

I am being swept along by a negative peace movement that perplexes me intellectually, disturbs me emotionally, and encourages me spiritually. These notes on this mess/mix should help at least me:

1. Lord Russell's British ban-the-bomb movement 1/3rd century ago was noble and pathetic. He was, throughout his life, a mad bomber with his mind, and felt he could destroy therewith everything needing destroying--so who needs nukes? But positively, he called for Wm. James' "moral alternative to war," and that call is history-long. Problem: The intelligentsia with their invisible weaponry and the peculiar blindnesses pertaining thereto have not done well when they have come to power over/among the people; and von Clausewitz's "Diplomacy is war by another means" sardonically points to the problem root underneath visible/invisible, physical/"mental" conflict: something is awry in the human spirit.

2. The "ban-the-____" notion requires a ban-keeping authority, and that the world does not have. Israel felt it had to crush Iraq's nuke-potential because the UN couldn't/wouldn't; what is to be done about Libya's? I agree with Howard Kurtz's mutual-surveillance-by-satellite, but its only information-gathering/disseminating: what's to be done once nuke-violations are discovered? Who's to punish/stop, and how (including at what cost and risk)?

2. The macho-mad view peaceniks as evidence of "moral" weakness and rot, "moral" here meaning the will-to-power. Hitler was amazed, given the strength of the peace movement in the English-speaking world, to see how quickly we put our minds to violence. In the deadly game of psyching out the Kremlin, Reagan wants to sword-rattle and Euro-American peaceniks want to wave the olivebranch; the diametrical opposition of these two actions may make "the enemy" cross-eyed enough so he can't shoot straight, but more probably neither will have any significant effect on Moscow.

3. The fact that nonrational imponderables are, in all human conflict, heavier than reason discourages rational thought. I'm an omnivorous reader of peace/war propaganda, and I find little reason in any of it--"reason" in the sense of total analytic/synthetic, though there's plenty of internal reasoning (e.g., "Nuclear war is insane because"). Analogical thinking makes good propaganda--e.g., the "New Abolitionist Covenant," on the analogy of the abolition of slavery --but poor reasoning. (Note, e.g., the difference in root-motivation on either side of this analogy: slavery abolitionism was *faith-driven*, nuke abolitionism is *fear-driven*.)

4. While I agree with Jer./Eze./NT that each suffers for his/her own sin, I believe that history's evils continue as shock-waves, just as history's goods continue as "clouds of blessing on our heads." God calls us to be honest-to-history, honest-to-the-human-heart, honest-to-nukes. Such honesty will violate many tabus and feelings, prejudices and "convictions." It may not come to power till after humanity has almost destroyed itself and the biosphere (the fanatic cry that we can destroy both is an instance of excessive rhetoric, than which nothing discredits faster a movement that is word-based rather than sword-based). Maybe, for the foreseeable future, the human choice is not between victors (even "peace" victors) and victims but between victims and martyrs, the very choice we have in such cases as (1) Jesus' crucifixion and (2) the Holocaust. Up against the nukes, humanity, the earth, is the Warsaw Ghetto. What mood does this analogy suggest?

5. Goodwill calls for action intelligently motivated by both faith and fear, to God's glory.