

CATHOLIC WORKER

Vol. XII. No. 2

March, 1943

Price One Cent

EASY ESSAYS

By PETER MAURIN

I. Scholar and Bourgeois

1. The scholar tells the bourgeois:
"A man is a man for all of that."
2. But the bourgeois tells the scholar:
"A man is a commodity for all of that."
3. Because the scholar has a vision, the bourgeois calls him a visionary.
4. And while the bourgeois laughs at the scholar's vision, the worker is left without vision.
5. And the worker, left without vision by the scholar, talks about liquidating both the bourgeois and the scholar.

II. Scholar and Worker

1. The scholar must tell the worker what is wrong with the things as they are.
2. The scholar must tell the worker how the things would be if they were as they should be.
3. The scholar must tell the worker how a path can be made from things as they are to the things as they should be.
4. The scholar must cooperate with the worker in the making of a path from the things as they are to the things as they should be.

III. On to the Street

1. Fr. Bede Jarrett says:
"The truths of a generation become the platitudes of the next generation."
2. Henrik Ibsen says:
"Thought must be rewritten every twenty years."
3. That is to say eternal principles must at all times be presented in the vernacular of the man on the street.
4. Emerson says that the way to acquire the vernacular of the man on the street is to go to the street and listen to the man of the street.
5. The way to become dynamic and cease to be academic is to rub shoulders with the men on the street.

About the Supplement

Because of the continuing demand for extra copies, we are reprinting with this issue Father Hugo's article, "The Immorality of Conscription." Ten thousand extra copies have been distributed since publication in November, and we are printing 10,000 extra copies of this issue.

FOOLS AND BEASTS

By ERIC GILL

MAN is a person.

War today, like work today, is impersonal.

Modern weapons, like modern machines, reduce the soldier, and the worker, to a subhuman condition.

War today is not fighting; it is destruction.

Work today is not ennobling; it is degrading.

The worker is made into a fool. The soldier is made into a beast. What we call peace today is simply the preparation and provocation of war.

Rivalries between men of business lead to rivalries between nations for economic advantage. Those who see these things are powerless; their only course is passive resistance.

Whether or not forcible resistance to injustice is ever justified—whether it is ever even successful—is not the point.

What we have to consider first is whether the methods of force which we call war today can ever be justified even if apparently successful.

And second, whether the wars of today are really struggles for justice, or whether they are not really struggles for economic supremacy, and we must note: Wars today are not fought by small, professional armies or mercenaries, i.e., men in the pay of and at the command of their employers, as all the old national armies were—men who, in a manner of speaking, may be said to have died for their living—war today involves the conscription of whole nations, so

that it may be said everybody, men, women and children, are forced to risk or lose their lives and their goods in quarrels which they neither make nor understand.

FIRST then as to the nature of war today: the following quotations indicate the situation very clearly:

"There is no one in Europe today, and I don't care who he is, who does not know what war in

want to save yourselves." (Earl Baldwin again.)

"The object of the bomber is not to defeat the rival air force, but to terrify into submission populations whose women, children and homes are attacked and destroyed by fire, explosives and gas." (The Times, Jan. 12, 1938.)

Even were we to suppose that forcible resistance is justified, that the brave good man is justified in fighting the brave bad man, how can we deceive ourselves into thinking of war today in such terms? What then...

We are persons—we have free will and the use of reason. But war today is for the vast majority of those who are dragged into it, not a personal struggle at all. It is not fighting, just or unjust. It is merely indiscriminate and impersonal destruction.

It is not defense of our country. It is not defense of our men, women and children.

It is not defense of our homes. It is simply offensive.

It is simply terrorism.

The brave young bomber has not the least desire to fight his rival brave young bomber—his job is to get behind his opponent and destroy or poison foreign people and their homes. (How useless and mendacious is the pretense that bombers can confine their attention to military objectives is shown by daily experience in Spain.) And it's not only the airplane that has changed the nature of war...

The same developments have taken place in ordinary artillery and rifle fire. The use of guns and rifles as instruments of precision, things which individual men use to destroy or kill an individual target or person, has almost disappeared. (The sniper is merely an eccentric.) High explosive and long-range has made

(Continued on page 2)



the long run means. It means all over Europe the degradation of the life of the people. It means misery compared with which the misery of the last war was happiness. And it means in the end anarchy and world revolution, and we all know it." (Earl Baldwin on November 9, 1936.)

"The only defense is offense, which means that you have to kill women and children more quickly than the enemy if you

SAVAGERY AND FRIGHTFULNESS

By FR. CLARENCE DUFFY

"The Allied air bosses have made the long awaited decision to adopt deliberate terror bombing of the great German population centers as a ruthless expedient to hasten Hitler's doom."

The above is one extract from the newspapers during the month of February. Here is another one which refers not to the air bosses but to the enlisted men of the army of the United States:

"U. S. 1st Army Infantrymen assaulting the Westwall found a method of dealing with Nazis who refused to leave their pillboxes.

"A mobile acetylene torch unit crept up behind one emplacement and welded the steel doors shut, sealing the Germans inside. Other Nazis in neighboring pillboxes who realized what had happened, quickly became more susceptible to persuasion."

Both quotations prove that the Americans and the British are equal if not superior to the Nazis in savagery and frightfulness. Many of them indeed are boasting and glorying in the fact that they can excel the latter and the admittedly heathen Jap in bigger, better and more savage methods of slaughter and destruction in this global war

(Continued on page 11)

NOTES BY THE WAY

By DOROTHY DAY

Peter first interested me in Wm. Cobbett with his "History of the Protestant Reformation." Then through my son-in-law, who has long been a Cobbett enthusiast, I have read, "Cottage Economy," "Advice to Young Men and to Young Women," and bits of "Rural Rides." He was the forerunner of Eric Gill, Chesterton and Belloc and their distributist program. On my last visit to the Grail family at Loveland, Ohio, I told them about his rigorous life, his advice on early rising, drinking only cold drinks for breakfast, bread and cheese and milk, or water, cold baths (all babies should be started out with cold baths, he thought). He was truly a poor man, a disciplined and a happy one. He was the best historian and economist of his time, and we feel that he belonged much to us in America, too, since he lived right after the revolution in Philadelphia and also on Long Island. He was a journalist, a seedsman, a historian, a pamphleteer. He inveighed against the evils of his day but not so much against his fellows. He was against the system, but his indignation was large, general and generous.

At the farm. Teresa says: "Remind people that they once sent rose bushes and irises for beautifying the upper farm. Maybe they will send some more."

On the feast of St. Vincent of Saragossa, we wrote to Bill Gauchat, whose Lady of the Wayside Farm at Avon, Ohio, is in the midst of the grape country, to send us grape cuttings. Also to Milt Fess of St. Benedict's Farm, Scottsville, New York, for

(Continued on page 2)

Breastplate of St. Patrick

(This version of the beautiful prayer, composed by the Apostle of Ireland, is a direct translation from the original Irish text in the "Liber Hymnorum," preserved in Trinity College, Dublin.)

I arise today
through a mighty strength,
the invocation of the Trinity,
Through belief in the Three-ness,
Through confession of the Oneness,
Of the Creator of Creation.
I arise today
Through the strength of Christ
with His baptism,
Through the strength of His
crucifixion with His burial,
Through the strength of His
resurrection with His ascension,
Through the strength of His
descent for the judgment of
Doom.
I arise today
Through God's strength to
pilot me,
God's might to uphold me,
God's wisdom to guide me,



God's eye to look before me,
God's ear to hear me,
God's word to speak for me,
God's hand to guard me,
God's way to lie before me,
God's shield to protect me,
God's host to secure me.—
Against snares of devils,
Against temptations of vices,
Against inclination of nature,
Against everyone who shall
wish me ill.
Afar and near,
Alone and in a multitude,
Christ to protect me today
Against poison, against burning,
Against drowning, against
wounding,
So that there may come to me
abundance of reward.
Christ with me, Christ before
me, Christ behind me;
Christ in me, Christ beneath
me, Christ above me;
Christ on my right, Christ on
my left;
Christ in breadth, Christ in
length, Christ in height;
Christ in the heart of every man
who thinks of me,
Christ in the mouth of every
man who speaks to me,
Christ in every eye that sees
me,
Christ in every ear that hears
me.

CATHOLIC WORKER

Published Monthly September to June, Bi-monthly July-August
(Member of Catholic Press Association)
ORGAN OF THE CATHOLIC WORKER MOVEMENT

PETER MAURIN, Founder
DOROTHY DAY, Editor and Publisher
115 Mott St., New York City—13
Telephone: CAnal 6-8498

Subscription, United States, 25c Yearly Canada and Foreign, 30c 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

Retreat

LIVING as we do in the slums, in the cities, almost in the streets, I am often reminded of our quest:

"I will arise and go about the city; in the streets and broad ways I will seek Him whom my soul loveth.

"I sought Him and I found Him not. . . . But, when I had a little passed by them, I found Him whom my soul loveth. I held Him and I would not let Him go."

We must all pass by these works of ours, we must retreat from them, because if we don't find Him and hold Him; how are we going to bring Him to others?

Retreats are for Lent, and are generally associated with prayer and fasting. But in this stormy age in which we live, we need them all the time. Or rather, we need to be having them all the time on the farm, so that people can find time to get away from their family and work duties.

The next retreat at Maryfarm will be during Easter week, a time of rejoicing, and will begin April 2. Please write to us, all those who want to come and join us. But if you find at the last minute you can come, get on train or bus and come anyway, whether or not you have notified us.

Busses leave at frequent intervals from the Greyhound depot in New York, and the Lehigh Valley train leaves from the Pennsylvania station. By the time the retreat commences we will have a telephone and a car and can pick up the pilgrims. Just ask information for the number of Maryfarm, Fr. Pacifique Roy, R.R. Number 4. We do not know which name it will be under.

On Tyranny and War

From Plato's "Republic"

"THE people always have some champion whom they set over them and nurse into greatness. This and no other is the root from which a tyranny springs. When he first appears above ground he is a protector. In the early days of his career he is full of smiles, and he salutes everyone he meets—he is to be called a tyrant, who is making promises in public and also in private; liberating debtors and distributing land to the people and his followers, and wanting to be so kind and good to everyone! But when he has disposed of foreign enemies by conquest or treaty, and there is nothing to fear from them, then he is always stirring up some war or other, in order that the people may require a leader. He has another object, which is that they may be impoverished by payment of taxes and thus compelled to devote themselves to their daily wants and therefore less likely to conspire against him. And if any of them are suspected by him of having notions of freedom and of resistance to his authority, he will have a good pretext for destroying them by placing them at the mercy of the enemy; and for all these reasons the tyrant must always be getting up a war."

To One of These My Least Brethren

"To one of these my least brethren, you did it unto me"
And everywhere He heard men talk of the justice of liberty,
For Christ, the Lord, went walking with tired feet,
Through countryside and village, through lane and city street.

He heard His fellows murmur if He tried to ride
In buses, trains, or streetcars seated by their side,
And often when He paused to eat they peered into His face,
And would not give Him service, for He was not of their race.

He hung His head in sadness, His heart was sorely rent,
For shunned and scorned by those He met was He wherever He went.
He thought about His purple robe, His crown of thorns once more,
Because the people spat at Him, and jeered Him as before.

From a shouting mob of lynchers at last He fled in fright
As they came to take Him captive one terrible dark night.
His feet were torn and bleeding as He stumbled through the town;
Like sportsmen thirsting for the kill, they ran the Victim down,
And He who died for all mankind upon Mount Calvary
Was broken, black, and lifeless as He dangled from a tree.

MARY C. FERRIS.

Notes By the Way

(Continued from page 1)

hop plants. St. Vincent is the patron of wine growers. This is a great time for reading catalogues at the farm. We are going in for tree planting in a serious way this spring, and recommend especially the fascinating catalogue from Sunny Ridge Nursery, Swarthmore, Pa. J. Russell Smith is the author, and he has been loving trees, he says, for fifty years. He has written a wonderful book, "Tree Crops."

Rex D. Pearce, seedsman, Moorestown, New Jersey, also gets out a wonderful catalogue, filled with good sketches and bits of homely philosophy, such as, "You can't have both freedom and security, for freedom is never secure nor is security ever free."

On Feb. 15, Teresa and I were picking water cress from a brook down the road and had a fine salad for supper. And she had a bouquet of forsythia all in bloom on the table. I brought some into town with me for the shrine of the Blessed Mother, which delighted Shorty.

My sister has a copy of Arabia Deserta by Doughty, which makes good background reading for one's study of the Bible. "Cheerful is the bare Arabic livelihood in the common air, which has sufficiency in a few things snatched incuriously as on a journey; so it is a life little full of superfluous cares; their ignorance is not brutish, their poverty is not baseness."

In another part he writes, "There is a winter proverb of the poor in Europe, 'Fire is half bread.'" I thought of this many times when we were without coal and oil during January and February. Rose Maguire of Jamaica came to our rescue during this crisis. She not only brought a taxi load of wood to us the next day, but went to friends, until she got two ton of coal. God bless her! She warmed our hearts as well as our bodies.

"Attend to reading," St. Paul said to Timothy. St. Jerome writes to Eustochium, "Let sleep creep over you holding a book, and let the sacred page receive your drooping face." St. Augustine said, "Do you know how we should read Holy Scripture? As when a person reads letters that have come from his native country, to see what news we have of heaven." Rodriguez says that reading is sister and companion to meditation. St. Jerome wrote, "Where is this fire? (of the love of God). Doubtless in the holy Scriptures, by the reading whereof the soul is set on fire with God and purified from all vices." St. John 6, 64: "The words that I have given you are spirit and life."

Thoughts on holy silence: St. Gregory kept silence during Lent. Holy Abbot Agatho for three years carried a pebble in his mouth to gain the virtue of silence.

Abbot Deicoola always had a smile on his face and when asked why he was so happy, he said, "Be what may be and come what may come, no one can take God from me."

Newman's picture of a Christian character: free from excitement or effort, full of repose, still, equable. "Act then as persons who are in a dwelling not their own. . . . What matters it what we eat, what we drink, wherewith we are clothed, what is thought of us, what becomes of us, etc."

On the other hand there is the sacramental attitude toward life. "Whatever you do, whether you eat or drink, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." (We need a concordance to verify quotations.) Isaiah, 32; 17, 18: "The work of the righteous shall be peace, and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance forever. And my people shall

FOOLS AND BEASTS

(Continued from page 1)

gunnery, like air bombing, more and more indiscriminate. The machine gun is not directed against individuals but against masses.

I SAY we are persons—we have the use of reason. War today is a degradation of personality. The human has become sub-human. In this respect war today is the exact counterpart of our work today. The personality of the worker no longer counts. The worker as such is no longer a person—he is an instrument employed for the profit of his employer. Modern commerce, like modern politics, is ruled by finance, and with the same results. The bestialization of men. In this connection I may quote from *The Plough* (magazine of the Cotswold Bruderhof) quoting a modern German writer, anon.:

"The atmosphere of commerce is one of mutual hostility rather than of mutual help. The daily waste of effort, the wear and tear of human life caused by this degeneration of commerce into a species of masked warfare are incalculable."

"A factory or workshop in time of peace is perhaps an even worse training place for Christian character and morals than an army in campaign."

I say we are persons. We have free will. Is it not within our power to refuse any longer to be made fools of? Certainly it is. For as some one said: "The only thing that was wrong with the conscientious objectors in the last war was that there were not enough of them."

I am not going to write about the present political disputes in Europe or Asia. The object of this tract is to promote the cause of peace. The cause of peace is not promoted by politics but by keeping out of politics. (As has been said before.) Peace, like charity, begins at home. Is there peace in this country? Have we done away with competition between rival money-makers? Is farming a way of life or a way of business? Is the worker a responsible person or only an instrument of profit? Has every man who is able to work a chance of working? Have we done away with the violent contrast between

the incomes of those who invest money and control credit and the incomes of those who work for wages? We have not! Are not the foundations of modern business the very same competition, aggrandizement and greed of power which are the causes of war between nations? Then how can there be peace between nations when there is neither charity nor justice in our dealings with our own countrymen?

IN my opinion, therefore, we should serve the cause of peace very, ill if we confined ourselves to arguing about the justice or injustice of German or Czechoslovakian or Italian or Japanese or Russian ambitions, especially when we bear in mind that we are kept, and purposely kept, ignorant of the real economic stresses and rivalries which are behind the window-dressing of politicians. We shall serve the cause of peace best by promoting those things which make for peace in our own land. This means the abandonment of imperialism; it means the abandonment of dependence on foreign investment, it means a return to dependence on home food production, it means "Little Englandism." Are we prepared to face these things? If we are not, there can be no escape from foreign wars. (The Empire was built by foreign wars.) And it is no use talking about peace until we have made the foundations of peace in our own land. Meanwhile, those who agree about these things are powerless. Our only course is passive resistance. Remember the captain in the shipwreck: The ship was sinking. The captain went around among the passengers saying: "The ship is sinking, our help is in the name of the Lord." One old lady passenger said: "Oh, captain, is it as bad as all that?" It IS as bad as all that. And remember: No one, neither Church nor Government, can compel or even ask us to go against our consciences.

[The above is an address given at a public meeting convened at Friends House, London, by the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups on September 26, 1938. While Mr. Gill is speaking of England, much of what he says applies also to our own country.]

dwelt in a peaceable habitation and in sure dwellings and quiet resting places."

To think nothing of ourselves and always to judge well and highly of others, is great wisdom and high perfection. (Following of Christ.)

Prayer is what breath is to the body. Prayer is the hand of the body, waits on it, feeds it, washes it, tends it—as the hands do everything, so prayer. "If Stephen had not prayed," writes St. Augustine, "the Church would never have had St. Paul."

Buddha says that community life is like sword grass in one's hand.

St. Apollo formed a community of 500 monks near Hermapolis, who received daily communion and listened to a daily homily. In these he often insisted on the evils of melancholy and sadness, saying that cheerfulness of heart is necessary amidst our tears of penance as being the fruit of charity, and requisite to maintain the spirit of fervor. He himself was known to strangers by the joy of his countenance.

"The grace of the Holy Ghost, like a good mother, has put aloes on the breasts of the world that that might become bitter to me which before was sweet, and sweetest honey on the things of virtue and religion in order to make that tasty and sweet to me

which before seemed bitter and disagreeable."—Rodriguez.

"It was a rule among the Jews that all their children should learn some handicraft in the course of their studies, were it but to avoid idleness and exercise the body, as well as the mind, in some sensible pursuit."

—Butler.
Charles de Foucault wrote: "Manual labor is necessarily put into the second place, to make room for studies, at present, because you and I are in the period of infancy; we are not yet old enough to work with St. Joseph, we are still with Jesus, the little child at the Virgin's knee, learning to read. But later on, humble, vile, despised manual labor will again take its great place, and then Holy Communion, the lives of the saints, prayer, the humble work of our hands, humiliation and suffering!"

For Thoughtful
Comment on
Public Affairs Read

The Commonweal

386 4th Ave., N. Y. 16, N. Y.

\$5 a year 10 cts. a copy

CATHOLIC WORKER



Page Three

The Immorality of Conscription

By Father John J. Hugo

To fight war we must fight conscription, the acceptance of conscription. To this fight *The Catholic Worker* pledges itself as long as we are permitted to exist.

The Popes opposed it. The German Bishops opposed it. Cardinal Mannix of Australia defeated it. It was defeated in Ireland.

We urge all our readers to enlist with us to fight conscription in America.

The above lines are quotations from the leaflet, "FIGHT CONSCRIPTION," by Dorothy Day, published four years ago. In fulfillment of its pledge, *The Catholic Worker* has since published the pamphlets, "War and Conscription at the Bar of

Christian Morals," by the late Msgr. George Barry O'Toole, and "Weapons of the Spirit," by Father John J. Hugo. The fight against compulsory military service has been carried on unremittingly in the pages of *The Catholic Worker*. Father Hugo's article, "Catholics Can Be Conscientious Objectors," published in the May and June, 1943, issues, stands as the definitive and most forthright statement on the subject. We now present Father Hugo's analysis of the immorality of conscription, at a time when the proponents of universal military service are urging immediate passage of a law making such service a permanent establishment. With this presentation we renew our pledge, and repeat our urgent request that all our readers join us in this fight against conscription.

The Editors.

PART I

Introductory:

The State of the Question

1. The Urgency of the Subject

UNIVERSAL military conscription alone is what makes modern war possible. More important even than technological advance for carrying on the wholesale slaughter characteristic of war today is the levying of modern mass armies. Were it possible to end this practice, war, as it is known in the twentieth century, simply could not exist.

Accordingly, in examining the ethical justification of modern war, there is no aspect of the question more important than that of the morality of conscription. Yet, despite this obvious importance, the subject has been little discussed, and the morality of universal compulsory military service is commonly taken for granted. Even moral theologians have to a great extent allowed conscription to go unchallenged. For this reason it may seem a little late to take up an inquiry into an institution that has existed for a century and a half without apparently having been seriously questioned. Yet there are reasons for this silence, reasons why the subject can best be considered now. Older theologians, like St. Augustine and St. Thomas, knew nothing about conscription, which existed only since 1793; neither did de Vitoria (d. 1546) or Suarez (d. 1617), the most authoritative modern theologians who deal with the morality of war. This is a very significant fact. It means that the leading theologians to whom Catholics go for principles concerning war made their judgments at a time when the most important factor in war as it exists today was quite unknown. Whatever may be the authority of these older writers, there is need today of an evaluation which takes account of compulsory military service.

Need for Careful Study

Few of the moralists who have written since conscription has become a general policy have condemned it. This fact, however, cannot be taken as an argument in its support. For, on the one hand, those who have considered it at all have usually condemned it while, on the other, the standard modern authors in moral theology have generally not touched upon the subject except briefly and in passing. It must be admitted, however reluctantly, that modern Catholic scholars have failed to give the whole problem of war the attention it deserves and demands. A few pages in manuals of ethics and moral theologies, and then the more than a formal enumeration of

conditions required for just war. There is too little effort to apply these conditions to modern circumstances or to study thoroughly this greatest evil in the whole modern world. In classes of ethics and moral theology, the entire subject is dismissed in an hour. In a word, war and conscription have simply been taken for granted. We have given the decision of conscience over to statesmen, most frequently of the old Liberal school, and therefore thoroughly irreligious, who have lulled our consciences to sleep by camouflaging the sordid military expeditions of capitalism and national imperialism with a profession of high moral ideals. But in our time war and conscription have reached such proportions of evil that they can no longer be taken for granted.

Whatever may be the reasons for this tardiness of conscience in asserting itself (and there are several reasons, of which only one that directly concerns conscription will be considered here), there seems to be little doubt that the present is the best time to make a rounded and complete study of conscription. For conscription, although existing now for a century and a half, has reached its full development only in our generation. At present, for the first time, it can be viewed in its fully matured form. This fact has undoubtedly been greatly responsible for preventing moralists from attempting to make a definitive judgment in the past. They have not had all the facts before them; and it must also be conceded to them, in extenuation of an otherwise inexplicable silence on so grave a matter, that the facts which they did not possess are the most decisive ones.

Hidden Seeds of Evil

Until now conscription has been difficult to judge for the same reason that a child's character is difficult to judge. The child is immature; his traits have not yet fully revealed themselves. All children seem, on the surface, sweet and innocent; yet this natural goodness, besides being unstable and fleeting, conceals certain potentialities of evil which will manifest themselves only gradually and which, unless mortified, will grow into serious moral defects. An evil tree brings forth evil fruit. Only it takes time to do so. You do not plant a seed one day and go out the next day with a basket to gather the fruit.

The evil of conscription, in a similar way, can be seen clearly only as it reaches maturity and we are able to see its full stature and characteristic effects. Not that the evil is only in the effects; it is there from the beginning, but we cannot fully realize this—above all, we cannot be perfectly sure of it—until we see its effects. In a bad man, the beginning of evil was already present in the seeming innocence of childhood; but development was necessary to bring it out. Or, in the example of the evil tree, the poison is already in the seed, but it can be detected only when men attempt to eat of the fruit.

2. An Instructive Parallel

A SOMEWHAT similar case is found in the development of extreme feminism, that is, in the demand made by so many modern women for complete emancipation from their own peculiar duties and responsibilities. And because this case, besides providing an instructive parallel, provides useful material for a later stage of the argument, it will be well to pause here and consider it briefly. It was difficult, when women first began to agitate for freedom, for Catholics to assert or explain their opposition to feminism—although the movement is certainly evil and was eventually condemned by the Church—for the reason that a very real admixture of good elements prevents the errors from at once appearing. We Catholics do not need feminists to point out to us the dignity of womankind. We believe, and have believed from the beginning, that women have immortal souls and are equal to men in dignity and worth: in the kingdom of heaven there is "neither male nor female". Indeed, because of our Lady, so uniquely privileged among all human beings, we have conceded to women greater respect, greater veneration, than is given to men. As Chesterton pointed out, even many of the so-called disabilities of women proceed, not from contempt, but reverence; they are like the exemptions from secular activities conceded to priests. We did not even need the feminists to tell us that women are endowed with intelligence and have therefore a right to education. If in former times women were not generally given greater opportunities for intellectual culture, this was due to social and historical reasons, as well as to stubborn male prejudices, and not to any doctrine of Christianity closing to women the advantages of instruction.

Functional Differences Ignored

Catholics do, of course, believe that the function of women, both in human society and in the Mystical Body of Christ, is distinct from that of men. This is the only reservation that must be made.

(Continued on page 4)

¹ See Msgr. George Barry O'Toole, "War and Conscription at the Bar of Christian Morals" (Catholic Worker Press, N. Y.). The opinions of several other authors are summarized in *National Patriotism in Papal Teaching*, by John J. Wright, p. 180 et seq. (Newman, 1943). Also John Eppstein, *The Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations*, pp. 133-134 (London, Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1935).

² We do not mean here—and this is to be carefully noted—that the calling of soldier is as such evil. What we mean is that in fact the actual circumstances of modern conscription and war invariably tend to make it extrinsically evil. And of course the soldier as such is an abstraction that exists only in a philosopher's brain. He is a kind of "laboratory" man, like the "economic man" or "man in the state of pure nature"; he has no passions and no morally determining purposes, and he is remote from all the actual circumstances of human life. But the soldier in reality, has passions and weaknesses; he works for motives that have moral significance, performs actions that are good or evil, uses means that are just or unjust: it is less difficult for him to deviate from the line of righteousness!

³ Gal. 3, 28.

(Continued from page 3)

Nevertheless, a Catholic almost instinctively opposes feminism. He might not know exactly why, and he might assign poor reasons for his views, taking his arguments from custom and tradition instead of from moral principle. Yet in the last analysis his opposition is moral. He becomes aware of this, perhaps, only when he sees the results of feminism: the breakup of the home, scrapping of marriage morality, divorce, flagrant impurity and the disappearance of modesty, together with many other evils, like juvenile delinquency, noted even by secular sociologists, which have come, or increased, as a consequence of women's demand for complete emancipation from the responsibilities of their sex. Confronted with these effects, the Catholic can conclude only that feminism is evil. Yet the evil is not merely in the effects. It was present from the beginning, in seed, but has taken time to manifest itself. It consists precisely in the denial that there is any difference of function between men and women, in the determination to have women treated exactly as men. By such an attitude feminism goes directly counter to the providential plan of God, who has formed human society (and the supernatural society of the Mystical Body) organically, assigning to each group, and even to each individual, a particular purpose and function, just as He does in disposing the members and organs of the human body. Whatever the dignity, the intellectual capacity, or the political rights of women, their special office, their tasks and responsibilities are quite different from those of men.

Degradation of Woman Results

The error of feminism—the offense of women in men's clothing, engaged in men's tasks—is their rejection of the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ. Their sin is a sin against the Mystical Body. For it they are punished swiftly and fittingly. When women seek to be treated exactly as men they lose their own dignity and are even degraded. When they try to rival men in tasks which are peculiarly masculine they are invariably inferior. Only in their own sphere are they supreme, inimitable. The girls slaving in factories; the clerks working all day for a pittance in stores—what a wonderful boon their “freedom” and “independence” has been to them! The women in men's clothing working about mills and railroad yards, outdoing their male companions in vilenesses of language, assigned the dirtiest and most unskilled tasks—how wonderfully have they increased their dignity, enhanced their privileges, escaped “the drudgery of the home”! The effect of feminism has been a loss in status for women.

In a similar way, conscription, viewed on the surface, may seem unobjectionable to the human conscience; perhaps this is why it is so easily taken for granted. It may even appear necessary, from a moral standpoint, because of the State's right to defend itself. Corresponding to this right of the State, there must be a duty on the part of the citizens to undertake their country's defense. Thus, there would seem to be (and so the defenders of conscription argue) an obligation of conscience to accept conscription; so that he who refuses to do so is usually regarded, not only as a “slacker” from the patriotic point of view, but delinquent as well in regard to his moral and religious duty.

Nevertheless, hidden beneath the apparently harmless exterior character of conscription, there is a great evil, one whose internal logic requires time to work itself out fully, but clearly showing, when it does, that universal military service is opposed at once to the standards of natural justice and to the teachings of the Gospel.

3. The Development of Conscription

THE history of conscription clearly reveals the logic of its development. Although we today seem to think that conscription always existed, it is in fact, in its modern form at any rate, no older than the French Revolution. Of course something like it was known in ancient pagan nations, like Greece and Rome, whose tendency to deify the State, plus their barbarism or semi-barbarism, led them to adopt the ideal of “the nation in arms.” Sparta, in which every child was brought up to be a soldier, or to assist in war, or simply left to die if not fitted for this, is the typical example of ancient compulsory military service and of the nation in arms. However, even in pagan nations, such service tended to disappear with advancing civilization; so that Greece and Rome, at the height of their cultural achievements, were overcome by more barbarous peoples who saw in force, not art of learning, the measure of greatness. In Christian times conscription vanished almost entirely, and, with certain isolated

exceptions, was unknown for a thousand years before the French Revolution.

Limitations of “Universal” Service

The theory of equality, one of the ideals of the Revolution, led logically to the demand that all citizens undertake military service, “and as the majority of people are naturally adverse to risking their skins, universal service was tantamount to compulsory enlistment.” Despite the theoretical acceptance of conscription and its adoption by the revolutionary government, it did not at once work in practice: besides administrative inefficiency, there were numerous evasions and even open rebellion against it. Carnot made conscription workable by limiting service to men between 18 and 25 years of age. So soon were the revolutionary ideals of brotherhood and equality compromised! Conscription could be made to work only by imposing it on a politically impotent section of the population. This is as true today as then: the “duty” of bearing arms and of dying for one's country is skillfully evaded, without any apparent scruples of conscience, by all parties able to exercise political pressure on the government. That in years following the Revolution it was possible to extend the age limits of those required to do service was largely owing to the fact that, with the progress of the Industrial Revolution, an ever increasing body of men, the proletariat, has become politically impotent.

In 1798 the law of conscription was improved by General Jourdain and was later made more effective by Napoleon. Conscription provided Napoleon with more than two and a half million men from 1800 to 1813: it was thus conscription that made possible the Napoleonic victories, and the massed army used by Napoleon was his basic contribution to military strategy. Thus the conquests of Napoleon were one of the first great fruits of universal conscription. Prussian militarism was to be next.

Imitators of Napoleon

Prussia adopted conscription in imitation of Napoleon, in 1808, after her humiliation at his hands at Jena. Following the fall of Napoleon in 1815, it was scientifically developed until it reached perfection under William I and Bismarck, coming to a climax of efficiency in the quick and easy Prussian victories over Austria in 1866 and France in 1871. The success of their great military machine “convinced Germans that the preservation of their national union depended upon the continuance of the principle of compulsory military training.” Because of this, Prussia forced all the other German states in the confederation which she dominated to adopt the same policy, while she herself became burdened with ever increasing armaments.

Of course, in relation to later happenings, the victories of 1866 and 1871 were but adolescent triumphs for the conscription system; they became the beginning of even greater developments. Other European states, impressed by the example of Prussia, now began to follow her lead, until conscription became universal. In 1868 Austria-Hungary adopted it, France again in 1872 (it waned here after the fall of Napoleon), Japan in 1873, Russia in 1874, and Italy in 1875. Meanwhile, Great Britain, while it had not yet adopted compulsory service, was fostering a complementary movement by doing for navalism what Prussia was doing for militarism. In time the nations would imitate Great Britain, too. Conscription and militarism were coming to a lusty majority.

Modern Developments

The year 1913 and the beginning of the First World War brought further growth. Prussia once more took the lead by raising her peace-time army from 686,000 men to 870,000. Once more all Europe followed the example—France, Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Italy. Even the small countries, like Belgium, caught the fever. When war actually broke out, both Great Britain and the United States adopted universal conscription. During the war, between fifty and sixty million men were conscripted altogether. Of these, ten million were killed and twenty million wounded; at Verdun alone one million men were killed (compared with a French army of 81,000 surrendered at Sedan in 1870). Civilization was making progress indeed. Here was another and a greater triumph of slaughter for the conscription system. But there were still greater things ahead.

4. The Final Phase: Total Conscription

CONSCRIPTION was to reach its fullest development in the Second World War and in the preparations that led up to it. No complete figures are available as yet, but the total number

of conscripts must be staggering. For example, the United States, which conscripted only about five million men in the First World War, brought its total number to around eleven million in 1944. The armies of the other belligerent nations, especially Russia, are proportionately larger now than in 1917.

However, it is not simply because of numerical growth that conscription has reached its maturity at the present. There has been something more than an increase in quantity. With World War II, conscription became “total”; that is to say, instead of coercing one section of the population into service, it now began to force the entire population into the war system either directly or indirectly, disregarding all rights whatsoever. Total conscription means then that married men as well as young single men are conscripted; as a consequence, homes are dislocated and abandoned, children neglected, women forced out of their proper sphere. It means that labor is conscripted also: for in total war the whole economic system becomes part of the war machine. It means, finally, that because of manpower shortage caused by the voracious appetite of modern war, women, too, are conscripted.

Fertile Soil

No doubt these evils which we note as belonging particularly to the Second World War existed before, at least germinally. Thus priests and married men had been subject to the draft previously. But the real nature of conscription, its true proportions, inevitable consequences, and final fruit appear with the total conscription of the Second World War. Indeed, before conscription could reach its full growth certain other preliminary conditions had to be realized. Widespread moral deterioration was necessary to make possible the general acceptance of the theory that human rights, instead of being rooted ineradicably in man's spiritual personality, as traditional ethics had maintained, are a gratuitous gift conferred upon the individual by the State and may therefore be revoked at will by the State. Another necessary condition was the increase of political centralization by which individual liberties could be effectively restricted; and this in turn could become possible only by final developments in the process of economic centralization, which has made the masses of men in every country utterly dependent on a centrally controlled economic system.

Once these conditions were realized, totalitarian conscription became a possibility. It first became a reality in Russia, in 1930, with the passage of a compulsory service law that established liability for all citizens, regardless of sex. Women are accepted in peace time and may be drafted for war. Although their greatest service has been in non-combatant work, they have also served in the army on the same basis as men in several branches of the service.

Totality in Germany

In Germany, total conscription came into being with the National Defense Law of 1935 (amended in 1938), by which every male German is obligated to perform military service from the completion of his 18 to his 45th year. All women are obliged to render service over and above strictly military duty. The result is total mobilization of the entire adult population.

England, despite its dislike of conscription, adopted in 1940, under the threat of a German invasion, an Emergency Powers Defense Bill which provided for the conscription of all British resources, human as well as material. This act is legally parallel to the measures adopted earlier by the dictator states; indeed, through it, England “has mobilized her manpower more fully than any other nation in the war.” The United States, although inducting married men into the armed forces, has not yet adopted total conscription. However, the U. S. government does not refrain from this step out of moral principle or democratic conviction, but simply out of expedience, because total conscription has not yet become necessary. Labor conscription and conscription of women have been advocated by high officials, and bills providing for them were introduced into Congress. In fact, President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress for February, 1944, asked for an

⁴ See the articles on “Conscription” in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and *The Americana*.

⁵ See *Makers of Modern Strategy*, by Edward Mead Earle, pp. 73, 74, 77. (Princeton, 1944.)

⁶ Carlton Hayes, *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II, p. 689. (Macmillan, 1935.)

⁷ Of these, 2,000,000 “volunteered”; but because they volunteered only under threat of conscription, they are numbered with the conscripts.

⁸ See *Makers of Modern Strategy*, by Edward Mead Earle p. 355. (Princeton, 1944.)

⁹ James B. Reston, *New York Times Magazine*, January 22, 1944.

act that would authorize "total" conscription. Meanwhile, the United States has used women volunteers in services organized as auxiliaries for the armed forces. Clearly, it is not principle that prevents the U. S. government from conscripting women now.

Following the Leader

One of the last and most lurid of the flowers of conscription is the use of enforced labor and the deportation of conquered peoples for purposes of labor. In this Nazi Germany has led the way. But inasmuch as the other nations have quickly imitated Germany in every other practice of militarism, always alleging military necessity as the reason, it can scarcely be supposed that the democracies will refuse to adopt this practice also should it appear expedient. Already there is talk of compensating Poland for the territory that Russia threatens to take from her by the "gift" of East Prussia and the deportation of German inhabitants to German soil. Whether or not this should come about, it is significant to notice that the suggestion arouses no moral indignation anywhere.

Such is the history and development of conscription: its inner logic leads inexorably to the denial of every human right in the name of nationalism and to the subordination of the most sacred interests of mankind to the requirements of war. Although the worst evils come to fruition only in the matured form, as fully developed fruit comes only from a grown tree, nevertheless the evil was present from the beginning in the theory that the national government has the authority to conscript all its subjects without regard for any right. We will now give our attention to the evil lying at the root of the development.

PART II

Conscription and the Human Person

1. The Alleged Ethical Basis of Conscription

HERE is the argumentation upon which conscription depends for its morality: The State's "primary purpose—the very reason for its existence—is the welfare of its citizens. But it is unthinkable that it continue in existence and be in a position to discharge its essential function, unless it be vested with the right to conscript the wealth and services of its citizens, according to the ability of each, in peace and in war, in so far as the public good demands it.

"When, therefore, the State calls its citizens to arms in a just defensive war, or in preparation for such a war, it is acting fully within the limits of its strict rights. It is but exercising its natural prerogative of taking legitimate steps necessary for justified, or even obligatory, self-defense. Now to the State's right to exact, corresponds the citizen's duty to render. The individual citizen is now no longer free to choose whether or not he will serve in the nation's armed forces."

Two Words to Watch

Mark the words exactly: Because of the State's right to exist, it "is vested with the right also to conscript the wealth and services of its citizens." By means of those two apparently innocent but (in reality) ambiguous words, "and services," conscription has been made morally acceptable. There is its ethical foundation. Is it really solid?

Taking these words, *and services*, exactly as they stand—in their formal sense, as the philosophers say—we do not at present quarrel with the conclusion: a State, we may concede, has indeed the right to conscript the wealth and services of its citizens.¹⁰ Only, despite appearances, this is not an accurate description, therefore not a convincing justification, of compulsory military service.¹¹ In reality, a State, when it conscripts soldiers, demands far more than what properly belongs to it, lays claim to something far beyond the wealth and services of its citizens.

Even in the conscription of property, there are limits to a State's authority, bounds beyond which it may not go. If its conscription of wealth, for example, is tantamount to a denial of the right to private property; if it absorbs the total wealth of a nation, as is done by Communism, then certainly it goes beyond what is allowed by justice. "Man's natural right of privately possessing and transmitting property by inheritance must be kept intact and cannot be taken away by the State, 'for man is older than the State' and 'the domestic household is anterior both in idea and in fact to the gathering of men into a commonwealth.' Hence the prudent pontiff [Leo XIII, from whose *Rerum Novarum* Pius XI has quoted these principles]

had already declared it unlawful for the State to exhaust the means of individuals by crushing taxes and tributes: 'The right to possess private property is from nature, not from man; and the State has only the right to regulate its use in the interest of the public good, but by no means to abolish it altogether.'"¹²

Are There Limitations?

Now if there are limits which a State cannot exceed in conscripting impersonal wealth, what shall be said of its right to conscript personal services? Is this without limit? Suppose that a State's demand amounts to a repudiation of human personality; suppose that it treats its citizens as mere creatures of the State—is this within its rights? Assuredly not! Yet this is what universal compulsory military service involves. It absorbs the life of the citizen completely, to the violation of his innermost personality. Here is the evil that condemns conscription, the evil which, we say, has come to maturity in our own day.

2. The Individual and the Person

MAN being composed of body and soul, he can be considered either in his bodily life, as an individual, or in his spiritual life, as a person. Looking on him as an individual, we see him primarily in his material component, his bodily life and work, his physical, economic, and social activity. From this point of view, he is part of the community and is therefore under the authority of the State. The State, therefore, whose end is the temporal welfare of its citizens, has power (though within limits) over their temporal possessions and activities. But man is not only an individual, a material unit in the State. He is also a person, a rational and spiritual substance, a complete agent of action, free and responsible in his own right. As a person, he is not part of the State, but is rather himself a whole, a universe within himself, independent of the State and above it. "... For St. Thomas the individual as such is a part. ... On the other hand, for St. Thomas, the idea of personality as such bespeaks the independence of a whole."¹³

Supernatural Destiny Is Paramount

Hence the Angelic Doctor teaches that "man is not subordinated to the community in his total being and in regard to all matters." "Person" signifies that which is most perfect in the whole of nature."¹⁴ Accordingly, if we consider man as a person the community exists to serve him.¹⁵ The reason is, of course, that human personality is spiritual and superior to all material interests. Yet this is not the only reason, nor would it be sufficient to prevent him, at least in practice, from being absorbed by the State. The human person also has a supernatural end; and as the heavens are exalted above the earth, so is man's supernatural destiny above the terrestrial interests and temporal end of the State.

The Answer of Peter

The person "can be considered either under the formal aspect of an individual part of the city or under the formal aspect of a person destined to God: in the first place its own good is to be referred to that of the community, in the second case it is that common temporal good which is to be referred to its interests, spiritual and eternal."¹⁶ As a person, man is destined to be united immediately to God. That is why St. Thomas says that in certain matters—that is, in the innermost core of personality—he is bound by obedience only to God.¹⁷ Because of eternal interests, therefore, one may be at times exempt from obedience to the State. Further, there may be times when one is bound in conscience to disobey, i.e., when the welfare of the soul or the interests of God are threatened. "It is a sin to disobey God for the sake of pleasing men; it is wrong to break the law of Jesus Christ in order to obey the magistrate, or under pretence of civil rights to transgress the laws of the Church: 'We ought to obey God rather than men' (Acts, 5, 29). The answer which Peter and the rest of the Apostles were wont to give to the governors, when they laid unlawful commands upon them, must always be made once for all on occasions. There is no better citizen either in peace or war than the Christian who is mindful of his duty; and he ought to suffer everything, even death itself, rather than forsake the side of God and of the Church."¹⁸

Pius XI on Atheistic Communism

Moreover, the end of the State is not only inferior to that of the person, belonging to an altogether lower order, but it is also subordinate to the latter; society and the State are bound to help men realize their supernatural destiny. In the

providential plan, the State's task is to care for those earthly interests whose real although hidden purpose is to assist, instruct, and try men in the practice of virtue, thereby conducting them to their supernatural end and beatitude. If men must obey the State within the limits of the latter's authority, the State may nevertheless not interfere with the rights of the person; this is precisely the reason for the Church's condemnation of Communism: "Man cannot be exempted from his divinely imposed obligations toward civil society, and the representatives of authority have the right to coerce him when he refuses without reason to do his duty. Society, on the other hand, cannot defraud man of his God-granted rights. ... Nor can society systematically void these rights by making their use impossible. It is, therefore, according to the dictates of reason that ultimately all material things should be ordained to man as a person, that through his mediation they may find their way to the Creator. In this wise we can apply to man, the human person, the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles, who writes to the Corinthians on the Christian economy of salvation: 'All things are yours, and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's' (I Cor. 3, 23). While Communism impoverishes human personality by inverting the terms of the relation of man to society, to what lofty heights is not man elevated by reason and revelation!"¹⁹

3. The Argument Restated

WITH these truths in mind, let us see what happens when we restate the argument given above in justification of conscription, extending it to cover the real requirements of the case. Because the State has the right to exist—so the argument goes—it must also have the right to conscript the wealth and services of its citizens. This conclusion, within limits, we have said, may be conceded. But suppose the wording were changed—suppose it were to be argued, "Because the State has the right to exist, it must also have the right to conscript the wealth and persons of its citizens." Would this be true? Unobjectionable? By no means! The difference, verbally, is very slight, but the difference in meaning and implication is enormous. And if conscription as it exists today is to be ethically justified, it can only be because a State has the right to conscript, not only the services of its citizens, but also their persons. The argument must be capable of standing in its corrected and extended form if it is to be broad enough and strong enough to support conscription. Conscription invades the domain of personality, and unless the State can be truly said to have complete sway over men, over their interior lives and rights, over their supernatural actions and choice of a final end, as well as over their external life and activity, then this method of raising soldiers, so intimately bound up with modern war, is without moral foundation.

Confusion of Terms

Let us add that, if scholars, realizing the value of words and concepts, present the argument carefully, as it appeared in its first form ("and services"), ordinary men, not so skilled in fine distinctions, but knowing the actual extent of the

¹⁰ "The Morality of Conscientious Objection to War," p. 25 (A report of the Ethics Committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace.—N.C.W.C.—Washington).

¹¹ This is conceded here for purposes of argument without intending however to acknowledge its truth—*dato non concessio*, as the Scholastics would say. So much may be conceded here without diminishing the force of the main argument. However, if there is any truth in the principles of democracy even this concession may be too much. For a discussion of conscription vs. democracy, see Part III.

¹² In other words, the conclusion is not true if it is understood in a wider or looser sense—the material sense. Yet it is in the material sense that it is understood, and must be understood, by defenders of conscription.

¹³ Pius XI *Quadragesimo Anno*.

¹⁴ Jacques Maritain, *Three Reformers*, p. 195. (Scribners, 1929.) For a development of this distinction between individual and person this work of Maritain can profitably be read (pp. 14-28; also the notes). Likewise his *Freedom in the Modern World*, pp. 46-54 (Sheed and Ward, 1935). Be it noted that in quoting this author it is not intended to claim his support for the conclusions that follow. As a matter of fact he thinks differently. He is quoted because he gives an authoritative, reliable, and disinterested statement of the principles involved.

¹⁵ I II, 21, 4, ad 3: "Homo non ordinatur ad communitatem politicam secundum omnia sua."

¹⁶ I, 29, 3.

¹⁷ Cfr. Pius XI, *Divini Redemptoris*: "Society is for man and not vice versa." Of course this axiom must be understood aright, according to the explanation given by the Pope. It is not a justification of anarchy. Relevant to the present subject are these words: "But on final analysis ... Society is made for man, that he may recognize this reflection of God's perfection, and refer it in praise and adoration to the Creator. Only man, the human person, and not society in any form is endowed with reason and a morally free will."

¹⁸ Maritain, op. cit., p. 195. Note 28. (Italics ours.)

¹⁹ I II, 104, 5, c.

²⁰ Leo XIII, *Sapientiae Christianae*.

²¹ Pius XI *Divini Redemptoris* (On Atheistic Communism). It should also be noted that the Church has condemned the Liberal teaching that the end of the State is amoral and that the State therefore is without responsibility to the spiritual interests of its citizens. Cfr. Leo XIII, *Libertas Humana*.

State's claim, concede the second position, i.e., that it has authority over the human person. It is only by such confusion, by such swamping of the spiritual by the material, such a persistent failure to understand the spiritual things, that the popular mind is enabled to accept conscription as a duty. Were men more spiritually-minded, more proficient in perceiving the realities of the spiritual world, they would be troubled by these huge concessions to the State—concessions which are part of that pagan conception of society whereby the human person is entirely absorbed by the State and subordinated to its terrestrial aims. Even the scholars, though careful enough in the formal statement of the case, in practice carry their conclusion far beyond the premises; they say that they give the State rights only over human services, but in fact they concede to it rights over human persons. Conscription, as we shall see in a moment, could not exist without this claim to rights over the person.

If you consider man as an individual, in his external life and activity, he exists for the sake of the whole, as the hand exists for the entire body. From this point of view, being a part, he is obliged to act for the good of the whole, even though this would involve great sacrifices, like the giving up of wealth and even life itself; as it may be necessary to sacrifice an arm to procure the health of the body. The individual as such has the same relation to the community that the bee does to the swarm or the ant to its colony. This is why materialism and paganism so quickly and inevitably lead to slavery. Seeing only man's material life, they judge his value solely in reference to the social whole, so that his personality, his freedom, his spiritual life, are completely disregarded and he is absorbed wholly in the life of the community.

Spiritual Rights Are Sacrosanct

When, on the contrary, we take account of man's unique spiritual life, together with the dignity and rights that go with it, then the material measurement and analogy no longer hold. In this case his value cannot be assessed as that of a material part in relation to a whole, existing only for the good of the latter. Consequently, although a man must give up his natural goods, even life, for the sake of his country, should this be necessary, he is never required, nor is he permitted, to give up his spiritual and supernatural rights and gifts for this reason. Thus he is not required to give up his chastity for the sake of the State. More, he is not permitted to do so, and, should such a command be given to him, he must obey God rather than men. The same holds true of other spiritual goods: to give up what is spiritual for something material, to abandon a supernatural good for one that is merely natural and even material, this would be a frightful inversion. The State has not the right to require it, and, should it be required, the citizen has neither a duty nor a right to obey. Right order requires a due subordination of ends: what is material must serve the spiritual, what is natural must serve the supernatural. The State, being of the natural order, is infinitely inferior to the supernatural good which the human person is bound to pursue. Accordingly the State violates the rights of the person when it fails to provide, within its own sphere, the assistance which men need to seek after their supernatural end. It also violates these rights when it places in the way of its citizens hindrances to the attainment of their supernatural end, compels them to live in conditions opposed to their soul's welfare, or in any other way jeopardizes by its policies their true and eternal good. "Hence civil society, established for the common welfare, should not only safeguard the well-being of the community, but should have at heart also the interests of its individual members, and that in such a manner as not to hinder, but in every way to render as easy as possible the possession of that highest and unchangeable good for which all should strive. For this purpose, care must especially be taken to preserve unharmed and unimpeded the practice of religion which is the bond connecting man with God."²²

4. The Rights of the Person

THE next task is to apply these truths. In order to prevent any misunderstanding in making this application, let us distinguish at the outset between peace-time and war-time conscription. The arguments here given, as shall be evident as they unfold themselves, apply with full force and without any reservations to peace-time conscription as it is known in the great nations today; this kind of conscription has also been explicitly condemned by the Holy See, as we shall notice in Part III. What about war-time conscription? Obviously, in the case of an unjust war, conscription (as well as all other means used to

carry on such a war) is already condemned; for any means, however blameless in themselves, become evil when made to serve an evil end.

Unlikelihood of a Just War

But what of the case of a just war? In answer to this question, let it be observed in the first place that, although the possibility of just warfare is unassailable in principle, nevertheless in practice wars rarely if ever meet the requirements of justice laid down by theologians, that is, they are in fact never wholly just on one side and wholly unjust on the other, owing to the fact that in the long run human nature apart from grace cannot live up perfectly to the requirements even of natural justice. The tangled claims and counter-claims of the unending wars that have disgraced the history of mankind and Christendom give ample evidence of this fact. Least of all can the modern wars of mutual aggression waged by conflicting national imperialisms be fitted into the pattern of justifiable warfare, even with the powerful assistance of nationalistic passion and propaganda; so that, in fact, this pattern of just warfare is scarcely to be looked for outside of the laboratory of a philosopher's brain.

Evil Means Never Permissible

Furthermore, as de Victoria observes, "much attention must be paid to the admitted fact that a war may be just and lawful in itself and yet owing to some collateral circumstance may be unlawful." That is to say, even though the cause of a war may be clearly just (and therefore clearly unjust on the other side), the waging of such a war may nevertheless be evil because of some extrinsic circumstance. A principle of ethics states that an action, to be good at all, must be entirely good; one evil circumstance is enough to condemn the whole. Now conscription, as it exists today, is a circumstance inseparable from modern total war; and it is at the same time a thing so evil, because of its effects both on the individual and on society in general, that it alone is enough to make a war unjust, however just may be the cause. Evil is never to be done for a good end; and even when the waging of a war would seem to eliminate greater evils than those caused by universal conscription (if such a possibility can be imagined), still it must be affirmed, again in the words of de Victoria, that "evil is not to be done even in order to avoid greater evil still."²³

What remains now is to establish the minor premise, that is, to show that conscription as practiced by the great powers today does in fact violate the most sacred rights of human personality. We proceed as follows:

Right of Vocation Violated

First of all, conscription hinders men from following their God-given vocations. It takes them at the best time of their youth, the time allowed them to prepare for their life work, pulls them out of their normal activities, postpones their education, in many cases putting a stop to it altogether, and prevents them from taking advantage of whatever opportunities might be given for pursuing their careers. In order to appreciate how deep an injury this is, recall to mind the meaning of vocation. It is a call from God to some particular life-work, as a means of glorifying Him here below and of meriting happiness with Him in heaven. Knowing all the secret and unrealized potentialities of each person, God apportions to each his place and function in society, and also, on a higher plane, in the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ. Everyone has his own unique and necessary place in each of these communities: in human society there is need of a division of labor, in the Mystical Body there are "diversities of ministries." The work given to each man—manifested to him by his special abilities, the providential direction of his life, and the opportunities placed in his path—is his true and rightful vocation, his own way of serving God, of doing God's will, of working out his own soul's salvation. Military conscription forces men to leave off, perhaps wholly to abandon, their true vocation. It forces them to depart, in many cases permanently, from the path intended for them by God, the path in which they were to find happiness, salvation, and the graces necessary to obtain these ends.

Danger of Presumption

No doubt—to meet an inevitable objection—in whatever difficult circumstances men find themselves, God can and will provide them with the strength needed to overcome temptation. Yet the fact that God can circumvent evil and injustice is no permission for men to commit it. God forbid, as St. Paul says (Rom. 6, 1) that we should go on doing evil because we know that God can turn it to good. Moreover, there are certain situations

favorable, others unfavorable, to the practice of virtue and correspondence with divine grace: and these situations vary from person to person. Now if any place is favorable for a given individual, surely it is the one chosen by God and appointed as his vocation. But the State, by conscription, compels men arbitrarily to accept less favorable, or even unfavorable, circumstances and in this way hinders them in their efforts to save their souls.

This argument based on vocations is a very strong one, although it may not seem so today, for the reason that men, even before being inducted into the armed forces, have been deprived of their vocations by mass production, uncontrolled use of machinery, depersonalized labor, and other iniquitous practices that are part of the capitalistic system. However, two wrongs do not make a right: and the first wrong does not justify the second even when it prevents the latter from being felt or understood.

Vocations Cannot Be Imposed

If you should say, again by way of objection, that the career of a soldier is itself a vocation, as is indicated by many Catholic writers and taken for granted in Papal documents (as well as by the practice of the Holy See), it will be readily conceded that you are right—if by a soldier you mean a kind of national or international policeman whose work is to keep the public order. But then, if this is truly a vocation, there will be sufficient volunteers for it without conscription. The same Providence, who gives vocations would see to it that a sufficient number of men are led to follow this one voluntarily. In any case, such a consideration does not give the State the right to force everyone to become a soldier. An executioner, presumably, is also following a vocation. But may the State, for that reason, compel all its citizens to become executioners?

5. The Evil of Enforced Celibacy

DEPRIVING men of their vocations involves still graver evils. Conscripts, most of whom would ordinarily be married, are compelled by the State to accept a condition of celibacy for which they have neither call nor preparation nor the "graces of state" which are needed for this higher and more difficult mode of life. Even when the conscription is temporary, this is a great hardship and an occasion of sin. Already, the unnatural exigencies of modern life force many young people to defer their marriage years beyond what is good for them, exposing them to inward strain and great outward temptation. Conscription makes the difficulty much greater. It is all very well for comfortable middle-aged people who are accumulating war bonds and otherwise batten on the carrion of war to admonish the young that they should be "prudent" and well-advised, and therefore postpone their weddings until after the war or the term of conscript service. These young people have a right to get married if that is their calling; they also have a need to do so; and a duty as well if failure to satisfy this need places them in a danger of sin. In other words, this is a right which very intimately involves their spiritual well-being and eternal salvation. Accordingly, the matter of vocation, it is worth while to notice, is one of the instances explicitly cited by St. Thomas over which (he says) human authority has no jurisdiction and the citizen is under no obligation to obey.

If it were a question merely of material good, no doubt the State could compel great sacrifices for the sake of the common welfare. But not even the State has the right to place men in the way of sin, at the same time depriving them of the ordinary aids needed for living a life of virtue. The condition of enforced celibacy demands that men observe a rigorous chastity, such as is obligatory for priests and religious. In other words, they are made to live according to the obligations of a state in life which is not properly theirs and which becomes in fact an occasion of sin. This is true, although, despite the conscription, they do actually get married; for they must in this case live as celibates anyway. Indeed, in the case of

²² Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*. Bear in mind also the words of Pius XI, quoted above: "Society on the other hand cannot defraud man of his God-granted rights . . . Nor can society systematically void these rights by making their use impossible."—*Divini Redemptoris*.

²³ This and the previous quotation are taken from de Victoria's *On the Law of War*, Paragraphs 33 and 38 respectively. (Classics of International Law, Edited by James Scott Brown. Washington, D. C., 1917.) Mark carefully that in condemning conscription we do not condemn the vocation of the soldier as such, but conscription in its actual present-day circumstances. See footnote 2, Part I.

²⁴ The major premise of the argument is: "The State has no rights over human personality." The minor premise is: "But universal conscription by State authority violates the rights of personality." And the conclusion: "Therefore universal conscription is unjust and immoral."

[Note: There is no footnote reference numbered 25—Ed.]

married conscripts, the injustice is much more flagrant.

An Impossible Situation

The State itself recognizes the impossibility of the situation into which it forces its conscripts by the provisions it makes for keeping up their morale—provisions which are a further wound in the personality. Entertainments in which the passions are incited, lust aroused, and an artificial outlet provided for concupiscence, are supplied to maintain the conscripts in the mental and emotional condition needed in "good soldiers." The immense cynicism of the godless State is shown in the fact that it will bring suggestive and even obscene entertainments, not only to training centers, but also to the very battle-fronts all over the world where men are living in the very shadow of death and may at any moment be sent to stand before their Creator and Judge. First to put the young men in an occasion of sin, then to provide carefully prepared temptation, finally to lead them out to be slaughtered—this is the devilish procedure of modern war, the manner in which the State of today seeks to assist its citizens to procure their eternal salvation.

Worse yet, realizing full well the impossibility of celibacy in conscripts, the State makes ample provision for contraceptives. Catholics may blink their eyes at this, seeing in it merely an accidental adjunct of a great crusade. Army authorities know differently, and they have therefore made available to the manufacturers of contraceptives materials which are not otherwise available outside the war industries. The practice of contraception, the encouragement of fornication and adultery—these are necessary means of keeping up "morale" in a conscript army.

Unfortunate Position of Chaplains

We do not forget that the governments provide chaplains for the men in the armed forces; nor do we underestimate, or wish to underestimate, the good that is done by these chaplains. The heroic devotion of so many of them is an inspiring story. However, we are not concerned here with the achievements of individuals; we are trying rather to assess objectively the moral dangers of a particular situation. And it must be said that the army accepts chaplains, not as ministers of religion, but as *morale officers*. As such, they are burdened with many duties that have nothing to do with religion: this is the price that they must pay in order to provide divine services for their men. Furthermore, as morale officers their function as ministers of a Catholic and transcendent religion is obscured or lost altogether by the fact that they are expected to subordinate their ministry to the furtherance of the national cause. Although Catholic chaplains in particular, through the administration of the sacraments, are able to give great aid to souls in spite of the restrictions laid upon them, they are as helpless as the others to change those basic conditions which make army life a morally unhealthy environment. Their achievements, however heroic individually considered, are at best a palliative. This is particularly true when they are expected to provide religious services acceptable to all sects and shades of belief—a situation which prevents Catholic priests from communicating those specifically Christian and Catholic moral and ascetical teachings which are so indispensable for the practice of virtue.

Heroic Virtue Required

Again, it is not denied that many fine Christian men are able to retain their moral integrity even in the demoralizing atmosphere of army life. But such men preserve their virtue in spite of their army experience, not because of it, by what is little if anything short of moral heroism. However, heroism is not to be expected of all, especially in the young, or where there is no spiritual preparation given for it, or amid surroundings not conducive to the pursuit of holiness. Indeed, a situation which regularly requires high holiness or heroism from ordinary men is in reality an occasion of sin, an almost certain cause of spiritual collapse. Religious and priests, who have voluntarily accepted a celibate life, seek almost instinctively certain protections for their virtue, and would find themselves in great danger not only in the surroundings of a military camp, but also in the surroundings of ordinary life. In this connection it is instructive to study the decrees promulgated by Rome concerning the spiritual care to be given to priests required to do military service. The decrees take for granted that such priests are in a most undesirable moral and spiritual situation; consequently, certain provisions are made to give them special spiritual aid during their term of service. Furthermore, upon completion of their service, these

priests are required to retire to some religious house, for a period of time to be determined according to individual needs, in order to renew themselves interiorly through spiritual exercises. The Church, obviously, has no illusions about army life. Now if priests are thus exposed to great danger, what of laymen, who, without the spiritual preparation or advantages enjoyed by priests through a long period of training, are nevertheless compelled to practice extraordinary virtue, even to the observance of celibacy and complete chastity, in circumstances unfavorable even to ordinary virtue?

6. The Corruption of Youth

It is necessary also as part of the indictment of conscription, to take account of the other training given to soldiers: propaganda to hate and instructions in brutal methods of inflicting death. "Until he (i.e., the soldier) hates the enemy with every instinct and every muscle, he will only be afraid. . . . Hate must become first nature to a soldier." That is a sample of instruction handed out to soldiers in World War II. Men must be made utterly callous in regard to taking human life; all their moral repugnances must be broken down. "The average Englishman and American, unfortunately"—to quote a Major, speaking to a group of Allied soldiers he is instructing—"suffers from remorse. You must overcome that, or it will slow you down at a crucial moment and cause your own death. Shooting a Jerry is like swatting a fly. Keep thinking that, shoot a few, and you'll sleep like a baby even after the bloodiest shambles." Such excellent instruction naturally bears fruit, as is shown by such words as the following, spoken by an Allied pilot who had shot down 32 planes: "It's strictly fun. . . . I like to knock the enemy down and the only question that ever flashed across my mind is whether he'll be blown or fried." (exploded in mid-air or burned up)."

The Confirmation of the Devil

Surely the barbarous cruelty attributed to the Nazis is no worse than this. Such a statement, which might be matched by others of the same kind taken from newspaper reports any day during the war, reveal the moral corruption that result from the profession of arms: "out of the fullness of the heart the mouth speaketh." This is a sample—no better or no worse than hundreds of others of the same kind—of what military training does, and is intended to do, for youth. There is no exaggeration in saying that military training today forms and confirms youth in evil (the confirmation of the devil), corrupts them to the heart, glorifies every evil passion and gives ample opportunity for their expression.

Fruits of Hatred

Precisely because Nazi youth organizations corrupted youth, they were condemned by Pius XI: "If the State organizes a national youth, and makes this organization obligatory upon all, then, without prejudice to rights of religious associations, it is the absolute right of youths as well as of parents to see to it that this organization is purged of all manifestations hostile to the Church and Christianity. These manifestations are even today placing Christian parents in a painful alternative, as they cannot give to the State what they owe to God alone." The methods used on American youth, even if lacking the frank appeal to heathen myths and materialistic ideologies, are nonetheless offensive in outlook and practice to Christian sensibilities. If, for the most part, the evil that is done is in the heart and therefore not open to observation, this is after all the worst evil in God's sight. However, there are also visible results, as the above instances show. The widespread and shocking breakdown that followed World War I revealed the extent of the corruption caused by war. A further breakdown is to be expected after World War II. "He that gathereth not with Me, scattereth." (Matt. 12, 30) The law of God must be observed in entirety or it will be thrown out altogether. When men are whipped to a frenzy of hatred and taught to be cruel and merciless killers, their whole moral character is impaired and they come as a matter of course to treat other precepts of the moral law with contempt. Thus, to the facts that conscription interferes with the right of vocation and the right to enter married life there must be added the further fact that it is a corrupter of youth.

7. The State's Power Over the Body

To all the foregoing limitations of the State's power there must be added a further and greater restriction, which reinforces from below the conclusions thus far set forth. Although the State has authority over man's terrestri-

life, and individuals must therefore be ready to sacrifice for the common good, nevertheless, on the other hand, even its power over the body has definite bounds and, as St. Thomas says, does not extend to those things that pertain to the nature of the body; so that in such matters men are not bound to obey human authorities, but only God. Pope Pius XI confirmed this teaching when he said, "Public magistrates have no direct power over the bodies of their subjects. . . ." Hence, even public authority (apart from crime, which gives it an indirect authority over the body) "can never gravely harm, or tamper with the integrity of the body either for reasons of eugenics or for any other reason."

Freedom of the Body

This principle, as the last phrase indicates, has a much wider application than suggested by the example of eugenics. Besides forbidding the State to inflict any actual physical harm on the bodies of its citizens, it also prohibits interference with the body's essential and necessary good. Thus (to cite the examples mentioned by St. Thomas), men are not subject to human authority "in whatever concerns the sustenance of the body and the generation of offspring." How closely such rights as these are tied up with the particular vocation of each person, over which the State has no authority, is very evident; and the Angelic Doctor himself notes the fact when he completes his teaching on this point by concluding that men are not obliged to obey human superiors "in regard to contracting marriage or remaining in the state of virginity, or other such matters." Thus, whatever the obligations of the citizen, the State cannot dispose of human life or even human bodies as it pleases, that is, as though it had direct and exclusive power over them and could disregard the requirements of the souls that dwell in them. Yet by conscription it does in fact seek to exercise complete control, disposing of men's vocations, their families, their marriage rights, their very lives, as though there were no higher good than its own terrestrial ends. Hence, even without appealing directly to the freedom of personality, as we have done above, the freedom of the body is already sufficient to condemn universal conscription. Of course, the honors and rights due to the human body, which of itself is no higher than an animal body, result from its intimate union with the spiritual soul, to its being the dwelling place of a human personality, and above all to the fact that it is a temple of the Holy Ghost. If the Church, by putting ashes on her children at the beginning of Lent, reminds them that they are but dust, she also shows, by her

²⁶ Complaints from responsible moral authorities, as well as from decent men in the services, testify to the truth of this charge. In addition to those entertainments which are particularly obnoxious, it may be added that in general the entertainments provided for servicemen are of the "variety" type (*New York Times Magazine*, April 2, 1944). Even in civilian life the variety type of show is morally dangerous, specializing as it does in low humor and a display of the flesh—the lust of the eyes and of the flesh exploited commercially. Such shows would not help much in maintaining purity and celibacy.

²⁷ See *America*, Feb. 5, 1944, in an article entitled "American War Chaplains Find Scope for Apostolic Spirit," by Stephen B. Early. "Both Army and Navy regard chaplains as Morale Officers, and frequently they are all the Morale Officers there are in an outfit. That means, to be truly successful, they should be composed of almost equal parts of Billy Rose, Dorothy Dix, Florence Nightingale, Gene Tunney, Sumner Welles, and St. Paul. It would help considerably if, at one time or other, the chaplain had run a loan-office, a department store, a missing-persons detective agency, a course in letter-writing, a library, a surveying office and, in many cases, a restaurant. Getting back to parish life is going to be a breeze." Such a statement seems to belie the title of the article: whatever may be the value to the army or to individuals of the services here attributed to chaplains (one wonders about some of them, for example, the connection of Billy Rose activities with the ministry), it seems clear that they would allow little scope or time for spiritual work among the men.

²⁸ Some chaplains, given tasks which they considered incompatible with their religious profession, resigned. One of these said that he had orders "not to tell the men what the Bible teaches concerning salvation," but rather to tell them "character stories and that they must be willing to die for their country." (*Time*, July 10, 1944; also Feb. 7, 1944.) He was afterwards reinstated because of pressure exerted by Protestant organizations.

²⁹ On the other hand, the story of a religious revival in the armed forces during the Second World War, invented in an excess of sham patriotism, to make plausible the idea that the Allies were crusading for Christianity—this outrageous fiction, unsupported by actual observation in the forces, was the product of minds, we will not say deliberately untruthful, but too superficial and immature to perceive the awful reality of war and its actual spiritual implications.

³⁰ See *The Canon Law Digest*, by T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., pp. 99-103; 106-109. (Milwaukee, Bruce, 1934.)

³¹ From a pamphlet distributed in American army camps. According to an article published in "The Readers Digest" (Nov. 1943): *Murder is His Business*, and originally taken from the N. Y. Herald Tribune. (Italics ours.)

³² *Time*, Aug. 7, 1944.

³³ *Mit brennender Sorge*—If it is objected to this quotation, and to others that we have given from papal documents, that they refer to particular circumstances and were not intended specifically to oppose conscription, it must be answered that the force of any true and valid principle is not spent with one application. A valid principle applies to as many instances as fall within its scope.

³⁴ II, II, 194, 5, c.

³⁵ Casti Conyubi.

³⁶ St. Thomas, op. cit.

rules for burial, that the body is not to be treated with contempt. Hence, whatever may be the legitimate authority of the State over man's material concerns, the union of the body with an immortal soul is an unassailable protection against the tyranny that would wholly absorb his bodily life.

8. Conscription and the Family

IF what has been said so far is of itself enough to condemn conscription, it is by no means the whole of the indictment. To the evils so far described must be added others that have recently appeared and are rapidly attaining to their full stature.

Destruction of Spiritual Values

One of these is the conscription of married men. Here the violation of the right to vocation is even more apparent than where the unmarried are concerned. Young, unmarried men have barely begun to follow their vocations, if they have begun at all. Married men, on the other hand, are interrupted in mid-career and compelled to give up the practice of a trade or profession or business for which they have special aptitude and training and in which it has taken them perhaps many years to become established. Everything must be dropped at once. And when they return (if they do return) after their period of military service, it will be almost impossible for them to resume their work where they left off, or now, at a more advanced age, to take up anew the struggle to get started. Once more, it is not merely the question of material goods, which might easily be replaced. In regard to material goods, however, it is significant to notice that the State is really very moderate in its demand for them. It asks that people support the war financially by the purchase of bonds; and by doing this it happens that, instead of sacrificing anything, they enrich themselves. Materialistic governments would not dream of depriving men of such precious things as money and material goods. It confines itself to the destruction of spiritual values, which in eyes of political realists are non-existent.

Bad Effects on the Family

In the case of married conscripts, the break-up of the family and the violation of family rights are likewise more obvious and more flagrant. An already existing home is dissolved. Husband and wife are both compelled to accept an enforced celibacy, being thus deprived of an intimate right and at the same time subjected to the abnormal strain and extraordinary temptations that go with such a state. Moreover, the father's influence is removed entirely from the home. Already, modern industrialism had created a grave family problem by compelling fathers to work away from their homes and thereby throwing almost the whole burden of rearing children upon the mother. This is certainly an undesirable situation and one responsible for much mischief. In God's providential plan both husband and wife are meant to cooperate in the rearing of children; by depriving the latter of either parent there is removed from them an influence which the other parent cannot supply. In this matter also, male and female, father and mother, complete each other. With shocking indifference to the sacredness of family life, the spiritual well-being of spouses, and the moral and religious upbringing of children, the State by its policy of conscription removes the father from the home entirely. It does not even stop to ask the number of children, but in large families as well as small ones throws the burden of rearing entirely upon the mother. With its utterly materialistic outlook, it thinks that it is making sufficient compensation when it gives a money allowance for the care of each child.

Labor Conscription Equally Undesirable

An absolutely universal policy of conscription, which would include labor as well as military service, would extend and intensify all the undesirable results of military conscription. As the latter type forces men to be killers, so labor conscription compels them actively to cooperate with war by entering war industries. It would shift them about, according to the needs of the State, without regard for their own personal liberty, their vocations, or their family obligations. The world has been horrified at the manner in which Hitler has used conscript labor, forcing subjugated peoples to serve in his war economy, and moving them about without the slightest regard for rights or justice or humanity. The practice does not change its moral character by being transplanted to the democracies. Already it is evident, although labor conscription has not actually taken place, that we are not in principle opposed to it; if not employed in the U. S. A. it will

be because it is not yet a military necessity. If the need arises there will be labor conscription here also.

9. The Conscription of Women

THE final desecration of the home and of family rights comes with the conscription of women. Having moved the father from the home, the State now removes the mother. True, we do not actually have conscription for women in this country as yet. But this fact is scarcely relevant to our discussion, for we will have it should those in authority think it necessary in this or in another war. England, our sister "democracy," has it already; and as for us, it is quite clear, as has been already observed, that we are not opposed to it in principle. We do not find—at least the greater number of us do not find—that it is incompatible with our democratic ideals. Accordingly, against the proposed law providing for the conscription of women, there was no general protest based on moral grounds. There were, indeed, courageous protests made by a few special groups; but these, too, sometimes were motivated by political or ideological, rather than moral, considerations. Out of political considerations, or because the need was not proven, Congress did not accede to the President's request for universal conscription. Congress will debate hotly enough over political or financial matters, but is not much interested in moral issues. Indeed, statesmen and legislators no longer see moral problems at all.

False "Emancipation"

Now why is conscription of women specially unjust and evil? Because, in the first place, it involves an acceptance of that utterly false and un-Christian conception of woman's character and woman's liberty, which, while freeing them from their own special offices and responsibilities in society and the Mystical Body, places them exactly on a par with men and makes no distinction between the functions of men and women. Such false "emancipation," described earlier in this article, was precisely that condemned by Pius XI: an emancipation "social, economic, physiological—physiological, that is to say, the woman is to be freed at her own good pleasure from the burdensome duties properly belonging to a wife as companion and mother (We have already said that this is not an emancipation but a crime); social, inasmuch as the wife, being freed from the care of children and family, should, to the neglect of these, be able to follow her own bent and devote herself to business and even public affairs; finally economic, whereby the woman, even without the knowledge and against the wish of her husband, may be at liberty to conduct and administer her own affairs, giving her attention chiefly to these rather than to children, husband, and family."

Repudiation of Purity

The moral dangers of enforced celibacy, following from conscription, are the same for women as for men. They are placed in a situation in which emotional and moral tension are inevitable. They will be subject to all the demoralizing influences which accompany war; for the sixth commandment follows the fifth, and contempt of the one infallibly leads to carelessness about the other. In the past it has been a mark of Christian nations to have a special esteem for virtue in women, especially the virtue of purity, and to protect it by social custom. Our own age has no esteem for virtue in anyone; above all, it hates purity and glorifies that false freedom, the freedom from restraint, the freedom that is a cloak for malice, in which passion is able to find easily opportunities for its gratification. Because the modern State has no care about virtue, it does not concern itself with safeguarding the virtue of women. Yet if one has retained any shreds of Christianity about himself at all amidst the vile paganism of the modern world, then this repudiation of purity, characteristic of the whole age, entrenched and made official by conscription, is a thing to him wholly evil and unacceptable. It alone is sufficient to condemn compulsory military service; for, to a Christian conscience, exposing souls to an occasion of sin is a serious matter indeed.

The conscription of women likewise brings grievous harm to the family. Unmarried women are hindered from entering into married life, the married are prevented from living with their husbands, establishing families, and accepting their married obligations. It takes those married away from already established homes and families, throwing the care of children on hired nurses or public agencies. Conscription for women also means, besides their use in the auxiliary service of the armed forces, their mobilization for industry, as this has taken place in England. Mothers can be shifted about at the will of bureaucrats or

army officials to wherever they might be considered useful or necessary. They can be removed from their homes, separated from their families, sent to distant cities. In any case, families are neglected while their mothers spend most of their waking hours in mills and factories.

10. The Rights of the Family

IT must be insisted that concern for family life is not mere sentimentality. As the person is above the State, so that the State may not interfere with his essential life, so also the family is prior to the State, which therefore may not interfere with the family's natural rights. "In choosing a state of life, it is indisputable that all are at full liberty either to follow the counsel of Jesus Christ as to virginity, or to enter into the bonds of marriage. No human law can abolish the natural and primitive right of marriage, or in any way limit the chief and principal purpose of marriage, ordained by God's authority from the beginning. 'Increase and multiply' (Gen. 1, 28). Thus we have the family—the 'society' of a man's own household; a society limited indeed in numbers, but a true 'society,' anterior to every kind of state or nation, with rights and duties of its own, totally independent of the commonwealth."

Tyrannical and Irreligious Injustice

These principles have received a very telling (although most unfortunate) corroboration in the wave of juvenile delinquency that has spread over the country following our entrance into World War II. The whole moral and spiritual welfare of individuals and nations is involved in the life of its families. To tamper with it, or with marriage, as conscription does, cannot but have disastrous results. For the State to interfere with normal family life and force the members of families into situations that expose them to great moral danger is to commit an act of tyrannical and irreligious injustice.

The despoliation of the Christian ideal of womankind and of family life has, of course, already taken place, long before their general conscription, when women were encouraged to enter, although voluntarily, the auxiliary services of the armed forces and to take the places of men in defense plants. No one has the right to renounce what is necessary for his spiritual welfare; and the State, while not having direct concern for the spiritual needs of its members, must nevertheless go as far as possible in its own sphere to see that these interests are cared for, and in any case it must prevent, or at least not encourage, what is opposed to them. The moral dangers involved in the limited use of women in the war services, the denial of personal needs and of the right to vocation, as also the infringement upon family rights, are the same as in conscription only not so extensive. Universal conscription is the last step in the deflowering of Christian womankind. Women scarcely have the right to "volunteer" for such services for the same reason that they have not the right to cast aside their special duties and responsibilities. And the State, when it encourages a policy that is opposed to the true welfare of women, is itself acting immorally.

Enforced Celibacy of Women

Moreover, the fact that women enlist voluntarily (as the situation stands today in our country) should not blind us to the fact that the evils which they suffer and which induce them to take this step are quite involuntary. There is, here again, the condition of enforced celibacy: enforced in this case by an evil situation—the removal of men from civilian life. That women are now unable to enter marriage, or, if already married, that they are unable to fulfill their married obligations, is due to the fact that conscription has removed the men who are, or would be, their partners in marriage. Then the State, having thus prevented marriage, takes advantage of the aimlessness and restlessness that is caused by such a situation and seeks to attract women into auxiliary military service; in this it is aided by "patriotic" propaganda and other kinds of moral pressure.

The same is true of the women who enter industry. Were the State faithful to its purpose, it would try to prevent women from doing this to the neglect of their families. Even true national interest should dictate such a policy. The State depends on its families and is ultimately no stronger than the families who compose it. Like the man who killed the goose that laid the golden eggs, the pagan State is willing to sacrifice the

²⁸ Casti Conubii.

²⁹ Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum*. Once more, in speaking of the moral dangers that conscription and barracks life hold for women we are not attempting to judge individuals but rather seek to appraise a situation.

family, especially the moral values of family life, for immediate military interests or material aggrandizement. The unmarried women who do not join the auxiliary services are also prevented from entering married life by an artificial and evil situation. Married women with families neglect these families to go into industry. They are compelled to take work unbefitting their sex and obligations because of the shortage of men. The pretense for this abandonment of the family is patriotism; often the real reason is greed. In any case it is a violation of the family and its rights.

11. Conclusion

CONSCRIPTION—this will be our general conclusion—especially in the case of women and of unmarried men, brings the State into direct opposition with the Christian (and true human) conception of personality and family life. Because the person is *above* the State and the family *prior* to it, compulsory military service must be rejected as unjust, evil, and un-Christian. The democracies, by adopting it, have aped in detail the very tyrannies whose vile principles they have claimed to oppose. They have thereby shown that there is in fact no difference in principle between themselves and the totalitarian dictatorships. Convenience, material interest, expedience, power, national honor at any price, military necessity—these are the things, and not moral principle, which fix the abominable code that is observed by all participants in the modern war system. As for conscription, the ethical theory which is its foundation-stone is that moral relativism, which, inseparable from State absolutism, holds that society and the State are the source of rights, that rights enjoyed by individuals are conferred by the State, and that the State may therefore revoke any of all individual rights at will. This is the direct opposite of that other ethical system which, based on reason and natural law, provides a starting point for the supernatural teaching and practice of Christianity; for the latter system teaches that human rights are rooted ineradicably in human personality and in the inescapable duty of every person to seek his final supernatural end in God.

PART III

The Testimony of History

1. Lack of Scriptural Support for Conscription

OUR general conclusion, which proceeds at once from doctrinal principles and direct observation of the actual conditions produced by conscription, is confirmed by tracing the history of the practice and by studying the origins of the alleged duty to accept it. It is certainly remarkable that throughout most of Europe's history, including the ages when men were most religious and therefore most deeply impressed by moral obligations, there was no consciousness of such a duty. Patriotism was not unknown, neither was the concept of moral duty; but there was no such thing as conscription in Christian Europe until a century and a half ago. Its discovery, and the knowledge of the moral obligation supposed to be attendant upon it, not only had to wait for a very long time, but had to wait also for an age which was frankly irreligious and "scientifically" immoral.

No Conscription in Israel

In seeking the origin of this alleged moral duty, we might reasonably look for some trace of it in Jewish history, since under the Old Testament God had at various times commanded the Jews to take up arms and carry on wars. But there is no sign of it. Some, indeed, who refuse to acknowledge the divine mission of the ancient Jewish people, profess to see in their migration to the Promised Land an early example of the nation in arms. Yet quite apart from the fact that this mass movement was providentially directed for a clearly non-military purpose, although the realization of that purpose involved warfare, there is the fact that the Old Testament explicitly requires that military service shall be voluntary. The law determining the conduct of wars exempted married men, men with homes, and agriculturalists (Deut. 20, 8), thus affording a Scriptural vindication of the principles we have set down in Part II of the present essay. The law also went much further than this when it permitted even the "fearful and faint hearted" to remain at home in time of war (Deut. 20, 8). Yet the Jewish wars were certainly duties, clearly and explicitly commanded by God Himself!

The Side of Providence

More than this (and in spite of the "militarism" of the Old Testament) there is no trace there of that doctrine which has become the "theological" foundation (!) and *raison d'être* of modern militarism, namely, that "Providence blesses the side with biggest battalions." The Old Testament, in fact, teaches just the opposite: "If thou go out to war against thy enemies, and see horsemen and chariots, and the number of the enemy's army greater than thine, thou shalt not fear them: because the Lord thy God is with thee, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt." (Deut. 20, 1) Old Testament histories—that of Gideon, for example—show how well God kept His promise in this matter. Thus, although the duty of accepting conscription is supposed to be religious, it is really irreligious from this point of view, since it wholly excludes that dependence on Providence which God demanded even during the period when He explicitly sanctioned war.

2. The Testimony of the New Testament

IF we cannot find any trace of conscription in the Old Testament, where war was clearly sanctioned by Providence, then *a fortiori* we are not likely to find it commanded in the New Testament. As a matter of fact, in the New Testament we find no explicit approval of war at all, as in the Old, no commandment to go to war, no regulations for the conduct of wars: altogether a most significant silence in view of the importance of war in the history of the chosen people. The reason for this, as Origen already pointed out⁴⁰, is that with the coming of Jesus, God's special Providence was no longer confined to one people, but embraced all mankind. The Old Testament was nationalistic; the Gospel is universal. Henceforth, there is "neither Jew nor Greek" (Gal. 3, 28), but all people are bound "in one body," which is Christ (Eph. 2, 16). Accordingly, there is no further need for nationalistic wars, no reason to protect one particular nation against all others: God's plan of redemption, as revealed in the New Testament, includes all nations. Moreover, with the coming of Christ, revelation was completed, the vast reservoirs of divine grace were opened up to all mankind, human nature itself was renewed and recreated: henceforth, men should reconcile differences among themselves on a higher plane. With the weapons of the spirit—prayer and penance—they can remove the causes of war; with grace and charity they will be able to effect a lasting bond among themselves and also to convert the heathen: "When the ways of a man shall please the Lord, He will convert even his enemies to peace." (Prov. 16, 7)

The Things That Are God's

True, Jesus told us to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. But He also told us not to render to Caesar the things that are God's; and, as we have seen, by conscription Caesar tries to take over the things that are God's. Accordingly, in the Christian Middle Ages, military service was voluntary. During all this time warfare was definitely restricted—in physical extent, destructiveness, and, above all, in its conformity to certain ethical norms. Indeed, without idealizing the Middle Ages, it may be truly said that in the Holy Roman Empire the men of that period went very far toward realizing even on the political plane the Christian ideal of an international society as taught by Christ in the doctrine of the Mystical Body. Consequently, the chief wars of those times were fought with non-Christian nations, i.e., the Crusades; for, with notable exceptions, like St. Francis of Assisi, even medieval men did not yet see, at any rate in practice, that all nations are Christ's and must be converted rather than killed.

Crusaders Were Volunteers

In the Crusades, which were fought against infidels, the armies were raised by voluntary enlistments. St. Bernard, who used all his eloquence and his vast theological knowledge to gain recruits for two Crusades⁴¹, never thought of compelling men to go to war—although he considered the cause sacred and the duty religious. The same is true of the entire Christian era. The Church, whom Liberals delight to represent as the enemy of liberty (and, of course, her human policies are always influenced historically by the shortcomings of her leaders and of each age), nevertheless protected personal liberty, in this matter at least, throughout the period of her ascendancy, while, on the other hand, the French Revolution, which claimed liberty as its own discovery, asserted the principle and began the practice that was destined to destroy liberty and reduce the whole world to a shameful slavery to militarism.

3. Machiavelli and the French Revolution

THUS, both natural ethics and moral theology had completed a long history in Europe, and the most influential part of their history, before there was any knowledge of conscription or of a moral obligation attached to it. When conscription did at length appear, it came with the decline of the Church's influence, the break-up of Christendom, and the rise of secularism. In a word, conscription is an ancient barbaric custom, repressed for centuries by the influence of the Church, which rose to life again in the ruins of Christian Europe. Significantly, it returned with the Renaissance as part of the general European movement to revive the pagan past. Its beginnings in recent times, therefore, marked a reversion to the pagan religion of State-worship as well as to the pagan ideal of the nation in arms.

Machiavelli Proposed Conscription

Machiavelli was the first modern to propose universal compulsory military service. Quite apart from the lateness of the age, here certainly is a strange beginning for a moral obligation! It is, in fact, with Machiavelli that the modern concept of war, as distinguished from the medieval idea, takes its beginning: the modern concept being one of unrestricted war—*physically* unrestricted in the extent of its destructiveness, *morally* unrestricted in its rejection of ethical limitation and control.⁴² Essential also to the modern idea is the use of war, not as a last resort, which was the requirement of traditional ethics, but as a normal, though alternate, means for securing national power and "honor" when diplomatic measures fail. As is to be expected, Machiavelli, true son of the Renaissance, went back to the example of pagan Rome in his study of war, finding no model for his studies during the Christian centuries. Here then, in an environment of neo-paganism, which excluded, deliberately and cynically, every breath of Christian thought and idealism, was born the idea of universal conscription.

Christian Ideals Debased

The subsequent history of this moral duty is scarcely less strange than its beginning. Although proposed by Machiavelli, conscription did not actually begin, as we have already observed, until the French Revolution. Its actual beginning, like its first conception, thus issued from an explicit rejection of Christianity. It came, in other words, not from the contemplation of religious or moral truth, but on the contrary from the irreligious tenets of the Revolution and the conscious repudiation of Christian teaching. Its service, from the beginning, was not made to the one true God nor to Jesus Christ His Son, but rather to the goddess reason, in this case a deflowered goddess who desecrated the Christian altar. For if much good has come to the world from the Revolution, there has been much evil too—and even its good is not without taint. The great ideals of the Revolution—liberty, fraternity, equality—are clearly, in their purest form, Christian. All that the Revolution did was to debase and materialize these ideals and then give them currency in this debased form throughout the modern world. Therefore, if the violence of the Revolution and its persecution of the Church (however unjust in itself) was a fitting retribution upon those Catholics who, through spiritual short-sightedness and self-interest, had detained the truth of God unjustly (Rom. 1, 18) by preventing the ideas of freedom, brotherhood, and equality from entering the social sphere and obtaining a concrete social embodiment—so, on the other hand, a just and ironic Providence has seen to it that catastrophe and suffering should follow everywhere from the effort to realize these ideas in the debased form which made them dangerous and ultimately destructive half-truths.

4. Conscription and Democracy

THE revolutionists saw universal conscription as a concrete realization of brotherhood and equality and a measure necessary for the defense of their newly won liberty. Their choice of means was an unhappy one.⁴³ They did not

⁴⁰ See Eppstein, *op cit*, p. 41-42. Hence Origen holds that with the New Testament the laws that were proper to the Jews as a nation lose their force. This includes the divine sanction of war.

⁴¹ While St. Bernard considered the Crusades just and holy, he held it was a crime for Christian nations to fight among themselves. See *The Life and Times of St. Bernard*, by Ailbe J. Luddy, p. 530 (Dublin: 1937).

⁴² For a study of the process whereby paganism tends to absolutism and the cult of the State, see J. Maritain, *Religion and Culture*, p. 10 et seq. (London: Sheed & Ward, 1931.)

⁴³ Edward Meade Earle, *op cit*, p. 3 et seq.

⁴⁴ Other means are possible. "It is crystal clear that the British Government is not prepared to give up power over the India millions unless the latter develop the strength to wrest it from them. I hope India will do so by purely moral means."—Mohandas K. Gandhi, (Reported in *N. Y. Times*, Aug. 20, 1944; Sect. 4).

foresee that their invention was destined in the end to destroy brotherhood by setting men all over the world at one another's throats, and that it would realize equality and freedom by making all men equal in a terrible bondage. For who are more slaves: the ancient millions who labored under the threat of a whip to build the pyramids, or the modern millions who must abandon their homes, the pursuit of happiness, and their very lives, in order to take up arms and kill their fellow slaves? This in the service of a demonic god, like Moloch of the Carthaginians, who is satisfied only with the blood of human victims! There might have been more liberty and brotherhood in the world today had the revolutionists possessed sufficient spiritual perception to distinguish the dross from the ideal in their aspirations. But the revolutionary ideals were betrayed in their beginnings. The bourgeoisie—the rich, the merchants, the manufacturers—these are the ones, so historians are now able to see clearly, who gained freedom by the Revolution; but not the poor, not the workers and peasants, not the common man—even today these have not achieved freedom in the great democratic nations, although they are told otherwise by their masters. Thus the revolutionary ideal of brotherhood was inadequate, partial, even hypocritical. What wonder, then, that under a concept of equality and fraternity, which holds as a theory that all men have a duty to die for their country, only a few are called on actually to give up their lives (and these the young, the immature, and the powerless), while their brothers continue, not only to live, but also to live in comfort that is materially increased by war.

Majority Cannot Determine Morality

Conscription must likewise be attributed in great measure to the immoral doctrine of the revolutionary philosophers which holds that the will of a majority of the people is the absolute and final arbiter of right and wrong. Only through this doctrine could compulsion be given to military service. From then until now, a majority vote, and not an objective standard of morality, has determined the rightness of conscription. Now if the majority vote is a convenient method for determining the details of social life, it is not, of itself, in questions that involve moral judgment, a sufficient support for a moral obligation, but requires a deeper basis in natural or divine law. Indeed, apart from this deeper basis, the majority vote is but the voice of the tribe, the articulation of a primitive blood-bond. As such its ethical justification is not to be found in reason or the Gospel, but rather in a return to the tribal morality of uncivilized nations. Ultimately, therefore, the moral sanction of conscription is no higher than that of the blood pacts and blood feuds of primitive peoples, by which they were "bound" to avenge in blood the lives of their fellow tribesmen.

Conscription Inimical to Democracy

Evidently, therefore, conscription is opposed not merely to the ethics of reason and the teachings of the Gospel, but also to the idea of democracy. This should be noted particularly since apologists for the practice in democratic countries rationalize it as democratic; the reason that they give for their assertion is that all are included in universal service and no able-bodied person is exempted from contributing in one way or another to the national war effort. Yet already the revolutionary government, basing itself on the will of the majority, and not on the free will of the individuals actually concerned, first limited the application of the law so that it would not include those able to resist it politically, and then compelled the others to go into service. The will of the majority was considered so sure a guide that the measure was carried, though, in spite of active resistance. Henceforth compulsion and not freedom has been of the essence of military service; and this in the name of democracy.

The whole history of the movement to spread democratic liberties confirms what is said here of the opposition between democracy and conscription. For example, the spread of democratic liberties in the nineteenth century was chiefly retarded, as in Germany and Hungary, by the growth of nationalism and its inseparable instrument, militarism. Again, it is in the least democratic and most autocratic nations that conscription has reached its highest perfection: Napoleonic France, Prussia and the German Empire of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Nazi Germany, and Russia under Stalin, which "in fact, has come nearer the goal of the nation in arms than any other nation in history." England and the United States, on the contrary, the two great democracies, were the last to adopt conscription; and they did so only under "necessity" and with reluctant reticence. It does not speak well for the

democracies that they had to learn their democratic duties from autocrats and dictators.

5. Consequence of Conscription for Civilization

IN view of this history, it will hardly be suggested that the discovery of conscription in modern times, like the slow recognition of religious and other human rights, is an example of that moral development which, after a long passage of time, gradually brings to light some great moral truth or law, present indeed among men from the beginning, but concealed for centuries under a mass of error and evil custom. Even secular historians see in militarism, and therefore in conscription, which is the extremity of militarism, one of the most unfortunate events of the whole nineteenth century. Can such a development, everywhere acknowledged as deplorable, be traceable to rectitude of conscience or a sense of moral duty? Duty to the State as to an absolute end is inspired, not by justice or true patriotism, but by a disordered nationalism. You may see this concept of duty perfected and exemplified in modern times by the Prussian officers' corps.

The Prussian Example

Cold, proud, and arrogant, this false idea of duty is rooted in a disordered sense of personal honor, pride of blood, and worship of the State; it is quite different from the sense of duty fostered by rational ethics or by the teachings of Jesus. In fact, if we were to seek a moral justification (higher than the blood bond spoken of above) for conscription and the particular concept of duty that is demanded by its acceptance, we could find it only in the ethics of Prussianism, or some similar system, enforced ultimately by a sanction akin to Kant's categorical imperative, that is, by a notion of blind duty without roots either in reason or in revelation. Such a categorical imperative, divorced from rational and objective morality, is found in the will of the majority, the voice of the blood bond, the oracle of tribal morality. That the Prussian system best fulfills the requirements of nationalism and militarism is demonstrated by the fidelity with which this system has been copied by the other nations. At present, the President of the United States is recommending peacetime conscription, the very essence of militarism, to democratic America! Yet this very willingness and "need" to imitate the German methods, Prussian and totalitarian as they are, indicates clearly how impossible and destructive is the whole war system in a civilized world; for it shows that, if force is to be the basis of international order and the measure of national greatness, then civilization will never be able to progress beyond the condition of the most barbarous nations, since the others will be compelled to adopt the same methods of barbarism in order to secure their own power and national interests. And it is conscription, more than any other single factor (apart from the spiritual deterioration which lies behind the whole process), which has in our day brought men back to the standards of barbarism, to the primitive ideal of the nation in arms.

6. The Position of the Holy See

THE Holy See, God's appointed teacher of morals to the peoples, has remained singularly unimpressed by the alleged moral duty we are considering. Pope Leo XIII, in 1894, having watched the frantic armament race that followed the Franco-Prussian war, protested against it, as follows: "We behold the condition of Europe. For many years past peace has been rather an appearance than a reality. Possessed with mutual suspicions, almost all the nations are vying with one another in equipping themselves with military armaments. Inexperienced youths are removed from parental direction and control, to be thrown amid the dangers of the soldier's life; robust young men are taken from agriculture or ennobling studies or trade or the arts to be put under arms. Hence the treasures of States are exhausted by the enormous expenditure, the national resources are frittered away, and private fortunes impaired; and this, as it were, armed peace, which now prevails, cannot last much longer. Can this be the normal condition of human society?" Note that the Pope's condemnation resumes the arguments that we have set down in Part II: conscription has an evil moral effect on youth, it removes them from their rightful callings; it upsets the normal order of society.

Disarmament a Fundamental Point

Later Pope Benedict XV added more clearly and expressly to this indictment that conscription is itself a cause of war. The latter Pontiff in his famous *Des Idees*, published in the midst of the First World War (August, 1917) and plead-

ing with the nations to lay down their arms and negotiate for peace, stipulated that disarmament is a necessary condition for true peace. Cardinal Gasparri, then the Papal Secretary of State, some time later gave an official interpretation of this condition in letters sent to Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England, and to Archbishop Chesnelong of Sens. According to this interpretation, disarmament did not mean merely the scrapping of a few battleships, which can be but too easily rebuilt, but the ending of compulsory military service. Since only by compulsory service are governments able to raise the huge armies necessary for modern wars, so only by putting an end to this practice can these wars be stopped. The Pontiff cited the pre-war example of England to show that conscription is not normally necessary for national security. Disarmament is also one of the five fundamental points required for a just and lasting peace by Pope Pius XII.

Papal Position Clear

Surprisingly enough, if it is usual to regard the acceptance of conscription as the fulfillment of a moral and patriotic duty, the Holy See attacks the practice, as a recent commentator points out, precisely on the grounds that it is anti-patriotic. In other words, although the Holy See does not deny that war may be theoretically justified and that soldiering is not intrinsically evil, nevertheless it holds that both are extrinsically evil because of the great harm they bring upon the whole world and upon individual countries. Compulsory military service, as the very extreme of militarism, brings such grave dangers to a nation's youth and such serious dislocation to public order that, quite apart from its evil effects on international society, it is opposed to the best interests of the countries that adopt it, and therefore, far from being the fulfillment of a patriotic duty, it is in truth opposed to true patriotism. Those who maintain that conscription is based on moral duty find no support in the teaching of the Popes. Here, as a matter of fact, is the culminating argument against conscription, an argument *ad hominem*, namely that it is directly opposed to the patriotic good that it claims to procure. When we say, therefore, as we did in the beginning of this article, that moral teachers have generally failed to give due attention to the problem of war, it must be added that however remiss lesser moral teachers have been in condemning and even in considering conscription, the Sovereign Pontiffs, the highest moral authority on earth, have been constantly faithful to their high mission of peace and have consistently given clear directives to the world. The trouble has been that Catholics within the several countries, too much influenced by nationalism themselves, have failed to follow, to interpret, and to apply the directives thus given to them by the Vicar of Christ.

To summarize and conclude: On the plane of ethics, conscription must be condemned as opposed to democratic principles, as an infringement upon individual rights, a violation of the family, and as contradicting the patriotic duty that citizens owe to the State itself. On a higher plane of truth and conduct we may say that conscription, since it is the chief element of militarism, and this in turn is the invariable instrument of exaggerated nationalism, is destructive of that international union of peoples which is demanded by Christian charity and implied in doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ.

⁴⁵ See War and Conscription at the Bar of Christian Morals, by Msgr. George Barry O'Toole, p. 40. (The Catholic Worker Press, N. Y.)

⁴⁶ This is no doubt why the obligation of acquiescing in conscription seems so deeply rooted and so "natural." It is the blood that argues, not reason. There is no doubt a legitimate love of kind and love of country; but in militarism, conscription, and nationalism, this love is carried to excess.

⁴⁷ Edward Meade Earle, op. cit., p. 363. Switzerland is an exception to this general rule: here democracy and universal service have been long associated. But in Switzerland, military training is for or three months, followed by annual "refresher" courses of two weeks. Such a program differs vastly from the militarism of the great powers and would only to a limited degree fall under the general condemnation of conscription.

⁴⁸ The German Army, by Herbert Rosinski, p. 22 et seq. (Washington, 1944).

⁴⁹ Apostolic Letter *Praeclare Gratulationis*. See Principles for Peace, p. 80. (Milwaukee, 1943.)

⁵⁰ See Principles of Peace, pp. 235-239.

⁵¹ Christmas Message, 1941. For an interpretation, see Gonella-Bouscaren, A World to Reconstruct, Chapters XIII and XIV (Bruce, Milwaukee, 1944).

⁵² John J. Wright, National Patriotism in Papal Teaching, p. 180. (Newman Book Shop, Westminster, Md., 1940.) The whole of Chapter Five, Part Two, should be read on this point.

⁵³ On this point see Epstein, op. cit. p. 128.



From the Mail Bag

Half a Loaf Is Better

Dear Editor:

The dominating theme in my octagon (one of the cottages of the hospital) for the past hour has been—bread. That half loaf—that marvelous half loaf of Father Duffy's whole wheat is the cause of it. "Why can't they give us bread like that to eat here?" has been the immediate cry.

To be frank, ever since I ate good Mrs. X's whole wheat biscuits I had been more or less skeptical of home-made bread. Feeling the weight of your contribution to my meager larder did not by any means tend to alter my opinion, but what a surprise I got! "Why, that bread is excellent!" It is (was) so good that I must let other palates than my own greedy one revel in the fine tasting, well baked wholesome half loaf of splendid whole wheat bread. It was a treat and it was duly appreciated by a few hungry gourmands who live with me in this crazy octagon.

Would it be asking too much to have you mail me some of that fine bread, with Father Duffy's consent, of course? I imagine it is not baked in huge quantity, but I beg that you keep me in mind when a batch comes from the oven in the near future.

With that nice jelly of yours and that grand bread I could be a humble gourmet. I could safely pass up the rich, succulent dishes of the Escoffier Society for such solid, nourishing, sensible diet.

I am sustained in this assertion by all who shared the humble feast so completely furnished by you last Sunday. God bless you.

JOHN GRIFFIN.

From Hazen Ordway

Dear Arthur:

The draft finally swept me into its path. I tried my darndest to keep out of its clutches because of believing it better to lay down my life than to take another's. I wanted to stay on the farm where we were working out a good Christian way of life, combining Peter's cult, culture and cultivation. Progress was slow and there were many failures, but such ventures must grow slowly. Then with the war upon us, the obstacles were great. The huge monster grabs everything within reach and devours all greedily.

I had a tough time deciding whether to go into the army 1-A O or to jail. I decided on jail. It wasn't long before the F.B.I. was after me, though longer than I expected. The Federal court sentenced me to five years in prison.

I guess I should tell you why I chose jail instead of 1-A O or a conscientious objector camp. I had several reasons. First of all, I believe conscription is wrong, that it is a violation of the human dignity of man, that it takes away that God-given responsibility for the choice of his actions. Secondly, I didn't want to be any part of the war machine, and thus contribute to the carrying on of the war.

I went to prison for six months with O.P.A. violators, other Selective Service violators and minor violators of Federal laws. It was quite an experience.

Many of the Selective Service violators were Jehovah's Witnesses, about a hundred and fifty of them; about a hundred were conscientious objectors. I don't know what the figures were for the rest. There were about fifteen Catholic C.O.'s. About twenty C.O.'s professed to be atheists. As I look back on the group now

it seems to me that most of the Selective Service violators were guilty of the heresy of overemphasizing certain truths to the neglect of others. However, I do not look on them as being any more guilty of faults than most people today. But who am I to judge? I do not mean to judge them or anyone personally, but only try to classify people according to true values as I know them. Towards battling against conscription I think they are doing more than anyone today. I hope I'm not being so liberal that I'm going in every direction with my thinking. To give some more definite direction to my ideas, I'll say that I believe the real leaders in the world today are those truly religious people, exemplified most perfectly by the Trappists.

I left prison because of certain dependencies which I believe it my obligation to support. I still don't have to fight, being in the Medical Corps, and at the same time I can fulfill my dependency obligation, but I don't like being a part of a conscripted group to carry on war against my fellow man. It is this situation, with my peculiar circumstances, on which I'd like some light. I finished fourteen weeks of basic training at Camp Grant, Illinois. After lying about the States for about a couple of months with a minimum of training, I finally wound up here in the Aleutians. My particular job is filling the oil stoves.

In order to make the most of my time, I study Catholic books, read the best literature available, go to Mass, participating in it with the Missal, and sing in the choir. We're preparing for Easter Sunday now. We had a Solemn High Mass here Christmas, and about six hundred received Holy Communion.

I'm waiting anxiously for the CATHOLIC WORKER. I haven't seen it for several months now.

My best wishes and prayers to all my CATHOLIC WORKER brothers, sisters, mothers and fathers.

Faithfully yours in the Mystical Body of Christ,

HAZEN ORDWAY.

HEAVENLY GIFTS

Christ proved His love for His spotless Bride not only by His tireless labors and constant prayers, but by His sorrows and His sufferings, gladly, lovingly endured for her sake. "Having loved His own . . . He loved them unto the end." It was only with His Blood that He purchased the Church. Let us then not be unwilling to follow in the blood-stained footsteps of our King. The security of our salvation demands it: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection," and "if we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him." Our zealous love for the Church demands it, and our brotherly love for the souls she brings forth to Christ. For although our Saviour's cruel passion and death merited for His Church an infinite treasure of graces, God's inscrutable providence has decreed that these abundant graces should not be granted us all at once; and the amount of grace to be given depends in no small part also on our good deeds. They draw to the souls of men this ready flow of heavenly gifts granted by God.

These heavenly gifts will surely flow more abundantly if we not only pray fervently to God,



especially by participating devoutly every day if possible in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, if we not only try to relieve the distress of the needy by works of Christian charity, but if we also set our hearts on eternal treasures rather than the passing things of this world, restrain this mortal body by voluntary mortification, denying it what is forbidden, forcing it to do what is hard and distasteful, and finally humbly accept as from God's hands the burdens and sorrows of this present life. Thus, according to the Apostle, "we shall fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in our flesh, for His Body, which is the Church."

Pius XII—Encyclical on the Mystical Body of Christ.

"We must give up trying to square the spirit of war with the Spirit of Christ. We must acknowledge that they can no more amalgamate than can fire and water."—The Church and War, by Father Stratmann, O.P.

"War is not only an evil as pestilence and famine are; it is not only blood shedding, but it is the exaltation of every physical, mental and moral evil."—Father Stratmann, O.P.

SAVAGERY AND FRIGHTFULNESS

(Continued from page 1)

which, we are told, is being fought by the so-called peace-loving nations for justice, freedom and right.

What kind of justice, freedom and right was meted out last month to the Poles, or at least to one-third of them, at Yalta in the Crimea, where the representatives of Britain, the United States and Russia handed over to the latter country 38 to 40 percent of the territory of an ally of theirs, not the territory of an enemy, but that of a friend? What kind of friends are these?

In September, 1939, Britain ostensibly went to war to preserve the territorial integrity and independence of Poland. That was the pretext anyhow at the time, though, of course, that was not the real reason that Britain, and later the United States, went to war with Germany. It was a much more sordid, subtle and selfish one than that. A lot of blood has been shed since then, and a lot of crocodile tears, too, by both British and Americans for "heroic Poland, our gallant ally," for "freedom" of various kinds, for "democracy," for "justice and right," yea even, if we would believe the phrasemakers (which we don't), for our "Christian civilization and heritage," for Christ and Christianity.

Yalta has proven what all this flowery language really meant to the phrase makers who were talking all the time with their tongues in their cheeks, hoping, in fact, confident, that they could do what Lincoln said could not be done, viz, "fool all the people all the time."

Scripture has been quoted (proving that the devil can quote it for his purpose) by war mongers and merchants of vengeance and hate to urge their listeners on to further vengeance and hatred. The name of God, and the words of Christ the Son of God have been used blasphemously by people whose sole object has been to delude their listeners, to make an impressive profession of exterior Christianity which had no interior

basis, as actual facts have proven.

There is nothing we can do about stopping such hypocrisy and blasphemy that are intended to delude and gull the public, which is very easily gulled and fooled. God will deal with the hypocrites, with the hate merchants, with the men who plan and approve deliberate terror bombing of civilians whether they be Nazis, or British, or Americans, with the soldiers who delight in slaughter for slaughter's sake, and with infantrymen, irrespective of their nationality, who weld steel doors shut and seal fellow human beings inside them with an acetylene torch. He will also deal with the blasphemers and abusers of His Name.

We can, however, if we are Christians, make some atonement, especially during Lent, for all this hypocrisy and blasphemy, for all this savagery and frightfulness, for all this spreading of hatred and seeking of terrible vengeance which are loose in a world in which the powers of darkness, temporarily at any rate, have a nauseating and revolting control. We can pray. We can ignore the un-Christian utterances of un-Christian people, and give to what they say the amount of attention and credence that they deserve. We can ignore them and their utterances as far as it is possible for us to do so, dethrone them from our minds and hearts, and endeavor, generally, to live as real Christians, whose leader is Christ, in a world in which there are relatively few Christians today.

There are, it is true, quite a few who call themselves Christians, but "not every one who says, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father Who is in heaven, he shall enter the kingdom of heaven." The will of God has nothing to do with hatred or the spreading of it, with seeking vengeance, with the slaughter of innocents, with the breaking up of family life, with organized fornication and adultery, with blasphemy, hypocrisy, injustices, cruelties, power politics and trade wars, and the terrible things that follow in their wake. It has nothing to do with wholesale deliberate murder of civilians abroad, or with race suicide at home.

People who voluntarily take part in or advocate such things are not Christians. They have, it is true, a God given freedom to reject Him and Christianity, but they should cease to pose as Christians. We should cease considering them as such and refuse to give any attention, weight or credence to any remarks of theirs, especially in the realms of faith and morals.

THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

By FRANK CULLEN BROPHY

I am the man you'll never know—
Perhaps it may be better so.
Before I'm twenty I'll have died,
Just like the Man they crucified.

Like you, I too would like to live.
Like Him, I pray I may forgive.
I'll die for your democracy,
Or any trite hypocrisy.

That sways the mob which cries for blood,
And never yet has understood,
Since Abraham's hand was stayed by God,
To spare the child and spoil the rod.

In some far hosting of the dead
I'll learn to know why I have bled.
There, with the youth of other land,
We'll learn His love, and understand.

We shall forget your hymns of hate,
And smile at your affairs of state,
Decreeing that the young must die,
For then we'll see it was a lie.

The young know what it is to love,
That is our gift from God above.
Had we grown old, perhaps we'd prate,
Like you, of dull affairs of state,

Think not that we're a lesser breed
Without ambition's spur of greed.
Had we but lived the longer hour,
We might have sold our souls for power.

The child is father to the man,
That is the way the story ran.
And so, to Christ we are the prize,
Who are so little in your eyes.

As we put off this mortal vesture,
Please God, we make His Godly gesture.
Like Him, may we breathe down on you,
"Forgive—they know not what they do."

BOOKS FOR THE TIMES

This Way Out 20c
A Farm in Ireland . . . 35c
It Happened in Ireland 35c

(All Three by
Fr. Clarence Duffy)

Parish Credit Unions . . 10c
By Arthur Sheehan

THE CHRISTIAN PRESS
115 MOTT STREET
NEW YORK 13, N. Y.

EASTER CARDS 25 FOR \$1.25

Dorothy Gauchat
Our Lady of the Wayside Farm
Avon, Ohio

Memories of My Yesterdays

BY CATHERINE DE MUECK DOHERTY

IT was Friday again. Friday was always a very special day in our house, and the houses all around us. Friday was cleaning day. Everyone prepared for Sunday, the Lord's day. All day, the smell of soap and polish was thick in the air, and now evening had come. The house was spotless; all the Lampadas (vigil lights) had been lit, the supper dishes washed, it was time to set the bread.

The big kitchen was spotless, the cat curled up near the stove. The vigil light's golden brown flicker was reflected in what seemed to me a hundred glistening, shining copper pots, multiplying itself in them indefinitely.

The cook and mother would bring out the big wooden bread tubs; they were never washed, just dried with a very clean cloth and covered with another, until needed again for use, and in each was a lumpy piece of dough the size of a fist, that seemed to me to be part of the tub, but really was the "leaven."

The flour bins were opened. Rye flour smells so good. Water was warmed just so. Then mother and the cook prayed for a good batch—to the Blessed Mother, of course. Was she not the Patroness of the Home, and wasn't bread-making the sacramental of a home? Now the tubs were blessed with the sign of the cross, and the bakers, too. All was ready to "set the dough."

Slowly, reverently, flour and water was mixed in a thin batter, and the tubs put on the tile edge of the stove, covered up first with a clean cloth, then old clean blankets, kept always handy for that purpose. Another sign of the cross for good rising, and the women would leave. I and the cat would stay, curled up near the warm stove in the dimness of the cosy, shining kitchen. As often as not we both would fall asleep there. Two hours later, if all was well, mother and the cook would be back, to add the rest of the flour, slowly again mixing the whole with a long big wooden paddle, first, then kneading, kneading with their elbows deep in the dough, until the latter would fall off the hands and arms. Now the batch was ready for "sleep." Rye bread takes a long time to "rise"; tomorrow morning it would be ready for the next operation.

And tomorrow could not come soon enough for me. Week after week, fascinated, I watched; somehow, that was home to me. Always when bread was made I felt "at home." It was like a ritual all tied up with God and His Cross and the Blessed Mother. And Home!

And now it was tomorrow. When I came down, the baking oven, which was a must in all Russian kitchens and sort of formed a part—the back part—of every stove, was filled with glowing coals which soon would be raked out into the stove. The things I saw in those glowing coals would fill a fairy book. Coals have that way with them; they stir imagination.

Mother and cook were already hard at work on the dough. They had kneaded it again, thrown it about the long pine table, put it once more to rise, but this time

on big sheets of tin. Russians seldom use tins to bake their bread in; they just put big lumps on the sheet and let it spread in round appetizing loaves. They rise a while on these, and then are gently transferred from tin sheet onto a wooden flat shovel and stuck in orderly rows in the baking oven. And what heavenly smell issues from the oven! I can still smell it, and feel all the ecstasy of my childhood. Hours later, round, brown loaves would be placed on the back of the baking oven on a white sheet and covered with blankets for the day. Saturday evening would bring a supper of milk, cottage cheese and freshly-baked bread with home-made butter. What restaurant can beat that?

BREAD plays such a great role in the lives of the Russians. To them indeed it is the holy staff of life. Soldiers' rations include two and a half pounds of bread per meal. It is THE MEAL. Even now in America, I often startle friends that walk with me, and certainly puzzle passers by, because whenever I see a piece of bread lying on the street or road, I stop, pick it up, kiss it, bless myself and put it on some ledge nearby, away from dirty shoes. An old Russian custom, reverence for bread, because the Son of Man chose BREAD as His substance for us.

Or take Easter. Easter, the greatest feast of the Eastern Church. One prepares oneself for it, by strenuous fasting. No meat, no eggs, no butter, nothing made of milk, no cheese. Honey instead of sugar. And unleavened bread for all Lent. But then Holy Week—the first three days of it anyhow—are all spent in baking and cooking, and nary a housewife or cook ever tastes what she fashions. For the Easter bread, koolich, is very rich. Raisins and butter, eggs and sugar, spice of cardamom seeds, much yeast, cream instead of water.

Whatever shapes the koolich might be baked in, one is sure to be round. For the Easter bread typifies Christ, the Eucharist, and roundness symbolizes infinity. God's infinity. Then there is the Pas-ha. Made of cottage cheese, butter, eggs and sugar as well as raisins—all mixed up—first cold, then put in a big saucepan to be brought just to a boil, then, when hot and liquid, poured into wooden moulds that have on their sides the symbols of Christ and the words: *Christ is risen—verily He is risen*. The moulds are lined with clean white, thin, gauzy cloth, weights are put on the

warm mass, and it is left to stand for several days, until it looks like hard cheese. This pas-ha typifies the Pasch of the Old Testament, the precursor of the real pasch of the New. Eggs are hard boiled and colored; the egg is the symbol of life, fertility in Christ. One yellow for spiritual wealth, charity; one green for spring and hope; one white with Christ's symbols again for faith. The rest, as fancy moves one.

NOW all is ready for midnight Mass. The whole family gathers. Father takes the bread, mother the pasch, children the eggs, and the family goes to church. There the gifts will be placed on the altar steps to be blessed. Some will be taken home to break the fast with and the rest given to the poor.

Or take a Russian wedding. When the wedded pair come back from church they are met by the father of the bride carrying a loaf of bread on a wooden platter, and the mother carrying salt. Symbols again of material and spiritual welfare that is wished them. This time bread typifies material goods, and salt spiritual. "For you are the salt of the earth," it has been said.

Yes, my yesterdays come back to me, and my todays long for the them. Because they were simple and rooted in the Lord and the home, which, as we Russians say, is God's resting place on earth.

Does anybody in America love scrubbing floors? Feeling the warm, soapy water on one's hands. Enjoying the soothing rhythm of a brush well yielded, the sight of a spotless piece of that floor emerging slowly, until all of it is "fit to eat from," as mother used to say.

And what fun to see the dirty grey wool off the sheep's back transform itself slowly, under deft fingers, into a clean, fluffy mass that soon becomes a strong thread, that one can dye to suit one's own fancy, and finally weave, into patterns of one's own creation. The joy of achievement ran strong in me the day I finished a lovely plaided piece of goods for my skirt.

Not so long ago, in Canada's Friendship House, I taught a young woman of the slums to make lovely curtains out of potato sacking, washed clean and dyed in strong coffee grounds a rich dark brown, and then embroidered with large cross stitches of multicolored wool. I was repaid a hundred-fold by the look on her tired face.

Mother of Christ... Keeper of St. Joseph House, Heart of all hearts, Patroness of Wives and Mothers, Give me the grace To make a home Wherever I am. Amen.

Personalist Leadership

1. A Leader is a fellow who follows a cause.
2. A Follower is a fellow who follows the Leader because he sponsors the cause that the Leader follows.
3. Thought must be expressed in words and deeds, and deeds speak louder than words.
4. To be a Leader requires thought as well as technique.
5. The thought must appeal to reason, and the technique must be related to the thought.

Catholic Worker Books

By Fr. John J. Hugo

IN THE VINEYARD
Essays in Catholic Action. 10c

WEAPONS OF THE SPIRIT
Indicates the causes of War and the means to be adopted for true peace. 15c

MOON'S HERALD, EVENING STAR

Who comes?—

Is this not Gabriel's, this star,
first light bright burst in darkness
fallen where day blazed?
Is this not wonderfully an annunciation's Angel,
this golden one, this undismayed and unmazed
above the clutter wrily the roofs,
who says that this day's dinges is scattered
windward, windward?

Who comes?—

See! splendour, a grave whiteness,
there where all razed day has fallen into night,
terrible in whiteness, above Babylon,
city entombed by its own darkness,
rises, like Miriam, the moon
shining in gifts of brightness from GLORY'S hidden light
(who rose first, unscathed, from all earth's withering
that ONE might rise
FIRST-BORN from winter of a winding-sheet,
Multifoliate, first BUD,
winterless and ONE with WONDER.)

RAYMOND E. F. LARSSON



MY KINGDOM
IS NOT OF THIS WORLD

PRAYER TO ST. JOSEPH

GLORIOUS ST. JOSEPH, model of all those who are devoted to labor, obtain for me the grace to work in a spirit of penance for the expiation of my many sins; to work conscientiously, putting the call of duty above my inclinations; to work with gratitude and joy, considering it an honor to employ and develop, by means of labor, the gifts received from God; to work with order, peace, moderation and patience, without ever recoiling before weariness or difficulties; to work, above all, with purity of intention, and with detachment from self, having always death before my eyes and the account which I must render of time lost, of talents wasted, of good omitted, of vain complacency in success, so fatal to the work of God. All for Jesus, all for Mary, all after thy example, O Patriarch Joseph. Such shall be my watchword in life and in death. Amen.

—PIUS X.



EASTER CARDS

Original Wood Engravings
By A. de Bethune

SAMPLE SET

12 Cards and Envelopes, All Different, 50c

ASSORTED SET

50 Cards and Envelopes, Assorted in Five Designs, \$1.50

ORDINATION CARDS

SAMPLE SET

20 Different Cards, 40c

100 for \$1.25
1,000 for \$10.00

Write to THE SAINT LEO SHOP
29 Thomas Street, Newport, R. I.

FROM UNION SQUARE TO ROME

By Dorothy Day

\$1.50

at all bookstores

The Preservation Press, Silver Spring, Maryland

HOUSE OF HOSPITALITY

By Dorothy Day

\$2.50

Sheed & Ward, publishers

63 Fifth Avenue
N. Y. C.