try have recalled traditional standards of the just war but have resisted the temptation to pass judgment on the conduct of the present ongoing war in Vietnam. Yet it is now that people are called upon to judge if they wish to influence that conduct or, in the case of potential draftees, if they are to question their own participation in it.

This is the sound basis on which the Tribunal rests. But it has endangered, if it has not completely destroyed, that basis by its announced procedures and plans. First, the questions to be placed before the Tribunal are directed only at the U.S. and its allies. The conduct of the opposing forces will pass unnoticed by the Tribunal. Second, those who are bringing the accusatory questions before the Tribunal are exactly those people who are to pass judgment. Third, those who are to pass judgment have, in fact, already done so in various forums in the last several years.

One need not question the sincerity of any single individual sitting on the Tribunal to question the objectivity, balance and value of the Tribunal itself. In spite of Lord Russell's denials the anticipated procedures run counter to those Western society has devised to ensure impartial judgment. If the Tribunal does as anticipated, those who support the present policy in Vietnam will have little reason to be perturbed, only those who question that policy need be concerned when the Tribunal convenes in March. J. F.

MEMBERS OF THE TRIBUNAL: Bertrand Russell (Honorary President); Jean-Paul Sartre (Executive President); Vladimir Dedijer (Chairman); Gunther Anders, writer; Mehmet Ali Agbar, Turkish M.P., President of Turkish Workers' Party; Lelio Basso, Italian deputy, Professor of Sociology at University of Rome; Simone de Beauvoir, author; Lazaro Cardenas, former President of Mexico; Stokely Carmichael, Chairman of Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee; Dave Dellinger, an editor of "Liberation"; Isaac Deutscher, political historian and biographer; Amado Hernandez, Poet Laureate of the Philippines; Mahmud Ali Kasuri, Senior Advocate, Supreme Court of Pakistan; Kinji Marakawa, attorney, Vice-Chairman Japanese Civil Liberties Union; Shoichi Sakata, Professor of Physics, Nobel prizewinner; Laurent Schwarz, Professor of Mathematics, Paris.

in the magazines

"Today, a new phenomenon seems to be appearing on the religious scene. This is the apparently growing belief among all religious groups that 'peace' is the ultimate and basic religious value of this generation. Formerly, peace was always considered to be the end-product, the result of justice or of liberty or of faith. Today, religious people seem much more likely to scale down the value of justice or of liberty or of faith if the promotion of these values or their defense should break the peace." Father James V. Schall, S.J., who further describes and analyzes this "new phenomenon" in an article on "Religion and War" which appears in the November 18 issue of Commonweal, sums up his remarks in the concluding paragraphs:

"The protest of religion against war, of course, has merit, yet it also has its peculiar dangers. It is much too prone to undervalue the heritage of freedom and democracy. It seems unable to distinguish clearly between force used to stop aggression and that used to start or sustain it. With its imperfect grasp of the nature of force, the religious mind is slow to see that force can be a means to teach and guide a totalitarian system into the paths of rationality. Thus, the apparent evolution of Russia and Eastern Europe into forms of communism somewhat less hostile to the West is not a sheer accident or the result of spontaneous development in the Communist system. Rather it is the result of the application of controlled force, which taught these powers to mitigate, though not to abandon, their expansionist hopes.

"We live in a time in which it is in part force that allows us freedom; it is force that prevents war, not totally, of course, but force is an essential element. This is why the analysis of force which implies that it is evil of itself misses the whole nature of force in the service of humanity. Peace, in the end, does not mean the absence of force, but the right use of it. There will be always the need of force while man is on earth.

"We cannot fail to recognize that such realities as evil, suffering, and sin do confront us. The task of the political and military leaders is to control and limit these consequences as much as possible, in the name and interest of the public. To rebel at this
choice imposed on our leaders is, in the long run, to rebel at the reality of original sin, to rebel at God for having allowed a world in which the Fall took place. This seems to be the theological heart of the problem. . . .

- In strong disagreement with this view is Rabbi Steven S. Schwarzchild who insists that "when God, the Radical, demands that we seek peace, He demands radically that we radically seek radical peace." (Dr. Schwarzchild's remarks, originally delivered at the National Interreligious Conference on Peace, are reprinted in Judaism, Fall 1966.)

He writes that "the insistence on religion's radicalism is important for two reasons, one appertaining to religion itself, the other to its effectiveness in today's society. So far as the former is concerned, for all too long, first in practice and then also in theory, it has been theological fashion to speak of the need for religion's relevance and realism. A distinction was made between the perfect law of God and the prudently proximate applications of this law in history. This distinction led to a number of results—the belief that we were under the divine obligation to obey God's law only insofar as possible, that we could properly judge—and beforehand, at that—what the limits of the possible were at any given time, and that religion itself was to make these compromises. As if there were not always enough politicians, journalists, popularizers, and other assorted realists around to make these compromises for us! . . . The social role of authentic faith is not to be acceptable to society but to pull it in the right direction."

Dr. Schwarzchild "suggest[s] that the relationship between religion and peace is that, not only when it fits into the political plans of our government, nor only when it is socially safe to talk about it, nor yet to the degree to which this seems practicably prudent and promising of results, but under the irresistible command of God, always, everywhere, in every way, and totally, religion must insist on, explore, and practice the ways of peace toward the attainment of peace."

"Again," he says, "by way of protecting my theological and ethical flanks, I must assert the theoretical validity and the practical realism of this view of the matter. Absolute insistence on peace does not mean that we do not, of course, fully realize that there are moral and social values other than peace, and that one or the other of them may even be superior to peace itself; we are only saying that no other human values can, especially in our historical epoch, be conceivably attained outside of a relatively peaceful society. And, in terms of political realism, unless religion proposes and enacts a peace program in accord with its own divine radicalism far ahead of the pragmatic peace programs of governments, social scientists, and independent social movements, religion will again rightly be regarded as the moralistic straggler behind the real world that advances either into greater human dignity or into self-destruction."

- Surveying similar territory from a political and lay vantage point, Ernest Van Den Haag of New York University, writes in the National Review of November 29:

"A world without war is desirable, though unlikely in the foreseeable future. But a world with less, or even with less extensive, wars is preferable to one with more, or more extensive wars. Just as not undertaking a comparatively minor, though still dangerous and painful, operation may ultimately cause more of the danger and pain the shortsighted patient tried to avoid, so unwillingness to fight a local, though still dangerous and cruel, war may make an immensely more cruel and worldwide war more probable. Certainly the second world war could have been avoided had it not been for the woolly-headedness, the misplaced 'good will,' the well-intentioned 'pacifism' and the utter shortsightedness of the English, French and American peoples—all too faithfully reflected by the governments they elected." . . .

And Prof. Van Den Haag concludes: "Although it is fraught with 'blood, sweat and tears' and the end is not in sight, our present policy in Vietnam seems vastly less dangerous, and, in the end, less painful than any alternative. Politically it has been successful beyond expectation. I do not think that the Chinese influence over the world Communist movement would have declined as it has had we not persisted in Vietnam. Nor would the uprisings in Africa which replaced pro-Chinese with anti-Chinese governments have happened. To be sure, these changes depended very largely on local factors. Yet, I doubt that they would have occurred, had the United States presented itself as a weak and unreliable ally."

"If we allow the Chinese to impress the world as 'the wave of the future,' their influence will increase. The destruction of the pro-Chinese Communist Party of Indonesia—which came near ruling the hundred million Indonesians—would hardly have occurred had the Indonesians felt that the future belongs to China, and that the United States is in the process of abandoning Asia."

"The sacrifices made in defending Vietnam against Communist domination have already prevented the Chinese from taking over vast territories, and have reduced their power in many areas and respects while increasing the power of our allies and the strength of our alliances. Continuation of our present Vietnamese policy is the best hope for world peace without surrender—the best policy to minimize violence and to avoid another war."
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