

Comparison of National Behaviour with Individual Behaviour

By Dr. W.E. Park.

Nov 17/37.

Tonight, I want you to study with me some of the causes of friction between nations, and to look at them as we would, ^{look at} similar conduct ^{among} ~~between~~ individuals or ^{among} ~~between~~ families. It will enable us to get a truer perspective of present day happenings. Perhaps also we will see something of the causes of war, and some of the things we have to do, before we can hope for permanent world-wide peace.

For the purpose of our study, let us imagine ourselves in what is now the state of California, in the year 1847. The country is wild and undeveloped. There is no government, but there are a few settlers. By a little log cabin on the slope of a hill we see Jake Peterson and his wife, with their family of four stalwart sons and two daughters, all of them between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one. The Petersons have been in that location for the last ten years, and have succeeded in carving out a small farm, from which they derive their ^{of} humble living, supplemented by ^{the} spoils ~~from~~ forest and stream. They always go about armed as a protection against wild beasts and Indians. Many an Indian has lost his life when he disputed the territory with Jake Peterson. Jake did not consider it murder to shoot an Indian. He was merely a wild beast.

A couple of miles away is another settler, Jim Archer, with his wife and family of three daughters and three sons,

also ranging in age from fourteen to twenty-one years. This family also is well established and their pioneer life is similar to that of the Petersons. A little to the north of both Petersons and archers, is another family known as the Swansons. Bill Swanson is a burly pioneer, of the coarser type, with eight children ranging from three to twenty years. The Petersons had a natural dislike for the Swansons, and would not allow them to trespass on ~~what they considered~~ their territory.

The Swansons hated the Petersons in return, and refused to recognize what the Petersons considered the bounds of their ~~territory~~ ^{land}. Whenever Bill Swanson had to buy something from Jake Peterson he had to pay more for it than Jim Archer did; and when ~~if~~ Bill Swanson sold anything to Jake Peterson he always "soaked" him in return. The enmity grew until Jake ~~Peterson~~ began to build a fence between himself and Bill Swanson. Swanson said the fence was on his land, and told Peterson to get off or he would shoot him on sight. Thus the feud broke out. Bill Swanson shot and wounded Jake Peterson. Jake's boys carried him home and nursed him until his wound healed, resolving in their hearts, that they would kill every one of those filthy Swansons. The feud raged on with frequent wounding on both sides. As time ~~went on~~ ^{passed} the hate grew more and more

intense.

The attitude of Jim Archer was one of indifference. He did not see any reason to interfere. It was immaterial to him which side won, or who was killed. He was ready to be friendly with whichever family succeeded in crushing the other.

Then came the time when one of the Swanson boys lured away one of Peterson's girls and made her his wife. Bill Swanson would not have her in his house or anywhere on his property. Jake Peterson would not let a Swanson into his domain even if he were the husband of his own daughter. The young couple appealed to Jim Archer and he consented to let them occupy, temporarily, a small section of his territory. Jack Swanson and his young bride spent the winter quietly but in ^{the} spring of 1848 Jack ~~Swanson~~ discovered gold on his corner of Jim Archer's land. Jim Archer claimed the gold and ordered the young couple off at once. Digging operations began simultaneously on all three territories and each family found gold. Jack Swanson and his bride, however, had no place to call their own. Jim Archer proposed a conference to settle the problem and thus addressed his neighbours. ~~Jim Archer said to the others:~~ "You fellows each give the young couple a section of your territory and let them settle down." Swanson and Peterson however each refused to give up any territory and

suggested, that since the young couple had already occupied a section of Archer's land, it was really theirs and not Archer's. Archer rose up in his wrath ~~said~~ ^{declaring}, "I am willing to cooperate with you fellows and do what I can to help you, but what I do with my own land is my business and I will tolerate interference from no one". And so the fight went on ~~between~~ ^{among} the three families. None had a legal claim to any of his territory, and each mined gold wherever he could get it, ~~and kept~~ ^{keeping} his neighbours off at the point of a gun. The young married couple were driven off by all three families and had to find a home elsewhere. There was much fighting, many wounded, and a few boys killed. There was no legal authority to restrain and lawlessness reigned supreme.

Finally in 1849 a government was established in California. ~~Each of~~ The three families registered their claims and became legal owners of their homes and respective territories. Enmity continued however, and bitter fighting broke out at intervals until the state police came and took away their weapons, ~~and were~~ finally ~~able to~~ making them understand, that they could appeal to a court of justice and get a fair settlement of their differences, and that they could depend upon the police force to maintain law and order.

The three families worked their

respective mines industriously, and all became fairly prosperous (in the next five years). The sons and daughters intermarried, and when help^{ers} ~~were~~ to spare in one family, they were put to work in the mines of one of their neighbours. And so about ten years more passed. The Peterson boys were all industrious and aggressive, as were also the Archers. These two families worked their mines well, ~~and~~ put in the latest mining machinery, and were now at the point where new territory for operations must be found to satisfy the need for expansion. The Swansons as a family were lazy and would work only enough to keep themselves alive. The Swanson group was the largest in numbers, but they were backward, ~~and~~ did not develop their mines rapidly, and were not interested in later methods of operation. So the time came when the Swansons, little by little, sold their claim to the Archers and Petersons in a peaceful legal manner, and ~~the Swansons~~ became the hired help of the more aggressive families; and all were content. All the younger generation learned to respect the laws of the state, and ^{all} ~~any~~ business transactions became ~~submitters~~ ^{affairs} of legal procedure as a matter of course. When differences arose there was no resort to arms, but the parties concerned applied to the courts of the state.

It would be interesting to look

further into the exploits of these pioneer families, but for our purpose tonight, I want you to visualize the behaviour of nations as similar to that of these early Californians, and see where we stand in international law and order. Let us remember that stable democratic government grows out of the desire of individuals to behave in an orderly and upright fashion. It is just in this manner we may expect international government to become a reality. That is, when enough nations have reached a sufficiently advanced degree of national morality, they will set up and support an international government.

Compared with the evolution of our California families, from early pioneer life to the days of law and order, the nations of the world have reached the stage of the family feud. Each nation is heavily armed, and recognizes no law except that of its own interests. Some nations, such as Italy and Japan, are in the act of taking somebody else's territory by force, while some others are in the position of merely holding what they have, and brandishing their guns to warn off any intruder.

A short time ago, when Mussolini seconded Germany's demand for ^{the} return of her colonies, many of which fell into the hands of the British, he brought forth from Anthony Eden the much applauded statement: "We offer cooperation to all but we take

orders from none". Doesn't that remind you of blustering Jim Archer of California, who was willing to help Jack Swanson and his wife to a portion of his neighbour's land, but unwilling to sacrifice any of his own.

With all due respect to the League of Nations and World Court, we really have no international body, which has the respect and support of the world powers. International relations are still in the family feud stage, and will remain so for a good many years to come. However there are hopeful signs. The very fact that the League of Nations became established is an indication of movement in the right direction, and failure at this time is not surprising. Furthermore, the attitude among nations used to be like that of Jim Archer, one of indifference and isolation.

Then there was the stage of taking sides and getting into the fight. Now the democratic nations are trying to stop the fighting, and so far have refrained from using the threat of joining the war in order to stop it. This last attitude, although in the eyes of some ~~is~~ an indication of weakness, I think is a sign of progress. It means that some nations are beginning to recognize the unfairness of isolated judgment and action, and that force to stop a war must come from an international authority.

We recognize then the need of an international authority, which, in order to be effective, must have the moral support of morally awakened peoples. ^{Moreover,} Furthermore, no international government can be effective unless the nations of the world give up their armies and navies and place all such under the international authority, to be used as a police force.

The idea of an international police force is not a new one, but no international police force can be effective unless the nations give up their armaments. There should not even be any military training except in preparation for the international police force, and no soldier should be asked to swear allegiance to any authority other than the international police force.

There would be enough adventure and glamour associated with such a career to satisfy the most adventurous. All armament manufacture and profits of course should be under the exclusive control of the international body. The World Court should have not only the authority to name the offending nation, but also the authority to levy penalties. The World Court should provide approval, registration, and enforcement of all treaties between nations, just as our courts hold a contract sacred, unless it is contrary to the public good. The World Court too should provide trial

and punishment for international libel. At the present time, there is nothing to prevent one nation from printing lying propaganda about another nation. There is nothing to prevent one nation from broadcasting by radio lying propaganda, even beyond ~~the borders of its own~~ its own borders. These two means of publicity alone are very potent causes of war.

Another great cause of international friction is tariff. If tariff regulations were under the control of an international government, there would be less unfairness among nations. Tariff is an instrument used to build up a ~~higher civilization~~ standard of living in one country, at the expense of the rest of the world. a high standard of living is a good thing, but when we have developed a better way of living, we should ^{also} give it to the less favoured peoples. We have not begun to see our responsibility to raise the standard of living in a fellow country. This is not to be wondered at, when we have scarcely seen our responsibility in regard to the slums in our own cities.

The League of Nations is the greatest forward step toward peace that this world has ever known, but it has so far failed. In some respects, actions of the League remind me of the kind of justice handed out in the early

days of Texas. Here is a quotation from last week's paper: on Nov. 11/37, some of the frontiersmen of the South Western States were holding a convention at Houston, Texas. An attorney, by the name of Elfege Baca, who in his youth was a notorious gunman, told a story of his early days. He was on trial for murder before a jury. During the trial, his brother got up and addressed the jury thus: "Elfege, my brother, is the second best shot in the Southwest, I'm the best and you'd better find him not guilty." They did. Of that kind of thing could happen in a court of law so recently that the chief actor is still alive to tell it, is it any wonder that the League of Nations, so recently formed ^{and} with practically no power, is loath to condemn a major power in the international arena? Furthermore if an individual such as a frontier gunman, under changing conditions of law and order, can become an attorney at law, surely we may believe that, when a proper basis for international cooperation is found, cultured, capable nations, like Germany and Italy, will be found working shoulder to shoulder with democratic nations.

Of course the League of Nations has failed. I don't know how we could expect it to do otherwise. If a dog fight started on the street, and some one ran and told the minister, and he sent back word

to the dogs to stop fighting because it was wrong, would they stop? Don't let us simply say, the League of Nations is no good. Let us wake up and see what is wrong with it. For one thing the League ~~made~~ ^{made} no provision for national expansion. The efforts of the League have been directed toward keeping each nation in its own territory. The League founders did not recognize that there was such a thing as national aggressiveness. If there ~~is~~ were no opportunity for one nation to excel another, we should have a ^{dull} dead world. In national life we recognize the right of one individual to climb above his fellows. It is the prime principle of liberty, that a man have opportunity to climb as high as he can. If we uphold liberty of this kind it is inevitable that a nation made up of vigorous, aggressive men and women, must excel other nations. That is why the British Empire became established and that is why the Great War could not permanently crush Germany. We have no means by which an aggressive nation may expand except by war, and until we provide that means we shall always have war. I think that today Japan is the best example of an aggressive nation which must expand. Japan during the last fifty years has made the most rapid industrial and commercial advance of any country in the history of the world.

Today a larger proportion of the population in Japan can read and write than in the United States. ~~and now~~ ^{now} Japan publishes annually about three times as many books as the whole of the United States of America. Her population is increasing very rapidly, with nearly a million births every year. You know how immigration laws have discriminated against the Japanese, and how tariff walls have gone higher ~~and~~ ^{higher} against them. The Japanese, ~~however~~, are, ^{certainly} not to be admired for their morality. They are unscrupulous and underhanded, and do not consider it wrong to take an unfair advantage of anyone. ~~However~~ ^{however} as imitators, they are unequalled, and because of this national characteristic they have taken over the advances of the Western world and lifted themselves from national obscurity to the ^{position of the} most dominant nation in Asia.

you can't keep a good man down, we often say, and you can't keep an aggressive nation down. ~~and~~ The sooner we recognize this ^{fact} and provide for peaceful national expansion, the sooner we shall have permanent world peace. after all, what right have we in Canada to hold such vast and rich natural resources for ourselves alone? When the good God created the world, did He set aside this rich territory for Canadians? No! We hold it now because our forebears

were the type of men who could go out and take it. And let me tell you, that our only hope of keeping it, is not in being able to defend it, but in being aggressive enough to develop this country until it fulfils its destiny in the world. If we haven't the stuff in us to do that, some other, more worthy ^{and progressive} people, will do it for us. Nations, like the Peterssons and the Swansons, become either masters or servants, as their abilities fit them to be, and, it is one of the tasks of international cooperation to provide a peaceful means for this change to take place.

Although Japan is undoubtedly the aggressor in this cruel Sino-Japanese war, I don't think the great powers will do anything more than to protest and condemn Japan. Although my sympathies are all with the unfortunate Chinese, I must admit that China will probably be benefited by an infusion of the more virile Japanese blood. These two peoples are so much alike they could easily become one people in a few generations.

While wars are going on in the world, and great nations are floundering for a means of stopping them, let us be hopeful for the future. We have no talk now of a way to end war. The great powers are loath to fight war with war. Let us take our bearings, and we

shall see that the greatest work is not done, but is ahead of us. The foundation only is laid. This generation and the next must build an international government which will prevent war, by removing the causes of war. Let me in closing just mention again some of the things which must be provided by that international body: - (1) some means by which a worthy aggressive nation may expand without going to war, (2) international control of immigration allowing movement of excess population to points where more population is needed, (3) free flow of commerce to all parts of the world, (4) a world court to settle differences between nations, (5) a world court with power to try and punish any nation publishing ~~lying~~ or broadcasting lying propaganda. (6) ~~Approve~~ a world court providing approval, registration, and enforcement of treaties between nations, (7) an international police force having the only army and navy in the world, (8) ^{international} control of all military and naval instruction in the world.

Perhaps it will help us to realize just where we stand in international development, in comparison with national development, namely at the stage of family feuds.

Perhaps it will help us to realize that international government must grow out of and lag behind national government, just as national government

lags behind and grows out of individual standards of behaviour. So let the church, and preachers, and teachers, and lovers of justice not forget that when they are building individual character they are building world peace.

Wilford Stark
Nov 17/37

Please return this manuscript if not used.
Return Postage enclosed—

Dr. W. E. PARK, L. M. C. C.	
PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON	
PHONE 31	BROWNSVILLE, ONT.
No. _____	Date _____
Directions _____	

For _____	
SHAKE WELL PLEASE RETURN NUMBER AND DATE	