

growing number of young men have concluded. There are those who submit to induction in the armed forces, but then carry on anti-war activity of various sorts within the military establishment. One may have criticisms or questions, as I do, about this approach, but I think it cannot be denied that it may be an expression of a truly conscientious objection to a war and a means of resisting it.

If there were enough young men who could not stomach participation in the war in Vietnam and who perhaps in a number of cases had been brought to the stand of conscientious objection to any war, then the government would be unable to pursue the war. This would be so because if so many men of draft age took this position there would be wide support for them among other elements of the population. The government would be in the position of the French regime some years ago when it *had* to terminate the Algerian War.

Dr. Norman K. Gottwald, distinguished member of the Faculty of Andover-Newton Theological Seminary, posed the question which is suggested by this analysis. In *The New York Times* of August 26, he wrote: "In the weighing of American honor in Vietnam, account must be taken of the dishonor which the escalated war is heaping up: breaches of international law going back to 1954; failure to submit the dispute formally to the U.N. for action; backing up a series of undemocratic puppet regimes; prosecution of a brutal and politically inept war which alienates more Vietnamese than it kills or defends." He concludes with a statement that will undoubtedly shock some but which certainly cannot be dismissed offhand: "By the usual tests of honor it is no longer clear that the United States deserves to win or to achieve a stalemate." In other words it may be that the United States "deserves" defeat. I take it that Dr. Gottwald probably does not regard this as automatically

or simplistically equivalent to plumping for a military victory of the other side.

What seems to me clearly implied is that the United States should call a halt—unilaterally if you please—to its military activities in Vietnam as the course which is required by its sense of "honor" as well as, presumably, other considerations. The United States should order its troops to cease fire and should take immediate steps to have them withdrawn. I am aware that these things take time, but a decision has to be made. The United States is now making daily decisions to escalate the war and to pursue it until a military victory or at least a stalemate is gained. I am proposing a decision to cease fire, to withdraw the United States military presence—and then to proceed from there.

Withdrawal has world-wide implications. It is followed logically by the proposal that the United States disarm unilaterally. Let me be more specific. I am not here advocating that all or even most Americans should become pacifists in the sense in which that term is usually used in the United States. What I propose is, briefly, that the United States abdicate the role of a big (nuclear) armed power and divest itself of the armament which enables it to wage war (as it is doing in Vietnam) and to threaten other peoples (as President Kennedy threatened the Soviet Union at the time of the Cuban crisis). So far as the present argument goes I am not objecting to the United States' disarming *only* to the extent that Ireland, Denmark, Norway, or Sweden, for example, have done; but I am insisting that it should disarm *at least* to that extent and, of course, with the understanding that it would not be in any military alliance with other big powers, as are some of the countries named. None of the Scandinavian countries is a major power. They are nevertheless cultured, highly respected peoples and perhaps more