

politically infeasible and unacceptable; in recognition of this, our stated intention is to await clear evidence of Soviet aggression against the United States or its allies before launching our nuclear strike forces. If the Soviet long-range striking forces are composed largely of hidden, dispersed, or mobile delivery vehicles (as they well may be), U.S. retaliatory forces will have great difficulty in locating and attacking Soviet weapons sites, and may well have to strike at other targets. Although other kinds of military installations, such as air bases, depots, communications centers, arsenals, etc., could be attacked, their destruction is not possible without severe loss of life.

Moreover, if a Soviet first strike against United

States air and missile bases were really effective, the residual American retaliatory capability might not suffice to take out military targets such as those described. Under these circumstances, the United States may willy-nilly be reduced to "city-busting"—paradoxically, in the interest of not being an aggressor. This then is the dilemma which confronts us: that to maintain the peace we must threaten millions of men, women and children with destruction. And if our efforts to maintain the peace fail, there is an increasing possibility that these people will form the only feasible targets for our retaliatory strikes.

(The third and concluding part of Dr. Coffey's article will appear in the next issue.)

THE DEATH OF A GOOD MAN

After a long, productive and continuously active life, Dr. Arthur J. Brown died early this year at the age of 106. He was the sole surviving charter trustee of The Church Peace Union, the previous name of the Council on Religion and International Affairs, and he remained active as treasurer until his death. He was a pioneer in the ecumenical movement and maintained a constant interest in international affairs. Only last November the editor of worldview received a friendly letter from him commenting on the policies of this journal.

*The following quotations of Dr. Brown, taken from his book, *Memoirs of a Centenarian*, show something of his range of interest but little of the warmth and wit which were always his.*

"War has so tragically affected all human life in my time and brought such problems into my own work, that it is an inescapable subject in these memoirs. It is clear that some other than military preparation must be made if the havoc of war is not to be repeated until the human race destroys itself. It is impossible to have peace between scores of jealous independent nations as long as their relationship is that of individuals in the days of the Judges in ancient Israel when 'every man did that which was right in his own eyes.' The world has reproduced on a global scale the conditions of a frontier mining camp when men settled their disputes with revolvers and there was no safety for life or property. The remedy for a lawless world is just what it has been for each nation and local community. Peace and order came, not when individuals went about armed and each was judge and executioner in his own case, but when they formed organizations with laws, courts and police."

"In this tumultuous world, convulsed by the passions and tensions engendered by a war of unprecedented magnitude, the fact that an international peace agency, now representing 82 nations, could be formed and, against jealousy, suspicion and active opposition, manage to survive as 'a going concern' is in itself highly encouraging. It is good to note the resolute determination of our own and several other governments to hold the ground that has been won in the United Nations, to build on it as a base, to work through it, and to seek the needed additional strength, not by starting something else, but by amendments as soon as participating peoples are prepared for them.

American critics of the United Nations might learn a lesson from the history of their own country. The desperate necessities of the Revolution urgently called for union, but the Continental Congress, which was constituted in 1774, was denied power to function effectively. Three years of blundering impotence passed before the jealous colonies could agree on the Articles of Confederation in 1777. Although the weakness of the Confederation was soon as evident as the weakness of the United Nations today, it took ten years to get the Constitution on paper. Then there was strong opposition to its ratification. Jefferson and Patrick Henry opposed it in Virginia. New York and Massachusetts ratified it by narrow majorities, New York by only three votes. North Carolina and Rhode Island rejected it and reluctantly came in later only when they found themselves outside. It was not till Rhode Island's reconsideration in May, 1790, sixteen years after the formation of the Continental Congress, and thirteen after the Articles of Confederation, that unanimity was secured. All that time to induce people in thirteen states in one country, of the same race, language and religion to agree to a workable government! Even then, the issue of its supremacy was not finally settled until the close of the Civil War seventy-five years later. Why, then, should we expect 82 variant

nations in Asia, Africa, Europe, North and South America, democratic and despotic, Moslem, Buddhist, Hindu and Christian, separated by age-old suspicions and jealousies, to unite in a world government in little more than a decade? World government is indeed the goal but it will take a long time to be practicable and, meantime, every consideration of statesmanship dictates the utmost use of the only international agency that we have.”

•

“The obstacles to world peace are numerous and formidable. But in every time of crisis we may be sure that there will be, as there are now, men animated by the unfaltering faith and courage which led William of Orange to say in a dark hour of Holland’s history: ‘You don’t have to be hopeful of success before trying to do something nor do you have to be successful to keep on trying.’ And to this we may add the words of the great philosopher, Immanuel Kant: ‘Even if the ideal of perpetual peace should remain only an aspiration, nevertheless we do not hesitate to adopt the plan of working for it without ceasing. For that is our duty.’”

•

“It is for the State to deal with the problem of Communism as a power menacing world freedom. It is for the Church to show that godless Communism is not the remedy for the privations and wrongs of life. Christianity cannot compromise with it, or ignore it, or run away from it. But in opposing it, we should be careful to make clear what we oppose and that we have something better to offer. We should not give the myriads in the world who are, or think they are, the victims of injustice the impression that Christianity has no remedy for the real wrongs in the existing order and that they must turn to Communism for relief. Indiscriminate denunciation and resorts to violence cannot convince

them. It is for men of intelligence, goodwill and faith in God to show the better way.

“The Churches today have many defects. I know what they are. I have lived among them. But they, too, are better than the Churches of a hundred years ago. They have not only increased in membership faster than the population, but they have a truer understanding of the Bible, a more cooperative spirit, a wider knowledge of the world, and a stronger sense of duty in relation to the problems of social and international order. They are emerging from the era of racial and sectarian jealousies into the sun-lit era where men see that the only race is the human race, the only bond is brotherhood, and the only God the Father of mankind.”

•

“A century ago, war was an accepted method of settling international disputes. Wars have ravaged the world in this century, but there is a stronger moral protest against them, a more determined effort to find peaceable ways to avoid them. Today there are 283 non-governmental organizations accredited to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, which are working for peace. All but a few were started in this century. Think of it! Practically all of the present organized world movement for the peaceful settlement of international disputes has been developed within the last fifty years. It was only forty-two years ago that Andrew Carnegie founded and endowed the Church Peace Union, and only eleven years ago that the United Nations was formed. It may seem visionary to hope for peace just now. But why are we not at war? Motives which caused former wars are present and active. What is holding war in check? Doubtless several forces. But the strongest is the unarmed but mighty force of an aroused humanity, determined that international disputes must be settled at the council table and not on the battlefield.”

“It is not inevitable that men should ask whether it is moral to intervene in the internal affairs of other nations. To some, it has obviously become a mere question of posture—how to keep a straight face while intervening, how to smile piously when discovered, and how to win converts during the moral upsurge that should accompany the exposure of others in the great game of intervention. Some are convinced that the Communist world represents a menace so evil that any action against this threat, as long as it is successful, is by definition moral, or else merely a problem of techniques.”

from

THE MORALITY AND POLITICS OF INTERVENTION

by Manfred Halpern

just published by the Council on Religion and International Affairs

36 pages

• 25 cents

• quantity rates available upon request