

# PEACE NEWS LETTER

Published by and for the New York State Peace Council  
Guest Editor

\$1.00 per year

SPC 283, No. 64-151  
March - April, 1964

**REPORT ON THE 1964 INSTITUTE** Last weekend the 24th annual Syracuse Institute of International Relations was held at the Yates Hotel under the joint sponsorship of the American Friends Service Committee and the Syracuse Peace Council. Assembled under the able guidance of "Dean" Norman Whitney, a distinguished international "faculty" considered the crucial topic "Can the Cold War Be Ended?" This "faculty" consisted of one professor, two government officials (one Yugoslavian and one American), and two representatives of what was referred to more than once as "that government in exile, namely the pacifist movement."

Dr. Reza Arasteh, an authority on conflict resolution, opened the Institute on Friday evening by emphasizing the following point. "Many liberals believe the problem of conflict resolution can be solved by law, but they neglect the psychological point that conflict must be resolved through trust. Reason and law alone become weak when irrational forces strike men." A change of attitude, not a change in law is what is required. Peace must be first in the hierarchy of values. Man is not a system in conflict, rather he is a system of potential harmony. Conflict, according to Charles Osgood, is an acquired characteristic. We are not born with conflict, we learn it. Finally, Dr. Arasteh stressed the fact that peace is not the absence of war. Peace is a positive force which brings men together.

On Saturday morning we were treated to a film festival -- three of the best peace films produced during the past couple of years. "The Walk" is an impressive picture description of the San Francisco to Moscow peace walk, sponsored by the Committee for Non-Violent Action in 1961. Following this, an entertaining cartoon "The Hole" was shown. It has some of the finest drawings ever used for a cartoon, and it is also an effective satire on nuclear war. The concluding film, "The Magician," deals in a compelling way with the process of conditioning our children to participation in war.

For the Saturday luncheon program there was a panel discussion opened by Dr. Egon Toms, correspondent at the United Nations for the Yugoslavian radio and television network. Throughout his talk, Dr. Toms explored the increasingly important role of the non-aligned nations. He discussed the Belgrade conference of non-aligned nations held in 1961. "Although the idea of non-alignment has been attacked by both sides, the small countries have something important to say to the world today. They can be very useful in helping the big powers find areas of understanding."

Dr. Toms also described Yugoslavia's difficult relations with its neighbors. Seven countries border Yugoslavia. Can you name them without consulting a map? Ten years ago Italy and Yugoslavia threatened to go to war over Trieste. This question was solved peacefully, and today Italy is Yugoslavia's most important commercial partner. Yugoslavia has also attacked the difficult question of national minorities living within its borders.

Dimitrios Roussopoulos, a leader in the Combined Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in Canada, was the next panelist. He discussed the events leading to the change in government in Canada in 1963 from the Conservative Party to the Liberal Party. Paradoxically, the Conservatives are the real liberals in foreign and defense policies, according to Roussopoulos. The great Conservative Foreign Minister, Howard Green, championed this liberal foreign policy. After the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 began the chain of events which led, ultimately, last April to the election of the Liberal Party and the introduction of nuclear weapons to Canadian soil.

Roussopoulos urged us to take account of the great and growing crisis between English and French Canadians. This cleavage is evident in each of the four political parties in Canada, and it permeates the social structure of the entire country. Roussopoulos raised the possibility that this cleavage may erupt into violence and even civil war. The French Canadian community contains many people who want complete separation from English Canada.

David McReynolds, Field Secretary for the War Resisters League, stressed the unique role of the peace movement in small nations like Canada. "The question of unilateral disarmament really only exists for the United States and Russia. We and the Soviets are prepared to defend certain countries whether or not they wish such defense. A disarmed Canada would not be attacked because of the United States. We would defend Canada whether or not she had weapons, whether or not she is allied with us, whether or not she wants us to defend her. This gives Canada a unique opportunity to unilaterally disarm. She can opt out of the arms race, knowing Russia will not attack. The same situation holds for England.

"In this country the pacifist movement is politically irrelevant when it raises the demand for unilateral disarmament. Morally it is very relevant. This question is politically relevant for Canada and Britain. It is also politically relevant for Poland and other countries in Eastern Europe. If Poland disarms, we would not attack it. Neither would West Germany. To attack Poland automatically brings Russia to its defense, whether or not Poland has weapons.

"De Gaulle has gained tremendous political power through his break with Washington. The fact that he has nuclear weapons is irrelevant. He would have twice as much power if he gave up these nuclear weapons. But even so, he has become an important political force in Latin America, Southeast Asia, and in Africa simply because he decided to become independent of American policy.

"We in the pacifist movement should encourage countries like Britain and France to break with us, because as such countries break with us, we shall find a new freedom of movement ourselves."

One observer, commenting after the panel had finished, remarked, "I have never heard three men give one speech before."

The Saturday evening speaker was John McKnight, Agency Planning Officer for the United States Information Agency. Mr. McKnight opened his remarks by saying that the United States, through the Information Agency, was consciously engaged in propaganda. "Why should we propagandize?" he asked. "In recent years there has been a revolution in diplomacy. Public opinion is increasingly important in formulating policy. Nuclear war has made it necessary for diplomacy to be peaceful. War by word is replacing war by weapon." Propaganda is like advertising. If one believes in something, he should try to sell it to others. Thus propaganda has become an instrument of national policy for all nations. Mr. McKnight emphasized the advantage to mankind in having international conflicts waged by radio waves rather than by weapons.

During the question period, Mr. McKnight was asked if he, through the USIA, had ever knowingly made a false statement. His answer was that he had not. He went on to say that the false information given out by the USIA about the U-2 overflight in 1960 was given in good faith. The USIA was not informed of the facts until later. Needless to say, the USIA was considerably embarrassed by this. Mr. McKnight stated that our naval base at Guantanamo was not useful as a military base, but that it would be politically disastrous for us to leave it at this time.

The closing address of the Institute was given by David McReynolds after Sunday dinner. In answer to the question "Can the Cold War Be Ended?," David McReynolds replied that it has ended, and that both Russia and the United States had lost the cold war.

"A. The danger of war. Loss of human life does not prevent a nation from going to war. States respond only to threats to their own existence. War now for the first time threatens to annihilate not only people but the state system as we know it. Both great powers are backing away from war. Both powers dare not win or lose the cold war. If either power thought it was losing, it would attack the other. Both governments dare not win the cold war either, for if one gave evidence of winning, the other would not hesitate to attack its heartland.

"B. Overwhelming military power has resulted in a stalemate which has paralyzed both powers and left them unable to respond effectively to new situations in the world.

"C. The efforts of the peace movement. Just as it is a mistake to overestimate the influence of the peace movement, so also is it a mistake to underestimate its influence. The test ban treaty is partly the result of world opinion against nuclear testing, and the peace movement helped shape that opinion."

David McReynolds continued by pointing out that a detente is not peace. He then asked the audience, "Do we want to really pursue peace or do we want to choose new enemies, such as China? Are we prepared as a society for the conflicts that peace will bring? Are we prepared as individuals to form a human culture? To live without enemies?"

"Russia and the United States have enforced a certain measure of stability in parts of the world, and if both were to disarm this stabilizing force would be taken away, leading to chaos and conflict. Are we prepared for the chaos and conflict that peace means? Are we prepared for the breaking out of conflicts in Latin America that have been repressed by the arms race? Are we prepared for the changes required within our own society? Are we prepared for the necessary economic changes that peace would bring?

"Can we find identity without an enemy? Can we know who we are if we only know who we are not? We are, all of us here today, barbarians. How then can we lay the foundation for a human culture if we ourselves do not know that we are lacking yet?