

CATHOLIC WORKER



Vol. XXXI No. 12

JULY-AUGUST, 1965

Subscriptions:
25c Per Year

Price 1c

WE ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR OUR TIMES, FOR THE LIFE OF OUR BROTHERS, AND WE ARE RESPONSIBLE BEFORE OUR CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCES

—POPE PAUL VI

THE COUNCIL AND THE BOMB

By JAMES W. DOUGLASS

The moral problem of nuclear war was introduced at the Vatican Council on November 9 and 10, 1964, shortly before the closing of the session. Hardly more than an hour was spent by Council Fathers in the opening statements on Article 25, "On Making Lasting Peace," a section of Schema XIII, "On the Church in the Modern World."

One speaker pointed out that the issue before them was capable of swallowing up the Council's pastoral achievements—together with most of the human race—but he received little response in either the aula or the press. From the assembly of more than two thousand Fathers, 18 had asked to speak on war and peace in the debate on Schema 13. Eight, presumably representative of the range of opinions, were granted the opportunity, and one of them used it to extol brotherly love without referring to the specific issue of war.

Father Arthur McCormack has noted that after the First Vatican Council, which ignored the industrial revolution and its social consequences, the workers could hardly lift their eyes from their misery to rejoice in the definition of papal infallibility. It is questionable whether the Church in Vatican II, by spending an hour of debate on the threat of man's global self-destruction, has shown a deep enough concern for the world to be worthy even today of the dialogue she so much desires with it.

The principal and virtually only point of contention among the Fathers was over how comprehensive the schema's condemnation of nuclear weapons should be. The draft of the schema condemned such weapons in the following terms: "the use of arms, especially nuclear weapons, whose effects are greater than can be calculated, and hence cannot be rationally controlled by men, exceeds all just proportion and therefore must be judged before God and men as most wicked."

Cardinal Alfrink, the first of the seven speakers to treat the question, was in favor of strengthening this statement to a clear and absolute condemnation of any and all nuclear weapons so that a so-called "clean bomb" could not be said to lie outside it. Patriarch Maximos IV and Bishop Guilhem of France also called for an absolute condemnation; and, following a recurring thought of Popes John and Paul, both appealed for a redirection of the billions spent for armaments to the aid of that two-thirds of the world suffering from hunger and poverty. Bishop Hengsbach of Germany asked simply that the schema go beyond Pius XII's and John's pronouncements, and Bishop Ansel



of France was concerned with pointing out an apparent contradiction in the text. The two remaining Fathers, Archbishop Beck of Liverpool and Bishop Hannan of Washington, believed that nuclear weapons could be used to wage a just war according to theological principles and drew on certain military data to support their arguments.

Conscientious Objection

Taken as a whole, the primary characteristics of the discussion were brevity and omission. Some of the problem's aspects which the speakers failed to touch on were the right to conscientious objection, Catholics' past participation in enormous war crimes by an unquestioning submission to authority, the possibility of non-violent resistance to an aggressor, the Church's role in a deeply divided world, a theology of peace, and the relevance, if any, of the life and teaching of Christ to the possibility of reducing man and creation to a smoldering dump of ashes.

The support of a majority of the speakers for a stronger statement against nuclear weapons provoked a question as to the Council's competence for such a statement. At the American Bishops Press Panel, Monsignor George Higgins insisted that the Council lacked the technical competence to make any judgment on nuclear weapons and that an attempt to solve some extremely complex problems in a few words would be "demagogic."

Taking a similar position, Bishop

Hannan's intervention corresponded at several points to the views of six Americans belonging to the State Department, Defense Department, and Catholic Association for International Peace, who had submitted a critique on the schema to the commission responsible for it. They advised, among other things, that the effects of nuclear weapons are certainly not greater than can be calculated, so that the schema's condemnation was meaningless.

This objection had the one value of calling attention to the schema's use of the terms "incalculable" and "uncontrollable," which seemed to suggest a technical judgment, thus inviting such rebuttals by weapons analysts and a technical debate that could only end by deadening the document's moral impact. The terms themselves were unnecessary to the prohibition and failed to make clear that the kind of "control" at stake in the issue was specifically moral: not a measurement of the physical effects of a weapon which might in fact have obliterated a city, but rather the traditionally taught duty in justice to distinguish a military from a civilian target, combatants from non-combatants, soldiers from civilians. The text stood in need of revision, therefore, to show clearly that its key notion was not the technical category, "nuclear," nor the technically suggestive "incalculable and uncontrollable weapons," but instead the underlying, morally definable category of indiscriminate killing by weapons of total war, whether they be nuclear or "conventional."

Toward Moral Precision

At the same time the appeal by several Fathers for a universal condemnation of nuclear weapons as such reflected their prudent recognition of the near-identity in the practical order of such weapons with total war. Their approach had the value of recalling the fact that the schema was, after all, not being addressed to moral theologians and weapons technicians, nor even only Christians, but to "all of God's children." Besides being morally precise, the schema had to be rhetorically effective—its purpose was to speak to the world.

Unfortunately none of the speakers showed enough awareness of both of these requirements, moral precision and rhetorical effectiveness, to propose an amendment that would satisfy each. This could have been done by a condemnation of the methods of total war (the use of massive weapons which strike indiscriminately at combatants and non-combatants) but specifying nuclear weapons as chief among them, thus showing the statement's practical relevance but qualifying the practical term by a distinctly moral category. The question of technical competence would then be beside

the point, since the basis for judgment would be a practical, moral distinction applicable to every weapon of war, and the object of judgement, total war, a moral category cutting across all nuclear and conventional boundaries. The specification of nuclear weapons would indicate the statement's primary application but would remain subject to the ruling moral category. The use of any nuclear weapon, "clean" or not, "strategic" or "tactical," would fall under the prohibition unless its use could be shown to be of a different moral character. In short, the burden of moral proof would rest on those who fire the missiles, not on those at the point of impact.

But although none of the speakers combined the elements of a precise, meaningful declaration, the support of the majority for a stronger statement, whatever its form, reflected their concern for the rights to life and home of the innocent in the face of a massive threat to both. It must be admitted that the Church's moral tradition on war has certain grave inadequacies, particularly in the area of authority and personal responsibility; but the inviolability of the innocent, as one Catholic writer has put it, has been the one hard and ineradicable diamond of the Christian tradition. This moral protection of innocent life has been an integral part of the Church's teaching wherever the right to life has been threatened,

from abortion to obliteration bombing.

For this reason, the Church's traditional defense of innocent life combined with the unprecedented threat to life everywhere from nuclear weapons, the interventions by Bishop Hannan and Archbishop Beck struck many as being preoccupied with the wrong problems. Bishop Hannan's objection to any conciliar declaration against nuclear weapons—"that there now exist nuclear weapons which have a very precise limit of destruction"—is true enough but of questionable relevance. It ignores the fact that each of the several thousand strategic weapons composing the backbone of nuclear deterrent forces has a destructive power towering over the Hiroshima bomb and in many cases greater than the explosive force of the entire Second World War. Even the relatively small tactical weapons defended by the Bishop constitute together in Western Europe, quite apart from our strategic forces, "a combined explosive strength of more than 10,000 times the force of the nuclear weapons used to end the Second World War," to use Secretary McNamara's description in 1963. The Washington bishop's recommendation that "theologians must be acquainted with the facts about modern weapons, including nuclear weapons, or they must be willing to secure the facts" is equally applicable to those members of the hierarchy who speak out on the question.

Archbishop Beck's intervention moved between opposite poles, reflecting the conflicting tendencies of one English school of theologians on the question of nuclear war. The intervention acknowledged in an opening paragraph that the direct killing of the innocent is "intrinsically evil" but failed to relate this principle to the later conclusion that "in certain circumstances peace can be assured only by what has been called the 'balance of terror.'" The speech also recognized the vast destructive power of most nuclear weapons but hypothesized situations in which these might be used legitimately, as in the outer atmosphere, so that the Council should not condemn the possession and use of those weapons as essentially and necessarily evil.

Archbishop Beck's defense of the "balance of terror" raised the question which even more than actual war is central to the moral problem of nuclear weapons: a total-war deterrent. But the Archbishop's defense of the nuclear deterrent on the grounds that it has "succeeded in keeping peace however tentative" only repeated the standard political argument

(Continued on page 8)

FRANZ JAGERSTATTER

It is not good if our spiritual leaders remain silent year after year. By "words" I mean, of course, instruction; but example gives direction. Do we no longer want to see Christians who are able to take a stand in the darkness around us in deliberate clarity, calmness, and confidence—who, in the midst of tension, gloom, selfishness, and hate, stand fast in perfect peace and cheerfulness—who are not like the floating reed which is driven here and there by every breeze—who do not merely watch to see what their friends will do but, instead, ask themselves, "What does our faith teach us about this," or "can my conscience bear this so easily that I will never have to repent?"

If road signs were ever stuck so loosely in the earth that every wind could break them off or blow them about would anyone who did not know the road be able to find his way? And how much worse it is if those to whom one turns for information refuse to give him an answer or, at most, give him the wrong direction just to be rid of him as quickly as possible!

CATHOLIC WORKER

Published Monthly September to June, Bi-monthly July-August
ORGAN OF THE CATHOLIC WORKER MOVEMENT
PETER MAURIN, Founder

DOROTHY DAY, Editor and Publisher
MARTIN J. CORBIN, Managing Editor
Associate Editors:

CHARLES BUTTERWORTH, EDGAR FORAND, JUDITH GREGORY,
WILLIAM HORVATH, WALTER KERELL, KARL MEYER, DEANE
MOWRER, HELEN O. RILEY, ARTHUR SHEEHAN, ANNE TAIL-
LEFER, EDWARD TURNER, STANLEY VISHNEVSKI, CHRISTO-
PHER S. KEARNS, PETER LUMSDEN, NICOLE D'ENTREMONT.

New subscriptions and change of address:
175 Chrystie St., New York 2, N. Y. 10002
Telephone OR 4-9812

Editorial communications to: Box 33 Tivoli, N. Y. 12583

Subscription United States, 25¢ Yearly. Canada and Foreign 30¢ Yearly
Subscription rate of one cent per copy plus postage applies to bundles of one
hundred or more copies each month for one year to be directed to one address.

Reentered as second class matter August 10, 1939, at the Post Office
of New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879



We Are All Under Judgment

With this issue of the *Catholic Worker*, which goes to over eighty-thousand people in the United States and around the world, goes a call to prayer, prayer for the shepherds of our souls. They will be meeting in the final session of the Vatican Council in a few weeks, and they will be making a statement on modern war.

At the outbreak of the Second World War, we printed an editorial that reflected the crisis that was in our hearts and souls: "Lord God, Merciful God, Our Father, shall we keep silent or shall we speak? And if we speak, what shall we say? . . . We will print the words of Christ Who is with us always even to the end of the world: 'Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you' . . . We are at war . . ." Sixty million deaths later, after World War II had touched every nation under heaven, we were still printing the words of Christ.

The crisis in this year of 1965 is of another dimension, an immeasurably greater dimension. Again we raise our voice, ineffectual as it may be. Now it is not only the crisis of man's possession of the means to destroy his own kind, but a crisis in the life of the Church. How will the Universal Church, gathered in Council, speak to this fact, the over-arching fact of our age?

This issue of the paper presents a spectrum of American thought. We are allowing the streams of anti-nuclear opinion, anti-deterrent thinking, to come to the surface. Such thinking has begun to permeate many levels of society both within and outside the Catholic community.

In this editorial, we speak to our spiritual fathers, the Bishops who, in the new sense of collegiality, are the fathers of everyone in the Church. We have prayed, and we have asked not only members of the Catholic Worker family, but other Catholics deeply versed in these matters, to help us speak.

The Church in The World

Schema XIII, which will carry the message on modern war, is the same Schema that will bear the weight of the Church's "new meeting with poverty." The wording of an earlier draft of "On Making Lasting Peace" is reprinted elsewhere on this page to indicate the strong current of Catholic thought that calls for the banning and destruction of weapons of indiscriminate slaughter. This draft was introduced by statements from Bernard Cardinal Alfrink of Utrecht (Holland) and three bishops, two French and one African, who urged that the condemnation of such weapons be made stronger and more unequivocal. The most prophetic words came from Patriarch Maximos IV, who reminded his fellow bishops that humanity was looking to them to be not only defenders of spiritual matters, but actual "defenders of the earthly city." This draft has been

discussed and re-worked in such Council Commissions as that of the Lay Apostolate and Theology, and in its changed form dispatched, as part of a 128-page document, "The Church in the Modern World," to all the bishops of the world.

The central problems of modern warfare collide directly with two principles that the Church has insisted upon ever since Christians were somehow first dragooned into armies. (This was much later in the history of the Christian Church than most people realize, since even St. Augustine strongly maintained that the individual Christian did not have the right to kill in self-defense.) The principles are: first, that there must be discrimination between guilty and innocent, between combatant and non-combatant; second, that there must be due proportion between the violence used and the evil to be remedied — in other words a strict limitation of weaponry, not only as regards human beings but also as regards their property and livelihoods. Even the least lettered of Christians knows that to kill the innocent is murder.

As weapons became more and more powerful and less and less controllable a rationale had to be developed to justify the incidental killing of civilians when an arms factory or a rail junction was destroyed. This rationale was the theory of the double effect, or second intention. The death of men, women and children who lived around the factory or rail junction was not intended, but was a regrettable side effect of a necessary attack on a valid military target. In the Second World War, with obliteration bombing and finally with nuclear bombing, cities became targets, and war became total. The principles of discrimination and due proportion (with proper limitation of violence understood) were erased from the rules of warfare and presumably from the consciences of Christians. It is to these questions that the Council Fathers are addressing themselves, and it is in precisely this area that Catholics in certain countries may have some very surprising things to say.

For example, an American Catholic spokesman recently wrote that the traditional Catholic teaching on the just war "seems to have trapped itself into an impossible situation in its handling of the concept of the immunity of non-combatants from direct attack." He goes on to state that the origins and "authoritative character" of this teaching are much more "controversial" than is generally known. What is behind this concern is that a new rationale is needed to justify such a nuclear deterrent as is now in the possession of the United States. Since churchmen in the early Middle Ages condemned the use of the crossbow against human beings, no theologians have been called in to pass on new weapons before they were used. The theologians

(Continued on page 7)



DESTRUCTION HANGS OVER HUMANITY

Intervention of MAXIMOS IV Salgh, Melchite Patriarch of Antioch, concerning the Schema De Ecclesia in Mundo hujus Temporis, Chapter 4, Paragraph 25:

November 10, 1964

Venerable Fathers:

A threat of destruction hangs over humanity: nuclear armament. And this threat increases daily, because of the growing number of possessors of these infernal machines.

Without entering upon physical and scientific considerations, which are beyond our competence and cannot be explored here, we believe that we have a duty to raise our voice, for we feel a sense of oppression. A cry of alarm rises spontaneously from our heart, a cry of anguish, I was almost going to say of despair . . . And we beg you to do everything possible, for whatever effect it may have, to avert such a disaster.

The intervention of two thousand bishops from all parts of the world on behalf of peace could change the course of history and safeguard the fate of humanity.

People talk about just war. What reason could be sufficient to justify, on any sound moral principles, the kind of destruction that an actual world cataclysm would involve. Can you annihilate a civilization and entire peoples under the pretext of defending them? And if men are bound to disappear in an instant, of what use is this pastoral that we have been so laboriously constructing since the announcement of Vatican II? Who will benefit from it?

Ought not the traditional conception of the just war be re-examined in the light of present realities?

Must not national sovereignty have its limits? Can the human community be completely ignored?

Venerable Fathers, all mankind is waiting breathlessly, and with haggard countenance, to see what we are going to do. We cannot keep silent for any considerations whatsoever. As faithful guardians of the souls of our people we also have duties in regard to their earthly lives. We must speak out, boldly and courageously, like John the Baptist before Herod or Ambrose before Theodosius, to condemn the use of these infernal weapons.

Our Holy Father John XXIII, of sainted memory, did so in his encyclical *Pacem in Terris*; the Schema we are studying *De Ecclesia in Mundo hujus Temporis* also speaks out clearly, if somewhat abstractly. But this is not enough. We at the Council must make a declaration *Urbi et Orbi* (to the City and the World), a declaration that will be plain, unambiguous and precise.

Such a radical condemnation by the Church could snowball, for all truth has the power to penetrate souls and spread. Other authorities, civil and religious, might follow, for example, a groundswell of opinion from all over the world

On Making Lasting Peace (Article 25 from Schema XIII)

(Unofficial Translation, reprinted from "Peace, The Churches and The Bomb," published by the Council on Religion and International Affairs, 170 East 64th St., New York, N.Y. 10021)

Among the principal signs of the times there stands out clearly before all men an immense desire for true and lasting peace, although the human race after so many bloody wars is still disturbed by almost continuous conflicts, and is terrified by new weapons capable of destroying the entire human family. In view of this extreme danger the barbarity of war stands out in an entirely new light. For this reason, the Church, the handmaiden of the peace of Christ, has to work with the greatest diligence, together with the entire family of nations which is the family of God. And she wills that peace, which transcends every desire and work of this world, may bear fruit among all people. This Sacred Council, replying to the suppliant voices reaching her from all sides, before God adjures all men, all nations, and particularly the rulers of nations, to be mindful of their very grave responsibility, and in view of the complexity of the situation to work with united forces for the establishment of peace:

1. Peace is made stable and lasting by mutual friendship and mutual help, effectively recognizing the united will to help, or "solidarity," which ought to govern the family of nations. There is no true peace, if wars are only postponed by a parity of weapons for spreading terror, rather than a sincere spirit of cooperation and concord. Therefore, everything that unfortunately divides rather than unites must be adjudged as opposed to peace, and above all any words, doctrines or actions that spread hatred, contempt, vengeance, or unfounded suspicion against any nation or even stir up an excessive patriotism and that burning desire to acquire excessive power. Everyone, therefore, and especially those who exert any influence on public opinion, must speak the things that are of peace, promoting mutual esteem among the nations, gladly extolling the virtues of other nations, speaking only patiently and calmly of their defects, and promoting mutual respect among different persuasions.

2. The controversies that may perchance arise between nations must not be settled by force and arms, but by treaties and agreements. Although, after all the aids of peaceful discussion have been exhausted, it may not be illicit, when one's rights have been unjustly hampered, to defend those rights against such unjust aggression by violence and force, nevertheless the use of arms, especially nuclear weapons, whose effects are greater than can be imagined and therefore cannot be reasonably regulated by men, exceeds all just proportion and therefore must be judged before God and man as most wicked. Every honest effort therefore must be made, so that not only nuclear warfare may be solemnly proscribed by all nations and alliances as an enormous crime, but also that nuclear arms or others of like destructive force may be utterly destroyed and banned.

3. Since the terrifying destructive force, which is daily increasing in war arms, is able to cause calamities and horrible destruction throughout the world, and since technological progress, communications and organizations for peacefully settling disputes are daily proving more effective, it is becoming ever more absurd that war is an instrument suited for the redressing of violated rights.

Therefore the Sacred Council denounces as a ruinous injury inflicted upon the whole human family, and in severest terms censures, the uncontrollable armaments race, inasmuch as it is injurious to and prevents real peace, harmony and trust among nations, places a great part of mankind in danger of their life, and dissipates the wealth needed for much better things.

The rulers of state should be thoroughly aware of the fact that it is their duty to deliver their people from this danger by agreements which will effectively work out a just peace and at the same time they must endeavor to put out of men's minds all hostility, hatred and mistrust. Better aids must be chosen to prevent wars and peacefully remove conflicts; among these aids are the following: consistent progress in building up a universal community among the nations, all of which will remain free; an international authority having at its disposal the means necessary to avoid war and to promote peace, so as to bring about conditions in which war of any kind can no longer be regarded as a legitimate instrument, even for the defense of one's own rights.

4. Let the faithful who believe in Christ the Lord, the Prince of Peace, feel His impelling love and in all gladness follow Him, who by the blood of His cross reconciled all men to God and restored the unity of all in the one family of God, and in His own flesh killed hatred. Let the faithful therefore shun no sacrifice, so that, practicing the truth in love (cf. Eph. iv: 15), they may in every way contribute toward establishing a lasting peace, which is a sign of the world redeemed. Let them, by their charity, justice and unity, be harbingers of the peace of Christ.

might impel the leaders, who are walled up in their national outlooks, to further reflection. Sanctions of various kinds could be envisaged. The fact remains that we cannot keep silent, under pain of disappointing the world, disappointing the noblest parts of ourselves and rendering our ministry to the peoples of the world worthless.

For the love of Christ, Who is Friend of Men and King of Peace, we earnestly supplicate you to pronounce a solemn and forceful condemnation of all nuclear, chemical and bacteriological war. Let this sacred Council address a message to the world, on the model of the one prepared at the outset of the Council's proceedings, condemning, in principle, all nuclear war, under all its forms, and demanding that the billions saved on disarmament be devoted to the alle-

viation of human poverty, in a world where two-thirds of the population does not have enough to eat and is in dire need.

Venerable Fathers, for two thousand years History has seen the Bishops as "Defenders of the Earthly City." The world needs unselfish and courageous defenders today more than ever. Let us not disappoint the world, which is watching us and which expects the Church to remain forever a pillar of strength and truth.

Large-scale nuclear warfare, which denies all distinction between soldiers and civilians, and which makes nurses, doctors, lepers, infants, the aged and the dying objects of direct attack, is certainly immoral.

Bishop FULTON J. SHEEN

Not Even a Single Lie

I am perhaps a simple soul living in a vastly complex world, but, without abandoning the traditional position of the Church and striking off on my own along the lonely though brave path taken by the pacifist or unilateralist some things seem perfectly clear to me. When I was quite young I was taught that even to save the world it was not permitted to tell a single lie. Now this seemed to me sound doctrine. It still seems to me sound doctrine and I know of no way to be a Catholic and not accept it. If it is rejected there is no crime, however monstrous, which cannot find reasons to justify itself. So then it seems clear to me in my simplicity that if one is not permitted to tell a lie to save the world one is not permitted for any purpose whatever to slaughter 70 or 80 or 90 or 200 million human beings, guilty and innocent, old and young, children and unborn babes indiscriminately jumbled together.

I know all about the principle of the double effect. It may be that this principle began to be irrelevant when citizens armies, mass conscription, and general mobilization changed the character of modern warfare. However that may be, it was surely irrelevant to Hiroshima and Nagasaki, to the fire bomb raids on Tokyo, the obliteration bombing of European cities. It is certainly irrelevant to the mass extermination of civilization which figures prominently in the war plans of thermonuclear age which in the cybernetic language of Rand Corporation-type experts speaks as blandly of megacorpuses as of megatons.

In passing I cannot refrain from observing that the remark often made today that the so-called "thought" machines, one of the remarkable developments of our electronic age, think more and more like humans seems to me the opposite of the truth. I find rather that humans are coming to think more and more like the machines. Now if a note of sentiment, emotion, or feeling creeps into a discussion of this problem of agonizing human concern, apologies are required. One feels almost ashamed: "Sorry, I was thinking like a human being. I'll try not to let it happen again."

I am unable, perhaps no one including the experts is able, to establish a clearly defined line beyond which the kinds of weapons produced and the strategies planned make meaningless the attempt to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants whose incidental killing is justified by appeal to the principle of double effect. I do know as well as the experts that wherever that line can be drawn it was passed long ago. The bombs being stockpiled today and the strategies to which they are tailored, are not concerned with such fine distinctions. They are aimed at the massive destruction of cities, the obliteration of civilian populations, the annihilation of entire societies. The destruction of military targets is incidental to the destruction of civilization.

This was true of Munich, Dresden, Cologne, Tokyo, Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Not even the coldest cynicism would dare pretend that it will not be true of the kind of thermonuclear bombing planned for the next war. Gone therefore is the only circumstance which permits appeal to the principle of the two-fold effect.

Since the use of such weapons cannot be justified, not at least if the doctrine I learned as a child is correct, then certainly there can be no moral justification for the manufacture of these weapons which can serve no other end, or for any experimental testing unless its purpose is other than the further development of even more frightful instruments of cosmic destruction leading perhaps with inexorable logic to the perfect bomb which will destroy the whole of creation.

My contention is that by concentrating so much of our energies and resources upon the limitless expansion of nuclear power we are pursuing policies which are not only morally dubious, to say the least, but strategically misdirected. This policy rests, I think, upon a misunderstanding of the strategy of our enemy and while we devote most of our resources to meet a strategy which he does not plan, we may find in the end that we have been overcome without a shot having been fired.

Rev. GEORGE H. DUNNE, S.J.
(Georgetown University)

Questions On Modern War

Many Americans, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, are looking forward with hope to the promulgation in the final session of the Vatican Council of "The Church in the Modern World." Pope Paul recognized this in his encyclical letter of May 1, 1965 in stating of the Council, "It is God's great time in the life of the Church and in world history."

In no issue could the final session of the Council be more crucial than in its pronouncements on peace.

Experience has shown that, in our time, war tends to grow into an almost infinitely greater evil than any injustice it may set out to remedy. Further, a pernicious fallacy has become commonplace in the thinking of countless people in many countries. It is the belief that the use of immoral means is the most efficient means of preserving peace and conducting war.

People of the world need a strong and unequivocal affirmation that immoral means are at once irrational and ultimately ineffective; that the problems of society, including a response to the use of violence by nations, cannot be solved by the indiscriminate slaughter of millions of innocent and non-combatant persons. They need an affirmation that the problems of the modern world can be resolved with charity and reason, and that only moral means are truly human, truly patriotic, and ultimately effective.

The enclosed items are offered by a group of PAX members in the hope that they will be of some help to Council Fathers and

theologians concerned with the final draft of Article 25, "On Making Lasting Peace."

• We associate ourselves with the spirit and aims of Article 25 in its present form. We are also in agreement with the statement that the "uncontrolled armaments race that diverts wealth from the needs of mankind" is "a ruinous injury inflicted on the whole human family." In our own country an annual expenditure of fifty billion dollars is poured out on weaponry. This has caused to be stillborn the millions of works of social justice and economic development that our affluent country could perform for the hungry, shelterless and unschooled portion of the human family, both in our own country and throughout the world.

• Should changes be made in Article 25 before it is brought to the next session of the Vatican Council, we support such recommendations as those made by Patriarch Makimos IV of Antioch and Jerusalem, by Bernard Cardinal Alfrink of Utrecht, Holland, by Archbishop Thomas D. Roberts, Titular Archbishop of Sygdea, by Bishop Alfred Ancel of Lyons, France, and by Bishop Jacques Guilhem of Laval, France. These suggestions call for a more explicit condemnation of A B C (atomic, bacteriological, and chemical) warfare, for a re-affirmation of the inviolability of non-combatants in war action, and for a statement supporting the rights of conscience in the context of modern war.

This is to say that we feel that

these two primary questions should be considered:

1. Is not any act or policy of direct or indiscriminate killing of innocent and non-combatant civilian populations to be condemned?

2. Does not every individual have the right and the duty in conscience to abstain from participation in any instance of war or killing which he judges not to meet the requirements of reason and morality?

• We dissociate ourselves from the nationalism of the nuclear powers who ask the Council Fathers to sanction their programs of deterrence based on strategic nuclear annihilation. Just as the distinction is to be made between the just and unjust war, we ask if there is not a distinction to be made between just and unjust deterrence? At the present time missiles capable of killing millions of people are already aimed at the major cities of many countries and the innocent can be instantly cremated alive or poisoned by radiation in untold numbers by the mere flick of a switch. As American Catholics we deplore with anguish the acceptance of these and all such weapons of mass destruction. We pray that the Universal Church will consider the plight of Catholics who are citizens of a great nuclear power and will speak out with strength and clarity on this newest problem of the modern world, deterrence.

• Two Council Fathers, one from the United States and one from the United Kingdom, have argued against a ban on nuclear weapons. They stated that nuclear weaponry can be justified when the target is a "ballistic missile in the outer atmosphere" or when the weapon itself "has a precise limit of destruction." Now it is perfectly evident that no such policy is held by any government and that the moral judgments inferred by it were constantly violated throughout the second half of World War II. It would seem, therefore, that any Bishops who support such a theory of the incredibly restricted and hypothetical moral use of nuclear weapons bear the onus of exacting guarantees of such use from their governments. Without such guarantees how can the faithful possibly serve in the armed forces? And how could they continue to serve when these extreme strictures had been violated?

• We strongly feel that any amendments to Article 25 which make room for nuclear warfare and unjust deterrence would constitute a reversal of *Pacem in Terris*, an encyclical that has already borne undeniable fruits for the whole human family. An instance of this is the impressive *Pacem in Terris* Convocation that was held in New York City in Feb. 1965. The Convocation, planned by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, an important American organization, has already involved leaders and thinkers from many nations of the globe. The support of the Convocation by men of all religions and diverse ideologies is a sign of the yearning of humanity for moral leadership, and it is a sign of the deep response of humanity to the Church when she acts in her prophetic mission.

The efficacy of what can be done by the Council Fathers depends not only on making a declaration of principles regarding modern war, but on actively and relentlessly promulgating them. It is only when the teaching of the Church about the injustice of war and the rights of conscience are present day after day in the

(Continued on page 8)

The same moral law which governs relations between individual human beings serves also to regulate the relations of political communities.

—Pope John XXIII
Pacem in Terris

The Church and the Nation

As the history of Western Europe demonstrates to us, there was from the time of the emergence of the nations, an ever-growing tendency for the Church in a given nation to identify itself with that nation. We can say, without too much inaccuracy, that the Church historically tended to permit an inversion of the old phrase developed through nationalism, *cutus regio, cutus religio*. The Church found itself in country after country of Western Europe in command of culture. Where the Church was not confronted with a situation of persecution (such a situation only developed in some instances after the Reformation) the Church was in a position of privilege, of possession. It dominated the culture, and in turn was fed by it. In consequence, we find examples after example whereby, in this identification of Church and State, the interests of Caesar were blithely assumed to be the interests of God. National interests came to shape the interests of the Church itself. How often, in how many countries (and in how many Catholic colleges and schools within the countries) can one see the motto *Pro Deo et Patria*. Patriotism, as we all know, is a virtue, but it is a slippery virtue to define, particularly in the concrete. The most egregious example of the confusion of the concerns of Caesar with those of God is that developed in great detail by Gordon Zahn in his work *German Catholics and Hitler's Wars*.

In our own time and in our own country, we are not free from the contagion of nationalism, an unquestioned hyper-patriotism, an attempt to identify the cause of the State with the cause of Christ. This tendency, which besets the Church wherever she finds herself, is reinforced in our country by the way in which Americans, and therefore American Catholics, tend to look upon the confrontation with Communism as a kind of crusade. Americans generally tend to look upon evil as something external to themselves. The clash between Good and Evil is seen in terms of the Western movie as the encounter of Good Guys and Dirty Guys. We, of course, are always among the Good Guys. The clash then assumes the proportions of a clash of cosmic forces rather than an interior struggle where we know as Christians that the struggle essentially takes place.

As Dostoevski remarks: "The battleground between Good and Evil is always and everywhere in the heart of man."

American Catholics, like Americans generally, in the tendency to externalize evil, find it easy to view the contemporary political struggle as a great crusade in which the forces of righteous American capitalism are pitted against Godless atheistic Communism. When we adopt this particular view it makes it difficult to be creative, to be flexible in situations which de facto do change day by day, week by week, month by month.

This nationalistic impulse is, I think, one cause for the particularly Catholic color of the general American apathy toward these questions of war and peace, especially with regard to the morality of nuclear warfare and the manufacture of nuclear armaments.

PHILIP SCHARPER
(Managing Editor of Sheed & Ward, Inc.)

"Whether the Human Family Will Live Or Die"

(Statement by an American Council Father)

When controversies arise among nations, they must be settled not by force and arms but by meetings and negotiations. For although the Church has maintained a nation's right to defend itself against unjust aggression, she has insisted equally on the universal right to life of the innocent, in war as well as in peace. Human life is sacred and must not be taken indiscriminately, for man was made to the image of God. In view therefore, of the threatened use of terrible weapons, it must be borne in mind that the natural moral order condemns with all its power as mala in se the methods of total war, i.e. the use of massive weapons, especially nuclear arms, which strike indiscriminately at combatants and non-combatants, soldiers and civilians. For no end can justify the use of means which involve the direct taking of innocent human life. Today more than ever there must be affirmed and upheld the rights of life and home of those not intimately participating in the destructive action of war and who together compose the majority of any wartime nation's population. Moreover, a nation's public threat of the methods of total war, as manifested in their preparation for ready execution, must be condemned equally with the act of execution, inasmuch as citizens called on in advance to support such a policy could only judge it on its public evidence as grossly immoral in intention. Every effort must therefore be made: first, to have nuclear war solemnly condemned by all nations and governing bodies as a terrible crime; second, to have nuclear weapons and others of a similar pernicious force completely abolished and suppressed.

Since each citizen must bear the responsibility in conscience before God for his own actions in war, the citizen's right, when prompted by conscience, to refuse his participation in war, in particular unjust wars and indiscriminate meth-

ods of war, must be acknowledged by the state. In view of the monstrous crimes so often committed by both sides in war and of Christians' past involvement in these through an unquestioning submission to authority, Christians confronted today by the possibility of even more terrible crimes cannot surrender their moral judgment on wars to civil authorities. They have instead the responsibility in justice and charity to examine the orders of authority and to bear witness, as conscience directs them, to the peace of Christ and the sacredness of human life.

In this light the two great rights of a citizen as defined by Pope Pius XII in his Christmas Message of 1944 acquire a still more profound meaning: "not to be obliged to obey without having been consulted, not to be obliged to make sacrifice without having expressed one's ideas."

For it is clear now that each man has truly been made his brother's keeper, and that the Creator has given to all men the most mysterious dimension of liberty, the faculty of deciding whether the human family will live or die.

As total war is now a war against mankind itself, the actualization of the spirit of Christ the Lord is more imperative than ever: the spirit of meekness and humility, renouncing violence, opposed by nature to force even in its just use, seeking by a love embracing enemies, to overcome evil with good. In order therefore to respond to the needs of our age, Christians should cultivate a deeper, fuller exploration of the non-violent love and teaching of Christ.

1 Cf. Pope Pius XII, Alloc. d. 29. 10. 1951. AAS 43, 1951, 838.
2 Cf. Gen. 9, 6.
3 Cf. Pius XII, Alloc. d. 30. 9. 1954, AAS 46, 1954, 589.
4 Cf. Mt. 11, 29.
5 Cf. Mt. 25, 52; Lc. 9, 34-8.
6 Cf. Mt. 5, 38-42.
7 Cf. Mt. 5, 43-8.
8 Cf. Rom. 12, 17-21.

ON PILGRIMAGE

By DOROTHY DAY

One wakes early in the city on hot summer mornings, and this morning I began my day by going on with my reading of Pope John XXIII's *Journal of a Soul* (McGraw-Hill). I had reached page 84, "Notes made during the spiritual exercises after the Babylonian Captivity" (which is what he termed his time in the Army). He wrote of knowing what hell was like, now that he had lived in barracks. "What blasphemies there were in that place, and what filth. Would hell be any better? What if I were to end there, while my fellow soldiers, the poor wretches, who grew up surrounded by evil were sent to Paradise—no wonder I tremble at the thought. . . . O the world is so ugly, filthy and loathsome! In my year of military service I have learned all about it. The army is a running fountain of pollution, enough to submerge whole cities. Who can hope to escape from this flood of slime, unless God comes to his aid. . . . I did not think any reasonable man could fall so low. Yet it is a fact. Today, after my brief experience, I think it is true to say that more than half of mankind, at some time in their lives, become animals, without shame. And the priests? O God, I tremble when I think that not a few among these betray their sacred calling. Now nothing surprises me any more; certain stories make no impression on me. Everything is explained. What cannot be explained is how it is that You, O most pure Jesus, of whom it is said 'He pastures his flock among the lilies,' can put up with such infamous conduct, even from your own ministers, and yet deign to come down into their hands and dwell in their hearts, without inflicting on them instant punishment. Lord Jesus, I tremble for myself too. If 'stars of the sky fell to the earth,' what hope have I who am made out of dust? From now on I intend to be even more scrupulous about this matter even if I become the laughing stock of the whole world. In order not to touch upon impure subjects, I think it is better to say very little, or hardly anything at all, about purity. We have this treasure in earthen vessels. I have reason to tremble. 'Is my flesh bronze?'"

A Hard School

In his letters to the rector of the seminary at Rome, young Roncalli is far more moderate in his expressions; the editorial note which introduces the two letters explains that at that time there were no military chaplains to give spiritual assistance in the barracks and that his letters, while commending the courtesy of the officer in command and the good nature of the Italian soldier, bear out what he wrote in his notes "with all the frankness of an innocent soul brought face to face with the reality of the moral crisis in which most young men, especially those who live the communal life of the barracks, find themselves involved. In such circumstances the weaker and less noble, one might say the most melancholy characteristics of youth come to the fore."

"Nevertheless," young Angello Roncalli wrote, "every day I am more convinced of the great benefit I shall draw from this year's experience, for the glory of God and to the advantage of the Church."

Now, half a century later, the Vatican Council at Rome is taking up this issue of war and peace, and the rights of conscience, as well as the formation of conscience in regard to the means used in modern war.

There was still time this morning to read a chapter in the Gospel, and I opened to the 22nd chapter of Luke, which begins with the story of the Last Supper, Jesus taking bread and wine and saying: "This is My Body, this is My Blood," and then crying out: "Behold, the hand of him who betrays

Me is with Me on the table." . . . "And they began to question one another which of them it was that would do this. A dispute also arose among them which of them was to be regarded as the greatest.

"And He said to them, the kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and they that have power over them, are called benefactors." (The newest version says 'Benefactors'.) "But you, not so: but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that serveth. For which is greater, he that sitteth at table or he that serveth. Is it not the one who sits at table? But I am among you as one who serves. And you are those who have continued with me in my trials. And I dispose to you, as my Father hath disposed to me, a kingdom. . . . And turning to Simon He rebuked him saying, 'Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not. And thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren'."

Simon Peter protested that he was ready to follow him to the death, but Jesus sadly told him that before the cock crowed Peter would deny him three times. He reminded them of His sending them forth without purse or scrip and asked them did they want for anything? They said "Nothing." And He went on; "But now he that hath a purse let him take it, and likewise a scrip, and he that hath not, let him sell his coat, and buy a sword.

"For I say to you, that this that is written must yet be fulfilled in Me: And with the wicked was he reckoned."

The apostles said, "Behold here are two swords. And he said to them: it is enough."

Mystery of Iniquity

I thought about these very mysterious passages in the half hour I stayed in church after my communion. Often I have thought of how the apostles were afraid and hid themselves behind locked doors. And I thought too of how even after Jesus' death and resurrection they were still hankering after a kingdom, a worldly kingdom and the subjugation of their enemies. It is all there in the pages of the New Testament, in the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles. It is not easy reading, the New Testament, any more than the Old is.

I am thinking of it now, in connection with the Council, this last session on which so many hopes are placed. This entire issue of the *Catholic Worker* is addressed especially, by scholars and workers, by the laity, men and women, by the little ones of the Church, to the three thousand bishops, to the Holy Father Pope Paul VI, as well as to our own readers.

Membership in Christ

Certainly Jesus knew that since He was reputed among the wicked, He was always going to be entangled with the things of this world. Christ is our head and we are His members. We are other Christs by our incorporation into the body of Christ. We involve Him even in our sin. "He became sin for us," according to St. Paul. He knew we were going to go after material things. (A certain amount of goods is necessary to lead a good life, St. Thomas Aquinas said.) When the Jews fled Egypt they took with them (as restitution for unpaid wages?) the belongings, the gold and silver of the Egyptians. To this day we have an increase of wealth in the Church until persecution takes it from us, or until we voluntarily do penance, deprive ourselves, deny ourselves and follow Him in serving our brothers. To this day we have the sword and the spectacle of brother fighting against brother, German and Italian Cath-

olic against French and English and American—Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, fighting each other. "The time will come when you will think you are serving God in putting one another to death."

It is as though He said, "Very well, take your scrip, your purse, your sword. Each one of you must have a personal encounter with Me, your risen Lord, your Jesus, your Master before you understand." Just as Mary Magdalene, Thomas, Peter, James and John did. "I have loved you with an everlasting love even when you are denying me. You will each one of you, loved uniquely by the Father, have to be visited by the Holy Spirit before you will understand. You have your freedom to make your choices. It is a matter of your individual conscience, your individual conversion. Ask and you will receive. Seek and you will find."

My comfort is that a thousand years are one day in the sight of God, and so Christianity is two days old, we have scarcely begun, we are still defending God and Country (putting them on an equality) by our wealth and our weapons.

Come Holy Spirit!

Our prayer and our hope is that from the chair of Peter, from the College of Cardinals will come during this last session of the Council, a clear statement, "Put up thy sword," with the healing touch of Jesus in such a statement to the ears of those who, hearing, do not understand.

The apostles didn't take the sword, they covered in fear instead and could scarcely believe that they saw Him again. They were still asking Him about when the earthly kingdom would come despite His clear statement that His kingdom was not of this world which is a testing ground, a place of trial, a school of Christ, as St. Benedict had it.

But after the Holy Spirit enlightened the apostles they went to martyrdom, embraced the cross, laid down their own lives for their neighbors, in whom they were beginning to see Christ.

"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren you have done it unto me."

We long with all our hearts for such a statement from the Bishops, clear, uncompromising, courageous. We know that men in their weakness, like the apostles, will still take the sword, will still be denying Christ in their brother the Negro, the Vietnamese.

But the teaching of Jesus has indeed been answered again and again over the ages, from the apostles to the present day and again and again these called by the Holy Spirit and touched by grace have laid down their lives for the Faith that God is our Father and all men are our brothers.

Love

"A new commandment I give unto you, that you love others as I have loved you," that is to the laying down of one's life. The commandment of love, which is binding on us all, in Old Testament and New, was finally heard by Peter, once the denier, and by Franz Jagerstatter in the second World War. And by how many others through the ages whose histories have never been written? Our God is a hidden God, and such stories are hidden too in the lives of the saints.

We read in the life of Theophane Venard in Vietnam of how he considerably shed his clothes before his head was chopped off so that the executioner who was paid for his deed with them would not be receiving blood-stained garments. Such was his love for his enemies, remembering Jesus' words, "Father, forgive them for they know what they do." We think of the martyrs of Uganda, Protestant and Catholic, when we read the history of Africa and her exploitation.

Christ is being martyred today in Vietnam, in Santo Domingo and in all places where men are taking to the sword in this world crisis.

He will be crucified to the end of time. He is with us in His humanity until the end of time.

Weapons of Peace

One of our Catholic pacifists asked me to write a clear, theoretical, logical, pacifist manifesto, and he added so far, in these thirty-three years of *The Catholic Worker*, none had appeared from my pen.

I can write no other than this: Unless we use the weapons of the spirit, denying ourselves and taking up our cross and following Jesus, dying with Him and rising with Him, men will go on fighting, and often from the highest motives, believing that they are fighting defensive wars for justice for others and in self-defense against present or future aggression.

To try to stop war by placing before men's eyes the terrible suffering involved will never succeed, because men are willing (in their thoughts and imaginations at least) to face any kind of suffering when motivated by noble

aims like the vague and tremendous concept of freedom, God's greatest gift to man, which they may not articulate but merely sense. Or, in their humility (or sloth, — who knows?) men are quite willing to leave decisions to others "who know more about it than we do." Without religious conversion there will be few Franz Jagerstatters to stand alone and leave wife and children and farm for conscience sake. But as Jagerstatter said, it was God's grace that moved him, more powerful than any hydrogen bomb.

Freedom

This month I saw the film *China!* and two years ago I visited Cuba and saw the changes the Marxist-Lennists were making there. Living so close to misery and vice, destitution and homelessness, hard and cruel labor, sickness of mind and soul and body at the *Catholic Worker* as we do,—seeing all this aspect of life each day in city and country, one is tempted by such a vision of a

(Continued on page 7)

CHRISTIE STREET

By NICOLE d'ENTREMONT

Sitting in the park across from St. Joseph's House of Hospitality, on Christie Street, you can look uptown and see the Empire State Building glinting in the sun. It rises massively and then tapers off into the sky, a symbol of everything that is detached, elegant and clean. But for many who live in any of New York's ghettos the Empire State Building is a mirage; the reality being the pavement that becomes a pillow, the rats that bite children, the junkie on the nod in this very park. That is why Houses of Hospitality are needed in any big city—because so many people are starved by these mirages and the rootlessness of their lives. A House of Hospitality sinks roots in this land and grows there.

By seven every morning Charlie is fixing his famous soup, into which everything goes, from bones to parsnips. By ten the tables are set and the first group of guests sits down while Dave, Nick, or John serves the soup. We had some trouble with the sewer, a month ago and had to suspend the soup-line and the Friday night meetings. The landlord wasn't at all enthusiastic about fixing it, until we appealed to his conscience by refusing to pay our rent. So now the sewer is fixed, and the Friday night meetings have begun again, and the soup-line starts at ten.

We keep the soup-line going now until three in the afternoon and then we have to clear space in order to prepare the evening meal for the fifty or so people who come for supper and make up the CW family. Often, of course, the soup runs out and we end up serving bread and tea to whoever comes in, but talk is food too and there is always someone around to talk to and if you prefer anonymity there is always the comfort of just tea. Chris Kearns still goes down to the market twice a week and begs what he can get. Usually we get very good vegetables, potatoes, onions, spinach and, if we are lucky, every so often, a carton of strawberries or melons. During the evening meal there is generally a healthy riot of noise, as there is in any family that is eager to share the day's experiences with one another. Occasionally someone gets a bit too animated and has to be asked to leave, but that is the exception. Ed Brown generally makes the coffee and Tony, Hiroshi, or whoever is around to help, waits on tables. Once a formal cut-away jacket came into the men's clothing room and one of the fellows that was waiting on tables put it on. Naturally there was a joyous heckle from the group.

On Friday nights, after the meal is over and dishes washed, everyone lingers a bit longer because of the meeting. The tables are placed on top of one another and chairs are set up while the floor is swept extra carefully. During

July, Miss Day spoke on her winter trip, Marcelo Bermudez, a veteran of the July 14th Movement in Santo Domingo, spoke of the United States invasion of his country, and Charles Hook, the new national secretary of the Student Peace Union, defended world federalism in a way that converted a few of his listeners to anarchism. Jacques Travers, who teaches French at Brooklyn College, spoke on the life and thought of Simone Weil, who possessed one of the most uncompromising of twentieth century minds. The meetings have been crowded, with a growing number of students, seminarians and nuns coming in the summer months.

One of Peter Maurin's ideas was that each home should have a Christ room. But since few homes do, the Worker attempts, as long as we have accommodations, to take in anyone who needs a place to stay. Some of the apartments we pay rent for are "Old Law," which means that they are heated by a gas stove in the kitchen and the toilet is in the hall, small inconveniences when one knows that there is a whole population in New York that sleeps in subways and lives out of shopping bags.

Here on the lower East Side, we live in an area already dispossessed in the name of progress and the Lower Manhattan Expressway. Where will the people go who will no longer have homes in this area after the wreckers come? Where will the next Bowery submerge, away from the eyes of uptown? These are perpetual questions, and although the Worker attempts to answer them by advocating Christian communism, the reality must meantime be lived with. So our community grows out of the need for roots. And, at the end of the day, after Marie has delivered to everyone who asks for one the evening papers she gathers on the streets; after Walter has swooped Ricky or Jimmy or Koochie up and out the door, after Smokey sits on the front stoop rolling a closing-time cigarette—after, more or less, a lull, those who wish to gather together sing *Compline*. There are a few lines in Tuesday's *Compline* that say:

"Because the poor are exploited, because the needy are groaning, I will rise up now," says the Lord; "I will grant deliverance to those who long for it."

Perhaps, some day, all of Christianity will rise to that vision.

"True communion among all nations cannot be built on a universal terror or fear of mutual destruction. It must be built on the common love that embraces all and has its roots in God, who is Love."

POPE PAUL VI in Bombay

Farm With A View

By DEANE MARY MOWRER

In a dry season, after many months, even years of drought—here in the Northeast we are now in our fourth year of much below normal rainfall—the crash and rumble of midsummer thunder can sound as music to the arid ear, like the drums and trumpets of Nature's own symphony reverberating through lightning-blazoned clouds until the pelting polyphony of the rain triumphantly proclaims over every rooftop, every leafy-bowered tree, every rocky little gully, every thirsty blade of grass—It is raining, it is raining, it is raining, July, which brought us these welcome thunder showers, gave us, after the storm, a bouquet of cool rainwashed days; and in tranquil moments, those who looked out over the river exclaimed at the serene, lakelike beauty, a blue mirror of sky, with the mountains beyond bright in the sun. Then, during the Mass of St. Mary Magdalen, which Father Kane said for us in our chapel, I heard through the window the voice of one of Nature's small choristers, a tiny wren, joining its bubbling alleluia to our liturgical, but less musical, praise and thanksgiving.

We do indeed live in a setting of great natural peace and beauty. Yet midsummer is here, as it was at Peter Maurin Farm; a time of much hubbub and activity. Nor does this, our second summer at the new Catholic Worker Farm in Tivoli, the farm with a view, show any fallings off from that eventful succession of comings and goings, discussions, conferences, work projects, recreational activities for Tivoli children and refugees from the city slums, and waves of visitors which filled our first summer here with such variety, stimulus, and interest.

There is, I think, no better way to begin a summer than with a retreat, and that is how our summer began. For during the last two weeks of June, Father John J. Hugo conducted here at the farm two retreats, the first for priests only, the second for the laity. Those of us who live at the farm considered it a rare privilege that we were permitted to participate in the masses of the priests' retreat and to listen to Father Hugo's homilies. With a number of priests possessing good voices and much love for the liturgy, and under the direction of Father Marion Casey, these masses were true feasts for the soul. Since the priests ate with us, we were also privileged to listen to the table reading, which was taken from the profoundly moving spiritual journal of Father Alfred Delp, the martyr priest, who died in a Nazi concentration camp. The retreat for the laity was participated in by most of our staff members, both from our Chrystie Street house and the Tivoli farm, by many of our family, and by some of our good friends, including Helene Iswolsky, Caroline Gordon Tate and Carmen Mathews. Table reading was taken from a biography of Charles de Foucauld; and retreatants tried to maintain at least a spirit of silence, keeping talk to a minimum. Father Hugo's retreats are exhausting and thorough, demanding of the soul nothing less than a true turning toward God. All of us who made the retreat were aware, I think, that we had undergone an important spiritual experience; and I, for one, am deeply grateful to Father Hugo.

No sooner had the prayer-centered, quiet days of our retreat ended than we were caught up in the din and hurly-burly of summer activities. Once more my room, with its five windows overlooking the driveway at the front of the house, seems set in the middle of a busy parking lot. Every afternoon, Monday through Friday, from 1:00 to 5:00, cars arrive at intervals, loaded with happy children from Tivoli, who make a noisy dash for our swimming pool, where they are being taught to

swim in a class sponsored by the Red Cross. On warm summer evenings and weekends, Tivoli families drive up for the cool relaxation and enjoyment of swimming. Shortly after our swimming pool had been put into full operation as a community recreation center, Cathy Swann drove down to New York City and brought back six young Puerto Rican boys to spend a two weeks vacation period here at the farm, living in the cabin Joe Cole and Frank O'Donnell worked so hard to make habitable, enjoying the fresh air and sunshine, the swimming, the cookouts and picnics, the playground facilities near the old mansion, and tramps through the woods with Cathy. Early in July, Tamar Hennessy drove down from Vermont, bringing five of her children for a vacation here. During that same period Frances Mazet, an old friend of Dorothy Day and Tamar, and a good friend and benefactor of the CW, arrived for a week's visit. On one weekend the American Friends Service Committee brought up a group of teen-agers from Harlem, who came not merely to enjoy the swimming and woodland beauty but also to

WAR BY ACCIDENT AND NUCLEAR TESTING

"Though it is difficult to believe that anyone would deliberately take the responsibility for the appalling destruction and sorrow that war would bring, it cannot be denied that the conflagration may be set off by chance. Though the monstrous power of modern weapons acts as a deterrent, it is to be feared that the mere continuance of nuclear weapons tests will have fatal consequences."

PACEM IN TERRIS

help with the work. They completed a number of useful projects, but their clean-up job on the first floor of the old mansion was particularly helpful. On another weekend a group of young people from the Committee for Non-Violent Action visited us and held a discussion in our library. Then after the return of the Puerto Rican boys to their tenement homes near Chrystie Street, Jean Walsh brought up a group of young Negro mothers—including Classic Mae and Lucille, who once lived with us at Peter Maurin Farm—and their children to take a vacation from the polluted air and squalid tenements of another lower East Side area. On a warm summer night during their visit, Arthur Sullivan invited some of the children and young people from Tivoli down to hold a hootenanny on the columned veranda of the old mansion which overlooks the river. The yellow light from the insect-repelling bulbs—dot unlike the yellow lamp-light of the old mansion's youth, perhaps—streamed out over a festive scene, over the children and young people from the village, over the Corbin children and Michele Dellinger, who has been visiting Dorothy Corbin, over Jean Walsh's young cousins, the Carolan children, over the mothers and children, over many from our community lured by music and the soft July night, and over Arthur Sullivan dispensing apple cider to all comers.

As for visitors in general, hardly a day has gone by without its quota, and some days have brought many to our door for Arthur Lacey or Stanley Vishnewski to show about the place on a guided tour. Priests, nuns, seminarians, students, old friends and readers of the Catholic Worker—some have been reading the paper since its beginning—all want to see what a Catholic Worker farm is really like. Some, of course, are good friends who once visited frequently when we were on Staten Island but cannot come so often now. Although it is impossible to list many names,

I cannot refrain from expressing my personal pleasure at the weekend visits of Anne Marie Stokes and Kenneth and Mary Boyd and their charming children, Christopher and Dennis.

As usual during the summer months, some of our visitors remain for longer periods and so become members of our family. Of these, some are students and young people who want to learn about the Catholic Worker and to help in the work for a while. This month, however, we have had two somewhat older guests who have made themselves very much members of our family and have given new interest and variety to our discussions and conversations. Helene Iswolsky returned after the retreat to spend the month of July with us; Dr. Karl Stern arrived on the eighteenth to spend something over a week of his vacation here at the farm. Helene, author of *Christ in Russia* and other books, founder of the Third Hour ecumenical movement and editor of the *Third Hour* publication, now heads the Russian department at Seton Hill College, and will be known to many of our friends and readers for her articles in the *Catholic Worker* and for her splendid talks on Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Turgeniev, Soloviev, Pasternak, and aspects of life in Soviet Russia, which she has given over the years at our Friday night meetings or Sunday afternoon discussions. Dr. Stern is not only a distinguished psychiatrist but like Helen, the author of a number of books, the latest of which, *The Flight from Woman* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux) has just been published. To most of our readers, however, he will probably be known for that extraordinarily moving and beautiful story of conversion *Pillar of Fire*. Since Dorothy Day has been with us during much of this period, our table talk—with three such gifted and articulate conversationalists—has often become true round-table discussion in the Peter Maurin tradition. Our only regret has been that we had no piano; for Dr. Stern is also a gifted pianist and had wanted to give us a concert.

During Father Hugo's retreat, he inserted in the Mass a special prayer for those who do the work, especially the cooking and cleaning and farm work. It is a prayer we should say every day, for we owe much to those who do the hard routine work of keeping things going. I think particularly of Hans Tunnesen, Ed Donahue, and Joe Cotter, who do the cooking; of Alice Lawrence, who does the housekeeping and shopping; of Fred Lindsey and George Roehm, who look after dishes and help care for the dining room; of John Filliger and Mike Sullivan, who do such a wonderful job keeping our ancient plumbing and wiring functioning; of John Filliger and his many farm helpers—Larry Evers, Joe Dumensky, Peter Lumsden, Catherine Swann, Joe Cole, who is now in the Peace Corps, Paul Roethermel, who is now at Combermere, and Arthur Lacey, who have looked after the work of cultivating, planting, and weeding. Then there is the remarkable work of George Burke—the landscaping, gardening, grass cutting, etc. around the shrine and chapel area; the hard work he has put into the care of our rocky, gully-washed driveway. There is the job of meeting trains and busses to pick up our many guests; this is a role Bob Stewart usually fills. There is the job of looking after the mail, which Arthur Lacey performs so faithfully. There is the job of caring for the sick, in which Jean Walsh, our nurse, excels. There is the work of renovating and repair, at which Frank O'Donnell, Larry Evers, Harold Bass, Dennis Giron, Erik Marx and other visiting young men work from time to time. Stanley Vishnewski finds occupation at his printing press and writing, though his most important contribution to the community is that of wit and good humor man. Peter Lumsden rebuilds ancient dump trucks and supervises visiting

(Continued on page 7)

BOOK REVIEW

IN SOLITARY WITNESS. The life and death of Franz Jagerstatter, by Gordon Zahn. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., \$5.95. Reviewed by DOROTHY DAY.

(Continued from Last Issue)

"There is no hiding the fact that it is much harder to be a Christian today than when it was in the first centuries, and there is every reason to predict that it will be even more difficult in the near future. When it becomes the 'sacred duty' of a man to commit sin, the Christian no longer knows how he should live. There remains nothing else for him to do but bear individual witness—alone. And where such witness is, there is the Kingdom of God."

It is these words of Reinhold Schneider which Gordon Zahn uses when he humbly dedicates this book to the memory of Franz Jagerstatter "and to all the others who, like him, stood alone and said 'No'—many of whose stories have been completely lost to history, at least as it is kept and written by men."

The facts of Franz' life are these: He was born May 20, 1907 in St. Radegund, a little village in upper Austria. His daily life was like that of most Austrian peasants. In nineteen thirty six he married a girl from a nearby village and she is credited with changing him from "a beloved, lusty youth," "an accomplished and enthusiastic fighter" into a strongly religious man. But his wife today denies this and said his religious awakening came about gradually around the time of his marriage. They went to Rome on their honeymoon.

She had met him at a dance at Ach where she herself had been working as a waitress. Later in addition to running the family farm, Franz became sexton of the parish church. When Hitler's troops moved into Austria in 1938, Jagerstatter was the only man in the village to vote against the Anschluss. Before this he has served his military training and had not been interested in politics nor was he involved in any political organization. After Hitler's occupation he refused to contribute in any way to Hitler's collections or to receive any benefits. It was necessary, he said, to disassociate oneself from the Nazi Folk Community and make no contributions to it. "Anyone who wishes to practice Christian Charity in his deeds can manage to provide the poor with something for their sustenance without Winter Relief Collection or the Peoples' Welfare Fund." He renounced all claims to the official Family Assistance Program under which he would have been entitled to cash allotments for his children and after a disaster to the crops, he refused the emergency cash subsidies offered the farmers by the government. He was alone in this refusal.

The family, Gordon Zahn pointed out, was living at a level described as being near the point of poverty, nevertheless he distributed foodstuffs to the poor. These facts might indicate a level of production geared to the minimal needs of subsistence and an

RECONCILIATION BETWEEN NATIONS

"Not only can it happen, but it actually does happen that the advantages and conveniences which nations strive to acquire for themselves become objects of contention. Nevertheless the resulting disagreements must be settled, not by force nor by deceit or trickery, but rather in the only manner which is worthy of the dignity of man, i.e. by a mutual assessment of the reasons on both sides of the dispute, by a mature and objective investigation of the situation, and by an equitable reconciliation of differences of opinion."

PACEM IN TERRIS

avoidance of higher levels of farm production.

Franz remained openly anti-Nazi and refused to fight in Hitler's war. He was finally called in February, 1943 and was imprisoned first at Linz, then at Berlin. After a military trial he was beheaded August 9, 1943. He was cremated, his ashes cared for by friends and after the war buried in the churchyard of St. Radegund, and his name included in the list of those who died in the war.

Gordon Zahn makes an interesting comparison between St. Thomas More and his witness and that of the humble peasant, the "great man" and the "little man," and the comparison, he says may perhaps enhance rather than diminish the significance of the latter's sacrifice. "For the very fact that none would notice or be likely to be affected by what he did serves to reduce the issue to the individual and his conscience in silent and inner confrontation with God. Certainly this is what it meant to Franz Jagerstatter himself. That same confrontation existed for St. Thomas More, but to the extent to which he knew that others would take account of what he did, he was not alone. As far as the St. Radegund peasant knew, the choice he made would pass unnoticed by the world and would completely fade from human memory with the passing of the handful of people who had known him personally."

We owe a great debt of gratitude to Gordon Zahn for undertaking so exhaustive a study of this modern martyr.

How did Franz Jagerstatter get that way? The few simple facts that we know are that his religious awakening came about because of a retreat. He had lived of course in the simple religious atmosphere of an Austrian village, where all were Catholic, and close to the church where he was sexton, which meant daily contact with the Holy Eucharist. He was poor, he led a life of hard work. He read Scriptures and the Lives of the Saints, (which included St. Thomas More and the Cure of Ars, who was what one would call today a "draft dodger.")

There was no chance at all of his affecting the policies of the State, or influencing the lives of others as far as he knew. Another little saint of today, who died ten years before Franz was born, was of a bourgeois background but equally little and unimportant, St. Therese of Lisieux, coming from a small town in France, born of a father who was a watchmaker and a mother who was a lacemaker.

No one encouraged Franz in his act of disobedience to the orders of the state. Everyone argued against what he was doing, even the most sympathetic of priests, who could only see his resistance as futile, and even bad for the institutionalized Church.

But to two priests today, Gordon Zahn writes, must go the credit of keeping Franz's memory alive today. The dean of St. Margarethe's Church in Bruhl, Germany, Heinrich Kreuzberg, who had been prison chaplain in Berlin, and Fr. Josef Karobath, pastor of the parish church of St. Radegund. And the greatest consolation Franz received while he awaited his execution in prison was the news that Fr. Franz Reinisch, a priest of the Pallotine order of Austria, also had been executed for refusal to take the military oath requiring that he swear unconditional obedience to the person of Hitler.

"Even while I was telling him of this," Fr. Kreuzberg writes, "his eyes lit up and after a deep sigh as if a heavy burden had fallen from his soul he joyously declared, 'But this is what I have always told myself, that I cannot be following a false path. If a priest made such a decision and went to his death, then I may do so too.'"

To me it is very consoling that

(Continued on page 7)

American Experts and Schema XIII

By GORDON C. ZAHN

There is a growing danger, assuming recent press reports are to be trusted, that the Council Fathers will be presented with a fait accompli when they renew their deliberations on those provisions of Schema 13 dealing with the morality of modern, specifically nuclear, war. The clear affirmation and extension of the principles set forth in *Pacem in Terris* and other statements of John XXIII promised by the original draft will now be replaced, we are told, by some degree of acceptance of "tactical and other" nuclear weapons as legitimate defense against aggression in kind. Since, as is always the case, the decision as to where and when aggression has taken place is left to the secular ruler, we may well find ourselves back at the starting post, with the door wide open to the terrible prospect of total world annihilation.

Some comfort may be taken in the thought that we are dealing with rumors or "inspired leaks" which exaggerate or distort the changes that will actually be proposed, but it would be foolhardy to sit by in silence and wait to see what really happens. Every effort should be made now to counteract the kind of argument being advanced by those who support such drastic modifications of the Johanneine message of peace.

One of the best examples may be found in the statement being circulated in the name of the Catholic Association for International Peace. This is important for two reasons: First, the statement or, more exactly, an earlier version of it) was mirrored in the only public intervention made on this subject by an American bishop at the last Council session. Secondly, in its present form and mode of presentation, it takes on a definite "aura" of official standing which, however false the impression actually may be, is likely to magnify its impact upon the thought and actions of other bishops as well.

This impression for such misinterpretation lies in the authorship of the statement and the auspices under which it has been issued. The reader is all but overwhelmed at the onset by the impression that this is the product of great deliberations and debate handed down by some massive church bureaucracy. Thus, the statement is issued by William V. O'Brien, "Chairman, International Law and Juridical Institutions Committee, Catholic Association for International Peace." Then, as if that were not enough to inspire the desired attitude of awe and respect, it is further identified as a summary of recommendations presented (note the past tense) to Council Fathers by the Association Committee's "Subcommittee on Arms Control" consisting of five distinguished holders of a doctorate and chaired by one of them, Dr. James E. Dougherty. Since the C.A.I.P., itself is known to be an affiliate of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, those not already familiar with its penchant for multiplication of committees and similar structural artefacts must be forgiven if the impression is taken that we have here a formal document issued on behalf of the most official voice of American Catholicism. Small matter that the impression is false and that the statement was not submitted for any kind of prior approval by the membership of the C.A.I.P.

Coupled with this fact, and in some respects even more disturbing, is the manner in which its authors are identified—or, rather, not adequately identified. There is no hint here that all of them have been directly involved to some extent in the military and diplomatic establishments of the nation and that when they speak of "qualified professional recommendations" as being essential

prerequisites to any Council action they are referring to men like themselves (if not, indeed, themselves) who can claim working experience in the Departments of State and Defense, in the War College, in the Air Force, etc.

Let me make myself clear on this: I am not accusing these men of intentional duplicity. Some years ago I was privileged to join most of them in a published symposium (*Morality and Modern Warfare: The State of the Question*, William F. Nagle, Ed.) and, even though mine was the solitary deviant voice in the crowd, I came to respect—as I still do—the seriousness and sincerity of their approach to this most vital issue. But I would insist that some indication should have been given in this C.A.I.P. statement of their professional involvement in order to dispel any notion that they came to the question as detached academics holding no brief or bearing no direct responsibility for the agencies and policies which would certainly benefit if their recommendations are accepted by the Council.

The Real Deterrent

As already suggested, a more exact identification would have placed their appeal for reliance upon the advice of "qualified" professionals and their proposal that "the schema should include a discussion of strategic nuclear deterrence" in sharper perspective. Certainly it would have added a new dimension of understanding to their further reference to such strategic nuclear deterrence as "the basic fact of contemporary international security, law and order, such as it is." There are those, including myself—committed to non-violence and sponsor of such organizations as PAX and SANE—who reject that flat affirmation. An even more basic fact, we would hold, is the deep spiritual revulsion against the very thought of another worldwide cataclysmic war, a state of mind—undefined and inchoate though it may be—that crosses all boundaries, whether of nation or religion. This, and not the mere calculation of a nation's "chances" in a nuclear exchange, may be the real factor restraining the decision-makers in an unstable world. It can be argued just as easily that the deterring stockpiles are the principal continuing threat to the maintenance of "contemporary international security, law and order, such as it is."

If there is even the slightest chance that this is the case, every step should be taken to strengthen and sustain this sense of moral revulsion and to give it more effective voice; and it would seem quite proper to expect the Church founded by Christ to contribute to this effort by purifying and proclaiming anew His message of universal brotherhood and peace. The kind of position the experts of military technology and strategy (including, one must assume, the authors of the C.A.I.P. document) would prefer actually offers a reversal of this role, a situation in which the Church would be called upon to assure her children that, however horrible the thought might be, even nuclear war can be viewed as a sometimes permissible option for the followers of Christ.

True, the statement avoids giving a "blessing" to all nuclear war. This is where the "professionals" are to make their contribution by providing their slide-rule calculations of how much control man can have over the effects of selected weapons and what the risks of escalation will be in any given situation. The inevitable result of all this, however, would be to take what is ultimately a moral decision out of the realm of spiritual determination and make it subject to the findings of such experts—and,

needless to add, the interests of the governments which employ them.

It is easy to see how this reverses the proper order of priority. All the pseudo-precision produced by RAND or any of the many other research facilities established and "kept" by the military establishment, together with the infinite series of graduations and typologies set in the euphemistic jargon designed to make them all palatable, disregard the two essential principles governing the conduct of war as set forth in our traditional morality. These are discrimination, the obligation to distinguish between the innocent and guilty in the "punitive" act of war, and limitation, the equally important obligation to restrict the "punishment" of the guilty to the minimum level necessary to persuade him to cease and desist from his unjust behavior.

These are calculations and distinctions that cannot be left to the automatic answers of some pre-programmed computer and its interpreters, no matter how expert they may be. And, it should be added, the C.A.I.P. recommendations are not helped by the statement's admission that "it is fair to say that now there are no outstanding experts on the morality of nuclear war and deterrence. We shall have to develop them under forced draft." Coming at the end as it does, it seems to leave the Council in something of a quandary: it is to be guided by the "qualified professional recommendations" mentioned in an earlier paragraph; yet the kind of experts it really needs do not exist! One might conclude in desperation that Vatican II must suspend judgment until the "forced draft" has been completed and has met the need. Fortunately, this need not be true. It requires little more than an act of simple recognition to see that even the smallest tactical weapon designed for battlefield use (such as the nuclear bullet once described by Herman Kahn which could pulverize a hill-top) would fail to meet at least one, and probably both, of these conditions. It should follow, then, that there is really no reason why the Council must wait for or defer to the professionals of military technology and strategy in setting the terms within which this particular moral issue must be resolved.

In arguing its case against "a blanket condemnation of nuclear weapons on the grounds that their effects are incalculable and cannot be reasonably controlled by man," the C.A.I.P. statement suggests that many of the interpretations of language used by Pius XII are "embarrassed" by the "more flexible and permissive interpretation of this language" offered by the late Jesuit theologian, Gustav Gundlach. Unfortunately (and possibly understandably) the authors omit a more detailed exposition of the Gundlach thesis which reached its most striking expression in his speech some years ago at the University at Wuerzburg, in which he revealed himself as ready to accept the possibility that the world could be brought to its end in a final nuclear confrontation, since, as he pointed out, we know from Church teachings that the world is not going to endure forever anyway. It is a matter of conjecture as to which side of the argument would be more embarrassed by the introduction of such theological reasoning in this most sensitive area.

Happily, the pessimism of Dr. Dougherty and his eminent colleagues does not run to this extreme—at least, not in this particular instance. But pessimism there is, perhaps most clearly present in the statement's preference for an endorsement by the Council Fathers for "systematic arms control" over the position which would favor what these authors describe

as "the unrealistic hope that maximum efforts be made to eliminate nuclear and similar weapons." This is even more significant than it might first appear in that this statement—indeed, the very name of the Subcommittee itself—serves in effect to range the C.A.I.P. against the principle of universal disarmament lately advanced by such churchmen as Cardinal Heenan) and in favor of an alternative approach stressing the effort to maintain a balance of weaponry which would produce a kind of world "security" resting upon the multilateral threat of annihilation in place of the mutual trust John XXIII declared to be the sole and essential basis for true peace on earth.

The final recommendation, in some respects the most disheartening of all, finds the C.A.I.P. spokesmen expressing the hope that "the final schema will not place exaggerated reliance in existing institutions of international law and organization." They go on to say, "The dilemmas of Cyprus, Malaysia, Vietnam, the Congo and Cuba, to name a few, do not offer any evidence that machinery for peace is adequate or that the desire for adequate machinery is strong. We do not aid the development of such institutions by assigning them tasks which they cannot presently accomplish."

One can agree with them that the U.N. and similar institutions have not yet reached the degree of effectiveness they must finally develop, but it is difficult to see how the tone and the direction of the C.A.I.P. recommendation can be justified. It is a matter of grave concern that the organization which is usually regarded as American Catholicism's most official agency for peace feels obliged to warn the Council Fathers against taking the U.N. too seriously in framing its teachings on the role of the Church in the modern world.

From time to time, in my past writings, I have been openly critical of the C.A.I.P. and what I regard as an unfortunate "false image" which leads Catholics in other countries to assume that it is more of an active "peace movement" than its own leaders would claim it to be. Despite such reservations, however, I have never questioned its commitment to the support and enhancement of internationalism in general and the U.N. and its associated agencies in particular. If anything, I have sometimes voiced the suspicion that the C.A.I.P. was inclined to stress this advocacy of solutions through international order and organizations to the exclusion of other, more immediately pressing, moral problems bearing upon war and peace. Thus, when other Catholic organizations and movements here and abroad were actively engaged in efforts to bring about the end of nuclear testing or protesting the grossness of the "massive retaliation" policies proclaimed by our government, the C.A.I.P. was more likely to be found propagandizing on behalf of world programs for famine control and relief or other similar concerns,

broader in scope and more abstract in principle.

No one can challenge the great and noble contributions the organization has made in these areas, no matter how much he may question the order of priority given to them at the particular time. Thus it comes as a serious shock to see this organization now put on record as cautioning against "unrealistic hopes" for disarmament and "exaggerated reliance" upon institutions like the U.N., imperfect though they admittedly are.

Representative Opinion?

This brings us back to a point made earlier. The objection was entered to any inference that this statement represents American Catholicism in general. Perhaps one must now question to what extent it represents the membership of the C.A.I.P. itself. Chairman O'Brien's release, while making it clear that the recommendations were presented in the organization's name in the fall of 1964, gives no indication as to how so seemingly official policy was formulated or by whom it was finally approved. As Dr. O'Brien's statement has it: "The subcommittee on Arms Control has, among others, made the following recommendations to the Council Fathers." The grammatical structure is not entirely clear. Does the "among others" refer to the recommendations made by the Subcommittee (in which case it should be of some interest to C.A.I.P. members to discover what the "other" recommendations were)—or does it merely mean that other individuals and groups not related to the C.A.I.P. had made similar recommendations?

This, obviously, is a matter for the C.A.I.P. members to settle among themselves. I am more concerned here about what may be taken as an effort to extend the statement's position so as to include all American Catholics under its wing. I refer to the concern it voices lest Vatican II, by taking too definite or too adverse a stand against nuclear war and nuclear weapons, "place close to fifty million American Catholics in an awesome dilemma as to whether to listen to the solemn findings of a Vatican Council or to the hitherto accepted assurances of their government that America's nuclear deterrent is the foundation for international stability and the *sine qua non* of the defense of the United States." Speaking as one Catholic who, for quite some time now, has suffered the dilemma of conscience arising from a personal religious conviction that his nation is involving him in an immoral course of action through its programs of armament and, even more directly, in its actual military interventions, I object to the suggestion that there is so complete a state of unanimity as these authors suggest. I might even question the rhetoric about "other Catholics who live in freedom because of the American deterrent." I know there are many (and I respect them) who follow Drs. Dougherty, Nagle, Moriarty, Enthoven, et al. in their whole-

(Continued on page 8)

Is Mother Church at this moment meeting the challenge of being an agent for peace?

There is within the Church a suspicion of peace-making (literal meaning of pacifist) groups. A Catholic may work for peace but his activity is questioned if he works against war. This attitude suggests a hidden conviction that peace is not attained by peaceful means.

We are so dedicated to the destruction of communism that we shall not limit ourselves to genuine and authentic Christian means of meeting its challenge. The principle Christian means are, of course, the love of one's neighbor unto death (exhibited in the proclamation of the Gospel) and assistance to him in his needs.

Perhaps we have less confidence in Christian means than we do in political and military means. What we have at our disposal here and now is the nuclear deterrent. If the war based on the deterrent is not immoral warfare, then there is no immoral warfare.

REV. JOHN L. MCKENZIE, S.J.
(Professor of Biblical History,
Loyola University, Chicago)

A Strong Statement For the Good of Mankind

By Dr. BENJAMIN SPOCK

(Co-Chairman of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.)

The Latin edition of *Pacem in Terris* printed by the Vatican Polyglot Press described nuclear war as "alien to reason." This emphasis on sanity finds concrete expression in the purposes of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (usually referred to as SANE). The world-famous Dr. Benjamin Spock, authority on child care and co-chairman of SANE, recently sent the following statement on the subject of Article 25, "On Making Lasting Peace," to Rome.

It has come to the attention of this Committee that Article 25, as part of Schema XIII, dealing with nuclear warfare and maintenance of peace, is now under active review, and will be discussed and acted upon at the next and final session of the Vatican Council, scheduled for September.

Our organization is a body of twenty-five thousand American families, under distinguished sponsorship, which has worked vigorously since its inception in 1957 to bring about international controlled disarmament and an end to the monstrous arms race.

Naturally, therefore, we have great interest in the work of the Council on these matters, and would like to acquaint you with our conviction that Article 25, as introduced at the Vatican Council in November 1964, would have a

tremendous impact on the efforts to achieve lasting world peace. We do hope that its dilution will not be seriously entertained by the Council Fathers at the final session. A strong statement that has its emphasis on the good of mankind and rises above considerations of military tactics will surely be acclaimed as preserving moral vision and with it the possibility of ending the arms race.

SANE is only one of many related organizations, all attesting to a changing climate of opinion in this country which will acclaim with gratitude the adoption of a statement of the quality embodied in the draft of Article 25 as submitted to the third session of the Vatican Council.

National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, 17 E. 45th St., New York, N.Y.

A Farm With A View

(Continued from page 5)

work-campers. Rita Corbin takes time off from her duties as wife and mother to work on the large mural of *Cult, Culture, and Civilization* in the dining room, or help make ready the new arts-and-crafts room she is planning for the old mansion. (If any of our readers have arts-and-crafts materials, which they might like to contribute to this shop, Rita could certainly find use for them.) Work is prayer, and like prayer, it is often not easy.

We have another kind of work, too—the job of getting out the paper and of trying to put into practice the ideas which make up the program of the *Catholic Worker*. Marty Corbin has spoken to a number of groups and has given a series of commentaries on WBAI, that excellent non-commercial, listener-supported FM radio station in New York City. Marty, Rita, Peter, Catherine, and from time to time, others in the community, have taken part in many demonstrations for civil rights and for peace, most particularly in demonstrations against the war in Vietnam, both in nearby towns, in New York City, and in Washington. Conferences on peace will also be conducted here at the farm during the Pax study weekend and the Peacemaker training program in August. With the war in Vietnam looking graver by the moment, and with a President under the militaristic influence of the Pentagon, caught up in the perilous spell of escalation, we have great need to demonstrate and work for peace. And pray for peace. Those of us who cannot so easily take part in demonstrations can certainly pray. During the retreat Father Hugo told us that prayer is work. Who would dare to say that it is the least important work? O Lamb of God, grant us peace.

With so much work, so many activities, so many people living together in community, we must have problems. And we do. Money problems, it seems, are always with us. But there are other problems, too, those problems also which are the common lot of all human kind — problems of sickness, affliction, death.

During the week of the priests' retreat, death came to another member of our community—Larry Doyle, who cooked at Chrystie Street, Spring Street and Peter Maurin Farm, and who had been gravely ill for some time with emphysema. After a period of hospitalization, he had returned to the farm; and early one morning, with Father Casey, who had the room next to him, by his side, he died. Father Kane sang a requiem Mass for him in St. Sylvia's Church, and Father Hugo, Father

COEXISTENCE WITH DIFFERING POLITICAL SYSTEMS

"It must be borne in mind, furthermore, that neither can false philosophical teachings regarding the nature, origin and destiny of the universe and of man be identified with historical movements that have economic, social, cultural or political ends, not even when these movements have originated from these teachings and have drawn and still draw inspiration therefrom. Because the teachings, once they are drawn up and defined, remain always the same, while the movements, working on historical situations in constant evolution, cannot but be influenced by these latter and cannot avoid, therefore, being subject to changes, even of a profound nature. Besides, who can deny that these movements, in so far as they conform to the dictates of right reason and are interpreters of the lawful aspirations of the human person, contain elements that are positive and deserving of approval."

PACEM IN TERRIS

Casey, and the other retreatant priests made up the choir. We are a loose, heterogeneous, and open kind of community, and come closest together, perhaps, in time of death. Everyone who could get to Larry's funeral was there, taking part in that Mass. Such a beautiful Mass, I think, would surely open the gates of Paradise for Larry. Requiescat in pace.

Now tonight, on the feast of good St. Anne, the mother of Our Lady, the voices of the children—who were regaled earlier by Larry Evers' tricks and one of Stanley's famous stories—are quiet. It is the crickets that sing, shrilly sweet, and, now and then, cicadas. A cool breeze moves with soft music through the leaves of trees. I drink the air. "Inebriate of air am I." O God, I thank You for this day, this night, this farm with a view.

On Pilgrimage

(Continued from page 4)

forceful working towards the common good.

If the Chinese and the Cubans are working for justice, and a better life for the masses, are they not also working for Christ, though they do not know him? But as Harold Robbins, the distributor, wrote in *The Sun of Justice*:

"Freedom is the primary and supreme reason for the existence of mankind. That He should be freely loved and served seems, as far as our thought can penetrate, to have been God's chief reason for calling us into being. At the cost of this freedom God could have established and maintained a world full of order, but not of justice, for free will is of the essence of human justice."

It is on these grounds that we stand opposed to war. Upholding this freedom for Communist and Capitalist, the East and the West.

"If I assert that it is wrong to kill a million schoolchildren, I do not have to prove my assertion. It is those who assert the contrary who have the burden of proof."

Rev. John C. Ford, S.J.
Professor of Moral Theology
Catholic University of America

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

"Since the right to command is required by the moral order and has its source in God, it follows that, if civil authorities legislate for or allow anything that is contrary to the will of God, neither the law made nor the authorization granted can be binding on the consciences of the citizens since God has more right to be obeyed than men."

PACEM IN TERRIS

We Are All Under Judgment

(Continued from page 2)

became in the matter of warfare "merchants of abstraction" par excellence. They formulated their concepts after the fact and away from the scene of slaughter — and more often than not, their conclusions were accommodations related to the pressure of their societies. A prime example of this accommodation was that the ban on the crossbow (hitherto permitted only against animals) was lifted in the war against the infidels.

The "defense" of the United States rests on a nuclear potential that includes, according to public testimony, more than thirty thousand atomic warheads, of which over thirty-five thousand are nuclear bombs of 10-1 or more megaton size. Jerome Wiesner and Herbert York, scientific advisers to the United States Government, point out that: "A one-megaton bomb is already about 50 times bigger than the bomb that produced 100,000 deaths at Hiroshima, and 10 megatons is of the same order of magnitude as the grand total of all high explosives used in all wars to date."

This is the actual United States deterrent, and any talk of the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons on the well-known "ship at sea" or on a ballistics missile in the outer atmosphere, is apocalyptically beside the point. The two scientists draw a conclusion that must have deep significance for the Fathers of the Council: "Both sides in the arms race are thus confronted by the dilemma of steadily increasing military power and steadily decreasing national security. It is our considered professional judgment that this dilemma has no technical solution." They advert to the fact that national security involves moral and human values. The Council Fathers, then, have become the stewards of humanity, the voice and champions of the innocent. It is the scientists and military technologists who are trapped and who are beginning to admit it openly.

It might be useful to apply some simple logic to the nuclear deterrent. This threat of megadeath deters an opponent only if he is convinced that it will be utilized. Those who have accumulated the deterring nuclear warheads intend to use them and to participate in the massive slaughter of the innocent. We all know that to intend an evil is sinful, so the guilt is already built in.

At this point, we may hear the argument that the threat of use is not actual, but rather a bluff to prevent attack by the other side. If this is the case, those who pose the threat of unleashing the deterrent are involved in a massive lie — also sinful by Christian standards.

Poisoned Atmosphere

The effects of the nuclear deterrent have been assessed in many ways. Special attention has been given to the problem of fallout, the poisoning of the atmosphere as a result of testing, and the poisoning of earth and sea through the disposal of atomic wastes. There is another type of fallout — what one could call a moral fallout, that arises from the possession by ostensible Christian communities of such genocidal machines. The American deterrent is pointed at centers of population across the Eurasian heartland, Russia and mainland China. Both of these nations in certain stages in their drive for a controlled and more egalitarian economy have given scant attention to the demands of the individual person. Americans decry the "ant civilization" of China, where millions are herded into collective farms and enterprises and forced to fit into a pattern of work and productivity.

The message of Christians, with its personal God and personal Savior, has always glorified the individual human person, unique, irreplaceable, infinitely loved. A Catholic writer has pointed out that "the great liberation that

Christianity has brought to men in every age is to make them realize they are loved." When circumstances are against the realization that man is loved by His Creator, then the role of Christians is to serve as the reminder through their expression of that love alone which comes only from the mystery of faith. The Russians and Chinese above all, need such reminders of our love. Instead, they learn that there are missiles, rockets and bombs pointed at them, and careening through the sky over them. If they are treated as less than human personalities in the collective farm or factory, they must realize that to the people behind the nuclear weapons, they are no more than insects to be cremated alive by the million. Who can convince the Chinese peasant that we, the Catholics of America, see him as a temple of the Holy Spirit, infinitely precious in the sight of God, another Christ to be lovingly served?

Slavery began to fall apart when the Christian began to receive his former slave (as Philemon was urged by St. Paul to take Onesimus) "as a brother most dear" . . . The deterrent system will begin to fall apart, and eventually to be dismantled, when Christians, American Christians first, begin to see their so-called enemies in Russia, China or across whatever border, as "brothers most dear."

Meantime, no pressures from the side of nuclear nationalism should move the Council Fathers to see the nuclear deterrent, and the "balance of terror" that it has brought upon the world, as anything but an eroder of the Christian concept of the infinite dignity of man, inhabited by the spirit of God and made in His image. How could such a threat of mass annihilation of God's human and material creation help preserve peace or stability? How can societies vowed to the defense of the rights of the human person preserve those rights by constant, coldly calculated threats to the bodily integrity of millions of innocent human beings?

There are those who suggest that a way out of the armament trap, which, by heaping overkill on overkill, is impoverishing mankind, would be unilateral steps toward disarmament. Those who are aghast at such proposals might remember that all morality is unilateral. We cannot wait for the other person to perform a moral act before we perform it or before we veer from a sinful to a moral course. They need perhaps to be reminded that the armament race, especially the nuclear build-up of the United States, was a unilateral action.

Presumption of Justice

The early Christians had a healthy mistrust of political authority, inspired partly by the fact that that authority was clearly wedded to idol-worship and the persecution of dissidents. Later, Christians often came to identify the concerns of Christ's Church with a particular nation-state. In time of war particularly, the nation-state became the ultimate guide for consciences, claiming an allegiance for Caesar that was due to God alone. The rule of thumb for the ordinary Christian came to be that if injustice was not open and clear, he was to give a "presumption of justice" to his own governmental authority. Certainly, in ordinary situations this may be a reasonable stance. In wartime, it becomes less than reasonable, and often flagrantly opposed to reason since every state presumes justice to itself. In modern war, the nation-state preempts news media and blocks off news at source.

Adolf Hitler tried to hide the facts of mass extermination by fire in the concentration camps as Josef Stalin tried to hide the fact of death by ice in Siberian labor camps. Our democratic leaders concealed their development of a geno-

(Continued on page 8)

Book Review

(Continued from page 5)

Franz Jagerstatter had in addition to Christ in the bread and wine of the Eucharist, also knowledge of Christ in one of His priests today who had taken the same stand and so was in a way accompanying him those last hard days.

I still do not feel that I am through with this review of Gordon Zahn's book until I have quoted at length from Franz's few writings, in the future issue of the *Catholic Worker*.

Let us pray that Gordon's book, which contains these writings in its appendix, will reach all the young men who are questioning their stand today in the face of conscription for the war which is going on in Vietnam right now. These essays, *On Irresponsibility*, *Is there anything the individual can still do?* *Is there still a God? War or Revolution? On Dangerous Weapons*. And last but not least, *The Prison Statement*, surely must be reprinted in the pages of *The Catholic Worker* as far as we will be permitted by the publisher.

If the most famous words of the little Saint Therese were "I will spend my heaven doing good upon earth," let us hope that these desires also animate Franz Jagerstatter today in this time of our utmost need, utmost danger. Standing before the face of God as he does, may he intercede for us all, and pray that the hearts of young men will be filled with the courage he showed, and the conviction which enabled him to take his solitary stand, and give his "solitary witness."

NUCLEAR WEAPONS SHOULD BE BANNED

"Justice then, right reason and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease. That the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned. That nuclear weapons should be banned."

PACEM IN TERRIS

The Council and the Bomb

(Continued from page 1)

for the morally dubious act of threatening genocide. On the morality of deterrence the speakers were either silent or so effusive in condemning it, in the case of Maximus IV, that the point was difficult to define. The schema itself was disapproving but evasive: "There is no true peace if wars are postponed only by a parity of weapons for spreading terror rather than by a sincere spirit of cooperation and concord." No effort was made in the schema to relate deterrence to the declaration against nuclear weapons.

This is, however, neither the only nor perhaps even the most important action possible to the Council on this question. Among those who were not granted the opportunity to speak was Archbishop Roberts, whose intervention, submitted in writing, stressed a different dimension of the problem, the right of conscientious objection.

Due mainly to the courageous, persevering efforts of Archbishop Roberts himself (and the quiet work in Rome of Jean and Hildegard Goes, Catholic members of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation), a statement on conscientious objection made its way into the adnexa to Schema 13. The statement recommended that the laws of the state respect those who "on account of either a witness to Christian principles or a certain reverence toward human life refuse military service in war on the grounds of conscience." In his intervention Archbishop Roberts asked that the statement be transferred from the adnexa to the schema in a clearer, firmer wording.

Archbishop Roberts' stress on the person's right to bear witness to his conscience introduces the dimension of action in which the Church can begin to respond to global war in a way that is more Christian than juridical. It also indicates a way out of the apparently insoluble dilemma which has become popular through efforts to harmonize nuclear strategy with traditional morality. The starting point of all such efforts has been the question: What can Western governments do when faced by the two threatening injustices of Communist aggression and their own thermonuclear means of destruction? The answers have been variations on the theme that the West can only resist one injustice by the other, that it can only deter aggression by continuing to threaten nuclear retaliation. The dilemma is therefore how to resist Communism by nuclear weapons without losing our own moral identity. The role of the Christian in this framework has been to see to it that, if the moment of truth does come, steps be taken to destroy the world and mankind as little as possible.

Individual Conscience

Archbishop Roberts' approach is centered not on Western governments but on the Christian as a person responsible to Christ. His starting point is the question: What can the Christian do when faced by these two injustices, Communism and mass destruction? The answer, not so surprisingly in this perspective, is that the Christian must resist both injustices, and moreover, that he must do so primarily by drawing on those sources and ways of action which define his identity as a follower of Christ. These have their strength rooted in the Christian's conscience, which beneath political slogans, military threats, and philosophies which more often obscure than define the motives behind them, is the basic reality at stake in the East-West conflict. It is conscience, and the extent to which its power is explored, that will determine the outcome of the most fundamental struggle: between those who are peace-makers in the deepest Christian sense and those whose orientation in life impels them toward war.

In order to recall the Christian

conscience to its responsibility in the face of global war, the Church herself must first acknowledge its right to an effective moral judgment. For the person's responsibility for his own actions in war and his right to conscientious objection have been neglected to the point of scandal in the recent teaching and history of the Church, from the submersion of the Catholic conscience in Hitler's war effort to its unquestioning role in Allied atrocities at Dresden and Hiroshima.

The text of Schema 13 did little to fill this vacuum when, after condemning nuclear weapons, it gave no counsel to the Christian ordered to use such arms. The adnexa's statement on conscientious objection, besides being relegated to an appendix, received less weight still by the emphatic reaffirmation in the same paragraph of the most abused rule in just-war casuistry: the presumption of right in war to government authorities. In view of the stress given this rule in the past and the consequent moral tragedies in the context of modern nationalism, its right to a place anywhere in the schema or adnexa should have been questioned severely, particularly in conjunction with the Church's long-overdue recognition of conscientious objection.

To restore to the Christian conscience its power to resist and counterbalance the enormous energy being expended on genocidal weapons, the Council could reinforce an affirmation of the right of conscientious objection in the schema proper by directing Christians toward a rediscovery of the Scriptural roots for a personal witness to peace. These are not hard to find—they constitute an essential part of the Gospel—but their relevance to war, and to modern war in particular, has been obscured by a scholastic ethic whose interpretation of the Gospels has involved a systematic de-emphasis of Christ's teaching of non-violence. The meaning of these Gospel texts has been obvious enough to men like Gandhi to provoke wonder at Christians who would fit them into a just-war ethic. In view of the Church's deepening understanding of Scripture and of the nations' deepening involvements in the machinery of total war, there would be nothing imprudent in the Council's support of a Christian dedication to total peace, especially by a recommendation in the schema that each Christian explore in conscience the non-violent love and teaching of Christ. The subsequent impact of the Prince of Peace on the course of history might well be greater than it has been through the just-war doctrine.

To the objection that such an approach could lessen Christian participation in certain sectors of the political order, the answer is that the scholastic ethic itself bears with it a hard recognition, untempered by any priorities in a fight against an external enemy: that to the extent—and no further—that nations are committed to murderous means of defense, the political order has become divorced from the moral order, and Caesar from the Christian's allegiance to God and man. The split between these two normally converging orders is a wound extending to the heart of the body politic and into the conscience of each citizen aware of the price set today on national security. It is a wound that will only go deeper through those efforts which in fact sacrifice the moral order to the political. The Christian ministers to this wound through the service of reconciliation: resisting injustice wherever he encounters it, making peace in the world as one informed by the life and teaching of Christ, and widening that community of love and reconciliation which is the Church in her fidelity to God. If this service must sometimes be performed elsewhere than at the center of

the political order, its ultimate effect on that order is no less for its obedience to the Lord of History.

Ed. note: James W. Douglass teaches theology at Bellarmine College, Louisville, Kentucky, and is a sponsor of the Catholic Peace Fellowship. This article first appeared in the COMMONWEAL for March 5th.

American Experts

(Continued from page 6)

hearted commitment to the theory and practice of nuclear deterrence. An even larger number, I would suggest, have simply "gone along" under the assumption that the national policy was morally indifferent or irrelevant—or even that they were bound under the principle of obedience to legitimate authority to resign themselves to policies they might otherwise reject. And there are those, like myself, who reject those policies and their implications; a statement such as that feared by these authors would actually free us from the dilemma of conscience or, failing this, make it easier for us to come to terms with it.

No one expects or demands that Vatican II will produce a decision which will finally and completely solve this problem for each of us. But where there is indifference or unconcern or misguided acceptance, it would seem to be the duty of the Council to correct false assumptions and to inspire Catholics the world over to recognize and face the moral dilemmas that do exist and must be resolved by each individual in the depths of his own heart and mind and soul. In any event, if these weapons or the use to which they are certain to be put are immoral, the dilemma is already there, and it would be of the utmost spiritual benefit to those "fifty million American Catholics" for it to be brought to their attention in this fashion.

No one can say what Vatican II will say or do about the Church and modern war. I, like the authors of the C.A.I.P. statement, hope that the Fathers will speak out of "an exhaustive study of all the material and moral questions involved." But I would add the further hope that we Catholics (and our bishops) who live in what these authors refer to as "the land of Hiroshima" would begin with that tragic event and the guilt we all bear for it so that we may lead the Church and the world to a more total commitment against the kind of pragmatic empiricism and "rational" calculation which made that horror possible. The facts of science must be taken into account; but here, too, we should begin by setting forth the kind and scope of destruction we may expect from any future resort to any weapons of total war, nuclear or conventional. Finally, the ruling consideration always and everywhere must be the laws of God and the counsels and example of His Son. Only in this way can we escape the temptations posed by those personal or national "imperatives" which, in this age when the potentiality of violence has become total, could lead us to contemplate and even accept the willful destruction of God's temporal creation.

Ed. Note: Dr. Zahn is currently Simon Fellow at the University of Manchester, England. He is Professor of Sociology at Loyola University, Chicago. Franz Jagerstatter, whose story is told in Dr. Zahn's latest book, (reviewed in this issue) is the subject of a half-hour film "The Witness," produced by the Television Division of the National Council of Catholic Men. Dr. Zahn is the author of several books and pamphlets and editor of a textbook of readings in sociology.

We Are All Under Judgment

(Continued from page 7)

cial weapon, secretly siphoning off two billion dollars from the public treasury and holding the discussions about the genetic risk of utilizing atomic fission in the form of a bomb behind closed doors. The human family as a whole, and the national groups into which it is divided, are best served by the responsible man who puts governmental actions to the test of right reason and his moral conscience. A presumption of injustice by the Christian citizen would help keep the nation-state closer to moral norms, especially in wartime. To those who fear anarchy in this use of freedom, it can well be argued that no world can be as lawless as the world where leaders can flout the human conscience and break all human and divine laws. The lessons of Nazism and Fascism, systems that grew in the wombs of Europe's oldest civilization, are perhaps too easily forgotten. These systems could not have swallowed up the German and Italian nations nor turned civilian societies into war machines without a presumption of justice on the part of millions of citizens.

The Right to Object

The right of the individual to refuse to participate in war and killing is enshrined in the laws of many countries, including the United States. Regrettably, the American Catholic conscientious objector did not receive from churchmen the same protection for the freedom of conscience that was extended by the political authority. It is to be hoped that any statement in Schema XIII on the right of abstention from or objection to war service will be unequivocal, that it will clearly state the Christian view of the freedom of man's conscience and not merely ask political authorities to give recognition to it.

Franz Jagerstatter, whose martyrdom is discussed in a review in this issue of the paper, was troubled to his dying day by the thought that he was sinning in the eyes of the Church by refusing to take the oath of fealty to Hitler or to fight in Hitler's wars.

Jagerstatter was born in the same province as the unfortunate Adolf Eichmann, whose defense against the accusation of genocide was that he was merely carrying out orders. Eichmann seems to stand for all the millions of "little Eichmanns" who tried to slough responsibility off on those above him. Franz Jagerstatter pondered these matters in his heart and wrote of them in commentaries which were preserved by his wife.

He once wrote: "One often hears it said these days: 'It's all right for you to do this or that with an untroubled mind: the responsibility for what happened rests with someone else.' And in this way, responsibility is passed on from one man to another. No one wants to accept responsibility for anything. Does this mean that when human judgment is finally passed on all the crimes and horrors being committed at this very time that one or two individuals must do penance for them all someday?"

The Judgment of Love

The judgment that we all face is the simple one of how we have treated our neighbor. Have we fed him, clothed him, healed him, sheltered him, ransomed him, or have we not? We know from our earliest years that it is only by the works of mercy that we enter the kingdom of God. And we know that mercy is only love under the aspect of need. We are all under the judgment of love. If all of us, lay and clerical alike, must meet that same judgment, we should look with terror at any human activity which makes it impossible for us to perform the works of mercy. War does just that. In times of old, the works of mercy were merely interrupted for the duration of the hostilities. Modern war literally reverses the works of mercy. Rather than feed the hungry, we scorch the earth from which the hungry are fed, rather than clothe the naked,

we raze the plants where clothing is manufactured; rather than shelter the shelterless we destroy, in minutes, the shelters that man patiently built for himself and his kind rather than give drink to the thirsty, we bomb reservoirs serving great cities; rather than heal the sick, we kill them in their beds in homes and hospitals; rather than ransom the captive, we make captives of as many of our opponents as possible. This is the face of modern total war, even of "conventional" war. Nuclear war, by vaporizing the human being so that he is no more than a shadowy outline on a Hiroshima sidewalk, makes all the works of mercy impossible.

It is at this face of modern war that we ask our Shepherds to look. It is to the face of the Cold War that we also ask them to look. In the United States alone, nearly fifty billion dollars annually goes into the bottomless pit of the nuclear deterrent and that inhuman thing known as overkill. These are the resources that the family of man needs for its health, its educational improvement, its dignity. Here again, there is a massive obliteration of the works of mercy, as Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI have so eloquently pointed out to the world.

Christians are called to be peace-makers, to reconcile man to man, as their Founder reconciled man to God. Now, when we can resort to violence only at the risk of destroying ourselves, we must make a witness, both as individual Christians and as a Church to a loving reconciling community. At the Council the Fathers can lay the foundation for the community of love which is the only thing that can overcome the existing community of fear. It is the Fathers who can bring hope back to the world by giving an unmistakable sign that they believe in the kingdom of peace which is to come. We already have in our midst many heroic witnesses to that kingdom. How else can we account for the million and a half men and women all over the world who are vowed to celibacy, witnesses to a supernatural love and to a kingdom where there will be neither marrying nor giving in marriage?

The time is upon us for a witness against war and for peace. In "The Church in the Modern World," the Fathers of the universal Church must call us to it in words that burn with the Pentecostal fire, a fire that will consume the hate from which war springs. There are some silences that thunder into all eternity. Let theirs not be one of them. The faithful and the whole family of man await clear guidance that will help snatch us from the abyss, a prophetic witness by the church to the peaceable kingdom. This witness may well go beyond words to a concrete realization in the Vatican of a permanent peacemaking, reconciling body. A Cistercian monk has written that total nuclear war would be a sin of mankind second only to that of the Crucifixion. It is in order to avoid that great sin that we beg clear words and deeds from the Fathers of the Council.

Modern War

(Continued from page 3)

churches, schools, and mass media that the Christian vocation of peace-making will be restored to its centrality. Only then will world public opinion outlaw war and the people of the world come to know and say that this is a Church of Peace.

HOWARD EVERNGAM

For the Committee on Modern War, American PAX Association. (An Association of Catholics and others who seek to promote peace and to encourage the practical application of Christian principles to the question of war.)

Box 139, Murray Hill P.O., New York 16.