

HOW THE URANTIA BOOK HELPS US UNDERSTAND THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

WAR AND PEACE - STATE OF THE WORLD

by

James C. Mills

URANTIA BROTHERHOOD
Summer Study Session
July 21 and 22, 1972

The attached speech, while perhaps based on the Urantia teachings in one way or another, should not be interpreted in any way as necessarily representing an official or unofficial pronouncement of the views or philosophy of the Urantia Brotherhood School, Urantia Brotherhood, and/or Urantia Foundation.

The author of this speech is solely responsible for the ideas and subject matter presented herein.

Direct quotations and all other material from the URANTIA Book (Copyright © 1955 URANTIA Foundation) which are used in this paper are by permission of the URANTIA Foundation.

WAR AND PEACE - STATE OF THE WORLD

by
James C. Mills

My topic is War and Peace - State of the World.

Taken by itself, this is a formidable enterprise for any non-expert to approach, even though he may be fortified, as I am, by that great courage which is supplied only by ignorance. However, with this topic to be contained within our over-all theme of "How the Urantia Book Helps Us Understand the Contemporary World," we are provided with an approach which eliminates a large amount of source material --that based upon emotion -- and permits us to take an objective view of war as a phenomenon indigenous to our planet, and as common to Urantia as air and water.

I speculate that when we have finished our course on this sphere and move on to those which will provide us with a less egocentric view of things in general, we may discover that this planet, as well as being known as the "World of the Cross," is also recognized as a sphere whereon the practice of waging war has been raised to a level of high development. Indeed we ourselves take this same viewpoint. Sociologists usually use the term "war" only if the conflict is initiated and conducted in accordance with socially recognized forms. Thus they treat war as an institution recognized in custom or law.

We have developed a certain terminology specific to war and though its content of self-delusion may be open to both qualitative and quantitative analysis, nevertheless our reporters, writers, commentators, and historians seem to be in agreement on its use. So put your tongue in your cheek and listen to some of the terminology developed by military writers who seem to be competing with the sociologists for verbal objectivity.

"War" is a term used only when the two contending groups are sufficiently equal in power to render the outcome uncertain for a time. Conflicts of powerful states with primitive peoples are called "pacifications," "military expeditions," or "explorations," with small states they are called "interventions" or "reprisals," and with internal groups, "rebellions" or "insurrections." However, if the resistance of the smaller group reaches sufficient magnitude, the whole operation is dignified by the word "war." Regardless of terminology, the dead are just as dead.

Speaking of the dead, the Urantia Book tells us that in the first third of this century more people were killed in wars than in all of the previous wars in history. The techniques of war are truly developing. By way of adding to the total, the civilian dead in modern wars exceed the military dead. In World War I, the military dead were 10,000,000, the civilian dead 10,000,000, but another 20,000,000 died from war-spread epidemics and famines throughout the world. Its economic cost was estimated at a total of \$338,000,000,000, with a direct cost of \$186,000,000,000. World War II yielded 17,000,000 military dead and 43,000,000 civilian dead, at a total cost of \$1,348,000,000,000 and direct costs of \$1,167,000,000,000. We can add 5,000,000 total dead in the Korean War and, excluding Viet Nam, the Spanish Civil War, and the Sino-Japanese War, still come up with a total of \$105,000,000 dead for the first half of the century -- and this is incomplete. It does, however, tell us something about the efficiencies of our modern killing techniques.

Now let us turn to a very objective consideration of war. To those of you who were emotionally moved by the foregoing statistics, I ask that you check your emotions; perhaps consider that the vast majority of the mortals who went to make up these statistics are either now upon the mansion worlds or are being held, totally oblivious to their state, for the next dispensational resurrection, and will awaken without the consciousness of the passage of any time whatsoever. All things considered, they are probably, from our point of view, somewhat better off than we are.

The definition of war which seems to most adequately cover the phenomenon is the one that describes it as "the effort on the part of one organized group to impose its will upon another organized group by means of force." Thus the key unit here is the organized group which today has come to mean the organized state or nation or empire or, if you will, "power" or "super-power." This is the key also to the philosophical approach so well expressed in the Urantia revelation.

I am going to paraphrase the statement in the Urantia Book in order to give order and coherence to this presentation, and to attempt to keep it within our contemporary framework. To those of you who are reference-minded, my sources are mainly *Paper 70, beginning on page 738, and Paper 134 beginning on page 1483, titled "The Evolution of Human Government" and "The Transition Years" respectively. To those of you who are very detail-minded, I trust you will avidly follow my every word and thereby benefit both of us by uncovering my mistakes.

Genesis and Some History

Primitive man, to survive in a totally hostile environment, was born belligerent. His survival depended upon his ability to defend himself and family and to secure his food by force. The battle was constant. Only within the family area could he relax his eternal vigilance. And here in the family area he experienced his first peace which in truth was only a temporary respite from constant hostilities. Today in the 20th century our periods of peace have become merely intervals between a state of constant war - hot or cold.

But as each primitive family faced the same conditions, though hostility was constant, war as we know it was non-existent for war presumes group action, hence organization.

Given this background of belligerence, it is easy to understand that war is the natural state and heritage of evolving man. The more primitive the individual and culture, the more violent their reactions to apparent frustrations. War is the same reaction carried on collectively. Thus by contrast to this animalistic reaction to misunderstandings and frustrations, peace is a part of a civilized solution and can be considered a direct measure of the degree of civilization of any culture.

As the primitive organization moved from family to clan, clans to tribes, and tribes to nation, peace within each group became the pattern. Peace between groups was again that period which marked the interval between wars. And this condition continues to the present.

Wars and their method of conduct have been subject to evolutionary developments. Earliest wars were intensely brutal, and led often to the extermination of one of the contending groups. Gradually refinements were added such as taking prisoners, exempting women from combat, care for the wounded regardless of side, and the giving of parole to those who would promise to return home and never fight again. Today we have rules of civilized warfare, refuge for political fugitives, and a Geneva Convention. Warfare has gradually evolved from a man-hunt to the more orderly system of "civilized" nations. "But only slowly does the social attitude of amity displace that of enmity." p.785*

Social Value of War

In past ages wars would institute social changes and facilitate and expedite the adoption of new ideas by as much as 10,000 years. Nevertheless, the price was always a society regressed to savagery, abandonment of civilized reason, and sometimes the destruction of the society itself.

War in the past has:

1. Imposed discipline, enforced cooperation.
2. Placed a premium on fortitude and courage.
3. Fostered internal unity within the group.
4. Destroyed weak and unfit persons.
5. Dissolved the illusion of premature equality and selectively stratified society.

Ancient war promoted travel and spread culture. In mathematics and science Europe owes much to the Moorish invasions and the Crusades. Even in modern times, many Americans in both World Wars have been transported to far-off lands to be exposed to various cultures and mores, and not a few have returned with brides from distant lands. True, there are much better ways of accomplishing these results today than through warfare, but as yet not on as large a scale.

War, like many other institutions of the past, has been an indispensable scaffolding in the building of civilization. War does promote invention which in post-war times is often turned to uses beneficial to civilization. War has been responsible for many new developments in medicine and surgery which have been brought about because the needs in these areas are forced into such focus that prime attention is demanded. Research in areas which has lagged because of insufficient funds has suddenly accelerated because the project being considered is vital and money is always made available. Witness the cool allocation of one billion dollars to the Manhattan Project in World War II, which in the post-war years has led to nuclear power development, without which our vocal environmentalists would have one less cause and opportunity to project themselves on the public stage. Consider the importance of radioactive isotopes in medicine, in analytical chemistry, in metallurgy, and a host of other uses. Without the Manhattan Project these still might not be with us.

Today the nations of Urantia are entering upon the gigantic struggle between nationalistic militarism and industrialism. In the past, those nations which

achieved great empire and wealth and power immediately became the target of coalitions of their less powerful neighbors and were finally reduced to the level of their neighbors. But this is a greater struggle today, for in many ways it is analogous to the age-long struggle between the herder-hunter and the farmer, both of whom envisioned different uses for the same land within the same national unit.

In the present struggle nationalistic militarism, given the technical level of combat equipment, needs industrialism. But industrialism does not need militarism except in a defense capacity only. Wars inhibit the development of progressive industrialism by their tendencies to freeze design, narrow research, and regiment the worker. Wars are horribly wasteful of capital and produce goods only for destruction.

Industrialism freed from the restraints imposed by war can expand research and open new markets by experimenting with the development of new design, products, and methods. We have an outstanding example of this today in Japan. Rising from the almost complete ashes of total defeat in World War II, Japan is today with a population of 105,000,000 people the third industrial power in the world -- from nothing to this status in 27 years. Why? Because we placed Japan under the protection of our nuclear umbrella and said to the rest of the world "hands off." With this status Japan could turn all her financial resources, except those necessary to support a small so-called "self defense force," to invention, building, research, personnel development, and market development, with little money spent on armaments. Today you all know what the results have been. But note, apparently Japan has learned a lesson. Mr. Tanaka, the new premier, whom Young Japanese expected to change many things and whom older Japanese feared because they suspected him of radicalism, made as one of his first pronouncements the proclamation of his decision to remain under the nuclear umbrella of the United States.

We have witnessed within the last few days a tremendous agreement between Occidental Petroleum and the Russian government for the development and exploitation of Russian oil reserves. Last week, a friend of mine, just returned from Russia, told me of the tremendous raw potential for development in Russia already just getting under way, with West Germany and Japan leading the way. We will now be involved also.

We are told in the Urantia Book that man will never accept peace as a normal mode of living until he has been thoroughly and repeatedly convinced that peace is best for his material welfare. This will be difficult as long as we feel we must raise our children on a diet of militarism.

It is true that old-fashioned war did select the innately great men for leadership, but modern war no longer does this. To discover leaders, society must now turn to the conquests of peace; industry, science, and social achievement. Never forget, though, that self-preservation is still the strongest reaction of man regardless of how it is manifested.

What then can we look forward to? Total freedom from war in our generation, the next, or succeeding generations? No, I fear that this is impossible. Total peace will come only as the culmination of a further long evolutionary development. Man has been evolving his social institutions for over 993,000 years on this

planet. You and I have learned that even accelerated evolution would cover a very very long time.

Some day, probably far in the future, we shall have real and forever enduring peace on this planet. This will be after the last of the sovereign nations of that time surrenders its power to make war into the hands of a representative government of all mankind.

Today our 20th century has spawned a League of Nations and a Kellogg-Briand treaty to outlaw war, and a United Nations. From a social point of view the United Nations has been the most successful. But where? Solely in those areas where its member nations have been willing to surrender a small portion of their individual sovereignty to the United Nations working group.

The League of Nations and the United Nations are merely a form of internationalism. A situation in which each sovereign nation agrees to work with other sovereign nations, but keeps one eye on its own interests and the other continually cast skeptically on the behavior of the others, while they piously proclaim the rights of self-determination for all.

But self-determination is one of the roots of the problem. For political self-determination goes through an evolutionary period of self-surrender through the whole process of the evolution of family to super-power. Political sovereignty is created out of the surrender of self-determinism first by the individual within the family, families within clans, clans within tribes, tribes within states, and states within nations. As each larger group is formed, individual loyalty goes to a larger and larger group. But as groups grow, loyalties solidify and it becomes more and more difficult to effect transference of group loyalty to the next larger group. Our two failures in this century, doomed at their beginning, are ample evidence of that.

The League of Nations and the United Nations in their early bloom of strength did more or less effectively prevent some minor wars. But when their own members are engaged in fomenting conflict, success becomes an hallucination. In the case of the League of Nations the United States early shot the first torpedo at it, when in a surge of isolationism the U. S. Senate refused to ratify our entrance. From this point it was doomed, but the final disintegration had to await the outright withdrawal of Japan whose militarists had other plans. The slow disintegration of the United Nations to the level of a debating society, as far as major questions are concerned, is a phenomenon of our generation observed by all.

So where do we stand today? The family, clan, tribe, and state structure has evolved to that of the nation. Three nations today have advanced to or may be called super-states. The most recent of course is China where after 25 years the bamboo curtain has been cracked so that we can peer through it just a little and see that apparently it is becoming a unified whole. There are a few of us here today who can remember when China was a land of warlords, dissension, and division between provinces -- an easy prey to the organized states of Europe who for 100 years exploited the opportunities provided by this giant in the throes of internal distress.

This same process began in Russia 55 years ago and today no one questions the unity of Russians.

So today we have evolved to a world of mixed states. There are three super-powers so-called. There are many important and powerful states somewhat below the level of super-powers. A coalition of these states -- and I am referring to those states involved in the European Common Market -- could well forge another super-state greater in population, wealth, and potential industrialism than the United States. What prevents this? The same group loyalties previously referred to. France is for Frenchmen, Germany is for Germans, and so on and on. Group loyalties are based solely on what is recognized as self-interest.

In our present state of distrust and fear can you conceive Russia, China, and the United States meeting and agreeing to relinquish military sovereignty to a central authority? It is quite possible even now for these three or two of the three to meet and enter into agreements which can prevent minor wars and stop those already in progress among smaller states. Most minor wars can be stopped easily for today most minor countries do not have the industrial capacity to produce their own armaments. Where would North Vietnam be today without aid from Russia and China, and South Vietnam without aid from the United States? Add to this list Egypt, Israel, the other Arab States, India, and Pakistan. All are belligerent, but all increasingly call for aid from the outside. (Comment on the U.S. rapprochement with China and Russia.)

If we peer a little deeper into our present world situation, we discover some interesting facts about the super-powers. Of the three, the political sovereignty of all three is based originally on force of arms. Considering governmental theory all three are different though the degree of difference varies.

Have you considered the position of the United States in this situation? We are less than 200 years old and only 110 years ago we were engaged in our own great war which determined that we would survive as a nation. Despite these facts, we are by far the oldest of the three super-powers in continuity of state and government. We are the only one of the super-powers that maintains the legislative, judicial, and executive branches by the representative government process. It is interesting to note that universe administrators have learned from experience that the evolutionary peoples on inhabited worlds are best regulated by the representative type of civil government when there is maintained proper balance of power between the well-coordinated executive, legislative, and judicial branches. This was the aim of our founding fathers. Today its achievement as fact depends upon the appointment of judges whose views on sociology tend to conform to those of the current administration, whose legislators and executives are elected on the basis of promises made to all or segments of the electorate. We have representative government of the type called democracy, which is a human institution -- the product of civilization, not of evolution. And inherent in democracy are: the glorification of mediocrity -- the choice of base and ignorant rulers -- failure to recognize the basic facts of social evolution -- the danger of universal suffrage in the hands of uneducated and indolent majorities -- and slavery to public opinion -- the majority is not always right.

The problems of the United States today are many, internally and externally. We have a chance as a nation to work with the other super-powers. We have the chance to show by example the great things that can be accomplished by the theoretically ideal application of our method of government. We lead in and can show the way to progressive industrialism and to social progress, but best of all we have the tools to open the way to progressive enlightenment in the field of religion.

My biggest and final question is: Can we, in the face of all of the impediments inherent in a democracy, develop the techniques to rise above ourselves and help lead the world to the only possible collective security from war -- that collective security which embraces all mankind -- universal sovereignty?