

CATHOLIC WORKER



Vol. XIV. No. 13

April, 1948

Subscriptions:
25c Per Year

Price 1c

EASY ESSAY

By JACQUES MARITAIN

(A free translation by P. Maurin from a chapter in the untranslated volume of Maritain—The Temporal Regime and Liberty.)

1. GOING TO THE ROOTS

In trying to bring the spirit of the Gospel, the spirit of integral humanism into the cultural and temporal order, people fail to realize the absolute necessity of going to the roots.

2. THE TWO ORDERS

1. It is not a question of changing the system; it is a question of changing the man who makes the system.
2. It is not the temporal that creates the spiritual, it is the spiritual that creates temporal environment.

3. TRUE RADICALISM

1. There is no social revolution without a spiritual revolution.
2. The trouble with radicals is not that they are too radical but not radical enough.
3. External radicalism is not radical enough because it is external.
4. Inner radicalism is true radicalism.

4. A RADICAL CHANGE

1. That there must be a change and a radical change is realized today not only by radicals, but by most conservatives.
2. And the change will come not from the masses, but from a few individuals that will make up their minds to give up old habits and start to contract new habits.

5. NO COMPLETE FAILURE

1. This radical change will not be a perfect change.
2. While it will not be a perfect change, it will be a change in the right direction.
3. While it may fail it will not be a complete failure, for it will be precedent for future generations.

6. ENGAGED AND DETACHED

1. A radical change requires human personalities, devoted to the cause, thinking about the cause, not the success of the cause.
2. It requires detached personalities, not indifferent personalities, not self-seeking personalities, engaged and detached, not engaged and attached.

7. BETRAYING CHRISTIANITY

1. To be detached from visible success makes a life of action a crucified life.
2. But to be engaged in Christian reconstruction and not to do it in a Christian manner would misrepresent it for the sake of making it prevail.
3. To so misrepresent it would be the most treacherous way to betray Christianity.

8. PURE MEANS

1. People trying to bring about a Christian reconstruction of the social order, must be made aware of the great temptation to use unchristian means.
- (Continued on page 12)

A CELL OF CHRISTIAN LIVING

When I consider how we Christians exhibit our Christianity—making it appear that there's not a ha'porth of difference between Christians and anyone else—neither in our daily life and behaviour nor in our political and economic theory—when I consider this, I say, I don't see how we can expect to convert the world. Perhaps we don't expect to; we are quite comfortable with our accustomed manners and customs.

Communism started as a movement to overthrow capitalism. It is now, it appears, an equally bloody tyranny. I think the Christians have none but themselves to blame. So it is in many affairs. By our lukewarmness and complacency and blindness we have betrayed our own cause. I think we've got to learn our Christianity again. I think we have succumbed to the prevailing and all-pervading poison of material progress. We think we can get riches and plenty by political and scientific and mechanical trickery. Trickery, that's what it comes to. Press the button and the figure works. They call it the application of science to industry. It's not. It's the application of science to money-making. And the Christians haven't seen through it. No, they think it's "jolly fine" and that working men ought to be grateful for the higher standard of living and the lower standard of muscular effort.

Well, the point here is not social reform or the rottenness of capitalist culture. The point is that the whole world has got it firmly fixed in its head that the object of working is to obtain as large an amount of material goods as possible, and that with the increased application of science and the increased use of machinery that amount will be very large indeed, while at the same time the amount of necessary labor will become less and less, until machines being minded by machines, it will be almost none at all. And the point is that this frame of mind is radically un-Christian and anti-Christian. And the point of that is that it is therefore contrary to Nature and contrary to God—as anti-God as any atheist could wish. And that, no doubt, is why our Eng-

lish industrialism is so popular among Russian Communists.

The alternative is the Cross. That's the awful fact. And it's not simply a matter of ethical behaviour, as who should say: "take up your cross and follow me." It's also a matter of intelligent behavior, as who should say, "thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee." Man is made for happiness, not for wealth, and the two are entirely independent of one another and

even inimical. A moderate amount of physical health and material wealth is necessary to man, that he may maintain his life. Of course! But even so it is better to give than to receive and therefore better to be given than to take. The whole of our trouble is the secularization of our life, so that we have descended to animal conditions of continual struggle for material goods. By sin—sin, that is to say, self-will and self-worship—by sin man does not descend from the superhuman to the merely human, but from the superhuman to the sub-human. Strange fact! Man cannot live on the human plane; he must be either above or below it. The marvellous feats of our mechanized "scientific" industrial world are not human feats. They are no more than the feats of highly intelligent animals and the more we perfect our mechanization so much the more nearly do we approach the impersonal life of bees or ants.

And if I might attempt to state in one paragraph the work which I have chiefly tried to do in my life it is this: to make a cell of good living in the chaos of our world. Lettering, type-designing, engraving, stone-carving, drawing—these things are all very well, they are means to the service of God and of our fellows and therefore to the earning of a living, and I have earned my living by them. But what I hope above all things is that I have done something towards reintegrating bed and board, the small farm and the workshop, the home and the school, earth and heaven.

The thing about Christianity, the thing about the Cross, about Calvary, is that it is true to man. Man, not that creature, that biped known to Science—measured as to his dimensions, his comparative dimensions, for there are no others; dissected as to his physiology; analysed as to his psyche—but man, the person known to himself and to God, the creature who knows and wills and loves, master of his acts (however much he be hindered by and subject to heredity and circumstances), therefore responsible. That is the creature who desires happiness and by the very nature of things, by his own nature, cannot find it except in God. That is why death is the gate of life.

—From Eric Gill: *Autobiography* (New York: The Devin-Adair Co.)



ON Pilgrimage

Whenever I groan within myself and think how hard it is to keep writing about love in these times of tension and strife which may at any moment become for us all a time of terror, I think to myself, "What else is the world interested in? What else do we all want, each one of us, except to love and be loved, in our families, in our work, in all our relationships. God is Love. Love casts out fear. Even the most ardent revolutionist, seeking to change the world, to overturn the tables of the money changers, is trying to make a world where it is easier for people to love, to stand in that relationship with each other of love. We want with all our hearts to love, to be loved. And not just in the family but to look upon all as our mothers, sisters, brothers, children. It is when we love the most intensely and most humanly, that we can recognize how tepid is our love for others. The keenness and intensity of love brings with it suffering, of course, but joy too because it is a foretaste of heaven. I often think in relation to my love for little Beckie, Susie and Eric: "That is the way I must love every child and want to serve them, cherish them and protect them." Even that relationship which is set off from other loves by that slight change in phraseology (instead of "Loving," one is "in love") the very change in terminology, denoting a living in love, a dwelling in love at all times, being bathed in love, so that every waking thought, word, deed and suffering is permeated by that love, yes, that relationship above all should give us not only a taste of the love of God for us, but the kind of love we should have for all.

When you love people, you see all the good in them, all the Christ in them. God sees Christ, His Son, in us and loves us. And so we should see Christ in others, and nothing else, and love them. There can never be enough of it. There can never be enough thinking about it. St. John of the Cross said that where there was no love, put love and you would take out love. This sounds rather clumsy, and I would like to get the exact quotation and translation if some of our readers would send it in to me. The principle certainly works. I've seen my friend Sister Peter Claver with that warm friendliness of hers which is partly natural (she is half Jew and half Irish), but which is intensified and made enduring by grace, come into a place which is cold with tension and conflict, and warm the house with her love.

And this is not easy. Everyone will try to kill that love in you, even your nearest and dearest; at least, they will try to prune it. "Don't you know this, that and the other thing, about this person? He or she did this. If you don't want to hear it, you must hear. It is for your good to hear it. It is my duty to tell you, and it is your duty to take recognition of it. You must stop loving, modify your loving, show your disapproval. You cannot possibly love—if you pretend you do, you are a hypocrite and the truth is not in you. You are contributing to the delinquency of that person by your sentimental blindness. It is such people as you who add to the sum total of confusion and wickedness and soft

(Continued on page 2)

Picking Cotton

By AMMON HENNACY

Having a few free days after the winter lettuce season at the large vegetable ranch where I had worked, I left my shack situated between a cabbage and a lettuce field on land of the Russian pacifist Molokons and went to Phoenix to visit an atheist friend and spend the night in order to get the cotton truck before daylight. (This friend had bought a Catholic Worker from me in front of the library in Milwaukee one Saturday in 1941. He later read an article of mine in the Catholic C. O. His admiration of the courageous pacifist spirit of these papers led him to deviate from his atheistic norm.)

The next morning two bonfires

were already burning along the curb where Mexicans, Indians and Anglos, many of the latter being "winos," were waiting to select the truck in which they would go to work. Just now there were only cotton trucks, there being a lull in citrus picking. Cotton pickers carry their own 8- to 10-foot sacks fastened with a strap around the shoulders and dragging behind them like a giant worm. There were eight trucks and several pickups. Most of them were shaped like the traditional covered wagon with canvas. There were benches on either side and in the middle. I walked around searching for someone I might know, but my friends of

the lettuce fields were wary of cotton picking, considering this the hardest job to be had and one to be taken only as a last resort.

"Last call! Take you there and bring you back. Three dollars a hundred. All aboard gentlemen!" shouted a good-natured Negro in a bright mackinaw. The truck to which he pointed was box-shaped, of wood veneer, with a short ladder leading inside from the rear. I entered and found a seat between a colored woman and a colored man. After a few more calls the doors were shut, and we could see each other only as one would light a cigarette.

Later on the truck stopped, and

(Continued on page 12)

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:
JACK ENGLISH, IRENE NAUGHTON, ROBERT LUDLOW,
TOM SULLIVAN
Managing Editor and Publisher: DOROTHY DAY
115 Mott St., New York City-13
Telephone: CAmal 6-8498

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

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

128

We Are Un-American We Are Catholics

Is it Soviet Russia who is the threat to the world? Is it indeed? Then may we quote from Scott Nearing's *THE WAY OF THE TRANSGRESSOR*?

"What nation today has a navy bigger than all other navies combined? The U. S. A. What nation today is steadily adding to the only known stockpile of atom bombs? The U. S. A. What nation today is tops in the development of buzz bombs, jet planes, bacterial poisons and death rays? The U. S. A. What nation today is spending the largest sums on military preparations? The U. S. A. What nation today is permitting representatives of the armed forces to take over the direction of domestic and foreign policy? The U. S. A. What nation today is arming its neighbors (in Latin America), intervening in the internal affairs of Europe and Asia, threatening the world peace and security and rapidly surrounding itself with a black curtain of anxiety, suspicion and hatred? The U. S. A."

If we are to accept the materialistic and atheistic philosophy of the capitalist state which holds sway in the United States, then there can be but little objection to this state of affairs. If our values are derived from the stock exchange, if we are to join in the psychopathic mania that has made war an end in itself, which has made it the norm of the American economy, if we are to be united against an ideology rather than for an ideology—then we are on the right track.

Some of us at THE CATHOLIC WORKER have been going to the colleges and distributing a leaflet against UMT. And most everyone to whom we gave the leaflet has expressed acceptance of UMT, has thought it a good thing. There are no antiwar organizations in the colleges these days, at least not in the Catholic colleges. There is a sense of the inevitable, that war is to come; that morality has nothing to do with it, that it is a question of licking Russia before she gets too strong, before she gets the atomic bomb. Around the local churches they are distributing leaflets and cards asking the Italians here to write to their relatives in Italy not to vote Communist. It would be interesting to know who is financing this campaign. It would be interesting to know why Communism has become such a threat in Italy. Is it perhaps that we have failed? And that, to cover that failure, we attribute the influence of Communists to trickery. Have Catholics in Italy been radicals, have they worked for freedom, those who control official policy? Has there been as much concern for worker ownership of the means of production and distribution, for decentralization, for a peaceful liquidation of acquisitive classes, as there has been in establishing a modus vivendi with fascism, as there has been in cooperating with elements of the Right? Have not we Catholics, by and large, gone down the road of compromise so far that we can awaken no enthusiasm among the people? That the only thing we can whipup enthusiasm for, in conjunction with the Hearst press, is an anti-Communist crusade? A crusade that utilizes the anti-Christian and Mohammedan concept of a "holy war." A defense of Jesus Christ by bombs, a blood soaked earth, quick death, hate. A hate that always exists in war despite the unreal and pedantic distinctions of theologians whose love of refinements is equalled only by their ignorance of psychology, of what happens to a man to get him prepared to murder. To get the poor in a state of mind where they will attribute every decent sentiment, every cry for justice, all love of man for his neighbor, to "Communists." Because to go to war means to go against every decent sentiment and against all cries for justice and against all love of man for his neighbor. The policy of the United States is anti-Catholic because it is atheistic. God does not enter into it for in place of Him there is EXPEDIENCY. It has become expedient that we murder, it has become expedient that we ignore the precepts of Jesus Christ laid down in the Sermon on the Mount and applicable to ALL MEN, not just to a chosen few who are to be perfect. It has become expedient that we preach hatred of Communists to the people, that we fasten signs of hate on Church doors and sell comic strip hate books in the Church vestibule. Christianity has been reduced by the theologians to a rule of expediency, Christianity has been made to identify itself with Americanism, with the scum of the Right!

Why is THE CATHOLIC WORKER opposed to UMT and to war? Because we are Communists? No! For we were opposed

ON PILGRIMAGE

(Continued from page 1)

appeasement and compromise and the policy of expediency in this world. "You are to blame for communism, for industrial capitalism, and finally for hell on earth."

The antagonism often rises to a crescendo of vituperation, an intensification of opposition on all sides. You are quite borne down by it. And the only Christian answer is love, to the very end, to the laying down of your life.

To see only the good, the Christ, in others! Perhaps if we thought of how Karl Marx was called "Papa Marx" by all the children on the street, if we knew and remembered how he told fairy stories to his children, how he suffered hunger and poverty and pain, how he sat by the body of his dead child and had no money for coffin or funeral, perhaps such thoughts as these would make us love him and his followers. Dear God, for the memory of that dead child, or that faithful wife, grant his stormy spirit "a place of refreshment, light and peace."

And there was Lenin. He hungered and thirsted and at times he had no fixed abode. Mme. Krupskaya, his widow, said that he loved to go into the peace of the pine woods and hunt mushrooms



like old Mrs. Dew down at Easton did, and we with her one October. He lived one time in the stums of Paris, and he lived on horse meat when he had meat, and he started schools for the poor and the workers. "He went about doing good." Is this blasphemy? How many people are dying and going to God their Father and saying sadly, "We have not so much as heard that there is a Holy Spirit." And how will they hear if none preaches to them? And what kind of shepherds have many of them had? Ezekial said in his day, "woe to the shepherds that feed themselves and not their sheep!"

And if there have been preachers, has there been love? If people will not listen, one can still love, one can still find Christ in them to love, and love is stronger than death. Dear God, may Lenin too find a place of refreshment, light and peace. Or don't we believe in retroactive prayers? There is no time with God.

Newburgh Retreat

It is an easy thing to talk about love, but it is something to be proven, to be suffered, to be learned. That's why we have that retreat house at Newburgh. Last week after my return from Berkeley Springs, I went up on a foggy

day, taking a train at Grand Central because the bus which leaves at 6:30 and passes our door at Newburgh was on strike. The train was slow, and the ferry slower. A fog which kept us floundering in the middle of the river for half an hour was so heavy that it was hard to breathe. It was a great relief from oppression to reach the high ground, where the retreat house stands, six miles inland, and to get to bed early after the oppression of the city.

It is always a terrible thing to come back to Mott street. To come back in a driving rain, to men crouched on the stairs, huddled in doorways, without overcoats because they sold them perhaps the week before when it was warm, to satisfy hunger or thirst, who knows. Those without love would say, "It serves them right, drinking up their clothes." God help us if we got just what we deserved!

It is a terrible thing to see the ugliness and poverty of the cities, to see what man has made of man. I needed those few days at Newburgh to brace myself for work. Fr. Anthony, a young Benedictine from Newton, N. J., was with us that week, giving a retreat on the sacraments and the conferences I was in time for continued what I had been pondering of the love of God for man and man for man.

"From Genesis to Revelation," he said, in one conference, "it is the story of God's love for man. All the story of God's dealing with man is a love story. Some say the Old Testament tells of God's justice and the New of his love. But there is not a page but emphasizes God's folly in every forgiving and drawing man back to him." I remembered the book of Osee, the prophet and Holy Man who was commanded by God to love and marry a harlot, who had children by him, and who left him again and again, having children also by her lovers. And how Osee again and again took her back. How he must have been scorned by his generation, he a holy man, so weak and uxorious, so soft-minded that again and again, "he allured her" to him, on one occasion even buying her back from her lover, even providing her while she was with her lover, with corn and wine and oil. And God even commanded it so that down through the ages there would be this example of God's love for a faithless people, of the folly of love, a foretaste of the folly of the Cross. If we could only learn to be such fools! God give us the strength to persist in trying to learn such folly.

We had three conferences a day, of an hour each, and a 15-minute period of prayer after each conference. There was silence for the week, and manual labor, in the house and out. There was rosary after lunch, and a holy hour midnight on Thursday. Every morning the day began with prime the first prayers of the Church for the day (after Matins and Lauds) and then there was a sung Mass, the first mass in the Kyriale

(Continued on page 11)

to World War II when the Communists were for it. Because we are indifferent to the fate of the Church? No! For she is our Mother, the Bridegroom of Jesus Christ. But she is more than real estate, she is more than temporal power, her spirit is not the spirit of the world and she has no need to be defended by the arms of the world. No more than her Divine Master who refused such defense.

We are against war because it is contrary to the spirit of Jesus Christ, and the only important thing is that we abide in His spirit. It is more important than being American, more important than being respectable, more important than obedience to the State. It is the only thing that matters. We are against Universal Military Training because it is preparation for sin. For the sin that is war. That it is better that the United States be liquidated than that she survive by war. What would we advocate? Wholesale disloyalty to Americanism. Wholesale refusal to fight. Wholesale withdrawal of labor (a general strike) from all industries that further the war effort.

We would urge a mighty band of Catholic Conscientious Objectors who will refuse induction, who will follow Jesus of Nazareth, Prince of Peace, in the way of non-violence, in love for all mankind!

Mott Street

The Voice of the Turtle has been definitely heard on Mott Street during the past few days and thus summer is nigh, thank God. The problems of trying to heat the house and keeping warm are over. No longer will we be faced with the unpleasant task of turning away ambassadors of God who come in search of warm clothing. During this past winter we have had to tell too many men that we didn't have the clothes that they were in desperate need of. As has happened in the past now that winter is over with, warm clothing will come in, but we will be grateful for them since we can and will store these garments for next fall.

Birthdays

During the month of March we celebrated two birthdays. The first was that of Mary Hughes who has reached the advanced age of one year, may she never never change. And the second was that of Joseph Martin who has also reached the first milestone. Little Joe bowed several times, waved his arms and joined in the celebration of this happy event. The honoring of birthdays seems to be getting out of hand around here since everyone in the house with a few exceptions insists that their birthdays be celebrated if it is only by some one of the women baking and serving a cake with the dinner of that particular day.

Second Family

And then there is the grey haired, lame, South American, who lives over on the Bowery. He comes in to visit and eat with us when he is out of work. He has two children who live with their grandparents over in Brooklyn. He claims that there isn't room for him in their cramped apartment or he would be living with them. There is no mention of a wife and we don't feel as though we have the right to ask about her. The other night our South American asked if we wouldn't celebrate one of the children's birthdays this month. He said, "you know I feel as though the people here are my second family and I want to have my children meet you."

Claire H. Bishop

On one of our Friday night lectures we were extremely fortunate to have the opportunity to listen to Claire H. Bishop, author of "France Alive." Mrs. Bishop's talk proved to be vital and very stimulating. Again she brought out the theme that the only way we Catholics can spread Christianity is by living it down to the hilt such as the French working priests and the active lay Catholics are doing in France.

Father Deacy

And on another night we heard Father Deacy speak on Gandhi. Father Deacy pointed out how Gandhi had followed the teachings of Christ as far as he was able to grasp them. It was good to sit and listen to Father and realize that it is possible to clearly recognize the full merit of outstanding men even though they don't happen to be formal members of the Catholic Church. Although we will and have given outlandish eulogies to public figures just because they happen to die in the Church, even though it is common knowledge that some of those men had had scarlet pasts that would put the devil to shame.

Visitor

Last night a seaman whom we hadn't seen for several months put in his appearance. He had a few drinks in him but one wouldn't say he was drunk. After he shook hands all around he launched into an hour attack on each and everyone of us. No one escaped his sharp criticisms nor could anyone get a word in edgewise, even if we had wanted to. As it would happen we had a visitor and consequently we were doubly embarrassed and humiliated. So much of what he accused us of was true that we were unable to discountenance the diatribe by claiming that he was drunk or in a state. At the end of the ordeal our friend shook hands all around again, said he was sorry for calling us down

(Continued on page 12)

CATHOLIC WORKER



First printing 50,500 copies with November, 1944, issue.
Second printing 10,000 copies, December, 1944.

Third printing 60,000 copies, March, 1945
Fourth printing 10,000 copies, June, 1945

April, 1948

Fifth printing, 73,000
copies, April, 1948 Page Three

The Immorality of Conscription

By Father John J. Hugo

PART I

Introductory:

The State of the Question

1. The Urgency of the Subject

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

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

Need for Careful Study

Few of the moralists who have written since conscription has become a general policy have condemned it. This fact, however, cannot be taken as an argument in its support. For, on the one hand, those who have considered it at all have usually condemned it (1) while, on the other, the standard modern authors in moral theology have generally not touched upon the subject except briefly and in passing. It must be admitted, however reluctantly, that modern Catholic scholars have failed to give the whole problem of war the attention it deserves and demands. A few pages in manuals of ethics and moral theologies, and then little more than a formal enumeration of conditions required for just war. There is too little effort to apply these conditions to modern circumstances or to study thoroughly this greatest evil in the whole modern world. In classes of ethics and moral theology, the entire subject is dismissed in an hour. In a word, war and conscription have simply been taken for granted. We have given the decision of conscience over to statesmen, most frequently of the old Liberal school, and therefore thoroughly irreligious, who have lulled our consciences to sleep by camouflaging the sordid military expeditions of capitalism and national imperialism with a profession of high moral ideals. But in our time war and conscription have reached such proportions of evil that they can no longer be taken for granted.

Whatever may be the reasons for this tardiness

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

Hidden Seeds of Evil

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

The evil of conscription, in a similar way, can be seen clearly only as it reaches maturity and we are able to see its full stature and characteristic effects. Not that the evil is only in the effects; it is there from the beginning (2), but we cannot fully realize this—above all, we cannot be perfectly sure of it—until we see its effects. In a bad man, the beginning of evil was already present in the seeming innocence of childhood; but development was necessary to bring it out. Or, in the example of the evil tree, the poison is already in the seed, but it can be detected only when men attempt to eat of the fruit.

2. An Instructive Parallel

A SOMEWHAT similar case is found in the development of extreme feminism, that is, in the demand made by so many modern women for complete emancipation from their own peculiar duties and responsibilities. And because this case, besides providing an instructive parallel, provides useful material for a later stage of the argument, it will be well to pause here and consider it briefly. It was difficult, when women first began to agitate for freedom, for Catholics to assert or explain their opposition to feminism—although the movement is certainly evil and was eventually condemned by the Church—for the reason that a very real admixture of good elements prevents the errors from at once appearing. We Catholics do not need feminists to point out to us the dignity of womankind. We believe, and have believed from the beginning, that women have immortal souls and are equal to men in dignity and worth; in the kingdom of heaven there is "neither male nor female." (3) Indeed, because of our Lady, so uniquely privileged among all human beings, we have conceded to women greater respect, greater veneration, than is given to men. As Chesterton pointed out, even many of the so-called disabilities of women proceed, not from contempt, but reverence; they are like the exemptions from secular activities conceded to priests. We did not even need the feminists to tell us that women are endowed with intelligence and have therefore a right to education. If in former times women were not

generally given greater opportunities for intellectual culture, this was due to social and historical reasons, as well as to stubborn male prejudices, and not to any doctrine of Christianity closing to women the advantages of instruction.

Functional Differences Ignored

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

Degradation of Woman Results

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

In a similar way, conscription, viewed on the surface, may seem unobjectionable to the human conscience; perhaps this is why it is so easily taken for granted. It may even appear necessary, from a moral standpoint, because of the State's right to defend itself. Corresponding to this right of the State, there must be a duty on the part of the citizens to undertake their country's defense.

[Note: Figures in parentheses refer to footnotes, which will be found on page 10.]

Thus, there would seem to be (and so the defenders of conscription argue) an obligation of conscience to accept conscription; so that he who refuses to do so is usually regarded not only as a "slacker" from the patriotic point of view, but delinquent as well in regard to his moral and religious duty.

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

3. The Development of Conscription ⁽⁴⁾

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

Limitations of "Universal" Service

The theory of equality, one of the ideals of the Revolution, led logically to the demand that all citizens undertake military service, "and as the majority of people are naturally averse to risking their skins, universal service was tantamount to compulsory enlistment." Despite the theoretical acceptance of conscription and its adoption by the revolutionary government, it did not at once work in practice: besides administrative inefficiency, there were numerous evasions and even open rebellion against it. Carnot made conscription workable by limiting service to men between 13 and 25 years of age. So soon were the revolutionary ideals of brotherhood and equality compromised! Conscription could be made to work only by imposing it on a politically impotent section of the population. This is as true today as then: the "duty" of bearing arms and of dying for one's country is skillfully evaded, without any apparent scruples of conscience, by all parties able to exercise political pressure on the government. That in years following the Revolution it was possible to extend the age limits of those required to do service was largely owing to the fact that, with the progress of the Industrial Revolution, an ever increasing body of men, the proletariat, has become politically impotent.

In 1798 the law of conscription was improved by General Jourdain and was later made more effective by Napoleon. Conscription provided Napoleon with more than two and a half million men from 1800 to 1813: it was thus conscription that made possible the Napoleonic victories and the massed army used by Napoleon was his basic contribution to military strategy. (5) Thus the conquests of Napoleon were one of the first great fruits of universal conscription. Prussian militarism was to be next.

Imitators of Napoleon

Prussia adopted conscription in imitation of Napoleon, in 1808, after her humiliation at his hands at Jena. Following the fall of Napoleon in 1815, it was scientifically developed until it reached perfection under William I and Bismarck, coming to a climax of efficiency in the quick and easy Prussian victories over Austria in 1866 and France in 1871. The success of their great military machine "convinced Germans that the preservation of their national union depended upon the continuance of the principle of compulsory military training." (6) Because of this, Prussia forced all the other German states in the confederation which she dominated to adopt the same policy, while she herself became burdened with ever increasing armaments.

Of course, in relation to later happenings, the victories of 1866 and 1871 were but adolescent triumphs for the conscription system; they became the beginning of even greater developments. Other European states, impressed by the example of Prussia, now began to follow her lead, until conscription became universal. In 1868 Austria-

Hungary adopted it, France again in 1872 (it waned here after the fall of Napoleon), Japan in 1873, Russia in 1874, and Italy in 1875. Meanwhile, Great Britain, while it had not yet adopted compulsory service, was fostering a complementary movement by doing for navalism what Prussia was doing for militarism. In time the nations would imitate Great Britain, too. Conscription and militarism were coming to a lusty majority.

Modern Developments

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

4. The Final Phase: Total Conscription

CONSCRIPTION was to reach its fullest development in the Second World War and in the preparations that led up to it. No complete figures are available as yet, but the total number of conscripts must be staggering. For example, the United States, which conscripted only about five million men in the First World War (7), brought its total number to around eleven million in 1944. The armies of the other belligerent nations, especially Russia, are proportionately larger now than in 1917.

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

Fertile Soil

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

Once these conditions were realized, totalitarian conscription became a possibility. It first became a reality in Russia, in 1930, with the passage of a compulsory service law that established liability for all citizens, regardless of sex. Women are accepted in peace time and may be drafted for war. Although their greatest service has been in non-combatant work, they have also served in the army on the same basis as men in several branches of the service. (8)

Totality in Germany

In Germany, total conscription came into being with the National Defense Law of 1935 (amended in 1938), by which every male German was obli-

gated to perform military service from the completion of his 18th to his 45th year. All women were obliged to render service over and above strictly military duty. The result was total mobilization of the entire adult population.

England, despite its dislike of conscription, adopted in 1940, under the threat of a German invasion, an Emergency Powers Defense Bill which provided for the conscription of all British resources, human as well as material. This act is legally parallel to the measures adopted earlier by the dictator states; indeed, through it, England "has mobilized her manpower more fully than any other nation in the war." (9) The United States, although inducting married men into the armed forces, has not yet adopted total conscription. However, the U. S. government does not refrain from this step out of moral principle or democratic conviction, but simply out of expedience, because total conscription has not yet become necessary. Labor conscription and conscription of women have been advocated by high officials, and bills providing for them were introduced into Congress. In fact, President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress for February, 1944, asked for an act that would authorize "total" conscription. Meanwhile, the United States has used women volunteers in services organized as auxiliaries for the armed forces. Clearly, it is not principle that prevents the U. S. government from conscripting women now.

Following the Leader

One of the last and most lurid of the flowers of conscription is the use of enforced labor and the deportation of conquered peoples for purposes of labor. In this Nazi Germany has led the way. But inasmuch as the other nations have quickly imitated Germany in every other practice of militarism, always alleging military necessity as the reason, it can scarcely be supposed that the democracies will refuse to adopt this practice also should it appear expedient.

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

PART II

Conscription and the Human Person

1. The Alleged Ethical Basis of Conscription

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

"When, therefore, the State calls its citizens to arms in a just defensive war, or in preparation for such a war, it is acting fully within the limits of its strict rights. It is but exercising its natural prerogative of taking legitimate steps necessary for justified, or even obligatory, self-defense. Now to the State's right to exact, corresponds the citizen's duty to render. The individual citizen is now no longer free to choose whether or not he will serve in the nation's armed forces." (10)

Two Words to Watch

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

Taking these words, and services, exactly as they stand—in their formal sense, as the philosophers say—we do not at present quarrel with the conclusion: a State, we may concede, has indeed the right to conscript the wealth and services of

its citizens." (11) Only, despite appearances, this is not an accurate description, therefore not a convincing justification, of compulsory military service. (12) In reality, a State, when it conscripts soldiers, demands far more than what properly belongs to it, lays claim to something far beyond the wealth and services of its citizens.

Even in the conscription of property, there are limits to a State's authority, bounds beyond which it may not go. If its conscription of wealth, for example, is tantamount to a denial of the right to private property; if it absorbs the total wealth of a nation, as is done by Communism, then certainly it goes beyond what is allowed by justice. "Man's natural right of privately possessing and transmitting property by inheritance must be kept intact and cannot be taken away by the State, for man is older than the State and the domestic household is anterior both in idea and in fact to the gathering of men into a commonwealth." Hence the prudent pontiff [Leo XIII, from whose *Rerum Novarum* Pius XI has quoted these principles] had already declared it unlawful for the State to exhaust the means of individuals by crushing taxes and tributes: "The right to possess private property is from nature, not from man; and the State has only the right to regulate its use in the interest of the public good, but by no means to abolish it altogether." (13)

Are There Limitations?

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

2. The Individual and the Person

MAN being composed of body and soul, he can be considered either in his bodily life, as an individual, or in his spiritual life, as a person. Looking on him as an individual, we see him primarily in his material component, his bodily life and work, his physical, economic and social activity. From this point of view, he is part of the community and is therefore under the authority of the State. The State, therefore, whose end is the temporal welfare of its citizens, has power (though within limits) over their temporal possessions and activities. But man is not only an individual, a material unit in the State. He is also a person, a rational and spiritual substance, a complete agent of action, free and responsible in his own right. As a person, he is not part of the State, but is rather himself a whole, a universe within himself, independent of the State and above it. "... For St. Thomas the individual as such is a part. ... On the other hand, for St. Thomas, the idea of personality as such bespeaks the independence of a whole." (14)

Supernatural Destiny Is Paramount

Hence the Angelic Doctor teaches that "man is not subordinated to the community in his total being and in regard to all matters." (15) "Person" signifies that which is most perfect in the whole of nature. (16) Accordingly, if we consider man as a person the community exists to serve him. (17) The reason is, of course, that human personality is spiritual and superior to all material interests. Yet this is not the only reason, nor would it be sufficient to prevent him, at least in practice, from being absorbed by the State. The human person also has a supernatural end; and as the heavens are exalted above the earth, so is man's supernatural destiny above the terrestrial interests and temporal end of the State.

The Answer of Peter

The person "can be considered either under the formal aspect of an individual part of the city or under the formal aspect of a person destined to God: in the first place its own good is to be referred to that of the community, in the second case it is that common temporal good which is to be referred to its interests, spiritual and eternal." (18) As a person, man is destined to be united immediately to God. That is why St. Thomas says that in certain matters—that is in the innermost core of personality—he is bound by obedience only to God. (19) Because of eternal interests, therefore, one may be at times exempt from obedience to the State. Further, there may be times when one is bound in conscience to disobey, i.e., when the

welfare of the soul or the interests of God are threatened. "It is a sin to disobey God for the sake of pleasing men; it is wrong to break the law of Jesus Christ in order to obey the magistrate, or under pretence of civil rights to transgress the laws of the Church: 'We ought to obey God rather than men' (Acts, 5, 29). The answer which Peter and the rest of the Apostles were wont to give to the governors, when they laid unlawful commands upon them, must always be made once for all on occasions. There is no better citizen either in peace or war than the Christian who is mindful of his duty; and he ought to suffer everything, even death itself, rather than forsake the side of God and of the Church." (20)

Pius XI on Atheistic Communism

Moreover, the end of the State is not only inferior to that of the person, belonging to an altogether lower order, but it is also subordinate to the latter; society and the State are bound to help men realize their supernatural destiny. In the providential plan, the State's task is to care for those earthly interests whose real although hidden purpose is to assist, instruct, and try men in the practice of virtue, thereby conducting them to their supernatural end and beatitude. If men must obey the State within the limits of the latter's authority, the State may nevertheless not interfere with the rights of the person; this is precisely the reason for the Church's condemnation of Communism: "Man cannot be exempted from his divinely imposed obligations toward civil society, and the representatives of authority have the right to coerce him when he refuses without reason to do his duty. Society, on the other hand, cannot defraud man of his God-granted rights. ... Nor can society systematically void these rights by making their use impossible. It is, therefore, according to the dictates of reason that ultimately all material things should be ordained to man as a person, that through his mediation they may find their way to the Creator. In this wise we can apply to man, the human person, the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles, who writes to the Corinthians on the Christian economy of salvation: 'All things are yours, and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's' (I Cor. 3, 23). While Communism impoverishes human personality by inverting the terms of the relation of man to society, to what lofty heights is not man elevated by reason and revelation!" (21)

3. The Argument Restated

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

Confusion of Terms

Let us add that, if scholars, realizing the value of words and concepts, present the argument carefully, as it appeared in its first form ("and services"), ordinary men; not so skilled in fine distinctions, but knowing the actual extent of the State's claim, concede the second position, i.e., that it has authority over the human person. It is only by such confusion, by such swamping of the spiritual by the material, such a persistent failure to understand the spiritual things, that the popular mind is enabled to accept conscription as a duty. Were men more spiritually-minded, more proficient in perceiving the realities of the spiritual world, they would be troubled by these huge concessions to the State—concessions which are part of that pagan conception of society whereby the human person is entirely absorbed by the State and subordinated to its terrestrial aims. Even the

scholars, though careful enough in the formal statement of the case, in practice carry their conclusion far beyond the premises; they say that they give the State rights only over human services, but in fact they concede to it rights over human persons. Conscription, as we shall see in a moment, could not exist without this claim to rights over the person.

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

Spiritual Rights Are Sacrosanct

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

4. The Rights of the Person

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

Unlikelihood of a Just War

But what of the case of a just war? In answer to this question, let it be observed in the first place that, although the possibility of just warfare is unassailable in principle, nevertheless in practice wars rarely if ever meet the requirements of justice laid down by theologians; that is, they are in fact never wholly just on one side and wholly un-

just on the other, owing to the fact that in the long run human nature apart from grace cannot live up perfectly to the requirements even of natural justice. The tangled claims and counter-claims of the unending wars that have disgraced the history of mankind and Christendom give ample evidence of this fact. Least of all can the modern wars of mutual aggression waged by conflicting national imperialisms be fitted into the pattern of justifiable warfare, even with the powerful assistance of nationalistic passion and propaganda; so that, in fact, this pattern of just warfare is scarcely to be looked for outside of the laboratory of a philosopher's brain.

Evil Means Never Permissible

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

What remains now is to establish the minor premise (24), that is, to show that conscription as practiced by the great powers today does in fact violate the most sacred rights of human personality. We proceed as follows:

Right of Vocation Violated

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

Danger of Presumption

No doubt—to meet an inevitable objection—in whatever difficult circumstances men find themselves, God can and will provide them with the strength needed to overcome temptation. Yet the fact that God can circumvent evil and injustice is no permission for men to commit it. God forbid, as St. Paul says (Rom. 6, 1) that we should go on doing evil because we know that God can turn it to good. Moreover, there are certain situations favorable, others unfavorable, to the practice of virtue and correspondence with divine grace, and these situations vary from person to person. Now if any place is favorable for a given individual, surely it is the one chosen by God and appointed as his vocation. But the State, by conscription, compels men arbitrarily to accept less favorable, or even unfavorable, circumstances and in this way hinders them in their efforts to save their souls.

This argument based on vocations is a very strong one, although it may not seem so today, for the reason that men, even before being in-

ducted into the armed forces, have been deprived of their vocations by mass production, uncontrolled use of machinery, depersonalized labor, and other iniquitous practices that are part of the capitalistic system. However, two wrongs do not make a right: and the first wrong does not justify the second even when it prevents the latter from being felt or understood.

Vocations Cannot Be Imposed

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

5. The Evil of Enforced Celibacy

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

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

An Impossible Situation

The State itself recognizes the impossibility of the situation into which it forces its conscripts by the provisions it makes for keeping up their morale—provisions which are a further wound in the personality. Entertainments in which the passions are incited, just aroused and an artificial outlet provided for concupiscence, are supplied to maintain the conscripts in the mental and emotional condition needed in "good soldiers." The immense cynicism of the godless State is shown in the fact that it will bring suggestive and even obscene entertainments (26), not only to training centers, but also to the very battle-fronts all over the world where men are living in the very shadow of death and may at any moment be sent to stand before their Creator and Judge. First to put the young men in an occasion of sin, then to provide carefully prepared temptation, finally to lead them out to be slaughtered—this is the devilish procedure of modern war, the manner in which the State of today seeks to assist its citizens to procure their eternal salvation.

Worse yet, realizing full well the impossibility of celibacy in conscripts, the State makes ample

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

Unfortunate Position of Chaplains

We do not forget that the governments provide chaplains for the men in the armed forces; nor do we underestimate, or wish to underestimate, the good that is done by these chaplains. The heroic devotion of so many of them is an inspiring story. However, we are not concerned here with the achievements of individuals; we are trying rather to assess objectively the moral dangers of a particular situation. And it must be said that the army accepts chaplains, not as ministers of religion, but as morale officers. (27) As such, they are burdened with many duties that have nothing to do with religion: this is the price that they must pay in order to provide divine services for their men. Furthermore, as morale officers their function as ministers of a Catholic and transcendent religion is obscured or lost altogether by the fact that they are expected to subordinate their ministry to the furtherance of the national cause. (28) Although Catholic chaplains in particular, through the administration of the sacraments, are able to give great aid to souls in spite of the restrictions laid upon them, they are as helpless as the others to change those basic conditions which make army life a morally unhealthy environment. Their achievements, however heroic individually considered, are at best a palliative. This is particularly true when they are expected to provide religious services acceptable to all sects and shades of belief—a situation which prevents Catholic priests from communicating those specifically Christian and Catholic moral and ascetical teachings which are so indispensable for the practice of virtue.

Heroic Virtue Required

Again, it is not denied that many fine Christian men are able to retain their moral integrity even in the demoralizing atmosphere of army life. (29) But such men preserve their virtue in spite of their army experience not because of it, by what is little if anything short of moral heroism. However, heroism is not to be expected of all, especially in the young, or where there is no spiritual preparation given for it, or amid surroundings not conducive to the pursuit of holiness. Indeed, a situation which regularly requires high holiness or heroism from ordinary men is in reality an occasion of sin, an almost certain cause of spiritual collapse. Religious and priests, who have voluntarily accepted a celibate life, seek almost instinctively certain protections for their virtue, and would find themselves in great danger not only in the surroundings of a military camp, but also in the surroundings of ordinary life. In this connection it is instructive to study the decrees promulgated by Rome concerning the spiritual care to be given to priests required to do military service. (30) The decrees take for granted that such priests are in a most undesirable moral and spiritual situation; consequently, certain provisions are made to give them special spiritual aid during their term of service. Furthermore, upon completion of their service, these priests are required to retire to some religious house, for a period of time to be determined according to individual needs, in order to renew themselves interiorly through spiritual exercises. The Church, obviously, has no illusions about army life. Now if priests are thus exposed to great danger, what of laymen, who, without the spiritual preparation or advantages enjoyed by priests through a long period of training, are nevertheless compelled to practice extraordinary virtue, even to the observance of celibacy and complete chastity, in circumstances unfavorable even to ordinary virtue?

6. The Corruption of Youth

IT is necessary also, as part of the indictment of conscription, to take account of the other training given to soldiers: propaganda to hate and instructions in brutal methods of inflicting death. "Until he (i.e., the soldier) hates the enemy with every instinct and every muscle, he will only be afraid. . . . Hate must become first nature to a soldier. (31) That is a sample of instruction handed out to soldiers in World War II. Men must be made utterly callous in regard to taking human life; all their moral repugnances must be broken down. "The average Englishman and American, unfortunately"—to quote a Major,

speaking to a group of Allied soldiers he is instructing (32)—“suffers from remorse. You must overcome that, or it will slow you down at a crucial moment and cause your own death. *Shooting a Jerry is like swatting a fly. Keep thinking that, shoot a few, and you'll sleep like a baby even after the bloodiest shambles.*” Such excellent instruction naturally bears fruit, as is shown by such words as the following, spoken by an Allied pilot who had shot down 32 planes: “It's strictly fun. . . . I like to knock the enemy down and the only question that ever flashed across my mind is whether he'll be blown or fried.” (exploded in mid-air or burned up) (33)

The Confirmation of the Devil

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

Fruits of Hatred

Precisely because Nazi youth organizations corrupted youth they were condemned by Pius XI: “If the State organizes a national youth, and makes this organization obligatory upon all, then, without prejudice to rights of religious associations, it is the *absolute right* of youths as well as of parents to see to it that this organization is purged of all manifestations hostile to the Church and Christianity. These manifestations are even today placing Christian parents in a painful alternative, as they cannot give to the State what they owe to God alone.” (34) The methods used on American youth, even if lacking the frank appeal to heathen myths and materialistic ideologies, are nonetheless offensive in outlook and practice to Christian sensibilities. If, for the most part, the evil that is done is in the heart and therefore not open to observation, this is after all the worst evil in God's sight. However, there are also visible results, as the above instances show. The widespread and shocking breakdown that followed World War I revealed the extent of the corruption caused by war. A further breakdown is apparent since the end of War II. “He that gathereth not with Me, scattereth.” (Matt. 12, 30) The law of God must be observed in entirety or it will be thrown out altogether. When men are whipped to a frenzy of hatred and taught to be cruel and merciless killers, their whole moral character is impaired and they come as a matter of course to treat other precepts of the moral law with contempt. Thus, to the facts that conscription interferes with the right of vocation and the right to enter married life there must be added the further fact that it is a corrupter of youth.

7. The State's Power Over the Body

TO all the foregoing limitations of the State's power there must be added a further and greater restriction, which reinforces from below the conclusions thus far set forth. Although the State has authority over man's terrestrial life, and individuals must therefore be ready to sacrifice for the common good, nevertheless, on the other hand, *even its power over the body has definite bounds* and, as St. Thomas says, does not extend to those things that pertain to the *nature of the body* (35); so that in such matters men are not bound to obey human authorities, but only God. Pope Pius XI confirmed this teaching when he said, “Public magistrates have *no direct power* over the bodies of their subjects. . . .” Hence, even public authority (apart from crime, which gives it an indirect authority over the body) “can never gravely harm, or tamper with the integrity of the body either for reasons of eugenics or for any other reason.” (36)

Freedom of the Body

This principle, as the last phrase indicates, has a much wider application than suggested by the example of eugenics. Besides forbidding the State to inflict any actual physical harm on the bodies of its citizens, it also prohibits interference with the body's essential and necessary good. Thus (to cite the examples mentioned by St. Thomas), men are not subject to human authority “in whatever concerns the sustenance of the body and the generation of offspring.” How closely such rights as these are tied up with the particular

vocation of each person, over which the State has no authority, is very evident; and the Angelic Doctor himself notes the fact when he completes his teaching on this point by concluding that men are not obliged to obey human superiors “in regard to contracting marriage or remaining in the state of virginity, or other such matters.” (37) Thus, whatever the obligations of the citizen, the State cannot dispose of human life or even human bodies as it pleases, that is, as though it had direct and exclusive power over them and could disregard the requirements of the souls that dwell in them. Yet by conscription it does, in fact seek to exercise complete control, disposing of men's vocations, their families, their marriage rights, their very lives, as though there were no higher good than its own terrestrial ends. Hence, even without appealing directly to the freedom of personality, as we have done above, the freedom of the body is already sufficient to condemn universal conscription. Of course, the honors and rights due to the human body, which of itself is no higher than an animal body, result from its intimate union with the spiritual soul, to its being the dwelling place of a human personality, and above all to the fact that it is a temple of the Holy Ghost. If the Church, by putting ashes on her children at the beginning of Lent, reminds them that they are but dust, she also shows, by her rules for burial, that the body is not to be treated with contempt. Hence, whatever may be the legitimate authority of the State over man's material concerns, the union of the body with an immortal soul is an unassailable protection against the tyranny that would wholly absorb his bodily life.

8. Conscription and the Family

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

Destruction of Spiritual Values

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

Bad Effects on the Family

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

does not even stop to ask the number of children, but in large families as well as small ones throws the burden of rearing entirely upon the mother. With its utterly materialistic outlook, it thinks that it is making sufficient compensation when it gives a money allowance for the care of each child.

Labor Conscription Equally Undesirable

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

9. The Conscription of Women

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

False “Emancipation”

Now why is conscription of women specially unjust and evil? Because, in the first place, it involves an acceptance of that utterly false and un-Christian conception of woman's character and woman's liberty, which, while freeing them from their own special offices and responsibilities in society and the Mystical Body, places them exactly on a par with men and makes no distinction between the functions of men and women. Such false “emancipation,” described earlier in this article, was precisely that condemned by Pius XI: an emancipation “social, economic, physiological—physiological, that is to say, the woman is to be freed at her own good pleasure from the burdensome duties properly belonging to a wife as companion and mother (We have already said that this is not an emancipation but a crime); social, inasmuch as the wife, being freed from the care of children and family, should, to the neglect of these, be able to follow her own bent and devote herself to business and even public affairs; finally economic, whereby the woman, even without the knowledge and against the wish of her husband, may be at liberty to conduct and administer her own affairs, giving her attention chiefly to these rather than to children, husband, and family.” (38)

Repudiation of Purity

The moral dangers of enforced celibacy, following from conscription, are the same for women as for men. They are placed in a situation in which emotional and moral tension are inevitable. They will be subject to all the demoralizing influences which accompany war; for the sixth commandment follows the fifth, and contempt of the one infallibly leads to carelessness about the other. In the past it has been a mark of Christian nations to have a special esteem for virtue in women, especially the virtue of purity, and to protect it

by social custom. Our own age has no esteem for virtue in anyone; above all, it hates purity and glorifies that false freedom, the freedom from restraint, the freedom that is a cloak for malice, in which passion is able to find easily opportunities for its gratification. Because the modern State has no care about virtue, it does not concern itself with safeguarding the virtue of women. Yet if one has retained any shreds of Christianity about himself at all amidst the vile paganism of the modern world, then this repudiation of purity, characteristic of the whole age, entrenched and made official by conscription, is a thing to him wholly evil and unacceptable. It alone is sufficient to condemn compulsory military service; for, to a Christian conscience, exposing souls to an occasion of sin is a serious matter indeed.

The conscription of women likewise brings grievous harm to the family. Unmarried women are hindered from entering into married life, the married are prevented from living with their husbands, establishing families, and accepting their marriage obligations. It takes those married away from already established homes and families, throwing the care of children on hired nurses or public agencies. Conscription for women also means, besides their use in the auxiliary service of the armed forces, their mobilization for industry, as this has taken place in England. Mothers can be shifted about at the will of bureaucrats or army officials to wherever they might be considered useful or necessary. They can be removed from their homes, separated from their families, sent to distant cities. In any case, families are neglected while their mothers spend most of their waking hours in mills and factories.

10. The Rights of the Family

IT must be insisted that concern for family life is not mere sentimentality. As the person is above the State, so that the State may not interfere with his essential life, so also the family is prior to the State, which therefore may not interfere with the family's natural rights. "In choosing a state of life, it is indisputable that all are at full liberty either to follow the counsel of Jesus Christ as to virginity, or to enter into the bonds of marriage. No human law can abolish the natural and primitive right of marriage, or in any way limit the chief and principal purpose of marriage, ordained by God's authority from the beginning. 'Increase and multiply' (Gen. 1, 28). Thus we have the family—the 'society' of a man's own household; a society limited indeed in numbers, but a true 'society,' anterior to every kind of state or nation, with rights and duties of its own, totally independent of the commonwealth." (39)

Tyrannical and Irreligious Injustice

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

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

Enforced Celibacy of Women

Moreover, the fact that women enlist voluntarily (as the situation stands today in our country) should not blind us to the fact that the evils which

they suffer and which induce them to take this step are quite involuntary. There is, here again, the condition of enforced celibacy: enforced in this case by an evil situation—the removal of men from civilian life. That women are now unable to enter marriage, or, if already married, that they are unable to fulfill their marriage obligations, is due to the fact that conscription has removed the men who are, or would be, their partners in marriage. Then the State, having thus prevented marriage, takes advantage of the aimlessness and restlessness that is caused by such a situation and seeks to attract women into auxiliary military service; in this it is aided by "patriotic" propaganda and other kinds of moral pressure.

The same is true of the women who enter industry. Were the State faithful to its purpose, it would try to prevent women from doing this to the neglect of their families. Even true national interest should dictate such a policy. The State depends on its families and is ultimately no stronger than the families who compose it. Like the man who killed the goose that laid the golden eggs, the pagan State is willing to sacrifice the family, especially the moral values of family life, for immediate military interests or material aggrandizement. The unmarried women who do not join the auxiliary services are also prevented from entering married life by an artificial and evil situation. Married women with families neglect these families to go into industry. They are compelled to take work unbecoming their sex and obligations because of the shortage of men. The pretense for this abandonment of the family is patriotism; often the real reason is greed. In any case it is a violation of the family and its rights.

11. Conclusion

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

PART III

The Testimony of History

1. Lack of Scriptural Support for Conscription

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

No Conscription in Israel

In seeking the origin of this alleged moral duty,

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

The Side of Providence

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

2. The Testimony of the New Testament

IF we cannot find any trace of conscription in the Old Testament, where war was clearly sanctioned by Providence, then *a fortiori* we are not likely to find it commanded in the New Testament. As a matter of fact, in the New Testament we find no explicit approval of war at all, as in the Old, no commandment to go to war, no regulations for the conduct of wars: altogether a most significant silence in view of the importance of war in the history of the chosen people. The reason for this, as Origen already pointed out (40), is that with the coming of Jesus, God's special Providence was no longer confined to one people, but embraced all mankind. The Old Testament was nationalistic; the Gospel is universal. Henceforth, there is "neither Jew nor Greek" (Gal. 3, 28), but all people are bound "in one body," which is Christ (Eph. 2, 16). Accordingly, there is no further need for nationalistic wars, no reason to protect one particular nation against all others: God's plan of redemption, as revealed in the New Testament, includes all nations. Moreover, with the coming of Christ, revelation was completed, the vast reservoirs of divine grace were opened up to all mankind, human nature itself was renewed and recreated: henceforth, men should reconcile differences among themselves on a higher plane. With the weapons of the spirit—prayer and penance—they can remove the causes of war; with grace and charity they will be able to effect a lasting bond among themselves and also to convert the heathen; "When the ways of a man shall please the Lord, He will convert even his enemies to peace." (Prov. 16, 7)

The Things That Are God's

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

Francis of Assisi, even medieval men did not yet see, at any rate in practice, that all nations are Christ's and must be converted rather than killed.

Crusaders Were Volunteers

In the Crusades, which were fought against infidels, the armies were raised by voluntary enlistments. St. Bernard, who used all his eloquence and his vast theological knowledge to gain recruits for two Crusades (41), never thought of compelling men to go to war—although he considered the cause sacred and the duty religious. The same is true of the entire Christian era. The Church, whom Liberals delight to represent as the enemy of liberty (and, of course, her human policies are always influenced historically by the shortcomings of her leaders and of each age), nevertheless protected personal liberty, in this matter at least, throughout the period of her ascendancy, while, on the other hand, the French Revolution, which claimed liberty as its own discovery, asserted the principle and began the practice that was destined to destroy liberty and reduce the whole world to a shameful slavery to militarism.

3. Machiavelli and the French Revolution

THUS, both natural ethics and moral theology had completed a long history in Europe, and the most influential part of their history, before there was any knowledge of conscription or of a moral obligation attached to it. When conscription did at length appear, it came with the decline of the Church's influence, the break-up of Christendom, and the rise of secularism. In a word, conscription is an ancient barbaric custom, repressed for centuries by the influence of the Church, which rose to life again in the ruins of Christian Europe. Significantly, it returned with the Renaissance as part of the general European movement to revive the pagan past. Its beginnings in recent times, therefore, marked a reversion to the pagan religion of State-worship as well as to the pagan ideal of the nation in arms. (42)

Machiavelli Proposed Conscription

Machiavelli was the first modern to propose universal compulsory military service. Quite apart from the lateness of the age, here certainly is a strange beginning for a moral obligation! It is, in fact, with Machiavelli that the modern concept of war, as distinguished from the medieval idea, takes its beginning: the modern concept being one of unrestricted war—physically unrestricted in the extent of its destructiveness, morally unrestricted in its rejection of ethical limitation and control. (43) Essential also to the modern idea is the use of war, not as a last resort, which was the requirement of traditional ethics, but as a normal, though alternate, means for securing national power and "honor" when diplomatic measures fail. As was to be expected, Machiavelli, true son of the Renaissance, went back to the example of pagan Rome in his study of war, finding no model for his studies during the Christian centuries. Here then, in an environment of neo-paganism, which excluded, deliberately and cynically, every breath of Christian thought and idealism, was born the idea of universal conscription.

Christian Ideals Debased

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

ironic Providence has seen to it that catastrophe and suffering should follow everywhere from the effort to realize these ideas in the debased form which made them dangerous and ultimately destructive half-truths.

4. Conscription and Democracy

THE revolutionists saw universal conscription as a concrete realization of brotherhood and equality and a measure necessary for the defense of their newly won liberty. Their choice of means was an unhappy one. (44) They did not foresee that their invention was destined in the end to destroy brotherhood by setting men all over the world at one another's throats, and that it would realize equality and freedom by making all men equal in a terrible bondage. For who are more slaves: the ancient millions who labored under the threat of a whip to build the pyramids, or the modern millions who must abandon their homes, the pursuit of happiness, and their very lives, in order to take up arms and kill their fellow slaves? This in the service of a demonic god, like Moloch of the Carthaginians, who is satisfied only with the blood of human victims! There might have been more liberty and brotherhood in the world today had the revolutionists possessed sufficient spiritual perception to distinguish the dross from the ideal in their aspirations. But the revolutionary ideals were betrayed in their beginnings. The bourgeoisie—the rich, the merchants, the manufacturers—these are the ones, so historians are now able to see clearly, who gained freedom by the Revolution; but not the poor, not the workers and peasants, not the common man—even today these have not achieved freedom in the great democratic nations, although they are told otherwise by their masters. Thus the revolutionary ideal of brotherhood was inadequate, partial, even hypocritical. What wonder, then, that under a concept of equality and fraternity, which holds as a theory that all men have a duty to die for their country, only a few are called on actually to give up their lives (and these the young, the immature, and the powerless), while their brothers continue, not only to live, but also to live in comfort that is materially increased by war.

Majority Cannot Determine Morality

Conscription must likewise be attributed in great measure to the immoral doctrine of the revolutionary philosophers which holds that the will of a majority of the people is the absolute and final arbiter of right and wrong. (45) Only through this doctrine could compulsion be given to military service. From then until now, a majority vote, and not an objective standard of morality, has determined the rightness of conscription. Now if the majority vote is a convenient method for determining the details of social life, it is not, of itself, in questions that involve moral judgment, a sufficient support for a moral obligation, but requires a deeper basis in natural or divine law. Indeed, apart from this deeper basis, the majority vote is but the voice of the tribe, the articulation of a primitive blood-bond. As such its ethical justification is not to be found in reason or the Gospel, but rather in a return to the tribal morality of uncivilized nations. Ultimately, therefore, the moral sanction of conscription is no higher than that of the blood pacts and blood feuds of primitive peoples, by which they were "bound" to avenge in blood the lives of their fellow tribesmen. (46)

Conscription Inimical to Democracy

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

The whole history of the movement to spread democratic liberties confirms what is said here of the opposition between democracy and conscription. For example, the spread of democratic liberties in the nineteenth century was chiefly retarded, as in Germany and Hungary, by the

growth of nationalism and its inseparable instrument, militarism. Again, it is in the least democratic and most autocratic nations that conscription has reached its highest perfection: Napoleonic France, Prussia and the German Empire of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Nazi Germany, and Russia under Stalin, which "in fact, has come nearer the goal of the nation in arms than any other nation in history." (47) England and the United States, on the contrary, the two great democracies, were the last to adopt conscription; and they did so only under "necessity" and with great reluctance. It does not speak well for the democracies that they had to learn their democratic duties from autocrats and dictators.

5. Consequence of Conscription for Civilization

IN view of this history, it will hardly be suggested that the discovery of conscription in modern times, like the slow recognition of religious and other human rights, is an example of that moral development which, after a long passage of time, gradually brings to light some great moral truth or law, present indeed among men from the beginning, but concealed for centuries under a mass of error and evil custom. Even secular historians see in militarism, and therefore in conscription, which is the extremity of militarism, one of the most unfortunate events of the whole nineteenth century. Can such a development, everywhere acknowledged as deplorable, be traceable to rectitude of conscience or a sense of moral duty? Duty to the State as to an absolute end is inspired, not by justice or true patriotism, but by a disordered nationalism. You may see this concept of duty perfected and exemplified in modern times by the Prussian officers' corps. (48)

The Prussian Example

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

6. The Position of the Holy See

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

longer. Can this be the normal condition of human society?" (49) Note that the Pope's condemnation resumes the arguments that we have set down in Part II; conscription has an evil moral effect on youth, it removes them from their rightful callings; it upsets the normal order of society.

Disarmament a Fundamental Point

Later Pope Benedict XV added more clearly and expressly to this indictment that conscription is itself a cause of war. The latter Pontiff in his famous *Des le Debut*, published in the midst of the First World War (August, 1917) and pleading with the nations to lay down their arms and negotiate for peace, stipulated that disarmament is a necessary condition for true peace. Cardinal Gasparri, then the Papal Secretary of State, some time later gave an official interpretation of this condition in letters sent to Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England, and to Archbishop Chesnelong of Sens. (50) According to this interpretation, disarmament did not mean merely the scrapping of a few battleships, which can be but too easily rebuilt, but the ending of compulsory military service. Since only by compulsory service are governments able to raise the huge armies necessary for modern wars, so only by putting an end to this practice can these wars be stopped. The Pontiff cited the pre-war example of England to show that conscription is not normally necessary for national security. Disarmament is also one of the five fundamental points required for a just and lasting peace by Pope Pius XII. (51)

Papal Position Clear

Surprisingly enough, if it is usual to regard the acceptance of conscription as the fulfillment of a moral and patriotic duty, the Holy See attacks the practice, as a recent commentator points out (52), precisely on the grounds that it is anti-patriotic. In other words, although the Holy See does not deny that war may be theoretically justified and that soldiering is not intrinsically evil, nevertheless it holds that both are extrinsically evil because of the great harm they bring upon the whole world and upon individual countries. Compulsory military service, as the very extreme of militarism, brings such grave dangers to a nation's youth and such serious dislocation to public order that, quite apart from its evil effects on international society, it is opposed to the best interests of the countries that adopt it, and therefore, far from being the fulfillment of a patriotic duty, it is in truth opposed to true patriotism. Those who maintain that conscription is based on moral duty find no support in the teaching of the Popes. Here, as a matter of fact, is the culminating argument against conscription, an argument *ad hominem*, namely that it is directly opposed to the patriotic good that it claims to procure. When we say, therefore as we did in the beginning of this article, that moral teachers have generally failed to give due attention to the problem of war, it must be added that however remiss lesser moral teachers have been in condemning and even in considering conscription, the Sovereign Pontiffs, the highest moral authority on earth, have been constantly faithful to their high mission of peace and have consistently given clear directives to the world. The trouble has been that Catholics within the several countries, too much influenced by nationalism themselves, have failed to follow, to interpret, and to apply the directives thus given to them by the Vicar of Christ. (53)

To summarize and conclude: On the plane of ethics, conscription must be condemned as opposed to democratic principles, as an infringement upon individual rights, a violation of the family, and as contradicting the patriotic duty that citizens

owe to the State itself. On a higher plane of truth and conduct we may say that conscription, since it is the chief element of militarism, and this in turn is the invariable instrument of exaggerated nationalism, is destructive of that international union of peoples which is demanded by Christian charity and implied in the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ.

Footnotes

- (1) See Msgr. George Barry O'Toole, *War and Conscription at the Bar of Christian Morals* (Catholic Worker Press, N. Y.). The opinions of several other authors are summarized in *National Patriotism in Papal Teaching*, by John J. Wright, p. 180 et seq. (Newman, 1943). Also John Eppstein, *The Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations*, pp. 133-134 (London, Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1935).
- (2) We do not mean here—and this is to be carefully noted—that the calling of soldier is as such evil. What we mean is that in fact the actual circumstances of modern conscription and war invariably tend to make it extrinsically evil. And of course the soldier as such is an abstraction that exists only in a philosopher's brain. He is a kind of "laboratory" man, like the "economic man" or "man in the state of pure nature"; he has no passions and no morally determining purposes, and he is remote from all the actual circumstances of human life. But the soldier in reality has passions and weaknesses, he works for motives that have moral significance, performs actions that are good or evil, uses means that are just or unjust: it is less difficult for him to deviate from the line of righteousness!
- (3) Gal. 3, 28.
- (4) See the articles on "Conscription" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and the *Americana*.
- (5) See *Makers of Modern Strategy*, by Edward Meade Earle, pp. 73, 74, 77. (Princeton, 1944.)
- (6) Carlton Hayes, *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, Vol. II p. 689. (Macmillan, 1935.)
- (7) Of these, 2,000,000 "volunteered"; but because they volunteered only under threat of conscription, they are numbered with the conscripts.
- (8) See *Makers of Modern Strategy*, by Edward Meade Earle p. 355 (Princeton 1944).
- (9) James B. Reston, *New York Times Magazine*, January 28, 1944.
- (10) "The Morality of Conscientious Objection to War," p. 25 (A report of the Ethics Committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace—N.C.W.C.—Washington).
- (11) This is conceded here for purposes of argument without intending however to acknowledge its truth—*dato non concessio*, as the Scholastics would say. So much may be conceded here without diminishing the force of the main argument. However, if there is any truth in the principles of democracy even this concession may be too much. For a discussion of conscription vs. democracy, see Part III.
- (12) In other words, the conclusion is not true if it is understood in a wider or looser sense—the material sense. Yet it is in the material sense that it is understood, and must be understood, by defenders of conscription.
- (13) Pius XI *Quadragesimo Anno*.
- (14) Jacques Maritain, *Three Reformers*, p. 195. (Scribners, 1929) For a development of this distinction between individual and person this work of Maritain can profitably be read (pp. 14-28; also the notes). Likewise his *Freedom in the Modern World*, pp. 46-54 (Sheed and Ward, 1935). Be it noted that in quoting this author it is not intended to claim his support for the conclusions that follow. As a matter of fact he thinks differently. He is quoted because he gives an authoritative, reliable and disinterested statement of the principles involved.
- (15) I II, 21, 4 ad 3: "Homo non ordinatur ad communitatem politicam secundum omnia sua."
- (16) I, 29, 3.
- (17) Cfr. Pius XI, *Divini Redemptoris*: "Society is for man and not vice versa." Of course this axiom must be understood right, according to the explanation given by the Pope. It is not a justification of anarchy. Relevant to the present subject are these words: "but on final analysis . . . Society is made for man, that he may recognize this reflection of God's perfection, and refer it in praise and adoration to the Creator. Only man, the human person, and not society in any form is endowed with reason and a morally free will."
- (18) Maritain, *op. cit.*, p. 195, Note 28 (Italics ours).
- (19) II II, 104, 5, c.
- (20) Leo XIII, *Sapientiae Christianae*.
- (21) Pius XI *Divini Redemptoris* (On Atheistic Communism). It should also be noted that the Church has condemned the Liberal teaching that the end of the State is amoral and that the State therefore is without responsibility to the spiritual interests of its citizens. Cfr. Leo XIII, *Libertas Humana*.
- (22) Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*. Bear in mind also the words of Pius XI, quoted above: "Society on the other hand cannot defraud man of his God-granted rights . . . Nor can society systematically void these rights by making their use impossible."—*Divini Redemptoris*.
- (23) This and the previous quotation are taken from de Victoria's *On the Law of War*, Paragraphs 33 and 38 respectively. (Classics of International Law, edited by James Scott Brown, Washington, D. C., 1917.) Mark carefully that in condemning conscription we do not condemn the vocation of the soldier as such, but conscription in its actual present-day circumstances. See footnote 2, Part I.
- (24) The major premise of the argument is: "The State has no rights over human personality." The minor premise is "But universal conscription by State authority violates the rights of personality." And the conclusion: "Therefore universal conscription is unjust and immoral." [Note: there is no footnote reference numbered 25—Ed.]

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

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

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

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

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

(31) From a pamphlet distributed in American Army camps.

(32) According to an article published in "The Reader's Digest," (Nov. 1943): *Murder in His Business*, and originally taken from the N. Y. Herald Tribune. (Italics ours).

(33) *Time*, Aug. 7, 1944.

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

(35) II, II, 194, 5, c.

(36) *Casti Conubii*.

(37) St. Thomas, *op. cit.*

(38) *Casti Conubii*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(49) *Apostolic Letter Praeclarae Gratulationis*. See *Principles of Peace*, p. 88. (Milwaukee, 1943.)

(50) See *Principles of Peace*, pp. 235-239.

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

(52) John J. Wright, *National Patriotism in Papal Teaching*, p. 180. (Newman Book Shop, Westminster, Md., 1940). The whole of Chapter Five, Part 2, should be read on this point.

(53) On this point see Eppstein, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

WHAT YOU CAN DO ABOUT IT

You can do your part in the fight against conscription by helping to circulate this and other issues of the Catholic Worker. That is not easy to do, but it is necessary and important work. We do it in New York, and it is the most effective method we know of here for spreading the ideas to which our work is dedicated. Sometimes we are able to sell as many as a hundred papers an hour on busy corners such as 34th and Broadway. Maybe there aren't opportunities to circulate that many where you live, but there are opportunities of one kind or another wherever you are. Letters from our fellow-workers have told of gratifying results in winning new friends and readers, who have taken up with enthusiasm some phase of the work we have been advocating, such as sending food and clothing to Europe, or performing the works of mercy for closer neighbors.

We have had 73,000 copies of this issue printed, which means

we have about 11,000 extra copies available for circulation by our readers who wish to help to defeat the plan for universal military training. If you are willing to go out into the highways and the byways, as the early Christians did, to broadcast the message of the gospel of peace, send for as many papers as you can distribute. The price is one cent per copy, plus postage. If you are in or near New York, come to 115 Mott St. and help with our street sale work.

We believe that the text of this article should be preserved in a form that will be more permanent than this supplement. For this reason, we are having the type held by our printer, and we hope to hear from friends who will be interested in helping to finance the printing of about 3,000 copies in pamphlet format.

If students interested in debating or discussing conscription and related subjects will get in touch with us, we will send speakers to their schools or colleges.

THE EDITORS.

...PAX COLUMN...

With a tiresome, if unconscious stupidity, we fail to see that we live in fear because we live in a violent world—that the root problem comes from the failure to accept the pacifist precepts enunciated by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount. That if these principles became the motivating force of individuals and nations and constituted the procedural pattern of ideologies there would be no hysterical fear of Catholic for Communist, of Protestant for Catholic. If we, as Catholics, were to fully realize the pacifist teachings of the faith to which we adhere, if we could look for the day when these truths, contained implicitly in the deposit of faith, would be proclaimed explicitly, then indeed would we have a powerful and dynamic coherence, a unity in procedure which has hitherto been lacking. Then our diocesan papers would cease to inflame the faithful against other ideologies and, though pointing out the errors of those who have embraced a materialistic faith, would yet oppose as well any recourse to war, any defense of the Church that is pursued at the expense of mortal sin.

Freely

For we go to God freely or we do not go at all, there is no merit that can be attached to a preservation of the Faith through force. The Church would indeed exist after such a "victory" but it would exist as buildings, as a mere venture in real estate. There would be a dreary uniformity of forced opinion, it would be religion by edict. It is only too often that we can be justly accused of having a selective concern for freedom, that we issue edicts against voting for Communists but not against Nazis, that a rightful intolerance of error is carried over into an intolerance of persons, to a factual disregard for the rights of the individual conscience, to a tactical adherence to the separation of Church and State which we would violate if we came to power (see editorial in the April Blackfriars). Can we be certain that those who still retain a conception of Catholicism as a "culture," as the inheritor of the legalism of the Roman Empire, would not be only too anxious to establish some kind of theocracy, would not revive the very real horrors of the Inquisition? So that we, in common with the reactionary Marxists and fascists, would be covered with the blood of purges made more horrible in that they were done in the name of Him who forbade His disciples to use force even to protect His own body. This is a concern that we must take to heart, that we must not shrug off as something said in a bigoted publication like THE CHURCHMAN or THE PROTESTANT.

For it is an error that can only too easily creep into any system that adheres to absolutes. Truth becomes so evident to the adherent of any such system that there develops an impatience with those who have not as yet seen their way clear to acceptance. It leads to an intellectual sadism that expresses itself in torture chambers. The torture chambers of the fascists and marxists and political religionists such as Franco. It is utterly alien to the spirit of Christ, it cannot be baptized by aristotelian logic. It still remains true that we approach God freely or not at all—that we spread Christianity by love, not by torture. That we gain nothing for the Church by violating the sanctity of the individual conscience, that we should indeed proselytize and propose Catholicism and adhere to absolutes but that one of the absolutes to which we adhere should be the pacifism of the Sermon on the Mount, that that should be our program of action and that it is a superior action to that of edicts and political directives. That it is indeed the trump card for there is no answer to it in the ultimate sense, in the long run it will be those who proceed in non-violence who will triumph, for indeed those who use the sword will perish by it.

Absolutes

Catholics and Communists are

quite correct in adhering to objective truths. That is what gives coherence and dynamism to the Communist revolution, it is what should give a more revolutionary and dynamic character to Catholics—for, in the field of values, we possess the truth whereas materialistic Marxists are in error. As are also those in error who admit the existence of God as an absolute but would hold Him as a sort of convenient fixative around which relative truths circulate. Who find no difficulty in accepting one absolute but raise insuperable obstacles to accepting the truths that emanate from this fixative. Who accept God but not His incarnation in Christ or the continuation of that incarnation in the Church. The truths that are revealed from the Absolute are not relative inasmuch as acceptance of them is unavoidably bound up with acceptance of the Source of these truths. Acceptance of Christ should entail acceptance of those ordinary means of grace which He instituted and which are administered by the Catholic Church—that is one reason why it is so important that the Church be not identified with any particular culture or wedded to any specific political party or form of government. If it was possible for her to establish a modus vivendi with fascism or capitalist states, both of which are materialistic and atheistic, then it would be folly to proceed on the assumption that a modus vivendi is impossible with a Communist government. Not that I believe Catholics, as individuals, should not oppose all these forms of State government, but that such opposition should come, not from directives handed down from the hierarchy, but from the incompatibility of the capitalist-fascist-marxist, materialistic philosophies with Christianity. Their erroneous conception of man and their denial of man's responsibility to God. So that, rejecting the absolutes of Christianity they substitute for them economic or nationalist programs which are converted into absolutes. Man takes the place of God, and man, as an individual, is enslaved to the State which is set up as representing him. Subjection to God is not servility, for it is the subjection of a creature to his creator. But subjection to the modern State is servility, for it is subjection to a creature whose claims exceed reason and whose domination of the person of man rests as a tyranny. Opposition to such tyranny, if it is to be Christian, must proceed along the lines of non-violence, of non-cooperation—if it is not pacifist then it will have within the very means used the spirit of that tyranny it sets out to oppose. Man, in his nature, has possibilities of good and evil and to pursue a program by violence is to deliberately build on the evil and to accentuate it to the point where it will not be relinquished as an instrument of control, it will become the end and will be the normal procedure in any society achieved through this means.

Church and State

Catholics who do not believe in social, political or economic democracy would do well to frankly state their views rather than give a temporary lip service to democratic principles having in the back of their minds a preference for authoritarian regimes and even hoping the day will come when such a regime will be present in the society they exist in. This is particularly vicious when it would mean a theocracy—for it is neither desirable nor is it the function of the clergy to administer in the temporal order, and such an arrangement leads only too often to a false external adherence to orthodoxy which is quite contrary to the spirit of Catholicism. Moreover, it gives some substance to the accusations of those (usually bigoted) elements who would regard Catholicism as a plot of the "Black International" for the domination of the world. Nor in the concrete, in the world as it is in reality, is union of Church and State a desirable thing—for alliance with the State has

SALUTE TO MERTON

By RAYMOND E. F. LARSEN

FIGURES FOR AN APOCALYPSE, (Poems) by Thomas Merton. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions (500, Fifth Avenue, New York City): \$2.50.

The one spare pamphlet of thirty poems and the first book inclusive of them which Thomas Merton had published previous to the surprising appearance of this second collection of poems so soon after first pamphlet, first book, had been enough: they made obvious that in the Church had appeared the desired, the anticipated, yet again—a poet worth the most astute criticism within the Church, the wonder and the enthusiasm of the most lively intellectual society without. Merton is that. He is at once truly Catholic, of a substance and a detail which could not exist without the Christian province of the Church, of a devotion which could not find tongue without, yet of such exceptional liveliness of invention and resourcefulness in achieving a flowering truly poetry and intellectual prodigy, as alive and sensitive to the currents that in the times blow in hidden patterns from pole to tropics and from tropics to glacial ages of antiquity,

in the hour of a midnight watch, the moments of an afternoon, as the antennae of the flowers that resemble birds, the birds that resemble orchids. (Though his heart, therefore his images, his rhythmic pattern, the volume of implied breath that measures his line, are not strangers to the Fathers in their clefts in the rocks at prayer, yet his is no poetry of pedantry which must be handled under glass lest the dried-flower-iridescent and faded spectrum in moist air, agitated by living breath, injure the tone and tawn, or the inexpert, examining hand break the scentless flower, or injure the dustward leaf. His is a poetry more alive than the cola signs and it is earlier, more lasting and later news than the diesel streamline chassis on preview. It can stand the proximity of the headlines and the next issues of "Fortune" and "View." "Transition" cannot move it from the scene.) Nor can it be nudged into sucked insignificance by the cribbings and thieveries that perchance seek to achieve from it some semblance of being the live and veritable poetry of our time, posed in the right brand of tights

of the earlier, outmoded vaudeville, before exactly the right suggestion of the decor of the heartier writers of quatrains, the heftier troubadours. I'd rather it on the zepplin which nightly advertises the current film at The Paramount than quotations from Shakespeare: it has read the newspapers during the hour for relaxation after the vigil and the prayers; it has heard the news bulletins over the radio underscore *The Veritable Word*; and the newsreels, one remarks from reading it, have not been without a footnote significance to what it more hugely and lastingly contains of substance. It is: it would be of the permanent, true tradition and stream of Poetry as much in the period of Herbert and of Donne (who would not overlook its wit) as it would be in the mouths of Racine or Verlaine; Baudelaire could not have ignored it, Alice Meynell could not have failed to discern its singular excellences, or its eccentric, occasional ineptitudes; and Dante would, I think, have found it poetry and living speech. It now has happened: happen the greater poems by Merton subsequently now can.

ON PILGRIMAGE

(Continued from page 2)
for the festive season, and it was pure beauty that strengthened the heart to learn to love.

There was just a handful of us there, since we have not begun to send out our retreat notices for the year. We are urging our friends to study the following dates and figure out their vacations, and try to plan to spend some time with us this summer and fall. We are hoping to have two study weeks with Fr. Victor White, former editor of Blackfriars in England, and Fr. Oesterreicher of Austria. The latter week will be devoted to Scripture. I'm going to ask Fr. White to tell us about Eric Gill, his life and work, as part of his week, since Mrs. Gill wrote recently and told us he had long

meant alliance with mammon, a compromise with the spirit of the world, an apostasy from the spirit of Christ. It means indulging in all the miserable plays for power, political maneuverings and balances of power that characterizes the governments of this world. It has meant religious (ecclesiastical) sanction for murder, plunder, rape and slavery. Because allegiance to the respective States was exalted as a religious duty—even when that allegiance was to the State engaged in enterprises like war which are at variance with Christian principles.

Free Men

Essentially this thing boils down to a matter of attitude—to whether our guiding principles are going to be the precepts of love and non-violence laid down by Christ or whether they are going to be those accepted by materialist politicians and self-seekers in the world. If it is the latter then we will fall in with the current war hysteria and take up arms against Russia. If it is the former we will oppose war and conscription and refuse to take up arms against Russia or any other country. We will be guided by values that have transcendental sanction and not by the concrete realities of practical politics. We will ask first what Christ would have us do and not whether we should preserve the American way of life—and we will wish the Church to triumph, but only by means that flow from the Sermon on the Mount, that respect of all men of good will, that forces no beliefs on anyone, that will be indifferent to the approval of the world and not seek special concessions and wrangle for privilege. We will have all men arrive as free men to their final end in God.

Robert C. Ludlow.

been an old friend of the family. His articles on psychiatry in Blackfriars have been followed with great interest by many of our group.

MAY 1 there will be a study week-end on WORK.

MEMORIAL DAY week-end there will be a retreat for men conducted by Fr. Francis Meenan, Holy Ghost Father-from Norwalk.

JUNE 13-19—first study week.

JULY 4th weekend—a basic retreat for women.

JULY 18—Fr. Veales, Josephite from Washington, D. C., will give a basic retreat for men.

AUGUST 14 there will be another study week.

LABOR DAY week-end Fr. Purcell, an Augustinian, will give a retreat for families, and there will be several girls to care for the children, who will have their own little retreat at the same time. Julia Porcelli will be one of the girls, and she will have art classes for the children over the holiday. It will be a WORK week-end for the children, emphasizing the co-creative as well as the penitential aspect of work.

There will be extra week-ends and also through the fall, to be announced later.

We cannot over-emphasize the importance of these retreats and beg our readers to try to plan to come to some of them. While it is true that love sweetens all of life, and makes light of pain and suffering and brings us to the happiness we all desire, one must learn to love, and there is no place better than a retreat house to learn such lessons. We must withdraw for a time to renew our strength for the great struggle of the apostolate. Without the use of our spiritual weapon of love, which includes prayer and penance and work and poverty and suffering, our future is harsh and ugly to contemplate. Great struggles lie before us, in this era of war and revolution through which we are passing, and which we in America have not begun to suffer as yet. We must prepare, so we do beg you to come and help us. A brother helped by a brother is a strong city.

For the Poor, the Little Ones

The retreat house, of course, is not just for our readers who can afford to take train or bus and get to us for this time not only of rigor but of delight ("All the way to heaven is heaven, since He said, 'I am the Way.'") but it is also for the poor, the lame, the halt and the blind. So we recommend that you bring someone who could not otherwise make a re-

treat. We always have a few from our House of Hospitality, and come the summer, we are also going out on the highways and byways and persuade our brothers in. There is many a sick one just out of Bellevue, or off the breadline who needs "refreshment, light and peace," here and now. The retreat house is for us all, but most especially for those who can go no place else for lack of funds or because difference in race, color and creed, has kept them from this sweet rest of a retreat. God will raise up amongst us all those he wishes to work for Him, and He will give us all the strength we need for the part we all will have to play.

The Farm

The farm of ninety-six acres, attached to the retreat house, is going to provide meat and vegetables also, for our breadline at Mott street. It was a wonderful sight to see John Filliger out there on the horizon at the end of a long field, ploughing with his team and the hound dog trailing along behind. A number of the fields are ploughed now, and the greenhouse is filled with cabbages and tomato plants, not to speak of Spring salads. Hans and Charlie and Louis Owen and a new arrival by name of Murphy are busy at work these spring days and before he left Fr. Anthony blessed the house and the fields. Our chapel has been greatly enlarged, thanks to Hans Tunneson, and the conference room floor painted, and we are ready for our friends and fellow workers.

Peter

Thanks to several of our readers, Peter Maurin is going to have the hospital bed that can be cranked up at the side, and as soon as it arrives at Newburgh, Peter will be taken up to the farm again, where for some hours every day he can sit under the crab apple tree out in front of the adobe-like house which the men and the priests share. Nothing is blooming yet, no buds show green, and the wind is still harsh. But the spring sun is warming and after the desperately hard winter on Mott street, the warmth is a touch of God's love on us all.

This issue of the paper is given over so much to arguments against Universal Military Training, Conscription, and the fog of threatened war hangs so heavy over us all, we beg the prayers of all our readers that we may hold our stand with strong love, with warm love, because without it we know that all arguments will be unavailing.

—Dorothy Day

PICKING COTTON

(Continued from page 1)

we were joined by a large group of laughing Negroes of all ages. There were three whites besides myself, and one Indian.

Our destination was nine miles beyond Buckeye, which is about 80 miles west of Phoenix. After several sharp turns, when all in the truck were thrown this way and that, we came to the field. The Indian and I did not have sacks, so we rented them from the boss for a quarter.

This was tall cotton, and harder to pick than the small variety. The field was a quarter of a mile long and a mile wide. A young white man worked in one row, then the Indian, and then myself. I had never picked cotton before. The Indian, a Navajo, said this was to be clean picking, he understood.

Where the cotton was fluffy it was easy to grab, but where the boll was partly open it was difficult to extract and hurt your fingers. As we worked along the row from the far end of the field toward the weighing scales and truck my Navajo friend said that he was learning a lesson which he sadly needed. Now he had just enough money from day to day. Before this he had spent money freely and never had to count his pennies. He paid a dollar a night for a cot in a cheap hotel in Phoenix. He had an older brother who had been quite wealthy before the depression and was a big shot among his people because of his holdings in cattle. He drank, bought fine cars. Now with the "plowing under" and rationing system of the Government he was a poor Indian indeed.

In speaking of the Navajo he said that they had always been poor in these last years, but that the suffering was now no greater than last year. If left to themselves in sheep and cattle raising and in growing corn they would be able to get along. But the Government restrictions as to grazing and its refusal to provide schools for the Navajo according to treaty had given them little to do in their spare time except to succumb to the temptations of liquor and the allurements of the cities. The recent provision of half a million for food from Congress was coupled with three times that amount to "rehabilitate" the Navajo. This was another word for jobs for the white bureaucrats to feed on the misery of the Indian with boondoggling experiments.

Navajos do not eat fish, bear, pork; in fact any animal that does not eat grass is not "clean" to them. They will not kill a coyote for the bounty as do the whites.

We had worked three hours and took our cotton in to be weighed. I had 30 pounds and he had 42. The white man near us had 85. In talking over this discrepancy we found that we had been picking only the clean white cotton, while the more experienced pickers picked the bolls along with the cotton and more than doubled the weight.

As we waited our turn for weighing our cotton, groups were shooting dice in the roadway. A Negro woman served coffee, chili, pie, weiners, etc., at reasonable prices. Some of the truck drivers sold food to their passengers.

Returning to the field we picked in more of an orthodox fashion, and in the total 5½ hours the Navajo picked 82 pounds and I picked 62. Before we left I gave him the Catholic Worker to read with my letter about the Hopi refusing to go to war.

The next morning I met my Navajo friend beside the bonfire at 2d and Madison. The truck of Negroes did not go out on Sunday. One truck took only those who had sacks. I got in a small pickup which headed westward about 30 miles to Litchfield Park.

Several young girls kept us merry with songs. When we arrived at the field my Navajo friend came in on another truck. We happened to get sacks at different times, so did not work together.

An old man said that the rule here was "rough picking," which meant everything that had white in it, but no stems or leaves. When I emptied my sack I had 54 pounds. The man next to me seemed to work rather expertly, and I asked him what time they quit on weekdays here. He replied that he only came on Sundays. "Make \$1.25 an hour at my job in town, and time and half overtime."

I commented that unless a person had a large family that was a good wage.

"I don't work here for the money," he continued. "I just come out here so I can keep sober. Was drunk from Christmas until yesterday—ten days. I can keep sober if I'm working, but I can't stand to be quiet or to loaf. And as I have eight kids, I need to keep working."

There was not much cotton left to pick in this field, and the word went around that we would quit about 2 p.m. At that time my second sack weighed 31 pounds, which, after paying for my sack, netted me \$2.23. My Navajo friend had not done so well, picking only 68 pounds. He said he had liked my reference to the Hopi in the Catholic Worker.

As we were going into town in the truck the man who picked cotton to keep sober was discussing the merits of different brands of liquor with another picker. This man was telling of going to a town upon receiving a paycheck as a "gandy-dancer" on the railroad, going to the police and asking them how much the fine was for being "drunk and disorderly." They said it was \$17.50, so he paid it at once, for he intended to get drunk and disorderly. I did not hear the rest of the story, for the truck soon passed lateral 20, nearby where I lived, and I proceeded homeward with \$3.93 for two part days spent in the cotton fields.

Later in the day, sitting in my doorway, resting, I was asked by a man who drove up in a car to work for him for a week irrigating, at \$7.20 per day. Gladly I was willing to let this two part days of cotton picking suffice. Good pickers can make from \$8 to \$12 a day, but I was not in that class.

MARSHALL PLAN

Paris, France.

Dear Miss Day:

Mrs. Kennedy had advised me that you were about to send me a subscription to your paper, the first number of which I received today.

I had already seen several copies at the C.F.T.C. (French Confederation of Christian Workers), where I am employed and had noted its timeliness.

I thank you heartily for the help you are giving me through your publication and shall make it known among my associates, if that is agreeable to you?

I was particularly impressed by a recent editorial on the Marshall Plan, an article thoroughly imbued with a true Christian spirit. This I have brought to the attention of two French reviewers in the hope that they may spread this testimony of America's social Catholicism.

I rejoice in this establishment of contact between us and beg you to accept the assurance of my complete sympathy.

J. ETEVENON.

Mott Street

(Continued from page 2)

and left. Charley O'Rourke, who was quite amused by the blast, said that the seaman was good for our humility and hoped that he returned soon again. We simply groaned and gasped that there must be an easier path to humility.

Peace

As is everyone else, I am becoming more and more discouraged about any continuing peace. All the newspapers seem to be screaming for war and none attempt to offer a peaceful solution for the relations between this country and Russia. About the only exception to this war mongering is Max Lerner in PM. He claimed that we should make some definite attempts to get together with Russia and try to come to a peaceful solution of our mutual problems. With the passage of time this will become increasingly difficult due to the constant hate campaign that is being launched in this country against the Russian people. And yet when you talk to individuals they will agree that we don't want war but shrug their shoulders moaning what can one do in the face of such things. Well, each one of us can and has a duty to write to all people in Congress demanding that we be kept out of war and we can also discourage all groups or individuals who seem bent on driving us to war. Some time ago some one made the suggestion that in such times of crisis as this the leaders of the countries involved should be locked up in a room until they had arrived at a peaceful solution.

Enemies?

And now the stage has arrived that anyone who persists in preserving the little peace we have left is labeled a communist or an enemy of the state. It is constantly pointed out that this is no time for idealists since they are completely impractical, however it isn't pointed out that it is the so-called practical people that have ensnared us in the present day mess. We would be very interested to note the reaction of the people to a presidential candidate who would use the Sermon on the Mount as his political platform. What a crackpot and enemy of the state he would be called. Nevertheless he would be in fine company since the early Christians were also tagged enemies of the state.

Response

The returns of the spring appeal have been hopeful thus far and we have been around distributing a little here and there to our creditors. And we are extremely grateful to all our dear readers who sent in money to purchase a hospital cot for Peter Maurin, and, as they say in business circles, we are now negotiating for a suitable bed. Since we have had such success with obtaining the wherewith for Peter's bed our courage is renewed sufficiently to beg again for a truck or a station wagon. It is simply impossible to manage without some sort of conveyance.

Thomas Committee

This morning while one of the members of our group was selling our paper on the streets, up town, he was stopped by a woman who inquired as to the policy of the Catholic Worker. She refused to accept the explanation of our man and made it quite clear that our paper was vicious in her opinion. She also stated that she intended to have the Thomas Committee investigate us. And now we are thumbing through Emily Post for instructions as to how to go about welcoming the Thomas Committee, we will probably discover to our dismay that we will have to run a carpet from our office down to the curbstone. And to be quite proper we will have to do something about concealing the garbage cans on the sidewalks, the rats scurrying through our passageway and those huge cats who are continually pole vaulting over our

Easy Essay

(Continued from page 1)

2. Social revolutions cease to be revolutions when social revolutionaries cease to use pure means.

3. As Emile Zola says: "The pure means are the strongest means."

9. WORK OF THE FEW

1. It is not true to say that all men must be changed before the social system can be changed.

2. Revolutions are the work of a group of men generally few. Who throw all their energies in the work of revolution.

10. RIGOROUS DISCIPLINE

1. Russian Bolsheviks saw it clearly.

2. They made of their Party a kind of brotherhood imposing on their members a rigorous discipline.

3. They tried in their way to renew the basis of the moral life of the people.

11. APPEALING APPEAL

1. What impresses us most in the Russian Revolution is not the appeal to pride and violence.

2. It is the appeal to poverty and suffering willingly accepted for the sake of an ideal.

12. FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

1. The general tendency of dialectic materialism is to conceive matter as the source from which flow such qualities as freedom and spontaneity.

2. Freedom and spontaneity we recognized as necessary concepts in the building up of the revolutionary spirit.

13. AN HEROIC IDEAL

1. The weakness of such a conception is to destroy in the souls of men the notion of truth.

2. While they try to present it as a scientific conception it is an admission that no social transformation can be brought about without the fostering of an heroic ideal.

14. CHRISTIAN HEROISMS

1. But the greatest heroism is the heroism of love.

2. The heroism of the cross must be expressed in the social field besides the heroism of Bolshevism and Fascism.

3. But Christian heroism must remain Christian heroism even when expressed in the social field.

15. FROM THE HEART OF GOD

1. Christian heroism must be exercised not only in private life but also in social life.

2. Christian heroism comes from the heart of a God made man, scorned by men, crucified by men.

16. TRANSFORMING SOCIETY

1. As during the Middle Ages Christians must again transform society.

2. But the strength and greatness of this transformation must spring from elsewhere.

3. Great social undertakings must not be the monopoly of Fascists and Bolsheviks.

17. PROTECTING SOULS

1. The protection of souls is the work of the Church.

2. To assure this protection the Church is sometimes obliged to deal

courtyard fence to the abandoned building next door.

Cardinal Suchard

In the May issue we hope to review Cardinal Suchard's book, "Growth or Decline." From all comments it is one of the best things written in the past twenty-five years. So if you haven't read it be sure to do so at the first opportunity.

—Tom Sullivan

with temporal powers which are far from being as they should be.

3. Blind is the one who blames the Church for doing so.

4. Christ was not asked to change water into wine or multiply the loaves when nailed to the Cross.

18. BELIEVING BEFORE SEEING

1. Greater things than miracles are happening on this occasion.

2. Resurrection will come but after three days.

3. Asking for miracles on those occasions is to reverse the order of things.

4. One cannot see before believing but one must believe before one can see.

19. CHRISTIAN TRANSFORMATION

1. Will a Christian transformation of the social order come to realization in this century?

2. A Christian transformation cannot come about in the same way that other transformations come about.

3. A Christian transformation will be the product of Christian heroism.

CHESTERTON'S ROLAND

Chesterton, in his introduction to a recent very readable translation of the French epic, "The Song of Roland," into English assonant verse, remarks that there were no conscientious objectors among the Christians of that period. We might well inquire how far the prevailing opinions in the court of Charlemagne should be allowed to influence us in forming our conscience on questions of militarism and pacifism.

Will we never learn that Catholic means Universal and that Christ did not break the bonds which confined the true worship of God to the descendants of Jacob and their associates in order to establish a new chosen race in the West?

The indignant Apostles asked Christ whether they should summon fire from heaven upon an inhospitable city, after the manner of the great prophet, St. Elias, but the Lord told them: "You know not of what spirit you are."

We can well understand the conditions which led the contemporaries of Charlemagne to hold such views as are expressed in the "Song of Roland," but we will certainly show less understanding of the spirit of Christ than the Apostles did in the incident just mentioned above, if we think to spread or even defend Christianity not by invoking fire from heaven, but by methods of mass extermination of which the most spectacular means is the atomic bomb.

We are not allowed to hate anyone. I cannot see how a Catholic who seriously tried to avoid sin could long remain in military service as we know it today without losing his mind, or suffering martyrdom. If it be treason against Christianity to say that there are certain means which must not be used in its defense no matter how ruthless its enemies may be, then Christ and the Holy Martyrs would be the first to incur such a charge.

Let us not allow the great thrill of the French epic to befuddle our brains so that we are betrayed either into a narrow identification of the cause of Christ with any nation or group of nations or into a shortsighted reliance on the weapons of this world which His Holiness the Pope has clearly warned us can only destroy and can decide no question except who survives.

Allan C. Bates.