobeying law only in those relatively rare instances where specific laws ran counter to their consciences. Even then they have not suggested the abolition of the legal system, but only a change in such laws as appeared to them morally wrong.

Friends have recognized that behavior which threatens the welfare of society must be restrained and changed. They have believed that the rule of law is the kind of coercive force necessary for keeping the peace and promoting justice in a heterogeneous society and that law can be compatible with love and respect for the human person.

FAITH AND PRACTICE of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting (p. 40), in describing the requirements for world peace, says: "Nations no less than individuals are members of one another. For both, the framework of government is essential to the settlement of disputes and to providing a mechanism for the joint fulfillment of common needs."

Although many Friends advocate world law, they feel obliged to measure its specifics by certain criteria, just as they measure laws at other levels of society, to determine whether they merit Friends' support or opposition. For instance, law *may* be imposed on a people against their will and be enforced by a dictator with unbridled violence. Such law would be, at the world level, a world government imposed by conquest and administered by the victors. Friends would insist that the establishment of world law be by common consent both to the laws governing the behavior of nations and to the means of

their enforcement. The prior consent of those to be governed, in fact, makes enforcement less of a problem. For instance, the Uniting for Peace resolution passed by the UN Assembly in the midst of the Korean war was initially supported by Britain and France as a means of curbing future aggression by the USSR. Yet when this resolution was invoked against the interests of Britain and France at the time of the Suez Crisis, the decision did not have to be enforced. This was partly because Britain and France recognized it as the legitimate application of a "law" to which they themselves had given prior consent.

However, law must be supported by adequate means to enforce it when necessary. Law can be enforced more precisely, more justly, and with less use of violence, if it is enforced upon the individual than if it is enforced upon a group. The accused individual is arrested by the police, tried and punished by a court. The individual is the object of law enforcement in social units from the smallest village to the largest nation, and this should be the pattern also for the enforcement of world law.

Friends are troubled by proposals for world law which envisage, as the *sine qua non* of enforcement, a U.N. armed force poised to make war against nations. They feel that much confusion results from calling such a force a U.N. "police force."

Police is, "the organized body or force of civil officials in the department of government charged with the enforcement of law and the maintenance of public order." (Funk & Wagnall). The object of police action is never the destruction of life or property but rather the maintenance of public order and the apprehension of the individual offender so that he can be tried in court. The police is authorized to use violence, if at all, only in pursuit of this end. Punishment of the offense is no part

of the authorization of the police. The police has clearly defined laws to enforce and is subject to clearly defined regulations concerning the weapons and other means which it is permitted to use in the enforcement process.

An Army, on the contrary, is "a large organized body of men armed for war." (Funk & Wagnall). Even though such a force may act under the directives of a government and ostensibly in defense of the common good, it is specifically equipped and trained for violence and the destruction of life and property. Moreover, only strategic considerations seem to limit the extent of the violence used to attain its ends.

A UN force armed and acting in this way must, therefore, be called an "army", rather than a "police force". The so-called "police action" in Korea was the action of a UN army, and the resulting violence was scarcely different from that in any other war. The fact that the war was fought under UN authorization does not warrant comparing it with police action.

On the other hand, the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) patrolling in the Gaza strip between Egypt and Israel is not an army according to the above definition. It acts less like the UN force in Korea charged with waging war than like a genuine police charged with maintaining public order. UNEF is armed lightly only for self defense. It can properly be called a "Peace Force" in that it cannot wage war and represents the moral rather than the physical force of the world community. In some ways, of course, it does not accord with the accepted concept of "police"; there is no codified law for it to enforce nor are its own actions subject to codified law. It operates under ad hoc UN directives. Moreover it cannot arrest individual offenders and bring them to court for trial; there is no world court authorized to try individuals. However, many Friends welcome UNEF

as a step forward because it attempts to keep the peace with a maximum of consent on the part of those who are policed and with a minimum of violence. In these respects it approaches the kind of force characteristic of law enforcement.

Less completely nonviolent has been the UN force operating, at this writing, in the Congo. It was dispatched in response to the Congo government's request for "military aid" for restoring order. It has, however, adhered to a "police function", to the extent that it has used its arms only to quell disorder and to protect itself rather than to take sides in the conflict, impose a political solution, or punish either side.

In moving toward the goal of world law, one must welcome steps to reduce the use of violence. Complete disarmament under law is the goal and it is to be expected that, as at other levels of society, generally accepted means for the just settlement of disputes will be a prerequisite to willingness to abandon weapons for self defense. It is also to be expected that the achieving of world disarmament will depend on a growing confidence in the impartiality of the U.N. and its competence both to supervise disarmament and to prevent aggressions in the process.

There is a rather prevalent notion that a *first* step toward disarmament must be to give the UN decisive armed might to "enforce" disarmament by making war upon violators of the disarmament agreement or upon aggressors. This seems wholly unrealistic. There are at least two cogent reasons why none of the Great Powers desire or would consent to giving the UN, at this time, a force capable of waging war decisively:

1. An armed force capable of "enforcing" anything on a Great Power, heavily armed as at present, would be prohibitively expensive.

2. None of the Great Powers yet has sufficient confidence in the UN to trust it with any such enormous power and the absolute weapons required to exercise it.

If there had been any real desire to give the UN substantial armed force, this could have been done long ago under the provisions of article 43 of the UN Charter. One suspects that advocacy of a UN armed force (whether called a "Police Force" or a "Peace Force") as a *prerequisite* to disarmament may be a delaying tactic, rather than a stimulus to starting actual world disarmament. It appears probable that initial steps in disarmament will be carefully inspected by the UN but can be "enforced" only by the fact that verified violations will bring world condemnation upon the violator, free everyone from the agreement, and probably reopen the arms race.

However, as disarmament progresses, nations will give up more and more of their ability to protect themselves. If they feel that the UN has proven itself competent in its administration of the initial stages of disarmament, there may come a time when they will wish to put some armed force into the hands of the UN as protection against aggressors or possible secret violators of the agreement during the final stages of total disarmament and for a time thereafter.

This possibility faces Friends with a real dilemma. Could Friends, under any circumstances, favor the creation of a UN armed force?

Some Friends feel that, under no circumstances, could they approve the creation of a UN armed force, since they could neither conscientiously participate in such a force nor approve of any conceivable use of it which would involve the injury and killing of human beings. They fear, moreover, that the possession of such a force

might enable the UN to tyrannize over member nations. Giving arms to the UN, which is now unarmed, would, they believe, be a backward step comparable to giving weapons of war to the now lightly armed police of any of our cities.

Other Friends feel that, whereas giving weapons of war to a city's police, who already have the well-established authority to operate in an unarmed community accustomed to living under law, would certainly be a backward step; an UN army, operating under world law, might be a forward step in a world of mutually terrified nations just emerging from armed lawlessness. They believe that, *if a force were established by common consent, and specific UN consent were required for its use in any crisis*, it would be used only after all nonviolent measures for achieving peaceful settlement of the dispute had been exhausted. Furthermore its use would be confined to stopping the aggression rather than crushing the aggressor. In short, they believe that it would be used with more justice and restraint than national armed forces.

These Friends feel that it is not inconsistent for Friends to accept as an interim measure, a UN armed force in which they themselves would not be willing to participate, and about which they would be uncomfortable. They would feel constantly compelled to keep pushing toward the goal of world law enforced solely by police and courts acting upon the individual offender. However, if faced with a choice between 1) the continuance of national armies and 2) the creation of a UN army to maintain order and reassure the nations during the process of disarmament and for a time thereafter, they would accept the creation of a UN armed force.

This difference of opinion among Friends may not prove to have as great relevance to the problem of initiating world disarmament as appears on the surface.

If we agree that 1) increased confidence in the fairness and competence of the UN, 2) acceptance of reliable means for settling disputes between nations, and 3) substantial initial steps toward world disarmament must be achieved *before* the nations will have any real desire to establish a heavily armed UN force, the problem is certainly far from an immediate one!

C. FRIENDS AND STRENGTHENING THE U. N.

Let us put the problem of a UN armed force in proper perspective by considering some currently feasible steps which lead rather directly toward the goal of world peace through world law and which Friends can conscientiously support:

1. *Steps to build the prestige and authority of the UN.*

a) accepting in principle a permanent inspection and patrolling body like UNEF and with right of access to troubled spots anywhere in the world — thus establishing the UN's unquestioned right to deal with threats to the peace.

b) placing unclaimed areas such as outer space, Antarctica, high seas, and their depths under UN jurisdiction — thus giving the UN actual governing experience over some potential sources of international conflict.

c) giving UN jurisdiction over Atoms for Peace program and safety regulations for all fission reactors and atomic waste disposal — thus paving the way for UN supervision of nuclear disarmament.

d) achieving military disengagement and demilitarization under the UN of such tense areas as Central Europe and the Middle East, or preventing the militarization of Africa under UN guarantees of security — as pilot projects for UN supervision of world disarmament and a disarmed world.

e) changing the voting procedure of the UN assembly to correspond with population and other realities — thus making it possible that law-making power may be entrusted to the UN.

2. *Steps toward law governing peaceful settlement of international disputes.*

a) removing reservations (e.g., the Connally Amendment) on the International Court of Justice so that no nation can prevent the Court from dealing with judicable international disputes to which that nation is a party.

b) using UN machinery (Security Council or Assembly) for the settlement of all international political disputes not readily settled by direct negotiation. (Historical experience has shown that submission of disputes for arbitration generally guarantees compliance even without provision for enforcement of the decision. Since 1800 only about 15 of the more than 1500 judgments rendered on the basis of international law by national and international courts have been disregarded, even though there was no enforcement procedure.)

c) improving UN machinery for peaceful settlement, e.g., abolishing the veto in questions of peaceful settlement and establishing regional UN courts with appellate function and jurisdiction over the individual.

3. *Steps toward law governing world disarmament.*

a) including the Peoples' Republic of China in all disarmament negotiations in order that the resulting agreements may be workable.

b) declaring that total disarmament under law is the goal and agreeing to a step-by-step program to this end, the steps to follow one another automatically in sequence as each is declared by UN inspectors to have been completed.

c) taking initial steps toward world disarmament — e. g., banning nuclear tests, placing ceilings on national armed forces, depositing some weapons under UN surveillance. These agreements would be “enforced” only by strong likelihood that nations will withdraw from the agreement and recommence the arms race if violations are verified by UN inspectors and not promptly rectified. Moreover, these agreements cannot be made conditional upon a “foolproof” inspection system. The best possible system of inspection will be demanded and is desirable. However, the world has long passed the point where every nuclear weapon, missile launching site or cache of germs or poison gas can be detected with certainty. But the high probability of detection would be an adequate deterrent against cheating, and in a generally disarmed world deprived of the means for follow-up on the use of these weapons such cheating would have little practical value anyway. Hence, the risks involved in continuing the arms race greatly exceed those involved in possible undetected violations of a reasonably well inspected disarmament agreement.

Progress in building the general authority of the UN and in preparing to deal with the specific problems of peaceful settlement and of disarmament should be concurrent and progress in any one area will facilitate progress in the others.

IT IS NOTEWORTHY THAT ANY OR ALL OF THESE STEPS CAN BE TAKEN WITHOUT GIVING THE UN ANY REAL ARMED FORCE. It appears that UN armed force is not as essential an element in the evolution of world law as public discussion of the subject now indicates. If the above steps were taken, it is at least possible that the nations would feel little need to put armed force in the hands of the UN. Their fears of their inability to defend themselves during the further

stages of disarmament might be counterbalanced by their growing confidence in each other, in the UN, and in the inspection system under which they are disarming.

Therefore, instead of concentration on an argument about UN armed force which may prove to be purely academic, Friends and others concerned for disarmament under law might well work to strengthen the UN in the above preliminary ways upon which they can agree as they push toward the goal of a disarmed world under law.

Some questions arising out of Chapter III.

1. *Bankruptcy of Deterrence?* In the event of an attack on the U. S. by the Soviet Union, would you favor retaliation? If so, how do you justify this by religious doctrine? If not by religious doctrine, on what grounds?

If you would not favor retaliation, would you agree that the threat of retaliation is justifiable, but the actual use of retaliation is not? Does this threaten-but-not-do position pull the teeth out of the threat of force as a deterrent?

2. *Dealing with Aggression?* Do we as a Christian or religious nation have a moral right to stand by while the Communists gobble up innocent people, as in Hungary?

Could there be alternatives to violence in dealing with this?

3. *Role of World Organization in Peace Keeping?* Can a person reasonably favor disarmament in the absence of world organization?

4. *Legitimacy of Violent Coercion?* Is there any moral difference between violence used by nations in their own interest, and that which might be used upon the decision of a supra-national organization in the interest of the world?

CHAPTER IV.

POSSIBLE ROLES FOR FRIENDS IN WORKING FOR POLITICAL PEACE

Three general points of view are held by Friends whose common aim is to combine immediate political relevance with faithfulness to their religious insights regarding war and to work for practical alternatives to the war system.

A. ADVOCATING UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT AND NONVIOLENT RESISTANCE

ONE OF THESE POINTS OF VIEW IS THAT THE PARAMOUNT MISSION OF FRIENDS IS TO TRY TO STIMULATE THEIR NATION TO AN UNCONDITIONAL REJECTION OF THE WAR METHOD, TO COMPLETE UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT, AND TO PREPARATION FOR EXCLUSIVELY NONVIOLENT RESISTANCE TO ANY POSSIBLE AGGRESSION.

They feel that while many non-Friends, for all sorts of reasons, are now advocating world law and world disarmament, Friends are peculiarly fitted to take the more radical minority position in favor of unilateral disarmament. They believe that this will have political relevance in that it will constantly remind their fellow citizens of the moral unacceptability of war and tend to pull the moderates away from their present reliance on violence and toward a determination to seek *some* alternative to violence, even though they may not accept unilateral disarmament as that alternative.

Those who support this position believe that the world situation is such that only a revolutionary change in values and a great act of faith can save mankind. Talking

of political measures short of unilateral disarmament may actually delay this revolutionary act of faith. Sustained preparation for ever more hideous warfare has filled men with fear and distrust which force each nation to regard all disarmament proposals in the context of its own military advantage and, in effect, prevents any disarmament agreement. In other words, perhaps there can be no sincere and productive planning for world disarmament until *after* some one nation takes a leap of faith by disarming unilaterally. Perhaps only then can we hope for the establishment of world law.

If this is true, Friends can most usefully work for peace by persuading more and more of their fellow citizens to reject war and armaments unconditionally until, as a majority, they can commit the nation to unilateral disarmament and nonviolent resistance, come what may. In the newly emerging nations there are compelling reasons for not starting at all down the road to military preparedness but adopting a foreign policy which rests on the working principles of nonviolence. Persuasive arguments can be made for the nations defeated in World War II, notably Germany and Japan, to disarm and not become involved further as partisans in the Cold War. Thus a "wedge of peace" might be fashioned that would give impetus to a movement for unilateral disarmament within the two giant power blocs.

According to this view, a few Quaker experts in international affairs may feel a special calling to urge politically feasible measures to relieve international tensions and strengthen the UN. But most Friends can best serve society by demonstrating and preaching the relevance of nonviolence, rather than by advocating any political measures which at this moment might be acceptable to their non-pacifist fellow citizens.

B. ADVOCATING WORLD DISARMAMENT AND WORLD LAW

ANOTHER OF THESE POINTS OF VIEW WHICH STRIVE TO HARMONIZE POLITICAL RELEVANCE WITH THE RELIGIOUS CONVICTIONS OF FRIENDS, IS THAT FRIENDS HAVE A COMPELLING MISSION AT THIS TIME TO ENGAGE IN POLITICAL ACTION TO BRING ABOUT COMPULSORY PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES AND WORLD DISARMAMENT UNDER WORLD LAW.

The adherents of this view feel that, although many non-Quakers are showing some intellectual grasp of the urgent need for the development of world law, they need to be spurred to action by people with deep spiritual commitment of this goal. The imminence of a war of annihilation seems to demand that those who see any politically feasible way to save mankind, exert every possible effort to this end. Perhaps demanding only such a radical solution as unilateral disarmament may alienate moderates and thus actually inhibit rather than stimulate their action for Peace.

Whereas it is true that Friends have often made radical social protests, there is also considerable precedent for Friends working with others at the little ends of big social problems – not demanding revolutionary changes in spirit or action but using moral and practical arguments to initiate steps towards the reform of evil social institutions. Often reform is the only realistic possibility and to overreach is to prevent any progress. If Elizabeth Fry had told the British government that nothing would suffice but abolition of the prison system, she would have achieved nothing. Instead, she started with reforms capable of legislative enactment at that time.

It seems to the advocates of political action for world disarmament and world law more probable at this time that a workable agreement can be reached to supplant violence with law at the world level, as it has at other levels of society, than that some powerful nation will first take the unprecedented step of disarming alone. Other problems recognized as inescapably international (such as the drug traffic) have already been successfully subjected to international control. Even during the short life of the UN there has been a notable increase in its authority to deal with threats to the peace, e.g., Uniting for Peace Resolution, UNEF, UN presences in Lebanon, Jordan, Laos, and the Congo.

Throughout history, law has proved a stepping stone not only to a more orderly society, but also to a more loving society. As law and order replace lawlessness and insecurity, a sense of community is freed to develop and men's attention and material resources are liberated *from* their obsession with self-defense and *for* service to the common welfare.

If this is true, Friends in every Meeting and community should be actively cooperating with those who, for moral or practical reasons, are working to substitute for war the force of law.

Whatever any Friend believes to be his most effective role in peacemaking, he can rejoice at all progress toward either unilateral disarmament through faith in non-violence, or multilateral disarmament under the guarantee of world law. We agree on the goal. The difference of opinion about how Friends can best work for peace seems to be based less on a difference in moral judgment than on a difference in judgment as to the best practical strategy for achieving a warless world. To some it seems *more probable* that the nation can be induced to seek peace by unconditional unilateral disarmament and com-

plete reliance on nonviolence resistance. To others it *seems more probable* that the nation can be induced to seek peace by negotiations directed toward world disarmament under world law and submitting international disputes to third party (U.N. judgment.

C. ADVOCATING U. S. INITIATIVE TOWARD DISARMAMENT

TO SOME FRIENDS IT SEEMS PROBABLE THAT THE PRESENT STALEMATE IN DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS CAN BEST BE BROKEN BY SOME REVOKABLE BUT SIGNIFICANT INITIATIVE TOWARD DISARMAMENT TAKEN BY THE U. S. AND THAT THIS SHOULD BE THE IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE OF FRIENDS AT THIS TIME.

Such a US initiative might take the form of declaring a moratorium on missile testing, or destroying a fixed percentage of US weapons in being, or placing a percentage or category of US weapons in depots under U.N. guard. Whatever the initiative, it would be open to full inspection by the UN and the USSR. And it would be accompanied by a challenge to the USSR to match it and to allow the matching act to be fully inspected by the U.N. and the U.S. The force of world opinion would be brought to bear on the USSR to meet the challenge. If this challenge were met, way would be opened for further coordinated unilateral moves and eventually for the necessary negotiations looking toward total disarmament under UN supervision.

This approach combines aspects of both the unilateral and world disarmament approaches. It calls for a tentative unilateral act or acts but makes further disarmament conditional upon inspected matching acts by the other party. It is proposed as a tool for facilitating the eventual

negotiation of total world disarmament supervised by the U.N.

Probably only a tremendous popular demand could induce such a disarmament initiative by a government which has hitherto evidenced no great determination to achieve a bona fide disarmament agreement. But demanding such an initiative has the advantage of immediately putting to the test the good faith of *both* parties. Neither government could then tell its people, as both are now doing, that the disarmament impasse is due to the other's lack of sincere desire for disarmament, unless this becomes demonstrably true.

However we may assess the relative probabilities for national acceptance of these three programs, it seems clear that the viewpoints they represent can be considered supplementary rather than mutually exclusive. The Friends Committee on National Legislation policy statement (1959-1960) combines them as follows

"We believe that *immediate and complete disarmament by the United States*, together with far-reaching revision of its foreign policy, would be consistent with Christian principles. We are prepared to accept the risks involved in this course and we believe that non-violent resistance would be a more effective as well as a more Christian way of dealing with aggression than launching a mutually suicidal war.

"However, in the absence of such a national policy, we support any *substantial first steps toward disarmament by the United States Government* which may help increase international trust and thus improve the chances of world disarmament. And we urge our Government representatives at disarmament negotiations to maintain a conciliatory attitude and a willingness to take some calculated risks for the sake of a

disarmament agreement rather than to court the incalculable risk involved in failure to stop the arms race.

"We believe that an adequate world disarmament plan must eventually include agreed upon stages for disarmament down to the level of armaments needed for maintaining internal order; an effective inspection system; legal machinery for peaceful enforcement against individual violators. All responsible citizens must be alert to support every possible step which may facilitate progress toward this goal."

It is significant that many individual Friends who participate in direct action against the H-bomb and Chemical or Bacteriological warfare, *also* participate in more conventional political action aimed at negotiation or world disarmament under law. And it is significant that many Friends who work primarily for a negotiated world disarmament agreement *also* urge a decrease in the US arms budget and other immediate US peace initiatives. There is no hard and fast line separating these approaches.

Some questions arising out of Chapter IV.

1. *Practical Probabilities of Disarmament?* Whatever your own position on unilateral versus universal disarmament, what do you consider the relative *probabilities* of unilateral or universal disarmament being accepted as a United States policy?
2. *Values of Direct Action?* What is the chief value of direct action such as vigils? Speaking to the conscience of citizens and government? Coercion of government? Value to participants?
3. *Breaking the Negotiation Deadlock?* Some people say that when negotiations become deadlocked, we must then undertake conditional unilateral steps ("initiatives"), or unconditional unilateral disarmament. Do you feel that the nations are now in this situation?
4. *Unilateral Initiatives?* Can you suggest possible unilateral steps (initiatives) which the U.S. could now take toward disarmament which might persuade the U.S.S.R. of our sincerity, cause them to take matching steps, and open the way for genuine disarmament negotiations?

CHAPTER V.

WHAT MORE CAN FRIENDS DO?

Each person must decide for which of the various tasks or combination of tasks of peacemaking his own convictions and capabilities best fit him.

One person may feel called to direct action against war and to teaching the futile immorality of violence, and the greater effectiveness of nonviolent resistance to injustice. He may feel that he can best spread this message by joining with others of like mind in the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Committee for Nonviolent Action, etc. Such a person, whether he acts alone or in a group, must measure his motives, words, and acts by certain criteria (see Chapters IIC & IIIA) by which he can judge their moral quality and their probable effects. In his teaching of nonviolence he should make clear that, whereas he may believe that, in a world under God, nonviolent resistance can eventually prevail over evil, the way of nonviolence does not promise immediate victory and may involve the acceptance of suffering and self-sacrifice without apparent results — even as does the way of war!

Another person may feel called to put his efforts into political action aimed at the creation of the institutions of peace, and into teaching that world law and order have both moral and practical advantages over the world anarchy (“absence or utter disregard of government: Lawless confusion and disorder” — Funk & Wagnall) and unbridled violence which now prevail. He may feel that he can increase the effectiveness of this message by joining with others of like mind in the Friends Committee on National Legislation, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, United World Federalists, etc. Whether he acts alone or in a group, he must judge

every proposed political step by certain criteria (see Chapter IIB & IIIB) to determine its moral acceptability and whether it is actually in the direction of world peace under law. In his teaching about a world order he should make it clear that, whereas the world may be politically able to proceed only by halting and imperfect steps, the goal should be nothing less than the total elimination of violence in international affairs — and no Friend can relax until this goal is reached.

A person may choose to work in the area of nonviolent direct action or in the area of political action or, as the American Friends Service Committee and the Friends Peace Committee do — in both areas as way opens. Wherever one works, his greatest contribution to peace-making may be to create in others the following attitudes of mind and heart which are basic to the acceptance of both the conditions and the institutions of peace.

A. STIMULATE THE WILL TO ABOLISH WAR

Whereas all normal human beings want to avoid the horrors of war, most of them accept the institution of war as an inevitable and eternal fact of life. They therefore pin their hopes on deterring its use and reject as visionary any plan for its abolition.

Thinking persons accept the fact that general war is now suicide; that it has no conceivable use in furthering national interests. They grant that national self defense is impossible. They see that, in spite of all this, war by accident or miscalculation becomes daily more probable as the world goes on piling up nuclear weapons and semi-automatic means of delivery. But fear of war seems to be more than counterbalanced by fear of weakening the useless and positively provocative military threats which go by the name of “deterrence”. So mankind hastens

irrationally toward the final catastrophe. To the psychologist, this is not a surprising pattern of behavior. Experiments have shown that intense fear in either man or beast, instead of stimulating the victim to act to save himself, often stimulates him to meaningless activity based on old patterns of behavior which are entirely irrelevant to his present dangerous situation and which may even increase his danger.

Yet most of the arguments offered for disarmament and world government have been based on an appeal to fear. Everyone from the atomic scientists to the peace organizations have argued on this basis.

We would do well to remember how the allied governments in World War II built citizen morale and moved men to exert themselves for the war effort. Instead of trying to terrify the citizen with realistic depictions of the horrors in store for him if the war was *lost*, the governments stimulated him with the Atlantic Charter and Dumbarton Oaks which promised him a just, prosperous, and peaceful world if he would give his all to *winning* the war. This technique was psychologically sound, though of course war could not deliver the promised goods.

Now the paramount question is whether we shall lose or win peace. Yet we have concentrated attention almost exclusively on the horrors which will result if the peace is *lost* rather than on the tremendously exciting prospects before men, if they will give their all to *winning* the peace. Our technique is psychologically unsound and tragic, because peace can deliver what war can not.

Friends throughout their history have believed in the power of such positive incentives as faith, hope, and love rather than negative incentives of fear, despair, and revulsion. We have tried to give man a vision of himself

as a beloved child of God. We have believed that the most reliable method for repressing evil is to replace it with positive goodness. Can we not apply these insights to man's present predicament?

Here is mankind, able for the first time in the hundred thousand years of human history to produce enough to eat, to abolish illiteracy and many of his most damaging diseases. Here are the most distant members of the human family suddenly able to meet face to face and share their cultural riches to produce a Golden Age for mankind. Such a positive vision of warless world may move men where fear has failed.

Guilt for Hiroshima; guilt for the current preparations for far greater destruction; guilt for unnecessary poverty among most of the human race; all these are a crushing psychological burden which our fellow citizens are carrying, even though they generally carry it unconsciously. Let us hold before them the vision of a world where they can be freed from the guilt; where material resources can be devoted to producing a decent material life for all men, rather than to preparing for their death; where the creativity of man's mind can be devoted to producing food for the hungry, health for the sick and education for the ignorant, rather than to preparing instruments of the devil; where conflicting ideologies must compete for the hearts of men by demonstrating which can best serve men's needs rather than which can amass the most destructive power; where the marvellous means of communication and travel now available to man can be used to substitute mutual understanding for distrust, and can bring people of all cultures into contact so that their diversity can be a source of mutual appreciation rather than a source of mutual fear.

Modern technology has made of the world a small neighborhood. The danger in this situation in terms of the almost instantaneous delivery of missiles has been duly emphasized. *We* should emphasize the equally realistic possibilities of community and cooperation in the shrunken world, provided the war method is supplanted by peaceful methods of settling disputes. The positive vision of peace may restore to constructive action men whom fear and guilt has paralyzed.

B. STIMULATE FAITH IN NONVIOLENT SOLUTIONS FOR CONFLICT

Whereas every thinking person sees the necessity of a peaceful alternative to war, few have hope that there is any practical alternative. This hopelessness produces apathy. The peace organizations, believing that this apparent public apathy on questions of alternatives to war indicates stupid complacency or moral insensitivity, have redoubled their efforts to blast people awake to their physical danger and to the moral evil of war. Again, fear and sense of guilt have failed to produce the desired action. Numb fatalism is a psychological defense against apparently *inescapable* prospects too horrible to contemplate.

Friends' firm belief in the practicability of alternatives to war should compel us to spell out as clearly as possible the *force* of nonviolent direct action and the *force* of law as desirable and effective substitutes for the force of violence. Let those of us who are so moved, share with our fellow men our faith that evil can be conquered by unilateral disarmament and nonviolent resistance. This method may require self-sacrifice as great as that required by the soldier but it can produce results as it has in India and in the southern U.S., and both morally and practically it is infinitely superior to war. Let those of

us who are so moved, share with our fellow men our belief that world law and world disarmament are effective methods of eliminating war. Law enforced upon the individual is the least violent method in general use for dealing with conflicts in human society. Law is the accepted method at all levels of society except the world level — where it is most needed. It is possible to achieve and maintain world law as soon as there is sufficient will to do so.

Friends' belief in all men as children of God gives us faith that our fellow citizens and our government may heed the voice of goodwill and reason. We recognize the mixed motives of the multitude whose careers or jobs seem to depend on the war system. But we also recognize their potential capacity for good. We must continually try to reassure and strengthen this by offering them workable alternatives to war in terms which they can understand.

Friends' belief in all men as children of God also peculiarly fits us to deal with the most deep seated reason for our fellow citizens' despair of practical alternatives to war — namely, their belief that the Russian government will respond to nothing but violence or the threat of violence. We can remind our fellow citizens that this has always been said about the "enemy" nation. However a few years after a war is over we accept these same nations, (e.g., Germany, Japan) as our friends and allies and urge them to rearm!

It used to be that whole nations were thought to be subhuman in that they "could understand nothing but force". Now Americans admire Russians and vice versa but they prepare to kill each other because "the men in the Kremlin" or "the Capitalist—Imperialists of Washington and Wall Street" are believed to "understand nothing but force." Neither side, therefore, sees any

choice except deterring these leaders by threats or, if that fails, annihilating them and everyone else along with them.

Friends are equipped to strike at this root fallacy from which spring major psychological obstacles to all peace negotiations – e.g., the belief that no reasonable plan for world order will be acceptable to “the enemy”; the fear that neither world opinion nor any innate sense of decency will deter “the enemy” from attacking us the moment military deterrence is relaxed; the conviction that “the enemy” wants a disarmament agreement only in order to violate it and prepare for our destruction.

Blueprints for world law and for disarmament, however reasonable, cannot answer these fears. Friends must probe deeper, and, on the basis of their faith in man’s common spiritual heritage, declare to their fellow citizens that governments are but men; and since all men have spiritual potentialities in common, “the men in the Kremlin” can “understand” what we would understand and react in general as we would react; that whereas reasonableness does not always elicit reasonableness in return, it is far more likely to do so than is hostile intransigence; that negotiations recognizing “the enemy’s” legitimate interests and natural fears must therefore be tirelessly and honestly pursued. Only accepting our common humanity makes these truths self-evident. Only clearing away the *psychological* obstacles opens the way to surmounting the *political* obstacles to peace.

C. STIMULATE A SENSE OF INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR PEACE

Whereas every individual has a tremendous stake in peace, few are actively working for peace. The individual feels both ill-informed about the issues of war and peace

and incapable of influencing in any way the decisions on which his very survival depends. The peace organizations have put into his hands accurate information about current events and their interpretation and have shown him ways of influencing government by both direct and political action. But this is not enough. Even if a man has been stirred by the vision of a golden age for mankind and even if he has been convinced that his adversaries are human and that therefore peace is possible, he must overcome another psychological obstacle before he will lift a finger for peace. He must have restored to him a sense of his individual responsibility.

Friends should be peculiarly fitted to stimulate this necessary sense of individual responsibility. Our concept of religion, our type of worship and religious organization have trained us to accept individual responsibility as the ultimate basis for action. We believe that good results are less important than the individual's integrity in acting upon his convictions. We must share this compelling belief with our fellow citizens, from those highest in the government to the man in the street. Many men meet the moral challenge of war by saying, "I am not responsible. The Russians force me to act this way," or "I am not responsible. I'm only carrying out decisions made by someone else," or "I am not responsible. If I don't do this job, someone else will," or "I am not responsible. I'm just supporting my family the best way I can." However, a personal conviction about peace involves an inescapable responsibility to act in some or all of the ways suggested in Chapter IV. Even since Jesus said to Peter, "Follow *thou* me," and Peter said to the magistrate, "We must obey God rather than man," the individual's acceptance of his *responsibility to act* upon God's will as he understands it has been a basic Christian value. And ever since Pentecost, Christians have found within themselves the *power to act* and eventually to change the

course of history. But now even Christians are forgetting that nothing is done for good or ill in international relations except by *persons*. When governments decide the issues of war and peace, these decisions are made by *persons*. We are forgetting that progress toward better international relations starts with a minority — perhaps with *one person* who has the courage for conscientious nonconformity.

This minority or person who furnishes the germ of enlightened change may, of course, be either inside or outside the government. However, because of the limitations within which governments operate, the citizen is more likely than the government official to be the initiator of new and imaginative approaches to peace. Governments, operating within their traditional terms of reference, strive vainly to provide military security for their “sovereign” divisions of the human race. Perhaps only as the citizen frees himself from the myth that this is possible and exercises his imagination on alternative procedures can governments extricate themselves from the disastrous implications of this myth.

The greatest “force” in international affairs may be the ordinary human person transformed by an extraordinary power to act creatively and with vigor. Attitudes and institutions of peace will grow and prevail as individuals dedicate their time, their money, their mental and spiritual resources to speaking and acting for peace with all the “force” that is in them.

Some questions arising out of Chapter V.

1. *Changing the Level of Competition?* Can our immediate objective be to eliminate all conflict between the U. S. and the U.S.S.R., or should we try at least to eliminate the *military* competition and raise this conflict to the level of economic and ideological competition?
2. *Dealing with Fear of Communism?* How do we get around the paralyzing fear of Communists, which prevents serious negotiation? If they disagree with us, we say they are unreasonable and negotiation is impossible. If they agree with us, we believe they agree only because they see a way of breaking the agreement or of outwitting us, and so we change our position.
Since you cannot have negotiation unless you assume a bona fide desire for results, how do we build negotiation on the certainty of our common desire to survive?
3. *Balancing Risks?* Do you feel that the risks involved in negotiation for world disarmament, strengthening the U.N., etc., are more than counterbalanced by some of the risks which increase every day, such as the risk of war by accident or miscalculation, the risk of loss of personal freedom as society becomes more and more militarized, the prospects of violent revolution and the spread of totalitarianism if the economic needs of the world continue to be neglected in favor of huge military expenditures?
4. *Role of the Individual?* To what extent does social progress depend on mass movements, and to what extent does it depend on individuals? Which comes first? What is the role of the individual in social progress?

SUMMARY

1. Growing acceptance of the fact that mankind's survival depends on the elimination of war challenges Friends to propose workable alternatives to the war system for dealing with international conflict.
2. The members of the Working Party who prepared this paper believe that both
 - a) nonviolent direct action against evil; and
 - b) legal coercion of the evil doer, involve uses of force which are morally and practically superior to the use of violence (war) in dealing with international conflict.
3. We believe that world law applying to the peaceful settlement of international disputes and to total world disarmament must be substituted for war and that world law should be enforced by police and courts acting upon the individual just as law is enforced at other levels of society.
4. We agree that many steps can be taken to strengthen the UN and that world disarmament can be initiated without giving the UN an *armed* force. We agree that the UN needs a police force such as is used in law enforcement at other levels of society. We differ as to whether a UN *armed* force would be morally acceptable at any stage in world disarmament or in a world of disarmed nations.
5. We agree that there is more than one morally acceptable approach to achieving a warless world, e. g.:
 - a) unilateral disarmament with training for non-violent resistance
 - b) negotiation for world disarmament and world law

c) U.S. disarmament initiatives contingent upon reciprocity.

We differ as to which of these approaches has the greatest probability of being accepted at this time as the basis for national policy.

6. We differ as to which of these approaches merits major emphasis by Friends but recognize that our several viewpoints are supplementary and not mutually exclusive.
7. We believe that every Friend has a compelling duty to speak and act for peace in one or all of these areas. And we believe also that Friends are peculiarly called to stimulate in others the will for peace, faith in non-violent alternatives to war, and a sense of personal responsibility for developing the attitudes and institutions of peace.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

(as defined for the purposes of this paper)

ANARCHY — absence or utter disregard of government: lawless confusion and disorder.

ARMY (or armed force) — a large organized body of men armed for war.

COERCIVE FORCE (or coercion) — that which attempts to compel a change in behavior by external means involving punishment or the threat of punishment.

FORCE — that which induces or opposes action.

LAW — the establishment of rules of behavior deemed useful for maintaining order and safeguarding the common welfare, and of means for their impartial administration and enforcement.

MILITARISM — a system emphasizing the military spirit and the need of constant preparation for war.

NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION — active resistance to injustice by nonviolent noncooperation with, or obstruction of, the perpetration of injustice.

PEACE (in the political sense) — the renunciation of international violence and the substitution of relatively nonviolent methods for settling international conflict.

POLICE — the organized body or force of civil officials in the department of government charged with the enforcement of law and the maintenance of public order.

QUAKER PACIFISM — opposition to war or the use of military force and conversely, reliance on nonviolent words and acts in dealing with human conflicts.

VIOLENCE — the use or threat of activity whose objective is death or injury to people.

WAR — the use of violence against nation states.

25¢, \$2 for 10, \$16 per hundred, post paid