

α. 1948

PEACE, NOT AT THE PRICE OF REGIMENTATION.

One of the most hopeful signs of the day is the growing number of thoughtful men and women who have aligned themselves against the use of war as an instrument of racial, ~~and~~ class or national expression. As Schmalhausen has said: "War is insanity: men must first be made insane to find war normal".\* It is so utterly irrational; with its savag<sup>ry</sup> and futility it so profoundly shocks the judgment of an age that is rational in the practical sense; and further with the <sup>so</sup> real threat of disaster to our whole civilization which is contained in the habit of thinking in military terms in a day when man has at his disposal forces of almost unlimited destructive potency; it necessarily follows that there is hardly any concern before man greater than that of the ~~rad~~<sup>er</sup>adication of war or conflict in the military sense. The real issue against war is not that it entails loss of life and property, and accordingly the contention of the proponents of preparedness that their policy would save the most life and treasure, even if true, fails utterly to meet the demands of the philosophic pacificists. From the standpoint of the latter the real question is, before all else, ethical and spiritual. Thus the evil does not lie in being killed - for death is inevitable in any case ultimately - but in the <sup>act</sup> ~~act~~ of killing and the emotional state which military men have found necessary to induce in <sup>soldiers</sup> ~~man~~ before they can be ~~aroused~~ aroused to the will to kill. The worst phase of the recent war was the systematic cultivation both in the civil and military portions of the population of hatred of the enemy. Right in this lies the indefensible and unpardonable crime of war and the fundamental immorality of the military mind in so far as it includes hate-culture as a

\* "The Thinker" Feb. 1931 p 28

deliberately employed instrument of war. <sup>P</sup> The recognizedly greatest scientific figure of the day, who is probably also the most trenchant intellectual force in the western world, i.e., Albert Einstein, has said: "I would teach peace rather than war. I would inculcate love rather than hate". In these brief and simple words he has, with the power of real genius, formulated the issue between the philosophic pacifists and those who are military-minded in any sense. For ~~there~~ <sup>there</sup> simply can be no war of violence without hatred and accordingly the culture of real love destroys war. Preparedness must inevitably make for war since it implies the thinking in terms wholly incompatible with love-culture. No lover <sup>ever</sup> carries a revolver to guard himself from his beloved, for the revolver-carrying attitude of mind of necessity destroys the lover-beloved relationship. <sup>P</sup> The position of Einstein is in fundamental agreement with that of Mahatma Gandhi. The religio-political Saint of India has built his program under a philosophy which he has called "Satyagraha". This Sanskrit term ~~means~~ <sup>means</sup> literally "truth-holding" and is employed <sup>o</sup> by Gandhi in the sense of "Truth-Force", "Soul-Force" or "Love-Force". The principle involved is that ~~sheer~~ <sup>sheer</sup> Truth or Love is a potency under which men can act with power without any use of violence whatsoever. Under the guidance of this dominating principle India has already demonstrated more unity and practical power than ever before in the history of European contact with ~~India~~ <sup>her</sup>. Gandhi has proven in the practical sense ~~already~~ that revolutionary conflict can be maintained aggressively without the use of violence <sup>or the culture of hatred</sup> with respect to the opposition. On this basis any nation or any revolting class can immediately abandon all instruments of war in the military or violent sense and yet remain <sup>an</sup> extremely potent force.

under the banner of Truth or Love-Force. Now a very significant ~~fact~~ point is found in the fact that both Einstein and Gandhi recognize the importance of conflict. They simply shift the plane of conflict from one that is essentially destructive to one that is fundamentally constructive. <sup>Further, he</sup> ~~Einstein~~ proclaims a doctrine of "militant <sup>pacifism</sup> ~~passivism~~" in which men subject to "war-duty" would refuse military service even at the cost of liberty or life. There is plenty of conflict in this and abundant opportunity for the development of the finest kind of moral courage. Militant <sup>pacifists</sup> ~~passivists~~ thus are real soldiers, in the highest sense of the world, who willingly face hardship and loss of life in a cause that is entirely noble and constructive. Gandhi uses the instruments of non-co-operation and civil-disobedience which involve suffering and loss of life for his soldiers and thus also call for the best of manly courage. But in as much as he requires of his soldiers that they not only shall not hate those opposed to them but even must actively love them, the outcome of the conflict is a real advance for both parties and thus is evolutionary instead of devolutionary.

The culture of hatred is the worst phase of war and is sufficient to make indefensible any conflict for any purpose whatsoever that employs hate-force as an instrument of power. There is no possible gain from a war using this force that can offset the losses. But its being grounded in hate-culture is not the only basis for the moral condemnation of war and of thinking <sup>\*\*</sup> in military terms for the attaining of security. <sup>\*\*</sup> (The real issue here is much more against the military mind and the habit of thinking in military terms ~~even~~ especially during periods of technical peace, than it is against the state of actual ~~war~~ physical war. So long as the habit persists of

Thus Einstein says: "Men should continue to fight - Their weapons should be of the spirit, not ~~adrenaline~~ tanks" \*

\* Interview by George Sylvester Viereck

thinking in terms of military preparedness with respect to other nations, in the real sense, a state of war exists.) The second fundamental evil of military-mindedness lies in the principle of regimentation. It is the very essence of military training that all <sup>soldiers</sup> ~~men~~ shall be forced into the same mold. In the sense of external conformation this is done violently through the instrument of discipline. But by suggestion and other psychological methods military trainers are highly successful in producing like-mindedness in fundamental respects. During the actual state of physical warfare this process is extended to include the civil population as well. Thus men are punished for true statements that are counter to the artificial propaganda of the authorities, and they may be rewarded for false statements or interpretations provided <sup>these</sup> ~~they~~ tend in the direction of the given propaganda. The military mind thus stands radically opposed to the principle of "Truth-Force".

Now regimentation or standardization of culture, while typical of military consciousness, is not confined to the military field. It is a tremendous force today, more nearly world-wide than ever before in known history, ~~and especially is it active in America.~~ Accordingly the evil of regimentation is not confined to the military idea but <sup>is also present</sup> ~~is current~~ in the mechanized processes of current civil life. It follows, therefore, that at this point the philosophic <sup>pacifists</sup> ~~passivists~~ take issue with a <sup>larger</sup> ~~wider~~ group than that of those who are military-minded in the strict sense. But it is probable that this distinction applies only in the strict sense for it may very well be possible to show that the essence of military-mindedness <sup>is present</sup> ~~is present~~ in civil mechanization and standardization. If so, a mechanized culture would form armies with the greatest speed and ease. Perhaps herein lies the secret of the ability ~~of~~

the United States <sup>had</sup> to <sup>could be</sup> surprise Europe with the quickness with which a large and competent army <sup>was</sup> formed, during the <sup>recent</sup> great war.

We are well aware how standardization during war-time was inimical to truth and also to love, since hatred for the enemy was part of the standardized form. Less obviously, yet, I think, just as truly, civil mechanization and standardization are forces acting against Truth and Love. For the nature of both of these qualities is that of freedom. Thus Love ever has broken through standardized moral systems, provided it was strong enough. If it was not strong enough it was suppressed or crushed and hence standardized morals, as opposed to reflective morality, tends towards coldness and barrenness. Truth, also, has never been more than partly contained in any form that finite man has been able to evolve. A standardized form may initially contain a high degree of truth, and indeed it must do so if it is to have a <sup>great</sup> ~~high~~ degree of potency; but with an evolving consciousness the time must come when the initial form is more distinguished by incarnating error than truth. Thus, if the Newtonian form of mechanics were a formally entrenched standard today, in spite of the fact that it represented a tremendous expression of truth in the seventeenth century, it would now be a force acting against truth as developed in modern physics and astronomy. By following this line of reflection I think a strong case can be established for showing that standardization of culture tends in the same direction as military-mindedness in being destructive to both Love and Truth.

An important fact supporting the foregoing thesis is found in the attitude of all geniuses and spiritually-minded men toward standardization. The characteristic of genius is that it speaks

out from the very presence of Spirit itself. Thus, though genius is the great creator of forms, yet it will not conform to any externally imposed restriction, unless at the same time the latter fits <sup>its</sup> ~~the~~ inner demands ~~of the genius~~. The result is that the more standardization is extended the more the resistance genius must confront and break through in order to manifest. Where the vitality of the genius is not strong enough to face the power of the standardized resistance, mankind is simply impoverished to that extent. For in the Occident, at any rate, the masses are dependent upon genius for fresh contact with the spiritual fountain-head of Truth.

The modern cult of Behaviourism, one of the important phases of standardization - is simply the outgrowth of the "animal ideal", as Keyserling <sup>\*</sup> has so well shown. If this cult became universally triumphant it would simply result in reducing man to an intellectual animal divorced from his spiritual nature. And since no living thing can remain stationary and must either grow toward the spiritual pole or towards matter, the intellectual animal would tend to become progressively less intellectual and more animal. This would simply mean that Truth, which flows from out the spontaniety of Spirit, would be cut off from man forever. Now Behaviourism is precisely the principle that underlies military training since ~~likewise~~ for the military mind the soldier is only an intellectual animal to be controlled physically and psychologically by rigid habit-forming discipline, externally and forcefully imposed. It follows that philosophic ~~passivism~~ <sup>pacifism</sup> is also aligned against the thesis of Behaviourism, for precisely the same reason it opposes military <sup>d</sup> ~~mindness~~.

The two best <sup>modern</sup> examples of philosophic <sup>pacifism</sup> ~~passivism~~ are the two men already noted, i.e., Albert Einstein and Mahatma Gandhi. Both men <sup>\* See chapter on "The Animal Ideal" in "America Set Free"</sup>

alike emphasize<sup>a</sup> the superiority of a minority or even a single individual aligned with Truth as against standardized masses. Thus we have Einstein saying: "Every great cause is embraced first by an aggressive<sup>s</sup> minority".\* And in answer to the point that America is founded on the principle of majority rule he returns with the words: "Who was it that said one man and God make a majority? Is it not better for a man to die for a cause in which he believes, such as peace, than to suffer for a cause in which he does not believe, such as war?" Likewise Gandhi has maintained the right of a single individual to practice civil-disobedience provided he is acting for Justice and Truth as it seems to him, and is able to maintain an attitude of love for those who stand ~~exposed~~<sup>against</sup> to him. No position could be more diametrically opposed to standardization than this.

In the article "World Citizenship and Peace"\*<sup>\*</sup>, A.E. Wiggam has formulated a basis of world peace which is just the reverse of the standpoint<sup>d</sup> that I have called Philosophic ~~Passivism~~<sup>pacifism</sup> in that his foundation stone is the cultivation of "international like-mindedness through the instrumentalities of common education". The program proposed would require the youth of all lands to pass through "similar<sup>d</sup> educative experiences" and, specifically, Wiggam suggests a<sup>d</sup> ~~an~~<sup>similar</sup> interpretation of history in the main agreed upon by scholars of international repute and holding international confidence". Further, he suggests "a common interpretation of the great philosophic, economic and political ideas that have animated the trends of history". What is this, if not standardization with a vengeance<sup>a</sup>? In fact, it is just the kind of peace that the typical military mind seeks and, therefore, from the standpoint of philosophic ~~passivism~~<sup>pacifism</sup>, ethically equivalent to a

\* *ibid.*

\*\* "The Thinker" Feb. 1931

state of war. For conquering ~~nations~~ <sup>em</sup> imperial nations, ~~and~~ military dictators strive ~~to~~ <sup>t</sup> realize just the objective that Wiggam has formulated. The difference is, that, whereas the military leaders include <sup>physical</sup> violence as an instrument to effect cultural regimentation, Wiggam proposes to employ ~~the~~ simply psychological violence in the form of an arbitrary educative propaganda. From a spiritual point of view both methods have the same significance in that they inhibit spontaneity and originality. In the fundamental ethical sense psychological violence is not superior to physical violence. Hence if the price of technical peace is cultural regimentation, we might just as well have war.

There is absolutely nothing more valuable than the principle of spontaneity, since only through this gate are wider realizations of truth attained. As is well known, our modern science had to break through the throttling regimentation of the educational system prescribed by the Church. Jesus and Gautama had to ~~break~~ <sup>overcome</sup> through similar constrictions. In fact, every valuable idea comes as an essentially rebellious <sup>re</sup> force, in its earliest expression. All such birthings are of the Spirit and thus are inseparable from spontaneity. In such outbursts from the "within" conflict is inevitable and should therefore be recognized as essential to the harmony of the universe. Hence the recognition of the necessity of conflict is fundamental to philosophic <sup>pacifism,</sup> ~~passivism~~. In its more primitive stages, when war was dominantly personal conflict without military regimentation it unquestionably served as a freeing and therefore evolutionary force. But today conflict must be raised to a higher cultural level for the simple reason that the dominating field of action has been raised to <sup>that of</sup> the intellect. Once this stage is reached the effect of war is destructive in the absolute sense and hence must be completely

outlawed both as an instrument of national will-expression and of revolutionary programs, or the inevitable result will be cultural and spiritual degeneration. Let us therefore destroy war, not through the military method of regimentation, but by outlawing it from the standpoint of spiritual authority. On this basis every individual can produce the outlawry for himself and does not need to wait for the agreement of masses. Every individual who is convinced of the soundness of philosophic <sup>pacifism</sup> ~~passivism~~ can make his declaration of independence from military-mindedness and all forms of violence regardless of whether he stands alone or in the company of others. He must be prepared to face the price of suffering, for no great idea has ever been born save through suffering, but if he is willing to do so he can at once free himself from all authority of war-mindedness and make clearer the way for others to follow in his footsteps. For remember, "every great cause is embraced first by an aggressive minority", and that minority often, at first, consists of but one.

Franklin Merrell-Wolff.