

Pacifism And Security

The problem of keeping the United States out of the present European war has occupied some of the best minds in the country and has been the source of columns of editorial comment.

Not among the very least of the publications approaching the question has been the Furman Hornet. The sentiments expressed by the Hornet have been of a pacifistic nature and this paper believes they would not be favorable to the best interests of this country if they became generally adopted.

The pacifism of the Hornet would have the United States forego all instruments of war, on the premise that you can't fight a war if you have no weapons with which to fight. The execution of such a policy would certainly have the desired effect in that we could not go off and start a war somewhere else. However, the Hornet has either forgotten or ignored the obvious fact that someone else might have a motive for coming over here and picking an argument. The United States would certainly make rich pickings.

The world today is a tough neighborhood in which to live. The only law universally respected by nations today is the law of force. This certainly is not as it should be, but it behooves the resident nations of the globe to be prepared to protect themselves against aggression.

The United States must be prepared to meet any possible aggressor with such a force that he will think twice before attempting any rough stuff. This isn't war talk, just plain common sense.

The ideal situation would be pacifism attended by absolute security. A pacifism which advocates disarmament does not offer the necessary security to the country. Adequate armament for the sole purpose of national defense affords the necessary measure of security, and at the same time will go a long way toward keeping this country out of war by discouraging possible aggressors. C. C. E.