

VICTORY WITHOUT PEACE

By SCOTT NEARING

World Events

125 FIFTH ST., N.E.

WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

Price: 10 cents—3 for 25 cents—12 for \$1.00—\$6.00 per 100.

VICTORY WITHOUT PEACE

SALES CAMPAIGNS are common enough these days. Sales departments devote millions of dollars and of energy units to marketing breakfast foods, soap, automobiles, cigarettes, whiskey, cosmetics. Among the sales enterprises of the present century, none has cost more money—and none will have graver consequences for the immediate future—than the campaign to sell “victory” to western man.

Selling "Victory" to the People

It is a competitive campaign in which spokesmen for rival nations vie with one another to see which can “sell” his constituents more completely. The campaign reached one of its high points in Churchill’s “blood, toil, tears and sweat” report to Commons on May 13, 1940. And in the “unconditional surrender” formula that Roosevelt foisted upon Churchill at the Casablanca Conference.

“You ask, what is our aim?” (Churchill to Commons May 13, 1940) “I can answer in one word. It is victory. Victory at all costs—victory in spite of all terrors—victory, however hard and long the road may be, for without victory there is no survival.” More than two years later, at the instance of Roosevelt, Churchill expanded his victory formula to include unconditional surrender. “The President, with my full concurrence . . . decided that the note of the Casablanca Conference should be the unconditional surrender of all our foes.” (Commons, Feb. 11, 1943)

The next day, Roosevelt spoke to the White House correspondents of “our determination to fight this war through to the finish—to the day when United Nations forces march in triumph through the streets of Berlin, Rome and Tokyo The only terms on which we shall deal with any Axis government or any Axis factions are the terms proclaimed at Casablanca: ‘Unconditional surrender.’” (*The New York Times*, Feb. 13, 1943)

“Victory” was the key word in the preamble to the United Nations agreement of Jan. 1, 1942—“Being convinced that complete victory over their enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence and religious freedom.”

The victory slogan was no discovery of Churchill and Roosevelt. It had been ringing through Central Europe for fifteen years—"Sieg Heil!" (Hail to victory!) At every Nazi conference, meeting and assembly this greeting was exchanged. It had resounded through Italy during the Ethiopian war. It was echoed by the Japanese invaders of Manchuria and China.

Napoleon sold "Victory and glory" to France. Julius Caesar sold them to Rome. The Ancients even had a god of Victory and both Hebrews and Christians confer the honorific title, "God of Battles," upon Jehovah.

Age after age, authority and ambition have sold victory to the masses of mankind. Using modern advertising tricks to the full, they are doing the same thing today. With victory go glory, domination and often booty—but never peace.

Victory But No Peace

The Allies won a sweeping victory in the spring and summer of 1945 and dictated the armistice terms to their defeated rivals. But they did not establish peace.

Unconditional surrender of the Axis powers and total victory for the Allies were succeeded by a plague of minor wars in Asia, a major war in China, bitter controversies among the victors and wholesale preparations for another general war.

The minor military conflicts following World War II centered about the efforts of Asiatic peoples to liberate themselves from the yoke of western imperialism. Indo-Chinese, Siamese, Sumatrans, Javanese and Burmese took seriously the Atlantic Charter statement, reiterated in the United Nations Agreement, concerning "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live" and proceeded to establish independent republics. All these movements were suppressed by the armed forces and military supplies of Great Britain, Holland, the United States and France. In several instances, surrendered Japanese troops were employed in the joint effort of the western empires to crush popular movements in Asia. Javanese republicans alone offered serious resistance to the imperialistic forces.

War in China was a very different matter. Civil strife has raged through that country at intervals since the revolutionists overthrew the Manchus in 1911. Even during the Japanese invasion (1931-

45) it played a major part in Chinese politics. Japan's surrender found the Chinese Communists within striking distance of Peking, Tientsin and Shanghai. The Nationalist government, with its capital in distant Chungking, had neither the war material nor the transport facilities necessary to checkmate the Communists; both were supplied by Washington. The 100,000 members of the U. S. A. armed forces then in China served the Nationalist government in all save active combat duty.

Had the Soviet Union thrown equal support behind the Chinese Communists, war would have been on between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. Instead, the Soviet Union signed a thirty-year treaty with the Chinese Nationalist government.

The Chinese civil war continued, however, on a large scale, with the U.S.A. financing, arming, training and transporting Nationalist troops. United States Marines patrolled Chinese highways and did guard duty on Chinese railway trains.

Growing Discord Among the Big Three

This review of the military struggles that continued after Axis surrender would not be complete without some reference to the rift among the chief Allied powers. The foundations of disharmony were foreshadowed in the log-rolling, political trading and secret agreements of Teheran and Yalta. At Dumbarton Oaks, Bretton Woods and San Francisco the Big Three were in open conflict. They disagreed about the Polish government, Balkan elections, Iranian oil, Danubian navigation, the Dardanelles, the treatment of Franco, the partition and administration of Germany and Japan, and about treaty terms for the defeated Axis nations. They disagreed in the U. N. Assembly and Council, in the Council of Foreign Ministers, in the Paris Conference.

The war of words in London, New York and Paris was accompanied by a war of nerves between the rival foreign offices. Armed forces were maintained on a large scale. Conscription for military purposes was continued by the major powers. War, navy and air departments in the chief capitals vied with each other in producing faster planes and ships, more deadly bombs, more destructive germs. Here were the diplomatic and military preliminaries of World War III actively under way before the treaties ending World War II had been drawn up, much less signed.

"War-loving" Axis powers had no part in these broils; their representatives were not even present at the discussions. Bevin, Molotov, Byrnes and other spokesmen for the "peace-loving" Allied powers were the sole participants in these controversies.

Allied victory in 1918 prepared the way for World War II. Allied victory in 1945 was accompanied and followed by a power struggle among the victors, leading straight toward another general military conflict.

Why did peace not follow the victories of 1918 and 1945? What is victory—particularly a victory based upon unconditional surrender? Such questions can be answered satisfactorily in one of two ways—(1) by inquiring into the nature of victory or (2) by reading history.

The Victory Formula

Let us begin our inquiry into the nature of victory by asking what goal its advocates have in mind and what means they propose for achieving it.

Dictionaries define victory as "overcoming or vanquishing an enemy." Synonyms for victory are: advantage, conquest, mastery, supremacy, triumph. Antonyms are: defeat, disaster, overthrowing, rout.

The classical modern description of the ends and means implicit in victory is Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Its argument runs something like this:

I. *We are a superior people.* Many victory spokesmen—President Roosevelt and Truman and the British King, for example—go a step beyond Hitler and say, "We are God's chosen people" or "We are God's own people."

II. *What benefits us is right; what harms us is wrong.* Diplomats talk of "national interests." "My country, right or wrong," is another statement of the same idea.

III. *Our righteousness (rightness) rests on our armed might.* "Trust in God and keep your powder dry." "Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition." Battleships and bombing planes are christened with prayers and sent into battle with priestly invocations. "Then conquer we must, for our cause it is just; and this be our motto, In God is our trust."

IV. *Inferior nations or peoples that oppose our righteous inter-*

ests must be defeated. Henry Wallace referred to the Axis nations as "children of darkness." President Truman spoke of their leaders as "these evildoers." In the popular lingo of the time, the Japanese were "yellow monkeys," the Germans were "Nazi beasts."

V. Their land must be taken, their property carried away as indemnity, their men forced to labor, their women and children humiliated, degraded and indoctrinated with our superior mores. The Germans followed this line in Holland and France. It is the essence of the Potsdam Declaration of August 1945.

VI. Enemies who persist in opposing us will suffer national dismemberment, de-industrialization and extermination. The Nazis followed this practice in Poland. The Morgenthau Plan and the Potsdam Declaration applied it to Germany.

Hitler was frank enough to write out the victory formula in *Mein Kampf*; had the Axis won, it would have been applied to the defeated Allied nations.

Allied leaders, less forthright than Hitler, talked of freedom, democracy and self-determination. No sooner had they won the war, however, than they dismembered the enemy nations, confiscated their property, drove millions from their ancestral homes, forced other millions into slavery, lowered the standard of living, occupied the conquered territories with armed forces and began the work of indoctrination.

Mein Kampf and the Potsdam Declaration are not original. They are merely modern applications of two very old slogans, "Carthage (our persistent enemy) must be destroyed!" and "Woe to the vanquished."

Victory by Any Means

How is victory to be won? By any and all means. Anything, everything for victory! All is fair in war.

There are rules of war—international agreements respecting certain types of projectiles (such as mushroom bullets), poisons and poisonous gases, the treatment of prisoners and the civilian population. These rules of war are supported by custom and by a certain amount of world opinion. Otherwise, they are the merest gentlemen's agreements.

Each new weapon—the submarine for example—each new technique of destruction and murder, such as bombing from the air

renders the old rules obsolete. Before new rules can be adopted, new victories have been won through the new device or technique.

A widely accepted war rule requires that attack be directed against military objectives. Acceptance of this practice would outlaw attacks upon the civilian population—non-combatant women, children, and old people. But military “necessity” respects neither rules nor people.

During World War II one of the main features of both Axis and Allied strategy was the destruction of communications and the curtailment of supplies. Curtailing food supply meant starvation of civilians. The Axis attempted to blockade and starve out the British Isles. The Allies attempted to blockade and starve out the Axis-occupied portions of Europe. Thus both contestants used the starvation of civilians as a means to victory.

Submarine warfare depends for its effectiveness upon surprise—the sneak attack. The submarine that gives warning loses its chance to destroy a piece of enemy property. Therefore, in World War II submarines on both sides torpedoed warships, freighters and passenger ships, snuffing out the lives of combatants and non-combatants alike.

Aerial bombing was an important weapon in World War II. Bombing from great heights cannot be entirely accurate. A ten-ton “block buster” dropped into a city is bound to cause civilian casualties. In the early days of the war, lip-service was paid to the rule safeguarding civilians. As the fighting grew more desperate, both sides turned to “saturation” or “obliteration” bombing, aimed to destroy entire cities—for example, Coventry and Hamburg. The summer of 1945 witnessed the high point in obliteration bombing at Hiroshima. One bomb wiped out a city, killing perhaps 100,000 men, women, children, old people, and destroying homes, shops, factories, schools, hospitals. There was not even a pretense of a military objective, an entire civilian community was blotted out.

“But it brought victory, did it not?”

Yes, it brought victory by converting the rules of war into a scrap of paper. Anything, everything for victory.

President Truman, in his statement of Aug. 6, 1945, exulting over the atom bomb, said: “The Japanese began the war from the air at Pearl Harbor. They have been repaid many fold. And the end is not yet. With this bomb we have now added a new and

revolutionary increase in destruction to supplement the growing power of our armed forces . . . If they do not accept our terms, they may expect a rain of ruin from the air, the like of which has never been seen on earth."

Against the atom bomb there seems to be no adequate defense. Therefore, "our defense can only be a counter-offensive; we must be prepared to give as good as we take, or better" (General H. H. Arnold, *One World or None*. McGraw Hill, 1946, p. 31). Victory depends on having and using more atom bombs than the enemy.

Blockade, submarine warfare, aerial bombing tell the same story—anything, everything for victory. Nazis who cried, "Hail to victory!" and Churchill, making his V sign, employed the food blockade, submarine warfare and aerial bombing in their efforts to win.

Another item deserves at least passing notice. Before World War II ended, both sides were making extensive preparations to spread cholera, typhus and other deadly diseases behind enemy lines. Information on this subject is meager. On Jan. 4, 1945 the United States War Department issued a statement briefly outlining the joint work of Britain, Canada and the United States in preparing for "the use of bacteria, fungi, viruses, rickettsiae and other toxic agents from living organisms . . . to produce death or disease in men, animals or plants." On the following day the U. S. Navy Department made a parallel statement concerning its preparations for biological warfare. The available evidence was summed up by a Canadian scientist, Dyson Carter, in a documented article in *New Masses*, Sept. 3, 1946. On Sept. 18, 1946 the U. S. Chemical Warfare Service announced that, after spending fifty million dollars on research, it had produced a poison so powerful that one ounce could kill 180 million people.

The means are sanctified by the end. Food blockades, explosives, incendiaries, bacteria, poisons—anything, everything for victory!

Does Armed Might Keep the Peace?

So much for the nature of military victory. It is a triumph won over a rival by employing whatever means are required to achieve the objectives.

We turn now to the second or historical aspect of our inquiry—

what is our experience with armed might? Has it brought peace or only victory?

Attempts are being made to sell the idea that armed might insures peace. General George C. Marshall, while still Chief of Staff, reported to the Secretary of War on Sept. 1, 1945, "The peace can only be maintained by the strong." General Dwight D. Eisenhower told the House Military Affairs Committee on Nov. 15, 1945, "The greatest single force for world peace today is the organized military potential of the United States." President Truman, in his message to Congress on Nov. 23, 1945, urged peacetime conscription because "we can ensure such a peace only as long as we remain strong." In his Army Day speech, April 5, 1946, the President reiterated: "We are determined to remain strong . . . Only so long as we remain strong, can we ensure peace in the world."

There is no difficulty in checking the historical accuracy of these assertions that peace results from military power. Through the centuries, individual nations—Egypt, Babylon, Rome, Turkey, Spain, Holland, France, Britain, Germany—have built up powerful military organizations. In some cases their military potential was so dominant that they were able to defeat their neighbors in battle and establish a "Roman peace." It was peace only in name, however. Actually, it was a monopoly of armed might, which their rivals planned and prepared to destroy at the earliest opportunity. In every instance, arms monopoly was broken by (a) mutiny in the armed forces, (b) revolts of slaves, serfs and wage-workers, (c) uprisings in the colonies or (d) attacks by outside enemies. Without exception, the monopoly of armed force by one people, nation or empire resulted, not in peace, but in war.

Armed might has brought victory on many occasions; it has never brought peace. Peace is the outcome of a social set-up under which military rivalry, tension, controversy and conflict are handled through accommodation and arbitration or by an appeal to custom or law, rather than by employment of armed force.

Military victory is the outcome of an armed conflict in which one of the rivals demonstrates superiority in organized destruction and mass murder. Military victory may yield booty or power but, by its very nature, it also results in new wars.

There are four excellent reasons why victory has always led to war rather than peace:

1. Victors win a sudden access of power. They have the defeated rival at their mercy. For the moment there is no force capable of restraining them. They can exercise their new-won power as they please.

Power corrupts. Superiority intoxicates. Holders of unrestricted authority commit follies and excesses. No man seems wise enough to rule honestly and effectively over his fellows without their consent. When victory gives the opportunity for arbitrary and total domination over the property and lives of the vanquished, the victor almost invariably adopts measures that lead, not to understanding and peace, but to antagonism, hatred and war.

Such an outcome is rendered all the more likely because war is fought in hot blood, with the emotions deliberately aroused and unbridled. Victory, therefore, is the signal for outbursts of passion. Under such circumstances, reason and wisdom are almost inevitably subordinated to plunder, rape and revenge. The victory which concluded World War II has proved no exception to the customary pattern.

2. Victory, with the abuses that invariably accompany it and the humiliation, exploitation and frustration involved in defeat, engenders bitterness, hatred and a will to revenge. The purpose of military combat is the imposition of the will of the winner upon the loser. The usual result of combat is the subordination of the interests of one combatant to the interests of the other. The combatant whose interests are subordinated as a result of defeat nurses his grievances, builds up his secret organizations and longs for the day of vengeance.

The victory-vengeance formula runs like this:

I. They started it. They were the aggressors. ("The Japanese began the war from the air at Pearl Harbor."—Truman)

II. They were guilty of atrocities, of crimes against civilization.

III. They must have tit for tat—submarine for submarine, bomb for bomb, life for life, bacteria for bacteria. ("They have been repaid many fold."—Truman.)

IV. Yonder, across the river, is an industrious young farmer. He is the enemy—inferior, cruel, dangerous. Burn his crops. Obliterate his home. Riddle him with bullets.

V. He is hit. He is down. He surrenders. Disarm him. Organ-

ize a parade. Shout! Cheer! Gloat over the beast. Enslave him. Starve him. Never again must he make war.

VI. The young farmer is restive under the foreign yoke. He remembers, plans, organizes in secret, sabotages, revolts. Bare-handed, he fights against metal and high explosives. He loses and goes to prison or into exile.

VII. Foreign domination is more galling than ever, fanning the fires of revenge to white heat. At last The Day dawns when the young farmer and his compatriots turn the tables on their conquerors, win a victory, plunder, rape, burn, murder, disarm, oppress—and begin the victory-vengeance cycle over again.

Through the centuries, this formula has been followed—victory, defeat, oppression, vengeance. Hatreds have been fanned, property has been destroyed, misery has been intensified, lives have been sacrificed. World War II is only one episode among many. "They started it. Give them the works! They got what was coming to them."

3. Victors fall out among themselves. Seldom is an important conflict fought by a single nation on each side. Almost always there are allies. The division of the world into many sovereign states makes alliances inevitable. Victory is usually won by a coalition of nations.

Victory yields booty—bullion, farm animals, railway equipment, ships, colonies. How are these to be divided up? To the victor belong the spoils—but which spoils to which victor? Powers, united for victory, have fallen out again and again over the fruits of victory.

World War II was no exception to the rule. Even in its bitterest phases, the war hardly produced more hateful denunciations than those directed by spokesmen of the top-ranking victors against each other. Within a year of the Axis defeat, the victor nations were lining up for a new war among themselves.

4. The rivals make alliances with their former enemies, rearm them and use them as pawns in the game of power politics. "The enemies of today are the friends of tomorrow." World War I was fought between Britain, supported by her "hereditary enemy," France, and Germany, with whom the British had been closely associated for a century. No sooner had the firing ceased in 1918, than the British rehabilitated, re-equipped and rearmed Germany

as a make-weight against the dangerously great power of France and the threat of Bolshevism in Central Europe. Before World War II had ended, the U. S. State Department was defending the Emperor of Japan and urging his retention in office. With Japan's surrender, it became the task of General MacArthur to rehabilitate that country as a power strong enough to checkmate Soviet influence in the Far East.

Victory leads, not to peace, but to new wars because victors (1) abuse their power, (2) sow the seeds of vengeance, (3) fall out among themselves and (4) provide their late enemies with the means of reprisal. The victory formula begins with the assertion of superiority in fire-power and circles through the will to vengeance back to a renewal of hostilities.

Victory in 1945 did not bring peace to the world for the same reason that victory did not bring peace in 1918 and on many previous occasions. The means used to win victory and the conditions surrounding victory make peace unlikely—make future war all but inevitable.

The Great Dilemma—Victory or Peace?

Men must choose between victory and peace. They cannot have both, because the two are contradictory, not complementary. It is another case of "either—or." Current experience leads to this conclusion. History confirms it.

Thus far, in our analysis of the relationship between victory and peace, we have ignored the ethical or moral aspect of the question. There are two approaches to the ethics of victory. The first is a matter of viewpoint and purpose. The second concerns the means employed to achieve the end.

1. What is our basic relation to our fellow humans? Are we better than they or are we all members of one big family—mankind? If we are better than they, we should seek to share with them the benefits inherent in our superiority. If all men are brothers, any assertion of superiority stresses difference, distinction, division and opens the way to antagonism and conflict.

Those of us who believe in the oneness of mankind must answer, "All men are brothers." Their common interests are more vital than any individual or local interests. Whatever divides men points toward conflict and war, rather than toward cooperation and peace.

Therefore, our purpose must be to stress unity and cooperation by subordinating division and competition. Since victory, the outcome of competition, involves division and opens the way to future conflict, we must avoid and oppose victory as we avoid and oppose any factor that threatens the attainment of an objective.

Victory is the real and immediate enemy of peace. Churchill, Roosevelt, Hitler and other advocates of victory offer the human race an attractive package, wrapped in glory and beribboned with "freedom" and "democracy." The package contains antagonisms, hatred, power-struggle and war.

2. The second approach to the ethics of victory takes into consideration the means employed to achieve our objective, which is cooperation, peace and freedom among men. In any dealing between man and man or group and group, there are three possibilities:

(1) we can treat others worse than they treat us, going out of our way to antagonize, injure, persecute, (2) we can treat others as they treat us—friendship for friendship, enmity for enmity, tit for tat, or (3) we can treat others better than they treat us, always willing and eager to give a bit more and a bit kindlier than we get.

If we treat others worse than they treat us (which is implicitly involved in winning a war), we set the pattern of insult and injury. We are aggressors, doing what we can to benefit ourselves at the expense of our neighbors. We are not concerned with peace at all. We are following the well-worn formula—aggression, victory, fear, hate, revenge.

If we treat others as they treat us, we allow them to set the pattern. We merely follow suit, adjusting our conduct to the requirements of their ethical level—an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.

If we treat others better than they treat us, again we set the pattern. This time, however, we act, not as aggressors, but as cooperators, doing to others as we would have others do to us, sharing, seeking to understand, striving by all means, reasonable and unreasonable, to lift burdens, arouse hope, inspire confidence, make the sense of common interests predominate over the sense of separateness.

Woodrow Wilson stated the issue between victory and peace in an address to the United States Senate, Jan. 22, 1917: "It must be

a peace without victory . . . Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation . . . Only a peace between equals can last."

Maxim Litvinov made the same point at Geneva, when the Soviet Union was admitted to the League of Nations Sept. 18, 1934: "We must realize once and for all that no war with political and economic aims is capable of restoring so-called historical justice, and that all it could do would be to substitute new and perhaps still more glaring injustices for old ones, and that every new peace treaty bears within it the seeds of fresh warfare."

Twenty-five centuries before Wilson and Litvinov, the Chinese sage Lao-tsu is reported to have said, "Conduct your triumph as a funeral." At about the same time, in India, Buddha taught: "Victory breeds hatred, for the conquered is unhappy. He who has given up both victory and defeat, he, the contented, is happy. . . . Let a man overcome anger by love, let him overcome evil by good." Five centuries later, Jesus said to his followers: "Love one another . . . whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also . . . Love your enemies, bless them that curse you . . . Do to others as you would have others do to you . . . Blessed are the peacemakers."

Live and Help Live

This is the ethical and moral lesson of the ages—treat your rival better than he treats you; eschew victory; avoid any suggestion of superiority; understand, sympathize, share. All men are members of one great family, in which they must live and help others to live.

The war-to-end-war, victoriously concluded in 1918, led twenty-one years later to the most destructive conflict of modern times. The unconditional-surrender war for freedom and democracy, victoriously concluded in 1945, was immediately followed by a division of the planet into two power-spheres, organized and armed for a renewal of military struggle.

No one need be surprised or disturbed by either of these episodes. Current experience, history and our wisest teachers agree that victory is a prelude, not to peace, but to war.

If We Want Peace

Here is the problem in a sentence: We can have victory or peace; we cannot have both. A vote for victory is a vote for war.

If we want peace, we must begin by repudiating victory, repenting our wrongful or vengeful acts, abandoning any pretense of superiority, recognizing and practicing social equality, working for the unity of mankind, doing right, seeking justice, exercising mercy, living creative lives and helping others to do the same.

War-making is easy. Human beings have waged wars for centuries. War-making is part of the "free enterprise," free-booting social pattern that has been accepted and followed by civilized nations since the beginning of written history.

Peacemaking is a very different matter. Civilized men have never known peace except as the interval between wars. The peacemakers are pioneers, blazing a new path for their fellows.

Peace results from social discipline, control and organization. If war is the end-product of competition and "free enterprise," peace is the end-product of cooperation and social planning.

Peacemakers must discover the formula on which peace can be made, draw up plans, apply the principles of social science to the drafting of community policy, federate the world under adequate constitutional guarantees, set up a world government competent to administer world life, build world-public opinion, cultivate a sense of world responsibility.

Thus—and only thus—in a new social order, will controversy and conflict be resolved by accommodation and arbitration or under customary and legal procedures, rather than by an appeal to armed force. We live in a social order dedicated to a competitive struggle for wealth and power. War-making is one phase of this competitive system. If we want peace, we must be prepared to pay its price. The price we must pay for peace is the abandonment of the present social pattern and its replacement by one under which war will be improbable and peace will be likely. We have the knowledge necessary for this task. Have the experiences of the past thirty years enlarged our vision and strengthened our will to the point requisite for decisive action?

If we want peace, we must not only be prepared to live and act peaceably, we must organize a community in which cooperation predominates over competition and in which sectional interests of particular groups are subordinated to the common interests of mankind.