

10¢ per copy

PROMOTING THE GENERAL WELFARE IN 1955

by

Dr. Scott Nearing

(address delivered at Unitarian Public Forum,  
2936 West Eighth Street, Los Angeles, on  
Friday, February 4, 1955, at 8:00 p.m.)

Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman (in introduction): There is no feature in the multiple life of this church that I am prouder of than these monthly forums. In season and out, for the past seven years, we have carried on forums in this church on themes by necessity of controversial subject matter, because life is controversial. We haven't yet found a subject that was interesting that didn't seem controversial to somebody. Tonight we are having a speaker who is notoriously controversial and has been since I was five years old. I hope he does not mind the arithmetic that you are rapidly doing.

I am taking a moment or two for the benefit of the younger generation who may not know the true grandeur and the dignity and the power of the man who is about to take this podium. I am very proud that he not only comes here year after year, but that he considers this church as a part of his nation-wide circuit of free-speaking to Americans. He was born in a company-owned coal town in Morris Run, Pennsylvania. I will skip the earlier years, except to say that things happened in that industrial town, company-owned, that were a greater education than anything he learned from school books and teachers. And he never has shaken off that education in industrial Pennsylvania. He went to the University of Pennsylvania, and in 1906 became an instructor in economics. From then until 1914 he was an instructor and then became an assistant professor of economics. That lasted, I believe, one year - at the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University, where I turned up as a completely innocent freshman in 1920. There in the Wharton School of Finance, which was my indoctrination into religion, I first heard the name of this man, Scott Nearing, and heard of his power and his mind and his conscience. I dare say that if you went back now to West Philadelphia, to the sacred halls of George Wharton Pepper, who engineered this man out of the University, you would find that they are still talking about Scott Nearing. I am willing to lay heavy odds that they are, and still saying about the same things, as he is still the same man.

He comes to us one of the most competently prepared students of American economic and social life that we can call on anywhere in the land. Having to leave the University of Pennsylvania because his work against child labor was not welcome at that time, he went from Philadelphia to the University of Toledo. There, early in 1917, he and John Haynes Holmes and Rabbi Wise got together (if ever there was a Trinity, that would be it) and organized and spoke militantly for the Union Against Militarism - just before the First World War. Thereupon the University of Toledo did away with his services. In 1920 he was Socialist candidate for Congress in New York City. He has debated with Norman Thomas. He debated with Bertrand Russell. He has written forty or more books, and this makes any clergyman very envious. Two of the most recent of them are on the book table tonight: MAN'S SEARCH FOR THE GOOD LIFE, and LIVING THE GOOD LIFE. I am not going to review them; I am going to say that Scott Nearing knows what he is talking about. I have read the books, and I think I know enough of the man to say that the man is in the books. And, believe me, he has earned the right to talk about the good life more completely than most who talk about it.

Twenty-five hundred words a month of Scott Nearing's review of world events are found in the MONTHLY REVIEW, an independent socialist magazine which many of you read. The prodigious intellectual energy and

social conscience of our speaker is an amazement to hundreds of thousands of Americans, whether they agree with his words or not. They are astonished at the power, both of the body and of the mind and of the conscience of Scott Nearing who is talking to us tonight on "Promoting the General Welfare in 1955".

Scott Nearing: Friends, the term "general welfare" is ordinarily used in contrast with special privilege for the individual, for a class, for a race, or for a nation. General welfare as I am going to use the term tonight, bears the same relation to humanity as the welfare of the human organism bears to the body. You would not consider the welfare of the finger more important than the welfare of the hand, nor would you consider the welfare of the hand more important than the welfare of the body. The finger is a part of the hand, and the hand is a part of the body; so in thinking about general welfare, you begin with the body and work back to the hand and the finger. That is what I am proposing to do tonight with this topic "general welfare in 1955". The term as I shall use it refers to the welfare of mankind, of the human family. Any lesser group than mankind, or the human family, represents a local or a particular interest.

Those of you who have been following the course of world events during the last few weeks will agree that there is urgent need to promote the general welfare. Bertrand Russell referred to this need last week in London when he said that unless the tensions are eased in the Far East, "it is not unlikely that the human race will cease to exist before the end of the present year." This is the dilemma which we humans face, at the beginning of 1955, when we talk about the general welfare.

Unfortunately, we tend to think first in terms of ourselves, of the little finger rather than the hand, and of the hand rather than the body. One of the best antidotes to this approach that I know you will find in the book of Arnold Toynbee called THE WORLD AND THE WEST. Professor Toynbee is a Westerner, an Englishman. The ordinary Westerner thinks of the West first and then of the world. This book deals first with the impact on the world by the West and then of the reaction of the world to the West. This is, as you can see, putting the general ahead of the special or the particular. I commend to you this book of Toynbee's first, because it is written by a competent historian and, second, because in it a Westerner looks at the West from the point of view of the world. It is this point of view that I shall try to maintain tonight.

I should like to begin by enumerating some of the things which might be done in 1955 to promote the welfare of the human race, of the human family. Order, and therefore peace, should probably be the first item in the listing of needs for 1955 - order and therefore peace. I put order in front of peace because peace is not something like war - which is an agency, an institution, a function of society. Peace is the resultant of a social situation in which the controversies and conflicts of a community can be settled legally or traditionally or constitutionally, without an appeal to armed force. When a situation exists in which controversy can be decided without a resort to arms, then you have peace. That means that you are living in a community in which orderliness permits the non-violent solution of tensions and potential difficulties. So I list first in the general welfare needs of 1955, world order, and consequentially, world peace.

Second, comes sovereignty for the world's peoples. Sovereignty is the

right of a community to run its own affairs. In the ordinary meaning of modern international law it is a little something more than that. But, in effect, a sovereign nation is a nation that is competent or that is permitted, and enabled, to run its own affairs. My second category of need is: sovereignty for the world's peoples. This means independence, autonomy, self-direction. It means self-determination in domestic affairs. There are more than a hundred units of the world's population to which that type of sovereignty might be applied. There are about 80 sovereign nations now, and there are many more that might and should become sovereign.

Sovereignty for the world's peoples means that every people, every unit of human population, should have the right to institutions of its own choosing. One of the things that is troubling the world at the present time is that some peoples are trying to tell other peoples how to behave, and what to do, and what to think, and where to head in. This, of course, is what we call the exercise of power. Power is the capacity to push somebody else around. Some people are now engaged in pushing other people around. If we are to have order and peace in the world, this pushing around has got to stop. This means that the people of one country have no business interfering with the domestic affairs of any other people or country. We'll never get peace in the world unless peoples are sovereign, autonomous, independent, self-determining. That means until all nations learn to mind their own business; each nation, the people in each group, minding their own business.

Now comes my third category of welfare needs: these sovereign nations (if order and peace are to prevail in the world) must be members of a competent world authority. I didn't say that some of the sovereign nations must be members of a world authority. They must all be members of a competent world authority. This is the antithesis, the two halves of the whole. On the one side, in matters of domestic concern, nations and peoples must be sovereign and able to take care of their own domestic affairs. On the other side, in matters of general welfare, of general concern, there must be a competent world authority.

California is a large, rich and populous state. It is perfectly possible for the people of California to push the people of Nevada around. The people of California are rich enough and numerous enough, and potentially powerful enough to do that. If this were the Balkans instead of the United States, the history of the West would be a history of the rich and powerful pushing around the weak and the impotent. This is not the way we operate. In the United States each state is sovereign. Each state takes care of its own domestic affairs. But when inter-state problems arise, they are handled by a competent authority - the United States of North America in which each state has a membership. I am extending that same conception for the world: a world composed of autonomous nations and peoples and states, a world composed of autonomous units, all of whom are federated together in a competent world authority. I have written a book, UNITED WORLD, in which I have attempted to spell out the details of this dual proposition: sovereignty for the individual state and collective authority for a competent world organization.

That, of course, leads to the fourth need in our crusade to promote the general welfare in 1955, and that is the revision of the United Nations Charter. The United Nations at the present time is the nearest thing we

have to a competent world authority. In the Charter which was drawn up ten years ago, there is a provision that ten years after the Charter was drawn up, that is, in 1955, the problem of the revision of the Charter shall appear on the agenda of the United Nations. It does appear on the 1955 agenda of the United Nations and is receiving a great deal of attention at the present time.

Before we can have in the world an authority competent to handle international problems, certain changes must be made in the United Nations Charter. The first and most important of these changes is that each of us must become a citizen of the United Nations. You are citizens of Los Angeles, I assume, also of California. You are also citizens of the United States and thus have a series of civic citizen relationships - city, state, nation. I am proposing that you add a fourth relationship, with the world. You would then be a citizen of the United Nations as well as being a citizen of the United States, of the State of California, and the city or town in which you happen to reside. The first necessity is that we each acquire United Nations citizenship.

The second change is that the United Nations be set up on the basis of representative government. At the present time the United Nations is not representative. It is a confederation of sixty-two sovereign states. Each state, the United States, for example, appoints a delegate or delegation to the United Nations. You and I have nothing to say about it whatever. Not only are we not citizens of the United Nations but we are not represented in the United Nations. The government in Washington appoints Ambassador Lodge as the head of the American delegation, and the same pattern is followed throughout the whole of the United Nations Organization. The United Nations should be representative in character. That is, the Assembly, for example, should consist of people selected, as the House of Representatives is selected, by the people from various parts of the United States. It should be a representative body.

The third requirement or amendment is that the United Nations should have a source of revenue independent of the member states. The United States Government does not have to wait until the State of California makes an appropriation for the support of the Federal Government. The government in Washington has its own sources of income. The United Nations has no such sources of income. It has to wait until Congresses and Parliaments make appropriations. It is at the mercy of the states composing the United Nations. The United Nations should have a source of income, subject to its own control.

Fourth: the United Nations should have international police power.

Fifth: it should have a monopoly of arms. This is the positive aspect of disarmament. Disarmament means that the nations lay down their arms. The police power in the hands of the United Nations means that international affairs, international issues, should be policed by the United Nations. If any international police power is exercised, it should be exercised by a competent world authority, no matter where the international tension arises. This, then, becomes the business of the world authority, just as inter-state problems, no matter where they arise in the United States, become the business of the Federal Government.

These are some of the amendments (not all, by any means) which, if introduced into the United Nations Charter, would greatly strengthen the United Nations as a world authority.

The next need, the next thing we could do to promote the general welfare in 1955 is to utilize atomic energy, not for destruction, but for production. At this dawning of the atomic age, as with the beginnings of the use of steam or of electricity, we have begun a new period of social opportunity. All of these forces may be destructive or productive. Steam, for example, burns; electricity electrocutes; atomic energy vaporizes. All of these agencies can be used to destroy or they can be used to build. At the beginning of this atomic age, at the opening of this new period in history, we must learn how to use atomic energy to create abundance for the world. This is perhaps the greatest need of the period: to take this new power, this mechanical agency which is now at our disposal, and use it constructively instead of destructively.

The next welfare need for 1955 is: ceaseless propaganda, through all of the agencies at our disposal, for brotherhood, for cooperation, for learning how to get along with our fellow-beings. You and I are now the victims of ceaseless propaganda. We are propagandized politically, propagandized economically. The State Department works on us; the General Motors Corporation and the Coca Cola companies do likewise. We are propagandized ceaselessly. I propose that instead of this propaganda for the advantage of specially privileged groups, we propagandize ceaselessly, for brotherhood and cooperation, every day in the LOS ANGELES TIMES or EXAMINER, every week in the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT.

People can be conditioned in many ways. There are many patterns of behavior. We are being conditioned at the present time competitively and in terms of private, local, special interests. In terms of human welfare we must learn brotherliness and cooperation. We must propagandize incessantly for equal rights and opportunity. We must propagandize incessantly for construction, for creation, for building up mechanically and socially, emotionally, mentally and spiritually. We must propagandize in favor of respect for life. We must incessantly remind people that in doing the world's work we should impose the least harm on the least number and provide the greatest good for the greatest number. We should insist that individuals and communities learn to live well and that they help others to do likewise.

This is propaganda for the general welfare, and if LIFE, TIME and FORTUNE and the billboards of the United States, and the radio and the television and the press, the camera and the other agencies for channeling and directing public opinion were used to promote the general welfare, within a decade, and at most, within a generation, we would be living not only among new people, but we would be living in a new society.

President Eisenhower addressed Congress last Monday, a week. He began by saying that "the most important objective of our nation's policy is to safeguard the security of the United States." This is special pleading. About one-sixteenth of the population of the world lives in the United States. About fifteen-sixteenths live outside of the United States. The President says "the most important objective of our foreign policy" is to protect the little finger - our little local interests. This he sees as the most important purpose of our foreign policy. This is provincialism. This is

localism. This is special pleading.

I want to revise the President's statement as follows: the most important objective of our nation's foreign policy must be, economically, to increase the well-being in the backward areas, thus equalizing opportunity; politically, to help establish a world government with adequate authority to preserve order and peace in the world; and, militarily, to abolish the apparatus for making war.

If we wish to promote the general welfare, we - you and I - Henry Luce, and the entire United States, must abandon the drive to dominate and direct peoples who live outside of the United States. We must renounce the American Century dream. The 19th Century was dominated by the British. The advocates of the American Century believe that the 20th Century world should be dominated by the United States. The domination of the world by the British during the 19th Century led into the horrible disasters of the last fifty years. We don't want to repeat those disasters. We must abandon the drive for world empire and for world power.

It is interesting to note the attitude of mind that has come to dominate the people of the United States in this regard. I begin with the President and the speech which he made to Congress on the 24th of January. He was speaking about Formosa. The loss of Formosa "would create", he said, "a breach in the island chain of the Western Pacific that constitutes for the United States and the other free nations the geographical backbone of their security structure in that ocean."

Yesterday U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT appeared on the newsstands. It is a magazine with a very large circulation, especially among business executives. I will read you a few sentences from David Lawrence's editorial in this February 4th issue of the magazine. Lawrence is referring to President Eisenhower's statement of January 24. "The Congress of the United States", wrote Mr. Lawrence, "was given the opportunity last week to tell the whole world that the American people will fight if they must, to defend their frontiers. In this air age these frontiers now extend to bases far overseas." I skip a paragraph and then read: "Just as the late President Roosevelt once defined those limits in Europe when he said 'Our frontiers are on the Rhine', so today, with jet planes flying more than 600 miles an hour, another President of the United States has said in effect that our frontiers in the western Pacific are close to the mainland of China."

In that same connection, this number of U.S. NEWS, on page 22, publishes a chart in which it shows "the Pacific defense perimeter." In September, 1945, this defense frontier extended just beyond the Philippines but not as far as Formosa. The second defense line, drawn in June, 1950, at the outbreak of the Korean War, extends just beyond Formosa, but not up to the China mainland. The third defense line, drawn by the President on January 24, 1955, extends the United States frontier to the mainland of China, to the continent of Asia. That is the conception which President Eisenhower voiced in his talk on the 24th of January and which Mr. Lawrence detailed in his editorial in this week's U.S. NEWS.

The obvious question which Arnold Toynbee would ask (he not being an American but an Englishman and a world historian) is: "How about China?"

Suppose China reciprocates? Suppose China draws a defense perimeter along the coast of Washington, Oregon and California, and includes Catalina Island on the Chinese side of the defense perimeter? Catalina Island lies just off the coast of North America, as Formosa lies just off the coast of Asia. Formosa, from time immemorial has been a part of China, and Catalina Island for some time, since the Mexican War of 1846-8, has been a part of the United States.

The United States draws its perimeter along the Asian mainland. By what right do we exclude China from drawing its defense perimeter along the North American mainland? Why, says U.S. NEWS this week in its editorial, because the China fleet consists of over-sized row-boats. Read, if you have time and occasion, this number of U.S. NEWS. The whole first page, the page devoted to a general news summary, is devoted to heaping ridicule on the Chinese because their air force is so weak and their navy is so inadequate that they have no means of operating beyond their own land areas. In other words: we are strong and they are weak, so we draw a line of defense, a frontier, right in their front yard. And, if they question us, they become aggressors. We must abandon the policy and renounce the effort to tell other people where to head in and what to do. If the theoretical picture I have painted is sound, the people of China have the same right to decide their own affairs and mind their own business that we in the United States have to decide our own affairs and mind our own business. This is what sovereignty and autonomy mean.

The consequences of this conception are grave and far-reaching. If this conception is accepted, the 16 billions of dollars of American capital now invested abroad must be withdrawn or internationalized. Relief (Congress is being asked to appropriate 3 1/2 billions for relief abroad, for aid abroad, for subsidy abroad for buying up and putting into our pockets nations who can't afford to go on their own), foreign aid, like foreign investment, must be directed through an international body, such as UNRRA directed foreign aid through the period of the recent war. International matters, whether of economic aid or investment or trade, or of political association, all such matters must be dealt with by a competent world authority. There is nothing in justice or in equity which permits one nation to push other nations around. One nation pushing other nations around violates the basic principle of the relations between peoples. The United States has got to abandon its drive for world power, and will have to renounce all forms of unilateral action in the conduct of world affairs. Unilateral action means action by one nation. The United States had no business intervening in Korea in 1950; it has no business intervening in Formosa today.

As a part of this picture of renunciation, the United States must take a lead in abolishing the institution of war. War is an institution. It is the largest and most expensive institution in the United States. I have here a brief analysis of the war apparatus in the United States, as proposed by President Eisenhower for 1956, the coming fiscal year. Air Force: 975,000 men in uniform; 130 combat wings; 22,900 aircraft; 15 wings in the Far East and 16 wings in Europe. Marine Corps: 193,000 men; 3 combat divisions, two in the United States, one in the Far East. Army: 1,027,000 men in uniform, 19 combat divisions, 8 in the United States, 5 in Europe, 2 in Korea, 1 in Japan, 1 in Hawaii, 1 in Panama. Twelve separate regiments and regimental combat teams;



5 in the United States, 1 in Okinawa, 1 in Japan, 1 in Berlin, 1 in Austria, and 3 others in Europe. Navy: 664,000 men in uniform; 1,000 naval ships, 405 in service; 13,000 aircraft. Fleets in the Atlantic, the Pacific, the Far East and the Mediterranean. The analysis does not list the bases which the United States has scattered over the Northern Hemisphere, but George Marion in his 'BASES AND EMPIRE' does that. Victor Perlo in his 'AMERICAN IMPERIALISM' also does that. Militarily, the United States at the present time is reaching around the world, putting itself in a position to do to every part of the world what it is now doing to China, and other parts of Asia, telling them what to think, how to behave and where to head in.

We have got to renounce all of that, and we have got to be prepared to behave like an orderly, responsible member of a world community in which international affairs are decided by international authority and international activities, where policing, if necessary, is carried out by an international body. I say that we have to renounce these things, because the United States (unhappily for us and for the world) is now so rich and so powerful and so widely extended geographically, and so well-armed, that only a general combination of the rest of the world can restrain the will of the ruling oligarchy of this country to dominate the planet and direct the life of mankind. This presents the traditional, familiar danger, present again and again throughout history, when one nation becomes much richer and more powerful than any of its neighbors. Then the neighbors, in self-defense and in the interests of the common welfare, band themselves together to disarm the common menace to peace and security.

If we happen to be living in a nation in which the ruling oligarchy is attempting to impose conformity upon the whole population, by economic and other pressures, then self-respecting citizens and the private association to which they belong will have to behave as self-respecting citizens and private associations must behave. They must be self-respecting citizens and they must be private associations. And they must recognize the government as one segment of society.

We are living in a community where the government has walked in and taken over as though it were the whole show. It is not the whole show. Read the first ten Amendments to the Constitution. "The powers not delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the states respectively or to the people." The Federal Government is not the whole works; the states are not the whole works; the municipalities are not the whole works. Every individual citizen has an area of privacy. Under English common law, if the peasant goes to the palace, he must knock on the portal and ask to be admitted. If the king goes to the peasant's hut, he must knock on the door and ask to be admitted.

When Corliss Lamont, who teaches philosophy in Columbia University, was summoned before a Congressional Committee and asked by Senator McCarthy to answer certain questions, he replied as follows: "I will gladly answer any questions you may ask, except questions concerning my philosophical beliefs, my religious conceptions, my associations and my private life." This position is both legal and constitutional because these are four of the areas which Government may not invade, any more than the king may invade the peasant's hut. These are areas of autonomy in the community. These are areas in which the private associations and the self-respecting citizen carry on their affairs just as the Federal

Government carries on in Washington or the state government carries on in Sacramento. . . The legislators in Washington have no right to invade any of the areas named by Corliss Lamont because these areas are privileged areas, and you can perfectly legitimately put up a sign against any one of these areas saying, "Federal Snoopers Keep Out".

This is a statement of the principle of popular sovereignty. We, the people of the United States, create a government to promote the general welfare, says the Preamble to the Constitution. We, the people, create this government. You remember Lincoln said in 1865: "The people have the constitutional right to amend the Constitution and the revolutionary right to abolish the Constitution." Both of these rights are implicit in the principle of popular sovereignty.

Ironically enough, in the State of New Hampshire, Paul Sweezy, one of the editors of MONTHLY REVIEW, is out on bail charged of contempt of court for refusal to answer impertinent questions. In the Bill of Rights of the State of New Hampshire the right of revolution is specifically detailed in two paragraphs. I don't know whether California is as far advanced as that or not.

You will find a pamphlet out on the literature table called 'To Promote the General Welfare' in which I tried to outline this thesis about the duty of the private citizen and the private association to work for the general welfare, and the way in which this work can and should be done.

I want to make two other suggestions. The first is that in 1956 we call a conference of peoples, scientists, artists, professionals, a world-wide conference, to promote the general welfare.

I want to say another thing in passing. This particular forum, which is doing so much for the general welfare, occupies a unique position in the history of the United States at this time. I do not know any forum in the United States at the present time which handles the kind of controversial questions which this forum handles, and receives the public, popular support that this forum receives. One of the things you can do to promote the general welfare is to keep this, forum, and like institutions, operating full steam ahead.

In 1955 we should all try to broaden our horizons. Man, the individual, should dedicate himself to self-knowledge and self-mastery. Man, as a responsible member of a family, of a nation and of the world community, should direct his energies to establishing peace and order in the world. Man, the conscious, purposive, creative fragment of an evolving universe, should do his utmost to achieve that larger general welfare which transcends regions, and nations and human races, and planets.

MR. FRITCHMAN: I think we really owe a vote of thanks to George Wharton Pepper for giving this professor to the entire country in 1915 and to a student body of millions instead of hundreds of thousands. In the past 40 years this kind of good sense has been spoken both by his lips and by his pen, and I think I bespeak for you our profound gratitude for this profound academic contribution to our American life. And now for the questions.

Q. Will you enumerate some of the uses to which we could put atomic

energy for the general welfare?

A. Atomic energy happens to be de-centralizable. One of the great limitations on water power and steam power was the necessity for locating the activities immediately associated with the generators of the energy. It couldn't be transmitted very far. When electricity came along, it became easier to transmit electricity than it was power generated by steam. With the coming in of atomic energy presumably we will be able to take a pocketful of it and go almost anywhere. That means that the necessity for congested populations, congested industries, and other aspects of our modern urban centers, can all be by-passed and we can set up highly de-centralized modes of living. Apparently atomic energy lends itself to this purpose better even than electricity has done.

Q. The United Nations, as presently constituted, recognizes that peaceful solutions to world problems depends upon the unanimity principle among the great powers. With the world divided into treasurers and thinkers as Barrows Dunham put it, or into capitalist or non-capitalist nations, who would control police power in the U.N.?

A. Police power would be controlled by the United Nations. Who controls police power under the Federal Government or in the State of California? The authority that happens to be in the seat of authority at the time. One time in Washington it's the Democrats; at another time it's the Republicans. The U.N. authority would have police power, and whoever happened to be running the U.N. would exercise that power.

Q. If the world government which you envision has all war-making powers, what course of action should that government follow in the event of a civil conflict?

A. I did not say that the world government should have all war-making powers. I said that it should have police powers. The difference between war-making powers and police powers is that war-making powers are used to impose victory on a rival and to utilize that victory to take power from the rival and concentrate it in the hands of the victor. In other words, this is a competitive struggle for survival between nations.

Police power is an agency through which a community attempts to direct or compel a recalcitrant minority to move in the direction which the community thinks that minority should take. There is a very clear distinction between war and war-power and policing. In order to carry on war, it is necessary to have tremendous stock piles of money and energy and materials and vast stock piles of ammunition. In order to police the United States of North America, for example, which is a large country, with a considerable population, internal policing involves fantastically small outlays, compared with war spending. I assume that in an orderly world, which had been stable for a century or two, a world government would be able to spend fantastically small sums for policing.

The question is, suppose there is a domestic uprising, or a civil war. What action should the world authority take? Under the present Charter, the United Nations has no authority to intervene in domestic affairs. But in the United States, if an individual violates a law of California, he probably also violates a law of the United States. And, therefore, if you had an

insurrection in California, undoubtedly municipal, state and Federal authorities would all cooperate to deal with such a situation. And I assume that if there were a world authority, and if the insurrection was of large proportions, the world authority would also participate in policing an insurrection or civil war situation.

Q. What agencies of protest against our foreign policy are available to the common citizen?

A. He has his voice; he can speak up, unless he is incapable of speech. You say, "If I speak up, I lose my job." What does that mean? It merely means that speaking up at the present time carries with it a penalty. In various periods of history, speaking up has involved religious persecution and political persecution. Look at what is happening now in the United States. Throughout history, in certain periods, speaking out has involved the paying of a price, a penalty. The present Prime Minister of India spent nine of his first forty years in the penitentiary. About half of his adult life until he was forty was spent in jail. That is the price he had to pay for speaking up.

Q. How can we stop the colossus of American militarism from its Chinese advance?

A. You can't stop a military apparatus when it once gets underway until a point is reached when masses of people refuse to march. If you have studied the history of recent developments in the world, you will note that the war went on in Russia through 1914 and 1915 and on through 1916 and into 1917. In the beginning of 1917 the Tzar's soldiers refused to march. In China the civil war began in 1911. It continued until 1948. In 1948 Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist soldiers refused to march. In the 1917 episode the refusal to march led into the Russian Revolution. The 1948 episode led into the foundation of the Chinese People's Republic. I cite you this time table: World War I, - Revolution in Russia; World War II, - revolution in East Europe and Asia; World War III, - if attempted - revolution in North America.

Q. In your opinion, is Communist China a threat to the rest of Asia?

A. Communist China is the hope for the rest of Asia. Remember your history. Beginning 400 years ago, the West began to invade Asia, and until 1900 or thereabouts Asians continued to be kicked around by Westerners. I do not mean figuratively kicked around; I mean physically kicked around and beaten to death with impunity, by Westerners. The natives of Asia were dirt under the feet of the Western imperialists and exploiters. This knowledge has bitten very deep in Asia. And the Asian people have made up their minds that they will not put up with it any longer. You can call this decision communism, or you can call it colonial revolt, but if you take the map of Asia in 1940, and the map of Asia in 1955, you will notice that in those 15 years the West has been driven out of almost every part of Asia except a few footholds on the periphery of the continent and a number of island fortresses. The hope of Asia lies in the conference proposed for April, 1955: thirty Asian-African nations, getting together and preparing to assert their right to independence and self-determination. The State Department is fighting that conference with every means at its disposal. The Asians are pushing that conference.

From the standpoint of the United States Government, from the standpoint of western exploiters, the turn-over of China in 1949 is the decisive fact of recent history. With that turn-over in China, Asia becomes independent territory, and in the forefront of the Asian independent movement stands the Chinese People's Republic.

Q. Do you think that the Soviet Union can influence Europe not to follow the United States into the attack on China?

A. In the spring and summer of 1954, when Mr. Dulles was determined that the United States should enter the Indo-China war, Britain and France both refused to go along, and the refusal led to the complete diplomatic isolation of the United States. In the summer of 1954 when Mr. Dulles left Geneva in a huff, the United States was diplomatically isolated. At that time, in that crisis, Admiral Radford and Mr. Dulles talked with Anthony Eden in Paris on a Saturday. On Sunday a full meeting of the British Cabinet was held. The Cabinet at that time decided to break with the United States, if necessary, in order to prevent a war in far Asia. This decision might have taught the United States a lesson, but apparently failed to do so. The United States is now moving into a similar situation.

The first question is whether Britain, France, and other allies will follow the United States into another war that will involve China and perhaps other important areas of Asia. I think the answer for Japan will be no; the answer for Germany is no; the answer for France is the answer of impotence; and I think very probably the answer for Britain, in a crisis, will be no. If, however, any allies of the Government of the United States follow the United States into a war in Asia, the next question is: what will happen to the United States and its allies? It is a very interesting question, because about thirty-three years ago the Japanese, whose empire lay along the Asian mainland, decided to invade China, to absorb China, to take advantage of its great natural resources and manpower. In 1932 the Japanese invaded northern China. In 1937 this invasion reached full-scale. In 1948 Jack Belden wrote a book called CHINA SHAKES THE WORLD. In that book he tells what happened to the Japanese in the North China plain. They occupied the cities, and controlled the railroads and highways. By day they were masters of the country as far as they could shoot. At night, they withdrew into their fortified positions, and the armed Chinese peasants took over. The Japanese were right on the spot, a few miles off the coast of China. United States is 4,000 miles away. The Japanese spent from 1932 to 1945, and the Chinese proved more than a match for them. If the United States tries a similar adventure, they will be able to destroy Chinese cities (the Japanese did that), but before the Pentagon launches an attack of that kind, they ought to study carefully Japan's experience between 1932 and 1945. We should also remember that since 1945 China is united as it has not been for over a hundred years, and that since 1945, the Chinese have had a chance to test themselves out in Korea and elsewhere in combat with the West. If I were a military man, which I am not, and if I were asked by Washington authorities to give my advice, which I have not been, I would say to the President and the leaders in the Pentagon: "Boys, watch your step."

Q. Are not your proposals such as "propaganda for brotherly love" unrealistic as long as the vested interests control the means of communication? Do you expect the vested interests to give up their foreign interests?

A. No, any more than we persuaded the brewing interests in the United States in 1917 to give up the manufacture of malt liquors or alcoholic beverages. An amendment was adopted prohibiting alcoholic beverages. The brewing and distilling interests were expected and directed to obey the law. When we adopt the kind of legislation or build the kind of society that I described tonight, there won't be any vested interests, and therefore, they will not be able to put in a protest and to defy the general welfare of the people.