'Murder' Becomes 'Casualty' In War

SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Dec. 8—What is human "progress"? We have heard many definitions, ranging from technical development to economic affluence. Some even question whether the word "progress" has any objective and permanent meaning.

Perhaps the best definition I have ever heard comes from Margaret Mead, the world-famous anthropologist. After studying primitive tribes, and many different cultures, for more than 40 years, she said this:

"There is progress when the group in which the fact of killing a man is considered murder grows larger."

In earliest days, it was not considered murder to kill a man outside one's immediate family. Then it became murder to kill a man only within one's clan. Then the concept spread to the tribe, the town, the medieval duchy, and now the modern nation-state.

The ultimate goal of "progress," by this standard, is for the human community to recognize it as murder when we kill anyone belonging to the human race.

"If we look back at the factors which made us first human beings and then civilized beings," Dr. Mead says, "the most striking of all is man's capacity to recognize as members of his own group an ever-growing number of individuals separated by ever-increasing distances from his clan, his tribe, his nation, his religion, his hemisphere,"

This has been a steady trend in the history of humanity. Almost all primitive societies are characterized by exclusiveness—the clan across the river, the tribe across the woods, are "strangers," "aliens," to be feared, despised, and conquered.

We still find remnants of this feeling in backwards areas of the United States, where someone from the next town or county is considered a "foreigner," neither to be trusted nor dealt with as benevolently as one would deal with one's immediate neighbors.

But the slow and irresistible movement of human history goes against this primitive tendency. Century after century, we are involved in larger areas of loyalty; it must not be forgotten that the "patriotism" of the modern nation-state is a relatively new phenomenon, only a few hundred years old. Before then, only regionalism commanded our loyalty.

"Now, nuclear weapons," Dr. Mead goes on to say in a statement to the French magazine Realities, "have placed us before an ultimate problem: We can no longer fight a war with the enemy. In order to protect 'our' children, we must protect 'his' children, too."

We have not yet risen to this recognition. It is still "murder" if we kill a fellow-American, but only a 'casualty' if we kill a fellow human in warfare. We can only hope that our area of loyalty spreads faster than our capacity to kill each other off; if not, "progress" will indeed be robbed of all meaning.

The Challenge Of Responsible Citizenship

(Excerpts from a speech delivered before the Jacksonville Bar Association by Dr. Robert H. Spiro, President of Jacksonville University and Honorary President of the American Freedom Association, 21 October 1965)

"Today the movement for the full recognition of the rights of man, and his self-determination, is spreading rapidly from the western world throughout all the nations. Since 1945, when there were 68 sovereign nations in the world, the number has grown to 126. And in the last two generations, Fascism, Nazism, and Communism have reared their ugly heads, and have become serious twentieth century threats to the full realization of the rule of law and the rights of man. Such phrases as "people's democracy" is the most enticing modern political term, and represents the valid goal of contemporary society.

"The kind of freedom I am talking about is not to be found behind the Iron Curtain. A recent cartoon shows a smiling Mao Tse Tung telling an African leader: "Of course there is no discrimination in China. Here we enslave everybody." This indeed is the situation in China, as well as in Cuba, eastern Europe, and in all Communist countries. Recently a visiting Russian diplomat asked a Swiss official, "What is your position in the government?" The Swiss replied, "I am the Minister of the Navy." To this the Russian laughed uproariously. "The Minister of the Navy, ho! ho! Switzerland has no Navy but has a Minister of the Navy!"

"That's not nearly so funny," the Swiss replied cooly, "as Russia's having a Minister of Justice!"

"Permit my momentary digression into a related area of great interest today. You have seen pictures and read of draft card burnings by several students, and of several "teach-ins" and student demonstrations in violent opposition to our declared national policies in Viet Nam and the Dominican Republic.

"First, I doubt if one per cent of the five and one-half million students and faculty members is involved in these protests. Please do not judge students and faculties and their views, by the actions of a very small minority.

"Second, I wish that the minority would spend their energies, if they must demonstrate, in demonstrating against Communist Viet Cong and North Viet Nam aggressions, against Communist involvement in the Dominican Republic, against Castro's treasonable betrayal of the revolution in Cuba, and against Communism and fascism throughout the world.

"And third, I wish to state that as an American, a Naval Reserve Officer, an historian, and educator, I personally support wholeheartedly a strong national posture against Communist aggression anywhere in the world.

"Now, let me extend the thought about the rule of law one step further. Last year in Athens, Greece, there was a conclave of lawyers who spent several days talking about the rule of law among nations. And only last month in the Nation's Capital some of the most distinguished judges and lawyers in the free world met for one week under the leadership of Charles S. Rhyne, a former president of the American

(Continued On Page 6)

American Freedom Association Reprint

Saturday Review

Editor: NORMAN COUSINS
Publisher: J. R. COMINSKY
Associate Editors: HARRISON SMITH, IRVING KOLODIN, HORACE SUTTON

Associate Publisher W. D. PATTERSON
Managing Editor RICHARD L. TOBIN
Science Editor JOHN LEAR
Poetry Editor JOHN CIARDI
Education Editor PAUL WOODRING
Production Manager PEARL S. SULLIVAN
Book Review Editor ROCHELLE GIRSON
General Editor HALLOWELL BOWSER
Feature Editor JAMES F. FIXX
Editors-at-Large CLEVELAND AMORY, HARRISON BROWN, JOHN MASON BROWN, FRANK G. JENNINGS, JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH, T. S. MATTHEWS, WALTER MILLIS, ELMO ROPER, JOHN STEINBECK
Contributing Editors HOLLIS ALPERT, ALICE DALGLIESH, HENRY HEWES, GRANVILLE HICKS, ARTHUR KNIGHT, KATHARINE KUH, MARTIN LEVIN, ROBERT LEWIS SHAYON, MARGARET R. WEISS, JOHN T. WINTERICH

The Second Dublin Declaration

EDITOR'S NOTE: Twenty years ago Owen J Roberts, Supreme Court Justice of the United States, and Grenville Clark, lawyer and private American citzen who has been one of the most influential and constructive voices in the nation for more than a half-century, called together a group of forty-eight prominent Americans. The purpose was to think through the implications of the atomic explosion that had just ended the war against Japan. The meeting took place in Dublin, New Hampshire, and lasted five days. The statement produced by that group anticipated—far better than any official forecast of analysis—the main course of events during the next two decades. It called for the rapid development of the United Nations into a world federation with limited but adequate powers to enact and enforce world law.

Recently, Grenville Clark called a second conference in Dublin, New Hampshire, to consider the first Dublin Declaration in the light of events since that time. The conferees included sixteen of the original group. In addition, thirty-nine other Americans participated, among them Kingman Brewster, Jr., President of Yale University; Thomas H. Mahony and Edward Mahony, Boston lawyers; John S. Dickey, President of Dartmouth College; Erwin N. Griswold, Dean of Harvard Law School; John K. Jessup, chief editorial writer for *Life* magazine; Gerard Piel, publisher of the *Scientific American*; the Honorable Stanley A. Weigel, judge of the United States District Court; Dr. Paul Dudley White, Boston physician; the Reverend Dr. Donald S. Harrington of The Community Church of New York; A. J. G. Priest, Professor of Law, University of Virginia Law School; C. Maxwell Stanley, Engineer and President of the United World Federalists; and James P. Warburg, author.

The text of the Second Dublin Declaration follows:

THE RIGHTS of man and the conditions of life itself on this planet are imperiled by lawlessness among the nations. World anarchy is manifested by the growing frequency of international crises as well as by the number of nations with the capacity to build arsenals of nuclear weapons. One serious adverse effect of that anarchy has been an increasing acceptance of violence and, thereby, a cheapening of the worth of human life.

Protection of the safety and dignity of human beings is generally acknowledged as the highest obligation of governments. The growing inability of nation-states to provide this protection, particularly in the face of the nuclear threat, emphasizes the need to replace world anarchy with enforceable world law.

The highest sovereignty on earth resides with the peoples who inhabit the planet. National sovereignty is justified only as it safeguards this basic sovereignty of the peoples themselves. Since, in a nuclear age, national sovereignty alone cannot serve its highest obligation, it must be buttressed by an international authority.

Even if there were no threat of nuclear destruction hovering over the future of the human race, the increasing complexity of international life, the general welfare of mankind, and the requirements of orderly growth impose on the nations and on their leaders an imperative to establish world peace and order under an adequate authority.

We therefore affirm the imperative need for a world federation equipped with the powers necessary to enforce world law against international violence and the threat of it. We call upon all heads of governments to move swiftly and persistently for the creation of a world authority capable of maintaining world peace through world law. We call upon people everywhere to recognize the indispensable link between peace, justice, and meaningful survival on the one hand, and the existence of the instrumentalities of world law on the other. And we call upon them, as well, to make known, by every means at their command, their insistence that world peace through enforceable world law shall become the first business of their governments.

The Reasons: Peace means more than the temporary absence of major war in an armed world. Genuine peace requires enforceable law, order, and justice. In short, peace requires government. In its absence, law, order, and justice cannot exist.

The world must be made safe for the diversities of mankind – diversities of race, nationality, religion, forms of government, economic systems, and social values. The positive worth of these diversities cannot be preserved without enforceable world law.

History demonstrates the necessity for enforceable law as the prerequisite of order within community, province, state, and nation. Experience, reason, and common sense compel the conclusion that such law is also the prerequisite for genuine peace on the world level.

Yet it is precisely at the world level that enforceable law is nonexistent. The absence of any system of effective world law precluding international violence makes arms races and recurrent wars inevitable. Failure to correct this basic defect in the organization of human society has now become a threat to civilization itself.

Developments since the Second World War confirm and emphasize the growing need for an effective world federal authority.

Nuclear problems have been compounded by the beginnings of man's conquest of space. Effective world law is requisite (a) to keep space from becoming a jungle of nuclear weaponry, (b) to head off danger of war from rival nationalist claims to uses of space and planets in it, and (c) to guarantee that