

## Government Is the Answer

Weaponry mounts in savage deadliness. Until it is controlled, the life-expectancy of nations and peoples must be brief. Nuclear triggers could be pressed tomorrow. June might not come again.

Only a supranational agency can enforce disarmament and bring universal peace. That agency will be a government, a necessarily limited world government. It will be strong enough to prevent catastrophe. Its powers will be restricted to peace-keeping, but in that vital area it must have enough authority and resources to be effective. Nothing less makes sense. If the human race is to be preserved, it must be governed.

Alan Cranston, now senior United States Senator from California, but then president of United World Federalists, made this 1952 reply to a particularly fatuous representative of the American State Department:<sup>1</sup>

In every community on earth where there is law and order, in other words, where there is peace, there is also government. It is impossible to cite any community on earth, from the smallest town to the largest nation, where there is peace without government. The burden is upon opponents of our concept to demonstrate that what has never occurred on any lesser level can conceivably be sufficient for the world in this atomic age.

What are the basic purposes of government? The Declaration of Independence, which still seems as apposite as it was almost 200 years ago, says that "governments are instituted among Men" to secure "certain unalienable Rights" and that "whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of those ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness." That was revolutionary doctrine. And it still is. But it is American doctrine and we have thrived on it.

---

\*A.B. (1918), LL.B. (1921), Univ. of Idaho; Professor of Law (1953-66), Scholar-in-Residence (1966- ), Univ. of Virginia Law School; Fellow, Am. Bar Foundation; Member, Am. Bar Ass'n (formerly Chairman, Section of Public Utility Law), Ass'n of Bar of City of New York, Phi Beta Kappa.

<sup>1</sup>Used here with Senator Cranston's permission.

Raymond Swing declared in a trenchant 1952 broadcast:

The greatest revolutionary fact of our times is that the effective military defense of civilian populations and areas against destruction by a foreign enemy has become impossible — impossible in Guatemala, impossible in Russia, impossible in Ireland, impossible in these United States. Oh yes, we have a species of secondary defense. If we are attacked, we can retaliate devastatingly. And we are now relying on that power of retaliation to keep a potential aggressor from waging what he undoubtedly will call a preventive war. But if our adversary decides to strike first and thus obtain the overwhelming advantage of the initiative, it will be small comfort to the thirty million or more Americans who will die in the opening atomic assault to know that an equal number of the enemy will promptly join them across the River Styx.

Man's status has become even more perilous in the last twenty years. At this hour, neither our own government, nor that of the Soviet Union, nor Great Britain's, nor Panama's, is able to assure its peoples that it can "effect their Safety and Happiness." We plainly cannot alter the powers of our government "by fiat," by Congressional enactment or by executive decision, but we *can* act by amendment of the Constitution, following procedure for which that document provides. The surrender of the power to make war, for example, will serve the best interests of our whole body of citizens, *if and only if and when*, similar action is taken by friend and foe alike.

In lawless American settlements of only a little more than a century ago, any resident could and often did shoot an adversary on sight. "Authority" was vested in his six-gun and life frequently depended on the ability to draw quickly and to shoot straight. "Justice" was dispensed by hastily organized mobs or at best by self-serving vigilantes. What happened was that conditions finally became so intolerably anarchic that the male citizens of the settlement — encouraged by wives and mistresses, to be sure — finally surrendered some of their precious sovereignty to a sheriff or marshall who was selected from their number, and who disarmed them by checking their weapons at the leading saloon. Then they chose a judge empowered to dispense justice in accordance with concepts agreed upon by a town council or some other informal legislative body. Perhaps a lawyer or two put in their appearance at that time. Each citizen gave up a portion of his individual sovereignty, or rather merged it with that of others, to achieve the rudiments of liberty under law, to create a government.

We are sovereigns in our own homes. At least in theory, as the head, or rather the joint head, of my immediate family, I have exercised legislative, executive and judicial powers beneath my own roof-tree, settling disputes between our children in an earlier day, enacting, interpreting and enforcing

household law and otherwise functioning as a sovereign should — often a distraught and harried sovereign, to be sure, but a sovereign nevertheless.

Even within my own domain, however, that power was and is severely truncated. For example, I cannot keep a bureau drawer filled with heroin, or produce ten dollar bills in our basement, or slaughter hogs in the living room, or otherwise do violence to applicable statutes or ordinances enacted by any government, national, state or municipal, to which, in my own and the common interest, I have delegated large portions of my own sovereign power. I would not be even approximately as free from fear and anxiety as I am if I had not delegated that authority.

My sovereignty plainly ends at my own property line. I am quite without authority over my neighbor's children, strongly though I may yearn for that jurisdiction from time to time. Nor do I have the sovereign power to enter my neighbor's garden and convince him with a sledge-hammer. The point is that his authority is similarly limited. We are both well content to conduct our relationships under rules of law requiring the submission of controversies to tribunals which have compulsory jurisdiction. We have government in Mr. Jefferson's Virginia, in his Charlottesville, and in every town and village in the Commonwealth. Each of those governmental units has what a farmer in Greely, Colorado, once called the prime requisites: "A cop and a code and a court."

It is the aggregate planet which remains without law and order. The melancholy fact is that the peoples of the earth live under conditions as anarchic as those which prevailed in pre-law frontier communities. Some 140 separate, sovereign, amoral nation-states now occupy portions of our shrinking globe. Each of them is formidably armed, and each has the "right" to make war upon its neighbor for whatever reason it may assign. Furthermore, since modern weapons of mass destruction, including the hydrogen bomb, either are, or can ultimately become, available to every industrialized nation, any major conflict must become a war of annihilation.

The question is one of survival, and we are not likely to survive unless the nations are disarmed under an effective but limited world government, making war itself as anachronistic as the offering up of human sacrifices on reeking altars in the remote childhood of the race.

Some fifty years ago, the original *LIFE*, a sprightly comic weekly, offered substantial prizes for programs intended to make war immediate and certain. One of the winning proposals took the form of a single word, "MOBILIZE." If the formula for preventing war were similarly compressed, it might become "DISARM." There would be conditions, to be sure. Disarmament which meant anything at all, would have to be at once universal

and enforceable. And a planetary agency must be set up with power to do the enforcing.

Do we have the necessary time? Probably not. But the alternative is so hideous that an earnest, ardent effort must be made. Obstacles reach almost to the zenith: (a) "realistic" indifference in Western capitals; (b) the vast and terrible apathy of the decent and well-intentioned generally; and (c) perhaps most formidably, the opposition of dynamic communism.

When government on the global level began to be urged widely in the early 1950s, the Soviets reacted adversely. Pravda called Cord Meyer, Jr., first president of United World Federalists, "the fig-leaf of capitalist imperialism," and various other leaders were castigated, especially if they also were business executives. The Soviet Union would resist any substantial surrender of sovereignty to a neutral agency, but there have been historic break-throughs in circumstances just as inauspicious.

Occasional Western diplomats have declared that many Russians believe so strongly in validity of their approach that they might be willing to conduct their rivalry with the West on ideological, sociological and economic grounds, rather than by preponderance of armaments. Nobody can say that a proposal which seems obviously in the best interests of the U.S.S.R. and its people, which will increase standards of living as water rises in a lock, will be acceptable to the Politburo, but the offer must be made, and made in good faith on a basis which will serve Soviet interests as emphatically as it does our own. The Politburo just might be persuaded to act in behalf of the Russian people.

Our offer would be worth making if the odds in favor of its rejection were 100 to one. For our condition is desperate. Some experts give humanity a life-expectancy of fifteen years; others say ten. For mankind's sake, we must be ready to submit, with no trace of self-righteousness, a program for limited government on earth. If it is rejected, the Hottentots who finally take over and begin the long climb back to civilization may record — if they keep records — that at least we made the effort.

There is dissent in Russia,<sup>2</sup> just as there was seething beneath the surface of the Czarist tyranny. Writers, scientists, musicians and many of the other intelligentsia in general resist bureaucratic grossnesses. The break-through of reason and decency will come, even if not in our lifetimes. Solzhenitsyn, Sakharov, Pimenov, Rostropovich, Medvedev and Amalrik are only a few of the intellectuals who, although they are good socialists, oppose the callousness, brutality and inefficiency of the régime. They are

---

<sup>2</sup>NEWSWEEK, Feb. 1, 1971, pp. 29-34.

rigidly controlled at the moment, but their influence will grow despite the sodden orthodoxy of the Russian masses. In whatever event, they lift a small candle of hope.

It may be observed that leaden orthodoxy has similar roots in these United States. The John Birch Society, the Liberty Lobby, the hard-core fundamentalists and many of the professional patriots, should have some sympathy for the Politburo. But the two groups probably would be unable to agree that *both* Washington's Farewell Address and the teachings of Lenin have been cast in imperishable bronze.

The week that ended May 22, 1971, seemed more encouraging than any like period since the UN was launched. There were simultaneous announcements that the United States and the Soviet Union had agreed on a new framework for talks which look to the control of strategic arms. And The Washington Post commented editorially that this accord represented "a positive development and an admirable achievement."<sup>3</sup> After a day of talks with Prime Minister Heath, President Pompidou declared in a toast that on "the general conception of Europe, of its organization and objectives, our views are sufficiently close to allow us to continue our talks without pessimism,"<sup>4</sup> which seemed to pave the way for British entry into the European Common Market.

The White House and Kremlin apparently were ready to begin serious talks on the major reduction of armed forces in Central Europe. Charles M. Roberts referred to these and subsidiary events as "a vast canvas depicting great efforts to wind up the loose ends of World War II and to create a new framework for international life," adding that "central to much of this effort is the attempt to control the nuclear weapons that sprang from that war so that a human holocaust can continue to be avoided."<sup>5</sup> Hope, to be sure. Even high hope. But government on earth must be the final goal.

How relevant is the world order concept in the face of the high hurdles which confront it? Be assured that it is relevant if our civilization is relevant. It is more consequential than any lesser ideology, or the population explosion, or the exploration of space, or unemployment, or the fouling of our environment, or even aching hunger, for death is at the gate. Only universal, enforceable disarmament under world law can save mankind. India's Pandit Nehru said: "I have no doubt that world government must and will come, for there is no other remedy for the world's sickness." Just so!

---

<sup>3</sup>May 23, 1971, p. B1.

<sup>4</sup>The New York Times, May 21, 1971, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup>The Washington Post, May 23, 1971, p. B7.

Within the past decade — in our own immediate time — freedom has been murdered in Hungary and Czechoslovakia and calamity visited on Indo-China. Nuclear weapons were not used, but they have been available and bombs could begin to fall any day in this lovely month of June, putting an end to the interesting experiment called humanity.

At its 24th Session, the General Assembly of the United Nations resolved that complete disarmament was the most important question facing the world. The 1970s were designated the Disarmament Decade, and all responsible governments were called upon to end the nuclear arms race. As this was written, we were attempting — not without hope — to agree with the U.S.S.R. on the limitation of nuclear arms with which each nation could destroy the other at least a hundred times over.

*The Stockholm International Peace Institute* has reported that in 1970 the world's nuclear stockpile amounted to *fifteen tons of TNT* for each resident of the planet. That somehow seems enough! But no one can make the White House and the Kremlin agree. No one has authority to urge the rule of reason or the interests of humanity on the two consulting delegations. We (*and the Soviets*) are quite at liberty to bring ultimate catastrophe upon ourselves and upon the planet. Advocates of world order are only asking the nations to surrender enough sovereign power to make multi-national suicide impossible. Is that really too much to demand?

The UN has substantial achievements to its credit, in Iran, in Africa, in Cyprus, and elsewhere on the globe. It is, and has been, a necessary instrumentality which deserves full support. But it is little more than a league of sovereign states, not a government. It can neither enact nor enforce world law and it is quite as incapable of preventing a major war as have been all of its predecessors from the Delian League to the League of Nations.

UN has done no more than wring its hands as the agonies of Indo-China have deepened. Little Israel has announced defiantly that it would not consent to the setting up of a Near East buffer zone policed by UN contingents. Reports made by the UN military staff committee contemplate a police force which could not and would not act against any of the major powers. That is the equivalent of a declaration by the New Orleans police department that it would deal with pickpockets, shoplifters and traffic violators, but would not concern itself with murder, highway robbery or rape.

Sixty-three nations have signed a treaty banning nuclear armaments on the ocean floor. Who will enforce it? Not the UN, even though violations are to be reported to that agency. Why should that new treaty mean

substantially more than the Briand-Kellogg peace pact (the Pact of Paris) which renounced war and outlawed it? The High Contracting Parties seemed to believe (with perhaps no more than a few cynical exceptions) that Briand-Kellogg was a magnificent forward stride. At least it sent hope surging around the world; for the nations solemnly and formally agreed that "the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be . . . shall never be sought except by pacific means."<sup>6</sup> That pact was signed on August 27, 1926, and was proclaimed a binding agreement on July 24, 1929. At least for the purpose of editorials in the world press, war had been made obsolete! But scholars who know how wags our world of nation states were less optimistic. Professor Percy E. Corbett, one of the major authorities in this field, has written:<sup>7</sup>

Even the theoretical effect of this was largely annihilated by an unstated but firmly understood exception of the subjectively determined and therefore uncontrollable right of self-defense. As for any practical consequence, the Pact stands as a monument to the frailty of verbal undertakings unsupported by organized power.

Within the decade that followed Briand-Kellogg, that sorry jackal, Mussolini, invaded Ethiopia, the Japanese seized Manchuria, and Adolph Hitler, maddest of demagogues, turned his gray legions on Poland and then on France. The League of Nations was as helpless as leagues have ever been. Mankind was at the mercy of the immoral nation state. Nor is the present UN our answer. It must be strengthened into a limited world government which can enforce disarmament, which can prevent military adventuring by a great power in Czechoslovakia, or in Vietnam, or in Cambodia or Hungary.

What miracles might be wrought with the \$200 billions now being spent by the nations each year on war and preparation for war! If only that sum could be devoted to socially useful purposes rather than destruction! If only the \$400 millions which Appollo XV will cost could be spent to achieve lasting peace, to make government on earth a reality! President Nixon said in his 1971 State-of-the-Union message, "The time has come in America when the same kind of concentrated effort that split the atom and took man to the moon should be turned toward conquering [the] . . . dread disease [of cancer]."

If government on the planet *is* the remedy for mankind's ills (cancer is miniscule compared with the tragedy of war), that same kind of "concentrated effort" might achieve it. Mustard plasters may be useful in the treatment of pneumonia, but penicillin cures that "dread disease." Must we

<sup>6</sup>F. J. LIBBY, *TO PREVENT WAR* (Nyack, N.Y., 1969), op. p. 64.

<sup>7</sup>CORBETT, *THE GROWTH OF WORLD LAW* (Princeton, N.J., 1971), p. 40.

continue to use mustard plasters to treat the earth's fundamental agony? Of course politics is more difficult than physics, as Einstein said. But are we to be frustrated by ignorance and prejudice and vapid apathy? *Are* we to make no "concentrated effort" – no "concentrated effort" which might bring America the moral leadership of the world? Must we accept this Yeats dictum quoted by Lord Clark: "The best lack all conviction, while the worst/Are full of passionate intensity?"<sup>8</sup> Lord Clark adds that this is not quite true, but that the "trouble is that there is still no center . . . one can't exactly be joyful at the prospect before us."<sup>9</sup>

No single state has made world government its national policy. And only one American president has been sufficiently concerned, has had enough imagination, to speak for man. In a speech delivered at the UN in 1963, only brief weeks before his assassination, President John F. Kennedy said:

The U.N. cannot survive as a static organization. Its obligations are increasing as well as its size. The authors of that charter did not intend it to be forever frozen. The science of weapons and war has made us all, far more than eighteen years ago, one world and one human race with one common destiny. . . . In such a world, absolute sovereignty no longer assures us of absolute security. The conventions of peace must pull abreast and then ahead of the inventions of war. The United Nations, building on its successes and learning from its failures, must be developed into a genuine world security system.

If the Kennedy assassination is not to prove even more disastrous for the world than the assassination of Abraham Lincoln was for our Southern States, there must be enough empathy and wholeness and decency and passionate humanitarianism in some White House to launch an American offensive for peace on earth. The president who undertakes that crusade and who leads these United States and the world to lasting peace will achieve an immortality time cannot dim.

In order to avoid the too-facile charge of crackpotism, the writer of such an article as this (who is not a personage himself) seems required to quote at least one or two mighty figures who cannot be scorned even if agreement with them is not universal.

Just a few excerpts, then, from Pope John Twenty-third's magnificent encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*, a warmly human document which proceeded from one of the most enlightened minds of our time, and which, in Housman's phrase, should make men "fasten their hands upon their hearts:"

Civil societies . . . should join forces and plans whenever the efforts of an individual government cannot achieve its desired goals. . . . Justice, right, reason and humanity . . . urgently demand that the arms race should cease;

---

<sup>8</sup>KENNETH CLARK, *CIVILISATION* (New York, 1969), p. 347.

<sup>9</sup>*Id.*

that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned, and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control. . . . Relations between states, as between individuals, should be regulated not by the force of arms but by the light of reason, by the rule of truth, of justice, of active and sincere cooperation. . . . Today the universal common good poses problems of worldwide dimensions which cannot be adequately tackled or solved except by the efforts of public authorities . . . which are in a position to operate in an effective manner on a worldwide basis.

And the following is from an address delivered in Austin, Texas, on June 13, 1951, by quite a different personage, General Douglas MacArthur, who certainly was the great American soldier of this century:

The entire effort of modern society should be concentrated in an endeavor to outlaw [war] . . . . There is no half-way substitute. . . . It is the establishment of mechanics for its solution that is so difficult. It is there our leaders fail us. . . . I understand thoroughly that no one nation is going to put such a concept into effect until the others do. . . . They could, however, set the norm. Pass such a legislative fiat making it conditional upon the others doing so and you will thus take the moral leadership of the world.

One of the more important recent gatherings of Americans who realize that government is the remedy for the world's illnesses was the Second Dublin Conference held in 1965 at the Dublin, New Hampshire, home of the late Grenville Clark, a winner of the Gold Medal of the American Bar Association. Its chairman was Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, and those present included publishers, scientists, college presidents, a United States district judge, law school deans (one of them now Solicitor General of the United States), authors, editors, physicians, lawyers, business executives, ministers, teachers. The quality of law required by our troubled planet is indicated in these final paragraphs from the Declaration of that conference:

We call upon people everywhere to recognize the imperative need for a world federation with the powers necessary to enforce world law against international violence or the threat of it, — and thus to enhance the welfare of all.

We call upon them to recognize the indispensable link between peace, justice and progress on the one hand, and the institutions of enforceable world law on the other.

We also call upon them to insist, by every means at their command, that the establishment of world peace through enforceable world law shall become the first priority of their governments, and that their governments shall go on record to that effect.

And we call upon all heads of government, not merely to talk about the rule of law in world affairs, but to *take action* by moving swiftly and persistently to create a limited world federal government fully capable of maintaining

peace. To this end, we urge an early conference of the heads of government of every nation in the world.

We must *all* strive for a better world, freed from the burden of armaments and fear of destruction, and with a future of wider scope and greater promise.

There have been sitters in the seats of the scornful. Some of them are theologians who apparently hold small hope for man in this life. They see pie-in-the-sky for him, but not even rancid crusts on earth. They seem to revel sensuously in man's "original sin."<sup>10</sup> Alas, their reveling presumably will be shuffled off in Heaven, if any. Poor lads! They would be happier in Hell, but this writer and most other representatives of the unregenerate will campaign stoutly against their admission.

Reinhold Niebuhr is an interesting example. He urges that "real historians . . . know the hazards of predictions of the future . . . he [the historian] cannot make any generalizations about the past the basis of predictions of future actions and events."<sup>11</sup> As Professor Corbett says, however, Niebuhr "himself does not hesitate to make negative prophecies."<sup>12</sup> Consider, for example, the Niebuhr pronouncements that "the United Nations is not, *and cannot be*, a constitutional world order"<sup>13</sup> and that "the chaos of international relations . . . *cannot be overcome* by any system of 'collective security.'"<sup>14</sup> He seems to predicate his passion for doom on the belief that "man's freedom . . . makes him finally 'unmanageable.'"<sup>15</sup>

There are kindlier, more humanitarian spirits, "real historians" among them. Thus Arnold Toynbee says in his monumental *A Study of History*:

From our point of view in our day, the historic 'universal states' may be seen, in retrospect, as having been so many preparatory exercises for the eventual establishment of a literal universal state which, though still unachieved, is now, at last, no longer below our horizon."<sup>16</sup> He also observed that "the World's most powerful nations . . . have shown an uncustomary self-restraint

---

<sup>10</sup>See this comparatively mild passage at p. 342 of REINHOLD NIEBUHR ON POLITICS, Davis and Good, eds. (New York, 1960): The understanding of the Christian faith that the highest achievements of human life are infected with sinful corruption will help men to be prepared for new corruptions on the level of world community which drive simpler idealists to despair. The hope of Christian faith that the divine power which bears history can complete what even the highest human striving must leave incomplete, and can purify the corruptions which appear in even the purest human aspirations, is an indispensable prerequisite for diligent fulfillment of our historic tasks. Without it we are driven to alternate moods of sentimentality and despair, trusting human powers too much in one moment and losing all faith in the meaning of life when we discover the limits of human possibilities.

<sup>11</sup>*Id.*, pp. 46-47.

<sup>12</sup>CORBETT, *THE GROWTH OF WORLD LAW* (Princeton, N.J., 1971), p. 12.

<sup>13</sup>NATIONS AND EMPIRES (London, 1960), p. 29 (emphasis added).

<sup>14</sup>*Id.*, p. 194 (emphasis added).

<sup>15</sup>REINHOLD NIEBUHR ON POLITICS, Davis and Good, eds. (New York, 1960), pp. 55-56 (emphasis added).

<sup>16</sup>A STUDY OF HISTORY (London, 1948-61), Vol. 12, p. 310.

on some critical occasions. They have given priority to their sense of responsibility for avoiding a world-war that would be fought, this time, with atomic weapons, and they have subordinated, to this paramount concern, their national *amour propre* and ambitions and even their ideological convictions. . . . The attitude is negative and the motive is largely self-regarding, since it is obvious that atomic war-makers could not exterminate their fellow men without exterminating themselves together with the rest. . . . It is encouraging evidence of human nature's power to respond to the challenge of a revolutionary change of circumstances. It is also of great immediate practical importance, because it keeps mankind's foot in the door that opens into the future, and so promises to give time for Man's sense of responsibility towards mankind as a whole to take a more positive form."<sup>17</sup>

Professor Corbett also raises the banner of hope. He says:

If the original mode of expansion was conquest or colonization, this has now given way to voluntary association, planned to meet common needs. Why the process should stop short with the present constellation of nation states is by no means clear. Indeed, the now constant groping towards larger integration for purposes ranging from security to health and prosperity, impeded as it is by sacrosanct myths and special interests, suggests forces moving men willy-nilly towards universal organization.<sup>18</sup>

Corbett also suggests that

it would be far from wholesome to accept this condition of affairs [state absolutism] as an immutable feature of civilization. In the circumstances now surrounding us, to do so would be to abandon hope for the future of mankind.<sup>19</sup>

In a letter to the writer dated March 8, 1971, Professor Corbett observed:

I agree entirely with you that men must either contrive a large measure of world government or else vanish from the face of the earth. Where I think we differ is in method and time. . . . In so far as the changes are made, they will, I believe, move in the direction of world federation.

War is the arch-criminal — the murderer, the brutalizer, the ravisher, the despoiler of treasures to which men have given hands and hearts and genius over hundreds of years. Hear this declaration of a brilliant warrior, General Milton W. "Hap" Arnold, who directed America's air forces in World War II:

We won the last war. And it's the last war we'll ever win. If we have another, this nation will lose . . . and the enemy we fight will lose. . . . War is like fire: you can prevent a fire, or you can try to put it out, but you can't 'win' a fire, because fire is destruction. . . . If we fought Russia, the best we could hope to achieve is a moral victory and that would be small comfort to the remnants of our people, crawling amid the burnt-out foundations and charred chimneys of a ruined nation.

<sup>17</sup>*Id.*, p. 571.

<sup>18</sup>CORBETT, *THE GROWTH OF WORLD LAW*, (Princeton, N.J., 1971) pp. 114-15.

<sup>19</sup>*Id.*, p. 19.

Arnold Toynbee and Percy Corbett speak relevantly and eloquently in this context. Professor Toynbee says:

Modern Western technology has now acquired the power to wipe out the human race, simultaneously with the power to bring the amenities of civilization to the whole of it. The advance in humane feelings has been offset by the degeneration of war into an indiscriminate assault on civilians, after it had been reduced in the eighteenth century to a conflict confined to professional combatants and conducted according to agreed rules.<sup>20</sup> . . . In harnessing atomic energy he [Man] has now acquired a tool which is so potent that, if used as a weapon, it might destroy, not merely a hostile army or people or merely the users themselves, but the whole human race. . . . The invention of the atomic weapon has made future resort to war a crime against the human race.<sup>21</sup>

And Professor Corbett observes:

One [answer] is the demonstrated need for agreed rules, precisely defined, to meet problems that have taken on new urgency. In some areas of international relations . . . the lack of clear-cut consensus, barely tolerable forty years ago, has become intolerably dangerous in the intensified interdependence of a world which has discovered, accumulated, and mobilized the means of exterminating the human race.<sup>22</sup>

The following classic statement of the fundamental case for that disarmament so vitally necessary to the prevention of small wars and large, was made in 1953 by President Eisenhower, who was the only professional soldier to occupy the White House in the 1900s.<sup>23</sup>

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies — in the final sense — a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.

This world in arms . . . is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children.

The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: A modern brick school in more than thirty cities.

It is: Two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population.

It is: Two fine, fully equipped hospitals.

It is some fifty miles of concrete pavement. We pay for a single fighting plane with a half-million bushels of wheat.

We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people. . . .

This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. . . . Is there no other way the world may live?

These are 1953 data, but few would suggest that inflation has had a less pronounced effect on military hardware than on the economy generally.

<sup>20</sup>A STUDY OF HISTORY (London, 1948–61, Vol. 12, p. 531.

<sup>21</sup>*Id.*

<sup>22</sup>THE GROWTH OF WORLD LAW (Princeton, N.J., 1971), p. 166.

<sup>23</sup>Address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D.C., April 17, 1953.

The Pentagon has not been the American agency most acutely sensitive to the need for conserving tax dollars.

Other crimes of war have been no less serious than deaths in combat: massacres of the unarmed and defenseless (Mylai and Hue are episodes that have multiplied through the whole sweep of warfare), hideous genocide in too many parts of the earth, the indiscriminate bombing of civilian populations and (this list plainly is incomplete) the tearing-apart of nations – these United States by the Civil War and by the Indo-China conflict.

In his definitive *A Study of War*, that superb scholar, Professor Quincy Wright, said that “sovereignty is not . . . incompatible with the elimination of international violence”;<sup>24</sup> that World War II was fought “to restore general allegiance to the philosophy of human progress and human welfare which the great thinkers – religious, philosophical and political – of all regions and all ages of civilization have accepted. . . . [that] an organization to prevent war must accept the philosophy that institutions are to be judged by the degree in which they advance human freedom and welfare and that *the special aims of nation, state, government, or race are subordinate* [emphasis the present writer’s]. . . . In the continuous struggle to realize the philosophy of unity in diversity, under changing conditions, individuals and groups may satisfy the wish for ever newer experience.”<sup>25</sup>

Education and propaganda must play a full, aggressive and well-financed part in that “continuous struggle.” The peoples *and their statesmen* must be enlightened and convinced.

The time to outlaw war is now, by “concentrated effort,” by the restatement of national purposes, by respect for human life, by the expenditure of whatever billions are required, by *government* which will implement order and decency and law on earth.

Many approaches have been suggested, but leaders in this country probably have been most impressed by the definitive treatise, *World Peace Through World Law*, written by Grenville Clark with Louis B. Sohn, professor of International Law at Harvard. It sets forth a comprehensive and detailed plan for revision of the United Nations Charter to achieve world peace. And it has become a “desk-book” for many scholars and diplomats alike.

These are the basic principles, as set forth by Mr. Clark in his Introduction, by which he and Professor Sohn were guided:<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup>1969 edition (Chicago), abridged by Louise Leonard Wright with her husband’s warm approval, p. 378.

<sup>25</sup>*Id.*, p. 425.

<sup>26</sup>CLARK & SOHN, *WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW* (2d Rev. Ed. Cambridge, Mass., 1962), Introduction, pp. xv–xvi.

*First:* It is futile to expect genuine peace until there is put into effect an effective system of *enforceable* world law in the limited field of war prevention. This implies: (a) the complete disarmament, under effective controls, of each and every nation, and (b) the simultaneous adoption on a world-wide basis of the measures and institutions which the experience of centuries has shown to be essential for the maintenance of law and order, namely, clearly stated law against violence, courts to interpret and apply that law and police to enforce it. All else, we conceive, depends upon the acceptance of this approach.

*Second:* The world law against international violence must be explicitly stated in constitutional and statutory form. It must, under appropriate penalties, forbid the use of force by any nation against any other for any cause whatever, save only in self-defense; and must be applicable to all individuals as well as to all nations.

*Third:* World judicial tribunals to interpret and apply the world law against international violence must be established and maintained, and also organs of mediation and conciliation — so as to substitute peaceful means of adjudication and adjustment in place of violence, or the threat of it, as the means for dealing with all international disputes.

*Fourth:* A permanent world police force must be created and maintained which, while safeguarded with utmost care against misuse, would be fully adequate to forestall or suppress any violation of the world law against international violence.

*Fifth:* The complete disarmament of all the nations (rather than the mere “reduction” or “limitation” of armaments) is essential for any solid and lasting peace, this disarmament to be accomplished in a simultaneous and proportionate manner by carefully verified stages and subject to a well-organized system of inspection. It is now generally accepted that disarmament must be universal and enforceable. That is must also be complete is no less necessary, since: (a) in the nuclear age no mere reduction in the new means of mass destruction could be effective to remove fear and tension; and (b) if any substantial national armaments were to remain, even if only ten percent of the armaments of 1960, it would be impracticable to maintain a sufficiently strong world police force to deal with any possible aggression or revolt against the authority of the world organization. We should face the fact that until there is *complete* disarmament of every nation without exception there can be no assurance of genuine peace.

*Sixth:* Effective world machinery must be created to mitigate the vast disparities in the economic condition of various regions of the world, the continuance of which tends to instability and conflict.

The road to world order probably would be less rugged if men were bound by the mandates of a Universal Religion. But there have been so many wars between co-religionists — disastrously among Christian nations over centuries and most recently in East Pakistan, where half a million Bengalis have been butchered by their Moslem brethren — that decency and gentleness seem unlikely products of any church, established or otherwise.

God must be embarrassed by wars between believing nations. Petitions

addressed to Him, or perhaps to Her if one is a convert to Fem-lib, voice substantially identical pleas. The As seek destruction of the Bs and the Bs demand ruin for the As. It will be remembered that the second verse (now largely jettisoned) of *God Save the King* asks the Almighty to scatter the King's enemies "And make them fall/Confound their politics/Frustrate their knavish tricks/On Thee our hearts we fix/God save us all." That is, all except the King's enemies, of course. To bless those insensate slobbs plainly would be treason dark and foul. If each warring nation has been equally pious, how *is* God to decide? "Prevent war for God's sake" may not be a sacrilegious slogan.

Can God be fragmented? Can even the arrogantly self-righteous believe in an American God, a British, French, German, Algerian or Vietnamese Supreme Ruler of the Universe? Is such a God able, after long millenia that reach back into the pre-dawn of history, to free mankind from the scourge of war? It is submitted that the nations cannot rely on God or pacts or leagues or treaties or balances of power or terror. Government is the remedy for the illnesses of mankind.

Perhaps this country, agonized and bored by war, is now ready for a hero who can eloquently and consecratedly lead a great crusade for peace. If only such a leader can implement the deep longings for peace in this country, he will sweep before him all the militarists and merchants of death and professional patriots who blindly and heedlessly will not permit themselves to believe that the world is one — at least one in mankind's desire for peace.

What can we do? Certainly, before the year 2000, we can find a leader who loves people, and we can support him with informed minds and dedicated hearts. We can join one of the many organizations in this country which concern themselves with peace in significant measure, and we can somehow give effect to their highest aspirations. We must make America understand that government proceeds inexorably from individual to village, to state, to nation, to the world.

We can say, with A. E. Housman:

The troubles of our proud and angry dust  
Are from eternity and will not fail,  
Bear them we can and if we can, we must.  
Shoulder the sky, my lad, and drink your ale.

No other generation has faced the awesome obligation which is ours. We must shoulder the sky.