SPEECH MATERIAL - PEACE

used March 27, 1955 1 Keyser Church

Prepared by: Library of Congress

CHURCH OF BRETHREN

PROSPECTS FOR WORLD PEACE AS SEEN FROM THE NATION'S CAPITAL

I have been asked to speak today on the prospects for world peace as seen from the nation's capital. It is a pleasure to discuss this subject with a group which is so sincerely dedicated to building a true and lasting peace. Since 1719, when the first members of the Church of the Brethren came to America under the leadership of Peter Becker, the Brethren have exerted an unswerving influence in the direction of international peace. In the uncertain postwar years, your church's relief and international exchange projects have been significant and tangible contributions to this nation's efforts to prevent war. Moreover, your steadfast devotion to the ideals of brotherhood, equality, and the Christian life, assure that you will continue to share in the ceaseless endeavor to strengthen American democracy and world peace.

The establishment of a durable peace is also a primary interest of mine. One of my first acts in this session of Congress was to introduce a bill (H.R. 196) to establish a Department of Peace. I have supported this proposal for several years in the belief that our government's capability for promoting peace would be considerably reinforced by an executive department devoted solely to this cause. The Peace Department could form a core for developing international understanding on the widespread scale which is essential for a tranquil world.

Accordingly, I feel that the subject before us today, the prospects for world peace as seen from the nation's capital, is one of mutual interest. However, I must admit that the outlook from Washington on the prospects of peace is little clearer than it is from anywhere else in the country. Recent events, such as the change of leadership in Moscow and the increased tension in the Formosa Straits, have considerably clouded the view from there as well as here.

The year 1955 began with the prospects for peace appearing comparatively favorable. There were no active battlefields. Although the hazardous areas were many, nowhere was there any actual war.

Since the beginning of the year, however, the situation in the Formosa Straits has become acute. After his most recent journey to the Far East, Secretary of State Dulles said that he had returned with "a certain sense of foreboding." He based his apprehension on the impression that the Chinese Communists still have aggressive designs on Southeast Asia and Formosa and "do not intend to stop until it is apparent that they are stopped by superior resistance."

The United States has decided that it is necessary for its own security to help defend these areas against attack. We have treaties with many of the countries in the Far East and Southeast Asia, by which this country is committed to "act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes." In the case of the Formosa area, which appears to be in the most immediate danger, Congress has authorized the President to use American armed forces if necessary to protect

Formosa and related positions. If the Chinese Communists should attack Formosa or, under some conditions, Chinese coastal islands like Quemoy and the Matsus, they would knowingly begin a war which, I am sure, is no more desired by the people of China than it is by us. The prospects for world peace at this moment appear to hinge largely on whether the Communists will make such an attack and deliberately start war. United States foreign policy in recent weeks has been devoted to preventing such an attack. I hope that the Communist leaders of China will not plunge us into a struggle that can only mean bloodshed and suffering.

I think it would be a mistake to assess the prospects for peace only on the basis of individual problems which arise in various parts of the world. They are too easily magnified, thus warping the entire world-wide picture. There are good reasons to be hopeful. Ironically, many believe that the terrible potentialities of the atomic and hydrogen bombs are the chief cause for hope just as they are the chief cause for fear. The horrors of conventional warfare have not persuaded nations to renounce the use of war as an instrument of national policy. Nevertheless, it is held, the terrifying threat of atomic and hydrogen destruction will certainly convince all mankind that nothing can be gained by war. This view is advanced by Sir Winston Churchill, who in 1953 said about the nuclear weapons:

> . . .I have sometimes the odd thought that the annihilating character of these agencies may bring an utterly unforeseeable security to mankind. . . when the advance of destructive weapons enables everyone to kill everybody else nobody will want to kill anyone at all.

It may well be that fear of awful retaliation with hydrogen bombs will forestall from year to year the attack which would ignite a third world war. The possession of huge stockpiles by both the Communist and free worlds might then permanently deter war, as Sir Winston has again suggested more recently.

Be that as it may, a peace based on the maintenance of huge atomic stockpiles could only be a peace in the hollow sense of absence of war. The full blessings of true peace would still be denied to all. Adequate resources still could not be devoted to making the world a better place in which to live, for vast expenditures for armaments would continue to require an unfair share of every nation's wealth. Moreover, as long as the possibility remained that the stockpiles might be employed at any time, few could have inner security. Few could find faith in the future.

We cannot rest content with the negative peace which results from mutual fear of annihilation, although obviously this is preferable to world war. However, we can take advantage of the time offered by such a truce to build a real peace. Fortunately, many aspects of our foreign policy are already dedicated to building a world in which true peace can endure. In an assessment of the prospects for true peace, we must take these aspects of our policy more into account than the day to day efforts to cope with localized or temporary crises in the Far East or Europe, or wherever the spotlight may be at any particular time.

One program dedicated to building a world in which peace can reign securely is Point Four, or the Technical Cooperation Program. Point Four is aimed at the eradication of poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease in the undeveloped areas of the world. These conditions create the unrest and tension which too often lead to totalitarian governments and attempted aggression.

In 1954 the United States was working with 59 countries under the technical cooperation program in an effort to help the people of undeveloped areas help themselves. 1750 technicians were employed in teaching better methods of work, establishing training centers, and in other ways assisting governments in their effort to raise living standards and educate their people. Similar efforts were being made by international agencies such as the United Nations and private groups such as your own Brethren Service Commission. In some cases the immediate results have been dramatic. The most important effects, however, will not be visible for many years. Nevertheless, a beginning has been made toward bringing about the material conditions which are necessary for maintaining a true peace.

Similarly, in recent years we have increased our efforts to promote international understanding and mutual respect. One of the most effective methods of doing this is through the exchange of persons. By sending Americans abroad, and bringing foreign nationals to this country, the exchange program helps us to understand other

countries just as it helps other people to understand America. In 1954 the State Department reported that in the past year the International Educational Exchange Program had arranged for 7,121 exchanges with more than 70 countries. Many other exchanges were arranged by other agencies and private groups, again including the Brethren Service Commission. While all this is just a beginning, compared to the need for international understanding, nonetheless it offers some encouragement that with time the governments of various nations will work together for the betterment of all mankind and the ideal of brotherhood will become a reality.

I think one of the most heartening international developments this month was the news that a group of eleven Soviet students and youth newspaper editors are going to visit the United States, probably in the middle of April. Moreover, the Soviet Union has asked the United States to exchange visits of agricultural delegations, This request was in answer to the proposal of the Des Moines Register that Russia send some of their farmers to see how Iowa farmers raise their tall corn. While we cannot expect in a brief period to convert such visitors to our way of life, these visits will provide an opportunity, long forbidden by the Soviet Union, to give them an accurate picture of American democracy. They will promote understanding between the American and the Russian people.

Finally, I think the chances for peace in the future are strengthened by the continued existence of the United Nations. The ten-year-old international organization is by no means strong enough to guarantee

that there will be no wars. Nevertheless, it does provide a meeting place for the Communist and free nations. Problems can be discussed, and world public opinion can be brought to bear on the issues separating them. Emphasis and encouragement are given to attempts to settle disputes by pacific means rather than by resort to force.

In addition, the United Nations and its related agencies are also striving to create the conditions of well-being which peace requires. Technical assistance programs, international exchange projects, scientific research, and many other devices are being employed by the United Nations to promote the welfare of the people of the world.

We cannot ignore the fact that as long as there are situations inherently creating tension, the peace we have is precarious. As long as Communist doctrine preaches the aim of establishing a world of Soviet Socialist states, we in the democracies cannot feel secure. As long as traditionally unified peoples, such as the Germans and Koreans, are divided into areas one free, one Communist, the possibility remains that there will be attempts of reunification by force.

Nevertheless, we cannot allow ourselves to be blinded by pessimism, as are those who urge preventive war. If we look at the favorable aspects of world developments, we will find the rays of hope necessary to guide us through these perilous times. As long as we are not discouraged in our quest for lasting peace, the chance for peace exists.