

SPECIAL TO PNL For our first Atomic Anniversary number we are glad to present messages from members of the faculty of the AFSC Institute at Keuka, August 1 - 10.

EDDY ASIRVATHAM SPEAKS: It is barely a year since World War II was over; and already we are making the necessary psychological preparations for World War III. The only two countries which are in a position to provoke such a war now or in the near future are the U.S.A. and Soviet Russia. The responsibility, therefore, of maintaining the peace of the world rests specially on these two nations.

If the U.S.A. is sincere in her desire to maintain peace, she must take the lead in surrendering her armed forces, the atomic bomb, and other weapons of warfare to an effective international body which has the confidence of all the people of the world. Secondly, she must actively help the process of the withering away of imperialism everywhere by refusing to lend gold, troops or ammunitions to empire-builders and empire-maintainers. Furthermore, she should set herself resolutely against the temptation to launch upon an economic imperialism in the economically backward countries of the world. Even now, if American hands were clean and were not dripping with Iranian oil, she could play the role of a neutral arbiter.

America should take the lead in harnessing science to the promotion of the peace and prosperity of the world. Science made the West. Science today is beginning to unmake the West. And if the West does not wake up immediately and realize the nature of the destructive weapons with which she is playing, it is only a question of time when she will destroy herself thoroughly and, in so doing, destroy many others besides herself, even as Samson did of old. But the purposes of God must be fulfilled. He will raise other people and other leaders to fill the vacuum created. They will be the meek of the world who may come from the mud huts of India and the "bee-hives" of Africa. They will inherit the earth, but not its gold and silver, its trade and commerce, its oil and rubber, its cartels and combines; they will inherit the heritage of God in building a reign of justice and righteousness, of peace and brotherhood, of fraternity and equality.

JEROME DAVIS SPEAKS: The best way to prove that we can trust Russia is by doing so.

We should immediately outlaw the atomic bomb and declare that any country using it is the enemy of all mankind. We must increase our contacts and peaceful business relationships with Russia. Deal with the Soviet Union, work with her, settle international problems as they arise on a basis of give and take. If this involves some risk it is far less than the alternative of war. We must stand for the right as we see it but we must recognize Russia's right to the same freedom. We must go further and recognize that our interpretation of conditions across the seas may be and probably often is warped and biased. Let us actually practice Lincoln's precept, "With malice toward none and charity to all." Then let us go forward in mutual friendship. "We have nothing to fear except fear itself." Faith always inspires faith and cooperative effort is the only security against war.

MAYNARD KRUEGER: Solving the problems of war, race and depression requires political action. Each of these problems is political. It is a problem of public policy. Large political problems cannot be solved by small political techniques. Signing petitions and writing letters are weak techniques. Writing a letter to a bad Congressman is a poor substitute for electing a good one. We need a new mass-based political party carrying our answer to the problems of war, depression and race. The next depression will produce the mass base. We may have three or four years to get organizationally ready for it.

MILTON MAYER SPEAKS: Peace is not only indivisible; it is also inseparable from justice. No pacifist, no peace worker, no war resister is in fact any of these things unless he is working at the root evil of war, injustice. None of us, I insist, needs to be told what social injustice, political injustice, or economic injustice is. I insist, further, that educated Americans who ask, "But just what do you mean by justice?" are not serious. How to achieve this or that kind of justice--its specifications, its details, its application to this or that time or place or circumstance--is difficult. But it is not difficult to know that injustice occurs when some people are paid for doing no work while others are unable to support their families by working; or when some people are allowed to vote while others, because of their color or economic condition, are not; or when some people are admitted to neighborhoods, schools, hospitals, and churches, while others, because of their race or religion or national origin, are excluded. The first anniversary of the great American injustice--the dropping of the atomic bomb on a defenseless people whose government was trying to surrender--might well remind us that we, as a nation, can not in conscience ask for peace or in fact get it until we, as individuals, are ready to give justice.

A. J. MUSTE SPEAKS: There is an ambiguity which affects nearly all discussions about the abolition or prevention of war. What people--people in all countries--mean is that they do not want others to make war against them any more. Now war, on the receiving end, has become terrible. Dr. Oppenheimer, who was in charge at Los Alamos when the atomic bomb was perfected, says that it is a fair estimate that forty million people might be killed in an atomic raid on the United States in one night. That ought to be enough to convince sane people that war must be abolished. But if war is so terrible on the receiving end, surely it is much more horrible and evil on the sending end--for the United States, e.g., to destroy 40 million human beings in some other country. I have come to doubt that we shall in fact

get rid of war unless nations--and in particular the United States--decide not to commit the sin of making war any more--not ever for any reason.

It is the failure to face and settle that issue which makes many movements and projects ambiguous. For the most part, I fear, the people who advocate world government have it in the back of their minds that if world government should not be achieved and the United States were to be "attacked" by an "aggressor" nation, then the United States would "of course" have to defend itself and in an atomic age with atomic weapons. It follows, for these people, that the United States must keep up its armaments including an arsenal of atomic weapons. This in turn means that Russia maintains its weapons and seeks to improve upon them, and that means an armament race. But in these circumstances the reality which will determine the course of events is the armament race. World government remains in the realm of words, and the words serve as a smoke-screen for the reality which will lead to atomic war.

Even from the practical point of view, then, it seems to me we have to make up our minds first whether we are done with making war. Only if we answer that question by a clean-cut No, can we go on to work for world government with some hope of success. From the ethical and religious standpoint it is at least equally clear that "the fear of the Lord" leading us to renounce the sin of war-making, not the fear of having atomic bombs dropped on us, is the beginning of wisdom and the road to salvation.

BAYARD RUSTIN SPEAKS: There is a great deal of discussion of what can be done to "control the atom bomb." The bomb can not be controlled. Unless we clearly face the fact that the bomb is the logical result of the dependence on violence in the solution of conflict, a third world war will come and the atom bomb will be used again. To control the bomb we must reject violence.

At this point in history national states will not and can not reject violence. On the contrary, the ruling hierarchies will make little genuine effort to discover peaceful means and solutions because they know the citizenry can be depended upon to fight in a showdown.

Violence must be rejected by individual citizens. And when a substantial number of men within any state become organized conscientious objectors, perhaps they can convince the people to resist with non-violence. Such a state will not release the atom bomb because war as we know it will have been rejected. And the atom bomb will be controlled, in the only sense moral men finally can control it.--, by refusing to throw it even in the face of failure of our non-violent resistance.

HANS SIMON SPEAKS Generally speaking, there are three main sources for the difficulties existing between the US and the Soviet Union.

The first the two countries share. The positions of power both nations gained during the war were the result of efforts to defeat the common enemy. We as well as the Russians got where we are by marching our armies against Germany and Japan. Now these armies are facing each other - in Germany, Austria and Korea - and the pattern which made sense while the fighting was under way seems strange, unfamiliar and difficult to relate to a new situation.

The second we have in common with the Russians though it is different for each country. It is the conflict between traditional notions and political realities. The Soviets returned officially to the old concepts of world revolution, of capitalist encirclement and its threat to the socialist fatherland. We, on the other hand, returned to the ideals of western political democracy, to the magical effects of voting and the wonders to be expected from education, without realising that all these work only within an established and accepted system.

The third is the result of the basic difference in attitude which stems from the antithetical character of the two societies. The whole tradition of their revolution makes the Russian spokesmen dogmatic, inflexible and selfrighteous. The US is now primarily interested in the social and political status quo. Therefore it is sensitive to and even afraid of radicalism. Its willingness to compromise on principles rather than on positions affecting its power appears to the Russians as inconsistent and possibly insincere.

It is not possible to say how much hope for cooperation there is under these circumstances. However one can point out that in the UN Charter the Russians accepted a form which is essentially Western and primarily Anglo-Saxon, and that they are trying to meet the difficulties of working within it.

American Russian relations may well improve by loss of emphasis. We can hasten such an improvement if we stop shaping our policies for or against, or because of the Russians, simply because we cannot do so with them. It may be well to worry less about what the Russians ought to do, and more about what the US can do. There is an American foreign policy which is right, just and wise, regardless of how the Russian leaders feel about it. Such a policy ought to use more imaginatively and more generously the large margin of security which the US still enjoys. Of all nations ours can best afford to act according to principles of fairness, even at the risk of rebukes and disappointments. Certainly it is too early to say that they don't work. Let us try them first.