

CATHOLIC WORKER



Vol. XXII No. 2

September, 1955

Subscriptions
25c Per Year

Price 1c



"Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me, for I am meek and humble of heart; and you will find rest for your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden light."

"Do not labor for the food that perishes, but for that which endures unto life everlasting, which the Son of Man will give you . . ."

They said, "What are we to do in order that we may perform the works of God?" In answer, Jesus said to them, "This is the work of God, that you believe in Him whom he has sent."

"Do not be anxious for your life, what you shall eat; nor yet for your body, what you shall put on. Is not the life a greater thing than the food, and the body than the clothing?"

"Look at the birds of the air; they do not sow, or reap, or gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are not you of much more value than they?"

"And as for clothing, why are you anxious? See how the lilies of the field grow; they neither toil nor spin, yet I say to you that not even Solo-

mon in all his glory was arrayed like one of these. But if God so clothes the grass of the field, which today is alive and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, how much more you, O you of little faith?"

"Therefore do not be anxious, saying, 'What shall we eat?' or 'What shall we drink?' or 'What shall we put on?' For your father knows that you need all these things."

"But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be given you besides."

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

Associate Editors: CHARLES McCORMACK AMMON HENNACY
Managing Editor and Publisher: DOROTHY DAY
223 Chrystie St., New York City-2
Telephone GRamercy 5-8826

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



"The Communion of Distrust"

The message of the Catholic Worker has always been a simple one, though it leads to some surprising results. The practice of the works of mercy, the attempt to love God and love ones brother has repercussions. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." "Love is the measure by which we shall be judged." It is not an easy thing to love, but it is a commandment, a precept, that Christians love their brothers as Jesus Christ has loved us, "a harsh and dreadful thing," Fr. Zossima in The Brothers Karamazov said. The world is filled with suspicion and fear these days and we will admit that there is much to fear. One sometimes awakes in the night, and in the silence, in that dead calm of the early hours, a sudden dread comes,—"at any moment, perhaps now, some terrible disaster may strike." Having lived through an earthquake in childhood, and living still in a time of preparedness for war, one cannot be so naive as not to realize that at any time, at any moment, through some incredible folly, all hell might break loose in the way of atomic warfare. This in spite of all efforts of peace loving people to the contrary. Even without war, even through the stockpiling, and testing of nuclear weapons, anything might happen. Scientists admit that we have unleashed forces, that we are playing with forces that we are unable to control.

The only way to stop war is to stop preparing for war. "War will cease when men refuse to fight." War will cease when men truly begin to try to love one another, to let loose that tremendous force of love which is able to overcome hatred. Love casts out fear. These short and simple sentences, repeated so often should be studied. Soloviev in his book on the Meaning of Love, St. Bernard in his writings on love, these books should be read and studied so that we can grow in love. Above all, St. Paul has written of love. "Whatsoever things are true and just and beautiful, think on these things."

Karl Stern wrote in his great book, THE THIRD REVOLUTION, of the fear of communism, "vigilance has a tendency to open, in a subtle and imperceptible way, frontiers in the human soul which had better be forever closed. Vigilance in the face of evil may give rise to preoccupation with evil. And as the Fathers of the Church taught, if we are unduly preoccupied by evil, we become evil. There is danger in giving more thought to the things we are against than the things we are for. It is easier to have distrust than to have faith. The story of the early church shows clearly that it is the positive in faith which conquers the world."

"An interesting story from the life of Saint Therese of Lisieux concerns a book written by a convert, presenting what today would be called the 'inside story' of the freemasons. This book was apparently a best seller at that time and it was enthusiastically received by the good nuns of her community. Only Therese, in opposition to her superior and everyone else, disliked it intensely. The author was later unmasked as a psychopathic swindler. Today, when Communists and secret Communist machinations present an object danger, we face a great pitfall. It is not a question of paranoia in a clinical sense. It is an imponderable something which happens to a Community of faith. We have our ear to the ground to hear the distant rumbling; before we know it, something decisive has happened to us. We are no longer upright. Our gaze is no longer fixed on God and man in charity."

What we were trying to say, last June 15, by our acts and by the publicity attendant on our civil disobedience, was that fear is a terrible thing, and such air raid drills, seeking shelter when there can be no shelter, no safety, is a delusion and a trickery, a device to increase fear in our brothers, and therefore a readiness to prepare and use any means to defend ourselves. The means become the ends. We cannot do evil that good may come of it. We cannot kill in order to save our own lives. The new law is that we must lay down our lives in order to save them.

Perhaps it is open to question as to whether we used the best means to get our point across. After all we are journalists, we are trying to communicate ideas to others by writing and by act too. The main objection, made too by those who did not hesitate to disobey the law in the case of prohibition, saying then that it was an unjust law, was that there was nothing contrary to the law of God in the Civil Defense Act, and so we should have obeyed it. In our concept of obedience we are obeying the law when they say, "do this or go to jail." We expressed our willingness to take the penalty, those of us who are pleading guilty. The others in proclaiming that there is no moral guilt in their refusal to obey the order to

By AMMON HENNACY

"What about Pearl Harbor?" jeered a young man as I was picketing the tax office.

"When MacArthur entered Tokyo, according to Quaker reports, there were 60,000 conscientious objectors in jail there who objected to Pearl Harbor. They objected to the wrong which their country did. Today I doubt if there are six in this country who object to what our country is doing in making atom bombs; at least to the extent of openly refusing to pay income taxes for the bombs," I replied.

There is never time to go into an explanation of history in such a running conversation, and while it is true that you cannot tell a person anything which they do not know already somewhat, at least in the Market Place you have to keep trying. The same sort of question or rebuke comes up when we are told to "Go back to Russia," or else, "You couldn't picket in Russia." The inference is that Russians are supposed to oppose tyranny, but as we have no tyranny it is blasphemy to oppose any action by our democratic government. Before the Civil War to talk against slavery a thousand miles from it was not of much importance, but to speak of it in the deep South required fortitude. Likewise the place to speak up



against atomic bombing is in the country that dropped the first bomb and continues stock piling them. This is what we are doing and intend to continue doing!

This year I began my picketing in a cooler, and in a stormy atmosphere, and nearly all of the time we walked on the shady side which is the front of the Custom House. Dorothy helped the first half day and the last half day and Carol

take shelter are testing the constitutionality of the law and asking for a trial of their case by jury.

Other letters of objection to our action came in from a friend who had been a police matron for three years, and from the wife of a detective both of whom wished to plead excuses for Judge Kaplan who was undoubtedly tired and worn by work and heat, and for the matron who crowded us into a small cell and refused to allow us to send out for food. If I was uncharitable in the tone of my remarks (the facts can speak for themselves) then I am truly sorry and beg pardon of those I have offended. But I would like to point out that the criticism came from the other side of those iron bars, from officialdom. As for the other letters, we can only say that there is too constant an assent to the all encroaching State. There have been too few saying NO in the public squares and in the market place.

In the Market Place

Ferry came down each afternoon after her four hours uptown, working where there is no withholding tax.

Bob Steed who had a lone battle against prejudice in Memphis was nobly on hand all of the time to hand out CWs. At times Bob Owens, Jr., young anarchist who has helped me most of the winter at Pine and Nassau; a Quaker girl from Ohio; Bertha Tisius who has helped sell CWs all year, and Stanley Borowski who was with us in the air raid helped also. Jackson MacLow, young anarchist poet who was arrested with us in the mock air raid had his own sign and leaflet and generally came around noon. He also fasted the full ten days.

Judith Beck had her own dainty sign which was better than mine or Jackson's, reading:

LOVE AND LIFE
NOT
DEATH AND TAXES

Rita Corbin drew the best sign that I think I have carried these 12 years. On one side it read:

"The Individual Conscience
Versus the atom-bomb?
Yes, there is no other way."

(LIFE magazine editorial,
Aug. 20, 1945)

WE REFUSE
TO PAY INCOME TAXES
FOR WAR AND THE BOMB

The other side read:

10th Anniversary
HIROSHIMA
August 6, 1955
IN PENANCE
WE PICKET
August 6 to 15

The police were cordial Catholics who gave me a good natured argument about, being an anarchist. A photographer who said he was from the N.Y. POST, but whom I suspect may have been from the FBI took pictures of us and asked me if I was a real Catholic and went to mass every Sunday. When I told him that we all went to daily mass he shook his head. A lady asked a cop where she had to go to pay taxes. I was right there with my sign and pointing to the sign he said, "In there, and if you don't pay them you get three to five years."

Jackson's message in brief was that "You may be paying for your own death. If you pay taxes you are buying deadly radiation and terrible weather for yourself, your family, and everyone else on earth." He also urged that the money saved from not making bombs be used to get surplus food to the people who need it.

As I was passing by a man said to another cop who was new on the beat, "arrest that man!" The cop did not believe that the other police in his precinct knew of my picketing, so he said that he did not know if he had a right to arrest me or not but would go and see. Later he returned in good humor and wished us good luck, wondering if Judith could make it with her high heeled shoes. I met folks from Milwaukee, Columbus, O., Carmel, Cal., and other places, who had heard me speak and several students from New England who had heard me recently.

The Associated Press sent a small notice over the wire and the DAILY NEWS here had a small headline, A-Bomb and Taxes, and 19 lines about Carol and me

war and doing this picketing about refusing to pay income taxes for it. It is not very much of a penance for me to fast, as I do it often, so I thought that a real penance would be for a propagandist like myself to shut up for a time and be silent. I began my fast with silence, wrote a note now and then when I couldn't get out of it, but soon found that it was impractical, for I had in courtesy to answer the serious questions of many people. A retreat is the place for silence, not picketing in the streets. Still, I talked too much.

I lost seven pounds the first three days and only a little over a pound a day after that: a total of 15 pounds, which was a pound less than in my January Formosa 10 day fast when I sat around the house and did not picket. In the heat of Arizona I would lose 20 pounds in seven or eight days fasting. But here with the nice sea breezes, with good friends helping me, and perhaps with the consciousness of experience, I made it very well without any headache, dizziness, or cramps in feet or legs. We gave out as many as 1000 CWs in a day, finding only about one in a hundred being thfown away. Only half a dozen shouted "Commie" at us and many stopped and agreed with us or asked intelligent questions.

About an hour before we had intended to go home on the last day a nervous ex-marine walking along with his girl friend worked himself up into excitement and a small crowd finally collected around Jackson, Bob and Dorothy. Carol and I were handing out papers at the other end of the street just then and went to make a phone call. As we returned my heart jumped to notice a larger crowd and much loud talk, expecting to see Jackson, Bob and Dorothy in their midst, but happily they were picketing from the far end of the block up to the crowd. Later I heard what had happened from them. A sort of well dressed man said that all this picketing was a disgrace to his Church and wanted the crowd to beat up the Commies who pretended to be Catholics. He wanted Bob's name and called a cop who took Bob's name and address and went away. Dorothy had the good sense to refuse to argue with such excited people, so she and Jackson and Bob left the crowd to argue among themselves. An important and portly well dressed man came up and dispersed this crowd saying that he had heard Dorothy speak years ago and that the CW was a fine group of people, and that he was not going to allow any harm to come to these good Catholics. He showed them his Knights of Columbus membership card and in a few minutes the sidewalk was clear. Coming over he addressed me by name and I recognized that I had sold him CW's at Pine and Nassau. He was from Wisconsin and had heard Dorothy speak in Chicago once and here in New York City at the Labor Temple. He admired her "private life" as a Catholic and she laughed about her very obvious "public life" just now. We continued to picket for an hour with no more bother from anyone.

There is no recipe of just what to do or to say at any given time in handling crowds. From my experience with the KKK in Alabama in 1924, the vigilantes in Phoenix, and my regular picketing crowds there is always the right word to say, the right look in the eye, and of course the spiritual integrity back of my activity. I have always known that the blusterer is one of whom I am not afraid, neither will I needlessly aggravate him. Until you are ready to die you are not ready to live. And as Eric Gill says "It all goes together." Picketing of itself is a small thing; as part of an integral way of life it has special meaning.

Several people thought that with the Atom energy used for Peace and Eisenhower wanting peace that we were too pessimistic about what might happen with atomic warfare. I recalled to them that around the

(Continued on page 8)

Obedience and Authority

By JULIAN PLEASANTS

The word "fire" brings different pictures to different minds. Some think first of all of a family fleeing their burning home, of fire raining from the sky on Hiroshima, of napalm and scorched earth in Korea, of the ovens at Buchenwald. For others, the word "fire" conjures up visions of light and warmth and comradeship, a cosy home on a winter's night, a group around a campfire. And there are pictures of harnessed fire, supplying power to home and farm and factory; of purifying fire, separating the metal from the dross. There are others (though I may be pushing the analogy) who would think first of sacrificial fire, the holocausts of the Old Law, the altar candle and vigil light consumed in worship of God.

The word "obedience" brings to different minds a similar variety of pictures. And for a very good reason. It was obedience (to military authority) that lit the fires of Buchenwald and Hiroshima. It is obedience (to common need or commercial profit) that lights the fires of home, farm, and industry. It was obedience (to the law of Moses) that set fire to the holocausts of old. Obedience, like fire, can be all these things: it can be destruction, it can be sacrifice, it can be purification, it can be the light of guidance, the warmth of community, the power of common action. The reason it has so many possibilities is that, like fire, it is not essentially destruction, it is essentially transformation.

Opposite Views

Within the Catholic Worker movement we find people with diametrically opposite views of obedience. There are those who think obedience is a thing bad in itself, though sometimes the lesser of two evils; and there are those who think obedience is a thing good in itself, though sometimes spoiled by circumstances. Despite their seeming disagreement, both positions rest on exactly the same assumption about obedience, that it is essentially a destruction, the destruction of a man's will.

The first group consider obedience as the sacrifice to other men of an integral part of human nature, something that belongs ultimately to God. While they recognize its occasional necessity (in the family, for instance) they still consider it at best the lesser of two evils, forced on us by the immaturity of some human minds and wills.

The second group tend to see obedience, almost any obedience to other men, as a sacrifice to God. They feel that it is good because it is the destruction, for God's sake, of something that is ours, in fact our highest possession, our will.

Consider, however, the Nazi who herded Jews into the chambers of Buchenwald. Could he decide that what his spiritual development needed at that time was some blind obedience to his superiors? Why not? Because obedience is not essentially the destruction of one's own will. It is essentially the substitution of another's will, and the character of that new thing is what makes all the difference. It is one thing to decide that you won't go to the movies at a time when you want very much to go. It is a very different thing to let somebody else decide for you whether you shall go to a movie and what movie you shall go to.

Some of the tendency to regard obedience as a good in itself may stem from certain impressions that can be taken from "The Retreat." From the idea of going against oneself, the idea that the best thing to do with even the best of things is to give them up, we can jump to the conclusion that a thing is good because it is hard. We can reach the point of judging everything by its effect on our own spirituality, forgetful of any other effects it may have.

Much, however, of the tendency to regard obedience as an end in itself, must come from a very prevalent

assumption about the role of obedience in the religious life: that there we have obedience for the sake of obedience. St. Thomas Aquinas' discussion of religious obedience demolishes this assumption very quickly. For St. Thomas, obedience is not a good in itself. He does not even call it an evangelical counsel in the same sense that poverty and celibacy are evangelical counsels. He does not give a direct quotation from Christ to justify religious obedience (as he does for poverty and celibacy) because there is no such quotation.

For St. Thomas, only obedience to God is good in itself. Obedience to a religious superior must ultimately be justified by a prudential judgment: that religious obedience is the practical way for imperfect people to learn perfection from those who are more advanced. "The religious state is a school and exercise for tending to perfection. Now those who are being instructed or exercised in order to attain a certain end must needs follow the direction of someone under whose control they are instructed or exercised so as to attain that end as disciples under a master." (Summa Theologica, Part II-II, Question 186, Article 5).

St. Thomas makes this clearer when he shows why the life of a hermit is a more perfect state than life in a religious community. If obedience to other men were more perfect in itself and a direct counsel from the Gospels, then the hermit's life would be less perfect than the monastic life. This is not the case, however. "Actual obedience is required of those who need to be schooled according to the direction of others in the attainment of perfection, but those who are already perfect are sufficiently led by the spirit of God so that they need not to obey others actually." By "already perfect" he does not mean absolutely perfect, otherwise no one would have the right to be a hermit. In our times, monastic life is a school of perfection from which no one ever graduates alive, but this was not always true.

The whole thing becomes much clearer when St. Thomas points out that there are really two states of perfection, the religious state and the episcopal state and of these the episcopal state is higher, even though it demands neither a vow of poverty, a rule of life, nor a finely detailed obedience. The reason the episcopal state is higher is that "bishops are in the position of perfecters, whereas religious are in the position of being perfected". In St. Thomas' thought, it is a higher thing to command than to obey. We see in an ascending scale of perfection the monk, the hermit, and the bishop. The monk is led by another man, the hermit is led directly by God (although he is also subject to a bishop), and the bishop leads others to God.

States Of Perfection

The development of a lay spirituality has been greatly hampered by the prevalent assumption that the religious state is the highest state of life, and a model for all lesser states to follow as far as circumstances permit. As St. Thomas shows, it is not the highest state of perfection, and when he contrasts the religious and episcopal states, it becomes clear that the religious state is not a good model for any of the hierarchical vocations: pope, bishop, pastor, parent.

I use the word "hierarchical" as the early Fathers used it, to mean the whole structure of the church. The typical layman, father or mother, is not outside the hierarchy. He is not even the lowest rung of the hierarchy, since he has been placed, in charge of his children, and of the physical universe. This is the twofold vocation that was given to him in the Garden of Eden. The religious, however, is a free-lancer, set in a way outside the hierarchical structure. This frees him for a special function which is higher by far

than the lay role, but is not thereby a practical model for lay life.

We have only to look at it objectively to see that the life of the typical layman, father or mother of a family, is not at all like the religious life, yet very much like the episcopal state. It is true that the children in a family are like religious, for they are in a temporary state of poverty, celibacy and obedience and their chief role is self-development. The father of a family, however, has been compared to a bishop since the days of the early Fathers, and the home has been compared to a miniature diocese, an "ecclesiola."

In fact, the analogy works both ways. The rite of consecration of a bishop "weds" the bishop to his diocese, placing a ring on his finger in pledge of his fidelity. It is this solemn and perpetual consecration to the care of others which, according to St. Thomas, sets the bishop in a state of perfection, indeed the highest state of perfection, that of perfecting others. It is his task to beget spiritually, to nourish spiritually, and to perfect the children of God and the Church.

But the parents of a family, by their nuptial promises, are committed to the care of a church in miniature. In their own little diocese, and according to the level of their own powers, they are to beget, to nourish, and to perfect the children of God and the Church. In a descending scale we see Christ and Church, bishop and diocese, parent and family, fruitful unions consecrated by the Sacraments of Holy Eucharist, Holy Orders, Holy Matrimony.

Layman and Bishop

Fulfillment of the parental vocation requires a spirituality and an assortment of virtues which is not at all like that of the monk but very much like that of the bishop. It is not even like that of an abbot, because both bishop and parent are in charge of a motley group of persons who have been given them, not at all like the select group who have come voluntarily to a monastery. The job of bishop or parent is not to impose a detailed rule of life on some one who has asked for it, but to help individuals to find their own vocations and to develop their own potentialities for God.

The job of parent or bishop also demands that they know how to use the things of this world for the nourishing and educating of those under their care. A spirit of detachment from the things of this world is no guarantee that we know how to use the things that we have to use. The spirit of poverty, necessary as it is, is no substitute for the virtues of science and art by which we direct material things to the service of God. The spirit of detachment from one's own will is no substitute, either, for the virtue of prudence by which the parent must direct to God his life and his personal relationships.

A man can, like the religious, give up the lower responsibilities of property and child care and civic life, for the sake of a more direct relationship to God or a more direct service to the organized Church. But a man cannot keep those lay responsibilities and refuse to develop the virtues necessary to their fulfillment. The layman's task is not to live like a monk in the world, but to live like the bishop of his home.

Yves Simon

I have emphasized the extent to which the layman must be a man directing — directing himself, his family, his share of the physical universe and his share of the social structure. But there are obviously situations in which he must be a man directed. Part of that is clear from his position in the hierarchy of the Church. Within that hierarchical framework, it is usually easy to see how obedience to men is obedience to God.

Outside that framework, it is not

(Continued on page 7)

Anarchism and Leo XIII

By Robert Ludlow

It was interesting to read the comments of my godchild Ammon Hennacy and Reuel S. Amdur on my "Re-evaluation" article. Apparently I did not make myself too clear on some points so I had better do so now. For one thing I assumed in the reader a familiarity with the common teaching of the Church on these matters but, since the position I stated was taken to be that of Rousseau, I evidently assumed too much. Consequently, to avoid the contention that I am making my own opinion the "common teaching of the Church" I will use, as much as feasible, the words of Pope Leo XIII who treated of these matters at some length.

Anarchism and Personalism

First, however, I would like to note the psychological and ethical difference between individualist anarchism and personalism. Personalism stresses our responsibility to our fellows and it stresses the importance of man in the formation of society. When Mr. Amdur asserts that a large scale personal reformation is not necessary in order to achieve anarchism because it is anarchism itself that "makes possible such reformations" he shows himself not only at variance with personalism but as upholding the Marxist contention that it is not human nature that explains the historical movement but rather it is the historical movement which fashions, and that diversely according to the times, human nature. Pope Leo states (*Libertas Praestantissimum*) "Just as civil society did not create human nature, so neither can it be said to be the author of the good which befits human nature, or of the evil which is contrary to it." Which contention of Pope Leo not only upholds the personalist approach but disproves the anarchist contention that man is evil because institutions make him so. As for the first characteristic of personalism which I mentioned, the concern for others, for society, how does that square with the teaching of the founder of individualist anarchism. Max Stirner, who in "The Ego and His Own" writes "Away then with everything that is not wholly and solely my own affair. You think my own concerns must at least be good ones? A fig for good and evil. I am I and I am neither good or evil. Neither has any meaning for me. . . . For me there is nothing above myself." To which we may contrast the statement of Pope Leo, in the encyclical previously mentioned, "the true liberty of human society does not consist in every man doing what he pleases, for this would simply end in turmoil and confusion and bring on the overthrow of the State, but rather in this, that through the injunctions of the civil law all may more easily conform to the prescriptions of the eternal law." And before that the Pontiff states "Nothing more foolish can be uttered or conceived than the notion that, because man is free by nature, he is therefore exempt from law . . . for what reason and the natural law do for the individuals, that human law, promulgated for their good, does for citizens of the States."

In another section of Max Stirner's book he demonstrates how the individualist anarchist carries over his philosophy into social matters and makes his own will the criterion of justice. "Only that property" he states, "will be legally and lawfully another's which it suits you should be his property. When it ceases to suit you, it has lost its legality for you." Which sentiment not only strikes at the personalist concern for others but is hard to reconcile with the distributism advocated by some at *The Catholic Worker*.

Of course not all individualist anarchists gave or give such blatant expression to egoism as did Stirner, nevertheless that is the logical outcome of the theory for, after all, is not individualist anarchism simply the bourgeois doctrine of laissez-faire applied not only to the economic sphere but to the political as well?

Proudhon broke somewhat with

individualist anarchism so that he called himself a mutualist. Despite his assertion "No more parties, no more authority, absolute liberty of the man and the citizen," when the Paris Commune came into power Proudhon called on the authorities to put his ideas into practice. As a prophet we may, in view of what has happened, be pardoned a smile at his statement (*Idee General* p. 328) "If science therefore and no longer religion or authority is taken in all countries as the ruler of society, the sovereign arbiter of all interests, government becomes null and void, the legislators of the whole universe in harmony."

But the point I would especially make here is that as anarchists came to realize more a duty to society they moved away from the individualism of Stirner. Proudhon to mutualist anarchism, Bakunin to collectivist anarchism and Kropotkin to Communist anarchism. All calling for some type of societal arrangement that could be termed government.

The State

As Mr. Amdur points out there was a time when I used a distinction between State and government and, in the terms used, it was a valid distinction for I then thought of the State only in terms of the national State claiming absolute sovereignty. But in mulling these matters over it seems more advisable to me to use terms which are used and understandable to Catholics since there is no point to deliberately placing semantic difficulties in the way. So that I would now use the term State as used by Pope Leo as he writes in *RERUM NOVARUM* — "By the State we here understand, not the particular form of government prevailing in this or that nation, but the State as rightly apprehended; that is to say, any government conformable in its institutions to right reason and natural law and to those dictates of the divine wisdom which we have expounded in the encyclical *On the Christian Constitution of the State*."

Understanding the term then in Leo's sense I would not agree with such sweeping statements that the State is of necessity violent and evil. However I would assure Ammon and Mr. Amdur that by "world society" I do not mean world State. I was thinking rather of some international system of arbitration necessary to settle disputes after the individual national States surrender their claim to absolute sovereignty. This too may well be an impractical and unrealizable ideal but certainly not so far fetched as the "no-government" ideal.

Rousseau

As for the Rousseau business — of course I do not hold that truth is determined by the majority. Though here again I would not accept such a generalization as that "the majority is always wrong." Pope Leo, in *Libertas Praestantissimum*, states of such decisions, whether made by a majority or not.

"If then, by anyone in authority, something be sanctioned out of conformity with the principles of right reason and consequently hurtful to the community, such an enactment can have no binding force of law, as being no rule of justice, but certain to lead men away from that good which is the very end of civil society."

And in the encyclical *Diuturnum* the Pontiff writes "In every association and community of men necessity itself compels that some should hold pre-eminence, lest society, deprived of a prince or head by which it is ruled, should come to dissolution . . . many men say . . . that all power comes from the people, so that those who exercise it in the State do so not as their own, but as delegated to them by the people, and that, by this rule, it can be revoked by the will of the very people by whom it is delegated. But from these Catholics dissent, who affirm that the right to rule is from God, as from a

(Continued on page 8)

BOOK REVIEWS

MOTES AND BEANS

ROME and RUSSIA, A Tragedy of Errors, by Sister Mary Just of Maryknoll. The Newman Press, 1954. \$3.00. Reviewed by Helen Iswolsky.

In order to cure physical sickness, many years of training are required from the doctor. To understand and heal spiritual wounds—perhaps even more strenuous studies are necessary. It is Sister Mary Just's great merit to have courageously faced this task in the field of discovering all about the tragic misunderstandings between Rome and Russia. In doing so, the author has examined the cause and consequences of the old errors, and has sought the ways and means to avoid new ones. And so, this book tells the story of Rome and Russia from the earliest times, and winds up its tale with the situation as it stands today between the Holy See and the USSR. This is a procession of ten centuries, each of them having its own historical and religious landmark; each presenting, both in East and West, a continual cultural and spiritual progress. But every period brings us too, alas, its own set of errors, committed on both sides. The author takes us on this journey through time at an accelerated pace; in fact the story is told in 171 pages. But there are 50 additional pages entirely devoted to bibliography. This is the work behind the scenes, or, more correctly speaking, Sister Mary Just's laboratory in which she has patiently tested every statement made in her book. Her source-material offers all famous and also many secondary works written by Russian and non-Russian scholars on that subject. The major historical source is of course the set of five monumental volumes of Father Paul Pierling, S. J.: *La Russie et le Saint-Siège* ("Russia and the Holy See"). But even this fundamental work would be incomplete, had it not been implemented by Sister Mary Just with dozens of other books. There are all the books on history, philosophy, Russian religious thought, literary classics, political memoirs, essays and reports, ancient Russian texts and recent Soviet documents. Clearly, Sister Mary Just has not left a stone unturned to find the various threads leading through, and we may hope, out of the labyrinth of errors.

The story starts with the Kievan period, (Xth century), when Russia received Christianity from Byzantium. Though light came to Russia from the East, while the West (Rome) stood by, this happened at a time when the Church was as yet undivided, and all things were in common in the Christian world. Some fifty years later, Russia did follow Byzantium into the schism, which tore the Eastern Church from Rome and definitely established her seat in Constantinople. But as Sister Mary Just points out, even after this tragic rift there was no open hostility between Russia and the Holy See; there was however a growing estrangement, a gradual loss of contact, the folding up of Catholic outposts in Russian-held lands. The Eastern rite, which Byzantium bestowed on Russia before the schism, was first the mere sign of liturgical differences, especially in the use of the vernacular. But later, the Eastern celebration of the Mass and holy office became the symbol of liturgical exclusiveness. Deeply rooted in the Russian soul, the Eastern liturgy must be understood and respected by Catholics, for it would be a tragic error to try to supplant it by the Roman missal. This fact has been clearly understood by the Holy See, which encourages, promotes and stimulates the Greco-Slavonic liturgy for all Greek and Slavonic peoples. Nevertheless Latins were not considered in Kie-

van Russia as "undesirable aliens." The final break came two centuries later, when Russia was overrun and conquered by the Tartars. Not only was an iron curtain lowered between Russia and Rome, but the last "chinks" in it were soon sealed: "At the time of the Tartar Invasion, writes Sister Mary Just, Russia received no aid from Latin Catholics. On the contrary, both Swedes and Teutonic Knights (i.e. Roman-Catholics) assailed the stricken people at this crucial moment." Such was the first act in the tragedy of errors, and a very somber one indeed. The ruling prince Alexander Nevsky, who defeated the Western invaders while suffering the rigors of the Tartar yoke, was a good and generous man, beloved by his people, and later canonized by the Russian-Orthodox Church for his truly Christian virtues. His prestige is still so great in Soviet Russia today, that the Communist rulers have placed Alexander Nevsky foremost among Russian national heroes. The well-known film, bearing Alexander's name was produced by Soviet directors, and its musical score written by Prokofiev. Naturally, the Soviet production does not miss the occasion of having a thrust at Roman-Catholic armies invading Russia. But even Soviet propaganda set aside, there remains the fact that this armed encounter of Rome and Russia had a destructive influence on Russian-Orthodox minds. History tells us that Alexander Nevsky was approached by Pope Innocent IV, inviting him to join the Roman Catholic Church. Alexander refused to accept "the teaching of the Latins." Relating this unfortunate event, Sister Mary Just goes on to say: "After the period of Alexander Nevsky, Russian hostility toward Catholicism as the religion of the aggressive Westerners grew apace . . . virtually no intercourse in spiritual matters existed between the new Russia and the Holy See." This new Russia was born at the time of the Tartars' decline and fall, and her new capital was Moscow.

From the birth of the Moscow State to Peter the Great, and up to our times, Russian history followed a pattern, marked by more tragedies and more errors. These could no longer be chalked on the Western slate only. Russia, freed from the Mongol yoke, emerged very different from what she had been in the Kievan period. Moscow rose in splendor, while the fall of Constantinople had marked the collapse of the mother Church of Byzantium. The Russian tsars adopted the two-headed eagle of the Paleologues; Moscow prelates became as powerful as their Byzantine predecessors. Moscow developed a messianic consciousness, considering herself the direct and legitimate heir to both Empire and Church destroyed by the infidels. "Two Romes have fallen, wrote an obscure monk of that time, Moscow is the Third Rome, and there will be no other." And since Moscow was both State and Church, she became a theocracy, in which tsar and patriarch sat on twin thrones.

No wonder then, that Rome found herself once more in front of an iron curtain, this time by no fault of hers. What could the Universal Church undertake to overcome national and religious exclusiveness. Time and again the Holy See attempted to gain Russia, but with no avail. And so, the West lost patience and made more blunders, groping in the darkness of endless controversy. And the East responded in like manner.

We cannot follow in a brief book-review the complex trends of the Moscow-Rome relations: there was the Council of Florence, the Brest Union, the invasion of Russia by the pretender Demetrius supported by Catholic Poland (a

reminder of Western aggression in the days of Alexander Nevsky). There was Russia's bitter revenge, her persecution of Ruthenian Uniates, of Poles and of Lithuanians. There were the tsars and then the emperors playing the diplomatic game with the Vatican's envoys. There were the Jesuits allowed to settle in Russia, (when they had no other place to go), then again expelled from their Russian missions. And so the tragedy of errors continues till true religious interests are completely forgotten. The political, the national, the fanatical angle alone survives.

What then is the chance of reconciliation? When will this tragedy of mutual misunderstandings end? Let us once more open Sister Mary Just's book. We shall find in it a faithful, and loving description of all the spiritual treasures hidden away in Russia, far from "ignoble strife." The book tells us about the monks in Russia, whose love of prayer and work and holy poverty was so near to those of Saint Benedict and Saint Francis, that no iron curtain can possibly divide them. From the writings of Russian saints, from the great books of Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, Berdyaev, Sister Mary Just quotes to show that all that is good in the Russian Church seeks its conversation not in political conferences, but in heaven. And her book also demonstrates the fact, that while official channels can be blocked by misunderstandings, unofficial channels remain open. While the Vatican's own envoy, the Jesuit Posseven, failed, and no wonder; to move the heart of Ivan the Terrible, the roving priest Jury Kryzhanitch smuggled himself and Catholicism into Moscow, and into Siberia. When Russian official anti-Catholicism was supported by monarchs, ministers, high prelates, censors—the religious thinker Chaadayev advocated a return to Rome. And he inspired in turn the great apostle of Union, Vladimir Soloviev. Meanwhile, on the Western side of the picture, the Popes as well as Rome's learned prelates, theologians, philosophers, historians, dedicated priests and religious, have constantly prayed for Russia, and studied, and suffered, that "All may be One." Sister Mary Just belongs to these champions of UNITY.

Ex-Prisoner

7024 West Melrose Street
Chicago 34, Ill.
June 12, 1955

While incarcerated in Springfield, Missouri, for being a conscientious objector to war, I had the fine experience of being able to read the CATHOLIC WORKER regularly for my entire ten month stay. For this I shall be grateful, because I, being a Catholic, had thought I had been forgotten by my co-religionists; but instead, found to my amazement that many Catholics had very similar convictions as I have. Yes, love of fellow man, no matter who he be, can only solve all of the existing problems of man today.

While at Springfield, I was unable to contribute to the good, holy work you and yours are demonstrating in your daily living of charity—which I have a great deal of admiration for—and also for the newspapers you had sent me. Now I am a free man, well, as free as a man can be in this world of ours, and in a position to give a small sum to your "spring appeal" which I am a little late in sending. May this small gift help a little.

One favor I would like to ask of you at this time, and that is to have the CATHOLIC WORKER delivered to the above address rather than my old prison address. Thank you. God bless you and yours.

In love and fellowship,
HENRY ADAMOWICZ.

ANTI-CIVILIZATION

THE LAST ESSAYS OF GEORGE BERNANOS. Translated from the French by Joan and Barry Ulanov. Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1955. Reviewed by Charles Pegis.

This book, prepared shortly before the author's death, is a compilation of previously unpublished lectures which he delivered in various places in Europe in the years 1946 and 1947. These essays, entitled, "France Before the World of Tomorrow," "Why Freedom?," "Revolution and Liberty," "The European Spirit and the World of Machines," and "Our Friends the Saints," deal principally with the great evils in modern society, which the author believes to be due to its virtually complete lack of spirituality. Particularly in the first four essays he develops this theme with great profundity, denouncing with force and insight Communism, Fascism, and the materialism and corruption of the West.

The argument in each of these essays follows closely similar lines and may be outlined as follows: Modern society is sick because it is based on a definition of man which is materialistic and therefore false. This materialism has led to the development of technology at the expense of culture and true civilization, which must be based on the love of spiritual values rather than that of profit and material comfort exclusively. Through the power of machines, the power of the state and of large corporations have multiplied at the expense of individual liberty. This process has reached its logical conclusion in totalitarian countries, but even in the democracies it is gradually taking place so that they also will ultimately become totalitarian. For capitalism, he argues, tends towards the formation of larger and larger corporations until the supreme corporation, the state, takes complete control and becomes an economic dictatorship. Marxism and even very moderate forms of socialism likewise lead to dictatorship, since they seek to oppose large corporations by increasing the power of the state. This power, supported by machines has created what M. Bernanos terms an "anti-civilization" typified by disregard for human life and liberty and by destructive wars, which in such a condition of society are inevitable and which, in view of the power of present-day weapons could conceivably result in the extinction of life on the earth.

This condition cannot, he points out, be remedied by simply destroying machines; it is fundamentally a spiritual sickness and can be cured only by a rekindling of spiritual awareness in the souls of men. M. Bernanos looks especially to the young and to his own country, which has always been a cultural leader of Europe, to carry out this "revolution of the spirit." In the final essay he develops this conclusion more fully; technological civilization is inhuman because it is based on intelligence without charity, and only charity, as exemplified in the lives of the saints, can reform it. For only when we are free, that is, able to love, that life is worth while.

The truth of M. Bernanos' main thesis, namely, the inhumanity of modern civilization, cannot be denied. We daily see evidence of this fact in democratic as well as communist countries. Certainly a society such as ours in which violent crimes committed by the young have become commonplace, one-third of marriages end in divorce, and six billion dollars annually are spent on materialistic commercial advertising (which is useless if people are not influenced by it and harmful if they are) can hardly be said to be healthy. M. Bernanos characterizes modern society by a disregard of human life; can this country claim itself innocent of

this charge when we destroyed food surpluses in the thirties and wiped out thousands of civilian lives at Hiroshima and Nagasaki? We cannot escape the author's conclusion that our society is inhuman and unhealthy.

Yet M. Bernanos would not have us despair. As he explains near the beginning of the book, what is needed is neither despair nor foolish optimism but hope, which is a heroic determination to overcome obstacles and which can be achieved only by effort. This effort must be made if the world is to be saved.

This book is not an easy one to read. The style is very vivid and forceful, and particularly in the last essay there are passages of extraordinary beauty, but the arguments are marked by many long digressions and by a dislike of drawing particular conclusions. Thus, the widespread distribution of small-scale private ownership, which is the obvious answer to the dangers of capitalism and socialism, is not discussed. But the book is abundantly worthy of careful study, for it does what is perhaps more important than drawing conclusions: it provokes thought. For no one knows the answers to all the problems of modern society,

Russia

The Way of a Pilgrim

Translated from the Russian by R. M. French. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1952.

About a hundred years ago an unidentified Russian peasant, whose inheritance had been destroyed by a jealous brother and whose wife had died, took his Bible and his knapsack and set off on a lifelong pilgrimage through Russia, to "venerate the shrines of those who were pleasing to God, and ask for their help in [his] trouble."

This book is the account he has left us of his wanderings, and especially of his discovery and gradual perfection of a certain method of prayer, called hesychast. To Western minds there may seem something curious and Oriental about this way of praying, which consists in the ceaseless repetition of one prayer, until the tongue repeats it automatically and it becomes incorporated into the beating of the heart. However the simplicity and childlike joy of the narrative make it impossible to doubt the efficacy of the hesychast method of prayer so far as the Pilgrim himself and others like him were concerned.

In the course of his travels the Pilgrim inevitably met with a certain amount of misunderstanding, but he was always fortified and sustained by his prayer and his loving nature. And he also made a number of remarkable friends: a magistrate and his wife who ran a sort of House of Hospitality, an army officer who was cured of alcoholism by the power of the Gospels, and a host of others. It is well to remember that all these people, sturdily pious and in some cases even holy, were unexceptional Russians living in Russia, and only a hundred years ago.

The Pilgrim, like many pilgrims, wanted most of all to go to Jerusalem. Once he almost made it but was frustrated by the death of his benefactor. He accepted this as God's will: "... I reflected that even this had not happened without the providence of God, and I quieted myself with the hope that God, the lover of men, would take the word for the deed, and would not let my wretched journey be without edification and spiritual value." As the book ends the Pilgrim is about to set out again, and it is good to hope that he finally came safely to Jerusalem and there found fulfillment of his patient search for God.

PAULINA STURM.

Summer Camp

By EILEEN FANTINO

The end of summer is a slow thing, a gradual stillness and change of wind, a looking back and wondering where time has gone that was once ripe as a peach harvest. Sitting on our beach on the last full day of living by the sea, living closer to the movement of life in the rustling trees, the changing moons and moody waters that mourn, and with the next dawn leap to the rock strewn sands and over whitened branches and jagged logs with the spontaneous joy of children standing at the edge of the sea with foam washing over their sun browned feet, we think of what the summer has meant to us.

The last few weeks were like a sunset that moves swiftly, whose colors deepen and change like the wind blowing purple clouds along the edge of the sky, which are quickly turned to night and pierced with sudden stars.

We lived as a family with each group of children we brought to our summer camp in Staten Island. We cooked for them, put them to bed with stories and songs, explored the woods, walked along long stretches of beach picking up clams and crabs, and beautiful stones; we built fires at night which drove out all sights and sounds except the pounding of small determined waves. There were many moments of joy and like a family we had our own jokes and our own rituals. Our eyes were often filled with sights which brought peace, a group of children torn out of the struggle and tension of East Harlem life sitting on the beach dipping reeds in the water and weaving baskets or making pot holders to bring home or give to us to carry the huge pots that were constantly in use. Every day but the few rainy ones the faces and graceful swimming or ungainly splashing of the kids dotted the water and from the first timid steps into the waves each group developed swimmers of daring and fortitude who would only come out of the water to eat.

Like any other family we had our squabbles and bickering because we all brought our problems with us but there were moments of communication when so much ugliness, tension and bitter memories were forgotten in the closeness of our living, in the sharing of food and work and in the sharing of beauty and peace.

Our four beach houses were literally thrown together but that only added to their charm. Clustered behind a small cliff rising from the beach, they look like a small fishing settlement you might find in New England. Between two of our houses is a grape arbor which was twisted and thrown to one side by the hurricane. The fields around us and overlooking the sea were often filled with sprays of blue wild-flowers which opened after a rainfall like the sky above us. The storms left their mark on the beach, and the woods were flooded. Fish and crabs and piles of wood were thrown up on the sand. The high winds cleared the cobwebs from the earth and from the people who lived the hammering rain and cleansing of nature.

What two weeks here has done for the scores of children who came, whose anxieties and tensions sometimes seem ready to explode to destroy them, we can't tell except that we know they ran through the fields and swam for hours with their faces lashed by the warm sun and sea spray, rode out to sea in old boats, sang and danced and ate well, cried out some of their fears and bore others with more courage. To have your mind filled with the sight of a crowd of children coming back from the beach through the tall grass barefooted and laughing, their hair slick and wet close to their heads, hungry for the next meal and a little hungrier to live openly like the stretch of sea and sky behind them rather than cramped and afraid in the hell of a dark tenement crawling with garbage, suf-

focating from the smells of poverty and despair—this was a moment of truth and recognition and thankfulness.

Deliverance from fear is a struggle within ourselves and in the world, a struggle which will never be over. The struggle for peace is a good work like growing food, and shaping wood into a home and all the works which help man to live rather than to die. We find more beauty close to the sea, the earth and its fruits, a beauty which helps to heal these troubled children and

give them a spirit of peace for at least a short time, that spirit which all men need to transform the world and stop the forces of hatred, revenge and greed which corrode us. To bring peace into everything, to the poor with bread and love and justice, into our cities with forgiveness and help to replace jails and anger, with the exchange of gifts between nations to replace war, not for any return, or for "security," or for the freedom to "continue profit-piling, but only in the search for life, this is the following of the innermost urge of the soul, that moon which moves the tides of our being to the sight of God.

On Pilgrimage

By Dorothy Day

Last month we went to press, July 27. The next day I took the train up to Maryknoll to visit the cloistered Sisters who have long been a very present help in time of trouble. Sister M. Theodore, Superior, greets you with folded hands as they do in the East and I wondered afterward if she had been there. It is funny, I go there to talk about the work, to beg prayers, and to be in the little chapel for Office and the Mass. And I forget to ask them questions about themselves even if our long and dear friendship would make it permissible. Sister Mary Irene (her name means peace) is one of those sturdy friends who cheerfully listens to one's troubles and one feels immediately helped by her prayers. It was a joy to see Sister M. Xavier, who used to head the social service department in Stockton, California, and who is responsible for several little houses of hospitality out there. Carroll McCool, who formerly headed St. Colette's house in Oakland, is now starting one in Stockton. Sister M. Xavier is going to South Carolina in the fall. It will be interesting to visit her there later on another pilgrimage. Sister Joan Marie who has a magnificent article on what is happening in China in a recent issue of The Catholic World visited with me too, and I felt very humble, thinking how she has been accounted worthy to suffer, what with her two years or so in a Chinese prison, her only food rice gruel, and solitary confinement her lot a good part of the time. She minimizes her heroism of course, but not the grace of God which enables one to live through such an experience.

Baptisms

My visit was just for the night and the day, because Friday we had two baptisms at our parish church in Staten Island, our dear Fr. McGrath churching the women and consecrating the infants to the Blessed Mother. It was perfect weather, one of a long series of hot days, perfect for vacationers, but miserable for farmers who were seeing their crops wither away. (Now as I write in mid August, the rain is pouring down, and the lean-to room I occupy at Peter Maurin Farm is like a house boat with a stream of water running under it. In the middle of one field there is a pond these last two weeks that is being constantly replenished.)

Fr. Lambert, Dominican from Ottawa who is studying Russian at Fordham spent a weekend with us and gave us a Sunday afternoon conference. Helen Iswolsky has been with us every week end and we hope will spend more time at the farm now that summer school is over. We are looking forward to a Sunday lecture on Turgeniev next month, at Peter Maurin Farm.

August 2-3 I visited my old friends Allen Tate and Caroline Gordon Tate at Princeton. Both are in Rome now, but when Allen comes back on his way to University of Minnesota where he is professor in the English Department, he promises us a talk at Chrystie Street. While at Princeton I was privileged to hear him read his poetry at the home of the head of the English Department there.

August 5, which was a Friday, members of the CW group had a poster walk, together with members of the War Resisters, and

Fellowship of Reconciliation, and A. J. Muste and I presented a letter to the Japanese people, on this the tenth anniversary of the dropping of the Atom Bomb on Hiroshima. That night Bishop Fernandez of India spoke at Chrystie Street and it was heart-warming to hear him speak of Gandhi with such love, even with tenderness, calling him Gandhiji as his followers did. Fr. Pinto was there too, and had the happiness of seeing and talking to a native Goan girl who is studying in this country and looks so American that one would not have believed her Indian. Both priests were unmistakably Indian in spite of their Portuguese names.

Fasting

Ammon Hennacy's fast began at four that afternoon, and he tried to keep a silence too, but it lasted only that one evening. He felt afterward that as a propagandist it was only courteous to answer people's questions as to what he was doing and why. This year his fast was for ten days since it was ten years ago that America dropped the atom bomb. His picketing was only for the week days, Monday to Friday and then the following Monday, and of those days two of them were rainy, so he did not picket.

August 6 and 7th, another weekend, brought us a Quaker Work camp of twelve young people who slept out in the field in tents and in their Volkswagen, and spent Saturday in cutting fence posts in the woods, and the weeds along the edges of the fields. We had good discussions Saturday night and Sunday morning, the latter in my room where we teased wool and carded it and tried to do some spinning.

After the work camp left on Sunday, Larry Doyle and his wife and children and Hans Furth and his two Madeleine's arrived and we had music and singing and talk and supper and it was a very full day indeed. (We need a piano tuner badly.)

August 8, Monday morning, I went into New York to picket with Ammon, or rather to help give out papers, and stayed from eleven to two. Robert Steed from Memphis, Tennessee, had arrived the Friday before and offered to be on the job all week to give out papers and to be on hand in case Ammon fainted on the way. I had been expressing great objections to the combination of picketing and fasting, feeling that Gandhi had emphasized rest (with bath and massage in his case) but as the week went on, I could see that walking slowly up and down was quieting to the nerves and was an aid to the continuing of the fast. The place of demonstration was in front of the customs house, which was in the shade, until later in the afternoon, and across the street was Battery Park with its drinking fountain and benches where Ammon could sit and rest for five minute intervals every hour. Rita Corbin painted Ammon's sign for him, and I was astonished to see that there was no mention of his fasting on the placard. The sign read of course that he was doing penance for the dropping of the bomb, but the people who passed might have felt it was the picketing that was the penance. Indeed for me any demonstration is a penance, feeling as I do that I'd rather be playing my

Peter Maurin Wrote:

AN INDIVIDUAL

FAITH

A stone is not an individual. You can make little ones out of big ones.

A tree is an individual.

It comes from a seed.

"Only God can make a tree," says the poet.

A horse is an individual.

The horse is not an individual the way a tree is an individual.

It has animal life.

Man is an individual and has animal life like the horse.

Man has also reason, which the horse has not.

A PERSON

As an animal, man is an individual. As a reasoning animal, man is a person.

The difference between an individual and a person is the power of reasoning.

Through the use of reason man becomes aware of the existence of God.

Through the use of reason man becomes aware of his rights as well as his responsibilities.

Man's rights and responsibilities come from God, who made him a reasoning animal.

Man's primary duty is to act according to reason.

role of grandmother than propagandist or journalist. But Ammon is a prophet, as Peter Maurin was a prophet, and as such is impelled to go out into the highways and byways to cry out against the gigantic evil of war. Peter had, and Ammon also has, a consciousness of a mission, which means 24 hours a day, eating and sleeping and talking Peace and Justice, and our personal responsibility to achieve a measure of these goods.

It was very still and cloudy on Tuesday and Wednesday, but by Thursday Hurricane Connie had brought us a reminder of the storm which was proclaiming the power of God further south along the coast, and there was no picketing, though the fasting went on.

Fr. Lorrigan

Friday night Fr. Lorrigan of New Zealand spent the evening with us, and spoke of his country and socialism and decentralism, telling us how New Zealand had led the way in the welfare state idea, and how it was incomparably easier to socialize than to de-socialize an economy. His point was that of Chesterton and Belloc, —small holdings, small cooperatives, credit unions, which would mean ownership by the ordinary run of men rather than by the few at the top.

Saturday, Dorothy Gauchat and I drove down to the island to spend Sunday, and part of Monday, which was our Lady's feast of the Assumption. The bay was very rough and all the drive down we saw evidences of uprooted trees and broken branches and in some cases wires down and roads cut off. There was no light on many a street for weeks after, and the traffic lights are still not working on many a crossing. We visited the Callanan's in their beach cottage which I envy them, and had lunch there.

Dorothy has six children of her own and two infants she is caring for on their farm, named for Our Lady of the Wayside, in Avon, (Continued on page 8)

To guide himself

man has not only reason but also faith.

Faith

is not opposed to reason, it is above reason.

The use of reason leads to faith,

but reason cannot understand all the faith.

The truths of faith that reason cannot understand,

we call the mysteries of faith.

To use reason is to philosophize

and philosophy is the handmaid of faith.

Some truths

we get through reason and some truths

we get through faith.

EMMANUEL MOUNIER

Emmanuel Mounier wrote a book entitled "A Personalist Manifesto."

Emmanuel Mounier has been influenced by Charles Peguy.

Charles Peguy once said "There are two things in the world:

politics and mysticism."

For Charles Peguy as well as Mounier, politics

is the struggle for power while mysticism

is the realism of the spirit.

For the man-of-the-street politics

is just politics and mysticism

is the right spirit.

In his "Personalist Manifesto"

Mounier tries to explain what the man-of-the-street

calls "the right spirit."

Teachers Needed

Bucare 18,
Punta Maria,
Puerto Rico,
July 28, 1955.

Dear Dorothy:

The situation in Puerto Rico has at last made Catholics wake up to the need of the lay apostolate. The Government of Puerto Rico is conducting a Birth-Control and Sterilization Program . . . with the money of the tax-payers of Puerto Rico who are Catholics in the immense majority . . . but unfortunately not as practical Catholics as they should be . . .

One of things the Catholic Church favors in regard to the Population Problem in Puerto Rico is migration to the U. S. And one of the things the people need who go to the U. S. is to know English.

We have a large concrete building on a 10 acre farm in Monacillos, Rio Piedras, on a main road, with public bus service, city water and electricity where we can conduct Community and Recreation Center activities. The teaching and practice of English is one of the great corporal works of mercy that we should offer to the laborers there. For that, we need people who can do it. Can you help us obtain people—men and women—with the apostolic qualities, good Catholics who could come to Puerto Rico? You are in the best position to help us. We can give them room and board. If they can teach in public and private schools, they could do so in Puerto Rico, thus earning a salary and help us at the Community and Recreation Center at night, on their free-time and holidays.

Please give us all your help.

Very truly yours,

Francisco Sein, Jr.,

Director, Centro Comunal y Recreativo de Monacillos

Catholic Spiritual Life

By Dom Virgil Michel, O.S.B.

Chapter from an unpublished manuscript.

(Continued from last issue)

3. RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE. Insofar as the liturgy addresses itself to and permeates the entire person with all his faculties, it should also be the prime basis for the religious experience of the member of Christ. We have heard much of religious experience in our generation, but it has been referred to mainly in terms of subjective individualism. The religious experience of the liturgy is always something more than subjectivism or individual or social emotionalism. It is always related to the Church as the wider Christ, and to the continuous indwelling and activity of Christ in his Church. Just here, however, the objection has been made that the collective nature of the liturgy precludes the proper development of the individual spiritual life, a matter we have already touched upon. "By no means," answers Abbot Herwegen. "A community above all presents the possibility and the assurance that the individual may develop and exercise himself completely. It supplies his shortcomings and enhances his good qualities. Every community is of greater value, the more the individuals constituting it are personalities . . . (The liturgy) is in its entire nature a collective prayer: We praise thee, we sanctify thee, we adore thee. And yet, it does not overlook the individual. In the sacraments it addresses itself to the individual soul with special solemnity. Each single person is presented to the representative of Christ for baptism. On each one does the bishop lay his hands. He tours his diocese without rest in order to get into personal touch with every soul entrusted to him, to impart the Holy Ghost to each soul and thus the full right to citizenship in the kingdom of Christ. In the eucharistic communion the Bread of heaven is given to each one individually. And particularly in the sacrament of Penance, we uncover the innermost secrets of our heart to him who takes the place of our Redeemer" (Lumen Christi, pp. 30 and 32).

The religious experience of the liturgy, more than any other, is calculated to enrich the individual for the sole reason that it brings him into such intimate real contact with Christ the true Way and Life. The liturgy begins and ends with Christ as the sole Mediator between God and man. The more fully the soul enters into the liturgical action the more intimately is it united with the fellowmembers of the mystical body, but only through the head Christ. The liturgical action is ever a sacrifice of oneself to God, the rendering of a proper homage to him. In its repeated participation there is an ever closer personal union affected with Christ, the consciousness of Christ grows in the soul. This is the ultimate reason for the increasing growth of the individual soul, despite the fact that it seems to give up its own individuality in entering into the collective action of the fellowship. Christ is indeed infinite in His being and life. Yet the union of the finite individual with the infinite Christ, while it is a sinking of self in Him, is not a destruction of self. Rather it is the losing of one's life in order to find it on a higher level. It is an ennobling of self, a sort of divinization of self, in which the best characteristics of the self are not destroyed but transformed into a higher supernatural richness of being. Liturgical action means the obliteration of self, it is true, but never the annihilation of self except in the sense just explained.

It is an obliteration that has as its effect the receiving of sevenfold in return. It is a happy exchange of gifts between God and man, in which by the very nature of the case man becomes infinitely enriched. All the members participating in the common action become thus enriched, each becomes a new man in Christ, and all are assimilated to one and the same transcendent Christ. And yet all the members thus ennobled, remain ever different among themselves, truer and higher individual personalities than before.

This widening of the spiritual horizon and expanse of the individual soul, lies one of the greatest fruits of intelligent participation in the liturgy. Our Christian spiritual life, insofar as it is influenced by individualism and subjectivism, is often strongly negative and cramped, owing to the atmosphere we have been imbued with from youth on. Even retreats and spiritual exercises are often conducted with supreme emphasis placed almost exclusively on the divine wrath and justice of God and the malice of man—a temperament that in its exclusiveness is Puritanical and Old Testament rather than Christian. The New Testament has given us the two great commandments of the love of God and of man, and as a basis the wonderful work of the Redeemer, thoroughly a work of divine love and mercy. This is the spirit of the Church, true interpre-



ter and continuer of Christ, and the spirit of the liturgy in particular. "That is the spirit of the liturgy," says a recent writer, "the spirit of love and mercy, the spirit of confidence and gratitude, the spirit of joy and peace. What fear and misery, oppression and threats, could never accomplish, is achieved by the immeasurable love of God. Therein lies its greatness. It is the characteristic of narrower minds to try to lead men purely through fear, threats, and restrictions. Larger minds aim to lead through elevation, love and freedom. And God our Lord is good and loving just because he is so great. Two things I have heard, that power belongeth to God, and mercy", Joseph Kramp, S.J., "Liturgie und religioses Leben, in Stimmen der Zeit, vol. 106, 1924, pp. 93-4). The liturgy knows of no obligation performed merely for obligations sake. In her pages the way of God's commandments is run with love and desire. There the anxious care over the personal affairs of self are pushed aside by a holy zeal for the things of God—there we find the principle of seeking first the kingdom of God eminently followed out in the domain of the spiritual itself.

There is no spiritual life without charity, the divine charity of God as shared in by man with the aid of God. The divine love of God for man is the explanation of all the wonderful things that God has done for man, and it must in turn be the impelling motive of all that man renders unto God in prayer and work. The liturgy is filled with the spirit of divine love, of God's love reaching down to man, and of man's steeping himself in this love

and living by it as an adopted child of God and a very sharer in the divine nature. And the personal participation in the liturgy is thus a growing experience of this love which unites God and man ever more intimately. This is the true religious experience that it is given to all to attain by the bounty of God, for it is offered to all by God—It is the living experience of the peace of God that is freely given to all men of good will in proportion to that same good will. Here the effect of the liturgy should be analogous to that of great literature, with the difference always kept in mind that gives the liturgy its transcendent being and value. As great literature gives one a personal experience, so to say, of the best culturally that man has ever achieved, so should the liturgy properly assimilated give one a personal experience of the best that has been spiritually achieved for man by none other than God himself. "Containing in itself the deposit of the best and profoundest experiences of God, embracing the words of the greatest and most intimate souls of prayer, the liturgy possesses prayers of the most enlightened conception of God as of the purest mental attitudes over against God. To pray liturgically means to dip into the living stream of the classical adorners of God, of the great wrestlers with God, and thereby to enable one's soul to become worthy in their manner of the graces of these prayers. Thus the one praying will gradually be freed from a narrow self-seeking and brought into spiritual fellowship with the living springs of the religious life" (Steffes, Religious-philosophie, pp. 258-9).

(To Be Concluded in Next Issue)

Appeal

July 1, 1953.

Dear Editor:

Today is the feast of the Precious Blood. Steeped in that blood I appeal to you to help me once again. The Catholic Worker one year and the Ensign the next, brought me wonderful aid and helped us begin and finish a building for the training college for teachers in South India. It was nothing short of a miracle, a million, billion thanks, dear editor and all contributors. You will wonder how this poor church mouse reached the wonderful land. God's ways are marvelous. He had His designs. Three of us are here in California on Dominican charity. The good Reverend Mother of San Raphael has offered us a scholarship and board and tuition. And you'll wonder who has paid my passage.

A Canadian friend asked for prayers for a special intention. I entrusted St. Joseph with my request and I was sure He would do it, and He did it perfectly well. This time, armed with prayers my friend visited the doctor and "no operation" was the verdict. The Rs 2000 she had carefully put by for her surgery was sent to me to come to America to have my bad sight attended to, and here I am, a corneal grafting of the right eye is over, and I can see. Eternal thanks to all helpers. You little know how far a goodly deed can go. You have cast your mite or your generous cheque, you have probably forgotten all about it, but we don't. So once again, I come to you to help me build my convent chapel, a little room 15 feet by 10 serves the purpose now. I beg you to give me something that you waste, something out of this week-end's recreational activity, a little kind thought for two minutes for my struggling superiors, her sisters, and her orphan poor. Send your mite to:

Revd. Mother Euphrasia
Christ The King Convent
Lakshipuram, Mysore
Mysore State, South India
SR. CELINE.

A Village Exhortation

By JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN
at the Village of Kalpa, Jahanbad

You see profound changes taking place around you in the world. The British Raj which you knew for many years has gone, so have the Maharajah. The zamindar who was with you till the other day has also gone now. Do you think the world will now remain as it is for eternity? Is there any reason why it should now stop changing? I can assure you it is not so. That is not the nature of the Universe, in which there is constant change. For one thing the landless will not let it rest as it is. Some people have too much land, while others have none. Land must and will be more justly redistributed. Further changes must come, one way or the other.

In Russia they came with violence, brutality, and murder. They have done no one any good. In Telingana a similar effort resulted in at least three thousand people being killed and millions of rupees worth of property being destroyed. The bigger revolution is to bring about change peacefully and through love. Let those with a lot of land give away the surplus, let the middle peasants give away a sixth part of their land, and let even the poor give just a tiny bit as a token of their participation. Certainly, let laws be passed to redistribute the land fairly. But what merit is there for the man who waits to be disposed by virtue of law? Does anyone remember his name or sing his praises? Do you need a law to be passed before you desist from theft? Of course not. Self-redemption cannot come from above or without. There is little difference between the sword and the law. Both are coercive . . .

"Bhoodan" (Bhoodan Yagna—land gift) is a great mass movement of conversion and the creation of a new climate of thought and values of life. It brings about a living and immediate revolution in the minds of men and their mutual relationships. It attacks and corrects here and now the system of exploitation and inequality. It teaches men to share what they have with their fellowmen.

This revolutionary process could have been started in any other sphere than the agrarian. But this field was taken first because land is a primary source of production; the land problem is a most urgent one; it affects the vast majority of our rural country. But above all because it was possible through the medium of land to put across the new economic idea and the new social ethics much easier than through the medium of any other kind of property. What Bhoodan says about land is, according to Gandhiji, true of all our possessions, including even know-how and skill. All wealth is a social product and no earning is possible without social cooperation. Whatever we possess, therefore, belongs to society. We are no more than the trustees of what we have, im-

plicitly charged by society to take good care of our trust and use it for the benefit, not of ourselves, but of all our fellow men. But whereas in the agrarian sphere the idea that land, being a gift of nature, belongs to the community is easily accepted, in the commercial, industrial, or professional field, the corresponding idea would be difficult of general acceptance. But when Bhoodan has sown the seeds of this idea in five lakhs (a lakh is 100,000) of our villages and persuaded lakhs of land-owners to accept it in practice, even if partially, a psychological climate will have been created for the idea to take root and grow in other fields also.

Bhoodan does not aim at capturing the State in order to use it for its ends. As a corollary, it does not wish to create or become a political party in order to capture the State. It aims rather at persuading the people, independently of what the State may or may not want, to carry out a revolution in their own lives, and through that a revolution in society. It aims further at creating those conditions in which the people may manage their affairs directly, without the intermediation of parties and parliaments. Gandhism, like anarchism or communism, visualises ultimately a Stateless society. In the present world the State not only in its totalitarian form but also in its welfare variety is assuming larger and larger powers and responsibilities. The welfare State, in the name of welfare threatens as much to enslave man to the State as does the totalitarian State. The people must cry halt to this creeping paralysis. The fact that the welfare State is a creature of the people, in the sense that it is set up by them, does not affect the matter. The device of democratic elections cannot equate 500 representatives with eighteen crores (one crore is 100 lakhs)—counting only the adults of the people. To the extent that the eighteen crores look after their affairs directly, to that extent the powers and functions of the State are restricted and real democracy is practiced.

The response of Bodh Gaya has been wonderful. But it is not enough. The work to be done is stupendous. Not less than 50 million acres of land have to be collected. The donated lands have to be distributed. The landless have to be provided with the means of utilization. In the villages where Bhoodan has succeeded, a new order has to be created. Gram Rajva (village rule in 500,000 villages), Sampati-Dan (gifts of wealth) in the towns and cities, ultimately transformation of capitalism into trusteeship. And many other things.

From FREEDOM, London,
July 16, 1953

Editors Note. Jayaprakash Narayan was formerly the head of the Socialist Party of India and for some years now is associated with Vinoba Bhave in this very opposite plan to state law, that of Land through Love. His thought comes to us especially pertinent because of the discussion of anarchism by Ludlow, Hennacy, Amdur and Pleasants in the C. W.

Missouri

Dear Dorothy,

Monday and a holy day. I thought I would write to you and talk about the atom test trouble and the impressions I picked up along the way. I've talked to a few people about it and found that most of them had no real understanding as to the why of the thing. They read your article but said in effect, why all the fuss. A few thought you had made a mistake, others felt the government had no right to interfere with you but they too didn't seem to think it made much difference either way. Ruth Ann felt this was anarchism to an extreme and that all the government wanted to do was prevent future loss of life. Some intimated that you were an opportunist and that this provided a splendid opportunity to get a point across. Jack Woltjen.

Ade Bethune's
1956 WHEEL CALENDAR
will help you adjust your
missal to the new simplified
Church year.
Ea. \$1.00
Christmas Cards
Box A: 25—\$2.00
Box B: 10—\$1.00
(Please include 25c. postage
on each order)
ST. LEO SHOP
Newport, R. I.
Ask for Our Free Catalogue

Obedience and Authority

(Continued from page 3)

so easy to see, and it will be impossible to see if we look for something resembling ecclesiastical or monastic obedience. On this point of civic obedience, St. Thomas' language is not clear because he continues to talk in terms of a superior-inferior relationship. One of his modern disciples, however, Yves Simon, drawing from Thomas' basic principles, has made the essential function of authority (and obedience) brilliantly clear (*The Nature and Functions of Authority*).

In St. Thomas' view, the special role of authority and obedience in the religious life is educational, like its role in the family or the school. By obedience, the student of perfection learns not only obedience but other virtues as well. In this case, the superior is substituting his judgment for that of his subject until such time as the subject develops himself enough to follow his own judgment.

But this substitutional role is not the essential function of authority, nor even the only role of authority in the religious life. The essential function of authority, as Simon's book makes clear, is to enable people to do something together despite the fact that they do not agree unanimously on the way to do it. The real need for authority among mature men arises not from their wickedness or stupidity, but just from the nature of prudential judgments.

Common Action

When it comes to practical decisions about future actions in a field like politics, two men who both have good will and good sense can still come up with two different conclusions. So they decide in advance on how to make one judgment prevail. Such authority comes from God not in the sense that He made one man better, smarter than the other, but in the sense that some of the things He made necessary for man can be achieved only by common action, and common action in practical affairs demands authority.

It would be highly dangerous to see civil authority in terms of a superior-inferior relationship, a sort of "Father knows best" affair, or an Orwellian "Big Brother" situation. We can see how important the myth of omniscience is for the survival of dictatorship when we recall the efforts of Hitler and Stalin to establish just such myths about themselves.

It would be another great danger to view civil obedience as a way for us to escape having to think about practical community affairs, so that we would be free to think about higher things. The layman can rarely assume, as a religious does, that he has put the control of his environment in good hands and can therefore forget about it. For the religious, there is the rule and the centuries-old history of his order to justify his trusting himself to it. For the layman, there is the centuries-old history of government to justify his keeping an active watch over it.

Yet there is, as Dostoyevsky portrayed with striking insight in the Legend of the Grand Inquisitor, a frightening desire of many men to place their consciences in some one else's keeping. If that kind of servility is an evil, it does not follow that all civic obedience is an evil, albeit a necessary one. If there is a real common good, a good necessary for man's devel-

opment which he cannot achieve alone, then common action is the will of God. And if common action demands an agreement of prudence which can only rarely be achieved without authority, then some authority is the will of God. If it is an expression of God's will, then it is not a necessary evil, but a good.

Authority would be unnecessary if man were divine; so would be eating and drinking. Eating and drinking may be a nuisance, especially for the cook, but we don't call them evil. If our goal in life is really to follow God's will, then legitimate authority is something to be welcomed as a good, rather than something to be chafed at as a necessary evil. It is true that the prudential judgment which a group follows may be a lesser good in the abstract than some judgment of mine which the group rejects, but the former judgment is a greater good from the standpoint of effectiveness, just because it is the one which the group follows.

Coercion

The question of coercion is a totally different question. Coercion is one of the possible ways by which authority can achieve unity in common action. There is a whole descending scale of anarchisms. We can reject coercion as an instrument of authority. We can reject authority as an instrument of common action. We can reject common action as an instrument of the common good. We can reject the idea of a common good, or the idea that what is presented to us as a common good is necessarily so.

The possibility of getting along without coercion is a practical question whose possibilities are far from being fully explored. The non-violent achievements of Gandhi are sufficient proof that the question needs further investigation by Christians. For me, the greatest difficulty arises from the fact that God Himself uses the coercion of fear to get men started on the road to perfection. Surely He knows human nature better than we do. But it is not for us to set arbitrary limits to the power of persuasion. Those of us who have maintained Houses of Hospitality know how astonishingly effective persuasion can be even in the most unlikely situations.

The possibility of getting along without authority in common action is not for me an open question. The way by which a man reaches a prudential judgment in a complex practical situation is such a highly individualized process of mind and will that I cannot imagine any wide unanimity of prudential judgments save by some one's giving in, perhaps unconsciously, to some one else's judgment. I do not pretend to have proved that point here, but I do recommend Simon's small book to all who are interested in *"The Nature and Functions of Authority."*

When we come to the possibility of getting along without common action, or at least large-scale common action, we are coming to some very active roles of anarchism. The most effective way to cut down both coercion and authority is to reduce the need for large-scale common action. For small groups, consensus and persuasion may be quite adequate to achieve unity of action. The tendency, however, of both modern industry and the modern state is to make the elementary needs of men dependent on

vast economic and political communities.

Given this total dependence on large communities, we cannot deny to some competent authority, if there is any, the right order these vast organizations for the good of all. *De facto*, such things as social security and a more corporative structure of society are a real common good. The relevance of the social encyclicals and of what is called the "liberal" Catholic viewpoint stems from the fact that for most of our contemporaries the chance of a decent human existence depends on the common action of a very large system.

Intrusion Of State

But we do not have to accept the premise. A man does not have to be dependent on a sprawling economic system, monitored by a bureaucratic state, to provide him the necessities of daily life. It does not necessarily require the unified efforts of millions to assure a loaf of bread on my table, a roof over my head, a shirt on my back. To the extent that we have made it possible for some people to satisfy their needs outside the system, we have a right to protest the steady intrusion of state authority into more and more economic and social life. To the extent that we have failed to free men from the prevailing situation, we must accept the *de facto* necessity of the system and its authority. What is irresponsible is to accept the premise of dependence on a vast complex system, and refuse the conclusion of an authority competent to direct it to a human end.

St. Joseph's House (Chrystie St.)

I'd like to call this just Chrystie Street, but our readers might jump to the conclusion that Tom Sullivan is back from the Trappists. Yesterday we received a letter from Jack English (Brother Charles) who is also at Our Lady of the Holy Ghost Monastery at Conyers, Ga. and all is well on that prayer front. So it is up to someone to write of the goings on around Chrystie Street. To begin with the front of the house—the rain, I notice, has washed the bricks on one side to a pale pink. Grass is growing along the edges of the fenced-in lot next door which has become a parking lot, the old theater on the corner has put up a heavy "riot fence" as they used to be called during industrial strikes, so that the men that make up the Catholic Worker breadline cannot make a jungle of either the lot or the space under the fire escapes which are roofed with corrugated sheet iron. Many were the little camp fires burning there at night, close against the building, many were the men sleeping against the side of the building. Now they seek darker corners, more sheltered doorways.

Larry the painter continues to keep us shipshape and the doors and window trim on the first floors are painted. Inside the house, we have replaced the old linoleum on the first two floors. Pete and Roger were given the good heavy floor covering by the Sisters at St. Rose's Cancer Home, and one of our guests who is from the west coast spent days in putting it down. Larry the cook continues in the kitchen through the hottest of the Summer, and Marty and Roy over the dish pans. The sink is rusting out and springing new leaks daily and we sadly need to replace them. Jack English purchased them when we moved here five years ago. We'll get him to pray for money for a new one.

Bread keeps coming in from the Divine Providence temporary shelter for children, and Al Gullion, who does all the driving now, picks it up daily. But the food bill has mounted perilously. Tony de Falco called up this morning. He has the corner grocery at Hester and Mott Streets and we have traded with him and his family since 1936. He always has let us charge our groceries and comparing prices, he's been as reasonable as most wholesalers.

Fr. Ude's Seven Points

WE CHRISTIANS REFUSE MILITARY SERVICE ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS:

1. No individual man, likewise no government, no state, may force its citizens to the transgression of divine commandments. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is the great divine commandment that binds all men without distinction and therefore even the bearers of political authority—to which Christ expressly conjoined the commandments "Love your enemies" and "Thou shalt not kill" since "All who take the sword shall perish by the sword."

2. A convinced Christian must therefore be a conscientious objector, since the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" holds without exception. We therefore repudiate as immoral every statute that would force us to compulsory military service, and refuse obedience to it. "We ought to obey God rather than men."

3. Since the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" holds without exception, militarism in general is condemned *a priori* as offending against God's commandments. Therefore any further discussion of armament, ABC-weapons, or war is superfluous.

4. With Pope Leo XIII we repudiate compulsory military service as an "assault on the autonomy of the moral personality," and with Archbishop Langenieux of Reims we brand it as "godless in prin-

ciple and destructive of freedom of conscience."

5. As free democrats we demand that the people in general must be given the opportunity to decide for itself by free election whether it agrees to rearmament and statutory compulsory military service or not. We will not let either communist or capitalist interests use us for cannon fodder.

6. We are thus for "unarmed neutrality," and flatly repudiate "armed neutrality"—as offending against God's commandments. It is not the "policy of the stronger" through rearmament that is a true realistic policy, but he pursues a true realistic policy who makes up his mind to direct his whole private life and his whole social life in the sense of the ten commandments of God and the demands of the Gospel of Christ.

7. In professing that the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" holds without exception, we repudiate not only compulsory defensive service in arms but also all other works and material contributions that serve armament and war. We wish to live in peace and we wish to put our life and all our possessions and goods to the service of peaceful construction.

—Published in the *Obersteirische Zeitung*, June 14, 1955.

FREEDOM OF PRESS

Emanuel Redfield, counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union, successfully secured the reversal of the lower courts on my conviction for selling the CW and my Autobiography on the streets of New York City, when the Court of Appeals in Albany on June 9th handed down a unanimous decision. The Associated Press had erroneously reported that the decision of the court had been for my conviction, but the papers the next day gave the correct information.

Mr. Redfield in his report to the ACLU said, "The Court of Appeals held that there was no proof by the People that Hennacy was engaged in a commercial venture, and therefore no license was required. The case also stands for the principle that the burden is on the People to prove that he was operating as a business and is not for the peddler to prove, negatively, that he was not so engaged."

Last Sunday at St. Patrick's a gruff policeman wanted to know if I had a license to sell the CW. I replied that I did not need a license. He then wondered if the CW was approved by the Church. I told him that it was a lay paper and did not need official approval and that some of the hierarchy favored us and some did not. Just then Carol Perry came over from the corner where she was selling CW's and the cop wanted to know who she was. Meanwhile I had found the clipping in my pocket from the N. Y. POST and gave it to him to read. He perused it solemnly and as he turned away said, "That's good enough for me." It was fortunate that I had been down to the Tombs the Friday before and had recovered this clipping which had been taken away along with everything else in my pockets when we were all arrested for refusal to take part in the air raid drill. In the future it will be well for those selling CW's to have such a clipping in order to keep out of jail. For while this establishes freedom in the state of New York it does not mean anything to those police who keep on with the old method of "move on" when they see us selling CW's.

A. H.

PLEASE

A friend requests the Feb. 1952 issue of the CATHOLIC WORKER. We, too, need this issue for our files if any of our readers have a copy to spare.

THE COMMONWEAL

A Catholic weekly magazine which deals directly with the issues of the day and attempts positive, concrete suggestions. Competent evaluations of current books, plays and movies.

15 Issues for \$2

For New Subscribers

THE COMMONWEAL
386 Fourth Ave.
New York 16, N. Y.

30th ANNIVERSARY YEAR

(Continued on page 8)

The "Right-To-Work" Laws

By E. J. Egan

There has recently been given wide circulation and considerable notoriety in the Catholic press a commentary on "right-to-work" laws by the well-known moral theologian Monsignor Francis Connell, C.S.S.R., Dean of The School of Sacred Theology at the Catholic University of America.

Monsignor Connell, it seems, has taken exception to the general tendency among Catholic social writers (such as Msgr. George Higgins, Rev. Louis Twomey, S.J., Archbishop Rummel of Louisiana, Rev. William Kelly, O.M.I.) to condemn more or less out of hand the "right-to-work" laws as opposed to Christian social teaching. Monsignor Connell's basic objection is that the "right-to-work" laws do not deal directly with a matter of moral principle, but rather are in the order of means to social justice, means the character and propriety of which Catholics are free to judge for themselves. His argument goes on to elucidate further the distinction between the principles of social justice and the means of achieving them, and stresses that only the principles themselves must be held inviolate by Catholics.

Thus, obviously, "right-to-work" laws, labor union solidarity, union security, and other such pertinent concepts are considered as possible means toward a just recompense to the worker, means which are in the area of the debatable. Thus regarding "right-to-work" laws, Msgr. Connell states:

"... If other Catholics believe that 'right-to-work' laws do not produce evil results but rather help to adjust industrial and economic conditions, they are fully free to uphold such legislation as their own view without opposing any Catholic principle."

And then regarding his own position:

"I, myself, am not sufficiently familiar with all the industrial conditions to entitle me to favor definitely either side."

Now the implications of these remarks are interesting. First, regarding his distinction between principles and means, what Msgr. Connell has done is to give a careful solemnization of the obvious, which, despite its irrelevance, gives

apparent weight to his general argument of neutrality in the face of "right-to-work" laws. It is of course true that the only absolute in the field of social justice under consideration is the demand that the worker have an equitable share of the goods gained through production. However, certain logically relative means to that end are generally taken as practical absolutes with reference to prevailing circumstances; thus the axiom of the moral necessity of payment of a just wage.

Immediately and obviously upon this necessity follow whatever legal and organizational formalizations are indispensable to the achievement of the just wage—and it is here that Msgr. Connell's position shows its weakness. For what he has done is to confuse distinctions in such a way as to render them meaningless.

First of all, there is the matter of what a Catholic is free to maintain, as distinguished from what may quite obviously be the true Catholic position in a given case. Insofar as Msgr. Connell's comment is taken to defend the right of the individual Catholic to maintain an interpretation of principle in the absence of a clear magisterial directive to the contrary, we can have no argument with him. It ought to be noted, however, that no one has questioned this rather fundamental point, and its introduction into a discussion of the morality of "right-to-work" laws can be misleading. The question of the right to maintain a position (relative to dogma or magisterium), and the question of the validity of the position itself, are quite distinct matters, and must be kept so.

The next matter which ought to be considered regarding Msgr. Connell's comments is that of what precisely constitutes a "Catholic social principle." Father Connell accepts the "just wage" and a apparently accepts the right of the workingman to organize, as basic, and yet cannot "favor definitely either side" in the discussion of "right-to-work" laws.

It always seems strange when someone insists that of course the candle must be lit, and then cannot decide as to whether or not he favors striking the match to light it. As long as a number of events

needed to produce a good effect encompass in the series no immorality, then to endorse the effect and not the necessary means to it, is either dishonest or unenlightened. In the case under consideration, the effect desired is the achievement of an equitable recompense for the worker. This takes the form in our society of the just and regular wage, which however is not always readily forthcoming from those in the position to pay it. Thus there are required means with which the worker may compel the employer to pay him, and this means is of course an organization of the workers into a position of bargaining strength. Now if this organization is to fulfill its purpose, certain safeguards have been found necessary to preserve its power, a power which fundamentally resides in the ability of the union to apply economic and social pressure by way of the strike, which in its turn cannot be effective without solidarity of action among the workers.

It is of course obvious that such solidarity is impossible if the union comprises only a portion of the workers in an industry, and thus that any law which denies the union the right to enforce solidarity, renders the union to a large degree powerless. And the "right-to-work" law is just such a device. Despite its misleading designation, it certainly gives no one a guarantee of a job, but rather, makes illegal the union shop, thereby insuring the right of entry of non-unionized workers into an industry, and striking at the heart of union effectiveness.

When we look at this situation we cannot but wonder how anyone can hold that such laws are not opposed to Christian social ethics. For it makes no difference where the "principle" is set, be it a wage, organization, or that which makes the organization possible; for all of these are interdependent.

What then can Msgr. Connell mean, and what lies at the basis of his apparently impossible position? I think that it may be found in the fact that Msgr. Connell argues from social ethics the structure of which is basically individualist rather than communal, and which derives from the very unenlightened social ethic of Aristotle. In this view, the concept of "legal and distributive justice" is stressed, according to which an individual must render proportionate payment for goods or benefits received. This notion applied to the labor union question evades the properly social character of the individual's obligation; by which he is bound to join a union in view of the common good of the workers. And in the place of this concept of solidarity there is raised an ideal of payment for benefits received, an ideal which Msgr. Connell states most impressively:

"It should be said . . . that if a man benefits by a union, he is bound to return some benefit to his fellow workers—but not necessarily by joining the union. He might do his share toward benefiting them by setting a high example of a conscientious, diligent worker, or by visiting his fellow workers in their sickness, or by working as a St. Vincent de Paul member for their benefit."

Now this was actually written in our time, and I think bears out more effectively than any and all contrary argument the essential error in the school of social thought which the author represents. It is a mentality which forgets certain fundamental truths concerning man; such as the fact that his cooperation toward the common good of the societies in which he finds himself is not primarily determined by any debt to the society, but by the social nature which is within himself as a human being. It is a happy fact that this concept of social responsibility, through the work of Maritain and others, has come into general acceptance in the Church at the present time. The individualist ethic of the Nineteenth Century has been eclipsed, and when we hear it voiced today it is as an echo; increasingly faint and increasingly solitary.

Anarchism and Leo XIII

(Continued from page 3)

natural and necessary principle . . . those who may be placed over the State may in certain cases be chosen by the multitude . . . by this choice, in truth, the ruler is designated, but the rights of ruling are not thereby conferred "because" no man has in himself or of himself the power of constraining the free will of others by fetters of authority of this kind . . . they who resist State authority resist the divine will; they who refuse to honor rulers refuse it to God Himself." Now it was in this sense of Pope Leo's that I wrote of selection of a government by the majority and which Ammon mistook for Rousseauism.

Early Christians

It is commonly asserted by religious anarchists that they are akin to the early Christians. That the early Christians were indeed opposed to the State as such. Such a contention not only is devoid of historical justification but is expressly rejected by Pope Leo who in the same encyclical as last quoted says "The Christians of old . . . when they were harassed in a very unjust and cruel way by pagan emperors, they nevertheless at no time omitted to conduct themselves obediently and submissively . . . even under these circumstances, they were far from doing anything seditious or despising the imperial majesty that they took it on themselves only to profess themselves Christians and declare that they would not in any

way alter their faith." So that they died for the Faith not for any reasons of anarchism.

"Anything less than the Sermon on the Mount is not worth bothering about." There are always those who feel this way and the saints who did so became religious or, if in the world, practised this in their lives. They did not however make the mistake of transferring this to the sociological field where it, so long as reality is what it is, can not be made the basis of society. I am aware that this sounds as impious as the Grand Inquisitor in the Brother's Karamazov. And that is just the point. Dostoyevski had the Grand Inquisitor symbolize the Roman Church. And he does. For the Grand Inquisitor is really Christ who "had compassion on the multitudes"—the Christ of Dostoyevski is a false, misleading and cruel figure who would place on the multitudes a burden they are unable to bear. He would make counsels into precepts. Similarly anarchism, as a social ideal, is worthless. For it cannot be socially realized.

In all this I dislike hitting anyone over the head with papal encyclicals for that method has been used against me too. But it was unavoidable here because the issue at stake was—Is individualist anarchism compatible with Catholic teaching? In my contention that it is not, I could naturally look to no more authoritative presentation of the Catholic position than that emanating from the Holy See.

St. Joseph's House

(Continued from page 7)

tors come in from all parts of the country and from the world, and the people of the household drift in and out of the office which makes it hard to concentrate. The tradition is that the downstairs of the house is business and people must be quiet to concentrate. But here, we are only typing letters or stories, or visiting, so there is chatter and comings and goings not only from outsiders but from insiders.

Old Joe Davin was not happy on Welfare Island and now he is home again. He thought he would like it having worked there once, but he was lonely and now he is home again in the bosom of the family with everyone dropping in and out and offering him cold drinks, hot drinks, meals and between meal snacks. Surely there is a deep significance in that phrase, "they knew Him in the breaking of bread." When people share food together they are communing, they are comforting one another. That's why our grocery bills are so high, there is so much of it done around here.

When I was a little girl my mother used to impress on us all that it was a terrible thing to

hint. I remember one occasion especially of a visit we paid and I kept hinting that I liked the doll my little friend had. I got it when I got home, but not the doll.

Tom Cain helps in the file room, and translates Fr. Ude for us, and letters beautiful little mottoes to decorate the house. I have one on my desk, "Unto old age and grey hairs O Lord, forsake me not." He just came in and said that we had a cricket in the back yard! We have two privet hedges transplanted from the Hennessy acres a few years ago, and one vine of ivy, and that represents the vegetable kingdom. We have plenty of cats, and one black dog. And now a cricket praising God out there. A cheerful note.

During the summer we received three statues of St. Joseph, all of them works of art, which surely should be a sign that our good friend is watching over us. St. Teresa of Avila said that she never asked anything of St. Joseph that it was not granted. So we ask him to impel you to help. Paying grocery bills is casting bread on the waters. It will return a hundred fold.

DOROTHY DAY.

On Pilgrimage

(Continued from page 5)

Ohio. The House of Hospitality has closed in Cleveland, and now the farm has become a hospice too, and since Bill Gauchat, who represents the CW in Cleveland, works every day, the farming has become gardening for fruits and vegetables. Tamar was delighted to see Dorothy (they had both been apprentices of Ade Bethune at Newport) and they talked arts and crafts and homes and babies together, joined on Sunday by Jack and Colette Connor and their children. Sunday afternoons are always busy.

August 14th, and we have as guests two seminarians who are helping Jim Finn and the rest of the household prepare for a day of recollection Sunday, with Fr. Meyer, Maryknoller. Beth Rogers has two of her nephews with her, and with Paul Yamamoto and Angelo and Joey and Beatrice Scarpulli, there is a din of children. The two babies, Clare and Dylan occasionally lift their voices too. Yesterday with Becky, Susie, Eric, Nickie, Mary, Margaret and Martha also visiting at the farm, Tamar and I ran off to the library and to shop for Susie's birthday which is on the feast of St. Louis. Tamar only gets to go shopping one day a month, what with seven children, so she thoroughly enjoys those days. Yesterday it was paint, and new shoes, and money orders at the post office to pay bills and Louisa M. Alcott at the library and a wonderful book on New England handicrafts.

Handicrafts

What with washing wool, carding, spinning, weaving, knitting, afghans, hooked rugs, a small printing press, bakery, we begin to

have some crafts. We are always beginning. Our trouble is that we are also running a house of hospitality, a farm, an inn by the side of the road. We do this handwork for our own recreation and relaxation and joy, achieving some sense of the beauty of God's creation, the beauty of work, the rhythm of life which overflows in work of hand and brain. All work is repetitive and in a way monotonous but by that very fact may also be soothing and relaxing.

Labor Day Weekend

And now we are looking forward to our labor day weekend which will go off well if we have decent weather but which will be hard indeed if this constant rain keeps up. However, crowded conditions never seem to hinder discussion, though it may hinder work, and it is always more fun to be doing some work in between discussions whether it is work in the garden, the woods, or the house. We are going to turn the dining room and bakery, as well as every corner of the barn, into sleeping quarters, and people will camp out on mattresses. Morning discussions will be in the grove of trees or woodlot in the morning, and in the house in the afternoon when house work is done for the day. Our speakers will include Helene Isvolsky, Martin Corbin, Edmund Egan, Ammon Hennacy, and if Robert Ludlow is not paying his annual visit to the Whalens out at Easthampton, maybe he can be induced to come to speak too.

After Labor day, September 14, there will come the trial for our civil disobedience in City Hall park June 15. And who knows what will come of that?

In the Market Place

(Continued from page 2)

beginning of the century when there was a Peace Conference called, by of all people, the despotic Czar of Russia, that Tolstoy was asked to attend. Instead he sent a message and told them that if they wanted peace they would have to give up the things that made for war: imperialism and exploitation. Peace was not to come from those who make war anymore than you could expect a butcher to put a vegetarian sign in his window. They did not want peace so we had World War I. At its end in Paris Clemenceau said to the assembled diplomats, "Do you want peace? Then England must give up India, we must give up Indo-China and North Africa, the U. S. must give up Puerto Rico, the Philippines." Looking around there was a grim

silence. No one was willing to give up anything. "Then we will have war," was Clemenceau's answer. And we did in World War II.

Ours is now a war economy, increasingly so. From 1929 to 1941 we spent 9½ billions getting ready for war. Then in World War II we spent 233 billions, and since that time in our cold war we have spent 349 billions. Without this war economy neither the Republican or Democratic administrations could stay in power, for we would have a depression. And instead of working for peace the unions agree with the bosses to raise wages, raise prices and support war. So no matter how much peace talk is in the air the fact is that we nearly all support atomic warfare with our taxes, our work, our investments, and those of us who are not anarchists, by our votes.

GRAIL RESIDENT ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM. September 23, 1955 to May 20, 1956. Residential courses for the young Catholic student or working girl. Geared towards living a more meaningful Christian life, contributing to the lay apostolate in the Church today. Contact Miss Anne Mulkeen, The Grail Center, 4520 Chester Avenue, Philadelphia 43, Pa. (EVERgreen 2-5873)