So long as power is maintained by violence, it will be challenged by violence. In this sense, the displacement of collective violence in human affairs involves a comprehensive, although gradual and not necessarily total, substitution of modes of mediation, compromise, and persuasion, as well as a growing appreciation of the greater utility of nonviolent techniques of control and transformation.²

Nowhere does a blueprint presently exist for an effective alternative to the function of warfare and the present military establishment. An institute should be established, with adequate funds and personnel, to research alternative methods for resolving conflict without the use of armed force. The military should be at the forefront in support of such research.

An example of an alternative to armed struggle is nonviolent struggle. Resistance to the Stamp Act in 1765 was a nonviolent struggle. Nonviolent struggle is quite distinct from being passive and praying that evil will disappear. It is based upon the simple idea that the exercise of power depends on the consent of the ruled.³ No government, whether democratic or totalitarian, can effectively operate without the support of the people. People have the capability to withdraw their consent and thus undermine authority. Through noncooperation people can make a government ineffective. Nonviolent struggle is not easy. It requires discipline and the capacity to bear hardship. From the limited historical research which has been done, we know that nonviolent campaigns have been effectively waged against dictators and tyrants. Records show the Plebeians in 494 BC conducted a successful nonviolent campaign.

Nonviolent struggle is a strategy, which offers promise of tactical success in undermining an adversary. Its mode of operation is such that violence to individuals and property are limited. Yet, just another strategy or tactic for waging war is not enough. Serious research on conflict resolution is needed: a clear, more cogent understanding about what conflict is; of how conflicts evolve and escalate into violence; and of what methods exist for resolving conflict without resorting to violence. Although not entirely analogous, the methods by which individuals handle personal conflict might help broaden our understanding of the way in which international conflict is managed.

In my own work with the Schools Program of the New York office of the American Friends Service Committee I have found that people often have distorted perceptions of conflict. They equate conflict with violence:

\[
\text{CONFLICT} = \text{AGGRESSION} = \text{VIOLENCE} = \text{DESTRUCTION}
\]