tian answer to the problem of evil is ultimately contained in what he does with evil, itself the result of what Christ did with evil on the cross.
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existence, and the ethic of love as ‘an impossible possibility’ were inadequate as the bases for a dynamic theory of social change.” But, Smith speculated, King’s later commitment to nonviolent direct action reflected “the realism of Niebuhr.”

{Christianity and Society
Dr. Kenneth L. Smith
Crozer Theological Seminary
Sem II, 1951}

Though I cannot accept an absolute pacifist position, I am as anxious as any to see wars end and have no desire to take part in one. Man being what he is it seems to me that struggle will be a necessary part of human existence for a long time to come. I could not present my view as one to which there is no exception. No one can work out a theological or philosophical system which is perfect.

I found the position of Nels Ferré interesting especially since he was for a time a pacifist. He presents conflict as a part of the evolutionary process. Man struggles with his fellow man because he has not yet overcome the animal nature which is his. He sees war as a creative part of this process, but it is creative only as long as it is used to work toward peace. The true aim of war is peace. War has been creative in the past and might possibly be so in the future. A third world war might give us a united world. The development of larger units of government from smaller ones has often come about as a result of war. However he is not sure that war can be creative any more. War has been necessary under the concept of natural law and national sovereignty. The time has come for the nation to give way to world government. Under world government man could learn to control war with proper world police. He find the cause of war in the sinful nature of man and the proper attitude one of the practice of Christian justice.

John H. Hallowell of Duke University in an article in the Crozer Quarterly writes largely in criticism of a book by A. J. Muste. I think that his criticisms are valid. He first points out the strong emphasis of the pacifists on the im-

3. Nels Fredrik Solomon Ferré (1908–1971) was a Congregational minister and professor of philosophical theology. Ferré taught at Andover Newton Theological School (1937–1965) and the Divinity School at Vanderbilt University (1950–1957). He was the author of many books and articles, including The Christian Faith (1948); Faith and Reason (1946); Evil and the Christian Faith (1947); The Christian Understanding of God (1951); and his most popular work, Strengthening the Spiritual Life (1951).
4. John H. Hallowell, “Pacifism—The Way to Peace,” Crozer Quarterly 26, no. 1 (January 1949): 30–40. Hallowell (1913–) was an Episcopal layman educated at Princeton (Ph.D., 1939) and professor of political science at Duke from 1942 to 1981. He wrote The Decline of Liberalism as an Ideology (1943); Main Currents of Political Thought (1950), which he considered his most important work; and The Moral Foundation of Democracy (1954). A. J. Muste (1885–1967) was a militant pacifist who opposed both World Wars, served the Fellowship of Reconciliation, helped establish the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), and chaired the Committee for Non-Violent Action. Under Muste’s leadership, American pacifists adopted Gandhi’s tactics for nonviolent social change.
portance of the pacifist position since the atomic bomb has been developed. I
think he rightly sees that the ethical and moral problems are exactly the same
as they were. It matters little how one kills; the victim is just as dead. It may
shock the sensitivity of men to kill many but if it is wrong to kill many with an
atomic bomb it would be just as wrong to kill one with a stone axe. In fact the
position of non-participation advocated by Muste might cause a more horrible
death by starvation. His so called non-violence may become more violent than
war. That Gandhi was successful against the British is no reason that the Rus-
sians would react the same way.

A position of absolute pacifism allows no grounds for maintaining even a
police force, since there is no real difference in kind between war and police
action. Their position logically results in anarchy. Perhaps the most serious
criticism is that they fail to recognize the sinfulness of man. The believe that
if we just assume that the enemy will react favorably he will. They isolate war
from other ethical problems and ignore the fact that war is actually a symptom
of deeper trouble. By their total absorption in the question of war they neglect
the deeper underlying causes of war.

It seems to me that we must recognize the presence of sin in man and that
it can be done without seeing that there is also good. Since man is so often
sinful there must be some coercion to keep one man from injuring his fellows.
This is just as true between nations as it is between individuals. If one nation
oppresses another a Christian nation must, in order to express love of neigh-
bor, help protect the oppressed. This does not relieve us of our obligation to
the enemy nation. We are obligated to treat them in such a way as to reclaim
them to a useful place in the world community after they have been prevented
from oppressing another. We must not seek revenge.
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Notes on American Capitalism

[20 February-4 May 1951?]
[Chester, Pa.?]

King wrote these two paragraphs, probably as notes to himself, during the
Christianity and Society course. He criticizes aspects of Marxist thought but asserts
that "capitalism has seen its best days."

Will

Karl Marx, the German philosophy and economists, stated that capitalism
carries the seed of its own destruction. There is an obvious fallacy in that
statement. The fallacy is that it is limited to capitalism leaving the impres-
sion that other social movements do not carry the seed of their own destruc-
tion. The actual fact is that [strikeout illegible] every social institution carries the
seed of its own destruction; its survival depends on the way the seed is
norished. Now after admitting that there is a fallacy in Marx' statement, do
we find any truth therein? It is my opinion that there is. I am convinced that