

WAR *and* PEACE

By SCOTT NEARING

REPRINTED FROM "World Events"

"PEACE-LOVING PEOPLES"

MORE than thirty years have passed since July 1914. During those years "responsible statesmen" have been making decisions and giving directives that have involved the happiness, liberty and lives of hundreds of millions. It has been my job to read those decisions and directives—thousands of them. As I pass them in review, I am struck by the frequency with which the statesmen used the words "peace" and "prosperity" in a period that was characterized by war and depression.

Here is a recent example. Some years ago, Secretary Cordell Hull made a series of speeches in which he declared peace to be "normal" and war "abnormal." It was no concern of his that Block, in his *Future of War*, had shown that, in the past 2,500 years, the world has enjoyed peace one year in 12 and war the other 11 years. It made no difference to him that, since 1878, there have been four "peace" years and that the last of these years was 1910. He was unconcerned when military scientists referred to peace as "the interval between wars" and social scientists like N. J. Spykman wrote that "war is unpleasant, but it is an inherent part of state systems composed of sovereign independent units" (*America's Strategy in World Politics*, p. 25). Mr. Hull had found a phrase that sounded well and went over with the public and, without examining its validity, he repeated it again and again.

The latest edition of the phrase is "peace-loving peoples." American delegates to the Moscow Conference, headed by Secretary Hull, were evidently responsible for getting the phrase into the Moscow Declaration. When Secretary Hull opened the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, he used the phrase seven times in a twenty-minute talk. E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Acting Secretary of State, in reviewing the D. O. Conference, opined that "the peace-loving peoples of the world will be heartened and encouraged by

what we have accomplished." At the same time, Secretary Hull spoke of "the cruel and barbarous enemy" and contrasted them with "the peace-loving peoples." President Roosevelt used the phrase four times in his speech of Oct. 21, 1944.

Who are the peace-loving peoples? Of course, all peoples describe themselves as peace-loving. There is not a people on earth that would voluntarily line up under the banners of war. That is why all modern wars are "defensive."

This, however, is not a question of assertion or of sentiment, but of fact. Look over the record. Who has fought the recent wars?

Prof. Quincy Wright (University of Chicago), with a number of associates, recently completed a two-volume *Study of War*, covering the years 1480-1941. Here is a part of Prof. Wright's list of the number of wars in which various nations have taken part:

Great Britain	78 wars	Italy	25 wars
France	71 wars	Holland	23 wars
Spain	64 wars	Germany	23 wars
Russia	61 wars	Denmark	20 wars
Austria	52 wars	China	11 wars
Turkey	43 wars	Japan	9 wars
Sweden	26 wars		

Prof. Wright credits the U.S.A. with 13 wars in 150 years, but the War Department records show 110 wars fought against the Indians alone.

Of the 278 wars listed by Prof. Wright, 178, or two-thirds, were fought mainly in Europe.

That is the record. Among the chief nations during the past 461 years, Britain and France head the list of war-makers, while Germany and Japan stand at the bottom of the column.

The "peace-loving peoples" phrase is only one example of the verbal irresponsibility of present-day statesmen. Prime Minister Chamberlain's "Peace in our time," Prime Minister Churchill's "I have every hope that a wise and harmonious

settlement will be made in confidence and amity between the Great Powers" (speech to Commons, Oct. 28, 1944), President Roosevelt's "The vast majority of the people of Argentina have remained steadfast in their faith in their own free, democratic traditions" (press release, Sept. 29, 1944), are all examples of utterances unrelated to the facts.

There are two possible explanations for these irresponsible official utterances. The first is that the statesmen do not know what they are talking about. This ignorance alibi is charitable, if not creditable, to those involved.

The more probable explanation is that the statesmen are serving a class interest in a class-divided community. And, serving this interest, they must (1) fool their class rivals and (2) keep the factory-cannon-fodder loyal to the class interests for which they speak.

Peace-loving peoples will feel profound concern when they read that:

1. The American Legion, at its 1944 national convention, decided that, for the coming year, its legislative activity would be concentrated on the passage of a federal law providing for universal compulsory military training. The armed services strongly favor such a measure. It has been endorsed by the President and by high-ranking politicians, business executives and academicians.
2. The British Government has completed plans for compulsory military training after the war for all boys over 14, with a year of regular military service after reaching 18. Britain has more than 60,000 conscientious objectors in World War II. By beginning early with the new generation, the Tories hope to avoid a repetition of this embarrassment.
3. Sun Fo, chairman of China's Legislative Yuan, writes that, within 5 to 10 years after this war, China cannot hope to have either a strong air force or a big navy, but she can become a "second rank" nation by having "an army of the very first order, supported by an air force of some weight" (*China Looks Forward*, p. 203). "By carrying out the conscription law to the strict letter, to have a million men a year under military training should not be a hard thing" (*ibid.*, p. 202).
4. Soviet Russia already has a system of universal military training, as had most European nations before 1939.
5. Technicians assure the world that aviation

is in its infancy and that the robot bombs used against Britain this spring are only mosquito bites compared with the bigger and better species that are on the way.

With the "democratic and peace-loving peoples" speeding up the technical arts of destruction and training tens of millions in the science of mass murder, World War III will assume proportions that should stir the imagination and whet the appetite of every military strategist and munitions-maker.

November 9, 1944

WILL THEY NEVER LEARN?

I LIVED through World War I. I guess I was a liberal when the war began—satisfied to help scour the decks and improve the crew quarters on the ship of state. Most of my friends and associates in the academic and professional world followed Woodrow Wilson, first because of the liberal protestations in his New Freedom speeches of 1912; then, in 1916, because he had kept us out of the war and, in 1917, because he had led us into a war to end war. My friends emerged from that war in three groups:

Group I. Hard-boiled conservatives, plugging for the vested interests.

Group II. Disillusioned, embittered, tired liberals and radicals, *New Republic* devotees and *Nation* fans.

Group III. A very few, like Lincoln Steffens, who had "seen the future" in the Soviet Union and who realized that there was no future for profit economy.

World War II is the old, old story—liberals and radicals joining hands with conservatives and reactionaries to guarantee the Four Freedoms and usher in the Century of the Common Man, first under the New Deal, then in the crusade of the Great Democracies to unite the peace-loving peoples and perpetuate profit economy and protect the interests of the Friendly Empires.

Since August, 1944, the same story of disillusionment. Here is Edna St. Vincent Millay, for example, as good a poet and as gentle and sensitive a person as this generation has produced. Three years ago she joined the Crusade; she felt sure that she was on the side of the angels; her verse oozed blood-lust and vengeance on her demon enemies. The January

21, 1945 magazine section of *The New York Times* carried a long speech from her in verse "To the Leaders of the Allied Military Nations."

"Do you deceive us? Do you? Yes? No?" she demands in her first line. Then she cries out her anguish in paragraph after paragraph. "What do you plot?" "Gentlemen, you go too far." "Your loyal citizens and subjects doing our distasteful chores."

"We only want to hear you say again
Some things you said before
And feel you mean them still,
Just as we felt you meant them then."

Poor, wistful kid! She has had her emotional spree and now she is sobering up to the tough realities of organized exploitation and institutionalized violence, as expressed in the 1945 profit system. Where has she been living these past years? Has the system changed? Run your eyes over Ruskin's *Unto This Last* or H. D. Gibbins' *Industry in England* or Robert Blatchford's *Merrie England* or Frederick Engel's *Condition of the Working Class* or my *War and Must We Starve?* or F. L. Schuman's *International Politics* or R. P. Dutte's *World Politics* or John Strachey's *Coming Struggle for Power* or Lenin's *Imperialism*. These books have been standard reading, some of them for a century.

It is the old, old story of ruling classes and cliques using slogans for bait and then, when they have the suckers firmly hooked, closing in for the kill. Have the laws of society changed since the masters of Rome built an empire, while they fed the intellectuals atrocity stories, victory and glory, and to the masses bread and circuses? Not a whit! Machiavelli described the game in his *Prince*. The Italian, German, British and American governments practiced it when they struck down the Spanish Republic and restored the generals, the landlords and the church to power.

Will the intellectuals never learn? If the crash of 1929 and the Spanish civil war did not teach them, could they overlook Munich, with Mussolini, Hitler, Daladier and Chamberlain, their feet under the same table, plotting the destruction of the only European people's movement that had escaped their counter-revolutionary drive?

What allows the intellectuals? Must they always expect to pick ripe plums from the thorn-apple tree of exploitation and plunder, and in the winter of capitalism's decay? The law has not been altered by the change of one letter.

Representatives of the vested interests are ready to use the intellectuals to-day as they did yesterday and, when they are through with them, to toss them aside as they would a squeezed-out orange rind.

Wake up, intellectuals! The laws of social life are as inexorable as those of the physical world. You cannot build human brotherhood upon monopoly, exploitation, race discrimination, oppression, coercion, murder, rapine, fear, hate, blood-feuds and vengeance. If you would have brotherhood, you must begin by being brotherly. It will require co-operation in labor, sharing of the product, equality of opportunity, generosity, tolerance, sympathy, understanding and an infinite range of give-and-take, live-and-help-live before this sweat-stained, tear-drenched, blood-soaked planet settles down to order, peace and Walt Whitman's "institution of the dear love of comrades."

February 2, 1945

THE ROOTS OF WAR

PEOPLE generally hate and fear war; consequently, political leaders promise that their policies, if followed, will bring peace. But it is one thing to promise and another to perform. No matter how great the sincerity or how good the intentions, those who scatter gasoline over a fire will not put it out.

Political leaders have promised peace for centuries, and for centuries peoples have suffered the cruelties and horrors and anguish of war. If the political leaders or the people want to end war, they will have to make sure that the war-extinguisher they use is not inflammable. Before they choose their war-extinguisher, they must know why wars occur; otherwise, they may feed the fire instead of quenching it.

The current propaganda to the effect that wars are due to the Nazis and the Japanese militarists (the devil theory of war) are worth just one paragraph. Before the Nazis were heard of or the Japanese were known, wars were being waged on as large a scale as the resources of the French, Spanish, Roman, Greek, Babylonian and Egyptian empires permitted. Let us have done with this devil nonsense.

War is one of many forms of social intercourse, since it involves inter-relations between social groups. The world we live in, the western State System, consists of more than three-score nations, each having its own state apparatus, its own laws, traditions, customs and

practices. Each nation is sovereign—that is, arbiter of its own internal life. Unofficially, in the form of business, travel and the exchange of scientific information and news; officially through the post, diplomatic channels and official visits and conferences, the nations composing the western State System are in constant contact with one another. At irregular intervals these international relations take the form of armed conflict. Thus war is one type of international intercourse.

Every important member of the modern State System has a government department devoted to war. In the more wealthy and powerful states the war department or departments are immense organizations extending from cabinet ministers, general staffs and subordinate bureaus through the ramifications of land forces, navies, air forces, arsenals, fortifications, special military schools and a permanent personnel that runs into hundreds of thousands or even millions. During the past century the chief nations have spent more money on war preparations and the conduct of war than on all other objects of government expenditure combined and multiplied. In short, war is the principal preoccupation of the chief modern states.

War-making therefore provides an important vocation. Not only do the admirals, generals, diplomats, bureau chiefs, captains, lieutenants, ensigns and sergeants draw salaries and retire on pensions paid out of the public treasury, but their promotions, citations and decorations win them distinction and recognition in the community. Those who prepare themselves for careers in the armed forces are thus assured both of a livelihood and of social approbation. War is not merely a department of government; it is an avenue to wealth and power.

War-making is also a business. The merchants of death produce and market munitions and military equipment. Beyond them a wide range of contractors and purveyors provide supplies, from the office stationery to the food in the mess halls and field kitchens. The disarmament proposals advanced by the Soviet delegates at Geneva would have thrown millions of civilian workers, engaged in filling military orders, into the ranks of the unemployed.

War-making is both a science and an art. Military technicians have developed the science. Military leaders practice the art. Anyone who will take the trouble to go to a first-class library will find tens of thousands of books, pamphlets and articles devoted to the science and the art of war.

War is a department of government, a vocation, a business, a science and an art. Where? In Germany, Italy and Japan? Of course! In Britain, Russia, France and the United States? Certainly! War is a recognized means of intercourse, an accepted institution in the western State System. The "best people" advocate it, believe in it, practice it, glorify it and accept the benefits from it.

Go back to the tabulation of wars made by Quincy Wright. Where have two-thirds of modern wars been concentrated? In Europe. Why? Because Europe was the birth-place of the modern State System—a system based on a competitive struggle for wealth and power in which war is the final arbiter of state policy.

War is an instrument of state policy, both domestic and foreign. Civil war has played a role in the history of most modern states; but more important than civil wars are the foreign military struggles that unify a people behind their war-lords on the plea of defense, manifest destiny, freedom, democracy, victory, glory, empire, world domination. Twice in the last generation war has rescued profit economy from the economic depressions of 1913 and of 1929-37. There is an old saying in the chancelleries, "Postpone domestic difficulties by concocting foreign wars."

War is still more important as an instrument of foreign policy. How did the ruling classes of modern Europe gain territory, colonies, concessions? By war and the threat of war. How are frontiers redrawn? As a result of military victory. Which group of profiteers will hold the mineral deposits, coaling stations, landing fields, trade routes and investment markets? Those whose armies and navies have been victorious in battle. This has been true for at least four thousand years of written history. The empires of Egypt, Babylonia, Persia, Aegea, Rome, Spain, France and Britain were all built by armed force. Defeat has meant failure; victory has meant success in empire-building.

If the United Nations want peace, they must go deeper than Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta. They must go prepared to rip out of the modern State System one of its oldest and most honored institutions. They must go determined to make the social changes from competition to cooperation that must precede the change from war to peace. The cost of such a change may seem excessive but, unless they make it, they cannot hope to stop war.

March 14, 1945

WHAT THEN MUST WE DO ABOUT WAR?

SINCE war is an integral part of the social pattern which we call "western civilization" or "the American way of life," if we hope to escape war, we must change the social pattern in at least five essential respects:

First. We must think of the human race as one family or brotherhood. It is a large family, with more than two thousand million members; it is widely scattered and deeply divided by differences in nationality, language, traditions and customs, but it is a family all the same, living together on the planet Earth. The members of the human race will lose less and gain more if they live and work together as a united family.

Human family solidarity is impossible so long as one group or nation considers itself superior to another group or nation; so long as one group or nation thinks of another group or nation as "the enemy"; so long as one group or nation tries to impose its will on another by violence and, through such a victory, to win a position of advantage from which it can coerce and exploit another group.

War will not cease until groups of human beings learn to think of themselves as parts of a larger whole, learn that the welfare of the entire human family is more important than the welfare of any of its parts, learn to live and help live.

Such a result can never be gained so long as human beings devote their chief energies to competing against one another. On the contrary, their main concern must be cooperating with one another.

Second. Before the members of the human family can practice cooperation, they must have the will to cooperate. That will resides in the individual.

There is no use in saying, "I believe in cooperating with the fellow across the table or across the street or across the frontier—but, so long as he insists on competition and conflict, what can I do?" This has been said on countless occasions by countless human beings who were being devoured by antagonism, fear, hatred and the spirit of revenge, as the people of Europe are being devoured today. Once you get caught in that cycle of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth and a life for a life, victor and vanquished alike perish.

You and I must start the new cycle by stepping out of the competitive role into a

cooperative one. We must be friendly, kindly, considerate, brotherly—come what will, cost what it may. You can start living that way this afternoon or tomorrow morning and, by refusing to live any other way, you can cast your vote for peace by your example of cooperative living.

Third. You can associate yourself with like-minded folk. A phrase has survived even through these terrible war years—"traditional peace groups." The phrase refers to the Friends (Quakers), Mennonites, Doukhobors and other sects that refuse to make war on their fellowmen and insist upon the importance of friendliness and cooperation.

Fourth. The human family, because of its great numbers and the many factors which prevent its members from dealing with one another face to face, is forced to set up a social framework within which to cooperate. Such a framework already exists in the village assembly, the town meeting, the city, in provincial, state and national government. The time has come when these various devices for working together in the solution of common problems must be supplemented by a world government.

There is no use in mincing words or trimming ideas. Modern wars are carried on, not inside villages, towns, cities or nations, where government already exists, but between the nations, *where there is no government*. Government has ended most wars within villages, towns, cities and nations. Nothing less than world government will end war among the nations.

World government, to be effective, must be strong enough to restrain powerful states and protect weak states; must include in its constitution a bill of rights and duties that applies to every man, woman and child on the planet—to every one of its citizens; must make and enforce regulations covering all inter-national or inter-group affairs; must have specific authority over inter-national economic relations.

Villagers, townsmen, city-dwellers, provincials, nationals have all been forced, as a matter of survival, to set up village, town, city, provincial and national governments. By the same logic of necessity, citizens of the world must set up a world government within whose framework they can work together to advance their common interests.

I have presented this argument in two recent books, *United World* and *Democracy Is Not Enough*. Those who are interested to go beyond this brief summary will find many details there.

(Island Press, 470 West 24th St., New York 11, N. Y.)

Fifth. The first glimmer of a chance at a peaceful world will come when the individual has made up his mind to cooperate with his fellow humans and when the human family has taken the steps necessary to institutionalize the will to cooperate on a planet-wide scale. Then, and only then, will there be peace.

War is an attempt by one group, using armed violence, to impose its will on another group. Written history records thousands of wars, thousands of victories and thousands of defeats, but no real peace. Each war, each victory, each defeat has led on to other wars, other vic-

tories and other defeats.

Peace will come as the consequence of a social set-up under which friction, antagonism, controversy and conflict can be resolved, not by an appeal to force, but by compromise, arbitration or an appeal to law.

Villages, towns, cities and nations have enjoyed long periods of peace and order under customary and legal procedures which made compromise and arbitration possible, easy and obligatory. The planet is plagued by war, and this must continue until world peace is made and enforced under world law through the action of world government.

April 3, 1495

To the Reader:

Your cooperation in distributing this leaflet to all persons interested is earnestly solicited. Additional copies will be supplied free as funds permit. (Contributions toward the cost of printing and postage will be appreciated.)

THE foregoing articles are reprinted from "World Events," a 3,000-word analysis and interpretation of current happenings, issued tri-weekly by Scott Nearing, who has been rated by Congressman John M. Coffee as "one of the ablest and most disinterested and incorruptible economists this country has ever known."

"World Events" is published on a strictly non-profit basis. Neither the author nor the distributing committee accepts any compensation.

Subscription, \$2.00 per year. Introductory offer to new subscribers, 10 issues for \$1.00. Address: 125 Fifth St., N.E., Washington 2, D. C.

"As a writer and lecturer on economics and sociology, Scott Nearing is without a peer in this country."—DR. JOHN H. GRAY, ex-president of the American Economic Association.


RECENT BOOKS BY SCOTT NEARING
SOCIAL SCIENCE HANDBOOKS

No. 1—*Democracy Is Not Enough.*
Paper, \$1.00; cloth, \$2.00.

No. 2—*United World* (second printing).
Paper, \$1.50; cloth, \$2.50.

No. 3—*The Tragedy of Empire* (in preparation). Paper, \$1.00; cloth, \$2.00.

The Role of the U.S.S.R. in World Affairs (in preparation). Paper, \$1.00; cloth, \$2.00.

 Order from


THE ISLAND PRESS
470 West 24th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

Make checks, etc. payable to **WORLD EVENTS.**

WORLD EVENTS,
125 Fifth St., N. E.
Washington 2, D. C.

Date.....194.....

I enclose check—money order—for \$2.00 for one year's subscription,

Mr.  to start with No.
Mrs.
Miss

(Please print)

Street and number.....

City..... ZONE..... State.....

Send me.....free copies of **WORLD EVENTS**, which I wish to hand or mail to friends, with the suggestion that they subscribe.

Special introductory offer to new subscribers, 10 issues for \$1.00.

