FORWARD

In 1961, Richard H. Rovere, in what is surely one of the most charitable criticisms ever made of unilateral nuclear disarmament, dealt it what appeared a devastating and final blow. In an essay, *On Political Sophistication*, he said it in this succinct fashion:

The sophisticate, when he deals with political ideas, must do more than take moral soundings and measure the currents of power. There are ideas that positively coze goodness and are altogether within the realm of the possible, yet are unacceptable on the grounds that their consequences would be awful.

Unilateral nuclear disarmament, as a case in point, is surely an attainable goal. It has attracted some highly practical and sophisticated politicians in England, and the anxieties that have bred the clamor for it there are bound to mount on this side of the Atlantic. Its appeal is to the very best instincts. There are arguments in its favor plausible enough to commend themselves to Bertrand Russell, surely one of the most sophisticated men of our century. Its fatal programmatic weakness, which one supposes would have been spotted by a younger Lord Russell, is that it ignores the basic facts of power. Nations of either malign or benign intent use superior power for whatever leverage they can gain with it. The Soviet Union does it; we do it, when we can.

If Nation A were to disarm totally in advance of Nation B, Nation B's power would be augmented by a factor of infinity. To expect restraint and forbearance on the part of Nation B would be to expect what all human experience tells us we have no right to expect. In considering such a proposition as unilateral nuclear disarmament, the Westerner with a ripened political mind would ask himself whether, if the shoe were on the other foot and it were the Soviets who proposed to divest themselves of power, the West would seek no gain whatever from the absolute superiority it would thereby be accorded. Gullibility may be an amiable failing in some departments of
life. The sucker may be afflicted by nothing but an excess of faith, hope, and charity, and surely there are worse things than that. Political gullibility has political consequences, which can be disastrous.

But is the case really as pat as that? Perhaps so, if simply unilateral nuclear disarmament is the proposal that would presume the continued presence of so-called "conventional" weaponry, and therefore a continued reliance on another, relatively obsolescent form of violence. In a clash between two such unequal forms of violence, obviously the nuclear weapons would be almost "absolutely superior."

But what of the case for unilateral disarmament of all weapons, nuclear and conventional? In this event, a nation would disarm not just for moral reasons, but also because it had discovered and developed an alternative way of defending itself from violent attack.

Surely Richard Rovere would give the same reply. This would be gullibility writ large. For it would be patently clear to him that this would produce consequences most awful.

An examination of his argument shows that he accepts the widely held view that violence is power, and power is violence, the view that underlying all human society is the rock foundation that power is the ability to inflict greater harm, the most pain, and to kill the greatest number. He shares this view with Lincoln, Hitler, Churchill, Stalin, Genghis Khan, Lenin, Roosevelt, Niebuhr, and probably a vast majority of people on earth. But there are dissenters, and there is another case.

The dissenters include, of course, those we often call the great teachers and philosophers, the wise men: Buddha, Lao-Tse, Christ and St. Francis among them. We call them wise, but we ignore their counsel. They "ooze" goodness, but the consequences of following their advice would be "awful."

But the dissenters also include Gandhi, Martin Luther King, A. J. Muste, Tolstoy, Jane Addams, William Penn, Danilo Dolci, and not a few others whose practical experiences challenge, in some part, Richard Rovere's ideas of what constitutes real power, and whether a giving up of violence is necessarily followed by disaster. William Penn, for example, headed a government which had no army. The Indians, who were scourging other American colonies at the time, did not overrun and destroy the Quaker colonies. One asks why.
Gadhdhi, both a great teacher of mankind and, according to Rovere, a practical and sophisticated politician, organized a whole nation of unarmed people against an armed and already occupying Great Power. Was it simply British benevolence that helped Gandhi win the day?

THE POWERFUL ARE SOMETIMES POWERLESS

There is yet another level of dissent from the view that power is violence. Throughout the world since the end of World War II, former colonial peoples have been wrestling national independence from former colonialists on all sides. Before World War I, and for the most part until World War II, colonial powers had ruled over vast areas of the world and over a majority of the people of the world. They had done this through what seemed to them to be a clear superiority in the organization of violence.

Clive had brought whole princely realms under the control of the East India Company with a mere handful of soldiers armed with superior guns and Western know-how. Power, indeed, seemed to be simply a matter of military supremacy.

But today the world's foremost powers are frequently helpless and seemingly powerless before infinitesimal handfuls of formerly exploited peoples. Vide the U.S. in its relationships with Cuba and Vietnam, the U.S.S.R. with Finland, Yugoslavia, Albania, or in the Congo in 1961.

What the leaders in the United States and the Soviet Union are finding out is that power takes a number of forms, and that violence is only one form of power. Power does not mean primarily to be able to kill, maim and inflict injury. It means to be able to act, to accomplish one's purposes.

Gandhi achieved his purposes to a remarkable degree. So have Danilo Dolci in Italy, and so did Martin Luther King. None of them succeeded without casualties or suffering; none of them succeeded quickly; but they were clearly wielders of great power.

Richard Rovere, in the same essay, says that political sophistication does not, of itself, insure success. But, he says: "In general, though, the memorable figures are the astute reckoners of the possibilities, and the most memorable are those who have made the boldest reckonings and been proved right--those, that is to say, who have seen
and sought the outermost limits of the realm of the possible." They have, in short, had great purposes, and they have accomplished them. That is the reality of power.

THE ERRORS OF CONVENTIONAL WISDOM

It will be argued in what follows, and from several perspectives, that the conventional view about power in this world is mistaken. It makes broad assertions, usually unaccompanied by convincing evidence, which seem to hold up from a common sense point of view. But these, like a number of matters of common sense, fail to hold up when critically examined.

The "basic facts of power," Richard Rovere and others tell us, are that power is superior violence, that if we--or any other--should voluntarily relinquish it, "all human experience" tells us the remaining wielders of violent power would have achieved an "absolute superiority" and so would work their way with us to the nth degree. He says that we would be likely to do the same if the situations were reversed. All this is assumed to be self-evident.

Yet contemporary experience tells us that superior violence by itself does not necessarily accord to its wielder absolute power. The Chinese Communists, in the theory and practice of guerilla warfare, worked out over thirty years by Mao-Tse Tung, show clear recognition that a great potential for power (accomplishing one's purposes) lies in winning large numbers of people to a vision of society, basing its organization on the lives and characteristics of the country, and raising up the nonmaterial power of resistance, a psychological (even spiritual) phenomenon which, when operative within a group or on a mass scale, has prevented wielders of great violence from accomplishing their purposes. More recently, the North Vietnamese have been instructive in this matter.

Gandhi taught a variation of this concept of resistance to the Indian people. It became, in itself, a form of power. This, joined with the power of nonviolence, economic boycott, and village and national programs of reform, increasingly empowered the Indian people to prevent the British from carrying out their imperial purposes. In this way, they were able to develop their own national purposes.
NONVIOLENCE CAN ACCOMPLISH PURPOSES

We shall argue that not all gullibility is on the side of those who see and practice the power of nonviolence. We shall argue that if one actually examines human experience, one finds there is a great body of evidence to support the view that it does not necessarily follow that if Nation A were to disarm unilaterally, Nation B's power would be augmented by a factor of infinity, or even that Nation B would necessarily want to, or be able to tyrannize and exploit Nation A. Gene Sharp, in his book, The Politics of Nonviolent Action, cites 198 specific methods of nonviolent action. He also cites scores of historical nonviolent actions.

The facts of life today are that many people are blinded by the "self-evident" half-truths of the past, the little examined assumptions about the bases of power, and the continued war-like practices of nations. As a result, they believe that nations are incapable of better insights, better theory, and better practice.

Richard Rovere, elsewhere in his writings, admits that he, like a number of other American intellectuals in the 1930's, succumbed to Stalinism, if only for a relatively short period. This falling away from democratic values, he says, "damaged this country and the idea of a free and open society." He offered a reason why a number of intellectuals succumbed to Communism:

In the thirties, there were at least two totalitarian lures. The one that seemed to pose the greater threat to freedom and decency had no intellectual following at all in this country. On the contrary, American intellectuals, almost to a man, abhorred fascism, and if a number of them lent themselves to a tyranny quite as evil, it was in large measure their loathing of fascism that led them to do so. This did not justify or exonerate them. Many of our sins are functions of our virtues, and often these are the very worst kind. But the fact remains—and the present generation ought to have a clear understanding of it—that it was precisely when Communism appeared to be in militant opposition to totalitarianism that its attracting powers were greatest; and the point at which intellectuals in large numbers abandoned it was as a rule the point at which it became clear to them that Communism was itself totalitarianism.
THE NEW TOTALITARIANISM

The case of the dissenters against the social organization of violence is exactly in harmony with this: Richard Rovere and many other intellectuals, many theologians, most politicians, and most other Americans have again embraced one form of totalitarianism, because they and their society are "in militant opposition" to the Communist form of totalitarianism. The new totalitarianism they embrace is described by Bruno Bettelheim:

For it is totalitarianism when a nation plans for atomic destruction on a grand scale even if that nation is democratic and plans only for defense. This is because such plans fail to set limits within the human scope. To entertain the possibility of risking atomic destruction for millions is to toy with totalitarianism because it implies the right of the state to pursue its goals no matter what.

The difficulty from which Richard Rovere's society suffers is morally on a plane with Stalin's Russia and Hitler's Germany: they accept the evil notion that their ends are so righteous that somehow any means to achieve them are justified. This damages the country and undermines our free and open society. Such gullibility can have disastrous social and political consequences.

Here we have come full circle. The pacifists are wrong, because the consequence of their course would be the loss of all our democratic values and surrender to a tyrant. The non-pacifists are wrong, because the consequence of their course would lead to a giving up of democratic values and end in an embracing of totalitarianism. Heads they win; tails we lose. Perhaps in the long run, only tyranny and physical might will prevail.

THE POWER OF NONVIOLENCE

Rovere says that unilateral disarmament would be fine, except that as a consequence, the side which disarmed would be overwhelmed, since power is simply superior violence.

The nonviolent unilateral disarmer, on the other hand, would have actually "re-armed" first with entirely new weapons: nonviolence socially organized. His position would be that power is not, per se __
violence, because real power is the ability to accomplish one’s purposes, and therefore means and ends must be compatible. Further, he can demonstrate from history that force takes a variety of forms, some of which are compatible with democratic values, others of which are not. Thus he selects those forces which are in themselves democratic and organizes them to resist totalitarianism, that is, to prevent tyranny from accomplishing its purposes.

In short, the nonviolent activist denies that a society armed in nonviolence and strong in democratic practices would necessarily and inevitably be overcome by an armed totalitarian society. Instead, he argues that the responsibility of free people is to apply their resources and intelligence to nonviolent resistance with the same determination and skill with which, in the past, they have supported armed warfare.*

What follows is an effort to demonstrate how a nonviolent defense of a democratic society could be organized and carried out. It will be unlike almost all our usual conceptions of war and the defense of freedom. It is an attempt to think freshly, to break free from conventional wisdom and unexamined assumptions which tie us within the framework of the given. Just as the Founding Fathers of the United States tried to think "as if they were the first men to think," this is an invitation to you to face up to the full implications of the known: "Mankind must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind."

---

*The U.S., its allies, and their adversaries, in thirty years, have failed to achieve disarmament in any form, and attempts at arms control have resulted in a world bloated with arms and violence.
NONVIOLENT ORGANIZATION FOR DEFENSE:

AN ALTERNATIVE TO WAR

An authentic peace movement has emerged in the United States and other parts of the world in the past twenty years. Notwithstanding, its development has been hampered by a weakness in communication. Genuine dialogue and debate on a continuing basis have yet to be established.

Sometimes the dialogue has been muted in the clash of animosity or misunderstanding. Eric Larrabee, writing in the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists" some years ago said:

It is a vice of liberals and pacifists, in particular, to suppose that the military establishment is monolithic, that all departments of it are equally bent on self-destruction, and that the "military mind" in every form is equally impervious to comments from civilians. To suppose that is to cut off most of the fruitful possibilities for communication between those pitifully few individuals, however different their points of view, who are concerned with the same questions. It has been said, not as though they compared in powers, that the pacifists and the Strategic Air Command are probably more aware of one another than of the many groups that occupy the vast ideological wasteland in between them.

Actually the problem is even more acute than Eric Larrabee thought, for the very liberals and pacifists who seem to make up the backbone of the peace movement, find it difficult, if not impossible, to communicate clearly with each other. In their uneasy alliance, the liberals de-emphasize their own continued reliance on the final arbiter of violence, while the pacifists (scenting numbers and "effectiveness") take on, for the most part, the liberal's foreign policy program and de-emphasize the radical aspects of their nonviolent alternative.
Often these allies work together for long periods of time without ever finding out the full range of the views of the other, and without encouraging fruitful internal debate which would help each group to test its assumptions and find areas of agreement.

This is being written by one who shares many of the assumptions and experiences of the "radical pacifists." The social organization of nonviolence is not just a personal way to salvation and individual conscientious objection, but is also a politically relevant and viable method with which men and women can reorganize their societies to end the deadly hypertrophy of organized violence which now threatens all of us.

EFFECTS OF RADICAL ACTION

During the 1950's and 1960's, the radical pacifists performed a useful function, when they helped break the crusts that had been locking-in any debate: the holdover from the period of uniformity and silence characterized by the McCarthy label and the period of righteousness and lack of humility which ended as the American people became aware that the atomic monopoly was broken and that they could no longer play God. At about that point, more Americans wanted to begin talking about peace again.

The pacifists, who had been talking about peace for some time, helped make a kind of break-through with some of their nonviolent direct action demonstrations. The most radical of these actions, both here and abroad, were those in which civil disobedience was practiced. Suddenly there were people listening, supporting, and even joining in. Students began to find themselves and to participate.

But there was a difficulty. Now that a reasonable number of people were listening, or were prepared to listen, the radicals were so busy "acting" that they overlooked the importance of explanations. Internal communication among the pacifists at these periods was so taken up with plans for finding new ways to mount a Polaris submarine, or to otherwise court arrest, that it was sometimes difficult to determine for what reason these people were practicing civil disobedience. Ardent young people who were moved by soaring ideals to join in nonviolent actions, sometimes found they were seriously deficient in an understanding of nonviolence. They had, in good part, overlooked the necessity of learning about the principles, strategy and tactics of the nonviolent method.
UNDERDEVELOPED PACIFIST THEORY

Throughout this period, people tended to ask the wrong questions of pacifists. The whole concept was so foreign to them, that they were unable, for the most part, to ask significant questions. We have not been asked how nonviolent resistance would be applied if a nation, or some nations, should actually decide to give nonviolence a try. The result is that the development of the pacifist's own thought has had more to do with how to resist the warmaking practices of his own society than helping that society to be willing to consider alternatives to war.

Thus pacifists have lagged in trying to develop more clearly their ideas on how nonviolence might be applied as a method of socially organized resistance to an invading force. And resisting an outside force as a member of an organized majority is very different from resisting as a member of a minority inside that society. In the first case, one is a member of a group that has power; in the second, one is a member of a group out of power.

And so in almost any direction that we look, we can see that it is not an easy matter to get people with opposing points of view, preconceptions, misconceptions, and sometimes simply contempt for each other, to find a way to establish a real dialogue. In the same issue of the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists" referred to above, there is a letter of correction from a Harvard professor referring to a previous article in which he had been quoted. In part, he said this:

I did not myself describe the typical disarmament expert as 'a bit of an idealist or a pacifist, etc.' I merely wrote that this is the way he has often looked to the military mind, and that a compelling psychological reason in the past for the failure to recognize proper relations between arms control and military planning has been the vocational suspicion that existed between 'war-makers' and 'war-breakers'. Now a concurrent interest in security and survival has led to somewhat greater rapprochement and mutual respect.

COMMUNITY DIAGGQUE

That such openness is possible all of us know. Some years ago in my own community, my wife and I, with a group of Lockheed scientists and their wives, plus several other professional people, met at intervals
over a period of months to explore together our varying viewpoints about war and peace. Since I was the only pacifist, my views were a focal point of the discussions. Clearly the others were both attracted and repelled by these views, and they were not satisfied with their own largely complacent acceptance of the status quo in relationship to problems of war and peace. In the course of our discussions, after an initial period in which I had to deal with many of their misconceptions, we arrived at a point where we could analyze situations fairly objectively without misconstruing each others' ideas. I remember one woman having exclaimed with great relief, when she suddenly realized that by "nonviolent resistance" I did not mean surrendering meekly to the Communists to live forever in a state of slavery.

There can be little doubt that in our society the pacifist has the psychological advantage of making use of the values to which we all, pacifist and non-pacifist, give lip service. Hence, we arrived at a point in our dialogue wherein there was general recognition by the good that, while most of the men were in some way related to the social organization of violence in highly sophisticated forms, they had no great feeling of confidence that such organized violence would really help them or the kind of democratic society they desired. As a matter of fact, they were "going along" with this kind of social organization, not so much because they believed in it or desired it, but because they were "caught up" in it. As scientists and engineers, it was primarily in the military or militarily-related industries, where they could ply their professions, find adequate laboratories and research grants, not to mention good salaries, prestige, and a sense of loyalty to their country. But they also were there, because they had no other alternative.

Here was a point at which we differed. They were going about their tasks with reluctance and considerable misgiving, because they did not really believe in them. I, on the other hand, supported a minority position and resistance to the general trend of society with good morale, while being true to my best insights. They envied this resolution of internal tensions.

It was with this recognition on their part, that I could say to them: If you recognize that you are going along with a strategy which you do not fully believe in, that you are giving a major portion of your time, your intelligence and training to make it work, then are you willing, for a moment to put your minds to work on an alternative strategy that you also do not fully believe in? Are you willing, as a mental exercise, to try to construct
in your minds how a nation might make the attempt to organize itself and its people nonviolently—including the willingness to "make war without violence"?

I pointed out to them that just as games theorists "play games" about war in the violent sense, they might play games of figuring out strategies for nonviolent resistance.

HELP NEEDED

It is precisely at this point that the pacifists need help. Help, in the form of readiness to consider detailed programs and policies designed for nonviolent society. They need help in the form of intelligent criticism of such proposals by critics who are genuinely considering the proposals, not for the purpose of rejecting them on the basis of prior prejudice, but of testing them constructively, since ours is a world that desperately needs fresh alternatives.

The purpose of this paper is to try to lay out a contemporary nonviolent position that can adequately replace violence as a way to defend and advance our values. This paper is specifically concerned with presenting a concrete case for the application of organized nonviolence to problems of defense. This is a proposal of an alternative method and its organization; it does not presume to be a substitute for intelligent policies, foreign or domestic, and it does not preclude doing many things that are already being done. In the course of this effort, we shall wander over some relatively unplowed ground, and shall sometimes be in need of expert assistance. Thus we need the special training of professionals whose experience and understanding can be applied to nonviolence sometimes in ways they may little suspect. Professional soldiers, for instance, may find that their disciplines and training fit them in special ways for nonviolent resistance; their skills and courage would be required if any nation were to choose this new way to defend itself.

POPULAR MISCONCEPTIONS

Perhaps this is the point to attempt to meet some of the most common misconceptions about nonviolence and pacifist thought. The pacifist is not one who is urging unilateral disarmament upon a people who still rely upon arms psychologically and economically. He is not
urging acquiescence to tyranny in general, or Communism in particular. He would not rather be red than dead. He is not urging disarmament in a vacuum. He is not urging non-resistance, or passive resistance.

What he is urging is an active, open, resistance to tyranny anywhere. He is urging people to organize their societies in such a way as to be able to make use of their best values actively in the effort to resolve conflicts, and to be prepared to make war without violence in the event that less extreme measures fail to accomplish their purposes. In other words, the pacifist is not really of the opinion that war and peace are opposite. Rather, he sees them as alternative methods of tackling the problems with which he and his society are confronted, and by means of which he seeks to solve the problems and resolve the conflicts fruitfully and humanely.

The pacifist does not deny the existence of conflict, hostility, opponents, tyranny, or totalitarianism. On the contrary, he tries to find the most effective means, in keeping with the humanistic and democratic values which our society proclaims, to carry out the necessary struggles. He is seriously concerned with ends and means. He is concerned about them not just in some vague "spiritual" sense that will store up good marks in heaven. Rather, he is concerned about them pragmatically, believing that means and ends are intimately related: that the means determine and become the end—insofar as men ever arrive at an end. Therefore, in the words of Albert Camus, the pacifist "chooses to be neither a victim nor an executioner." As a result, he must search for and find an alternative to the old simplification "Kill or be killed."

It depends, of course, on the kind of society we want, or are seeking to protect. If we want a totalitarian society, then the organization of violence physically, psychologically, and socially is logical and necessary; it is the proper means to that end. But such violent organization used as a means of defending the dignity of the individual, of humane, democratic social forms, involves us in paradox and tragedy, at best, and in the complete frustration of intention, at worst.

But this only carries us back to that old ground of misunderstanding and disagreement. Pacifists and non-pacifists have found this the parting of the way for decades. It is here that the non-pacifists deny the validity of the good intentions of the pacifists—writing them off as impractical, powerless, and therefore, in reality immoral, since they cannot salvage any social good when the chips are down. The tyrant, we are told, will simply chop off all our heads.
As a result of this impasse, I am going to make a plea with the reader at this point to hold this critique in abeyance and to go on "playing the game" for awhile, even though he does not believe in it. I want his attention now regardless of whether or not he agrees.

There are some other assumptions which we must examine before we go on to make our construct of the nonviolent society.

One of these is that throughout this presentation certain concepts will spring into mind, or certain words will evoke certain preconceptions. Thus, in most discussions of war, "force" is used synonymously with "war". ("He abjures the resort to force.") And further, these two words are used interchangeably to mean "violence". ("All they understand is force.")

PACIFIST DEFINITIONS

Now to the pacifist, these words have more precise meanings. He does not equate them. For instance, pacifists reject violence, but not all force. There are different kinds of force, including certain kinds of physical force, which a pacifist would use. There are also physiological and moral forces which coerce, which a pacifist uses. Richard Gregg, author of the pioneering book, The Power of Nonviolence, speaks of "moral jiu jitsu" in clear recognition of different kinds of force available in a non-violent struggle.

There are particular circumstances under which a people relying on nonviolent methods might use physical restraints and confinement. There are even circumstances in which they might make use of non-lethal gases and drugs in carefully-controlled ways to help them maintain their own government and to resist orders and actions of some violently-armed invader. We shall come to these later.

Violence, for the purpose of this discussion, and considered in the context of its social organization and use in war, or to inflict tyranny on an unwilling people, will mean that which does serious injury, physically or psychologically, and which maims or kills. Recognition will be given to the fact that incidental acts of random violence in our society are not what threatens our survival, regrettable as they may be and symptomatic as they may be of the deeper ills of the society and individuals in it. Rather, it is the social organization of violence physically, politically, and psychologically, as in war, cold war, and in totalitarian societies that makes for peril in our time. The close relationship of this organization of violence to the national state and its claims over the lives of people
everywhere will be especially noted.

We shall not be talking about a society of saints in what follows. It is conceivable that a practitioner of nonviolence in a social context might spank his children, and even, under provocation, strike a person and yet fall within the pale. We will be talking not about "absolutists" in some moral sense, but about people who, seeing the danger to all they hold dear as a result of the organization of violence, make the choice of other "weapons." They will be people who do not disarm themselves first, but rather who re-arm themselves with a new kind of weaponry in order to bring under control the violence that threatens us all.

Now it is obvious that non-pacifists do not see nonviolence in this same way. They see "weakness" where the pacifist sees "strength". They think "surrender" when the pacifist thinks "resist". Therefore, it is important that this point for the non-pacifist reader to reserve judgment as to whether or not nonviolence really provides us with a new, different and adequate weaponry, and to consider first why such a revolutionary weaponry—if it existed in any form—could revolutionize the power structure of the world and could bring men everywhere from under the shadow and burden of the mass weapons, which now menace mankind with ultimate destruction.

**ALTERNATIVE VISTAS**

Think what could be done with a new weaponry which:

1) Could enable a society to achieve its purposes, "Power" in the useful sense, not just in the sense of the ability to injure and kill.

2) Could demoralize any enemy forces, in that it would undermine the morale of his armies, tend to win overt and covert supporters from his ranks, and could frustrate the establishment of any real or lasting controls over the country attacked.

3) Could do this without threatening the extinction of mankind or of the nation under attack.

4) Did not inflict casualties or death upon the enemy; did not kill or maim; in short, could meet important criteria of a "just" war.
5) Could make its goal the destruction of the enemy through winning him as a friend, thus achieving a resolution of the conflict which did not carry within it the seeds of future wars. This may sound "idealistic" in the fuzzy sense of that word, but we have actually had a demonstration of it in the resolution of the conflict between the British and the people of India. Gandhi had sought to win the British as friends, knowing that then they would no longer try to enforce their rule over India. And he did just that.

Now the pacifists may be wrong in believing that nonviolence provides such a way to defend and advance their values. But they may be right. If they are right, then our society has at hand an alternative to war and totalitarianism which could liberate us in the following ways:

1) **We could end the arms race.** Since we could depend on an alternative weaponry which doesn't need a gun, much less a bomb, we could proceed to accept disarmament multilaterally with or without controls. We could accept the Russian terms at their face value—not because we trust the Russians, but because we don't need such armament. Obviously, we could unilaterally disarm if we cared to, since our inhibitions about disarming under any circumstances would be eliminated.

2) **Psychologically we would be relieved of many fears, suspicions and tensions that have preyed upon us for years.** These tensions have eroded our freedoms and civil liberties. They have divided men and groups not just philosophically, but emotionally. Our "Radical Right" today, for instance, is less a genuinely conservative group philosophically than it is a paranoid group which wants to resolve the almost (for them) unbearable tensions.

3) **We could be freed to be true to our best insights and values.** Americans have not found it easy to turn to authoritarian practices and methods, but under the pressure of the threat of global nuclear war, with a permanent war economy and the foundations of a garrison state, plus twenty-five years of playing world policeman, culminating in Vietnam, we have developed a cynicism and dishonesty about values that reflects itself at all levels of our personal and national life.

Yet Americans don't take easily to the use of violence and killing. S.L.A. Marshall, the military historian, in his book, *Men Against Fire*, points this out:
(The American soldier) is what his home, his religion, his schooling, and the moral code and ideals of his society have made him. The Army cannot unmake him. It must reckon with the fact that he comes from a civilization in which aggression, connected with the taking of life, is prohibited and unacceptable. The teaching and the ideals of that civilization are against killing, against taking advantage. The fear of aggression has been expressed to him so strongly and absorbed by him so deeply and pervadingly—practically with his mother's milk—that it is part of the normal man's emotional make-up. It stays his trigger finger even though he is hardly conscious that it is a restraint upon him. Because it is an emotional and not an intellectual handicap, it is not removable by intellectual reasoning, such as "Kill or be killed."

...A revealing light is thrown on this subject through the studies by Medical Corps psychiatrists of the combat fatigue cases in the European Theatre. They found that fear of killing, rather than fear of being killed, was the most common cause of battle failure in the individual, and that fear of failure ran a strong second.

If Brigadier General Marshall is right, it seems a reasonable assumption that men who fear to kill more than they fear facing death themselves, would make absolutely the best kind of nonviolent soldiers. Nonviolence and nonviolent resistance fit well with American values and ideals. Witness the strong attraction to young Americans and old of the nonviolent sit-ins and freedom rides of the 1960's. Volunteer recruits to the Black Revolution came to the South from all sections of the country.
BASIC PROPOSITIONS

Since we have covered sufficient ground now to be almost ready to start "playing the game," let us try to envision some of the basic factors and kinds of organization that would be required of any society that chose the alternative of nonviolent social organization as a corrective to the organized violence of war and the totalitarian state.

Among the propositions we shall support are these:

Proposition A. No tyranny, however powerful, can continue to exist, if it cannot command the cooperation (obedience) of the people over whom it seeks to establish its way. The difficulty is that people usually have given obedience out of fear, if not out of agreement, so that the tyranny receives tacit support.

In his book, The Conspirators: a Study of the Coup d'Etat, Major D. J. Goodspeed of the Canadian Army has this to say about the role of people at large:

Although not so essential as the sympathy of the armed forces, public opinion can never safely be disregarded. No government can function long without a certain necessary minimum of popular support and cooperation. By one means or another any regime must compel the citizens to obey its decrees. This support does not have to be enthusiastic. It may be passive--mere acquiescence is enough to maintain a government in power. Himmler knew this very well. "We do not expect to be loved" he was fond of telling his S.S. and Gestapo cohorts. So long as the Nazis were obeyed, they were firmly in control of the state.

To demonstrate one aspect of his observations, Major Goodspeed, draws from one of six historical episodes which he cites as examples of successful and unsuccessful coups. He writes:

The Kapp putsch is the episode where the question of popular support is seen at its clearest. The Freikorps took undisputed possession of Berlin; the Ebert Government fled to Stuttgart; to all intents and purposes the coup seemed to have succeeded. Yet it was broken, very largely because the people would not obey the new government. Too much could be made of this, but even if the
Kappists had suppressed the general strike, they could not have survived long in the atmosphere of hostility with which they were surrounded.

Proposition B. People will tend to accept (go along with) the rule of whatever group is the government of the moment. That is, people who will accept a democratic government and support it, will tend also to accept an authoritarian government and to collaborate with it. For example, in our lifetime we have seen the German people acquiesce in the rule of a traditional and authoritarian emperor, a social-democratic government, Hitler's Naziism, and then after World War II (depending on where they were geographically) in a democratic republic and a Communist dictatorship. The Germans are not alone in these political vagaries; they are simply one dismaying example.

However, this seemingly neutral acquiescence is not uniform in all directions. That is, under most circumstances, but not all, people's sympathy and support tend to go more easily and with more conviction to a government that is, or seems, benevolent. Thus, Major Goodspeed concludes his work with this sentence: "There is some consolation in the reflection that so far no coup d'etat has overthrown a vigilant, practicing democracy." In short, people, for a variety of reasons, cling more tenaciously to a "practicing" democratic government, which is not as susceptible to being overthrown as some other forms of government.

In the effort to defend a society nonviolently, it would not be unimportant that people, simply by inertia, tend to continue to support a government. But where democracy is viable, their support goes beyond simple inertia. It has conviction. Hence, fundamental to the resistance against an aggressor is the maintenance of the government of the democracy.

Proposition C. An effort to conquer a country of the size and dynamics of the United States, with all the attendant problems of distance, numbers of people, types of terrain, and so forth, would be under any circumstances a hazardous and uncertain venture. George Kennan in his book, Russia and the West Under Lenin and Stalin, makes this point:

Many Americans seem unable to recognize the technical difficulties involved in the operation of far-flung lines of power—the difficulty of trying to exert power from any given national center, over areas greatly remote from that center. There are, believe me, limits to the effective radius of political power from any center in the world. It is vitally important to remember this, particularly in the
face of the fears one hears so constantly expressed today that the Russians want universal power and will be likely to take over the world if we fail to do this or that.

There is no magic by which great nations are brought to obey for any length of time the will of people very far away who understand their problems poorly and with whom they feel no intimacy of origin or understanding. This has to be done by bayonets, or it is not done at all...

What I am asserting is that universal world dominion is a technical impossibility, and that the effectiveness of the power radiated from any one national center decreases in proportion to the distance involved, and to the degree of cultural disparity.

Proposition D. Nonviolent resistance is a method which brings into significant play a substantial part of the population that has only a limited and passive role in traditional warfare: women and children. In the hands of determined women, nonviolence is a powerful weapon which can often be used with great psychological jiu jitsu against an army of men! American and Western pacifists in general are just beginning to realize the enlarged role that women can and must play. As Indian history shows, the Gandhian movement for independence was also a great liberating movement for the women of India. They played a much greater and fuller role in that struggle than their sisters in the West have played in international struggles.

Recent events in the United States, Great Britain, and Europe have demonstrated the growing power and effect of greater female participation in nonviolent conflicts. In the past twenty years, women have played a significant role in the leadership and in the ranks of the peace movement. They have been among the activists in marches, demonstrations, and in civil disobedience actions. In the Civil Rights nonviolent movement in the United States, young girls (students) and mature women were in the forefront of those who faced the police dogs, the fire hoses, and the crowded jails. In Birmingham, during the spring and summer of 1963, young children as young as eight and ten years of age participated and were jailed. It was that struggle which first jarred the American conscience and released the forces which have been called the Black Revolution. All of this was prelude to the present feminist movement which is the liveliest and most widespread movement for social change in the United States today.
Proposition E. Planning, organization and training should begin well before any emergency is actually upon us, and the traditional departments of government, including the military, would have important roles to play in the new nonviolent organization. Much study and research should go into the practical problem of what ideal resistance to tyranny would be: total disobedience, mated with fundamental friendliness and human solidarity. This would mean to so organize that all parts of the economy, the moving equipment of the country, the administrative paraphernalia, everything, could be brought to a standstill if and when desired by the resisting people and government.

Here some of the classical characteristics of the general strike need careful examination and analysis. In this case one of the distinct features of the "strike" would be the fact that the strike would be against an invader, an intruder, and that it would be supported, encouraged, aided and abetted by the government. But, even so, its limitations would have to be recognized.

Proposition F. Physical provision would have to be made in advance for the maintenance of the government no matter how extreme the situation should become. All degrees of possibilities should be foreseen. In many circumstances, the government could continue to operate almost entirely above ground and without major hindrance. But there is the strong likelihood that a determined and totalitarian opponent would seek to crush it, in which case an elaborate underground mechanism would have to be called into play. This resistance movement would differ from most of those in the past in that it would be planned in advance. It would have leadership. And it would have a way of replacing lost leaders. Finally, it would include for all practical purposes everybody in the country.

One of the characteristics, and difficulties, of the resistance movements in Europe during World War II was that they were small, fragmented, and sometimes there were several resistance groups struggling against each other as well as against the Nazis. One of the significant strengths of the ad hoc resistance in Norway and Denmark is precisely that major parts of the two populations could be relied upon and remained loyal to their governments. In Denmark the government continued to operate throughout the way, and it provided a real buffer between the Nazis and the people.

Proposition G. Contrary to popular opinion, nonviolence does not preclude the use of certain kinds of physical force and, in extreme
situations, the capture, detention and psychological coercion of certain key opponents: collaborators, quislings, certain soldiers of the invaders, and so forth.

It is conceivable that certain types of "weapons" might be legitimately used by a nonviolent army. Thus, certain non-harmful gases and chemicals might be used by nonviolent defenders or police to accomplish certain limited objectives when contingents of the invading force were proceeding violently to carry out orders—e.g., for example, forcing laborers to work in munitions plants, threatening to carry out mass movements of the population as punishment, imprisoning leaders or holding hostages.

Proposition II. Fundamental to successful nonviolent resistance would be the requirement of advanced planning for all eventualities—even the most bizarre. An occupying force should be constantly appealed to, harangued, propagandized, questioned as to motives, and made aware that it does not control the country. The nonviolent resistance forces would attempt to separate the individual soldiers and agents of the invader from their leaders. This effort would seek to subvert the enemy soldier and administrator, to undermine his belief in, or the carrying out of, his authoritarian task.

The defenders would seek to lower enemy morale and to attract him into sympathy, understanding and cooperation with a democratic people. Methods would also have to be arranged in advance to provide for maintenance of communication with the rest of the peoples of the world, including the people of the invading country. This would require the maintenance of much paraphernalia for taping, broadcasting, filming, radio and television transmission, telephone communication, and so forth. Every square mile of the occupied country should hold something to help the inhabitants in their struggle against the invaders.

Proposition I. The bona fides of the claim of the invaded country to be an exemplar of freedom, justice, and a healthy social system would have to be established as much in advance as possible. It is not easy to defend a bad cause with a nonviolent method. A social system that exploits and violates human dignity and personality does not lend itself to the organization of nonviolence. If, therefore, the self-proclaimed democracy is more form than reality, the capacity for true nonviolence would be extremely limited, and there would be little likelihood that a vital resistance could be sustained. On the other hand, if the social system is essentially democratic, if the government and the people are striving to practice their best insights and understandings, then any attempt at aggression or invasion would be
weakened. This would be true in the case of the Communist powers, since they would have difficulty maintaining the morale of their troops, who are indoctrinated to believe that the good life consists in harnessing the material things and sharing them widely with ordinary workers especially partaking of the benefits.

Since a nonviolently organized society would be able to turn almost its full time, wealth, and skills to working for a better world and a better society, and since, in America, this would free over fifty percent of the annual budget that now goes for military preparation, this nation practicing nonviolence could set a standard that would constitute a great challenge to Communism and every other system. A real Peace Race would be on. In a world that has become as one, but refuses to recognize it, this kind of social organization could liberate Humankind from the fears and tyrannies in which it wraps itself in the effort to preserve war as an institution.

Proposition J. In nonviolent war, the civil resisters would have to appeal consistently to the best traditions and aspirations of the system they are struggling against. The resisters would challenge the oppressors to exemplify their own best understandings of freedom, justice and social good. This appeal and challenge is a means of communication and dialogue, and a channel of conversion.

David Cort, in an article entitled "The Voices of Birmingham" (The Nation, July 27, 1963), describes the power generated by the nonviolent struggle in that city, led by Martin Luther King, Ralph Abernathy and others. He succinctly summarizes its challenge:

The Negro revolution, as heard from Birmingham, is in the most sacred American terms, of the Declaration and the Constitution and the Bible. The opposition almost inevitably must talk treason and sacrilege, and so it does. This alignment of the forces is primarily the achievement of Martin Luther King. On these terms, the Negro cause cannot possibly lose.

What needs to be added is that the communication and dialogue that arises from this challenge can only result in winning over a certain portion of the white citizenry to the values they proclaim but have not practiced. The often quoted speech of Charles Morgan, a young Birmingham attorney, who spoke up the day after the church bombing that killed four young girls, reflects a break in the monolith of white intransigence and apathy. He summarizes:
And who is really guilty? Each of us. Each citizen who has not consciously attempted to bring about peaceful compliance with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, each citizen who has ever said "they ought to kill that nigger," every citizen who votes for the candidate with the bloody flag; every citizen and every school board member and school teacher and principal and businessman and judge and lawyer who has corrupted the minds of our youth; every person in this community who has in any way contributed during the past several years to the popularity of hatred, is at least as guilty, or more so, than the demented fool who threw the bomb.

Mr. Morgan could no longer usefully serve the cause of exploitation and segregation. He had deserted to the camp of Martin Luther King.

Proposition K. Nonviolence requires training and understanding. It would be necessary for a nation that had determined on a nonviolent course to school itself in as complete an understanding of nonviolence as possible. This proposition, while well down the list here, is probably the foundation stone of them all. Without this, there would be nothing.

Seeking such understanding would not mean that every individual in the society would become personally a pacifist. But it would require an active leadership that was for the most part, philosophically convinced. With the development of a deeper appreciation of the relationship between means and ends; with a convinced and trained leadership, with social organization based on nonviolence and a high valuation of every human life, with one's status in one's own group linked with the ability to demonstrate courage through nonviolence, ordinary men, not always capable of nonviolent behavior through inner resources alone, can perform prodigies in a social situation that regards and encourages nonviolent behavior.

Note the similarity between the two possibilities: on the one hand, young men with an aversion to killing so great that they cannot pull the trigger, nevertheless make up part of an offensive armed force through training and by becoming a member of a group (comradeship). On the other hand, in India the Sikhs, traditionally a warrior caste, who are required to carry a sword as the symbol of their function in life, and who presumably would have far fewer cultural and emotional resistances to using violence, nevertheless were successfully integrated into the Gandhian movement and were often among those in the forefront of Indian demonstrations. Similarly, the Pathans, the
famous Moslem warriors of the Indian frontier, were among those transformed into nonviolent resisters.

Proposition L. Fundamental to the organization of nonviolence is a good understanding of the values popularly associated with nonviolence: love, forgiveness, compassion and truth, and of those other human emotions which play so powerful a role in our lives: hostility, fear, suspicion and revenge. Here we must have something to say about the conventional, and in part, superficial application of Western values, the Judeo-Christian tradition.

Advocates of nonviolence have tended to emphasize the positive values of love, kindness and compassion so that their critics thought them to be oblivious to or naive about the darker, underside of human nature. Indeed, the charge could be sustained in many instances, for some peace advocates have indulged in an uncritical sentimentalism, emitting an aura of "do-good" superficiality. The viewpoint that simple goodwill can see us through no matter what, that "love is enough," and that concrete situations and complex problems will melt before pietistic positive thinking, is still not eradicated from the peace ranks, nor from our society in general.

Our society suffers from a superficial understanding and application of our traditional morality. Love is popularized, for the most part, in a shallow, romantic sense. In our homes, schools and communities, we teach our children a distorted version of the traditional Judeo-Christian ethic: "one must love, not hate. It is wrong to feel hostility. One must love one's neighbors, one's mother and father, one's God, even one's enemies."

Thus, little Johnny is admonished by his all-powerful parent for having hit Jimmy on the head, when Jimmy kicked him in the shins. This was "wrong," Mother says. Jimmy is Johnny's friend; Johnny must not injury or dislike Jimmy.

Repression of Hostility

If we apply this moral lesson in most aspects of the child's life, we see the following consequences: the most powerful (authoritarian) figures in his life--God, Father, Mother--indoctrinate Johnny with the dogma that love is the chief value and force in human affairs. To hate is wrong, bad, and to be condemned. Inevitably Johnny tends to repress his feelings of hostility. He cannot easily give them recognition, since
all his chief authorities are agreed that one should not even recognize hostility, that it is an emotion a human being should not have. Johnny may wonder what is wrong within himself when he harbors such an inhuman feeling. He grows up with feelings of guilt and a tendency toward repressing hostility.

But there are a few areas where his society (the authority) overtly or covertly makes an exception. One must love everybody: God, Father, Mother, brothers, neighbors, the state, even enemies, though difficult. But one is not required to love the subhumans: the "vicious criminals" who "must pay this penalty to society" when "society" decides to kill them.

One is not required to love all enemies, and in time of war society takes down the barrier that requires non-injury and non-killing and says "hate, kill, and be rewarded; be a hero."

Men who have repressed hostility most of their lives can now give vent to their internal rage. Wartime gives recognition to the hatred we have not been allowed to recognize or express before.

A society that would organize for nonviolence would have to develop a more profound understanding of the dynamics of a system of morality and the complexities of the human personality.

Properly understood, no sound ethical system allows repression of hostility. No sound ethical system rests on a simple authoritarian foundation. Men should not be good, should not love one another simply because some supreme authority requires it and will punish them if they do not. Men must love one another because they are part of one another, bound together, sharing the same planet, the same life, and the same hazards. Love, understood in unsentimental terms, is a powerful force and can be harsh in its requirements.

THE REQUIREMENTS OF HOSTILITY

Men are also creatures who feel hate and hostility, a powerful force with its requirements. Hostility is real. It cannot be denied, ignored, or successfully repressed. It can be harnessed, understood, guided and controlled. Thus it can be directed into creative, humane, and even useful channels. But this can be done only if we know it is there, admit it, and struggle with it.
Traditional morality systems actually give this recognition. Christianity, for instance, teaches that men should hate the sin, but not the sinner, the wrong, but not the wrongdoer. This is a creative channeling of hostility. It does not lead to murder, but to right action, understanding, service to others. It seeks to eliminate the wrong insofar as it is susceptible to social remedy or individual therapy. It leads to the organization of social controls and public order.

Hostility can also be properly channelled and controlled through recognition that leads to broadened insight. Thus hostility that arises between two different and parochial cultures can be abated when members of each culture are led to broaden their understanding. There can be a reconciliation of men without reconciliation of the differing ideas and practices.

Humor is another useful and creative channel for hostility. It is a way of letting off steam between friends and friendly rivals. Humor which teaches us to laugh at our own shortcomings and eccentricities helps bring us into a more rational and objective view of ourselves and our problems.

A nonviolent society would encourage recognition and admission of the universal emotions of anger, suspicion and fear. Through this recognition, we could develop a more rational attempt to bring these powerful emotions under useful control and guidance—to organize them with rather than against the positive emotions of love, forgiveness and compassion.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PLANNING

Of the twelve propositions listed above, the one concerned with advance planning, organization and training is the most important and least considered. Pacifists, who have spent most of their time thinking about the moral aspects of nonviolence, have neglected the development of the political, the strategical and the tactical. They have been asked the wrong questions for so long, that they have become adept at "the right answers to the wrong questions." Just as the non-pacifist moralists struggle with the problem of how to make a "just war" under contemporary circumstances of total war and mass-killing weapons, without any comparable effort or thought given to a search for an alternative, so very few pacifists have concerned themselves with the problem of whether wars can be fought without violence. No one has concerned himself with thinking through systematically, and with the help of technically trained experts, how a nonviolent army could be organized.
Few people who know something of the history of nonviolent movements will deny that some kind of power is at work in them. Because of the present limitations of those experiments, simply assumed that their power is inherently inferior to that of a violent organization. But violent organizations today, are, in terms of the organization of violence per se, infinitely superior to those of old. Through the systematic application of scientific knowledge and technical developments, tremendous power to inflict harm has been developed. Almost any contemporary army equipped with today’s weapons could inflict defeat on any army of the past. The modern totalitarian society which organizes violence physically, psychologically, politically and socially terrorizes its citizenry more effectively than the less efficient brutalized societies of the past.

Some of the Indian followers of Gandhi have claimed that one satyagrahi (practitioner of nonviolent "soul force") acting purely and from truth is sufficient to overcome a great evil. Certainly few can gainsay the tremendous psychological power Gandhi himself exerted over India’s masses. In the bloody days of the communal riots that immediately followed Indian independence with its division of British India into the new states of India and Pakistan, Lord Mountbatten, Viceroy of India, stated: "In Calcutta I have four regiments and chaos; in Delhi I have Gandhi and peace."

The present writer holds to the view that nonviolence in a political sense and in a strategical sense becomes more persuasive and more powerful as it gains in numbers and in imaginative organization. We are always tempted, as heritors of an ethic of purity, to opt for personal purity and a withdrawal from politics, rather than an ethic of responsibility with its attendant risks of "impurity," since it means the plunge into group activity with its shadings of compromise and approximation.

Of course, the social and political organization of nonviolence will risk actions that are not perfect, that will achieve asymmetrical results. Harm will be done to some as a consequence. But the point here is that the intentional choice of the nonviolent course will undercut the major dilemma we now face, which is that violence now has reached the point of threatening the final breakdown of our societies and the potential destruction of major parts of the world. A nonviolent
society being able to act unilaterally, not dependent on what "they" do, could bring the whole conflict back to a human dimension. The wellbeing of the whole world would no longer be in jeopardy, and the basic problem of sheer survival would be solved. The continuing conflict could be lifted to a higher level, potentially to a creative level. The weight of Doomsday would be lifted.

Returning to the proposition that planning, training and organization are of basic importance, the argument here is that the power of nonviolence can be enhanced beyond anything we have ever known, if we will consciously turn our best intelligence, resources, men and moral insights to its proper organization.

Mulford Sibley, political scientist at the University of Minnesota and compiler of the anthology, *The Quiet Battle*, a syllabus of nonviolent organization, has held that the American people could, through conscious nonviolent organization, break away from their schizoid attitudes of the present, and become again whole people, able to act on their best insights and beliefs. Dr. Jerome Frank, psychiatrist from Johns Hopkins, has been studying the problem of whether men are by nature capable of creating and adapting themselves to a fully nonviolent life. As a result he now supports the view that nonviolently-organized societies are not only desirable but are also much more likely to help men out of the present impasse.

The effort of this writer will be to illustrate, in as concrete a fashion as possible, specific forms of organization and action which would allow a nonviolent society to cope successfully with a totalitarian society, and specifically an invasion by a totalitarian society.

This brings us to the consideration of what a nonviolent nation would do to resist the aggressive invasion of a totalitarian opponent. While the present writer does not believe that the response of the Communist world to nonviolent unilateral American disarmament would be that of military aggression or invasion, he is aware that for most Americans such Communist "take-over" and aggression is a central worry and concern. Therefore, accepting this concern at face value, the following is an attempt to describe how such an attack could be met and turned back with democratic, just and nonviolent methods.

In describing this conflict between violence and nonviolence, the reader will discover the kinds of advance preparations necessary
for defenders to be able to nonviolently resist.

The reader is invited to "play this game" along with the writer. Undoubtedly many whose backgrounds and training include a wider knowledge of scientific, technological, military and strategical matters will be able to elaborate and extend the techniques and methods described here. It is precisely at this point that nonviolent strategists need understanding and help from others with a fresh and original approach to the problems.
THE U.S. CHOSES A NEW COURSE

On February 19, 1990, President A. J. Rustjack announced to the world's press that the United States, after months of planning and preparation, had arrived at the moment to reverse its program of armament and that it was beginning immediately to disarm all of its armed forces and to replace the traditional military with a non-violent force appropriate to a modern society dedicated to the peace and democratic well-being of all peoples.

The President, in a proclamation that shook the world's chancelleries, invited and urged all other peoples and nations to join with the United States in such disarmament, and in the re-organization of the U.N. to make it into an effective agency to handle world problems and to resolve international conflicts without violence.

President Rustjack invited observers from all the world's governments to come to the United States to witness the step-by-step dismantling of the multi-billion dollar military establishment. He also invited them to oversee the same process as the United States, over the next three years, withdrew from all of its worldwide military bases.

Allied governments had already been fully informed of this U.S. move. Two years earlier, at the time of the election of President Rustjack and his new Party for Peace, American officials had forewarned their allies of the intention and urged them to prepare themselves for the same new kind of "armament" and reliance on nonviolence.

Few of the world's diplomats and statesmen had recognized the significance or power of this new force in American politics. They certainly had never taken seriously the new Party's platform based on a commitment to freedom and nonviolence. They had, of course, viewed with trepidation the course of internal events in the United States ever since the Second Cuban Crisis. That plus the Reactor Disaster on Long Island, New York, had thrown American politics into acute, even fundamental, crisis. It had split political forces as never before in American experience.

The tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy in November of 1963, partaking as it did of the most cruel violence and fanatical hatred, had started some soul-searching by an increasing
number of Americans. The insidious, poisoning effects of hate, un-
reasoning prejudice and cruel violence were seen to be interrelated.
The months before President Kennedy's murder had foretold this
same lesson: four young Black girls died in a church bombing in
Birmingham; a young man was shot and killed in Birmingham the
same day by a white youth shooting at random the first Black person
he saw; Medgar Evers was murdered in the front of his home in
Mississippi by a hidden sniper.

THE PEACE AND CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENTS COALESCE

In contrast, the humane behavior of Martin Luther King and others
who advocated and practiced nonviolence increasingly attracted those who
cherished democratic values and the worth of every human being. They
saw that the time had come when men must consciously choose which
course to take. The peace movement and the civil rights movement be-
gan to coalesce.

Later the revelation of a United States plan to destroy the Island
of Cuba with nuclear arms revolted the entire world. When members of
the American press discovered and reported that a nuclear attack was
to be carried out after the Cuban government had acceded to every
American demand, and when the attack plan was shown to be the child
of the Pentagon and White House "hawks" bent on finishing off Cuba
once and for all, even a significant wing of the conservative right was
struck with remorse and awe at the enormity of the crime of its poli-
tical and military leaders.

All the world was shown how irrationality and elements of change
would combine to precipitate genocidal acts on a scale never before visu-
alized by man. "Experts," generals, scientists, presidents had assured
the world and their respective nations for years that these weapons could
be controlled rationally, that the world was being spared from war only
because of the "balance of terror." Now the American people realized
that their own government leaders were the terrorists, the executioners.
Americans drew back in horror from the philosophy of the Cold War Liber-
als and the Red Hot Rightists. The American peace movement found
suddenly a mass audience ready to listen and to act.

Both within and outside of the United States a demand grew for
the resignation and trial of those responsible for what now appeared as
a crime against humanity. By August, the President announced his with-
drawal from the election campaign, and the Democratic Party, faced with
finding a new candidate, was split from coast-to-coast on the issue of foreign and military policy.

It was at this juncture that the peace movement found its first real political effectiveness. At the same moment within the peace movement, the position of the pacifists made great gains, for it was they who had long called for a rejection of all reliance on terror and violence. And it was they who now offered an alternative.

RUSTJACK EMERGES POLITICALLY

Into this national political vacuum stepped a remarkable man, A. J. Rustjack, with a program and with organizing ability seldom evidenced in minority politics. The time and the mood were ripe for his program. Running on a third party ticket in November, 1964, Rustjack and his vice-presidential candidate, George Pickslers, polled over fifteen million votes, throwing the election into the lap of the Republicans and their candidate, Richard Rockefeller.

Rockefeller's program was unlike his predecessor's only in that it was even more aggressively based on a reliance on violence and the threat of terror. Early in his term of office, he tried to push through a national compulsory civil defense and fallout shelter law such as Nelson Rockefeller had espoused in New York State.

Using the evidence from the American threat against Cuba, the peace candidates and the peace movement not only turned back President Rockefeller's proposals, but they built the solid base for the new Peace Party with a radical program based on some fundamentally new approaches in American foreign and domestic policy. They were especially effective in winning the support of the whole civil rights movement, in which American pacifists had long been leaders, plus a considerable number of the independent liberals who for years had tried to go along with the Democratic Party. But that party was now a shambles--utterly discredited through the act of barbarity planned under its Presidential aegis.

NUCLEAR CALAMITY

It was the following year when the great Nuclear Reactor tragedy occurred on Long Island, New York. Some years prior, the Atomic Energy Commission had approved the location of a new linear reactor that was to carry on research in the fusion process. For a
long time, experts had denied that any real danger existed from reactor accidents, although the world had already had the illustration in England in 1958, at Alderston.

During the night of January 27th, a terrible explosion had ripped the quiet air of Long Island, and within seconds radioactive debris was blown miles into the air and out over thousands of square miles adjacent. Even today the exact extent of the damage in lives lost is not known. The Government clamped down a complete wartime security quiet and would only admit that the extent of the damage was tragic and of great proportion. Unofficial estimates put the dead from 75,000 to 100,000, while those injured by the radioactivity were said to have exceeded 400,000. These are believed to have been conservative estimates.

The political consequences for President Rockefeller and his Republican Administration were greater than the damage done earlier to the Democrats. In the chaotic months which followed, the Peace Party, under the leadership of A. J. Rustjack, made monumental gains.

The corresponding prestige of politicians and Government scientists declined almost to zero. The public seemed to have lost all trust and regard for military scientists and technicians, who were increasingly viewed as carriers of some dread malady and as incorrigible liars.

Thus the Presidential Election of 1988 amounted to an almost revolutionary repudiation by the American people of the leadership and leadership groups that they had followed so readily and confidently since the end of World War II. The United States swept into offices high and low a whole new party and leadership group dedicated to radically new and different ideas and programs.

THE IMPACT OF THE NEW POLICY

Under the impact of the new nonviolent policies of the United States, accompanied by its military disarmament, Britain and Canada were irresistibly drawn to the same action. The peace forces in those countries were already well organized so that public opinion rapidly approved the new course. Norway and Denmark seemed well on the way to adoption of the same policy. While harboring misgivings of being overwhelmed by sheer size and numbers, both of these governments and their people had already shown in World War II a high degree of ability to resist nonviolently. Now they would have to organize intentionally for that course.
In the United Nations pandemonium was rife just beneath the surface of diplomatic decorum. The new countries of Africa and Asia at first welcomed the unilateral decision of the United States, as it made a move which could only be described as miraculous. Many suspected a trick, others, a failure of nerve.

Yet with the relief that came as the Cold War seemed to have its last teeth pulled, there came a sudden chill: the Soviet Union and China had not disarmed! Many unaligned countries, which had feared and suspected the bad motives of the United States as the most powerful military nation in the world, now began to wonder what would happen to them if the military withdrawal of the United States created a vast vacuum in major parts of the world...or so it seemed at first.

Meanwhile, on the domestic front, what of the tremendous economic wrench that would occur throughout America as a result of disarmament? Would there not be widespread unemployment? What would happen to major segments of industry?

The Administration pointed out that certain economic changeovers had been underway for months, but in addition, as a result of long evaluation and planning, economists, industrialists and labor groups had accepted a simple proposal: for the present all persons working in remaining defense industries, or carrying out defense contracts, would continue to receive full payment but would be put temporarily on vacation or assigned to specific planning or "transition" groups.

Their first job would be that of dismantling specifically military installations, weapons, and so forth. Actually, others had already begun the work of re-organizing and planning for the transition to a nonviolent army, specifically trained to deal with a variety of conflict situations.

EDUCATION IN NONVIOLENCE

In the United States, as a result of months of nationwide discussion and decision, both before and after the election of President Rustjack, a process of re-education for the people as a whole was well underway. There were, of course, minority voices and groups which remained angrily skeptical of the new course, but major segments of the population, and major institutions, were now joining readily, and with increasing enthusiasm, in support of the change.
With the stoppage of military armament, tremendous savings in raw materials and resources were effected. There was a growing realization on the part of the people of just how unproductive for human welfare had been the tremendous expenditure on mass weapons.

Throughout the country scientists and engineers were suddenly freed to start applying their ingenuity and talent to the human problems of how to improve life and social organization for people, rather than how to make new weapons that could more effectively wreak mass murder. A great burden was lifted, and a new elan was observable, as a whole nation prepared for a new life and felt an identity with all other peoples.

Poets and writers were transported. The alienation that their writing often expressed was released in a new emotion of optimism and empathy. Remaining cynics shook their heads and congratulated themselves that they had avoided the intoxication of the naive idealism now rampant, and which they felt was only the prelude to some major disaster.

The sheer propaganda effect of the U.S. decision was amazing and tremendous in its power.

APPEAL TO THE WORLD'S PEOPLES

The American people, through their government, invited the rest of mankind to join them in a genuine Peace Race, to learn the arts of peacemaking, problem-solving and of nonviolence together. They offered to help others to help themselves through aid programs without any military strings, without any paternalistic charity, but with guarantees that the programs would be operative only if the economic benefits extended to the lowest levels of the society. The recipients of aid could attain it on any of several terms of their own choice: outright grants for specific projects or loans at whatever interest terms the recipients felt were fair. American industry also offered private capital for investment in those countries that welcomed such investment. The one condition was that no military aid or armaments would be provided.

In turn, the U.S. Government invited widespread visits and cultural exchange programs with all countries of the world and with special grants in aid for students in order to increase the greatest possible contact between people. The purpose was, in part, to help others see for themselves the kind of civilization that could be developed when the economic burden of armaments and psychological burden of
suspicion and fear were lifted from modern society.

The United States announced to the United Nations that it was ready to join with all other governments to create organizational and legal machinery which would transform the United Nations into a federal world government with a nonviolent police force to enforce the laws against individuals.

The leaders of the Soviet Union were nonplussed. Nothing in Communist theory could support, or even hint at, such action by an imperialist state. They feared trickery. They alerted their armed forces. But domestically they also had a problem.

**IMPACT ON RUSSIANS**

The news of the American action could not be concealed from the Soviet people, even though reports in the Russian Press were brief, unclear, and suggested sinister motives. As the days and weeks passed, however, the unrelieved joy of the Russian people was unmistakable: the United States, long considered by them to be the major threat to their existence, and long presented as the chief threat to peace, was now, unaccountably, no longer a threat. In spite of the Kremlin's darkest hints of capitalist trickery, there was a definite relaxation of tension in the general population and an increased demand for consumer goods and housing.

Visiting Americans of every variety, from official to students to tourists, were circulating through wider and wider strata of Soviet society. Vodka flowed freely as many toasts were drunk to peace and friendship. Yevtushenko, for the first time in years, was officially rebuked for his new poem, "Hail to Friendship and Proletarian Non-violence." In Pravda, public attention was called to an earlier article by Y. Dolgopolov in the February, 1962, issue of International Affairs (Moscow), in which he had presented the Party view as follows:

Marxists do not doubt the sincerity of those who favor non-violent methods; they know that many of them are frequently subjected to repressions by colonial authorities. Still they do not and cannot agree with this rejection in principle of armed struggle. The theory of nonviolence does not provide a satisfactory answer to the question of what should be done if peaceful means do not bring the desired results, if the colonialists
themselves do not refrain from using force...

Actual experience and the practice of the national-liberation movement have proved the untenability of the theory of nonviolence...

Nevertheless, ordinary Soviet citizens reading this were strukk by the fact that a heretofore capitalist-imperialist power, THE United States, last stronghold of capitalism and repression, was not proclaiming its adherence to nonviolence. And from every indication foreign observers, including fellow Russians, were witnessing the complete dismantlement of the American military machine.

As the weeks stretched into months, and as the American disarmament had magically transformed the world's Cold War tensions, there was a period of flux and confusion while powers, great and small, tried to assess the new situation and to choose the right course. There seemed to be a clear danger that a number of small nations with long-standing grievances against some of their neighbors might be planning to take advantage of the Great Power vacuum—the policing role that the United States had played—and were reported to be planning aggressive attacks.

Yet on the surface, no nation made a warlike move, if for no other reason than that they were uncertain what Russia or the United States would do, for there was still the possibility that American opinion might swing back to support a military re-armament that would quickly be superior to that of a small power.

IMPACT ON THE WORLD

But below the level of diplomacy and governments people throughout the world were transported with hope and joy. The Millenium seemed at hand. Governments of all kinds were not unmindful of the powerful pull on their own people with respect to the nonviolent course now being taken by the United States, Great Britain, Norway, Denmark, Canada, New Zealand, India and any number of smaller countries.

Slowly the men in the Kremlin began to see the "trick". They had been outmaneuvered. They had lost the initiative. The unaligned nations were rapidly associating themselves with the new liberation revolution being proclaimed and led by the United States and Britain! Their own people were openly joyous and attracted by the same force. Their control over the satellite areas and over the Soviet peoples themselves was clearly reduced. Unless they acted quickly and decisively, the situation might
disintegrate rapidly through naive humanism and opportunism. The very reason for their possession of total weapons and controls was being slowly, but surely, withdrawn. Without an external threat drawn tightly around them, the Soviet and other Communist peoples might soon rise up in an effort to eliminate the totalitarian controls of the one party state.

Fyodor Skobelev, Chairman of the Central Committee, felt himself losing control all around, for now in inner-party councils his course of peaceful coexistence was being more strongly denounced than ever. And with good reason! The Americans, followed by major parts of the world, were reaping the rewards for their system that Skobelev had envisioned for his. The Americans had usurped the Communist slogan: "Workers of the World! You have nothing to lose but the chains of militarism and enslavement that bind you. Through the new techniques of science and industry--unknown to Karl Marx and Adam Smith--we can build a better world, more humane, just, free, yes, and even happy."

Feverishly the members of the Presidium met day after day for three weeks in non-stop sessions. An answer had to be found. By the third week, it was found.

Y. Dolgoplov had written:

Actual experience and the practice of the national-liberation movement have proved the untenability of the theory of non-violence. Many peoples began their fight for independence by peaceful, nonviolent means and yet the colonialists' reply to this was mass repressions, imprisonment, and torture.

Translating this into the context of an unarmed United States rapidly winning the support and friendship of the peoples of the world, the answer was--War! Better yet, a "police action" for one could hardly call taking over an unarmed nation, "war."

As they completed the plan, the Communist leaders gloated. Through failure of leadership and their class, the American capitalists had actually capitulated. In a few months' time they had so weakened the defense forces of the West, that the only armed forces of any size that remained were the French and the West German armies. Even in those cases, their will and capacity to fight was insignificant, since the anti-war, pro-nonviolence movement was running rampant through both France and Germany.
SOVIET WAR PLAN

The plan was simple and direct. The place to strike was directly at the United States—the last bastion of capitalism and the only power which would have a chance in outright military conflict with the Soviet Union, if it were given any time for re-arming. If the United States were seized and held by a lightning stroke, the whole affair would be little more than a coup d'état. Communist puppets would be easily available, and the people would be sheeplike, capable only of passive resistance and protest.

To the rest of the world, the simple explanation would be that the Soviet Union had saved the world from a fascist, Nazi revival. Fascist groups in the United States, it would be said, had angrily rejected the unilateral disarmament and pacifist stance and had been on the brink of taking over the United States and all its resources. Then, in league with the fascist forces in Western Europe, and especially West Germany, they planned a nuclear war with the peace-loving socialist countries.

While this explanation would be a gross exaggeration of any real fascist threat, the Soviet leaders were satisfied that it would suffice if elaborated firmly enough, for it would easily fit into the hazy, generalized view held by many peoples throughout the world about the reactionary forces in the United States. The recent American threat to Cuba would fortify this view. It would be given world-wide credence by the probable West German threat of military action that might follow upon the Soviet strike. But most of all, it would not matter in the long run, since once the U.S.S.R. controlled America—and shortly afterwards, Europe—the truth would be an academic question for old capitalists to discuss in their cells.

This deviation from all former Marxist-Leninist strategy, that is, outright military aggression against a people with only an infinitesimal communist grouping, would be justified in that it would be the final stroke of the World Revolution. After that, all the other fruit would tumble neatly into place.

On September 14, 1990, the American Ambassador was called to the Kremlin, where he was handed a document addressed to his government calling for the immediate capitulation of the Government of the United States to the control and direction of General Vladimir Odhanov, who was arriving in the United States with an initial escort of 10,000 Russian soldiers and airmen in a fleet of transport bomber jets within six hours. The Soviet Fleet was already near the American coastlines, both East and West, and a "police" Occupation Force of 350,000 men.
"would bring law and safety from the Fascist threat that hung over the peace-loving American people." Soviet ICBM's were on their pads ready for immediate delivery if there were any armed resistance to the Soviet police action. Millions of additional Soviet forces were standing by if the need for them should arise. Simultaneously, in Washington, D.C., the Russian Ambassador handed a duplicate copy of the ultimatum to the President's chief aide.

PRESIDENT ADDRESSES THE WORLD

Within an hour, the President went on television and radio throughout the world. He read the Soviet document. Then he reported to the people that their great test was upon them. Not only were they faced with military aggression, but for the first time in nearly one hundred and eighty years, the United States was about to be invaded. Then he soberly called upon them to join together to undergo a severe test of their democratic ethical values: to work with the American Government and the non-violent civil resisters in the struggle—the war without violence—with which they would engage the invading forces.

He reminded them that whatever exigencies should arise in the weeks, months, and even years of nonviolent resistance that might lie ahead, they must be ever mindful that only they, the people, and their government, working as one, could bring the struggle to a successful conclusion for all—including the Russian people. The American effort would not be to destroy the enemy by violence, but to destroy the enemy in the sense that Abraham Lincoln had recommended: "The only permanent way to get rid of your enemy is to make him your friend."

Whatever happened, and even if the Russians should announce that the American government had surrendered, the people would know it was not true. The government would carry on both underground and above ground as the situation required. Radio and television communication would be maintained according to known plans.

*During the struggle in Algeria and France between the rebellious FLN and the French government, the FLN frequently transmitted messages by both radio and television to the entire Algerian and French populations by breaking in on official French broadcasts. Similarly, an illicit radio voice for nuclear disarmament has operated in London by breaking into BBC broadcasts.
The nonviolent civil forces would be active, working closely both with the people at large and at the direction of the government. The National Resistance Movement would be directly linked with the nonviolent forces but would represent the generality of the whole population.

On the other hand, the people and the government would maintain their freedom of action even to the extent of neutralizing and confining any persons who actively joined or supported the Communist invasion or collaborated with it. Prominent persons and leaders of opinion throughout the country were urged to take their places in the forefront of the civil resistance. If initial efforts to negotiate and persuade the Russians to withdraw should prove ineffective, the strength of the resulting nonviolent resistance would depend upon strong but decentralized leadership and a good understanding throughout the population of the values and methods that were to be defended through exercising them.

The President reminded the American people that nonviolence is no guarantee of invulnerability. In a war, there are casualties. In this war, there would be casualties. Triumph for nonviolence and democracy would come only through the readiness of the defenders to risk torture and death for their cause.

On the other hand, the President urged the people to tighten their own discipline and to exercise the greatest self-restraint under provocation and hardship. Having intentionally chosen a nonviolent course, the ultimate success of the resistance would be to undermine the authority and will of the invader, and to significantly win his people to the cause of freedom and nonviolence.

The chief purpose of the total American resistance would be two-fold: first, to refuse to obey official Russian orders and counter them, legally and morally, by citing the laws and practices of the still-active government of the United States; and second, to work to befriend individual Russian soldiers and other personnel, in order to wean them away from the tyranny they accept.

He reminded his listeners that the Russians had never really known freedom in the best sense, and that they would be highly susceptible to its genuine expression and practice. Experience in World War II had shown that Russian troops in Germany, Austria and other Eastern European countries had been amazed at the kind of life others were living—so much so that discipline, morale and desertion problems had been very real and trying for the Russian Command. Now Russian soldiers would find themselves in a free land with an advanced standard of living, surrounded by friendly people who would not cooperate with tyranny, but who, on the
other hand, value life so highly that they will not physically harm the invaders.

The President closed his address by assuring the Americans that they would receive the support and encouragement of almost all the peoples of the world. He promised them that, through advance planning and arrangements, American agents would be working abroad in many lands to inform, aid and organize a great movement, even a revolution, of nonviolent resistance and non-cooperation with the Communists, coupled with the attempt to bring about such an internal convulsion within the Communist countries, and especially Russia, that their governments might fall, or at least feel constrained to withdraw from the ill-conceived aggression. Americans would be joined by the British, Canadians, Scandanavians, Indians, Japanese and many other peoples in a world-wide movement of resistance to Communist tyranny and repression.

Emergency Measures

Throughout the country, officials and citizens alike undertook those emergency measures immediately and exactly as planned. Secret caches of food were checked or replenished. Vast stores of equipment of every description—whole factories, special automobiles, trucks, helicopters, airplanes, radio and television transmitters and receivers, newspaper presses, newsprint, machinery of all kinds, clothing, lumber and thousands of other things—were arranged in secret stores in readiness for whatever might eventually arise.

Certain young men and women disappeared into the underground and into active units of the nonviolently trained forces. The whole world was barraged with lengthy accounts of the Russian ultimatum and the American readiness to resist if necessary. A complete background of information was available in the event that there would be any thought in the world that a real fascist movement might be threatening in the United States.

Thousands of leaflets and pamphlets were ready for the invading forces as they arrived. In addition to presenting the case of the American people to choose and support their own government, wide use was made of Marxist writings from many periods. One leaflet, for example, quoted from Lenin’s essay, "Socialism and War," the section concerned with the "Right of Nations to Self-Determination," ending:

Imperialism is the period of an increasing oppression of the nations of the whole world by a handful of 'great' nations;
the struggle for a Socialist international revolution against Imperialism is, therefore, impossible without the recognition of the right of nations to self-determination. "No people oppressing other peoples can be free." (Marx and Engels) No proletariat reconciling itself to the least violation by 'its' nation of the rights of other nations can be Socialist."

Millions of leaflets, brochures, pamphlets—many already prepared—were put into the works. Mysteriously, some were in circulation in many countries before the first Communist aggressor actually landed in the United States. The Voice of America and a number of European and Asian radios transmitted an appeal to the people of the U.S.S.R. to refuse to support their government in making war on the United States, Britain, and others. Again the people were assured that none of their sons would be injured, that the Americans were unarmed and intended no harm. The Russian people were assured that nevertheless the Americans were resisting the invasion, but in a spirit of friendship and human solidarity. The messages urged them to listen to the Voice of America, the BBC and other European transmitters. They were promised more reports of the actual events which were taking place in the United States. Specifically, they were urged to "down tools" in a strike demanding that their armies return home.

THE RUSSIANS INVADE

Within minutes of landing at Washington's International Airport, a Russian cavalcade of armored cars, supported by bazooka-armed troops in Russian jeeps and sidetracks, wheeled into the White House driveway, where the gates had been opened to them. At the airport, there had been some moments of confusion. As the Russian planes landed, unhindered, some hundreds of young Americans, men and women, were on hand to greet them, passing out leaflets while offering the Russians food and drink.

A surprising number of the Americans spoke Russian and began to welcome the Russian soldiers as friends but urged them not to believe that there was any danger either to Americans or to themselves from a fascist threat. The Russians were urged to inform themselves before acting in any way against the Americans. At one point, an angry officer had brought his troops to order as quickly as possible, and the young Americans were then pushed back at bayonet point, out of contact with the incoming troops.

A Russian colonel, accompanied by several officers, and surrounding
by the bristling arms of the Russian soldiers, was met at the Main Door by two White House aides. The Colonel, looking suspiciously about him, dispatched officers and men to strategic positions around the White House grounds and buildings. Then, accompanied by two staff officers, and at least twenty-five men, he entered the White House behind the two aides. His interpreter had already reported to him the message of the Aides: the President awaited them inside.

Leaving his men at intervals from the doorway into the interior corridors of the White House, the Colonel was brought into the Chief Executive’s office, still accompanied by his staff officers and ten armed men. The President and three Cabinet Officers, plus two members of his staff, were standing behind a large table, waiting to receive them.

The Russian Colonel immediately, in a most formal manner, delivered himself of a rather overlong speech. His interpreter condensed it:

The Russian armed forces had arrived in the nick of time to protect the American people and their government from overthrow by internal fascist and Nazi groups, in league with similar groupings in some parts of Europe, notably West Germany and France. The Russians had come as friends of the American people and workers, and had brought protection for them in their unarmed helplessness before the predatory repression and violence of the imperialistic capitalist and fascist forces. Through the American President and Congress, the armed police force of the U.S.S.R. would help establish peace and freedom for the Democratic People’s Republic of the United States of America.

In order to expedite the overthrow of the fascists, the President was immediately to go on television and radio with a message to his people to inform them that all was well; that, as a result of the magnanimous good will of the Soviet people and their government, a Protective Force of Soviet citizens, workers and peasants, had been sent to help the American people and their Government in a time of trial. For the immediate present, due to the still-present fascist menace, the citizenry was to remain quietly at home, leaving only to carry on all necessary work. Every night, until further notice, there was to be a nine o’clock curfew. Nobody was to be on the streets except the police and those night workers who had approved passes. It would be a matter of several days, even weeks, before necessary police measures had been established
throughout the country. Meanwhile the people were to cooperate with their government and the Soviet police regulations.

The President and his staff listened quietly. At the conclusion of the statement, the President was handed an official Soviet document which contained the conditions and terms of this surrender of power to the Soviet Army.

THE PRESIDENT RESISTS

The President then replied: "Gentlemen, you underestimate the character and purpose of the people of the United States. We are, of course, aware that you come not as friends, but in the hope of conquering us, absorbing us. You believe we are helpless, and you intend to exploit us. Let me tell you at once, it will not work."

His speech continued:

It is true, we are unarmed— but only in the sense that we have put aside all reliance on mankind's traditional weapons. But we are not weak. We are not afraid. We are not afraid of any so-called fascist menace. There is none. We are not afraid of you. Rather it is you who fear us, or you would not come now, in the guise of friends, wishing to harm and use us.

Let me tell you then, briefly, that we cannot be used. We will not cooperate; we will resist. But we will resist like men, not animals. While we will certainly feel hostility for you and your acts of aggression, we will try to understand and love you. Therefore we will resist you both with hate and with love. As you will find, our people will stand as one. As you attempt to conquer us, we will attempt to conquer you and your men—now thousands of miles from their homeland. We will seek to conquer you, not with violence, but by undermining your support of your own tyrannical system. We will invite you to become our friends, and therefore to cease striving to rule us. We invite you to join us in genuine friendship, peace and freedom, by refusing, as the self-proclaimed followers of Marx and Lenin, to become our exploiters and slavemasters.

That was as far as the President got, when the Russian Colonel gave a signal to his men to arrest the President and his staff.
THE ULTIMATUM IS ANSWERED

Outside the White House, the Russian soldiers and their officers gathered in great numbers. The lawn became a kind of temporary camp and headquarters. Armed groups were rapidly being sent to strategic posts throughout the city. The minutes went by, and still the Colonel's group remained in the Presidential office. Evidently arrangements were being made for the broadcast that would help allay any resistance.

Suddenly a voice speaking in Russian boomed across the White House lawn and through the streets of Washington, D. C. From hundreds of hidden loudspeakers throughout the city, so that every Russian soldier could hear, came the announcement that the President of the United States had refused the blackmail ultimatum of the U.S.S.R. Then the voice went on to appeal for the help and understanding of the Russian soldiers, rather than their acquiescence in an imperialistic attempt at conquest. It invited them to talk with American citizens and to learn about the realities of American life, its strengths and its weaknesses. It pointed out that the U.S. had led the world in disarming voluntarily, and that the people of the United States were genuinely peace-loving and peace-practicing. It quoted at length from Marxist and Soviet writers and analysts who opposed aggression, imperialism, "adventurism," and who proclaimed the peace-loving nature of the Soviet Government and people.

As the Voice continued, Russian officers frantically ordered contingents of men to find the secret loudspeakers and to silence them. From the White House lawn, after a hurried discussion, two Soviet officers with a number of men, quickly entered the White House door to try to find what was delaying the group which was meeting with the President. Obviously, from the message of the loudspeakers, some Americans had slipped through their fingers to report the ultimatum.

There was no answer when they knocked carefully at the great door of the President's office. The soldiers, already posted outside the door, reported that nobody had left or entered since the Colonel and his men had gone in. They then tried the door. It was locked. Rushing one man back to the entrance for reinforcements, the Russian officers then ordered the door to be forced open. In two or three minutes, the heavy door gave way before the combined assault of ten soldiers.

THE PRESIDENT VANISHES

Before them, lined up on the floor, lay the entire Russian group, officers and men. The furniture was in some disarray, but not an American was in the room. The President had vanished!
The limp Russians, upon closer examination, were obviously alive. It quickly became evident that they were asleep. They had been chloroformed.

Later, when their men were revived, and after ransacking the President's office, the Russians pieced together the whole story. At the moment that the Russian soldiers had moved to arrest the President and his men, there had been a swift movement from almost every corner of the room; Swarms of athletic men overwhelmed the Russians almost before they knew what had happened. The chloroforming took only seconds. The hidden men had entered the room from several secret doorways. Any noise of the scuffling had been entirely absorbed by the complete soundproofing.

The Russians sent groups of their own men along the passageways leading from the office. There were so many that it was impossible to guess which one the President and his party might have taken. Some were fairly short passages that merely led to other parts of the White House, its related buildings and so forth.

Other passageways led underground and extended for anywhere from several blocks to many blocks away. It was soon clear that the President had made good his escape. By now he was either at some secret place in Washington, or perhaps already well clear of the city.

Even as the Russian command was realizing that its plans had hit a first snag, a new process was begun.

Some of the searching parties working their way through the underground passageways, came to alternative subways. They divided their forces to follow new turns, and they soon found that they were not at all certain how to get back to the starting point. Some searchers surfaced at the end of a given passageway and then found their way back to the White House to report. Others seemed to be gone over-long, and new groups were sent to try to find them. But in most cases, the second group was too late.

"BRAINWASHING" THE INVADERS

Some of the original parties had been anesthetized in given sections of the passages, and then carried through hidden side openings into yet other unrevealed chambers. There, in isolation from their comrades, they were revived to find themselves unarmed in the company of several Americans, two or more of whom always spoke Russian. For several hours, they were "brainwashed" in a spirit of understanding and concern.
Why had they come to America? Why did they, if they were truly peace-loving, seek to make aggressive attack upon an unarmed country?

The interrogators showed a deep understanding of Soviet society. The Russians were questioned in terms of the values of their own society, in terms of values mutually held by both societies, and in general humanistic terms. Their captors assured them that they would not be harmed. They talked to them about American society, its weaknesses as well as its strengths. They explained the effort which was being made in the new climate of nonviolence, to release Americans from the tensions, fears and suspicions of their immediate past, and the attempt that was being made to create a new and better society than had ever before existed in the United States.

The Russians were shown movies of life in the United States. Finally, they were released to report back to their superiors, but they were asked to consider each for himself, the dilemma created in learning that the Americans (1) did not want to harm them, but (2) would resist the attempt to forcibly overthrow the American society which could only be understood as an imperialistic aggression on the part of the Russians, and (3) therefore Americans would have to refuse to obey any Russian orders. Ordinary Russian soldiers, they were told, should heed the rulings of the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials in 1946, when both American and Russian justices, acting together with British and French judges, held that it was a "crime against humanity" to undertake aggressive war against anybody, and certainly against an unarmed nation.

Therefore the Russian soldiers were asked to consider which course they should follow. According to the Allied tribunals at Nuremberg, all persons had a "duty" to refuse to cooperate in the commission of crimes against humanity. Hence Russian soldiers should either directly refuse the orders of their superiors, or they should become as inefficient as possible in carrying them out. That is, they should cultivate the art of ignoring orders, and of looking the other way when American resisters openly refused to obey such orders. In fact, the Russian soldiers were asked to consider whether or not they might not want to join with the Americans in a true struggle for peace and social justice. Then with a handshake, each Russian soldier, without his arms, was blindfolded, returned to the passageway, and allowed to find his way out.

RUSSIAN MORALE DECLINES

During the next two or three weeks, the Russian command struggled with the problem of establishing its holding points throughout the entire
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country. They commandeered trains, planes, and so forth, where they could find them. In some instances, American crews refused to work. When coercion was threatened, most of those who had refused held out. In keeping with the "kid gloves" policy of the initial period, the Russians simply arrested and confined such men.

The disconcerting thing was that everything that happened during the first days made it difficult to improve the morale of the Russian troops. The men seemed not to have a stomach for their work. There were grumblings and questionings. Some groups openly protested to their officers that so far as they could see, there were no fascists to be fought, and that they did not like to have to force fellow workers, American workers, as though they were fascists.

Next, the Russian commanders found some train crews that would continue to work. Nevertheless, the officers, taking no chances, posted armed guards at strategic points throughout the trains, including the engineer's cab. Curiously, when the officers were out of the way, a number of the crew could speak Russian. They fraternized with the Russian guards, and as the hours went by, they spelled out for the Russians their dismay that the Soviet Union and its people would make aggressive war against a country clearly no longer imperialistic in any sense. They expressed their surprise that the Russian soldiers would coerce simple workers in the name of destroying a fascist threat that did not exist.

While the reactions of the Russians varied, it was clear that a number of them were becoming more and more unhappy with their situation. These men expressed their desire to befriend and to know the Americans. They asked many questions about the life, work, and the role of the ordinary people in American society, and about the land they were passing through at the moment.

AMERICAN CONTROL CONTINUES

Along the routes, all signs and markers had been removed. Only the crewmen knew certainly where they were or where they were headed. While each train or group had definite destinations, it became clearer and clearer to some of the Russian officers that they were in the hands of the Americans for the moment.

Some of these trains reached their destinations. Others turned up hundreds, even thousands of miles from the appointed place. Train crews disappeared mysteriously. In several instances, anesthetized Soviet guards awakened to find the train rolling along open tracks minus the engineer and
brakeman. Several trains were completely commandeered by nonviolent resisters, as the Russian occupants were subdued by gases that filled the trains. Friendly interrogation and confrontation followed. Then the Russians were turned loose, but without their arms. Soviet officers and officials began to view the situation with a certain uneasiness.

The tactics of the resisters were disconcerting. Almost nothing in their training had prepared the Soviet forces for such a war. The Russian troops soon learned that there was no danger to themselves. The Americans were demonstrating every day that Russians had nothing to fear except their own motivations for having come in the first place. But the Americans were also demonstrating that despite the presence of Soviet arms, the Americans, not the Soviets, were in charge.

WORLD-WIDE MEDIA CAMPAIGN

Meanwhile, a constant barrage of radio and printed messages, even television films, were being sent abroad by the Americans. Throughout the world, the Russians were being soundly out-maneuvered. Their propaganda suffered from "wartime" censorship plus basic untruth in the original reason given for the invasion. On the other hand, the Americans, in keeping with the kind of open and nonviolent resistance they were giving, had nothing to conceal. Their reports were accurate and substantially complete. Foreign correspondents in the United States were allowed full coverage of any of the actions, so that their testimony corroborated that of the Americans.

The Russians were revealed to all the world as aggressive imperialists. The American reports about them revealed that having invaded the United States, they were essentially, and even ludicrously, out of control. Each day brought new reports of how their efforts were thwarted, about how their men were captured, talked to, and then released unharmed to report back the failure of another mission.

KREMLIN PROBLEMS

Back in the Kremlin, the top civilian and military leaders were in a state of embarrassed fury. There was a tendency for them to blame one another for the bungling. Three weeks after the invasion, they recalled and replaced General Odhanov and several of his staff. To replace him, they sent General Nikolai Borkenau, who was a Party member with considerable political training in addition to his military background. Borkenau was empowered to take extraordinary measures, if necessary, to break the American Resistance as quickly as possible. Nevertheless, due to the world forum in which the struggle was now taking place, he was to avoid excessive measures against unarmed civilians and any other
actions which might lend themselves to politically harmful publicity.

So far the Russians had not moved elsewhere in the world. They had predicated the success of their operation on a direct takeover of the United States. Their forces were massed and held in readiness in the event that West Germany, France, or any other nation with a military force should make an overt move. Public opinion in Great Britain, India, Canada, and all of the other countries which had joined the United States in re-arming nonviolently, was at a fever pitch in support of the Americans. So far, these countries were joyously delighted over the daily reports from America that the war, despite its basic seriousness, was being carried on with almost comic opera results—except for the Russians.

Throughout the Communist countries, the propaganda machines poured out justification and explanation of the American adventure. But the real question was how long these governments could keep their people in ignorance, since two-way communication was not cut off. The Voice of America, the BBC, Radio Free Europe and a number of other powerful bands were still beaming into Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and not all broadcasts were successfully jammed. But more, clandestine newspapers in Russian and other East European languages were being successfully smuggled into the various countries.

Since none of these countries, including the Soviet Union, was officially at war, the flow of travelers was not cut off, although it was obviously being cut down through visa controls, and so forth. A number of Americans applied for entrance visas and were discreetly held in abeyance on one pretext or another. The American Government, through its foreign embassies, kept the world fully informed about these delaying actions.

INTERNATIONAL EXPERT ACTION

Suddenly on October 21st a new dimension was added to the conflict, when an international team of workers, drawn from the nonviolently armed countries, made its appearance in Red Square in Moscow, with an appeal to the Russian people to convince their government to withdraw from the misguided adventure in attempting to overthrow the United States. Soviet authorities quickly arrested them, but not before newspapermen from many countries and Soviet citizens in the Square had received their message. Simultaneous actions occurred in several other major Russian cities.

At the same hour, throughout the world, the message of the international group of workers was released to the press. Protest meetings of
labor unions and workers' groups were called in many lands. Thousands of messages of solidarity with Americans, and condemnation of the aggression of the Soviet Union, were carried throughout the world.

Within twenty-four hours of the demonstration in Red Square, some hundreds of parachuters landed in cities and towns throughout the Soviet Union. They had slipped through the radar network by flying undetected at low levels. They were nationals and workers from many countries, including some Americans. They brought another appeal to the Russian people to bring an end to the imperialistic attack of their government. Together with the broadsides, the messages carried a resume of the actions that had gone on inside the United States since the day of invasion. They were complete with pictures. Through the combined action of workers from many European and Asian countries coming in this dramatic way to the Soviet Union, they hoped to show the Soviet peoples that they had aroused the antagonism and resistance of much of the world.

In the parachuting action, several of the unarmed planes were shot down, and a number of lives were lost. Insofar as possible the Soviet authorities represented this as an act of aggression, but they were hard put to demonstrate any damage or actual danger to the Soviet people, since the incoming planes and "invaders" were completely unarmed except with their message.

WORLD-WIDE DEMONSTRATIONS

Throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America, both inspired and spontaneous demonstrations opposing the Soviet Union's aggression brought thousands of people into action. The various Communist parties throughout the world were faced with the almost impossible propaganda job of whitewashing an inexcusable and brutal act of aggression, or of getting off the official track. Many Communists, especially rank and file members, began to defect and to denounce the Soviet Union's act. American propagandists throughout the world, joined by nationals from many countries, proclaimed the revolution of nonviolence: peace and freedom combined with social justice for all people everywhere.

A great mass "Walk for Peace" was begun in Western Europe, with hundreds of thousands of people, especially young adults and students, joining it along the way as it wended its way eastward to bring the message of nonviolent resistance to the Soviet Union and its people. In Eastern Europe dissident demonstrations cropped up in countries such as Poland, Hungary and Yugoslavia. There were reports that Russian students in
Moscow and other large cities were publicly protesting their country's actions. Certain writers and poets disappeared from view, but there was no evidence that any harm had befallen them.

RUSSIAN PROBLEMS

By the end of the first six weeks, the Russian leaders had revised their estimate of how many troops would be required in the United States. From 350,000 the figure was rapidly upped to two and one-half million, in recognition of the fact that a major resistance movement was going to have to be put down. The difficulty was that the Russian forces found themselves off balance. In a sense there was no one to fight. And yet in another sense, they were being resisted by everyone. The United States Government was a phantom. The leaders had all disappeared and yet were still completely in control of a vast national and international paraphernalia, with the full cooperation of all of the citizens.

So far the Soviet leaders had been unable to find any person or groups of persons whom they could trust to collaborate, or even carry out orders. In the few cases where Americans had not forthrightly refused to carry out Russian orders, the results had been worse than a refusal. In the effort to commandeer rolling equipment, for example, not only had there been the cases of the misguided trains, but a pool of trucks with truck drivers and mechanics, despite heavy armed escort, had caused a complete breakdown in the transfer of supplies to troops in inland cities and strategic centers.

There had been numerous instances, too, of the capture of small armed groups of Soviet soldiers along stretches of open highway, especially at night. Then these Soviet groups had been wined and dined by friendly groups of young American men and women—students and workers—who had in some strange sense actually befriended the captives. Young women had frankly told the soldiers that they were sorry that the Russians had come on such an unfriendly mission and urged them to find a way to bring the "war" to an end, so that Russians and Americans could meet and befriend one another.

General Borkenau issued an order that every effort should be made to capture the leaders of either the governing groups or of the guerilla nonviolent forces, so that a public demonstration of strength and repression could be carried out, in order to weaken the ordinary citizenry's will to resist. Soviet units redoubled their efforts in searches of the cities. They tightened their controls of streets, blocks, houses, public buildings, highways, airports and so forth, and any telephone and radio communications
they could find. Mysteriously, much of the radio equipment of regular city stations had disappeared from the very first day of the invasion.

A certain minimum of communication had still to be carried on through a dependence on the American personnel, so that the basic business and activities of both the nation and the Soviet invaders could be continued. The resulting snarls and misinformation for the Soviets were matched only by the amazing amount of illicit use made by the American Resistance to keep in touch, alert remote groupings, tip off Russian movements, and so forth. So complex were the electronics and other communication systems, that only the designers and builders of the equipment could really know the full intricacies and their variable uses.

RUSSIAN REPRESSION INCREASES

Nevertheless, the heightened Communist vigilance paid off. Over a period of some weeks, the Russian authorities rounded up everyone from single individuals who had been caught in some open act of resistance, or of helping the Resistance organization, to small groups of the nonviolent forces which had been caught in some act of sabotage of Russian movements, or even had been one of the groups instrumental in capturing Russians for the purpose of propagandizing the invaders against their own government and Army leadership.

The Russian commander ordered that most of these prisoners should be brought to Washington, D. C., so that they could be part of a public display to show both the world at large and the American Nation that the Soviet Armed forces were in full command of the situation, that further "fascist" resistance was useless, and that order and peace were being restored by the friendly police action of the Soviet Union.

Temporary stands were installed in front of the Capitol Building. Press and television representatives from many parts of the Communist world were on hand. A public address system was hooked up. The Russian soldiers were sent into all parts of the city to round up Americans and to bring them, on foot, by car, and by truck, to provide a full audience for the great public demonstration. A special effort was made to woo willing spectators from Washington D. C.'s large Black population. Since their arrival, the Russians had made every effort to stir revolutionary zeal or resentment throughout the country. They had assured Black Americans that they would need fear no longer the exploitation of capitalist-fascists and racists.
At the appointed hour, a substantial throng stood or sat in the open area before the grandstand. The ceremony was preceded by a military parade of several thousand Russian troops. Next there was a speech—in English—by a Russian explaining to the assembled Americans that the time of trouble was past, that for practical purposes the Soviet "rescue" forces had now brought the fascist-capitalist plot to an end. From now on the Soviet authorities would expect the full cooperation of the American people in reconstituting the country as a partner in the new world-wide brotherhood of socialist states which, under the banner of Marx and Lenin, would lead the peoples of all the world on to a great new society based on mutual understanding and respect. To underline the era that was passing, and to warn any who might still harbor in their breasts fascist or bourgeois plots and sentiments, the Soviet forces were going to hold a public trial of the terrorist bandits already captured, and would couple that with a general amnesty for those few who still remained in hiding.

The speaker then gave a hand signal, and some thousands of bedraggled prisoners were suddenly led out of the Capitol Building and down into the area in front of the grandstand.

AMERICANS DISRUPT RUSSIAN DEMONSTRATION

Just as the last of these were being brought into position, it happened. Eyewitnesses disagree. The first shot is supposed to have come from the direction of the Supreme Court building. At any rate, there was a sound as of a muffled explosion of an over-sized mortar. Sudden puffs of smoke, or gas, boomed immediately over the entire assemblage. The Russian troops looked wildly about, but there was nothing to shoot at. As the gas settled quickly over the crowd, its effect was almost instantaneous. There was some panic, but silence and submission soon followed.

The gas used was a new "disorienting" type, which made those affected incapable of realizing what they were doing. They wandered as in a daze, or they dropped quietly to a sitting position. Many of the Americans in the crowd in front of the grandstand had pulled a mask-like cloth from their pockets or clothing at the first smoke puff. They ran quickly to the imprisoned American group and proffered masks. Within seconds the Americans were disarming the dazed Russians and assembling them together.

While the Russians had concentrated a considerable portion of their Washington-based troops at the Capitol for the day's demonstration,
there were still some thousands of them throughout the city at posts and headquarters. Simultaneously with the gas attack at the Capitol, American forces turned loose a similar barrage at hundreds of points in and around Washington, D. C. and its neighboring cities and suburbs. Within fifteen minutes the entire Russian armed force in the region was immobilized, and for the most part, in American hands.

THE PRESIDENT APPEARS

Suddenly a small group of helicopters appeared over Washington, D. C. from some suburban spot. On several of them was emblazoned a bright American flag, accompanied by the clasped hands emblem of the nonviolent resistance movement. Minutes later the President, accompanied by members of his cabinet, Congressmen, and leaders of the nonviolent forces, assembled on the same grandstand in front of the Capitol. The thousands of dazed but reviving Russian prisoners, including all of their top command, were closely guarded by an unarmed force around them.

Radio and television reported to all the world the President's report to the people: that the American Government was carrying on its nonviolent struggle against the invading forces of the Soviet Union, so far with considerable success and with high morale. He thanked the millions of people throughout the world in many lands for rallying support to the American cause of nonviolence, freedom and justice for all. He reiterated the desire of the American people to befriend other peoples throughout the world, and to share with all their technical skills and knowledge where such help was desired. He also pointed out the desire of the Americans to learn more of the knowledge, philosophy and culture of the varied peoples of the earth.

Then, dramatically, he turned to the Russian prisoners in front of the grandstand and informed them that he, as President and the representative of the American people, sorrowed that they had been obliged to act as the unwitting, and perhaps unwilling, instruments of a tyrannical aggressive force. He asked them to understand why the Americans had had to act against them and to overpower them, but he pointed out that what had been done, had been done with the desire of resisting the tyranny to Americans that they had officially represented only minutes before, but that it had been done without injury to them, and actually in the hope that more of them would come to appreciate the dilemma now created.

The people of the United States desired to eliminate them as enemies, not by killing them, but by winning them as friends. Many Americans were of Russian origin. The Americans, and all the world, were
indebted to the Russian people for their vast contribution to civilized life and thought, and the Americans had rejoiced at the signs, in recent years, that a change had come over Soviet life that seemed to indicate a dying out of what Premier Khrushchev himself had once called the "prehistoric ideas" that caused men to war against one another.

The Americans had drawn on the compassion and insights of the great Tolstoy in their rejection of violence. The President quoted from Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God Is Within You*: "...if you are a soldier (that is, occupy a position on which all violence is based), you should, in spite of all the dangers of a refusal to obey, at once throw up your position."

In principle, the Soviet Union had essentially agreed with this declaration in 1946, when along with the other Allies at the Nuremberg Trials, their judges had held that: men should, on both moral and legal grounds, refuse to obey the orders of any government which sought to commit crimes against humanity—among which aggressive war was one of the foremost.

**RUSSIANS FREED**

Then the President told the Russian prisoners that they were prisoners no more, at least as far as the American Government and people were concerned. From this moment they were free to return to their own country, or to their own commanders still in this country. Whether they would still be free under such circumstances was up to them to decide.

But at the same time he invited them to become truly free men, by renouncing their attempt to conquer the American people, and by joining with them to remain as friends and fellow citizens in a free land dedicated to nonviolence and social justice. Any who chose to stay would receive full protection and anonymity somewhere in the United States.

Consternation broke out in the ranks of the Russian soldiers. Meanwhile as quickly as they had come, the Presidential Party climbed back into the helicopters and was whisked off into the horizon, as huge crowds cheered on the streets below. These were Washington crowds, and at least half of the upturned faces were dark in color. American Blacks still had not achieved full social justice and equal rights, but their quarrel with White Americans was a family affair. They were not even tempted to collaborate with Soviet Communists in order to welcome
a greater tyrant to replace the lesser one. Besides, in America the Blacks had been among the pioneers of the method of nonviolence. Their student leaders had helped train America's new unarmed resistance forces. In a truly nonviolent society dedicated to freedom and justice for all, the American Blacks expected to attain their goal of full equality.

It is not known how many Russians defected from their armies that day. Neither the U. S. S. R. nor the United States ever reported or published a figure, each for different reasons. But there is no doubt that here was the beginning of what rapidly assumed the proportions of a major problem for the Soviet Government: the defection and desertion of their officers and men in increasing numbers.

Within hours the Russians rushed more troops and equipment into Washington. All roads out of the City were barricaded at checkpoints. Trains and planes were held up for hours as the Russian Command made every effort to detect and recapture the escaped American prisoners, and to find out the whereabouts of the President and members of his government.

RUSSIANS FRUSTRATED

The Russians were frustrated and angered. Orders went out to troops that they were to shoot on sight any Americans of the Resistance Forces, and especially those Americans who had carried out the gas attack. Unless such resisters immediately surrendered and acquiesced, they were to be shot.

To discourage disaffection among their own troops, they posted notices of rewards—payable to Russians and Americans alike—for information leading to the capture of any Russian soldier who had deserted, or who was cooperating with the American authorities. The few soldiers they did pick up as deserters, were court-martialed and shot within hours.

From this point on the War of the Russian Invasion entered a new and more deadly phase. The Communist leaders, facing world censure, and with increasing unrest in the satellite states, not to mention stirrings within Russia itself, decided that the whole enterprise would have to be carried forward decisively to a quick conclusion.
They dropped much of the pretense about protecting Americans from native fascists, and simply demanded American acquiescence in their rule.

The Russians now had approximately two and a half million men in the United States. Since there was a nation-wide civil resistance movement in full operation, and a specially-trained nonviolent army, both concealed by and working with the population at large, the Russian leaders were agreed that more men were needed. The Americans, whose Government was still operative, defended themselves in their resistance activities at least in part by holding forth to the invaders that they were required by law not to cooperate--just as the Russians required their own soldiers and personnel to obey Russian laws and military discipline.

RESISTANCE GROWS

The American Resistance took many forms. At every level--national, state and local--responsible authorities and officials insisted on carrying out their duties according to American laws and requirements. Whole professions and other groupings acted in concert to resist Soviet ultimatums and orders. Whole city police forces went on strike rather than aid the Russians to carry out orders inimical to the citizenry. The teaching profession was under strong pressure to introduce propaganda and indoctrination courses. But sturdy refusal to undertake such teaching frustrated the Russian design. The legal profession, businessmen, workers, city administrators, farmers, in various communities and at various times, risked life and livelihood to resist the Russian takeover.

Through foresight and advance preparation, almost all American groupings had destroyed or concealed in advance the elaborate files and records so necessary to the present-day administration and control of a complex society. Thus, the Russians could find no records of names, identifications, and so forth, which would help them determine who, in a given community, was responsible for what. When both workers and management struck in Detroit and in some of the major industrial cities of the Midwest and East Coast, they accomplished their purpose by simply staying at home. The Communist commands in those cities were unable, in most cases, to find specific men upon whom they could place the blame for the refusal to work.

An effort was begun by the invaders to reorganize key industries, communications media and so forth through a Russian-controlled system. However, the whole effort was so dependent upon the cooperation of the
Americans, that it could be, and was, confused and frustrated from the start through elaborate misinformation, false names, addresses, occupational training and so forth.

It was during this period that the Russians introduced their effort to rule through puppets. Having scraped up those few Americans who, either because of shared ideology or disloyal self-interest, were willing to collaborate with the invader, they introduced them into the situation as legitimate authorities to replace men who would not cooperate.

COLLABORATIONISTS CAPTURED

In most cases, the collaborationists were no surprise to the leaders of the National Resistance effort. The Nonviolent Army moved swiftly in many parts of the country simultaneously on the night of December 18. Their object was quite simply to capture as many of the quisling figures as possible. In a number of cases these operations were carried out literally within the most highly-guarded strong posts held by the Communist invaders, and vulnerable, in part, for the reason that they were thought to be invulnerable.

In the whole operation, a number of Americans were killed and wounded, but in the one night's work, almost every public collaborator in the country was in the hands of the American Government. And not a Russian soldier was harmed!

Such instant determination and action made clear to the Russians, to would-be collaborators, and to the world that collaboration would not be countenanced. And it demonstrated to all who were concerned that the Americans had the necessary control to accomplish their chief purpose: not to obey the invader.

The captured traitors were revealed to the American people and to the world through filmed and recorded programs issued to all the world. Such programs were transmitted by radio and television transmitters secreted inside the United States, aloft in satellite form, rising from under the sea in submarines and smuggled abroad by passenger and merchant ships. True to the principles of nonviolence, the traitorous prisoners were not harmed, but were sentenced to detention and restraint, according to their age and condition, until such time as the Russian-American struggle had been resolved with the withdrawal of the Russian forces.
PROBLEMS OF FOOD AND TRANSPORT

During all these phases of the struggle, the ordinary routines of living, producing, transporting had been carried on in the usual manner. The Communists had interfered only slightly in this process, and then for reasons of commandeering transport, requisitioning food, and so forth, necessary for some specific purpose having to do with the care and movement of their own personnel. But as the struggle deepened, and in the attempt to take over directly in those areas where the Americans' refusal to cooperate had most impeded their efforts at control, the invaders began the attempt to control the nation's food supply and transport system.

Having foreseen the grave problems such an effort might produce, the Americans had made advance arrangements, with several alternative strategies, whereby to maintain ultimate control in these areas. In the first place, they had laid aside in concealed places, huge quantities of emergency rations made up largely from the vast reserve stocks of wheat and other farm products. These were strategically located throughout the country in relationship to the population centers. Secondly, realizing the dependency of the urban population on assured supplies of food, almost all families in cities and towns of any size had been supplied with quantities of emergency foods, which they had been advised to dispose of in such secret ways and places as were known to them privately.

Next, city families were urged to plant their own vegetable gardens in whatever soil was available. Public parks in cities blossomed forth with vegetable gardens.

Fourth, in the event that truck transport should break down or be stopped, almost all flow of food into the cities would be stopped. Hence there was set up a shadow organization to replace regular and ordinary transport from country to city. This was based upon several groups and organizations, but was dependent upon none of them alone. Thus the Government had a responsibility nationally, but it was recognized that at any given moment in an invasion, the usual governmental activities might be cut off or slowed down. Regional and local governments had a responsibility but mostly in relationship to contacting or urging into action trainmen or truckers, who might well be available personally even if cut off from their regular equipment; or such governments might bring into motion or aid such private groups as farm associations, Red Cross agencies and volunteers, police organizations, school and student groups, chambers of commerce, business associations and any others whose ordinary pursuits had to do with food processing, transporting and so forth.
In an emergency these groupings would often have to act on their own initiative and under their own leadership. They would have to undertake the huge task of finding ways of smuggling food into the cities by any of thousands of routes and methods. In some instances this would consist of literal underground tunnels, connections unknown to the invaders. It would consist of the use of private cars or other transport. There would be illicit warehouse and storage facilities. There would be dependence upon achieving a certain degree of cooperation from certain of the invading forces. Thus in a number of instances, Soviet troops would be relied upon to look the other way, or even to aid and abet the secret movement of food.

The whole operation would be under the surveillance of the Non-violent Forces, which would supply contingents to stand by to meet emergency situations and to prevent, where possible, Russian interference in the process. One tactic, for instance, could always be a diversionary hub-bub at some point in a city to draw away Russian forces from certain other areas. Such diversionary tactics could be used to accomplish real purposes in some cases. For example, the capture of collaborationists or of a small contingent of Russian forces for the purposes of "brainwashing" in the continuous program of discouragement directed at Russian troops.

Nevertheless, it was recognized that the Russians might begin the process of requisitioning and confiscating food and farm supplies on a grand scale. The agricultural distress in the Soviet Union and other Communist countries might lead to a program of draining American foodstuffs to feed vast populations. Stalin, much earlier, had successfully subdued and decimated the Russian Kulaks through a program of confiscation that had led to death by starvation of millions.

American farmers joined hands with many of the groups mentioned above in a program to maintain control over, and the distribution of, as much farm production as practicably possible in a situation where inevitably an invading armed force would succeed to a certain extent in seizing part of the crops. But which part, and how large, would be a decisive factor.

According to the plans, there would be several stages at which American control could be aided, plus several stages at which efforts to deliver the crops overseas could be effectively frustrated and reduced. In the first place, American farmers could often conceal the amounts of key foodstuffs that they were producing. Further, some crops could be planted so that they cannot easily be detected. Next, through regional clandestine cooperation a certain amount of every crop could be surreptitiously directed into the regional secret depositories. Likewise, the
amount of food going to regular markets could be incorrectly recorded, so that larger shipments than appeared could be delivered to urban markets. Thus even the urban reserves could be built up.

If the invaders began to confiscate or export certain foodstuffs, an organized program of slowdown, misshipment, sudden seizure, and other emergency measures were taken every step of the way from America's hinterland to the points of shipment along the coasts. Even measures of nonviolent seizure of ships at sea were undertaken.

REPRESSION GROWS

In actual experience, now that these advance arrangements were being given the test by real invaders, and now that the Soviets began to try to control foodstuffs both for overseas use and to discipline the urban masses, some of the darkest days of the war settled over the American scene. While the Russians had no real intention of literally and completely starving out some of the cities where they concentrated their efforts, they had no aversion to carrying the process to the brink of physical endurance in order to bring the city people to a state of obedience to their orders.

At the same time, the efforts of the various resistance groups to keep the food flowing, brought more of them into open and exposed positions. This, in turn, allowed the Russians to crack down severely with executions and other punishments aimed to terrorize and subdue all the resisters.

Everything that was taking place in this war, however, was being recorded, reported and filmed by the Americans, who were still managing to get their reports into almost all parts of the world, even into some of the Communist countries. Here, too, all the world to see, were the Russians killing, punishing, terrorizing. Here, too, were the Americans struggling bravely but nonviolently to maintain themselves and their values. The Russian soldiers were not harmed. Little or no justification was provided for the terror and violence of the Russians who were reduced to inventing lame tales of American hostility which were self-evidently untrue.

Despite severe provocation—and the Russians made use of agents provocateur—American nonviolent discipline was maintained in almost all cases. In those occasional instances in which enraged civil resisters resorted to violence, their own fellows and their own organizations acted to control them. Public apologies were offered to the Russians in every case. But in every case, too, the apologies were accompanied by assurances to the Russians that adamant resistance would continue.
At the height of some of these efforts to subdue the cities, the Americans increased the moral power and persuasiveness of their nonviolent resistance through the sacrificial acts of some of their prominent community figures and leaders who led mass protests and demonstrations. It was in this phase that the powerful role of women in nonviolent struggle became more evident. The Communist soldiers were confronted on the streets by thousands of women appealing to them to throw down their arms, to cease their efforts to rule American society, and to desist in their efforts to reduce the flow of food into American cities.

**GENERAL STRIKE**

As the Russian effort increased proportionately to the American counter-effort, the Americans moved on to the complete general strike throughout the regions where the Communists were concentrating their attempt at control. For two weeks nothing moved, as millions of men and women stayed home from all work, and ventured forth only for specific protests, vigils and demonstrations. Selected leaders in these cases made themselves vulnerable to arrest and punishment which could mean death. These volunteer men and women acted as spokesmen and acknowledged leaders of the strikes. They openly confronted the Russians and refused all cooperation. Some of them died on the spot, when Russian soldiers, under orders, fired into defiant crowds refusing Soviet orders to disperse.

Again, most of the world saw. American photographers, by skill and daring, managed to bring away many photographs and moving pictures of these dramatic scenes.

Behind the scenes, the Russians were having more and more difficulty with the morale and discipline of their own men. Dissension and disaffection were to be found in all ranks. Many officers were revolted and sickened by their own orders originating from the top. Great pressure was on the general in command, General Bubnev. Among the new troops sent in to reinforce the occupation troops were Mongolian and other Asian soldiers from the U.S.S.R.'s most remote republics. These men were counted upon to have less sympathy and compassion for things Western, and they were thought to be less likely to respond positively to appeals by the Americans for reasons of language differences and the lack of any shared traditions.

To meet the challenge of the general strike, the Russians now
introduced the hostage system. In those cities where strikes were under way, leaders were seized and held hostage. The workers were ordered to their tasks or the hostages would be publically shot at given time intervals at the rate of five at a time. Moreover, it was made known to the Americans that if they persisted in their refusal to work, the Russians would add to the hostage system a mass deportation movement, transferring skilled American workers to the U.S.S.R. where they would be put to work or would face death.

The Americans, in response to these new threats, tried two strategies. In some cities they called a halt to the complete general strike and allowed certain key workers to return. Thus they reinstalled transportation, public utilities, schools, services and light industries. But they held back the workers of heavy industry.

At the same time, the Nonviolent Forces struck the detention places, jails and prisons, where the American prisoners were being held. The Russians were not taken entirely by surprise. By this time, they had come to expect some kind of American action. But in many cases even their vigilance was of little use, since the Americans came by routes not anticipated.

Prior to the invasion, in the period of advance preparation, most public buildings, and especially places of detention, had been systematically rebuilt with secret entryways deep inside such buildings coming from tunnels carefully designed to resist detection. Only a selected handful of men knew about these entrances and exits. Now they were put to use.

In a number of cases, they were used so skillfully that the Russian guards never saw them open or close. All they knew was that suddenly the Americans were in their midst, and in number!

ACTION AT DANBURY

A typical case was the assault that freed the American prisoners held in Danbury, one of the old Federal Prisons at Danbury, Connecticut. In the middle of the night of February 21, 1991, (a night when the Nation had gone to bed with a Russian ultimatum ringing in its ears) some of the most highly-trained men from the Nonviolent Forces appeared suddenly and noiselessly inside Danbury's stone corridors, and on several levels simultaneously. Even so, the Russian guards were not asleep. Warning sirens rang throughout the buildings and reserves came running
from the temporary barracks inside the walls. Anticipating gas, most of the Russians quickly donned masks, and they open fired immediately at the attacking Americans.

But this time the Americans came armed with a new weapon: smoke bombs which they lobbed in all directions as they moved through the buildings. In seconds, all ordinary vision was ended. The Russians were like men blinded, groping through the smoke and completely at the mercy of the Nonviolent Forces whose masks were specially designed with red goggles which allowed them to "see" through the smoke.

Working quickly, they emptied cells of political prisoners and led them coughing and gasping to the secret outlets. At Danbury, as at other prisons, the Americans also carried off with them a substantial number of the Russians—to be questioned and talked with in the usual manner.

Within fifteen minutes, they had come and gone, but the smoke hovered on and was dissipated only slowly. When it cleared, all had gone, even those few Americans who had been killed or wounded in the first flurry of shooting by the Russians.

The Communists threw a ring of men around the area surrounding Danbury. They worked on the theory that the secret passages must come out someplace in the immediate vicinity and that the escapees and their rescuers would have to surface someplace near by. But they underestimated the builders of the tunnels. Those men had drawn from the experience of the Chinese Communists under Mao-Tse-Tung, who had, in the winter of 1944-45, dug miles of tunnels in the central Hopei plains of China, linking whole villages to one another underground.

Thus on the morning of February 22nd, the Americans had managed to rescue from the occupying forces almost all the prisoners they had been holding. If there were to be deportations or hostages, the Russians were faced with starting over again to capture them.

RUSSIANS FREED

Within twenty-four hours, the captured Russians were released. The Americans gave very public note to the fact that they had not been harmed, that they were not held as hostages, and they were not threatened with imprisonment or exploitation of their labor.
When the Kremlin received General Bubnov’s report, which
squared in almost all details with the American report, Skobelev and
his advisers decided that a complete review was necessary before
further steps were taken. Clearly the present Soviet course was now
escalating toward measures of savagery and repression such as had
not been contemplated by the Soviet leaders, when they embarked upon
this adventure. The moderates among Chairman Skobelev’s advisors
were urging second thinking. The ultras were calling for blood.

Fyodor Skobelev, Chairman of the Central Committee, issued
a statement that he was going to the United States! He would be accom-
panied by Vladimir Milyutin and a staff of aides. He hoped, he said, to
meet and talk with the American President to bring an end to the useless
resistance to Soviet power and help.

Within one hour of its being made public, there came a reply to
the Skobelev statement. The American President would come to Wash-
ington, D. C. under a safe conduct to talk with the Soviet leaders.

Communication was quickly established between representatives
of the American Government and the Soviet Commanding General. All
arrangements were completed for the meeting of the Soviet Premier and
the American President two days hence, February 25th, at the White
House in Washington. The President and his staff were guaranteed a
safe conduct.

CHAIRMAN SKOBELEV ARRIVES

The meeting of the two heads of government was on schedule. The
President arrived by helicopter, swooping low over Washington streets
and waving to the crowds below. Chairman Skobelev was waiting for him
inside the White House.

The meeting went on for several hours. In the course of it, Sko-
belev and General Bubnov both begrudgingly paid their respects to the de-
termination, courage and ingenuity which had been shown by the American
people, its nonviolent forces and the Government. But they called on the
President to be realistic, pointing out that the Soviet forces had vast re-
stores of weapons so far unused which could reduce the country to a rubble
heap.

"But you won't use them," the President interrupted, "because
they would be both an admission of your failure and an act of cowardice
and savagery that would negate everything that you and your system claim to stand for. Whatever your values, Mr. Chairman, you are no nihilist. You and your colleagues do not want to be remembered as the scourge of whole peoples who died valiantly—and nonviolently—resisting you. If your system has anything to offer, it will be because at this juncture in history, you are human enough and humane enough to recognize the proper moment to withdraw from an adventure that has misfired."

Skobelev cocked his head, and for a moment looked quizzically at the American leader.

"Would you have us meekly turn and leave?" he asked. "We are not Christians. We shall not inherit the earth from lack of will to act, but rather from seeing an action through." And he added in a low voice, "Even an action we may regret."

"Why are you afraid to compete with us?" the President asked. "If you really believe in the power of your ideas and your system, and if you are really concerned with improving the lot of mankind, ordinary men everywhere, then why do you persist in the sterile course of violent conqueror? The whole world is watching today to see how you will deal with this challenge. We Americans have never been so close to our fellows throughout the world as we are today. Millions upon millions of ordinary working people throughout the world—including millions in your own land—are with us in spirit, morally, hopeful to see us win our way through. They recognize that the only true victory for mankind, for Americans and Russians, for peoples everywhere who truly need and seek peace and justice, is the recognition on your part that you have grievously erred, and the magnanimity on your part to withdraw as gracefully as possible.

"For our part, and for myself," continued the President, "we hope even more. Terrible things have been done and men's lives have been sacrificed. Your own forces are torn between their dislike of the task you have imposed upon them and their loyalty to their country and to you. Both sides have already put too much into this to have only a sterile 'victory' for one side. This would only serve to reveal to the world that both countries and both systems are too dehumanized and too rigid to serve the true interests of mankind: the need to transcend the whole tragic history of at least the last century which has brought us today to the bleak world in which we live, a world in which men eke out their lives alternately playing the role of victim or executioner.

"It was your predecessor Chairman Krushchev who called most loudly for complete disarmament down to the last atom. Where are
you today? Do you come as a would-be conqueror, or as the hopeful agent of a new period of peace and well-being for all men everywhere? Will you join with me in proclaiming to all the world the end of this war and of every useless, mad urge to war which still stands in man's way to a more humane society? Will you announce today a withdrawal of your forces and the readiness of your country to join with ours—and with every other country—to wipe out the last vestiges of exploitation of man by man, and of the harnessing of science and technology to raise man forever from the grip of poverty and want?"

Skobelev listened and reflected. One could see, as he slowly rose, that his years weighed heavily upon him. He stood quietly for a long interval as though conducting an inward struggle. Then he turned to his military retinue, and pointing to the President, he wearily rasped: "Arrest that man!"

THE PRESIDENT'S FINAL MESSAGE

It was several hours later before the Nation and the world realized that the President of the United States was being held prisoner by the Russians. Some found it hard to believe, but others remembered that the Marxist-Leninist ethic held that any means were justified if they furthered the ends of the Revolution. But whatever justification they felt for the violation of the safe conduct, the American leader was now at the mercy of the Communists.

In the early morning hours of February 28th, the signal was given throughout the land that a special message was being carried to the people via illicit television and radio. Millions of Americans were watching when the Vice President appeared, surrounded by members of the Cabinet, leading Congressmen and four members of the Supreme Court.

The Vice President spoke first. He explained that while the detention of the President, in violation of the assurance of safe conduct was a serious and tragic turn of events, the President and other members of the Government had not been unaware of the possibility of such a treacherous move at the time that the "safe conduct" was accepted. The President had felt the risk necessary in order to carry directly to Premier Skobelev a message that might alter not only the course of the Russian-American struggle, but the course of events in the world. He explained the President's determination to appeal to Skobelev to rise above the narrow practices of Marxist-Leninism to a broad, humanitarian view of the better life for all men that would be possible through world-wide
cooperation and the creation of new institutions which would allow men to make humane and creative use of their new technology and organizational skills for the benefit of all.

Anticipating, however, the possibility that the Russians might reject this appeal, and might violate their word, the President, with members of his Government and representatives of both parties, had explicitly provided in advance for an orderly transfer of authority to the Vice President, so that the government and the people could continue, unswervingly and without stint, to nonviolently resist all efforts of the Communists to control the country or the lives of the people. Before departing for his meeting with Skobelev, the President had recorded a message to the American people and to the people of the world.

Then on all television screens there flashed the familiar figure of the President. His family was seated just behind him. The Vice President was seated beside him. The President spoke:

Friends and fellow citizens. If you ever see this recorded message, it will be because I am no longer able to perform my duties as your Chief Executive, and because our opponents have, in some manner, violated their solemn word. From this moment forward, I am turning all my duties and responsibilities over to the Vice President, who now becomes your President. Under his leadership, and inspired by his example, I have every confidence that you will not falter in the severe task that lies ahead of us.

No doubt the Russians believe that as a result of incapacitating my leadership, the Nation will waver. They cannot easily understand our system and our experience with responsible government passed steadily from hand to hand in all seasons, come good or come bad. They will not easily believe that the struggle will continue as before, only firmer, more resolved. They will probably think that as a result of their perfidious act, they will provoke hotheads among us to cause a breakdown in our nonviolent discipline, to an acceptance of their terms of struggle: age-old violence, unremitting hatred, self-defeating fear.

But again they underestimate us as a people, as human beings and as citizens of the great commonwealth,
the Brotherhood of Man. In our struggle with the Russian Communist State, we are not striving for ourselves alone. We are fighting the good fight for all men everywhere; yes, even for the Russian people themselves. If there is a victory to be won, it will be won for us all, Russian and American, Chinese and African, Black and White. The real defeat would not be that the Russians have weapons which could utterly lay waste our country. Indeed, the Russians have the physical weapons—nuclear weapons—in hand with which they could destroy us utterly! When we undertook nonviolent resistance, we knowingly took the risk that the suffering would fall on us: we might all be killed.

We made a choice knowing the range of possible consequences. We gambled that the Russian people are human beings capable of reason and compassion. We took the calculated risk that they are not impervious to the sufferings of others and that they are not dominated by criminally insane rulers. Therefore, the only real defeat for us would be to falter, or grow weary, in the hard course we have taken.

My appeal to you today is that you hold the course. Accept the sacrifices and the suffering without whimping. Make clear our repugnance for tyranny and inhumanity by refusing to tyrannize others or to wrongly use them. Continue to resist through all hardship, hate, violence, torture, and fear and the weakness that makes men their agents. Above all, persist in our way of nonviolence, harming no man, wishing no suffering upon any people, seeking to overcome those who fear us with compassion and understanding. Our victory shall lie in the friendships we achieve which will lead the Russian people and all the peoples of the world to stay the hands of the tyrants.

No tyranny can continue to exist and exercise its way, if those who live under it no longer obey its orders and carry out its will. And the end of that tyranny will come if each of us sustains the courage to act nonviolently against it no matter what the risk to ourselves.

In going to meet with the Russian leaders now, I sustain no risk that you would not bear yourselves.
Leadership among men is an inner discipline and sense of responsibility that sustains us all whether part of many or facing great odds alone.

Americans! The world is watching! Our country is sprung from peoples of all the world. Let us be worthy of mankind today and in the future. Maintain your fraternal cooperation. Never flag in your discipline. And despite all of your felt hostility, seek to befriend our individual enemies, to win them away from the tyranny they support out of ignorance or fear. Do not turn away from the struggle.

THE NEW PRESIDENT SPEAKS

After a brief pause, as the President's image faded, the television camera again picked up the Vice President and solemn assemblage of officials. Quickly the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court stepped forward and administered the oath of office. The new President of the United States turned back to the camera's eye and proceeded:

"With respectful memory of the high courage and deathless example of President Rustjacket, I ask you now to join with me and with my colleagues in following his path."

Controlling his emotions, the new President encouraged the American people:

Your government continues, as you must continue, in a course of nonviolent resistance to the invader that now occupies our country, but who cannot control our lives, our actions and our determination to remain free. We shall overcome this invader by winning his agents to our cause. Only our example, our readiness to suffer if necessary and our desire to befriend the soldiers of the aggressor can prove our case.

The Russian Government has announced a new phase in the struggle, one in which they have ordered their armed forces to act in a tougher and more ruthless manner. Our response to this must be, in turn, to act with greater determination in a gentler and even more nonviolent manner. Let the contrast be ever clearer between the valuation
placed on human life and dignity in our democratic, non-violent society, and in the Soviet, totalitarian society. Let every man choose. It is our role and our duty to provide the better choice.

Return to your work and to your part in the struggle. All parts and sections of the National Resistance carry on. Your government both leads and follows, for initiative in this struggle must come both from the institutions and from each individual. We appeal to all the world, including the Russian people, to join us in this struggle for human freedom and well-being.

THE AFTERMATH

In the days immediately following these dramatic events, new actions swirled throughout the country and the world, as the war approached a climax. The Russian army now moved swiftly and seemingly without scruples in an all-out attempt to terrorize and suppress the American people and their government. Casualty lists swelled as men, and some women and children, fell victims of localized raids and attacks, especially in urban areas. Not able to easily differentiate between official members of the nonviolent forces and the general citizenry, the Soviets experimented with general tactics of terrorization, much as in the past the Americans and others had tried to deal with guerilla warfare in various parts of the world.

One of the great handicaps constantly faced by the Russians was the widespread American practice of filming almost every terrorist act and then circulating the film throughout the world. Thus, people everywhere—workers and peasants, middle class and aristocrats—were daily provided with a blow by blow account, visually, of Russian aggression and terror in action.

The Americans, it turned out, while waging a kind of nonviolent guerilla struggle, were no simple, technologically-backward people. They countered Communist violence with actions and demonstrations of great courage and ingenuity—actions which had been planned and carefully worked out in advance. And they filmed these actions. Thus the people of the world could see the contrast between the two methods and systems, and could choose.

YEVTUSHENKO'S APPEAL

Five days after the Vice President took over the Presidency, there
was a great national demonstration in cities and villages throughout the country. It was led by the women and children. Delegations of women marched through the streets carrying appeals to the Russian soldiers to abandon their way of violence, and to join themselves with their own best values, as enunciated by their own leaders and thinkers. One of the American leaflets, written in Russian and several Eastern languages, quoted from the famous Russian poet, Yevtushenko (now himself in "protective custody" in the Soviet Union). It was from a newspaper article which he had written on November 29, 1962, for the Cuban paper, Revolucion, upon the occasion of his visit to that country. It was an appeal to the Cuban people not to make the same errors that the Russians had made when planning their Revolution:

> We were the first country to build socialism. It is impossible to be first without making mistakes. We made many. It would be absurd to suppose that all these were only Stalin's fault, even though he may have been personally responsible for many. I don't think that Stalin was a cynic who made high-sounding speeches about communism without believing in it. Stalin had faith in communism, but men were only construction material to him. He forgot that they were also the future inhabitants of the building. And he forgot that the means must be worthy of the end.

> He who lacks scruples can jeopardize the higher ends and cause men to forget them, as in this case, the end is transformed into the means for justifying the lack of scruples. How can we explain the death of so many worthy men, unjustly accused? How can we explain forgetting the most vital needs of workers and farmers...? How can we justify the implacable criticism and persecution of the best writers who, for love of their country, refused to paint reality in rosy pictures...?

> 'Communism is the supreme incarnation of the truth. Can we arrive at the truth through lies? Won't the truth change into just another lie? It is of singular importance for us that all the countries who follow our experience elect only the good means.

The Communist generals and higher officers were at a loss as to how to deal with these masses of thousands of marching women and their children. Aware that the world was watching, and that their own forces were more restive than ever, at first they simply held back while checking with Moscow for instructions.
In the Kremlin another crisis had arisen: there was a growing division in the Politburo itself and therefore, an irresolution in its decisions. Despite a wartime and complete totalitarian censorship of the news, the whole Soviet population was restive in a manner heretofore unknown in the history of the country. News trickled into the general ken of the population despite all official controls. There was illicit listening to the BBC, the Voice of America and other national radio reports. There was word-of-mouth information from returned soldiers and from letters from the men on duty in the United States. There was news carried person to person by travelers returned from other countries. There were even clandestine showings of some of the films from America.

From Western Europe came the rumblings of the great mass of the people and their governments. Across the Continent roared the great "Peace March to Moscow by the Peoples of the World"—literally scores of thousands of marchers from many lands. Now moving through West Germany, the March was approaching both East Germany and Poland, and the Soviet Peace Committee had already received delegations from the March seeking permission for the Marchers to move through the cities and villages of the Soviet Union.

KREMLIN MONOLITH CRACKS

The Kremlin was now faced with a triple crisis: division in the top leadership (the question of what measures to take against the growing nonviolent movement in America with women and children now complicating the problem) and a clamoring world represented most vigorously by an unarmed mass of people representing many millions of others, as well as governments, marching toward the Russian border in an attempt to nonviolently "invade" the Soviet Union with an urgent demand to the Russian people and government to desist in the aggressive military action in the United States.

Skobelev was a sick man. All of his work and plans seemed on the verge of collapsing under the demands of the "hawks," an amalgam of unrepentant Stalinists and some professional military men. They urged violent action on all fronts: against the Americans no matter what class, age or sex; against the Western European governments which were supporting the American cause, and hence, the advancing Peace Marchers; and finally, against the "doves," the right deviationists, the skobelevites, and Skobelev himself.
The issue was resolved in another of the all-night meetings in the Kremlin. Towards dawn Chairman Skobelev was relieved of all of his governmental and party posts, put under Army detention, with his final fate seeming only a matter of time. For the present, he was prudently spared in order to measure public reaction and army morale first.

The latter precaution seemed necessary, for the latest—and most threatening—straw in the wind was the report of internal discontent now spilling over into overt actions and subversion of public order.

Years earlier, in the time of the "Thaw" there had appeared in the Western press reports of officer cadets in Soviet military colleges who had challenged their officers' and professors' indoctrination concerning the "nobility of the military calling." The Manchester Guardian had reported in January, 1963, that "men at the Far East Military College have objected that "it is wrong to talk in general about the nobility of the military calling, because this is to propagate militarism."

"There could be no nobility, they claimed, 'Where men train to kill other men.' The harshness of military life, the need for constant subordination, the restriction of freedom—all these, they argued, 'preclude any nobility.'"

The new Soviet leaders may have recalled these earlier voices as there now grew within the Soviet Union open discontent and public demonstrations against the militarist policies of the government.

Yet the morning after Skobelev's disposal, there was no official recognition of this or of the action against Skobelev. Pravda and the other media in the Soviet Union reported nothing of Skobelev's fall, nor of the new clique of Stalinists and military officers who now claimed the supreme power. Rather, they reported only that the great patriotic war against the American fascists was now in its final phase, and that the whole population would have to draw together in patriotic discipline to carry out the necessary tasks to bring the war to a successful conclusion. In addition, there was a hint that new action might soon be undertaken in West Germany and other parts of Western Europe due to the "menace of the bloodthirsty fascists and militarists now mobilizing in West Germany." This last was in reference to the Peace Marchers now moving through West Germany.

That afternoon Soviet troops in New York City, Philadelphia, Boston, Washington, D. C., Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland and Seattle received orders to fire into any street demonstrations or
marches. Since women's marches and demonstrations were taking place in all these cities and more, there occurred one of the most brutal and cold-blooded acts of the war: more than 5,500 American women were slain, along with at least 1,500 children, and there were still uncounted wounded left lying in the streets, or being carried away by American rescue squads. Most of these actions were filmed by the Americans, and the films were flashed overseas within an hour of the massacres.

The Russian troops on the spot in the American cities reacted variously. In San Francisco, Washington, Boston and Philadelphia there were outright troop mutinies. Whole contingents of Russian soldiers refused to carry out their orders. In some instances, they turned on their officers, or were actually joined by the officers. In other situations, they reluctantly carried out the order, but in a slipshod manner, and only because they were themselves under the guns of their superior officers. A shiver ran through the Russian army in the United States, as the American government put all of its resources to work to be sure that not a Russian soldier in the United States failed to learn both about the order, the massacres, and the mutinies.

The new American President immediately took to radio and television with a passionate appeal to the Nation to stand firmly by its non-violent discipline. For under the emotion and grief of the massacres of the women and children, there had come demands from many Americans that now they could no longer remain nonviolent. But the leadership at the national and at the local levels held firm. The leaders of women's organizations rallied strongly urging all citizens to remain nonviolent. Meanwhile a wave of revulsion and indignation swept through the world. Despite the best efforts of the Soviet government, the Soviet people learned of the massacres and of the revulsion and heartsickness that had affected their own troops.

That same evening the word leaked out that Chairman Skobelev had been removed from office and had disappeared. Lights burned late in the Soviet Union as well as in America and the rest of the world.

THE NATION ACTS

The following morning, the Russian commanders in America awoke to learn that the streets and public squares of every town and city in the United States were crowded with what appeared to be the entire citizenry of the country. Led by elderly men and women, the lame and the halt, the Americans were presenting themselves both in defiance of
the Soviet Army and in commemoration of the women and children who had been shot down little more than eighteen hours earlier.

And then it happened.

No man knows yet just where or how it started, nor whether it was the result of a plan or simply a spontaneous upsurge from deep within the people.

The citizenry of the Soviet Union rose up. They stood up. They swarmed through their own towns and streets and public buildings. They demanded an end. An End to the war! An END to their own country's aggression and brutality in America or any other place in the world.

They demanded a beginning. The Beginning of Freedom and Human Brotherhood for which they had been waiting since time began. They demanded to be treated as adults, as valuable, even as priceless. And they demanded that all others be treated the same way.

They demanded peace and disarmament. What could be easier, since the American people had already disarmed and had already demonstrated that there was a better way to resist tyranny and war—that there was, indeed, a better way to practice peace! The Russian People proclaimed its solidarity with the American People and all of the Peoples of the world!

And so the war ended.

The Russian army contained thousands of men only too eager to put down their guns. There was no threat to their country or to their own lives. The Americans had demonstrated that, while they were prepared to resist tyranny to the end, they wanted not to injure or kill anybody in the world...not even the Soviet soldiers who had killed so many of them!

The Russian people demanded the reconstitution of their government with a chairman of their choice. There was a clear indication that from now on the people were going to demand, and get, a greater voice in the kind of government and in the kind of men who were to be their leaders.

In the United States, the Russian army laid down its arms and began its withdrawal. As a final act before leaving, there were somber American-Russian meetings of reconciliation and of friendship. If it had
been for the terrible bloodletting of only a few days before, these might have been joyous, even gay, occasions. The Russian soldiers, officers and men, attested at length their sorrow and shame that they had been the accomplices and agents of such terror. They swore eternal friendship and declared themselves ready to follow the American example of complete disarmament made possible through the practice of Nonviolence.

There is little now to add. Throughout the world men rejoiced in the final outcome of the Russo-American war, the first war in history that had ended with a victory for both sides and for humanity generally. For the first time in the 20th century a great struggle had ended leaving behind no reservoirs of hate and frustration at having lost a war. The people of the world felt a release from fears and tensions that they had carried all of their lives. Now they turned vigorously to the rational and nonviolent effort of solving some of the major economic and political problems that had been insoluble in a world eternally threatened with total war.