

CAN PEACEFUL CIVILIZATIONS BE VIRGILE?

I should like to discuss with you today one of the most delicate and yet most important ^{of} subjects, that of War.

I will try to ^{do so} ~~it~~ with almost complete detachment. And I will organize my subject ^{around the question:} ~~as follows~~: What is it that has made War the problem of our age? Why is it that in our time there is a popular sentiment according to which war is wrong, and some individuals actually refuse to take part in it, while those who take part in it, insist, that ~~such~~ wars must cease; in effect they are determined to make an end to it, once and for all? *At least in one part of the world, while in another part war is glorified.*

What in other words is the meaning of pacificism, this most characteristic spiritual development of our time, and ~~what~~ ^{how far can pacifists and non-pacifists agree} are the rights and wrongs of it?

I invite ~~to~~ you to follow this analysis with an open mind, for I hope that it may lead to a better understanding between two divergent groups of war the opponents of war, those who are usually described as pacifists, and those who want to abolish war and yet reject the pacifist position, ^{outright.}

However, I also invite you to have some patience with me, for in order to understand more clearly the nature of this question ^{several} ~~we~~ must first establish facts:

1. That pacifism as a popular attitude is ^{an} entirely recent phenomenon. *This is the first point to be established*

In effect, ^{since} ~~until~~ the post-War period; only small groups of individuals took up such a position. ^{Pacifism was a heterodoxy. However, during the war itself} ~~It is true that almost at once~~ the conviction became wide spread that pacifism had ~~been~~ ^{common} always been the natural attitude of men towards war, especially of the ^{people, who are its victims,} ~~Such a view,~~ ^{was, in my belief,} ~~however a~~ ^{mistaken,} and in effect, ~~it was~~ merely the result of the new popular feeling. *THE ROOTS OF PACIFISM p. 1-4!*

Here we have a fact of the utmost importance. The conviction that ~~war~~ ^{war is morally wrong} is incompatible with war, ^{is a new, popular} ~~is~~ a new conviction. ~~MINNENYBYN~~ I am not saying that Christianity has been only recently ^{declared incompatible itself} incompatible with war, but that the ^{popular} conviction that it always ^{declared} ~~has~~ ^{done itself} so, is ~~entirely~~ recent. ~~None~~ Only small groups of individuals, mainly descendants of the Anabaptist ^{branch} ~~movement~~ of the Reformation insisted that this was otherwise. But the mass of the

population,

whether Catholic or Protestant, abhorred these views and disbelieved them.

I repeat: The question of the truth or untruth of ~~the~~ nearly Christian pacifism does not arise. ^{in this connection (the early church was essentially pacifist or not)} Whether ~~true or not~~ - the fact remains that not until the third decade of the 20th Cty did ~~any~~ in any country the mass of the people become conscious of the ~~fact~~ pacifist character of some early Christian points and positions. *Dulles etc Memoirs*

Pacifism is ^(this is recent) ~~an~~ movement in the history of Western civilization.

2. Not only the Christian conscience but the non-Christian conscience ^(also) has become imbued with pacifist ideas, in our time. The ~~atheists~~ ~~and~~ agnostics of the socialist movements of the world turned almost with the same vehemence against the idea and practice of war as the Christians.

In Central Europe e.g. the ~~socialist~~ Social Democratic movement was the chief bearer of the new ^{anti-} War sentiment. Wars, armies, the military and militarism were derided ~~and~~ as an anachronism; a deeply rooted popular sentiment ~~denounced~~ war as ~~the~~ slavish remnant of man the beast; and although the religious position of the Christian pacifist was, in these circles, rejected (^{or rather,} ~~was~~ not even understood), still the pacifist culture of the early decades of this century was on the ^{Continent} ~~continent~~ as much due to the agnostic philosophy of the Socialist and Marxian working class movement as it was in England and America to the Christian tradition.

3. At the same time the conviction became wide-spread that war ^{has} ~~is~~ ^(remains) ~~not~~ ^{today} ~~evil~~, but that ~~it~~ is intrinsically evil i.e. that it has always been. ^{equally so} Consequently, its existence was explained by the negative sides of human existence such as ignorance, fear, error, greed, vested interests, ^(- the original sin of the race -) hatred, jealousy and ~~other~~ other vices and weaknesses of mankind.

These three ~~main~~ groups of facts should be carefully considered. The recent ^{popular} conviction that Christianity and war are incompatible. The similar conviction which during the same period took hold of the non-Christian parts of the community. Finally, the ^{rise of the} simultaneous conviction that ^{in every case} war must be due to some human vice or weakness, intellectual, moral or emotional.

Several theories were advanced to explain war, which was now regarded as an irrational, if not criminal act ⁱⁿ of an immoral society.

A. There was the economic theory. War being caused by colonial rivalries, ~~by~~ vested interests, ~~by~~ ^{mutual} ~~jealousy~~ ^{competition for markets, for raw material supplies} of the one or the other. But this theory ~~could~~ not account for the fact that wars ~~have~~ existed before the capitalist system, that war is ^{almost} in fact/as broad an institution as mankind itself. In tribal, in ~~primitive~~ ^{feudal}, in distributive societies, in the city states as well as the ancient despotes we find wars—under very different economic systems. *not that it has existed always, but for most of the time.*

B. The ^{psychological} hatreds and jealousies of man are credited with causing wars. But against this stands the fact that ~~except in modern history~~ war seems to have little to do with emotions. This may appear paradox to us. But war was mostly a matter of state, decided on state grounds, on grounds of high policy. No emotions need ^{ed} enter into such a decision. Think of the ~~numerous~~ dynastic wars of the 17th and 18th century; ~~thinking of~~ they were decided upon as coolly and unemotionally as other affairs of state. The people had nothing to do with it. They did not even serve in the army. For centuries ^{European} armies were not conscript armies, ~~or~~ even less volunteers, but mercenary armies or at least one or the other kind of professional armies. Feelings, emotions do not enter into war-fare, ~~at all~~. We are mistaking here a modern phenomenon -- the phenomenon of democracy -- with an essential of war. The high pitch of emotion we associate with war ^{is today} necessary to ^{carry on} war, but was not deemed necessary in most of the societies we know.

~~But~~ what about fighting? Does it not demand some degree of emotional tension? Yes and no. On the whole most races hate to fight ^{and regard it as a calamity} some enjoy the ^{whole} idea, or rather some individuals enjoy ^{it} the prospect. But ~~As~~ a rule human beings are not fighting animals, and almost all tribes have a technique of generating a wild enthusiasm before attacking the enemy. And hatred might be one of the factors entering into this wild enthusiasm, But *but need not be.*

That proves only how unnatural to man -on the whole- ~~the~~ cold blooded mass murder is, even when called war. True there are war-like tribes, but these are exceptional. The Red Indians were such, although not all of them as you know. ^{of the Pueblo Indians.} But even with the Red Indian ^{of the Plains} the warriors did not constitute the ~~whole~~ tribe. ~~I am speaking now of the Plains Indians.~~ The same was true of the Vikings, and so on. ^{only groups of warriors went to war}

As to modern armies, they do not ~~fight from~~ ^{and out of} hatred; they are unemotional altogether. Fighting has become too much of a technical job to leave room for such feelings ~~at all.~~

We gain the following result:

The origin of wars - the cause of wars - the reason why a war is started, is not emotional in the first place. For the decision about war and peace is usually a decision of state taken under all the safeguards of cool deliberation and rational decision. Only under democratic forms of government would such a decision necessarily reflect public opinion. An only under a popular democracy would public opinion itself be emotional. ~~BECAUSE IT IS CONSTITUTED BY A GREAT NUMBER.~~ Public opinion of select groups, the public opinion in Big Business Circles, public opinion in high Church circles, in the clubs or the country seats of the aristocracy is not emotional, but not because these people are better than the common people but because they are fewer. ~~Even in America today...~~

The fighting itself is an entirely different matter. But under mercenary or professional armies emotions do not enter into fighting. It is only with volunteers, or ~~rather~~ with conscripts of mass armies that hatred may be necessary to engender the state of emotion needed for fighting. This proves how unnatural fighting is to the average man. Some enjoy it but not many. Some tribes may be more war like than other, but very rarely do we find a war decided upon because they like to fight. This would be too great a luxury. War is regarded as a terrible calamity by most primitive peoples. ~~But an unavoidable one.~~ ^{War is} ~~War~~ ^{And yet profusion}

entirely new

Plato & Aristotle knew the nature

War as a problem is ~~entirely~~
~~entirely~~ as I said, entirely ~~recent~~, Great as the
calamity is - the greatest human societies know - its necessity was ~~never~~ never ~~un-~~
questioned. Crime and virtue are categories as old as mankind: yet war
was never deemed a crime. Murder is deemed a crime in almost every human soc
we know: yet war was never under a shadow because it was ~~never~~ brought
under the category of murder by popular conviction (I am ~~not~~ not
referring to individuals, to philosphers, to religious thinkers or to small
groups not responsible for the mores of a society). Never was the mass of the
people in any society, never was the popular conviction of any society, never
was the morality and ethics of any people troubled about war ~~because~~ it mean-
did not constitute a moral problem. There was no society in which the highest
morality does not sanction war; does not ^{condemn} ~~make~~ ^{courage in war} ~~doubt~~
a virtue, and so on. And many of these societies practice an very much high
degree of moral virtue than our ~~own~~ profit-seeking society. Some of these
societies are very much nearer in their every day practice ^{to} the Christian
virtues than our society which in several of its basic institutions is in
~~direct~~ direct contradiction with ~~the~~ the ideals of unselfishness. ^{to}

What then is the meaning of pain? Why has

~~What then is the cause of wars? What is the meaning of this terrible insit-~~
~~ution which is yet so widespread and which the consciousness of our time~~
~~suddenly~~ suddenly ~~recognised~~ recognised as morally evil, while in so many other respects
we ~~are~~ are not proud ourselves of having left behind us the morality of many of our
more primitive fellows?

Before we can answer this question, we must first offer an explanation of war.
The answer is quite simple. War is the method of ~~decision~~ decision between
two communities ^{in respect to} of vital issues - i.e. issues which must be decided if
those communities should be able to exist as human communities. *It is in the nature of courts of law of justice etc*

Let me give you a few examples.
a. No human community can exist permanently, can organise itself to higher
purposes unless the algaince of its members is definite. Unless one knows
who belongs and who does not belong to a community, it is not possible to fix
a

allegiances and develop a code of morality and law of traditions and customs, of emotions and notions, of all that which links up on a community and makes it what it is. I do not say that the decision could not have fallen in another way. But unless the territory, or the delimited boundary, or the rights or the sanctuaries have been ~~unambiguously~~ temporarily ~~unambiguously~~ with the relative finality which man's span of life or occupational character demands, it is not possible to found or establish a human society. All that ~~human~~ society offers to man: safety, security, forms of life and existence, values and principles, educational and other traditions - everything is dependent upon the finality with which the society is constituted.

This refers primarily to boundaries, to territorial frontiers, the fixation of which is an absolute necessity. But it must be generalised to almost all such matters as must be ~~permanently~~ decided on at least for such length of time ^{as} which we regard as permanent for practical purposes.

As long as there is no other way of deciding, as long as there is no tribunal (religious political or other) that can decide the issue, ^{war} war decides it. This has nothing to do with hatred, jealousy, irrationality with all the weaknesses the flesh is heir to. Whether fighting needs an emotional state or not is another matter ~~again~~ ^{altogether.}

Now before I proceed, I should like to say that this analysis of war does not in the least exclude that all the bad things in man should ~~not~~ come topmost --- but also the good ones --- in war. In every great stress ^{life} life is catalyzed as it were. And consequently ^{just} as war is the ~~human~~ repository of human self denial it is also the occasion ^{for} the worst in him ~~showing up~~ ^{to} showing up. And I should like to say that all the weakness of man, his jealousies, his hatred, his covetousness, and the murderous lust of some perverts would find a vent in war. That is inevitable. ^{But that} ~~This~~ is true ^{also} ~~even~~ of courts of law, ^{of the course of justice,} even perhaps of education - certainly of an education which permits whipping - that the ^{even our highest type of} ~~highest type of~~ institutions will be used by our lowest instincts.

annual necessity

You see, the inevitability of the institution of war as long as we insist to live in human societies, as long as we insist on the advantages of such an institutional setting, this ~~inevitability~~ or necessity is the ~~pronouncement~~ ^{moral} ~~premise~~ of man's usual attitude to war. ^{But} Only as long as it is necessary, only as long as it is inevitable, ^{does} ~~can~~ this attitude maintain its validity. The slightest ~~suspicion~~ ^{necessity} that ~~this~~ war might be not inevitable, that it might not be ~~necessary~~ ^{inevitable}, that by some moral effort or exertion we might do without it, - and war instantly appears in an entirely different light - as atrocious murder, as the mass performance of all that is inhuman.

It is here that the true meaning of pacifism lies. It is ~~the~~ ^a ~~prophetic~~ ^{expression of} ~~the recognition that~~ ^{became more certain} ~~assertion~~ that war might be ~~abolished~~. That mankind could live without ~~this~~ ^{it}, ~~institution~~. For, if this so, then war is evil, - the supreme evil.

~~and~~ This explains why pacifism arises when it arises in the history of man. It arises as a popular conviction after the War World I. After the first world war which made it obvious that ~~mankind~~ ^{so} ~~the world~~ had become ~~so~~ ^{so} small, the human race ~~was~~ ^{so} ~~so~~ ^{so} closely linked in its daily life, and at the same time ~~was~~ ^{so} ~~so~~ ^{so} closely linked by ties of a common moral order to make ~~the~~ ^{then it was} ~~elimination~~ of war ~~annoy~~ ^{annoy} conceivable, that pacifism became the popular mood ~~annoy~~ ^{annoy} in great countries, that it became almost the secular religion of the ~~world~~ world.

The truth ^{is} ~~was~~ this. War - for the first time in man's history - might be replaced by other institutions that would do what war had done: decide the frontier frontiers of human communities, and decide about other matters vital to the existence of communities. or rather which must be decided one way or another, if human life in society should be carried on at all.

The truth is that the time has come to replace war by other institutions. Human institutions, institutions of law and compulsion, of persuasion and discussion, but in any case by institutions which will produce the kind of final decisions we need. And that in the face of change - this absolute necessity of man's existence. The institutions we need will have to provide for ~~it~~ ^{peaceful}

change -

In the light of this recognition much of the ^{most} puzzling mysteries of the pacifist problem resolve themselves.

The pacifist position is ^a ~~an~~ prophetic one. It is the expression of the most important truth of our time: that the problem of ^{prophecy} our time is peace. The central problem of mankind today is the international problem. The question on which the growth of man depends today is that of the organization of the world. *Unless we solve it, we perish. -- When ever before was this true?*

This is the source of the almost incredible amount of false arguments we get to hear about war. For that which has become unnecessary must be eliminated and in order to do so we do not stop at logic or truth. War is like a fallen monarch: We accuse of the fallen system of being irrational, an abuse, meaningless, purposeless, the result of all that is irrational and futile in man. This is utterly unjustified. There is no truth in it. But there is a higher truth expressed in this paradox way: the truth of prophecy.

But that should not be ~~now~~ confused with political advice, political reality. When the pacifist argues that his vision provides him with a line of ^{today} action that ~~in every respect~~ safeguards the interests of the community better than war, he is ~~simply~~ transgressing the authority of his vision. The consistent pacifist does not do that. He restricts himself to the assertion of his conviction of his witness ~~ship~~ which is a true one. (P)



prophecy

The pacifist truth is the ~~truth~~ of our time. It is becoming true that ~~war~~ is a crime. Just as private revenge became a crime when courts of law were established. Just as private war became a crime when national sovereignty was established. ~~AN~~

The pacifist truth was not the truth of former times. When no community could be soundly established unless stability reigned, both communities would have rotted and perished unless some decision had fallen.

It is in our time that the futility of decision by war becomes a meaningful assertion. It was meaningless to the generation that won the war of Independence. They had gone through the Civil War. And our morality is not higher than theirs. But it is not meaningless to say that man is moving towards a final planetary order. That man's living one economic existence. That man's interdependence has become the order of the day. This is not meaningless today. *It would have been so yesterday. Where were the national states? No international economic system? We have them today.*

Man is spirit in the flesh. It is right that our morality should unfold. And when it unfolds we ~~know~~ that this was always so. ~~That we need not be the case. But truth is retrospective. Not all truths are timeless.~~

But the very meaning of his recognition is misunderstood if it is regarded as other than witnesship. The meaning of witnesship, is not practical success. It is different altogether. The religious truth of pacifism is not controverted by its essential witnesship. Who ever ~~has~~ heard that martyrdom was controverted by ~~death~~ death?

And yet the same paradox obtains here. Without the water of war ~~is~~ a true fight, the pacifist truth would not ~~be~~ be a prophecy.

For not yet has war been replaced by courts of law. Not yet is mankind one organization. Not yet is the economic organization of life unitary. Not yet is it safeguarded that peace would not be the peace of the criminals who have gone away with their victims.

We are very very far from that condition. The plight of the pacifist is a ~~plight~~ *plight* ~~of that~~ *of that* ~~truth~~ *truth* ~~the~~ *the* ~~stand witness~~ *stand witness*.

And that is why on no question is the difference between ~~us~~ *us* ~~and~~ *and* ~~the~~ *the* ~~ideal~~ *ideal* Germany as deep as on this one question of peace. ~~As long as~~ *As long as* ~~Germany is not safe~~ *Germany is not safe*. It is this which ~~is~~ *is* ~~the~~ *the* ~~problem~~ *problem* ~~of~~ *of* ~~the~~ *the* ~~new~~ *new* ~~world~~ *world*. ~~It is this which~~ *It is this which* ~~gives us~~ *gives us* ~~our~~ *our* ~~most~~ *most* ~~earnest~~ *earnest* ~~thoughts~~ *thoughts* ~~to~~ *to* ~~confront~~ *confront*.